



Journal of Medicinal Plants Studies

To study the use of information sources by tribal and non-tribal farmers in the Bilaspur district of Chhattisgarh state

Deepak Kumar Shrivastava

Assistant Professor, Barrister Thakur Chhedilal College of Agriculture & Research Station Bilaspur,
Chhattisgarh, India

*vscmadan9@gmail.com

This study looks at how tribal and non-tribal farmers in Chhattisgarh's Bilaspur district get their information aiming to show the differences in their info-gathering habits. The research points out how managing farm info plays a key role in food security and helps sustainable growth as farming tech changes. The team gathered data from 320 small farmers in eight villages, with an equal mix of tribal and non-tribal folks. The findings indicate that most of the respondents (40.00%) had five to six sources of information followed by 30.62 per cent of them who had three to four sources of information. It was also observed that most (38.12%) of the non-tribal respondents had five to six sources of information. The data reveals that the majority of the tribal respondents (86.87%) used neighbours for obtaining agricultural information. Similarly, the majority (78.13%) of the non-tribal respondents used neighbours as their source of agricultural information. Results show both groups turn to people they know - neighbors, friends, and family - for farm info. But non-tribal farmers tap into more info sources than tribal ones do.

Keyword: Tribal and non-tribal, information, farmers, agriculture

Introduction

After the advent of the World Trade Organization and multinational corporations, the current agricultural situation of the country is constantly changing. Timely management of information is essential to ensure both food security and globalization. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization has acknowledged that sustainable development and food security depend heavily on agricultural information management practices.

The most significant policy management issues, according to Peter (1994) ^[3], are organizing information services to satisfy research requests at various levels and supplying the thorough information needed for developing research interests. Research is

now focused on sustainable agricultural production and natural resource management, which calls for a change in the roles that researchers play in this regard. Therefore, from information gathering to processing, storage, distribution, and usage by end users, such as farmers, information management, including technology production, transfer, assessment, and refinement, is handled. Tribal farmers today seek information in new ways; they frequently need assistance and interpretation of the information rather than the information itself, which highlights the need of information management. An agricultural information system (AIS) is a system that generates, integrates, retrieves, and provides feedback on agricultural information in a way that allows agricultural

producers to apply their knowledge in a coordinated manner (Rolling, 1988) ^[5].

Analyzing the management of agricultural information is crucial in order to identify any potential flaws that can impede the farmer's advancement. "Future success for nations, organizations, and farmers lies not in high-level technology but in innovative and well-managed content," said Michael Riggs (2001) ^[2]. Since information technology is evolving at a faster rate than people realize, strategies for overcoming the monetary, social, and psychological obstacles to successfully embracing the technology needed for information management must be developed. But it's important to keep in mind that technology is only a tool, not a finished good. Therefore, in order to manage information effectively, it is up to the individual to use it appropriately. As a result, the intended information management behavior is crucial. The expansion of information in contemporary technology pertaining to all fields, including agriculture, has produced a special circumstance that leaves its consumers bewildered and unable to handle it.

This calls for information management, which at least lessens, if not totally removes, this gap. The significance of information management in the information age is summed up by Kranzberg (1987) ^[1], who promises to uphold the ideals of a good life.

Although these changes and advantages may not materialize right away, they will have a revolutionary impact on our society. The players in agricultural development are being forced to manage agricultural information in order to create a robust agricultural economy because of the void left by the quick advancement of agricultural production technology and mechanization. For tribal farmers, who are the most significant stakeholders in agricultural growth, agricultural information management thus becomes crucial and essential.

Research Methodology

The four blocks in the Bilaspur district of Chhattisgarh state—Kota, Marwahi, Lormi, and Gaurela-2 were focused of the current investigation. At a distance of 10 km from the block headquarters, two villages with a high proportion of tribal and non-tribal farmers were chosen from each block. Consequently, eight communities in all were chosen for the research. Each town had 40 randomly chosen respondents. Each chosen community had 40 respondents in total (20 tribal and 20 non-tribal small farmers). Therefore, 320 respondents were chosen for the study using a random number-selecting approach from the eight villages.

Results and discussion

Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to their sources of information

S. No.	Sources of information	Tribal		Non-tribal	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1.	One to two sources	41	25.63	37	23.13
2.	Three to four sources	49	30.62	30	18.75
3.	Five to six sources	64	40.00	61	38.12
4.	More than six sources	06	03.75	32	20.00
	Total	160	100.00	160	100.00

The data presented in Table 1 shows that most of the respondents (40.00%) had five to six sources of information, followed by 30.62

per cent of them who had three to four sources of information. 25.63 per cent of the tribal respondents had one to two sources of

information, while only 03.75 per cent of them had more than six sources of information. Further, the data shown in Table 1 that most (38.12%) of the non-tribal respondents had five to six sources of information followed by 23.13, 20.0 and 18.75 per cent of the respondents who had one to two sources, more than six sources and three to four sources of information, respectively.

It can be concluded that most of the small tribal farmers of Chhattisgarh plain who were surveyed had five to six sources of

information. On comparing the data on sources of information it can be broadly stated that non-tribal farmers studied were using more sources of information as compared to their tribal counterparts. Similarly, most of the small non-tribal farmers of Chhattisgarh plain had also five to six sources of information to obtain knowledge and awareness about improved farming practices. Raje (1991) reported that 61.70 per cent of the farmers were not getting information about scientific storage practices from any type of source of information.

Table 2: Distribution of the respondents according to the sources utilised for receiving agricultural information

S. No.	Sources of information	Tribal		Non-tribal	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Neighbour	139	86.87	125	78.13
2.	Friends	117	73.13	109	68.13
3.	Relatives	91	56.87	102	63.75
4.	Radio	62	38.75	98	61.25
5.	T.V.	48	30.00	87	54.38
6.	RAEO	39	24.38	81	50.63
7.	Progressive Farmer	28	17.50	55	34.38
8.	Worker of private agencies	21	13.13	51	31.87
9.	Agriculture Development Officer	13	08.13	23	14.38
10.	News paper	09	05.63	21	13.13
11.	Worker of co-operative society	08	05.00	20	12.50
12.	Agricultural scientist	00	00.00	04	02.50
13.	Magazine	00	00.00	02	01.25
<i>*Frequency is based on the multiple respondents</i>					

The data in Table 2 reveals that the majority of the tribal respondents (86.87%) used neighbours for obtaining agricultural information followed by 73.13, 56.87, 38.75, 30.00 and 24.38 per cent of them who utilized friends, relatives, radio, T.V. and RAEO respectively for obtaining agricultural information. The other sources utilized by the tribal respondents were progressive farmers (17.50%), workers of private agencies (13.13%), ADO (08.13%), newspaper (05.63%), workers of cooperative society (05.00%), agricultural scientists (00.00) and magazine (00.00%).

Similarly, it can be observed that the majority (78.13%) of the non-tribal respondents used neighbours as their source of agricultural information followed by 68.13 per cent of the respondents who used friends, 63.75 per cent of them used relatives, whereas 61.25 percent of them used radio as their sources of agricultural information. The other sources utilized were T.V. (54.38%), RAEO (50.63%), Progressive farmers (34.38%), workers of private agencies (31.87%), ADO ((14.38%), Newspaper (13.13%), workers of cooperative society (12.50%) agricultural scientists (2.50%) and magazine (1.25%).

Based on the findings, it can be stated that majority of the tribal respondents reported neighbours as the source of information for agriculture, followed by friends, relatives, radio, TV, RAO, *etc.* Similarly, it stated

that the main source of agriculture related information used by majority of the non-tribal respondents from the plains of Chhattisgarh was neighbours, followed by friends, relatives, radio, TV, *etc.*

Table 3: Distribution of the respondents according to the extent of media utilized for receiving farm information

S. No.	Mass Media	Tribal				Non-tribal			
		Nil	Low	Medium	High	Nil	Low	Medium	High
1.	Radio	98	46	16	00	62	78	20	00
2.	T.V.	112	38	10	00	73	61	16	10
3.	News Paper	151	09	00	00	139	13	08	00
4.	Magazines	160	00	00	00	158	02	00	00

The data presented in Table 3 gives the distribution of tribal and non-tribal respondents according to the extent of mass media utilized for receiving farm information. It is apparent that 98 tribal respondents never used radio whereas 46, 16 and 00 of them had low, medium and high utilization of radio respectively; with reference to T.V. the data reveals that 112 of the tribal respondents never used T.V. but 38, 10 and 00 of them had low, medium and high use of T.V. respectively. Regarding newspapers, it is observed that 151 of them never used it while only 09 tribal respondents used newspapers for obtaining farm information. All the 160 tribal respondents surveyed reported that they never used magazines as mass media sources of farm information.

Further, it is observed from Table 3 that 62.00 non-tribal respondents never used radio whereas 78, 20 and 00 respondents had low, medium and high utilization of radio respectively for receiving farm information. In the case of T.V. 73 non-tribal respondents never used it while 61, 16 and 10 respondents had low, medium and high utilisation respectively. As regards newspapers 139 of the non-tribal respondents never used it followed by 13, 08 and 00 respondents who had low, medium and high utilisation

respectively. So far as magazines are concerned 158 non-tribal respondents never used it and only 02 respondents reported that they had low utilization of magazines as mass media sources for receiving farm information.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the survey results show that most small tribal farmers in the Chhattisgarh plain got their farming info from neighbors then from friends, family, and radio. Non-tribal farmers, on the other hand, use more sources, including neighbors, friends, family, radio, and TV. The data makes it clear that both tribal and non-tribal respondents don't use mass media like radio, TV, newspapers, and magazines much. This highlights how important person-to-person networks are for the dissemination of agricultural knowledge in the area studied.

References

1. Karanzberg M. The information age: Evaluation of Revolution. Agricultural information development Bulletin; c1987, 9(2).
2. Michael Riggs. International conference on Development of Agricultural Information Management Technology

- and Markets in the 21st century. 4-6. Beijing, China; c2001.
3. Peter Ballantyne. Bridging gap between practice and policy: policy management challenges for agricultural information specialists. Quarterly bulletin of IAALD. 1994;39(1&2):23-31.
 4. Raje AB. A study of scientific storage practice of food grains and utilization of ware housing facilities by farmers. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis Dr. P.D.K.V., Akola; c1991.
 5. Rolling Niels. Extension Science Information systems in Agricultural Systems. Cambridge university Press; c1988, 179-212.