International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences
ISSN: 2278-6236
Impact Factor: 4.400

INFLUENCE OF FARM TELECASTS ON THE VIEWERS' LIFESTYLE

D. V. Singh*

Abstract: *The study was conducted in two blocks of Agra district of Uttar Pradesh to investigate the influence of farm telecasts on the lifestyle of farmers. Influence of farm telecasts as perceived by farmers was discussed under three broad areas i.e. economic, social and psychological sphere. The findings revealed that maximum number of male respondents had low and moderate economic influence whereas in case of females, the maximum number of respondents had low economic influence. Maximum number of males and females had moderate social as well as psychological influence. Statistical significant difference was found between economic influence of telecast on the lifestyle of male respondents, whereas in case of females, non-significant difference was found. Similarly significant difference was found between economic influence of telecast on the lifestyle of male respondents, whereas in case of females, non-significant difference was found. Likewise statistical significant difference was found between lifestyle of viewers with their social as well as psychological influence of telecast in both the categories of respondents.*

Key Words: *Economic Influence, Farm Telecasts, Lifestyle, Psychological Influence, Social Influence.*

*Programme Coordinator, Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Kandhamal, Odisha and Orissa University of Agriculture & Technology, Bhubaneswar (Odisha), India

INTRODUCTION

Television plays an important role in non-formal education and deals with important issues relating to social and economic progress of rural people in the world. It is constantly providing the farmers with information on new agricultural practices, motivating them to adopt new techniques of farming, integrate them into their on going practices and attempting to raise their consciousness. The TV has virtually shrunken the world into a global village and exposed the village to the global dimensions. Salzman (1993) pointed out that television is playing an important role in the modernizing processes of rural life i.e. democratization, consumerism, urban modeling and linguistic hegemony that are presently widespread and each has major ramifications for cultural life locally and beyond, and they all deserve close and detailed attention by anyone trying to understand contemporary life.

Extension researches conducted in India have revealed a discriminative rural response structure towards farm television programmes. Televiewing behaviuor is one of the significant parts in that. Behaviuor of the viewer is not a change or random phenonmenon, it is a response to a cause or stimulus and it is purposeful and goal oriented. It is intended to accomplish some objectives, which in turn would satisfy or at least reduce some need of the viewers.

Television has ability to convey life and events in action to develop a profound influence upon the viewers. It provides viewers with realistic experiences, which capture their attention and motivation them in proper direction. So keeping in mind the use of television in the process of social change, the present study was undertaken to analyze and understand the influence of the farm telecasts on the lifestyle of the viewers.

METHODOLOGY

The study was carried out in two purposively selected blocks namely: Etmadpur and Khandouli of Agra district of Uttar Pradesh. Total 10 progressive villages (5 from each block) were randomly selected. Twenty two TV owner farmers (11 Males and 11 Females) were randomly selected from each village, considering farmers who had television sets for the last three years, thus making a total sample of 220 respondents.

In the present study the influence of telecast was operationalized as the effects of telecasts as perceived by the viewers on their life. For this purpose, all the possible influences of telecast were divided into three spheres, viz., economic, social and psychological. To

measure influence of telecast, three- point continuum schedule was used. These three points continuum were most influence, influence and least influence comprised scores of 3, 2 and 1 respectively. On the basis of scores obtained by the respondents, they were grouped into low (11-15), moderate (15-19) and high (19-23) economic influence, low (14-22), moderate (22-30) and high (30-38) social influence and low (9-13), moderate (13-17) and high (17-21) psychological influence of farm telecast categories.

A well-structured interview schedule was used for data collection. The level of influence of telecasts on the viewers' life was classified in-to three categories, viz., low, moderate and high on the basis of mean standard deviation. To analyze the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables, chi-square test was used.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Viewer's Lifestyle: Large number of males (41.82%) and females (44.55%) respondents had semi-modern lifestyle (Table 1). It was followed by 35.45 per cent modern and 22.73 per cent traditional lifestyle of male respondents. In case of females, it was followed by traditional (30.00%) and modern (25.45%) lifestyle.

The fact that more females were having traditional lifestyle than males was somewhat expected. It is because females generally have lower education, less mass media exposure and less extension contact.

Economic Influence of Farm Telecasts: It is clear from Table 2 that maximum and equal number of male respondents (34.54%) had low and moderate economic influence followed by high (30.92%) economic influence. Whereas in case of females, it was found that maximum number of respondents (40.00 %) had low economic influence followed by equal number (30.00 % each) who had moderate and high economic influence. Overall, it was found that maximum number of respondents (37.27%) had low economic influence followed by moderate (32.27%) and high (30.46%) economic influence.

The data in Table 3 shows the relationship between economic influence of farm telecasts on the lifestyle of the viewers. The Table reveals that a large number (68.00% male and 54.55% female) of the traditional lifestyle had low economic influence followed by moderate (16.00% male and 27.27% female) and high (16.00% male and 18.18% female). Overall, it was found that majority of the respondents (60.35%) of the traditional lifestyle had low economic influence followed by moderate (22.41%) and high (17.24%) economic influence.

Similarly, in case of males maximum number (41.30%) of the semi-modern lifestyle had moderate economic influence followed by low (32.61%) and high (26.09%) economic influence. Whereas, females (38.78%) of the semi-modern lifestyle had low economic influence followed by moderate (34.69%) and high (26.53%) economic influence.

Overall, it was found that maximum number of the respondents (37.89%) of the semi-modern lifestyle had moderate economic influence followed by low (35.79%) and high (26.32%) economic influence.

Likewise, it was found that maximum number (46.15% males and 50.00% females) of the modern lifestyle had high economic influence followed by moderate (38.46% male and 25.00% female) and low (15.39% male and 25.00% female) economic influence. Overall, it was found that maximum number (47.76%) of modern farmers had high economic influence followed by moderate (32.84%) and low (19.40%) economic influence.

Further, the Table reveals that statistically significant difference was found between economic influence of farm telecast on the lifestyle of pooled and male respondents (X^2 =27.208** Pooled and 20.638** Male; P < 0.01%), whereas, in case of female, non-significant difference was found (X^2 = 09.476 NS ; P < 0.01%).

The results obtained might be due to the fact that males have higher risk orientation than females and they are the supreme decision making authority in the family. So whatever they learnt from the farm telecast, tried to materatise it in the farm situation.

The similar results were also reported by Salzman (1993), Kaur (1999), Johnson (2000) and Chew and Palmer (2005).

Social Influence of Farm Telecasts: The data in the Table 4 depicts that maximum number of males (41.82%) and females (43.64%) had moderate social influence. It was followed by high (34.54% males and 30.00% females) and low (23.64% males and 26.36% females) social influence. Overall, it was found that maximum number of respondents (42.73%) had moderate social influence followed by high (32.27%) and low (25.00%) social influence.

The data in the Table 5 shows the relationship between social influence of farm telecasts on the lifestyle of the viewers. Table 5 shows that in case of males, more than half (52.00%) of the traditional lifestyle had low social influence followed by moderate (48.00%) social influence of farm telecasts. Whereas, in case of females more than half (54.55%) of the traditional lifestyle had moderate social influence followed by low (45.45%) social influence

of farm telecasts. None of the male and female of the traditional lifestyle had high social influence of farm telecasts. Overall, it was found that maximum number of the respondents (51.72%) of traditional lifestyle had moderate social influence followed by low (48.28%) social influence.

Similarly, maximum number (47.83% males and 44.90% females) of the semi-modern lifestyle had moderate social influence followed by high (36.95% males and 30.61% females) and low (15.22% males and 24.49% females) social influence. Overall, it was found that maximum number of respondents (46.32%) of the semi-modern lifestyle had moderate social influence followed by high (33.68%) and low (20.00%) social influence.

Likewise, it was found that more than half male (53.85%) and female (64.29%) of the modern lifestyle had high social influence followed by moderate (30.77% males and 28.57% females) and low (15.38% males and 7.14% females) social influence. Overall, it was found that more than half (58.21%) of the modern farmers had high social influence followed by moderate (29.85%) and low (11.94%) social influence.

Further, the Table 3 depicts that statistically significant difference was found between the social influence of farm telecast on the viewer's lifestyle (X^2 = 54.815** Pooled; 31.799** Female and 25.692** Male; P < 0.01%).

This result of the study might be due to the fact that both males and females had wide circle for human relationship. Moreover they also got opportunity to improve the living standard of the family and removing age-old barrier from the society.

The similar results were found by Chauhan (1976), Kaur (1999) and Johnson (2000).

Psychological influence of farm telecasts: The data in the Table 6 depicts that maximum number of males (38.18%) and females (41.82%) had moderate psychological influence. It was followed by high (36.36% males and 30.00% females) and low (25.46% males and 28.18% females) psychological influence through farm telecasts. Overall, it was found that maximum number of respondents (40.00%) had moderate psychological influence followed by high (33.18%) and low (26.82%) psychological influence through farm telecasts. This means that nearly two third respondents got psychological influence by viewing farm telecasts.

The data in the Table 7 shows the relationship between psychological influence of farm telecasts on the lifestyle of the viewers. Table 7 clearly shows that majority of males

(60.00%) and females (54.55%) of the traditional lifestyle had low psychological influence followed by moderate (40.00% males and 45.45% females) psychological influence. None of the male and female of the traditional lifestyle had high psychological influence of farm telecasts. Overall, it was found that majority (56.90%) of traditional lifestyle had low psychological influence followed by moderate (43.10%) psychological influence. Similarly males (41.30%) and females (46.94%) of the semi-modern lifestyle had moderate psychological influence followed by high (39.13% males and 26.53% females) and low (19.57% males and 26.53% females) psychological influence. Overall, it was found that maximum number of the respondents (44.21%) of the semi-modern lifestyle had moderate psychological influence followed by high (32.63%) and low (23.16%) psychological influence.

Likewise, it was found that majority of the males (56.41%) and females (71.43%) of the modern lifestyle had high psychological influence. Further, males (33.33%) and females (28.57%) of the modern lifestyle were with moderate psychological influence. Whereas, few (10.26%) males and none of the females of the modern lifestyle were with low psychological influence of farm telecasts. Overall, it was found that majority (62.69%) of the modern lifestyle people had high psychological influence followed by moderate (31.34%) and low (5.97%) psychological influence.

Further, the Table reveals that statistically significant difference was found between the psychological influence of farm telecast on the viewer's lifestyle (X^2 =69.547** Pooled; 43.775** Female and 29.761** Male; P < 0.01%).

This was because of the fact that television broadened their mental horizon to adopt agriculture as an improved enterprise and develop a positive attitude for taking important farm decision or family decision.

The similar findings were observed Sinha et al. (1994), Kaur (1999) and Johnson (2000).

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that maximum number of male and female respondents had semi-modern lifestyle. It was found that maximum number of modern farmers had high economic influence. More than half males and females of the modern lifestyle had high social influence. Similarly, majority of the males and females of the modern lifestyle had high psychological influence.

A significant difference was found between economic influence of telecasts on the lifestyle of male respondents whereas, in case of females, non-significant difference was found. Similarly, significant difference was found between social influence as well as psychological influence of farm telecasts on the lifestyle of both male and female respondents.

REFERENCES

1. Chauhan, K.N.K. (1976). Inducing change through SITE. A study of some socio-psychological and communication correlates of adoption behaviour of the rural audience of SITE in North Bihar. *Ph.D. thesis (Unpublished), Division of Agricultural Extension, IARI, New Delhi*.
2. Chew, F. and Palmer, S. (2005). Television health promotion in four countries, Nutrition, *Elsevier Publication, New York, USA,* 21 (5): 634-638.
3. Johnson, K. (2000). Television and social change in rural India, *Sage publication, New Delhi*.
4. Kaur, J. (1999). Influence of television on social life; study reveals, enhancement of mobility and maturity. *Communicator*. 34 (1): 32-35.
5. Salzman, P. (1993). The Electronic Trojan Horse : Television in the globalization of pera-modern cultures: presented at the plenary session "Societies, evaluation and globalization". *13th International Congress of Anthropological and Enthrological Sciences, Maxico City.*
6. Sinha, B.P.; Borker, M.M. and Singh, P. (1994). Effect of television advertisement on women viewers. *Interaction*, 12 (2): 48 – 51.

Table:1: Distribution of respondents according to their lifestyle

Lifestyle	Respondents					
	Male (n = 110)		Female (n = 110)		Pooled (n = 220)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Modern	39	35.45	28	25.45	67	30.45
Semi-modern	46	41.82	49	44.55	95	43.18
Traditional	25	22.73	33	30.00	58	26.37
Total	110	100	110	100	220	100

Table:2: Distribution of the respondents according to economic influence of farm telecasts

Economic influence	Respondents					
	Male (n = 110)		Female (n = 110)		Pooled (n = 220)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Low	38	34.54	44	40.00	82	37.27
Moderate	38	34.54	33	30.00	71	32.27
High	34	30.92	33	30.00	67	30.46
Total	110	100	110	100	220	100

Table:3: Relationship between economic influence of farm telecasts on lifestyle of the viewers

Lifestyle	Economic Influence											
	Low			Moderate			High			Total		
	Male	Female	Pooled	Male	Female	Pooled	Male	Female	Pooled	Male	Female	Pooled
Modern	6 (15.39)	7 (25.00)	13 (19.40)	15 (38.46)	7 (25.00)	22 (32.84)	18 (46.15)	14 (50.00)	32 (47.76)	39 (100)	28 (100)	67 (100)
Semi-modern	15 (32.61)	19 (38.78)	34 (35.79)	19 (41.30)	17 (34.69)	36 (37.89)	12 (26.09)	13 (26.53)	25 (26.32)	46 (100)	49 (100)	95 (100)
Traditional	17 (68.00)	18 (54.55)	35 (60.35)	4 (16.00)	9 (27.27)	13 (22.41)	4 (16.00)	6 (18.18)	10 (17.24)	25 (100)	33 (100)	58 (100)
Total	38 (34.54)	44 (40.00)	82 (37.27)	38 (34.54)	33 (30.00)	71 (32.27)	34 (30.92)	33 (30.00)	67 (30.46)	110 (100)	110 (100)	220 (100)

The value in parenthesis indicates percentage of respective lifestyle category.

X^2= 20.638** Male; 09.476 NS Female; 27.208** Pooled.,** = Significant at 0.01% level of significance.

NS = Non-significant at 0.01% level of significance.

Table:4: Distribution of the respondents according to social influence of farm telecasts

Social influence	Respondents					
	Male (n = 110)		Female (n = 110)		Pooled (n = 220)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Low	26	23.64	29	26.36	55	25.00
Moderate	46	41.82	48	43.64	94	42.73
High	38	34.54	33	30.00	71	32.27
Total	110	100	110	100	220	100

Table:5: Relationship between social influence of farm telecasts on lifestyle of the viewers

Lifestyle	Social Influence											
	Low			Moderate			High			Total		
	Male	Female	Pooled	Male	Female	Pooled	Male	Female	Pooled	Male	Female	Pooled
Modern	6 (15.38)	2 (7.14)	8 (11.94)	12 (30.77)	8 (28.57)	20 (29.85)	21 (53.85)	18 (64.29)	39 (58.21)	39 (100)	28 (100)	67 (100)
Semi-modern	7 (15.22)	12 (24.49)	19 (20.00)	22 (47.83)	22 (44.90)	44 (46.32)	17 (36.95)	15 (30.61)	32 (33.68)	46 (100)	49 (100)	95 (100)
Traditional	13 (52.00)	15 (45.45)	28 (48.28)	12 (48.00)	18 (54.55)	30 (51.72)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	25 (100)	33 (100)	58 (100)
Total	26 (23.64)	29 (26.36)	55 (25.00)	46 (41.82)	48 (43.64)	94 (42.73)	38 (34.54)	33 (30.00)	71 (32.27)	110 (100)	110 (100)	220 (100)

The value in parenthesis indicates percentage of respective lifestyle category.

X^2 = 25.692** Male; 31.799** Female; 54.815** Pooled.,** = Significant at 0.01% level of significance.

Table:6: Distribution of the respondents according to psychological influence of farm telecasts

Psychological influence	Respondents					
	Male (n = 110)		Female (n = 110)		Pooled (n = 220)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Low	28	25.46	31	28.18	59	26.82
Moderate	42	38.18	46	41.82	88	40.00
High	40	36.36	33	30.00	73	33.18
Total	110	100	110	100	220	100

Table:7: Relationship between psychological influence of farm telecasts on lifestyle of the viewers

Lifestyle	Psychological Influence											
	Low			Moderate			High			Total		
	Male	Female	Pooled	Male	Female	Pooled	Male	Female	Pooled	Male	Female	Pooled
Modern	4 (10.26)	00 (00.00)	4 (5.97)	13 (33.33)	8 (28.57)	21 (31.34)	22 (56.41)	20 (71.43)	42 (62.69)	39 (100)	28 (100)	67 (100)
Semi-modern	9 (19.57)	13 (26.53)	22 (23.16)	19 (41.30)	23 (46.94)	42 (44.21)	18 (39.13)	13 (26.53)	31 (32.63)	46 (100)	49 (100)	95 (100)
Traditional	15 (60.00)	18 (54.55)	33 (56.90)	10 (40.00)	15 (45.45)	25 (43.10)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	25 (100)	33 (100)	58 (100)
Total	28 (25.46)	31 (28.18)	59 (26.82)	42 (38.18)	46 (41.82)	88 (40.00)	40 (36.36)	33 (30.00)	73 (33.18)	110 (100)	110 (100)	220 (100)

The value in parenthesis indicates percentage of respective lifestyle category.

X^2 = 29.761** Male; 43.775** Female; 69.547** Pooled.,** = Significant at 0.01% level of significance.