https://doi.org/10.56572/gjoee.2024.37.2.0016 Gujarat Journal of Extension Education Vol. 37 : Issue 2 : June 24

ASCERTAIN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN YOUTUBE USER FARMERS AND THEIR UTILITY PERCEPTION

Abhijeet Sarje[1], V. S. Manvar[2] and R. P. Kadam[3]

1 Ph.D. Scholar, Dept. of Agricultural Extension and Communication, AAU, Anand-388110
2 Assistant Professor, Department of Community Extension and Communication Management College of Community Science, V.N.M.K.V., Parbhani-431 402
3 Head, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, College of Agriculture, V.N.M.K.V., Parbhani-431 402
E-mail; sarjeabhijeet@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in Maharashtra's Parbhani district, 120 farmers who were users of YouTube were surveyed. The results show that the majority of respondents belonged to middle age group having high school level education belonged to medium family size with small size land holding having low social participation with high extension contact, medium level innovativeness, medium level source of information who possess good network connectivity and medium level for possession of ICT tools. The study aimed to understand the relationship between various independent variables and the utility perception of YouTube. The analysis revealed noteworthy relationships between independent variables and utility perception. The variables namely education, social participation, extension contact, innovativeness, source of information, network connectivity and possession of ICT tools were positively and significantly related to utility perception of YouTube. Whereas, family size and land holding did not show any significant relationship with utility perception of YouTube. However, age of the respondents was significantly negative relationship with utility perception of YouTube.

Keywords: *utility perception, youtube, farmers, relationship*

INTRODUCTION

In today's world, social media plays a significant role in shaping how people communicate, share information, and connect with others. The concept of social media revolves around online platforms that facilitate the creation, sharing and exchange of user-generated content. In Social media applications, YouTube is one of the most widely used applications in audio-visual form of content source. Social media and YouTube are two distinct but interconnected components of the online landscape, each serving unique purposes and playing significant roles in how people consume and share content. Social media are tools meant for digital communication that aids in the interaction among a group of people and acts as information exchange media across the globe. Since ages newspapers, television, and magazines have been the most used source of information in the agriculture sector. But now the power of the 21st century is literally in our hands. Platforms like Facebook, YouTube, and WhatsApp have 2.6 billion, 2 billion, and 1.6 billion active monthly users respectively as of 2020.

YouTube is a video-sharing platform with a mission to give everyone a voice and show them the world and is based on four values: Freedom of expression, Freedom of information, Freedom of opportunity, and Freedom of belonging. Users can upload and watch the videos, and there is provision for sharing and commenting on videos with additional facilities for the subscription of other users.

OBJECTIVES

(1) To study the profile of the YouTube users

(2) To delineate relationship between profile of the YouTube users with their utility perception of YouTube

METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted in the Parbhani district purposively as a Headquarter of the University where farmers are using newly developed apps by the university who are interested in social media for collecting farm information. Two talukas viz Parbhani and Manwath were selected randomly for the study. Ten villages were randomly selected from the Parbhani taluka viz., Raipur, Ithlapur Deshmukh, Pedgaon, Dharmapuri and Shendra from Manwath taluka viz., Tadborgaon, Kolha, Kharba , Rudhi and Raipur. Twelve user farmers of YouTube were selected randomly from each village. Thus, a total of 120 respondents were selected as sample respondents for the study.

Ex-post facto research approach was used for the

present study and one-shot case study research design was used, Kerlinger (1976) stated that ex post facto approach and the independent variables have already occurred and created the impact. The interview schedule was prepared for collecting data from the respondents. Data was collected in face-to-face situations by personally contacting the random smartphone user farmers. Before actually seeking the information, the researcher was introduced himself with farmers and narrates the objectives of present study. The pretested interview schedule was then used for data collection. A pre-tested structured interview schedule was used for collection of data. The respondents were interviewed generally at their homes or at shops and on the farms, work places. Schedule was administrated to the respondents and responses were marked in their presence to verify the accuracy and validity of the recorded responses. The statistical tools used for the analysis of the data were percentage, mean, standard deviation, correlation coefficient.

Age

Table 1 revealed that majority of the respondents (58.34%) were middle aged (28-50 years), followed by 20.83 per cent and 20.83 per cent of them were young (up to 28 years) and old age (50 years & above), respectively. This shows that, majority of respondents were from middle age group. The reason might be that most of the smart mobile users are youngers and well aware about handling of mobile. These findings are similar with the findings of Naganikar (2005), Sarnaik et al. (2008), Mangal Shinde (2016) and Babu (2018).

Education

It has been reported from Table 1 that maximum (40.83%) respondents had middle school level, followed by High school level (25.00%), education primary level (20.00%), graduate level (10.00%), can read and write (2.51%), can read only (1.66%) and illiterate (0%). The finding suggest that majority of respondents were having High school level education group followed by primary level. The reason might be that, at least high school education is necessary for handling of the smart phones. Mobile users' farmers were selected purposively for the study. These findings are similar with the findings of Gurav et al. (2010), Bairagi et al. (2011), George and Kumar (2015) and Sivraj et al. (2017).

Family size

It has been observed from Table 1 that majority (65.00%) respondents belonged to medium family size. Whereas 25.84 per cent from small family size and 9.16 per cent respondents to large family size. It shows that, majority

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Profile of YouTube user farmers (n=120)

Sr. No.	Category	Frequency	Per cent
1	**Age**		
	Young age (Up to 29 years)	25	20.83
	Middle age (30 to 50 years)	70	58.34
	Old age (Above 50 years)	25	20.83
2	**Education**		
	Illiterate	0	0
	Can read	2	1.66
	Can read and write	3	2.51
	Primary school level	24	20
	Middle school level	49	40.83
	High school level	30	25
	Graduate	12	10
3	**Family size**		
	Small (Up to 4)	31	25.84
	Medium (5 to 8)	78	65.00
	Large (9 and above)	11	9.16
4	**Land holding**		
	Marginal (Up to 1 ha)	36	30.00
	Small (1.1 to 2 ha)	50	41.66
	Semi Medium (2.1 to 4 ha)	30	25.00
	Medium (4.1 to 10 ha)	3	2.5
	Large (10.1 ha & above)	01	0.83
5	**Social participation**		
	Low (Up to 5)	84	70.00
	Medium (6 to 7)	21	17.50
	High (above 7)	15	12.50
6	**Extension contacts**		
	Low (up to 35)	24	20
	Medium (36 to 40)	44	36.67
	High (41 and above)	52	43.33
7	**Innovativeness**		
	Low (up to 8)	30	25.00
	Medium (9 to 10)	71	59.16
	High (11 and above)	19	15.83
8	**Source of Information**		
	Low (up to 16)	16	13.33
	Medium (17 to 20)	87	72.51
	High (21 and above)	17	14.16
9	**Network connectivity**		
	Poor (below 6)	40	33.33
	Good (7 to 8)	73	60.83
	Excellent (above 8)	7	5.83
10	**Possession of ICT tools**		
	Low (below 3)	11	9.166
	Medium (3 to 4)	92	76.66
	High (above 4)	17	14.16

of respondents were belong to medium family size. These findings are similar with the findings of Pattanashetti and Nithyasree (2012), Rao (2013), Raksha (2014) and Gour et al (2015).

Land holding

Table 1 revealed that maximum number of respondents (41.66%) had small size land holding (1.1 to 2 ha), followed by marginal farmers (30.00 %), semi medium farmers (25.00%), medium farmer (2.5%) and large (0.83 %). From the result, we can say that, majority of respondents were having marginal to medium size land holding, it might be due to fragmentation of land. These findings are similar with the findings of Gurav et al. (2010), Kapoor (2011), Pattanashetti and Nithyasree (2012) and Gour (2015).

Social participation

Regarding social participation of the respondents, it was observed from Table that majority (70.00%) of the respondents had low social participation followed by medium (17.50 %) and high (12.50%) social participation. This trend may be because the respondents remained busy in their farming activities and less involved in social organizations. They were sparing much time for farming activities rather than social activities. Some of the farmers have high social participation due to village level institutions. The finding from above mentioned table suggests that, majority of respondents were belong to low social participation group. These findings are similar with the findings of Patil (2007), Ghadi (2008), Shiraskar (2011), Lad (2014) and Mangal Shinde (2016).

Extension contacts

It has been observed from Table 1 that majority (43.33%) of the respondents had high extension contact category, followed by medium (36.67%) and low (20 %) level of extension contact. Thus, it could be concluded that, majority of respondents had medium extension contact. It might be due to better network of extension agencies in the study area and due to fact that most of the farmers contact with the extension workers for solving their problems. These findings are similar with the findings of Patil (2007), Ghadi (2008), Salunke (2008) and Mangal Shinde (2016).

Innovativeness

Table 1 indicated that majority of the respondents (59.16 %) had medium level of innovativeness category, followed by low innovativeness category (25.00%) and high innovativeness category (15.83%). Reason for medium level of innovativeness in the respondents might be due to majority of farmers had small land holdings with high school education and are mostly engaged in agriculture for their livelihood. These findings are similar with the findings of Sidram (2008), Chauhan (2009) Teza (2016) and Machapathri (2023).

Source of information

It has been observed from Table 1 that majority (72.51%) of the respondents had medium source of information, followed by low source of information (14.16%) and high source of information (13.33%). The finding indicates that, majority of respondents were belonged to medium level source of information. These findings are similar with the findings Ghadi (2008), Todasam (2009), Salunkhe (2011), Pawar (2013), Chavan (2016) and Machapathri (2023).

Network connectivity

Table 1 indicates distribution of respondents according to mobile network connectivity. It was evident that 60.83 per cent of the respondents had good network connectivity, followed by poor network connectivity (33.33%) and excellent network connectivity (5.83 %).It could be concluded that majority of the respondents had agreed that the existing mobile has good network connectivity as the mobile handset does not pose any problem in the receiving network signal. This might be due to reason that good network connectivity is reached to rural area very effectively. These findings are similar with the findings of Teza (2016).

Possession of ICT tools

It has been observed from Table 1 that majority (76.66%) of the respondents had medium possession of ICT tools, followed by high possession of ICT tools (14.16%) and low possession of ICT tools (9.166%). The plausible reasons for the above trend might be due to the fact that the majority of the farmers having good source of income that helps them to purchase a new ICT tool. The finding indicates that, majority of respondents were belonged to medium level possession of ICT tools. The result is in accordance with Naik (2018).

The variables namely education, social participation, extension contact, innovativeness, source of information, network connectivity and possession of ICT tools were positively and significantly related to utility perception of YouTube. Whereas, family size and land holding did not show any significant relationship with utility perception of YouTube. However, age of the respondents was significantly negative relationship with utility perception of YouTube.

IMPLICATIONS

Table 2: Relationship between profile of the YouTube users with their utility perception of YouTube

Sr. No.	Profile of the respondents	'r' value
X_1	**Age**	-0.2523**
X_2	**Education**	0.1994*
X_3	**Family size**	0.0193^{NS}
X_4	**Land holding**	0.0754^{NS}
X_5	**Social participation**	0.3133**
X_6	**Extension contacts**	0.2530**
X_7	**Innovativeness**	0.2028*
X_8	**Source of information**	0.2090*
X_9	**Network connectivity**	0.2150*
X_{10}	**Possession of ICT Tools**	0.2364**

*Significant at 0.05 level of probability

**Significant at 0.01 level of probability

The findings of the study will be useful to the extension administrators, planners, extension personnel, universities, department of agriculture, YouTube content creators related to agriculture and others who are involved directly or indirectly in the transfer of technology. Also, it will be excellent source to the transfer of new ideas and various agriculture related information through audio visual aid as a reference material since very few studies are available on the utility of YouTube.

An overview of the findings revealed that most of the user farmers were almost medium in their profile characteristics. Hence the extension functionaries need to bestow attention on medium level of profile characteristics of farmers rather than others.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my deepest appreciation and gratitude to my M.Sc. guide,

Dr. V. S. Manvar and Head of Department Dr R. P. Kadam for their invaluable support and guidance throughout my research work. Their expertise, dedication, and commitment to excellence have been instrumental in shaping this study.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflict of interest among researchers

REFRENCES

Anusha,V. V. S. S., Patel, S. R. and Vinaya Kumar, H. M. (2023) Unlocking agricultural information networks: A social network analysis approach. *Guj. J. Ext. Edu.* **36**(2):104-111. https://doi.org/10.56572/gjoee.2023.36.2.0019.

Babu, Anjali k, Sentikumar, R & Nandhini G (2018) Information Communication Technology Utilization Behavior of Dairy farmers in Thissur District of Kerala Department of Veterinery and AH Extension, College of veterinary and animal sciences, Mannuthy, Thissur.

Bairagi, A.K., Roy, T. & Polin, A. (2011). Socio-Economic Impacts of Mobile Phone in Rural Bangladesh: A case Study in Batiaghata Thana, Khulna District. *IJCIT*, **2**(1):42-48.

Chauhan (2009) *"A study on perception on viewrs krishi darshan programme of doordarshan in selhore district of Madhya Pradesh"* M.Sc. (Agri) Thesis unpublished R.A.K, COA, Sehore, JNMKV, Jabalpur

Chavan, N.N (2016) *Utility perception of broad BED furrow technology by the soyabean growers.* M.Sc. (Agri) Thesis, M.A.U, Parbhani.

Dhanwal, Sanyogita (2023) Purpose and extent of use of social media by students. *Guj. J. Ext. Edu.* 35(2):115-121. https://doi.org/10.56572/gjoee.2023.35.2.0023.

George, S. & Kumar, K.V.V. (2015). Use pattern of mobile by the farmers. *Journal of Communication Studies*, 33:5-8.

Ghadi. G. R. (2008). *Utility perception and use of agriculture advertisement by farmers*. M.Sc. (Agri) Thesis, M.A.U, Parbhani.

Gour, S., Mandal, M.K. & Singh, R. (2015). Assessing Knowledge of Tribal Farmers Regarding Scientific Animal Husbandry Practices. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu*., 15(2):90-94.

Gurav, K.V., Jadhav, B.S. & Jagdale, U.D. (2010). Information sources used and suggestions by the Sugarcane growers for adoption of recommended ratoon management practices in Kolhapur district of Maharashtra. *Agriculture Update*, 5 (34):385-387

Kapoor, N. (2011) Role of mass media in promotion of environmental awareness along with skill development among the rural people of Shringverpur, Allahabad district, India. Paper presented in International Conference on Chemical, Biological and Environmental Sci. (ACCESS 2011)' held at Bangkok in Dec., 2011

Kerlinger, F. N. (1976). Foundation of behavioral research. New Delhi. *Surjeet Publication*: 198-201, 442-478.

Lad, A. S. (2014). *Utility perception of mass media by farm women*. M.Sc. (Agri) Thesis, M.A.U, Parbhani.

Machapathri, Praneeth, Shaik N. Meera and Awasthi H. K. (2023) Perception of farmers about E-NAM and digital marketing applications. *Guj. J. Ext. Edu.* **36**(2):76-82.

Mangal Shinde (2016) *Utility perception of VNMKV calendar by the readers.* M.Sc. (Agri) Thesis, M.A.U, Parbhani.

Naganikar, S. G. (2005). *Utility perception of readers of MAU Agricultural diary*. M.Sc. (Agri) Thesis, M.A.U, Parbhani.

Naik, B. J. (2018). *A study on ICT tools usage by the farmers in anantapur district of Andhra Pradesh*. M.Sc. (Agri.) A.N.G.R.A.U. Guntur Andhra Pradesh.

Patil, N. S. (2007). *Utility perception newspaper reading farmers,* M.Sc. (Agri) Thesis, M.A.U, Parbhani.

Pattanashetti, M. & Nithyasree, A. (2012). Awareness and preference of Krishi community radio programmes. *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci*., 25(4):514-519.

Pawar, D. J. (2013). *Utility perception of about Deoni cattle by the cattle reader.* M.Sc. (Agri) Thesis, M.A.U, Parbhani.

Pratik Kiritkumar Patel and Vinaya Kumar, H. M. (2021). Farmers socio- econimic status and constraints using social media for sustainable agriculture development. *Guj. J. Ext. Edu*. 32 (1): 34-39.

Raksha. (2014). Information needs of the Rural Women involved in Livestock Sector: A study form Jharkhand. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu.,* 14(4):70-74.

Rao, D.S. (2013). *Knowledge Empowerment of Shepherds on Sheep husbandry practices through multimedia modules-An Analysis.* M.V. Sc thesis, Sri Venkateswara Veterinary University, Tirupati.

Salunkhe, S. N. (1989). *A study of readership pattern and effectiveness of shetkari magazine as perceived by readers.* M.Sc. (Agri) Thesis, M.A.U, Parbhani.

Salunkhe, S. R. (2011). *Utility perception of goat reares about Osmanabadi Goat in Marathwada region*. M.Sc. (Agri) Thesis, M.A.U, Parbhani.

Sarnaik, S. D, Surve, R.N, Shrivastava K. K., & Bhoyar, S. S. (2008). 'Socio-economic attributes of farmer influencing their utility perception of agricultural Technology Transfer through farm telecast', proceeding of National seminar on 'Socio-economic Dimension of Technology development and Technology transfer in Agriculture held on 24-25th May 2008, at Nagpur.:12

Shiraskar, S.B. (2011) *Utility of newspaper a perceived by farmers*, M.Sc (Agri.), Thesis (Unpub.), Dr. PDKV, Akola (M.S.).

Sidaram (2008) *Analysis of organic farming practices in pigeon pea in Gulbarga district of Karnataka* M.Sc. (Agri) Thesis, Univ. Agric. Sci, Dharwad, Karnataka (India).

Sivaraj, P., H. Philip., & V. Geethalakshmi. 2017.Climate Change Impact on Socio- Economic Status and Communication Pattern of the Paddy Farmers of Tamil Nadu, India *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied SciencesVol*:6(6) pp: 550-557.

Teza J., (2016). *Mobile Apps as an extension services delivery tool among the livestock farmers: An exploratory study.* Ph.D. (Agri), P.V. Narsimha Rao Telangana Veterinary University, Telangana.

Received : March 2024 : Accepted : June 2024