

Farmers' Access to Farm Programs of Bangladesh Betar: An Evaluation of Effectiveness

Mahedi Hasan¹, Nazrul Islam Mondal², Nurul Islam³ and Aminul Hoque⁴

ABSTRACT

Different forms of farm programs (FP) have been being developed and aired by Bangladesh Betar (BB) for decades to hasten the development of agriculture and the farming communities of Bangladesh. These programs are in dire need of academic study for in-depth evaluation to discern their effectiveness. This study was supposed to reveal the effectiveness of the FP of BB in respect of the extent to which it reaches the farmers of Bangladesh. Data and necessary information were collected by means of document analysis and survey methods. A sample of 465 respondents was selected for questionnaire survey. Frequency distribution and z-test for significance test of proportions were done for data analysis. It was divulged that the FPs of BB were ineffectual because they failed to reach 93.33 per cent of the farmers. Radio set, a culturally unfit device was possessed by only 4.30 per cent of the farmers. Most of the farmers were accustomed to unauthorized sources (salesman and fellow farmers) of farm information. A vast majority of the respondents were insolent towards the authorized extension agents and departments. The unconsciousness regarding the importance of farm knowledge and their mindset were the most influencing factors for listening to the FPs. Initiatives were must to change the long cherished mindset of the farmers and culturally fit devices were to be patronized in receiving the radio FPs.

Key words: Bangladesh betar, farm programs, effectiveness of farm programs, farmers of bangladesh

INTRODUCTION

The effectiveness of farm programs (FPs) of Bangladesh Betar (BB) depends on the extent to which BB has been able to convey the information of the modern technologies to the farmers. This is because, one of the main objectives of the FPs of BB is to build awareness of the modern agricultural technologies among the farmers; and being aware of the technologies is the prerequisite for the adoption of these technologies which is directly related to the development of agriculture and the farming communities.

Farmers can have their required information from two types of sources: (i) profit oriented sources, and (ii) non-profit oriented sources. According to the cultural studies theory the social elites (profit oriented sources) who operate media to earn profits and exercise influence in society may benefit from the information need of the farmers. The farmers may be exploited thereby. On the contrary, BB (one of the non-profit organizations) has been trying to provide the farmers with the information of modern technologies. The farmers also use the sources

which are cost effective, easy to access and convenient to them. The farmers have many alternatives to them. Among the alternatives they will choose the media based on their ability to give the right kind of information to the right people in the right way at the right time. Right information may not be received by the farmers if it is not disseminated at the right way and at the right time. A successful communication is established when the receiver is able to receive and comprehend the message sent by the sender. If the receiver cannot take delivery of the message then the communication system will be ineffective. A study in 1992 revealed that radio (BB) was used as information source along with other media where it was ranked 4th and television (TV) at that time was ranked 15th. But, in 1999 radio was ranked 1st of all the electronic mass media and among all the media it was ranked 4th where TV was 8th. Another study showed that as mass media radio, TV and poster were mostly used by the farmers in obtaining information about chemicals use and were ranked 1st, 2nd and 3rd respectively.

Hundred percent of the experts who were involved in extension services thought that the farm programs of BB

¹Institute of Bangladesh Studies, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi 6205; Bangladesh, ²Department of Population Science and Human Resource Development, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi 6205; Bangladesh, ³Department of Statistics, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi 6205; Bangladesh, ⁴Department of Agronomy and Agricultural Extension, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi 6205; Bangladesh

were fit enough to meet the needs of the farmers (Hasan, Mondal, Islam and Hoque, 2016). A literacy survey in 2010 reported that 2.82 per cent of the inhabitants of Bangladesh aged five years and over listened to the radio programs daily for education purposes whereas daily viewers of TV were 13.87 per cent of the inhabitants. That means, radio (BB) has already lost its position; but to what extent? Does the information broadcast through BB reach the farmers? It is subject to the effectiveness of the FPs of BB and BB itself. In this study an effort was made to examine the effectiveness of the FPs of BB in respect of their ability to reach the target listeners, the farmers of Bangladesh.

METHODOLOGY

The study was qualitative in nature. Required data and information were collected from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data were collected by means of document analysis and sample survey. For document analysis as part of content analysis documents of BB and other relevant organizations were analyzed. Questionnaire survey technique was used to collect primary data from the sampled respondents.

The main farm program of Bangladesh Betar is developed and broadcast by the Farm Broadcast Cell of BB and at the same time the regional stations relayed this program. There are twelve regional radio stations of BB. There are a few programs developed and broadcast by the regional stations based on the needs of the particular regions; but formats and contents of the programs which are prescribed and approved by the head quarter are almost same for all the stations. So, a single regional station can represent the whole of BB. This study purposively selected BB Khulna, and BB Rajshahi. The BB Khulna is one of the biggest radio stations covering the total of the south-west of Bangladesh and almost the half of Bangladesh and the BB Rajshahi is also one of the biggest radio stations that covers almost all of the northern part of Bangladesh. There are eighteen upazillas (sub-district) in Khulna and Rajshahi districts (nine for each). Multistage stratified sampling technique was used in sampling. At the 1st stage, the study selected eight upazillas out of eighteen (four from each district) of Khulna and Rajshahi districts.

At the 2nd stage eight unions were selected from eight upazillas (one from each upazilla) and at the 3rd stage sixteen villages (two from each union) were selected. At the 4th stage the farmers (respondents) were selected by means of random sampling technique from each village and the total sample size was determined using the following formula:

$$n = \frac{Z^2 pq}{\epsilon^2}; \text{ assuming that } p = 0.5 \text{ and } q = 0.5.$$

Here, n = sample size, Z = tabulated value = 1.96 (for large sample at 5 per cent level of significance), p = proportion of success, q = 1 - p = proportion of failure, ϵ = margin of error = 0.05.

Based on this formula it was supposed to select 384 respondents from the two districts. But for the betterment of the research 465 respondents were selected from the two study areas and the sampling ratio is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Sampling ratios of the study areas

Sectors	Ratio	Sample (n)
	Khulna : Rajshahi	193 : 272
Crop	1 : 2	81 : 191
Livestock	1 : 1	33 : 42
Fisheries	2 : 1	79 : 39
Total (n)		465

The 465 farmers were interviewed from June to September, 2014 to know about whether they had any need of FPs of BB and other information relevant to the research objectives. Secondary data were collected by means of content analysis of the documents collected from BB and other relevant organizations viz. Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock, and Ministry of Information.

The collected data were arranged and scrutinized cautiously in accordance with demonstrable indicators of the objectives. The processing steps were: editing, coding and classification. For data analysis frequency distribution and z-test for significance test of proportions have been done. Statistical Package for Social Sciences software version 17.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) and STATISTICA 8 were used for data analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The access of the farmers to the FPs of BB is to be ensured with a view to ensure the effectiveness of BB and its FPs. Actual and potential farmers are the target listeners of the FPs of BB. If BB fails to transmit the message or information to its target listeners then it is the ineffectiveness of the FPs.

In this research a systematic endeavor was made to measure the effectiveness of the FPs of BB in the context of the access of the farmers to the FPs, that is, how many times how many farmers tune BB in order to listen to the

FPs. The study results revealed that 2.37 per cent of the respondents every day listened to the FPs of BB. Regular and irregular listeners totaled only 6.67 per cent (Table 2).

Table 2: Distribution of the farmers by their farm program listening habit (all areas and sectors)

Variables	Number of farmer (n)	Percentage (%)	Cumulative percentage (%)
Every day listens to the farm programs	11	2.37	2.36
Listens to the farm programs once or twice a week	9	1.93	4.30
Listens to the farm programs once or twice a month	11	2.37	6.67
Never listens to the farm programs	434	93.33	100.00
Total (n)	465	100.00	

When it was seen that there was a very few farmers who used to listen to the FPs of BB, in this study it was tried to find out the factors that could stand as the obstacles to listening to the FPs namely-Mindset of the farmers, the possession of radio sets, education of the farmers, capacity of FM transmission, farm training of the farmers, mobile sets usage, consultation with government agencies, cultural fitness of radio set, farm knowledge, consultation with salesman and fellow farmers and so on. Firstly the farmers who used not to listen to the FPs were requested to answer to why they did not use to listen to the FPs of BB and their responses are portrayed in Table 3.

Table 3: Distribution of the farmers by the causes for not listening to farm programs

Variables	Number of farmers (n)	Percentage (%)
Watch TV	37	8.52
Do not have radio set	45	10.37
Do not know that there is farm programs	6	1.38
No faith in radio information	4	0.92
Radio is now out of culture	235	54.15
Do not feel good listening to radio	38	8.76
Programs cannot be seen on radio	4	0.92
Very busy	48	11.06
Lack of importance	15	3.46
For religion	2	0.46
Total (n)	434	100.00

The research findings revealed that more than half (54.15%) of the respondents (Table 3) told, “radio is now out of culture”, that is, outdated. Some of the respondents said, “If people see them listening to radio programs then they will laugh at them”. It was a very frightening expression of their mindset. The second highest number of respondents (11.06 %) accused their daily workload of abstaining them from listening to the programs. But another question was thrown to the farmers to answer with a view to cross check their comment on their heavy work load and they were requested to tell how they used to spend their daily leisure period. Through this question it was tried to know whether they were really busy or not. Almost all the farmers (93.55 %) admitted that they had leisure (Table 4). The third highest number of farmers told that they did not use to listen to the FPs because they did not have radio set. It was noteworthy to know how many farmers possess radio sets, because the FPs are broadcast

in Medium Wave (MW). Radio set is an essential prerequisite to receive the programs or message or information broadcast through an MW transmitter. This is why, in order to receive any information of MW transmitter the receiver has to satisfy the precondition of having a radio set. Consequently, the possession of radio sets surges the likelihood of listening to the FPs. A survey was conducted on the possession of radio sets among the farmers and it was seen that almost all (95.70 %) the farmers did not possess radio set (Table 4).

Table 4: Distribution of farmers by their leisure, radio sets and use of radio sets

Subjects	Variables	Number of farmers (n)	Percentage (%)
Leisure	Have leisure	435	93.55
	Have no leisure	27	5.81
	No comment	3	0.64
	Total (n)	465	100.00
Radio sets	Have radio set	20	4.30
	Do not have radio set	445	95.70
	Total (n)	465	100.00
Use of Radio sets/phone	Use radio set	13	41.94
	Use cell phone	18	58.06
	Total listeners (n)	31	100.00

Some of them who possessed radio sets proclaimed, “I have radio set but I never tune BB to listen to the FPs”. Even they made no use of radio sets for listening to other programs of radio. That means, the radio sets were not in use. Along with the MW transmitter from the 1st January, 2014 BB Khulna and from the 2nd October, 2013 BB Rajshahi started broadcasting FPs through Frequency Modulation (FM) transmitter, but to a very short extent. Both Khulna and Rajshahi Betar broadcast FPs through one kilowatt transmitter. This FM transmission covers almost 10 to 15 kilometers surrounding the transmission center. Any program of this transmission can be received by any mobile phone device that has the FM program receiver. It was also seen that more than half of the listeners (58.06 %) used cell phone devices for listening to the FPs (Table 4). Having a radio set undoubtedly matters but not to a great extent, if the listeners belong to the coverage area of FM transmission. This study revealed that only 10.40 per cent of the respondents did not listen to the FPs only for not having radio sets (Table 3). But the power of the FM transmitter is a dominating factor here. A number of respondents complained about the problem in receiving the FPs in FM frequency by means of their cell phone devices. The researcher also failed to receive the FPs from some of the study areas. Even from the residential area of the Institute of Bangladesh Studies of the University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh the researcher could not listen to the programs clearly. This problematic transmission of FPs from FM transmitter stands as the obstacle to the listening to the FPs especially for those who listen to FM radio programs. If radio was obsolete to them, they must have taken the benefit of FPs by dint of

any modern technology. But the study revealed that nearly one fourth (24.09 %) of the total respondents watched FPs on TV and very few of them (2.37 %) watched FPs on TV regularly. The research findings revealed that most of the farmers (75.91 %) never watched FPs on TV (Table 5).

Table 5: Distribution of the viewers (farmers) of farm programs on TV

Variables	Number of farmers (n)	Percentage (%)	Cumulative Percentage (%)
Regularly watch farm programs of TV	11	2.37	2.37
Very often watch farm programs of TV	10	2.15	4.52
Sometimes watch farm programs of TV	7	1.51	6.03
Very few times watch farm programs of TV	84	18.06	24.09
Never watch farm programs of TV	353	75.91	100.00
Total (n)	465	100.00	

Note: TV refers to television.

The number of respondents (2.37 %) who regularly watched farm program on TV was same to those (2.37 %) who regularly listened to the farm program of BB. Even all of the respondents (54.15 %) who proclaimed that they did not tune radio for listening to FPs for the obsolescence of radio did not watch TV for farm information. The viewers and listeners totaled only (24.09 % + 6.67 %) = 30.76 per cent of the farmers. It was evident that the viewers and listeners of FPs had decreased. It was seen that education of the respondents was an influential variable. Almost all of the listeners (93.55 %) of the FPs were literate (Table 6). The illiterate did not tend to listen to the FPs. Among the listeners of the farm program a very few farmers (6.45 %) were illiterate (Table 6).

Table 6: Distribution of farmers (farm program listeners) by their educational qualification

Variables	Number of farmers (n)	Percentage (%)	Cumulative Percent (%)
Up to Class 5	7	22.58	22.58
Below SSC	11	35.48	58.06
SSC	3	9.68	67.74
HSC	5	16.13	83.87
Bachelor	2	6.45	90.32
Master's	1	3.23	93.55
Illiterate	2	6.45	100.00
Total (n)	31	100.00	

Among the literate respondents 29 farmers (8.28%) listened to the FPs. On the other hand, among the illiterate respondents 2 farmers (1.74%) listened to the farm program. The researcher drew the following hypothesis to test the significance of the difference of the proportions:

Ho: There is no difference between literate and illiterate farmers in listening to the FPs of BB.

H1: There is difference between literate and illiterate farmers in listening to the FPs of BB.

In the significance test (z-test) it was seen that $p < 0.05$ (Table 10) and the null hypothesis was rejected at 5 per cent confidence level. So, the difference between the two proportions was significant.

In an effort to examine whether farm training had any influence on listening to the FPs it was seen that 11.38 per cent of the trained respondents used to listen to the FPs. On the contrary, 4.97 per cent of the untrained respondents listen to the FPs (Table 10). To test the significance of the difference the following hypothesis was tested.

Ho: There is no difference between trained and untrained farmers in listening to the FPs of BB.

H1: There is difference between trained and untrained farmers in listening to the FPs of BB.

In the statistical test (z-test) it was seen that $p < 0.05$ (Table 10). That means the null hypothesis is rejected at 0.5 per cent confidence level and the difference was highly significant.

Beside BB and TV, Upazilla Agriculture Officers (AOs), Upazilla Veterinary Surgeons (VSSs) and Upazilla Fisheries Officers (FOs) are the authorized authorities for disseminating farm technologies to the respective farmers. Since a great number of respondents did not use radio and television as sources of farm information, the researcher assumed that they might go to the AO, VS and FO. But the study revealed that half of the respondents (49.63%) from crop farmers never go to the AO for their farm information or suggestions (Table 7). There were some respondents (17.28%) who consulted with the agriculture officers very rarely. The number of respondents who had inner urge for farm information was very less (18.75%) who frequently consulted with agriculture officers. The findings revealed that more than half of the livestock farmers (58.67%) never consulted with the VS and most of the fisheries farmers (72.88%) never consulted with the FO. Through the tests of the following hypotheses it was tried to see whether the consultation with the govt. agencies had any impact on listening to the FPs:)

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} H_0 : \text{Those who consult and those who do not consult with AO are} \\ \text{identical in listening to farm programs.} \\ H_1 : \text{Those who consult and those who do not consult with AO are} \\ \text{not identical in listening to farm programs.} \end{array} \right\} (I)$$

H_0 : Those who consult and those who do not consult with VS are identical in listening to farm programs.
 H_1 : Those who consult and those who do not consult with VS are not identical in listening to farm programs. } (II)

H_0 : Those who consult and those who do not consult with FO are identical in listening to farm programs.
 H_1 : Those who consult and those who do not consult with FO are not identical in listening to farm programs. } (III)

In the statistical tests (z-test) the three null hypotheses mentioned above were accepted at 0.5 per cent confidence level (Table 10). So, statistically it could not be said that the consultations with the experts stimulated the farmers to listen to the FPs of BB. Most of the farmers do not use radio, TV, AOs, VSs and FOs as the main sources of farm information. Then what are their main sources of information for farming? This study revealed that most (77.94%) of the crop farmers consult with the sellers of seeds, fertilizers and pesticides while purchasing these (Table 8). But, almost all the livestock (93.33%) and fisheries farmers (89.84%) were not used to consulting with the salesmen (Table 8). To know whether consultation with salesman affected listening to the FPs of BB the following hypotheses had been tested:

H_0 : Among the crop farmers who consult and who do not consult with salesman are identical in listening to the FPs.
 H_1 : Among the crop farmers who consult and who do not consult with salesman are not identical in listening to the FPs. } (I)

H_0 : Among the livestock farmers who consult and who do not consult with salesmen are identical in listening to FPs
 H_1 : Among the livestock farmers who consult and who do not consult with salesmen are not identical in listening to FPs } (II)

H_0 : Among the fish farmers who consult and those who do not consult with salesmen are identical in listening to FPs
 H_1 : Among the fish farmers who consult and those who do not consult with salesmen are not identical in listening to FPs } (III)

The research findings were that in case of crop and fisheries sector the null hypotheses were rejected, that means, those who consulted and those who did not consult with salesman listened to the FPs identically. But, in case of livestock farmers consultation with the salesmen had positive impact on listening to the FPs. The research finding disclosed that more than half (58.82%) of the crop farmers took the suggestions from the fellow farmers and almost all the (84%) the livestock farmers never consulted with the fellow farmers for suggestions. Nearly half (45.76%) of the fish farmers consulted with the fellow farmers (Table 9). From all the sectors 226 respondents consulted with their fellow farmers for agricultural suggestions and 5.309 per cent of them listened to the FPs

(Table10). Here the hypothesis to test the significance is as follows:

H_0 : Farmers who consult and who do not consult with fellow farmers are identical in listening to the FPs.

H_1 : Farmers who consult and who do not consult with fellow farmers are not identical in listening to the FPs.

Here, $p > 0.05$ that is the difference of proportions was insignificant. And so the null hypothesis was accepted. That means those who consulted with the fellow farmers were equivalent to the respondents who did not consult with the fellow farmers in listening to the FPs. Most of the farmers did not listen to the FPs of BB and even did not watch the FPs of TV. The cause behind this might be that their farm knowledge was sound. But in the research it was found that most of the farmers (60.8%) had very poor knowledge in agricultural technologies (Table 11). For listening to the programs it is a prerequisite to have confidence in the information given through the programs. In this study it was seen that almost all (96.56%) the respondents believed the information broadcast from BB (Table 12). So, lack of faith and confidence in the information given through the FPs of BB was not the cause for not listening to the FPs. The research finding revealed that there were many farmers who did not have faith in the knowledge of the experts especially the agriculture and fisheries officers but they believed the information provided through the FPs of BB. Knowing details of something is the precondition of accepting that. But, the research revealed that half (50.97%) of the respondents did not know that there had been FPs broadcast from BB (Table13). It was also seen that a large number of farmers (36.85%) who listened to the FM radio programs were unaware of the FPs of BB (Table 14). The ignorance about the FPs might be a cause for not listening to the FPs.

Table 7: Distribution of the respondents who consult with the respective experts

Sectors	Variables	Number of farmers (n)	Percentage (%)	Cumulative percentage (%)
Crop	Always consult with AO	6	2.21	2.21
	Very often consult with AO	45	16.54	18.75
	Sometimes consult with AO	39	14.34	33.09
	Very few times consult with AO	47	17.28	50.37
	Never consult with AO	135	49.63	100.00
	Total (n)	272	100.00	
Livestock	Consults with VS	31	41.33	41.33
	Does not consult with VS	44	58.67	100.00
	Total (n)	75	100.00	
Fisheries	Very often consult with FO	21	17.80	17.80
	Sometimes consult with FO	9	7.63	25.43
	Very few time consult with FO	2	1.69	27.12
	Never consult with FO	86	72.88	100.00
	Total (n)	118	100.00	

Note: 'AO, Agriculture Officers'; 'VS, Veterinary Surgeon'; 'FO, Fisheries Officers'.

Table 8: Distribution of the respondents who consult with the salesmen

Sectors	Variables	Farmers (n)	Percentage (%)
Crop	Consult with salesman	212	77.94
	Never consult with salesman	60	22.06
	Total (n)	272	100.00
Livestock	Consult with salesman	5	6.67
	Never consult with salesman	70	93.33
	Total (n)	75	100.00
Fisheries	Consult with salesman	12	10.16
	Never consult with salesman	106	89.84
	Total (n)	118	100.00

Table 9: Distribution of the respondents who consult with the fellow farmers.

Area	Variables	Farmers (n)	Percentage (%)
Crop	Take very little suggestions from fellow farmers	160	58.82
	Never take suggestions from fellow farmers	112	41.18
	Total (n)	272	100.00
Livestock	Take suggestion from fellow farmers	12	16.00
	Never take suggestion from fellow farmers	63	84.0
	Total (n)	75	100.00
Fisheries	Take suggestion from fellow farmers	54	45.76
	Never take suggestion from fellow farmers	64	54.24
	Total (n)	118	100.00

Table 10: Distribution of the differences of proportions

Sectors	Variables	Number of farmers (n)	Listeners of FPs	Percentage (%)	p values
Crop	Consult with AO	137	10	7.299	0.4720
	Never consult with AO	135	7	5.185	
	Total (n)	272	17		
Livestock	Consult with VS	29	3	10.34	0.5544
	Does not consult VS	46	3	6.52	
	Total (n)	75	6		
Fisheries	Consult with FO	32	4	12.5	0.1343
	Does not consult with FO	86	4	4.65	
	Total (n)	118	8		
Crop	Consult with salesmen	212	12	5.66	0.4513
	Never consult with salesmen	60	5	8.33	
	Total (n)	272			
Livestock	Consult with salesmen	5	2	40	0.0079
	Does not consult with salesmen	70	4	5.71	
	Total (n)	75			
Fisheries	Consult with salesmen	12	1	8.33	0.8216
	Does not consult with salesmen	106	7	6.60	
	Total (n)	118			
Farmers of all sectors	Literate	350	29	8.285	0.0150
	Illiterate	115	2	1.739	
	Total (n)	465	31		
Farmers of all sectors	Trained	123	14	11.38%	0.0149
	Untrained	342	17	4.97%	
	Total (n)	465	31		
Farmers of all sectors	Consult with fellow farmers	226	12	5.309%	0.2546
	Not Consult with fellow farmers	239	19	7.949%	
	Total (n)	465	31		

Note: 'FP, farm programs of Bangladesh Betar'; 'AO, Agriculture Officers'; 'VS, Veterinary Surgeon'; 'FO, Fisheries Officers'.

Table 11: Distribution of agricultural knowledge of the respondents

Variables	Farmers (n)	Percentage (%)	Cumulative Percentage (%)
Very poor (secured numbers 0%-20%)	264	60.83	60.83
Poor (secured numbers 21%-40%)	122	28.11	88.94
Average (secured numbers 41%-60%)	40	9.22	98.16
Good (secured numbers 61%-79%)	7	1.61	99.77
Very good (secured numbers 80% & above)	1	0.23	100.00
Total (n)	434	100.00	

Table 12: Distribution of farmers by their faith in farm programs

Variables	Number of farmers (n)	Percentage (%)
Have faith in radio information	449	96.56
Do not have faith in radio information	5	1.07
No comment	11	2.37
Total (n)	465	100.00

Table 13: Distribution of awareness of the farm programs of Bangladesh Betar

Variables	Number of Farmers (n)	Percentage (%)
Aware of the FPs from BB	209	44.95
Are not aware of the FPs of BB	237	50.97
No comment	19	4.08
Total (n)	465	100.00

Table 14: Distribution of FM program listeners' awareness of the farm programs

Variables	Number of Farmers (n)	Percentage (%)
Aware of the FPs of BB	63	55.26
Not aware of the FPs of BB	42	36.85
No comment	9	7.89
Total (n)	114	100.00

The objective of the study was to know the effectiveness of the FPs of BB in context of the farmers' access to the FPs. It was seen that a very negligible portion of farmers of Bangladesh listen to the FPs. The result is in disagreement with that of previous studies in Bangladesh.

The result was also in disagreement with that of the studies abroad. In search of the causes behind this result it was seen that the obsolescence (culturally unfit) of radio set was one of the main obstacle to listening to the FPs. Some of the respondents were exasperated by radio set for its operating system. They had complained that it was disturbing to buy battery for radio set and it also incurred extra expenditures. The farmers were in cognitive dissonance. Subsequently, the researcher concluded that according to cognitive consistency theories the repulsion for radio set had resulted in the detachment of the radio programs especially the FPs. The mindset of the farmers was also an obstacle. The causes behind this might be most of the farmers were not rational in their thinking. If

the people for whom the programs were broadcast rejected them in fear of being mocked without any analysis of the programs in context of their importance and usefulness then it would be very difficult to orient new technologies to them no matter how modern the device of transmission is. Another expression of distressing mental set up of the farmers was that most of the farmers deserved negative attitude towards the experts (AO, FO and VS); they thought they knew more than that of the experts about farming. Most of the farmers did not search for the suggestions of the experts. This finding was in accordance with that of the studies abroad' and did not match with the study in home . But, they had faith and confidence in the information given through radio (BB) which was in agreement with that of the study in India and Ghana . For the lack of the awareness of the importance of farm knowledge most of farmers especially in the crop sector used unauthorized sources (salesman and fellow farmers) of information and this findings resembled those of many studies in home and abroad.

It was seen that most of the farmers had formal education and it had a significant relation with access to the FPs. This result is in accordance with that of studies done overseas . Farm training had a significant relation with access to the FPs. This might be because formal education and farm training made them conscious of the importance of the FPs which stimulated them to listen to the FPs. Many farmers did not know that there were FPs broadcast from BB which was in accordance with that of another study . Lack of awareness of the FPs might be the cause for not listening to the farm program.

The limitation of the study was that the forest sector of the agriculture was excluded from this study because of time and economic constraints and it was confined to Rajshahi and Khulna regions. The result may vary beyond the study areas and the methodology followed here. And so, there may be further research on strategies to motivate the farmers to listen to the programs; finding out the device which is culturally fit to convey the FPs to the farmers, the target listeners for accelerating the extension services.

CONCLUSION

In the context of the farmers' access to the FPs, the farm program of BB was ineffective as it itself failed to reach most of the farmers (93.33%), because reaching the receiver is the prerequisite of a successful communication. In pursuance of the above analysis the researcher concluded that radio was culturally unfit. The farmers of Bangladesh were cognitive miser , that is, most of the farmers of Bangladesh did not have the urge to know any new technology. Even most of the farmers were

not aware of the important modern technologies for farming. Lack of consciousness was an impediment to listening to the FPs of BB. Besides, a vast majority of the respondents thought that they were more experienced and skilled in farming than the govt. experts. This type of negative attitude towards the experts acted as an impediment to listening to the FPs. Academic education and training on agriculture played an important role in increasing the consciousness of the farmers which led to listening to the FPs. The researcher assumed that it was a great challenge to the authority of BB to build awareness of the FPs and their importance among the farmers and then broadcast the programs in such a way that the target listener (the farmers) could receive the programs at their convenient time by means of a culturally fit device and cell phone could be a better alternative.

Paper received on : November 16, 2016

Accepted on : November 23, 2016

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, M., Akram, M., Rauf, R., Khan, I. A., & Pervez, U. 2007. Interaction of extension worker with farmers and role of radio and television as sources of information in technology transfer: a case study of four villages of district Peshawar and Charsadda. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture*, 23(2), 515-518.
- Ango, A. K., Illo, A. I., Yakubu, A. A., Yelwa, F. J., & Aliyu, A. 2013. Radio Agricultural Programmes: A Means of Bridging Research Findings - Rural Farmers Gap. A Case of Zaria Metropolitan Area, Kaduna State, North Western, Nigeria. *International Journal of Science and Nature*, 4(3), 538-545.
- Aziz, M. A., Deputy Regional Engineer, Bangladesh Betar, Noapara, Jessore. (2014, 2nd December). Personal interview on FM transmission of Bangladesh Betar. Interviewer: Researcher.
- BBS. 2011. Report on the Bangladesh Literacy Survey, 2010. Retrieved from Dhaka, Bangladesh. [http://www.bbs.gov.bd/webtestapplication / userfiles / image /](http://www.bbs.gov.bd/webtestapplication/userfiles/image/)
- Boshu, S. R., Deputy Regional Director, Bangladesh Betar, Rajshahi. (2014, 1st December). Personal interview on FM transmission of Bangladesh Betar, Rajshahi. Interviewer: Researcher.
- Buckingham, D. 2000. The making of citizens: Young people, news and politics. New York: Routledge.

- Chapman, R. 2003. Rural Radio in Agricultural Extension: The Example of Vernacular Radio Programmes on Soil and Water Conservation in [northern] Ghana: Overseas development institute (ODI). Agricultural research & extension network (AgREN).
- Dewri, A. A. K. 1999. Mass Media and the Growth of Agriculture with Reference to Principal Crops in Bangladesh. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Institute of Bangladesh Studies, University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh.
- Fadiji, T. O. 2006. Effectiveness of radio in dissemination of agricultural information to farmers in rural settings of Nigeria. *Global Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(1), 33-36.
- Hasan, M. M., Mondal, M. N. I., Islam, M. N & Hoque, M. A. 2016. Fitness of Farm Programs of Bangladesh Betar for Extension Services: A Field Study. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*, 16 (1), 16-24.
- Irfan, M., Muhammad, S., Khan, G. A., & Asif, M. 2006. Role of mass media in the dissemination of agricultural technologies among farmers. *International Journal of Agriculture and Biology (Pakistan)*, 8(3), 417-419.
- Kashem, M. A. & Islam, M. S. 2001. Information Sources Used by Farmers Regarding the Use of Agro-Chemicals. *Bangladesh Journal of Extension Education*, 13(1 & 2), 71-75.
- Kashem, M. A. & Halim, A. 1991. Use of communication media in the transfer of technologies to farmers: A farm level study. A Research Monograph No. 2. Department of Agricultural Extension Education, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh, Bangladesh.
- Kashem, M. A., & Poddar, S. 2000. Communication Behaviour of Meheragar Banana Growers. *Journal of Communication Studies*, 18, 88-99.
- Kashem, M. A., Halim, A., & Rahman, M. Z. 1992. Farmers' Use of Communication Media in Adopting Agricultural Technologies: A Farm level Study in Bangladesh. *Asia-pacific journal of Rural Development*, II (1), 94-112.
- Khan, G. A., Muhammad, S., Chaudhry, K. M., & Khan, M. A. 2010. Present status and future preferences of electronic media as agricultural information sources by the farmers. *Pak. J. Agri. Sci*, 47(2), 166-172.
- Kumari, N., Choudhary, S., Jha, S. & Singh, S. 2014. Radio: An Educational Media to Transfer Agricultural Information among Farmers. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*, 14(2), 134-136.
- Madu, U. A., Umar, M. H., & Khalique, M. 2012. Farmers' Media Use Pattern in Adamawa State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 167-174.
- Muhammad, S., & Garforth, C. 1999. Farmers' information sources and their relative effectiveness. *International Journal of Agriculture & Biology*, 1(4), 222-226.
- Muhammad, S., Ashraf, I., & Siddiqui, B. N. 2002. Effectiveness of different communication methods/media used by Novartis pesticide company in Tehsil Arifwala. *Int. J. of Agri. and Biol*, 4(3), 335-337.
- Nazari, M. R., & Hasbullah, A. H. 2010. Radio as an educational media: impact on agricultural development. *The Journal of the South East Asia Research Centre for Communication and Humanities*, 2, 13-20.
- Okwu, O., Kuku, A., & Aba, J. 2007. An assessment of use of radio in agricultural information dissemination: A case study of radio Benue in Nigeria. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 2(1), 14-18.
- Rahman, M. M. 1996. Factors Associated with Communication Behavior of Winter Vegetable Growers of Sherpur Thana Under Bogra District. Unpublished MSc Thesis, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, Institute of Postgraduate Studies in Agriculture, Gazipur, Bangladesh.
- Shah B. K., Regional Engineer, Bangladesh Betar Khulna. (2014, 25th November). Personal interview on FM transmission of BB Khulna/Interviewer: Researcher.
- Stanley, J. B. & Davis, K. (2010). Mass Communication Theory: Foundation, Ferment and Future (6th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.
- Ullah, A. K. M. 1996. Information Media Used by Vegetables Growers in Kashimpur Union under Gazipur District. (MSc Thesis), Department of Agricultural Extension Education, Institute of Postgraduate Studies in Agriculture, Gazipur, Bangladesh.
- West, R. & Turner, L. H. 2010. Introducing Communication Theory: Analysis and Application (4th ed.). New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.