

INFORMATION PROCESSING BEHAVIOUR OF DAIRY FARMERS OF JAMMU REGION

J. S. Manhas*, N. Ahmed**, Q. J. A. Peer*** and Praveen Kumar****

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in Akhnoor and R.S. Pura blocks of district Jammu of Jammu and Kashmir to find out the information processing behaviour of dairy farmers. Proportionate random sampling was used to select 200 respondents. Interview schedule was used to illicit information relating to information evaluation methods, information storage methods and information transfer methods used by the selected dairy farmers. Data were analyzed using mean per cent score (MPS). The findings revealed that majority of the respondents were found to have discussed the information received by them with the family members, friends, fellow farmers, progressive farmers and neighbors. Almost all the respondents stored information received by them by way of conveying to family members and asking them to remember. Majority of the respondents had followed the technique of transferring the information to their friends, fellow farmers, progressive farmers and neighbours.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid strides that has taken place in recent years in the field of information technology has paved the way for revolutionary change in higher education and the new technologies have provided access to a vast volume of information and helped in their processing more competently. Thus, improving both quality as well as quantity of production system. The transfer of technology from the seat of its generation to the point of its utilization is widely dependent upon the efficiency of extension and client system. The last component is most important for dairy modernization. Keeping this point in view, the present investigation was undertaken with the specific objective to study the information processing behaviour of dairy farmers of Jammu region.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted in purposely selected Jammu district of Jammu and Kashmir as it had maximum milch bovine population. Jammu district consists of eleven blocks, out of which two blocks viz., R.S. Pura and Akhnoor were selected based on maximum milch bovine population. Then from each of the selected block, five villages which fall within the radius of 15 km from the block head-

quarters were selected on the basis of possessing highest milch bovine population. Thus in all, 10 villages were taken for the study. After knowing the number of dairy farmers in each village, a proportionate sample of 200 respondents was selected from these villages. Further, on the basis of number of milch animals (bovine) possessed by the dairy farmers, they were divided into three categories of small, medium and large dairy farmers. Thus, there were 80, 68 and 52 small, medium and large dairy farmers, respectively. The data were collected through personally interviewing the respondents with the help of a pre-tested structured interview schedule. Thereafter, data were analysed, tabulated and interpreted in the light of objective of the study. The information processing behaviour of dairy farmers has been analysed in terms of evaluation of information received, storage of information received and transfer of information received. The responses obtained from the respondents were recorded on three point continuum scale viz., 'always', 'sometimes' and 'never' which were assigned 2, 1 and 0 scores respectively. Total score obtained by each respondent as well as for each statement was calculated. Further, to determine the information processing behaviour of the respondents, mean per cent score (MPS) for each

* Jr. Scientist, Agricultural Extension Education, RARS, SKUAST-J, Rajouri, Tardwal, J & K.

** Associate Professor, Division of Agricultural Extension Education, FoA, SKUAST-J, Chatha.

*** Ex-Ph.D Scholar, Division of Agricultural Extension Education, FoA, SKUAST-J, Chatha.

**** Ex-Ph.D Scholar, Division of Agricultural Extension Education, FoA, SKUAST-J, Chatha.

statement was calculated and ranked accordingly. Mean per cent score (MPS) was calculated by using following formula:

$$\text{Mean per cent score (MPS)} = \frac{\text{Total score obtained}}{\text{Maximum obtainable score}} \times 100$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Information evaluation methods used by the respondents

The data incorporated in Table 1 vividly corroborate that majority of the respondents (MPS 89.71) were found to have discussed the information received by them with the family members, friends, fellow farmers, progressive farmers and neighbours which was placed at first position in the rank hierar-

chy of information evaluation methods. Most of them were found to have judged the information received by them on the basis of its economic feasibility (MPS 86.79) and accorded second position to this information evaluation method. A fair proportion of dairy farmers (MPS 73.52) were found to have evaluated the received information after consultation with officials of State Department of Animal Husbandry. Processing by weighing the merit of an innovation in the light of past experience (MPS 67.64) was accorded fourth rank by the respondents followed by acceptance of received information with modifications (MPS 60.53), judgement based on technical feasibility (MPS 45.89) and judging in the light of climatic conditions (MPS 33.76) which were assigned fifth, sixth and seventh ranks respectively by the respondents. However, it is interesting to note that small

Table 1: Information evaluation methods used by the respondents

n = 200

Information evaluation methods	Small dairy farmers		Medium dairy farmers		Large dairy farmers		Total	
	MPS	Rank	MPS	Rank	MPS	Rank	MPS	Rank
Discussion with officials of State Department of Animal husbandry	70.62	III	90.35	II	59.61	IV	73.52	III
Acceptance of received information with modifications	58.50	IV	78.02	IV	45.07	V	60.53	V
Judging on the basis of economic feasibility	82.00	II	85.14	III	93.26	I	86.79	II
Accepted information as it is	10.62	VIII	18.82	VIII	7.69	VIII	12.37	VIII
Discussion with family members, friends, fellow farmers, progressive farmers and neighbours	90.50	I	96.11	I	82.53	II	89.71	I
Judging in the light of climatic conditions	25.62	VII	49.76	VII	25.96	VII	33.76	VII
Judgement based on technical feasibility	38.75	VI	60.47	VI	38.46	VI	45.89	VI
Weigh the merit of an innovation in the light of past experience	53.12	V	70.02	V	79.80	III	67.64	IV

MPS = Mean per cent score

proportion of respondents (MPS 12.37) accepted the dairy information as it is received without deletion or addition.

A deep glance at the data incorporated in Table 1 divulge that discussion with family members, friends, fellow farmers, progressive farmers and neighbours was assigned first rank by small (MPS 90.50) and medium (MPS 96.11) dairy farmers. Whereas, the same information evaluation method was assigned second rank by large dairy farmers with MPS 82.53. Judging on the basis of economic feasibility was placed at second position by small (MPS 82.00), third position by medium (MPS 85.14) and first position by large dairy farmers (MPS 93.26). Likewise, discussion with officials of State Department of Animal Husbandry was accorded third rank by small (MPS 70.62), second rank by medium (MPS 90.35) and fourth rank by large dairy farmers (MPS 59.61). In case of weigh the merit of an innovation in the light of past experience, small and medium dairy farmers assigned fifth rank with MPS 53.12 and 70.02 respectively, whereas large dairy farmers assigned third rank with MPS 79.80. Similarly, acceptance of

received information with modifications was accorded fourth rank by small and medium dairy farmers with MPS 58.50 and 78.02 respectively, while large dairy farmers assigned fifth position to this aspect with MPS 45.07. In rest of the methods, all the categories of dairy farmers assigned similar ranks.

The frequent interpersonal communication might be responsible for majority having evaluated the information by discussion with family members, friends, fellow farmers, progressive farmers and neighbours. Besides, costly nature of dairy vocation might be responsible for majority having judged the received information on the basis of economic feasibility. Further, majority of the respondents were found to evaluate the information by way of discussion with officials of State Department of Animal Husbandry. This might be due to the reason that officials like Veterinary Assistant Surgeons, Livestock Assistants and Veterinary Attendants were considered as the reliable sources of communication by the respondents to check with. Similar findings were reported by Balasubramanian (1976) Kadian (2002) and Ganesan (2004).

Table 2: Information storage methods used by the respondents

n = 200

Information evaluation methods	Small dairy farmers		Medium dairy farmers		Large dairy farmers		Total	
	MPS	Rank	MPS	Rank	MPS	Rank	MPS	Rank
By conveying to family members and asking them to remember	93.75	I	96.17	I	97.11	I	95.67	I
By maintaining classified notebooks/ diary	50.00	III	55.94	III	40.38	III	48.77	III
Preserve in the form of printed literature like leaflets, folders, clippings appeared in newspapers etc.	13.12	V	15.29	V	10.57	V	12.99	V
By maintaining a subject matter file	25.00	IV	25.32	IV	19.23	IV	23.18	IV
By memorizing	83.75	II	86.88	II	86.53	II	85.72	II

MPS = Mean per cent score

Information evaluation methods used by the respondents

The data incorporated in Table 2 reveal that almost all the respondents stored information received by them by way of conveying to family members and asking them to remember (MPS 95.67) closely followed by the method of memorization (MPS 85.72), which were placed at first and second positions in the rank hierarchy of information storage methods. Nearly half of the respondents (MPS 48.77) maintained classified note books/diary to store the information. However, by maintaining a subject matter file (MPS 23.18) and preserve in the form of printed literature like leaflets, folders, clippings appeared in newspapers etc. (MPS 12.99) got very minimal response, which were accorded fourth and fifth ranks, respectively by the respondents. A further perusal of data reveal that all the categories of dairy farmers had similar pattern of ranking with respect to use of information storage methods for processing information relevant to their vocation. Similar findings were reported by Kadian (2002) and Pramella (1992).

Information transfer methods used by the respondents

The data given in Table 3 vividly corroborate that majority of the respondents (MPS 92.43) had followed the technique of transferring the information to their friends, fellow farmers, progressive farmers and neighbours. Nearly three-fourth of the respondents (MPS 73.57) transferred the received information by speaking in local meetings. A fair proportion of dairy farmers (MPS 60.60) gave information to those who come and seek. More than half of the respondents (MPS 52.71) transferred the received information to their relatives. More than one-fourth of the respondents (MPS 29.26) gave the information to those who cultivate their land on lease. However, it is discouraging to note that a small proportion of respondents had the habit of lending printed literature to others (MPS 16.42) and conducting demonstrations to show the practical aspects of the received information (MPS 9.62). -A deep glance of the data incorporated in Table 3 show that the method of speaking in local meetings was accorded third rank by small dairy farmers (MPS 63.12), whereas the same

Table 3: Information transfer methods used by the respondents **n = 200**

Information evaluation methods	Small dairy farmers		Medium dairy farmers		Large dairy farmers		Total	
	MPS	Rank	MPS	Rank	MPS	Rank	MPS	Rank
To those who come and seek	73.75	II	65.76	III	42.30	IV	60.60	III
To my friends, fellow farmers, progressive farmers and neighbours	90.00	I	96.91	I	90.38	I	92.43	I
To my relatives	50.62	IV	50.79	IV	56.73	III	52.71	IV
To those who cultivate my land on lease	33.12	V	31.61	V	23.07	V	29.26	V
Speaking in local meetings	63.12	III	80.67	II	76.92	II	73.57	II
By conducting demonstrations to show the practical aspects of received information	7.5	VII	11.76	VII	9.61	VII	9.62	VII
Lending printed literature to others	16.25	VI	17.64	VI	15.38	VI	16.42	VI

MPS = Mean per cent score

method was assigned second rank by medium (MPS 80.67) and large dairy farmers (MPS 76.92). The method of giving information to those who come and seek was assigned second rank by small (MPS 73.75), third rank by medium (MPS 65.76) and fourth rank by large dairy farmers (MPS 42.30), respectively. However, in case of method, passing on information to my relatives, both small and medium dairy farmers accorded fourth position with MPS 50.62 and 50.79, respectively, whereas the same method was assigned third position by large dairy farmers with MPS 56.73. Rest of the items were accorded similar ranks by all the categories of respondents. It was observed during the period of data collection that majority of the respondents had regular contact with their friends, fellow farmers, progressive farmers and neighbours. This might be the plausible reason that majority of them transferred the received information to their friends, fellow farmers, progressive farmers and neighbours. Similar findings were reported by Ramasubramanian (2003).

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that majority of the respondents were found to have discussed the information received by them with the family members, friends, fellow farmers, progressive farmers and neighbours. However, small proportion of respondents accepted the dairy information as it is received without deletion or addition. Almost all the respondents stored information received by them by way of conveying to family members and asking them to remember

closely followed by the method of memorization. However, preserve in the form of printed literature like leaflets, folders, clippings appeared in the newspapers etc. got very minimal response. Majority of the respondents had followed the technique of transferring the information to their friends, fellow farmers, progressive farmers and neighbours. However, it is discouraging to note that a small proportion of respondents had a habit of lending printed literature to others and conducting demonstrations to show the practical aspects of the received information.

REFERENCES

- Balasubramanian, S. 1976. Study of communication fidelity and associated factors. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, TNAU, Coimbatore.
- Ganesan, R., Shanmugam, M.A., Noorjehan, H.A.K.A. 2004. Information management for sustainable cotton production. *Agricultural Extension Review*, 16 (3):10-15.
- Kadian, K.S. and Kumar, R. 2002. Information processing pattern of dairy farmers of Kangra valley. *Indian J. Extn. Edn.*, 38 (1&2):65-67.
- Pramella, K. 1992. An ex-post facto study on communication channels utilization behaviour of farm women. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, TNAU, Coimbatore.
- Ramasubramanian, M. and Manoharan, M. 2003. Communication behaviour of mango growers. *Agricultural Extension Review*, 15 (1):16-20.



Received : June, 2013
Accepted : January, 2014