

Inter-system Communication Patterns of Village Level Workers

B. B. Patel¹ and A. O. Kher²

INTRODUCTION

Information communication depends upon the quick dissemination of farm innovations in an intelligent and more compatible manner among the farmers, mostly through effective extension agency. The extension personnel has to go for spreading new agricultural information to the villages. The VLW is the last and closest unit of the extension machinery at village level. VLWs are acquiring the required information from the researchers/scientists and communicators after due processing to its ultimate users i.e. farmers. Thus, communication between agricultural scientists and consumer farmers through extension personnel and vice-versa can improve its effectiveness through improvement and by accelerating the rate of flow of scientific findings and identifying problems confronting consumers in putting them in practice on their own farms. Hence, keeping this in view, this study was undertaken.

OBJECTIVES

1. To analyse the inter system communication patterns of Extension Personnel (EP) with Researchers communication (EP-RC)

2. To identify the inter system communication patterns of EP with Farmers Communication (EP-FC).
3. To find out the inter system communication patterns of EP with Researchers Contact Span (EP-RCS).
4. To know the inter system communication patterns of EP with Farmers Contact Span (EP-FCS).

METHODOLOGY

For the study, Junagadh district of Gujarat State was selected purposively. Only one category namely grass-root level extension personnel called village Level Workers (VLWs) working in T&V system of Junagadh district were taken up as sample of the study. Out of 180 VLWs, 116 VLWs who were present at fortnightly training on the day of personal interview were selected as respondents to the study. For data collection structured interview schedule was used. To find out the communication patterns; EP-RC, EP-RCS, EP-FC and EP-FCS, frequencies and percentage were worked out and then grouped into four categories as most frequently, frequently, rarely and never. The scores allotted were 3, 2, 1 and 0

1. Associate Extension Educationist, E.E.I., G.A.U., Anand.
2. Deputy Director of Extension Education (Zone), G.A.U., Junagadh.

respectively. Scores obtained were added up to arrive at his total score. The total score of the respondents were classified into low, medium and high categories by using mean \pm S. D. method of classification.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Extension Personnel-Researchers Communication (EP-RC)

The degree to which the members of extension system (VLWs) communicated with the research system for acquiring information and delivering farmers problem about farming were studied under this heading. The

personnel and researchers followed by low (16.38 per cent) and high (12.93 per cent) level of EP-RC.

This indicated that there exist a medium link between EP and researchers. This is not so healthy sign as it may hamper the quick transfer of newly evolved farm technology to the users because the extension personnel themselves may be deprived of the latest technical know-how owing to their low to medium links with the researchers.

2. Extension Personnel-Farmers Communication (EP-FC)

The extension personnel (VLWs)

Table 1 : Respondents according to extension personnel researchers communication (EP-RC)

Sr. No.	Communication level	No.	Per cent
1.	Low (upto score 8)	19	16.38
2.	Medium (score 9 to 15)	82	70.69
3.	High (above 15 scores)	15	12.93
Total		116	100.00
Mean = 11.66		SD = 3.23	

respondents were asked to indicate the methods alongwith frequency they had used in receiving agricultural information from the researchers and for the feedback for obtaining further solution of the problems. The data, thus collected are tabulated in Table 1.

It is obvious from Table 1 that majority (70.69 per cent) of the respondents placed in medium level of communication between extension

used several media/methods for transferring agricultural technology to the farmers. The farmers were asked to indicate the media/methods they had used alongwith the frequency of use, to transfer the agricultural technology to the farmers. The relevant data are given in Table 2.

The data presented in Table 2 revealed that majority (70.69 per cent) of the respondents belonged to medium EP-FC category and 18.10 and 11.21 per cent

Table 2 : Respondents according to extension personnel farmers communication (EP-FC) (N=116)

Sr. No.	Communication level	No.	Per cent
1.	Low (Score upto 12)	21	18.10
2.	Medium (score 13 to 22)	82	70.69
3.	High (score above 22)	13	11.21
Total		116	100.00
Mean = 17.07		S. D. = 4.92	

of the respondents had low and high EP-FC categories, respectively.

Further probing of data indicated that communication of more than 88.00 per cent extension personnel with the farmers was found to be of low to medium level. Only 11.21 per cent of EP were in high category which is not a quite healthy situation or the growth of communication work.

given them field problems of the farmers. The data collected for the same are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 indicated that nearly about two-third of the respondents belonged to medium level of contact span with the researchers (EP-RCS) followed by low and high (19.83 and 17.24 per cent) contact span with researchers respectively.

Table 3 : Respondents according to extension personnel-researchers contact span (EP-RCS) (N=116)

Sr. No.	Contact span	No.	Per cent
1.	Low (upto 5 Score)	23	19.83
2.	Medium (6 to 8 score)	73	62.93
3.	High (above 8 score)	20	17.24
Total		116	100.00
Mean = 6.55		S. D. = 1.67	

The finding was in line with the findings of Singh (1988) and Sharma (1993).

3. Extension Personnel - Researchers Contact Span (EP-RCS)

The respondents were asked to indicate to whom they had contacted/communicated to acquire innovations and

It can be thus concluded that a great majority (82.76 per cent) of the respondents have contacted researchers/agril. scientists less to moderately in the matter of communication and exchange the field problems and find out their solutions. This might be due to low opportunity to come in contact and communicate with the scientists.

It might also be due to the feelings of inferiority complex among the VLWs.

4. Extension Personnel-Farmers Contact Span (EP-FCS)

The respondents were asked to indicate to whom they had contacted in the village and with what frequency to communicate the farm information. The data collected from them are depicted in Table 4.

in the dissemination of farm information, convincing them for use and so on. This finding was in the line with those of Singh (1988) and Sharma (1993).

CONCLUSION & IMPLICATONS

The overall conclusion of the study was EP-RC, EP-FC, EP-RCS and EP-FCS found to be of medium level of communication and contact span with the

Table 4 : Respondents according to extension personnel-frmers contact span (EP-FCS) (N=116)

Sr. No.	Contact Span	No	Per cent
1.	Low (Score upto 13)	31	26.72
2.	Medium (score 14 to 25)	65	56.03
3.	High (score above 25)	20	17.25
Total		116	100.00
Mean = 18.94		S. D. = 6.43	

From the perusal of Table 4, it is clear that majority (56.03 per cent) of the respondents were in medium level of contact span with the farmers, while 26.72 and 17.25 per cent of the respondents had low and high contact span, respectively. However, more than 82.00 per cent of EP have contacted farmers low to moderately

researchers and farmers. To make the communication patterns more effective, the EP need to have dynamic, live and close links with the scientists and farmers for acquisition and dissemination of new farm technology and more opportunity should be given to the EP to come in contact and communicate with the scientists.

REFERENCES

- Sharma P. L. (1993). Communication Pattern of Agricultural Extension Personnel. Unpublished M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, GAU, S. K. Nagar.
- Singh Joginder (1988). Communication Pattern of Agril. Ext. Personnel. Unplished Masters' Degree Thesis, Haryana Agil. University, Hisar.