

Original Research Article

<https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2020.904.261>

Reading Habit of Agricultural Literature by Orange Growers

Pawan V. Chimote^{1*}, V. S. Tekale² and Pranali N. Thakare²

¹Extension Education Section, College of Agriculture, Nagpur (MS) 440001, India

²Department of Extension Education, Dr. PDKV, Akola (MS) 444104, India

*Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Keywords

Reading habit,
Agricultural
literature, Orange
grower

Article Info

Accepted:
18 March 2020
Available Online:
10 April 2020

The present study, “Reading habit of agricultural literature by orange growers” was undertaken in Morshi and Warud tahsils of Amravati District in Vidarbha region of Maharashtra state. The data from 120 orange growers were collected with the help of interview schedule. The findings emerged out of the present investigation are summarized as follows, majority (70.84%) of respondents had medium level of reading habit of agricultural literature. Majority of respondents encounter the problem of agricultural information not given daily (67.67%), followed by higher price of newspaper and magazine (53.33%), information given in articles is not always suitable to existing situations (48.33%).

Introduction

Print medium is one of the most important mass medium. Newspapers, bulletins, newsletters, pamphlets, folders, leaflets, circular letters, krishi patrika, shetkari magazine, baliraja, and other magazines are some of the popular printed sources of information which disseminate agricultural information particularly to the rural masses, farmers.

They are read by people at leisure. Print media has shown tremendous impact in changing the agricultural scenario. It is

believed that, print media demands for more active and creative participation on the part of the rural leaders than it is demanded by the audience of other media.

Materials and Methods

The present study was undertaken in Amravati district of Vidarbha region of Maharashtra state. An exploratory research design of social research was used for the present investigation. Morshi and Warud tahsils from Amravati district were purposively selected as circulation of newspapers; magazines would be more in

these locales as compared to other rural tahsils of this district area. Ten villages were selected from each tahsil. From each selected village, a list of literate orange growers who could read printed matter was obtained and from this list, six orange growers were selected by random sampling method.

Thus, from selected 20 villages of two tahsils of Amravati district, 120 orange growers were selected and considered as respondents in the present study. The interview schedule was used for data collection after suitable modification on the basis of pre-testing.

Results and Discussion

From Table 1 it was observed that, in case of newspaper, 35.00 per cent respondents read market information, followed by agricultural information (26.67%). Whereas, 21.67 per cent read information other than agricultural, market, news and advertisement. The 19.17 per cent respondents read news, followed by 16.67 per cent read advertisement in newspaper.

In case of magazine, 32.50 per cent respondents read agricultural information and 04.17 per cent read market information and advertisement, respectively. Meager per cent of respondents read other information (02.50%) and news (01.66) in magazine, respectively. In case of leaflet, one fourth of respondents (25.00%) read agricultural information from leaflets, followed by other information (04.17) and meager per cent of respondents (01.66%) read market information and advertisement, respectively.

From pamphlet, 21.67 per cent of respondents read agricultural information and 01.66 per cent respondents read other information. In case of bulletin, 05.83 per cent respondents read agricultural information and 01.66 per cent read other information. The 13.33 per

cent respondents read other information and 03.33 per cent respondents read agricultural information from other sources like book, booklet, poster etc. By and large higher proportion of respondents read newspaper especially for market information (35.00%) and agricultural information (26.67%) and 32.50 per cent respondent read magazine mostly for agricultural information.

From Table 2 it was observed that, great majority of respondents (92.50%) were read newspaper followed by magazine (36.67), leaflet (27.50%), pamphlets (21.66%), other (booklet, book, poster etc) (16.67) and bulletin (05.83%), respectively.

In case of newspaper, it was found that, majority of respondents (51.35%) read newspaper at their home, followed by equal per cent of respondents (15.31%) were read the newspaper at their neighbors home and village canteens and remaining respondents read newspaper at rural library (09.90%) and Grampanchayat (08.10%), respectively.

In case of magazine, it was observed that, more than half of respondents (54.55%) read magazine at their home, followed by 22.73 per cent respondents read magazine at rural library and equal percentage of respondents (11.36%) were read magazine at their neighbors home and Grampanchayat, respectively. In case of leaflet, majority of respondents (60.60%) read leaflet at rural library, whereas (30.30%) respondents read leaflet at village canteen and only (09.10%) of respondents read at Grampanchayat.

In case of pamphlet, (38.47%) read pamphlet at Grampanchayat, (34.61%) respondents read at rural library and (26.92%) read pamphlet at village canteen, respectively. In case of bulletin, near about three fourth of respondents (71.43%) read bulletin at rural library and 28.57 per cent respondents read

bulletin at their home. In case of other publication (books, booklet, poster and folder) 55.00 per cent preferred rural libraries, followed by 45.00 per cent respondents who read other publication at their home.

From Table 3, it was observed that, in case of newspaper, 19.81 per cent respondents preserved article and 18.01 per cent use information given in newspaper, only 01.80 per cent respondents took notes. In case of magazine, some of the respondents (22.72%) preserved article, followed by 11.36 per cent respondents use information given in magazine and meager per cent of respondents (06.82%) taking notes from magazine.

From leaflets, 39.39 per cent of respondents use information and 24.24 per cent of respondents preserved article, respectively. In case of pamphlet, majority of respondents (57.69%) preserved article and more than one fourth of the respondents (26.91%) use information given in pamphlets.

From bulletins, most of the respondents (42.85%) preserved article and more than one fourth of the respondents (28.57%) use information given in bulletin. In case of other publication (book, booklet, poster and folder) equal percentage of respondents (05.00%) preserved article and use information, respectively.

From Table 4 it was observed that, in case of newspaper, most of respondents 43.25 per cent read newspaper for thirty minute, followed by (38.74%) respondents read newspaper for one hour. Only 18.01 per cent respondents read newspaper for fifteen minute.

In case of magazine, 45.46 per cent respondents read for thirty minute and 40.90 per cent respondents read magazine for one hour, respectively. Few respondents (13.64%)

read magazine for 15 minute. In case of leaflets and pamphlets, 100.00 per cent respondents devoted 15 minutes for reading, respectively.

In case of bulletin, more than half respondents (57.15%) read bulletin for thirty minute, followed by 42.85 per cent respondents read bulletin for 15 minute. In case of other publication (books, booklets, poster and folder), majority of the respondents (45.00%) read other literature for one hour, followed 30.00 per cent read for half an hour and one fourth of respondents (25.00%) read for fifteen minute.

From Table 5 it was observed that, majority of the respondents (70.84%) were found to be in medium level of reading habit, followed by 17.50 per cent of respondents in high level of reading habit and 11.66 per cent respondents in low level of reading habit.

Thus, it is concluded that, relatively large proportion of respondents (70.84%) had medium level of reading habit. Similar findings are also observed by Dhararukar *et al.*, (2011) and Hanumanakar *et al.*, (2011).

Constraints expressed by the orange growers in reading of agricultural literature were agricultural information not given timely (67.67%), higher price of newspaper and magazine (53.33%), information given in articles were not always suitable to existing situations (48.33%), agricultural information is not timely (39.17%), poor economic condition hence cannot subscribe newspaper and magazine (35.00%), special issue on agriculture and allied information were not available at village level (33.34%), difficult language (25.00%), information given in article is inadequate (14.16%) and quality of information is not so good (11.66), respectively (Table 6).

Table.1 Distribution of the respondents according to subject matter read

SI. No.	Subject matter read	Respondents (n = 120)					
		News paper	Magazine	Leaflet	Pamphlet	Bulletin	Other (book, booklet, folder and poster)
		Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)
1	Agricultural information related to orange	32 (26.67)	39 (32.50)	30 (25.00)	26 (21.67)	07 (05.83)	04 (03.33)
2	Market information	42 (35.00)	05 (04.17)	02 (01.66)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)
3	News	23 (19.17)	02 (01.66)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)
4	Advertisement	20 (16.67)	05 (04.17)	02 (01.66)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)
5	Other	26 (21.67)	03 (02.50)	05 (04.17)	02 (01.66)	02 (01.66)	16 (13.33)

Multiple choice responses

Table.2 Distribution of the respondents according to place of reading

SI. No.	Place of Reading	Respondent (n=120)					
		Newspaper	Magazine	Leaflet	Pamphlet	Bulletin	Other (book, booklet, folder and poster)
		n=111 (92.50%)	n=44 (36.66%)	n=33 (27.50%)	n=26 (21.66%)	n=07 (5.83%)	n=20 (16.66%)
		Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)
1	At home	57 (51.35)	24 (54.55)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	02 (28.57)	09 (45.00)
2	Neighbors home	17 (15.32)	05 (11.36)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)
3	Rural library	11 (09.91)	10 (22.73)	20 (60.60)	09 (34.61)	05 (71.43)	11 (55.00)
4	Grampanchayat	09 (08.10)	05 (11.36)	03 (09.10)	10 (38.47)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)
5	Village canteens	17 (15.32)	00 (00.00)	10 (30.30)	07 (26.92)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)

Multiple choice responses

Table.3 Distribution of the respondents according to quality of reading

SI. No.	Publication read	Respondent (n=120)		
		Taking notes	Preserve articles	Use of information
		Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)
1	Newspaper (n=111)	02 (01.80)	22 (19.81)	20 (18.01)
2	Magazine (n = 44)	03 (06.82)	10 (22.72)	05 (11.36)
3	Leaflets (n=33)	00 (00.00)	08 (24.24)	13 (39.39)
4	Pamphlets (n=26)	00 (00.00)	15 (57.69)	07 (26.91)
5	Bulletins (n=07)	00 (00.00)	03 (42.85)	02 (28.57)
6	Other (n=20)	00 (00.00)	01 (05.00)	01 (05.00)

Table.4 Distribution of the respondents according to time spent on reading

SI. No.	Material read	Time		
		60 min (1 hr)	30 min	15 min
		Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)
1	Newspaper (n=111)	43 (38.74)	48 (43.25)	20 (18.01)
2	Magazine (n=44)	18 (40.90)	20 (45.46)	06 (13.64)
3	Leaflets (n=33)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	33 (100.00)
4	Pamphlets (n=26)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	26 (100.00)
5	Bulletins (n=07)	00 (00.00)	04 (57.15)	03 (42.85)
6	Other (n=20)	09 (45.00)	06 (30.00)	05 (25.00)

Table.5 Distribution of the respondents according to overall reading habit

SI. No.	Reading habit	Respondent (n=120)	
		Frequency	Percentage
1	Low	14	11.66
2	Medium	85	70.84
3	High	21	17.50

Table.6 Distribution of respondents according to constraints faced by them in reading

SI. No.	Constraint	Respondent (n=120)	
		Frequency	Percentage
1	Difficult language	30	25.00
2	Higher price of newspaper and magazine	64	53.33
3	Agricultural information is not timely	47	39.17
4	Agricultural information not given daily	80	67.67
5	Information given in articles is not always suitable to existing situations	58	48.33
6	Information given in articles is inadequate	17	14.16
7	Poor economic condition hence cannot subscribe newspaper and magazine	42	35.00
8	Quality of information is not so good	14	11.66
9	Special issue on agriculture and allied information were not available at village level	40	33.34

It is concluded that, the overall reading habit of orange growers were in medium level hence government agencies or publishers should provide recent, advance and high technical information through agricultural literature at low price to increase reading habit of orange growers. It was also observed that, higher proportion of orange growers prefer newspaper for market information and followed by magazine for agricultural information.

So publisher can published the agricultural information in newspaper and magazine. The agricultural information should be published in newspaper daily. The agricultural literature published by government and state agricultural universities need to be made

available at lower prices and in plenty for the farmers.

References

- Dhararukar, H. S, S. Gaikwad and B. N. Tambe. 2011. Reading habits of farmers, *Agric update*, 6(3&4): 87-89.
- Hanumanakar, R. H., L. Manjunath and K. V. Natikar. 2011. Reading behaviour of farmer-farm magazine, 24(4): 471-473.
- Jambhale, M. G. 2015. Correlates of utility perception of *Krishipatrika* by the respondent, 6: 149 -154.
- Tekale, V. S. 2003. Credibility, readability and utility of farm periodicals by subscriber farmers. Ph.D. Thesis (Unpub.), Dr. PDKV, Akola.

How to cite this article:

Pawan V. Chimote, V. S. Tekale and Pranali N. Thakare. 2020. Reading Habit of Agricultural Literature by Orange Growers. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci*. 9(04): 2183-2188.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2020.904.261>