

"Communication Patterns between Source Linkage and Consumers of Farm Technology in Gujarat".

Submitted to Gujarat Agricultural University,
1978

N. C. Patel

Department of Extension, B. A. College of
Agriculture, Anand.

In this area of technological explosion, the traditional practices still dominate the agricultural scene in India. The time is quite ripe when agriculture needs to be transformed into a modern market oriented agriculture.

The main problem as it exists today is that of effective dissemination of adequate agricultural information to the consumers farmers. A study was therefore undertaken to determine how communication of farm technology takes place from agricultural scientists to the extension personnel and return to the consumer farmers and vice-versa.

Specific objectives are :

1. To analyse the individual communication and consumer farmers patterns of agricultural scientists/extension personnel with regard to (a) Information input patterns (b) Information processing patterns and (c) Information output patterns.

2. To analyse intrasystem communication patterns of agricultural scientists/extension personnel/consumer farmers.

3. To analyse intersystem communication patterns of agricultural scientists with extension personnel and consumer farmers.

The study was conducted in three districts namely, Mehsana, Kheda and Valsad of Gujarat State. It focused mainly on communication of technology pertaining to Kalyan sona wheat/hybrid bajri No. 3 and Manauri paddy 1.

A sample of 47 scientists, 205 extension personnel, and 285 farmers growing Kalyan sona wheat, hybrid bajri No. 3 Manauri paddy from 12 villages of six talukas of the three districts, were purposively selected.

The data were collected through field survey, interview schedules were developed for each category of respondents. The communication variables included in the study were measured by developing indices for each category of respondents. In order to construct various indices, the data were collected from the respondents against various items. These items were assigned numerical scores. The scores assigned to items were converted into 1 scorers as these items had different ranges and units of measurement. The Z scores were added up and rounded up to the nearest whole figure.

Some of the communication and personal and situational variables were measured with the help of standardised scales developed by other investigators. Standardised scales used for measuring variables were : Risk Preference scale developed by Supe and Singh (1968); Cosmopolitaness Localiteness scale developed by Singh (1964); Economic Motivation scale developed by Chakravarthy (1974) and knowledge test developed by Jhod Singh (1965).

Major Findings :

It is an exhaustive study. There are 85 findings out of which only 9 major findings

are given pertaining to individual communication pattern of each system.

1. The information input index of the scientists had significantly positive association with information processing, output, scientist extension personnel communication, scientist-consumers content span and communication between them, inter and intra-section colleagues communication, communication net work centrality and opinion leadership. It did not establish significant association with scientist extension personnel contact span, peer communication and facility.

2. The information processing index of the scientists had significantly positive association with information input, output, scientist-extension personnel communication, scientist consumers communication, interasection colleagues communication, communication net work centrality and opinion leadership. It had no significant association with scientist extension personnel contact span, intrasection colleagues communication, peer communication and facility.

3. The information output index of the scientists had significantly positive association with information input, processing, scientist extension contact span and communication between them, inter and intra-section colleagues communication, peer communication, communication net work centrality, and opinion leadership. It did not establish significant association with facility.

4. The information input index of the extension personnel had significantly positive association with information processing, output, extension personnel-scientists contact span, extension personnel scientist communication, peer communication and facility. It had negative but non-significant association with extension personnel consumers contact span.

5. Information processing index of the extension personnel had positive and significant association with information input, output, extension personnel scientists communication, extension personnel consumers communication, peer communication and facility. It had no significant association with extension scientists, contact span and extension personnel consumers contact span.

6. The information output index of the extension personnel had significantly positive association with information input, processing, extension personnel-scientist contact span and communication between them, extension-personnel-consumers communication, peer communication and facility. It had positive and non-significant association with extension personnel-consumers contact span.

7. The information input index of the consumer farmers had significantly positive association with information processing, output and education, while it was negative but significant with age and economic motivation. It had positive and non-significant association with facility size of family, risk preference and cosmopoliteness localiteness.

8. Information processing index of the farmers, had significantly positive association with information input, output, education and size of the farm. It had positive and non-significant association with facility, size of family, risk preference and cosmopoliteness-localiteness, whereas it was negative but non-significant with age and economic motivation.

9. The information output index of the consumer farmers had significantly positive association with information input, processing, education and size of farm. It had positive and non-significant association with facility, risk preference and cosmopoliteness, localiteness while it was negative but non-significant with age size of family and economic motivation.