Vol.7 No. 1, 144 – 146 (2018)
Received: February, 2018; Accepted: May, 2018

Short Communication

Communication Sources Used By the Small Farmers in Adoption of Wheat Technology

V.K. Sharma and Rajesh Kumar

Deptt. of Agril. Exten. R.B.S. College Bichpuri, Agra
Email of corresponding author: vijaysharma77@rediffmail.com

The efficient timely transfer of farm innovation and their practical application by the farmers is the key for social and economic development of India where the majority of population depends upon agriculture[1,2]. To achieve this goal, appropriate extension services, proper communication network, suitable technical know how, existing farming situation, suitability of appropriate technology are the important areas to be tackled by all concerned to help the farmers in general and small farmers in particular for increasing productivity and production of agriculture. Thus considering the above facts the present study was undertaken with the specific objective "Communication sources used by the small farmers in adoption of wheat technology."

This study was conducted in Farah block of Mathura district, Uttar Pradesh. This block was selected purposively. The 5 villages were selected random sampling method for the study. For the selection of respondents 125 wheat growing farmers were selected, consisting 25 respondents from each village. The data were collected personally through structured interview schedule. The data were further analysed, interpreted and tested with the help of appropriate statical techniques.

Table 1 Technology and sources of communication used by the farmer

S.No.	Technology	Source of Communication	No. of Respondents	Percentage
1.	Seed Technology	**A. Personal cosmopolite channel**		
		Campaign	24	19.20
		Training	44	35.20
		Exhibition	60	48.00
		B. Personal Localite channel		
		Cooperative	38	30.40
		Farmers organization	62	49.60
		Progressive farmers	64	51.20
		Friends	21	16.80
		Neighbours	18	14.40
		Farm leader	27	21.60
		Relatives	40	32.00
		C. Impersonal cosmopolite channel		
		Radio/T.V.	110	88.00
		Printed material	20	16.00
		News paper/articles	86	68.80
		Farm journal	32	25.6
2.	Irrigation Technology	**A. Personal cosmopolite channel** Training	30	24.00

		Exhibition	50	40.00
		B. Personal localite channel		
		Farmers organization	42	33.60
		Friends	56	44.80
		Neighbours	35	28.00
		Relatives	70	56.00
		C. Impersonal cosmopolite channel		
		Radio/T.V.	98	78.40
		Printed material	23	18.40
		News paper/articles	90	72.00
		Farm journals	17	13.60
3.	Fertilizer Technology	**A. Personal cosmopolite channel**		
		Farm and home visit	42	33.60
		Campaign	19	15.20
		Training	36	28.80
		Exhibition	48	38.40
		B. Personal localite channel		
		Cooperative	67	53.60
		Farmers organization	31	24.80
		Progressive farmers	36	28.80
		Friends	84	67.20
		Neighbours	93	74.40
		Relatives	27	21.60
		C. Impersonal cosmopolite channel		
		Radio/T.V.	92	73.60
		Poster/charts	24	19.20
		Printed materials	38	30.40
		News paper/articles	92	73.60
4.	Plant Protection Technology	**A. Personal cosmopolite channel**		
		Group discussion/meeting	50	40.00
		Exhibition	39	31.20
		B. Personal localite channel		
		Cooperative	30	24.00
		Farmers organization	24	19.20
		Progressive farmers	45	38.40
		Neighbours	38	30.40
		C. Impersonal cosmopolite channel		
		Radio/T.V.	96	76.80
		News paper articles	77	61.60
		Farm journals	21	16.80

Table 1 reveals that 88.00 per cent respondents have used Radio/T.V. while 68.80 per cent used news paper/articles as a source of communication for adoption of wheat technology under impersonal cosmopolite channel. Further 51.20 per cent respondents were progressive farmers, 49.60 per cent had used farmers organization as a sources of communication for adoption of wheat technology under personal localite channel. Table also reveals that 48.00 per cent respondents have used 'Exhibition' while 35.20 per cent used 'Training' as a source of communication for adoption of wheat technology under personal cosmopolite channel[3].

Further indicates that 78.40 per cent respondents have used 'Radio/T.V. and 72 per cent respondents have used Newspaper/articles as source of communication for adoption of irrigation technology under impersonal cosmopolite channel. Table further reveals that 56.00 per cent respondents have used relatives followed by 44.80 per cent used friends, 33.60 per cent used farmers organization and 28.00 per cent used neighbours respectively as a source of communication under personal localite channel. Table also reveals that 40.00

per cent have used training as a source of information for adoption of irrigation technology under personal cosmopolite channel.

It was also that 73.60 per cent have used 'Radio/T.V. followed by 70.40 per cent, newspaper/articles, 30.40 per cent printed material and 20.00 per cent poster/chart used as a source of communication under impersonal cosmopolite channel. Majority 74.40 per cent have used neighbours followed by 74.40 per cent friends 53.60 per cent cooperative society under personal localite channel. Table also reveals that 38.40 per cent respondents have used exhibition and 33.6 per cent farm and home visit as a source of communication for adoption of fertilizer technology under personal cosmopolite channel[4,5].

It was noted that 76.80 percent respondents have used 'Radio/T.V.' followed 61.60 per cent Newspaper/articles under impersonal cosmopolite channel. Table also reveals that 38.40 per cent have used progressive farmers and 30.40 per cent respondents used neighbours as a source of communication under personal localite channel. Table further reveals that 40.00 per cent respondents have used group discussion/meeting and 31.20 per cent used exhibition as a source of communication for adoption of plant protection technology.

Conclusion

From the above discussion it could be concluded that majority of the farmers 88.00 per cent used Radio/T.V. and 68.80 per cent used Newspaper/articles as source of communication regarding seed technology majority of the respondents 78.40 per cent Radio/T.V. and 56.00 per cent used relatives as source of communication in case of irrigation technology. It is also concluded that 74.40 per cent used 'Neighbours' and 73.60 per cent Radio/T.V. as source of communication in case of fertilizer technology. Majority of respondents 76.80 per cent used Radio/T.V. as a source of communication in adoption of plant protection technology. The finding of the study shows that if information's are desseminated through aforesaid sources of communication it will be used and adopted by the villages. Therefore it is suggested that traditional and modern sources of communication should be used for dissemination of new technology in the villages

.

References

1. Mishra, D.C. (1996). Agricultural effectiveness in India: A cross sectional analysis. Indian Journal of Extension Education; 32(1):1-4.
2. Mundy, P. and Compton, L. (1991). Indigenous communication and Indigenous knowledge. Development communication Report, 74(3):1-3.
3. Namdeo, Maynka and Mishra, O.P. (2005). Indigenous and Exogenous channels of communication a Trival village. Indian Research Journal of Extension Education; 5(2 & 3):61-63.
4. Sharma, A.K., Jha, S.K., Vindod Kumar, Sachan , R.C. and Arvind Kumar (2008). Critical analysis of information sources and channels preferred by wheat growing farmers. Indian Research Journal of Extension Education; 8(2 & 3):42-45.
5. Singh, B.B. and Jha, S.K. (1995). International communication behaviour of Tarai farmers of Uttar Pradesh. Indian Journal of Adult Education, 56(3): 38-44.