

5 Influence of Agricultural Actors


There are a number of different groups and individuals that influence farmers' decisions about agricultural practices and strategies. Social power is the ability of one person to influence another person. Influence is the pressure a person, organization and/or institution exerts on someone else that leads to changes in attitudes, opinions, values, goals, and/or behaviors (Morton 2011). In farming, agricultural advisors, organizations and agencies are sources of data and information transfer, technology exchange, as well as values, beliefs, attitudes, and social pressure.

The survey provided a list of major agricultural and environmental organizations and agencies and asked farmers the degree to which the groups influence their decisions. The list was preceded by the text, "please indicate how influential the following groups and individuals are when you make decisions about agricultural practices and strategies." Degree of influence was measured on a five-point scale ranging from "no contact" (0) to "strong influence" (4).


Table 6. Influence¹ of various agricultural advisors on decisions, average (n = 4,778)

Watershed (HUC6)	Seed Dealer	Farm Chemical Dealer	NRCS	State Climatologist	University Extension	Conservation NGO	State Department of Agriculture
Weighted Full Sample	2.7	2.9	2.2	1.4	1.7	1.1	1.5
Loup.....	2.6	2.8	2.1	1.4	1.5	1.2	1.5
Middle Platte.....	2.6	2.7	2.0	1.4	1.6	1.0	1.4
Elkhorn	2.8	2.9	2.3	1.5	1.7	1.2	1.4
Big Blue	2.7	2.9	2.2	1.6	1.9	1.1	1.5
Lower Platte.....	2.8	2.9	2.2	1.6	2.0	1.1	1.4
Big Sioux	2.8	2.9	2.1	1.4	1.7	1.1	1.4
Missouri-Little Sioux	2.8	2.9	2.2	1.7	1.9	1.2	1.6
Missouri-Nishnabotna.....	2.7	2.9	2.4	1.5	1.8	1.1	1.5
Minnesota.....	2.7	2.9	2.1	1.3	1.6	1.0	1.6
Des Moines.....	2.8	2.9	2.2	1.7	1.8	1.1	1.5
Iowa.....	2.8	2.8	2.3	1.7	1.9	1.2	1.6
Black Root	2.7	2.8	2.2	1.2	1.6	1.0	1.5
Skunk Wapsipinicon	2.8	2.9	2.3	1.6	1.7	1.1	1.4
Maquoketa Plum.....	2.6	2.7	2.2	1.4	1.6	1.1	1.5
Lower Illinois.....	2.7	2.9	2.2	1.3	1.7	1.1	1.5
Rock	2.7	2.8	2.2	1.2	1.5	1.0	1.5
Kaskaskia	2.7	2.8	2.2	1.3	1.7	1.2	1.5
Upper Illinois.....	2.6	2.8	2.1	1.2	1.6	0.9	1.3
Wabash	2.7	2.8	2.2	1.2	1.5	1.0	1.3
Patoka-White	2.7	2.9	2.2	1.2	1.5	0.9	1.3
Southeastern Lake Michigan	2.6	2.8	2.0	1.2	1.7	1.1	1.4
Western Lake Erie	2.7	2.8	2.3	1.2	1.7	1.0	1.5


¹Influence was measured on a 5-point scale: no contact (0), no influence (1), slight influence (2), moderate influence (3), strong influence (4)




Map 36. Influence of seed dealers on decisions about agricultural practices and strategies, average.




Map 37. Influence of farm chemical dealers on decisions about agricultural practices and strategies, average.




Map 38. Influence of NRCS or county Soil and Water Conservation District staff on decisions about agricultural practices and strategies, average.




Map 39. Influence of state climatologist on decisions about agricultural practices and strategies, average.



Map 40. Influence of University Extension on decisions about agricultural practices and strategies, average.



Map 41. Influence of conservation NGO staff on decisions about agricultural practices and strategies, average.



Map 42. Influence of state departments of agriculture on decisions about agricultural practices and strategies, average.

