

letters

Awa Article Questions and Answers

Dear Mr. Awa:

I've read your article, "Communicating with the Rural Poor," in the *Journal* (Winter, 1974).

Your findings confirm some of my assumptions about non-institutionalized channels of communication. However, I was surprised that you did not try to find out why such a large percentage of the sample did not read farm bulletins as much as they read other materials. You seem to have explored "why" in other questions.

In your recommendations, you suggest that bulletins, newsletters, and short pamphlets will probably be more effective than radio. Can you provide us with such data or the basis for your conclusions?

You also suggest the use of a two-way communication between editor and client receiving the newsletter. I do like your ideas. Was this approach used in any of the newsletters or advertising newspapers they received?

HADA I. LUGO-PAGAN
DE SLOSSER
New York, New York

Dear Ms. de Slosser:

Many of the respondents said they did not receive farm bulletins, nor did they make a personal effort to get these publications. Most of the printed materials read by the poor is distributed free by publishers or advertising and shopper newspapers.

These newspapers are read by the poor just as enthusiastically and ritualistically as regular newspapers are read by those who can afford their cost.

The comparative effectiveness of bulletins, newsletters, short pamphlets, and radio wasn't investigated in the study.

No attempt was made to verify a two-way communication or feedback mechanism between the editors of the free newspapers and their clientele.

Thank you for your penetrating questions. I hope that the data furnished will shed some light on the problem of communicating with the poor.

NJOKU E. AWA
Ithaca, New York

Note: Awa's letter to de Slosser included more data and tables not printed here.

More About New Format . . .

Congratulations to you for the big improvement in the *Journal*. Many agents have expressed their opinions—all in favor of the new size, color, and format. It really is a much more impressive journal than we had previously.

NETTIE RUTH BROWN
President, NAEHE
St. Augustine, Florida

First, I appreciate the "new look" of the *Journal*, and especially the "forum" addition. In fact, I read the entire issue—whereas in the past, it was somewhat a "hit and miss" situation.

Likewise, to me, the articles were more Extension and practical oriented, whereas past articles were more academic and research oriented. I believe this direction desirable for a useful Extension journal.

O. W. CUNDIFF
Blacksburg, Virginia