

**CREDIBILITY AND UTILITY OF AGRICULTURAL
INFORMATION ON RADIO: CASE STUDY OF TALUKA QAZI
AHMED, DISTRICT BENAZIRABAD - SINDH**

*Har Bakhsh Makhijani
Abdul Razaque Chhachhar*

ABSTRACT

Radio is one of the basic tools of disseminating information about different issues such as education, health and agriculture in rural areas of developing countries. The aim of this study was to evaluate the perception and credibility of radio among farmers. The most important thing was observed that how radio disseminate information regarding agriculture issues and problems among farmers. In this perspective radio is best source for spreading information about agricultural knowledge for solving the requirement and needs of the farmers. In this context the study was conducted in District Benazirabad Sindh, Pakistan about the radio credibility and evaluation for agricultural information among farmers. The 250 respondents were interviewed. For quantitative survey random sampling was used in this study.

INTRODUCTION

Radio is one of the best medium of communication which has played a very vital role in socio-economic, cultural and agricultural development. It is an influential communication tool in rural agricultural market for information dissemination. Since most rural areas have no access to electricity, therefore, farmers and other communities mostly depend on radio to meet their needs of information regarding education, health, agricultural news and weather information. The success of agricultural development programs in developing countries basically depends on the nature and level of use of mass media channels in mobilization of people for development in general. Radio plays main role to provide timely advice knowledge and information at the local level.

In this connection, updates on weather conditions, soil-water management, reports on flood disaster, information of market for agricultural produce, radio is vital medium for farmers in developing countries. Furthermore, radio is considered as major

ingredient to spread latest agricultural technologies to farmers. In Pakistan farm and home transmission with agricultural knowledge and information were introduced in 1966 to inform farmers on the use of different technologies in order to boost up agricultural development. For rural communities in Pakistan, this sort of transmission is suitable medium of diffusing agricultural information and latest practical development (Malik 2000).

In comparison to print and film media, radio was found famous for communicating agricultural technologies among farmers. Use of radio for farmers could enhance their knowledge because it provides medium which agriculture extension officers and experts identify to be the most appropriate for rural emancipation programme. Radio has reduced gap and distances thus has immediate effect. However, credibility of information on radio is one of the most important elements of communication process and its success will grow proportionally if the recipients of information perceive the sources to be trustworthy and competent (Sadaqath & Mariswamy 2007).

In the Punjab, a number of radio stations broadcast many different agricultural programs such as, Sandhal Dharti, Khait Khait Haryali, Dharti Bakht Bahar, and Wasnay Rehan Garan Utum Khaiti in Punjabi and Siraiki languages, whereas in Sindh, Kheti Sir Seti, Sar Sabz Pakistan broadcast from Hyderabad station in Sindhi languages are widely listened on radio.

STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

In rural areas many farmers have no specific knowledge and information regarding use of pesticides in farming and adoption of technology to increase agriculture produce. The medium of radio has substituted this dearth of agricultural information among farmers. There is need to provide such kind of programs on radio which could guide the farmers about proper use of technologies in farming. In this context radio is one of the best medium to transfer information among illiterate and literate farmers about usage of technologies in their field for increasing their production.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

The study was conducted in District Benazirabad Sindh-Pakistan where the quantitative approach was applied for data

collection. A total 250 of the respondents from Qazi Ahmed Taulka were involved in this study. The simple random method was used for this study and data in the form of percentage mean and standard deviation was analyzed by using SPSS.

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

Demographic Respondents' Profile: In Table-1 demographic result was distributed into respondents' gender, age, level of education and farming experience. The 250 respondents participated in this study and all were male participants. The age of the respondents were distributed from 20 years to 60 years old. However, more than half of 58% of the respondents' age was 31 to 40 years while 22% of the respondents' age was 20 to 30 years old, furthermore 16.8% of the respondents age was 41 to 50 years only 3.2% of the respondents age was 50 to 60 years old with the mean value of $M = 2.01$ $SD = .719$.

Table-1 revealed that the level of education. Here, 36% of the respondents' education level was of primary level while 26.6% of the respondents' education level was non-formal education, 19.6% of the respondents education level of was matriculation, however 18% of the respondents education level of was intermediate to graduate level with the mean value of $M = 2.47$ $SD = 1.40$. The result showed that more than half 56% of the respondents' farm experience was 11 to 20 years while 26.4% of the respondents experience was 1 to 10 years. However, 17.6% of the respondents' experience was from 21 to more than 30 years in agriculture farming with the mean value of $M = 1.93$ $SD = .705$.

Table-1
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Demographic profile	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
Gender				
Male	250	100	1.00	0.000
Female	0	0	0	0.000
Age group	250	100		
20- 30 years	55	22	2.01	0.719
31- 40 years	145	58		
41-50 years	42	16.8		
51- 60 years	8	3.2		
Education level				
Non formal education	66	26.4	2.47	1.40
Primary School	90	36.0		
Matriculation	49	19.6		
Intermediate	14	5.6		
B.A	17	6.8		
Degree/ Master/PhD	14	5.6		
Farm experience				
1- 10 years	66	26.4	1.93	0.705
11- 20 years	140	56.0		
21- 30 years	39	15.6		
More than 30 years	5	2.0		

Respondents General Information: Table-2 shows general information by the respondents regarding farm operation, ownership and best farm operation. The result indicated that 74.4% of the respondents had no another job without doing farming while 25.6% of the respondents were doing job as well as farming with the mean value of $M=1.25$ $SD=.437$. Also, 55.6% of the respondents are engaged in crop production while 20.4% of the respondents in livestock production. However, 7.6% of the respondents were using aquaculture and 16.4% of the respondents were doing other agriculture with the mean value of $M=1.84$ $SD=1.12$. The information regarding ownership of land 64.8% of the respondents does farming by contracting. While 21.2% of the respondents were the owners of the land and they do farming themselves and only 14% of the respondents do farming on rent ($M=2.43$ $SD=.820$). Similarly, 55.6% of the respondents were

doing self-agriculture on their land, 36% of the respondents were contracting land and only 8.4% of the respondents were simply peasants with the mean value of $M=1.52$ $SD=.647$.

Table-2
GENERAL INFORMATION

General information	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
You have work/employment apart from your job as a farmer				
Yes	64	25.6		
No	186	74.4	1.25	0.437
Your main agricultural operation				
Crop Production	139	55.6	1.84	1.12
Livestock production	51	20.4		
Aquaculture	19	7.6		
Others	41	16.4		
Ownership of land that you do				
Owner	53	21.2	2.43	0.820
Renter	35	14.0		
Contract farming	162	64.8		
Your best farm operation				
By self	139	55.6	1.52	0.647
contract farming	90	36.0		
Others	21	8.4		

Contacts with Agricultural Extension Officers: Table-3 depicts information obtained about contact with agriculture extension officers. In this context result showed that 46.8% of the respondents said that they communicated with agriculture one time a month. Furthermore, 10.8% of the respondents contacted once a week or more with agriculture officer. While 26.4% of the respondents rarely contacted with agriculture officers, however 10.4% of the respondents never talked with agriculture officer and 4.4% of the respondents two times in a week about getting the information about agriculture with the mean value of $M=2.92$ $SD=1.32$. The contact with fisheries officer for information about fisheries and agriculture indicated that 88.8% of the respondents never contacted with fisheries officer regarding fisheries and

agriculture information, while 8.0% of the respondents communicated one time a month, however it was indicated that only 0.8% of the respondents contacted with fisheries officers about information for agriculture ($M=1.26$ $SD=.796$). Also information about communication with veterinary officers, the result revealed 50.4% of the respondents never talked with veterinary officer, 36.8% of the respondents contacted once a month with veterinary officer to information about animal diseases and agriculture related information.

Table-3
CONTACT WITH EXTENSION OFFICERS

Contact with Extension Officers	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
Contact with agriculture officer for agricultural information				
Never	26	10.4	2.92	1.32
Rarely	66	26.4		
Once a month	117	46.8		
Two times in weeks	11	4.4		
Three times in a weeks	3	1.2		
Once a week or more	27	10.8		
Contact with fisheries officer for agricultural information	250	100%		
Never	222	88.8	1.26	0.796
Rarely	2	0.8		
once a month	20	8.0		
Two times in weeks	3	1.2		
Three times in a week	1	0.4		
once a week or more	2	0.8		
Contact with veterinary officer for agricultural information				
Never	126	50.4		
Rarely	25	10.0		
once a month	92	36.8		
Two times in weeks	1	0.4		
Three times in a week	6	2.4		
Once a week or more				

Respondents Radio Listening Programs: In Table-4, the result indicated that 86.4% of the respondents had their own radio,

the 13.6% of the respondents did not own radio set with the mean value of $M=1.13$ $SD=.343$. The farmers were also asked about listening to agricultural related program of radio, the result showed that 39.6% of the respondents responded that they listen to agriculture related programs 5 to 20 minutes on radio. While 25.2% of the respondents listen to agriculture programs 21 to 40 minutes on radio. However, 18.4% of the respondents said that they listen to agricultural, news and other programs more than one hour on radio. Furthermore, 16.8% of the respondents listen to agricultural and different programs 41 to 60 minutes on radio ($M=2.14$ $SD=1.13$). When farmers were asked about listening to advertisement about agriculture on radio, the result revealed that more than half 54.0% of the respondents listen to advertisements some time on radio regarding agriculture. It was also revealed that 21.2% of the respondents occasionally listen to advertisement on radio about agriculture specially pesticides and urea. It was also indicated that 16.4% of the respondents listen to advertisements on radio often by, and only 8.4% of the respondents never listen to agricultural related advertisements on radio regarding agriculture and pesticides with the mean value of $M=2.78$ $SD=.817$.

The respondents were also asked about different agriculture programs on AM and FM radio, the result showed that 42.2% of the respondents listen to Hari Samachar on FM105 occasionally.

However 34.4% of the respondents listen to agricultural program some time on radio. It was also showed that 18.8% of the respondents were never listening to agricultural programs on radio only. 4.4% of the respondents often listen to agricultural related programs on FM105. However, the agricultural related programs on AM the result showed that 49.2% of the respondents occasionally listen to Kheti Ser Seti on AM Hyderabad. While 31.2% of the respondents some time listen to Kheti Ser Seti on AM Hyderabad, furthermore 16.0% of the respondents were never, not listening to Kheti Ser Seti on radio. And 3.6% of the respondents were often listen to agricultural programs on AM Hyderabad radio with the mean value of $M=2.22$ $SD=.753$.

The information about another program Sar Sabz Pakitan on AM radio Hyderabad was also solicited. Here, 40.8% of the respondents occasionally listen to it, while 30% of the respondents were sometime listening to Sar Sabz Pakistan and 21.2% of the

respondents never listens this agricultural program on radio. However, only 8.0% of the respondents often listen to Sar Sabz Pakistan on radio with the mean value of $M=2.24$ $SD=.879$.

The respondents were also asked about their favourite radio stations, the result revealed that 58.4% of the respondents responded that the AM radio Hyderabad is their best and favourite station which provides not only agricultural related news as well as entertainments, education, dramas, news and health programs which has increased their knowledge and skills. Followed by that 30% of the respondents said that FM105 was their favourite radio station which provide good music, entertainments and agricultural related programs ($M=1.66$ $SD=.474$).

Table-4
RADIO LISTENING PROGRAMS

Radio listening programs	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
Radio ownership				
Yes	216	86.4	1.13	.343
No	34	13.6		
Listening farm related programs	250	100		
5- 20 minutes	99	39.6	2.14	1.13
21- 40 minutes	63	25.2		
41- to 60 minutes	42	16.8		
More than one hour	46	18.4		
Listen to advertisements on radio	250	100		
Never	21	8.4	2.78	.817
Occasionally	53	21.2		
Some time	135	54.0		
Often	41	16.4		
Listen to Hari Samachar on FM105				
Never	47	18.8		
Occasionally	106	42.2		
Some time	86	34.4		
Often	11	4.4		
Listen to the Kheti Ser Seti on AM Hyderabad	250	100		
Never	40	16.0	2.22	.753
Occasionally	123	49.2		
Some time	78	31.2		
Often	9	3.6		
Listen to the Sar Sabz Pakitan on AM Hyderabad				
Never	53	21.2	2.24	.879
Occasionally	102	40.8		
Some time	75	30.0		
Often	20	8.0		
Favourite radio station				
FM105	75	30	1.66	.474
AM Hyderabad	146	58.4		
Respondents given mix answer	29	11.6		

Radio Credibility: In Table-5 the respondents were obtained information regarding radio credibility. The result showed that more than half 57.6% of the respondents agreed that the content of agricultural radio program was clear, while 26.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed and said that the content of agricultural radio programs was not clear, however, 12.4% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed regarding the content of agricultural radio programs. And only 0.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed that radio content of agricultural program was not clear with the mean value of $M=4.07$ $SD=.746$. The respondents were also asked the bias in agricultural program. 73.6% of the respondents agreed agricultural programs were unbiased broadcast, furthermore 13.6% of the respondents strongly disagreed while 7.2% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed about the content of agricultural programs being unbiased the mean value was ($M= 3.94$ $SD=.700$).

The respondents were also asked about the content of agricultural radio programs. The data indicated that 42% of the respondents strongly disagreed that the radio did not broadcast whole story regarding the agricultural programs. While 29.6% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that radio produce agricultural programs whole story, however 24.4% of the respondents strongly disagreed and said that radio did not tell full story of agricultural related programs. Only 4% of the respondents strongly disagreed that radio not broadcast agricultural related full story programs with the mean value of $M=3.13$ $SD=.827$. When asked about accuracy in the content of radio agricultural programs, 79.2% of the respondents strongly disagreed and responded that the radio did not produce accurate content of agricultural programs. While it was also indicated that 14.8% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that content of agricultural programs were accurate, however only 1.2% of the respondents agreed that radio provide accurate content regarding agricultural related programs with the mean value of $M=3.78$ $SD=.583$.

Furthermore, the respondents were enquired about trust in the content of agricultural radio programs. 76.4% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that radio produce trusted content of agricultural programs, 13.2% of the respondents disagreed and said

they did not trust on radio content agricultural programs, while 10% of the respondents strongly disagreed and said that radio was not producing such trusted programs ($M=3.95$ $SD=.516$). With regard to information about the appropriate timings of the programs, the result indicated that 55.2% of the respondents disagreed and said that the agricultural programs timing was not appropriate, 23.6% of the respondents neither agreed or not disagreed about the appropriate timing of the programs on radio. While 12.4% of the respondents strongly agreed that agricultural programs produce on appropriate time. However, whether the agricultural radio programs are up to date, 43.2% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed and 34.0% of the respondents agreed that radio produce up to date programs regarding agricultural with the mean value of $M=4.03$ $SD=.900$.

Table-5
RESPONDENTS LEVEL OF RADIO CREDIBILITY

Level of Radio Credibility	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
The content of agricultural radio program is clear				
Strongly agree	2	0.8	4.07	0.746
Disagree	6	2.4		
Neither agree nor disagree	31	12.4		
Agree	144	57.6		
Strongly disagree	67	26.8		
The content of agricultural program is unbiased				
Strongly agree	3	1.2	3.94	0.700
Disagree	11	4.4		
Neither agree nor disagree	18	7.2		
Agree	184	73.6		
Strongly disagree	34	13.6		
The content of agricultural radio programs tells the whole story				
Strongly agree	61	24.4	3.13	0.827
Disagree	105	42.0		
Neither agree nor disagree	74	29.6		
Agree	10	4.0		
Strongly disagree				

The content of agricultural radio programs is accurate				
Strongly agree	3	1.2	3.78	0.583
Disagree	7	2.8		
Neither agree nor disagree	37	14.8		
Agree	198	79.2		
Strongly disagree	5	2.0		
The content of agricultural radio programs is trusted				
Strongly agree	1	.4	3.95	0.516
Disagree	33	13.2		
Neither agree nor disagree	191	76.4		
Agree	25	10.0		
Strongly disagree				
The content of agricultural radio programs broadcasted at the appropriate time				
Strongly agree	31	12.4	3.98	0.527
Disagree	138	55.2		
Neither agree nor disagree	59	23.6		
Agree	17	6.8		
Strongly disagree	5	2.0		
The content of agricultural radio programs is up to date				
Strongly agree	20	8.0	4.03	0.90012
Disagree	37	14.8		
Neither agree nor disagree	108	43.2		
Agree	85	34.0		
Strongly disagree				

The respondents were asked about the radio helping to get latest information of market price. The 41.2% of the respondents disagreed, followed by 37.6% of the respondents were strongly agreed. While 16% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed about radio to find a good market for their products ($M=1.92$ $SD=.970$).

Similarly, on radio as a source of pricing information, 36% of the respondents disagreed and said that radio was not source of pricing information about agriculture product, while 35.2% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed regarding radio as a

source of pricing information, but 28.8% of the respondents strongly agreed with the mean value of $M=2.06$ $SD=.799$.

Furthermore, the respondents were also asked about latest information regarding crop livestock, the result revealed that 47.6% of the respondents agreed and 40% of the respondents strongly disagreed about information of crop and livestock on radio. However, only small number 2.4% of the respondents strongly agreed ($M=4.16$ $SD=.947$). On the information about farming practices of the crop livestock, 32.4% of the respondents strongly disagreed while 27.2% of the respondents agreed and 22.4% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed regarding, however, only 6.0% of the respondents strongly agreed with the mean value of $M=3.68$ $SD=1.21$.

The information about farmers' skills and knowledge for controlling the diseases of crops and livestock, the result showed that 42.4% of the respondents agreed regarding information provided by radio while 16.8% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, furthermore 15.6% of the respondents disagreed with the overall mean value $M=3.32$ and $SD=1.22$. The respondents were also enquired about the information of pest controlling diseases by radio, here 64.8% of the respondents strongly disagreed while 18.8% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed about radio provide information of pest control, however only 1.2% of the respondents strongly agreed with the mean value of $M=4.41$ $SD=.932$.

About 'radio keeps farmers up to date on reliable weather and climate information', 36.8% of the respondents disagreed and said that radio did not keep up to date regarding the reliable weather information. Followed by that 30% of the respondents strongly disagreed that radio provided latest information about weather, while 24.8% of the respondents agreed and said that radio keeps up to date on reliable weather and climate information with the mean value of $M=2.39$ $SD=1.36$

Table-6
EVALUATION OF RADIO

Evaluation of radio	Frequency	%	Mean	SD
Radio helping farmers to find a good market for their products				
Strongly agree	94	37.6	1.92	0.970
Disagree	103	41.2		
Neither agree nor disagree	40	16.0		
Agree	3	1.2		
Strongly disagree	10	4.0		
To serve farmers as a source of pricing information				
Strongly agree	72	28.8	2.06	0.799
Disagree	90	36.0		
Neither agree nor disagree	88	35.2		
On farm credits and loans provided by organizations				
Strongly agree	54	21.6	2.26	0.871
Disagree	87	34.8		
Neither agree nor disagree	101	40.4		
Agree	4	1.6		
Strongly disagree	4	1.6		
To keep farmers up to date on latest information regarding crop livestock				
Strongly agree	6	2.4	4.16	0.947
Disagree	17	6.8		
Neither agree nor disagree	8	3.2		
Agree	119	47.6		
Strongly disagree	100	40.0		
On good farm practices of the crop livestock.				
Strongly agree	15	6.0	3.68	1.21
Disagree	30	12.0		
Neither agree nor disagree	56	22.4		
Agree	68	27.2		
Strongly disagree	81	32.4		
To help farmers to overcome the problems affecting crops livestock production				

Strongly agree	1	0.4	3.52	1.01
Disagree	66	26.4		
Neither agree nor disagree	10	4.0		
Agree	146	58.4		
Strongly disagree	27	10.8		
To improve farmers skills and knowledge about controlling the diseases of crops livestock				
Strongly agree	28	11.2	3.32	1.22
Disagree	39	15.6		
Neither agree nor disagree	42	16.8		
Agree	106	42.4		
Strongly disagree	35	14.0		
To provide farmers with knowledge regarding pest control				
Strongly agree	3	1.2	4.41	0.932
Disagree	11	4.4		
Neither agree nor disagree	27	10.8		
Agree	47	18.8		
Strongly disagree	162	64.8		
To keep farmers up to date on reliable weather and climate information				
Strongly agree	75	30.0	2.39	1.36
Disagree	92	36.8		
Neither agree nor disagree	10	4.0		
Agree	62	24.8		
Strongly disagree	10	4.0		

CONCLUSION

Radio provides current agricultural related news, agricultural information and programs to transfer messages which could enhance the knowledge and information for capacity development of farmers. The role of radio about agriculture programs cannot deny. It is very essential that radio should provide more agricultural related programs as well as latest concerning information of weather, market and pesticides where farmers could increase their production. The timing of different agricultural programs is not suitable and not matches with farmers and

frequency is 10 to 20 minutes which cannot provide whole story and details. Radio producers should broadcast programs about technological usage in farming where the farmers could utilize these technologies in farming to increase their product and income.

REFERENCES

- Hanif, S. (1992). *Comparative Effectiveness of Various Sources of Information for Cane Growers in Crescent Sugar Mills' Zone Area*. M.Sc.(Hons.) Thesis [un-published], Department of Agriculture Extension, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad.
- Hussain, M. (1986). *Agricultural Information System in the Punjab: A Review*. Islamabad: National Agricultural Information System in Pakistan.
- Malik, S. (2000). *The Role of Mass Media in Diffusing Modern Agricultural Techniques in Distt. Sheikhpura*. M.Sc. (Hons.) Thesis [un-published], Department of Rural Sociology, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad.
- Mazher, A., A.D. Sheikh, S. Muhammad and M. Ashfaq. (2003). 'Role of Electronic Media in the Adoption of Agricultural Technologies by Farmers in the Central Punjab, Pakistan' *International Journal of Agriculture and Biology*, 5(1), 22-25.
- Muhammad, S. (2005). *Agricultural Extension: Strategies and Skills*. Faisalabad: Unitech Communications.
- Muhammad, S., Lodhi, T. E., & Khan, G. A. (2012). 'In-Depth Analysis of Electronic Media to Enhance Their Role in Agricultural Technology Transfer in the Punjab, Pakistan', *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 49 (2), 221-227.
- Purushothaman C, Kavaskar M, Reddy YA and Kanagasabapathi K (2003). *Role of Mass Media in Agriculture*. In the Proceedings of International Conference on Communication for Development in the Information Age: Extending the Benefits of Technology for All. 07-09 January.
- Sadaqath, S. & Mariswamy, H. (2007). 'Analysis of Usefulness and Credibility of Radio as Perceived by Literate Farmers', *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 20 (4), 784-787.
- Weiss, A., Van Crowder, L., & Bernardi, M. (2000). 'Communicating Agro Meteorological Information to Farming Communities', *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 103 (1), 185-196.