



**P-ISSN: 2349-8528**

**E-ISSN: 2321-4902**

IJCS 2019; 7(6): 1649-1653

© 2019 IJCS

Received: 21-09-2019

Accepted: 25-10-2019

**Mayank Singh**

Assistant Professor, Department  
Agriculture Extension, Uday  
Pratap Autonomous Collage  
Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India

**Ravi Pratap Singh**

M.Sc. (Ag.) Horticulture, Collage  
of Horticulture & Forestry,  
ANDUA & T, Kumarganj,  
Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

## The constraints in communication (information-input-processing and output) behaviour among the benifesor in district Allahabad

**Mayank Singh and Ravi Pratap Singh**

### Abstract

Communication is the core activity of human association in general and progress as well as development in particular. No human life can exist in isolation. A man can survive only in society and the survival in society is possible with communication. Therefore, communication is identified as the oldest continued activity of human being since birth and goes-on and on till death. More precisely, communication is the basic need of human being and web of society which makes the survival, growth, progress and development of man possible and holds the society intact and progressive. The study was conducted in purposively selected Allahabad district of Uttar Pradesh. Out of 20 CD Blocks only 5 CD blocks-Bahadurpur, Chaka, Handia, Meja and Soraon were selected randomly. Thereafter 2 villages from each selected CD block were selected by using stratified random sampling method. These selected villages were Andawa and Bhagipur of Bahadurpur, Dabhawn and Chaka of Chaka, Jagwawala and Aasepur of Handia, Jamwa and Detwa Kala of Meja and Juwnapur and Chaturipur of Soraon CD Block. Further, stratified random sampling was used for the selection of respondents of three categories of farmers. These three categories of respondents were large, medium and small farmers according to their possession of land. Total of 155 respondents of small 106 respondents of medium and 39 respondents of large land holders were selected in ratio proportion from selected villages.

**Keywords:** communication, behaviour, benifesor, Allahabad

### Introduction

India is predominately agricultural country. Majority of population, about 60 percent, of the country subsist on agriculture and its allied occupations and contributing 25 percent to our national income. The early years of independence the country had witnessed wide spread food shortages compelling to import large quantity of food grains even under PL-84. The widespread famine, flood, starvations, sufferings and deaths India was branded as “basket case” or “ship to mouth” or “field-to mouth” or “begging bowl”. After independence Indian policies, administration reformers, agricultural scientist made considerable and significant efforts to break the begging bowl to the present food surplus. The extensive efforts in this direction was witnessed through the Green Revolution which launched in mid-sixties when the production was only 74.2 million tonnes. India trebled the production of food grains upto 211.2 million tonnes by 2001-2002. It is worth to quote today India is the second highest producer of wheat in the world touching 76.4 million tonnes in 2000 A.D. Resultantly, India is able to raise its status among the comity of nations as one of the premier agricultural countries of the world. Due to large buffer stocks of food grains India is able to help generously countries which needed food, whether it is the war, drought, terrorism hazards and like. Today, India is the third biggest producer of food grains in the world. Scientists, and the planners, politicians, and responsables of country have already realized to meet the future challenges of growing population of India by 2020 and even 2030 onwards. The futurology has been worked out and started implementing massive development programmes to modernize the agriculture through research and technology. It is clear that the main problem is not the lack of technology but its integration of farming practices in order to convert the information into production accomplishment. Vashistha (1987) stated that there are hundreds of extension programmes to reach millions of farmers in lakhs of villages. To fulfil the mission of any extension programme there is need to study the communication behaviour of the target audience. The communication behaviour refers the activity performed by an individual from the collection of

**Corresponding Author:**

**Mayank Singh**

Assistant Professor, Department  
Agriculture Extension, Uday  
Pratap Autonomous Collage  
Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India

information to final stage of its adoption. The communication behaviour is identified in three stages or communication behaviour is the outcome of three stages of activities performed by individuals. These three acts of communication are information input behaviour, information processing behaviour and information output behaviour. Therefore, there is need to find out the state of communication behaviour along with these three acts in terms of behaviour which affects the result of planned communication strateg.

### Research methodology

Social research in general and behavioural research in particular require systematic approach and procedures to accomplish the objectives of the study. Therefore it was imperative to adopt scientific research procedures, approved techniques, standard-reliable and valid tools and appropriate statistical analysis of collected data to arrive at any conclusion in view of objectives of study. Besides the collection of primary data, baseline informations, reports, relevant official publications and other secondary sources as well as discussion with experts were also used as a source of additional relevant data.

### Research design

Any social study when attempted systematically requires collection of place and people. Then the size of sample is determined in order to suit the study. The selection of place and people of study, here-in-after called locale/tract and respondents, requires an initial survey-collection of Bench mark data. The system which provides the method and steps to conduct the study as per its objectives is termed as research design.

### Locale of study

The title of study clearly indicates that the study was conducted in Allahabad district of Uttar Pradesh state. The locale of study Allahabad district was selected purposively with following justification and limitations

- i) The scholar being native of selected locale who is conversant with language, dialect, culture and background of the people as well as the area.
- ii) The research center being located in the district.
- iii) The study being academic, indepth and comprehensive.
- iv) All the headquarters of related organizations like Allahabad Agricultural Institute, Planning Office, Divisional Agricultural Office, Agro-economic Research Centre and like were located in Allahabad.

### Selection of CD blocks and villages

Allahabad is administratively divided in 07 tehsils, 20 CD blocks and 3539 villages. In view of objectives and research design of the study, it was not possible and appropriate to conduct the study in all the villages with in the specified period of present academic research. Therefore, the study was conducted in 10 villages of 5 CD blocks.

### Selection of respondents

India is country of diversities, so was the case with selected villages. There were various types of farmers belonging to different socio-economic status, possession of holdings, caste, religion and so on. With a view to have comprehensive and indepth study all the farmers were selected as respondents on the basis of land holdings possessed by them. The three categories of land holders-large, medium and small were taken into account in view of objectives of study.

### Method of data collection

After the establishing the rapport with the selected respondents, part I of the structured schedule was administered to collect the personal and socio-economic data of the respondents. Thereafter a gap of one week the part II of the schedule was administered to find out their level of extension contact and mass media exposure as per objectives of the study. Further, part III of the schedule was administered among the selected respondents after the gap of one week list out the constraints of communication which restricts individual to receive the desired information. The process of data collection including the preliminary informations and establishing the rapport was completed during February 2004 to March 2005.

### Statistical analysis

The scientific research requires accurately in results and contentions. Therefore statistical tests were applied to process the dates together the results and conclusions.

### Result & Discussion

#### Constraints of three factors of communication behaviour

The constraints in performing any social activity are experienced by every individual at different intensity and levels depending upon individuals personal social, economic, physical, psychological etc. factors. Here, the constraints of communication behaviour were identified, communicated and statistically analysed to find out the significance of its level of constraints experienced by the respondents. These communication constraints were related to the information input, processing and output behaviours of the respondents. These constraints of communication behaviour were grouped in three categories by using the formulae Mean  $\pm$  S.D.

**Table 1:** Distribution of respondents according to their level of input, processing and output behaviour in relation to constraints, N=300

S. No.	Level of constraints	Frequency distribution		
		Input behaviour	Processing behaviour	Output behaviour
1.	Low	102 (34.00%)	88 (29.33%)	58 (19.33%)
2.	Medium	166 (55.33%)	196 (65.34%)	125 (41.67%)
3.	High	32 (10.67%)	16 (5.33%)	117 (39.00%)

The table 1 reveals that the constraints of information input behaviour among majority of 55.33 percent was at medium level followed by 32.00 percent and 10.67 percent respondents had low and high level, respectively. In case of constraints related to information processing behaviour, identical trend was found where 65.34 percent respondents had medium level followed by 29.33 percent and 5.33 percent respondents who had low and high levels, respectively. The constraints of information output behaviour among the majority of 41.67 percent respondents had at medium level closely followed by 39.00 percent and 19.33 percent respondents had at high and low level, respectively.

It may be concluded that there were constraints of communication related to information input and processing behaviour at medium level followed by low and high level. However, the constraints related to information output behaviour were at medium level closely followed by at high and low levels. It is inferred that because of constraints the communication behaviour of Allahabad farmers were not at progressive level as it should have been. Therefore, the optimum benefit of innovation each only be had unless

constraints of communication are minimized, which automatically the socio-economic status of the farmers will increase.

### Difference among three categories of respondents in three factors of communication behaviour and their constraints

The part of the chapter presents the differences among three categories of respondents-small, medium and large landholders on their three factors of communication

behaviour-information input, processing and output behaviour as well as overall communication behaviour. These behaviours were measured on the basis of interaction of respondents with extension system, and mass media exposures used in acquisition of knowledge. The difference among three categories of respondents on their three factors of communication behaviour was worked out to find out its state and significance with the help of "F" test. The calculated results have been presented as follows in table 2 & 5.

**Table 2:** Difference in information input behaviour among three categories of respondents

S. No.	Communication behaviour	Difference in three categories of respondents		
		Small vs Medium	Small vs Large	Medium vs Large
1.	Extension Contact	2.034**	1.996**	0.199
2.	Mass-Media Exposure	1.519*	1.899**	1.516*
3. (1+2)	Overall Communication Behaviour	1.309*	2.014**	2.142**
4.	Constraints of Communication	2.013**	4.556**	1.698*

\*Significant at 5%, \*\*Significant at 1%

The table 2 reveals the significance of difference among three categories of respondents in their information input behaviour. It was found that the extent of extension contact in relation to information input behaviour of small category of respondents differed significantly with other two categories of respondents medium and large at 1 percent level of probability, whereas there was no statistical difference among medium and large category of respondents in this regards. The mass media exposure in relation to information input behaviour among three categories of respondents had differed significantly with each other at 5 percent level of probability, however the significance of difference between small and large categories of respondents in this regards was at 1

percent level of probability. As far as overall communication behaviour in relation to information input behaviour was concerned, the three categories of respondents had differed significantly at 1 percent level of probability, however the significance of difference between small and medium categories of respondents had at 5 percent level of probability. The constraints of communication in relation to information input behaviour were found significantly different among three categories of respondents with each other at 1 percent level of probability however the significance of difference between medium and large category of respondents was at 5 percent level of probability.

**Table 3:** Difference in information processing behaviour among three categories of respondents.

S. No.	Communication behaviour	Difference in three categories of respondents		
		Small vs Medium	Small vs Large	Medium vs Large
1.	Extension Contact	1.451*	2.431*	0.216
2.	Mass-Media Exposure	1.460*	2.045**	1.941**
3. (1+2)	Overall Communication Behaviour	1.964**	2.139**	1.668*
4.	Constraints of Communication	1.342*	4.163**	1.392*

\*Significant at 5%, \*\*Significant at 1%

The table 3 reveals the significance of difference in information processing behaviour among three categories of respondents. It was found that there was significant difference in information processing behaviour through extension contact, mass media exposure and overall as well as constraints of communication among three categories of respondents with each other except information processing behaviour through extension contact between medium and large category of respondents. As far as level of significance in difference is concerned, the difference between small and medium category of respondents in their information processing behaviour through extension contact, mass media exposure and the constraints of communication were at 5 percent level. However, the overall communication behaviour in relation to information processing behaviour between small and medium respondents was at 1 percent level. The

difference between the small and big respondents in their information processing behaviour through all the dependent variables were significant at 1 percent level of probability. The difference between medium and large farmers in their information processing behaviour through overall communication-Extension contact + Mass media exposure, and their constraints were significant at 5 percent level of probability whereas the information processing behaviour through mass media was significant at 1 percent level of probability. It further findings substantiate the earlier table where the large farmer reduces the extension contact and increases the leaning towards mass media exposure for rapid acquisition of knowledge-fast, accurately and as and when needed. This may be because of saving in time, money and resources. More precisely the large farmers are switched over to commercialized agriculture.

**Table 4:** Difference in information output behaviour among three categories of respondents.

S. No.	Communication behaviour	Difference in three categories of respondents		
		Small vs Medium	Small vs Large	Medium vs Large
1.	Extension Contact	3.700**	3.817**	1.382
2.	Mass-Media Exposure	1.702*	2.004**	2.141**
3. (1+2)	Overall Communication Behaviour	1.962**	2.021**	1.913**

4.	Constraints of Communication	2.388**	2.757**	1.412*
----	------------------------------	---------	---------	--------

\*Significant at 5%, \*\*Significant at 1%

Table 4 shows that there was significant difference among the three categories of respondents with each other in their information output behaviour through extension contact and overall communication as well as their constraints except where there was no difference between the medium and large category of respondents in their information output behaviour through extension contact. All the significant differences among all the three category of respondents were at 1 percent

level of probability except the medium category of respondents who had significant difference in the information output behaviour through mass media exposure and constraints of communication with the medium category and large category of respondents at 5 percent level of probability. The data of table substantiate the earlier table where the trend shows leaning among large farmers towards commercialized agriculture by preferring the mass media.

**Table 5:** Difference in overall communication behaviour among three categories of respondents

S. No.	Communication behaviour	Difference in three categories of respondents		
		Small vs Medium	Small vs Large	Medium vs Large
1.	Extension Contact	2.167**	1.485*	1.621*
2.	Mass-Media Exposure	1.488*	2.015**	2.171**
3. (1+2)	Overall Communication Behaviour	1.624*	1.913**	2.138**
4.	Constraints of Communication	2.936**	3.016**	1.692**

\*Significant at 5%, \*\*Significant at 1%

Table 5 shows that the communication behaviour (information input + processing + output behaviour) through extension contact, mass media exposure and overall communication as well as their constraints of three categories of respondents were found significantly different with each other at 1 percent level of probability except where few differences were at 5 percent level of probability. The data of this table substantiate statistically the tables of part 6.2. The table clearly indicates the information input, processing and output behaviour of three categories of farmers differ with each other.

### Conclusion

The study was conducted in purposively selected Allahabad district of Uttar Pradesh. Out of 20 CD Blocks only 5 CD blocks-Bahadurpur, Chaka, Handia, Meja and Soraon were selected randomly. Thereafter 2 villages from each selected CD block were selected by using stratified random sampling method. These selected villages were Andawa and Bhagipur of Bahadurpur, Dabhawn and Chaka of Chaka, Jagwawala and Aasepur of Handia, Jamwa and Detwa Kala of Meja and Juwnapur and Chaturipur of Soraon CD Block. Further, stratified random sampling was used for the selection of respondents of three categories of farmers. These three categories of respondents were large, medium and small farmers according to their possession of the selected dependent variables were information input behaviour, information processing behaviour, information output behaviour communication behaviour and constraints of communication. Data were collected with help of structured interview schedule specially developed based on standard scales with modification in light of objectives and selected variables of study. The developed schedule was pre-tested, made reliable and validated. The collected data was tabulated, classified and statistically processed by using mean, percentage, standard deviation, "F" test and coefficient of correlation.

As far as extent of extension contact was concerned, majority of 80.67 percent respondents had medium level of information input behaviour whereas low level of information processing behaviour and information output behaviour were had by majority of 62.33 percent and 88.00 percent respondents, respectively. Information input behaviour and information output behaviour in relation to mass-media

exposure was found at medium level among majority of 52.67 percent and 60.67 percent respondents, respectively. The information processing behaviour in relation to mass media exposure was found at low level among majority of 68.33 percent respondents. As far as overall communication behaviour was concerned, the information input, processing and output behaviours were found at medium level among majority of 67.00 percent, 60.67 percent and 58.00 percent respondents, respectively followed by at low and high levels. The constraints of communication related to information input, processing and output behaviours were found at medium level among majority of 55.33 percent, 65.34 percent and 41.67 percent respondents, respectively.

### References

- Ahmed MB, Ali MM. Impact of farmers communication behaviour on types of information generated in BS-farmer. *Annals of Bangladesh Agriculture*. 1999; 8(2):119-127.
- Ahsan E, Huda-ANMS, Ahmed N, Rahman S. Bangladesh's Second Extension and Research Project. *Public Administration and Development*. 1991; 11(3):207-209.
- Akhouri, MMP. Communication Behaviour of Extension Personnel: An Analysis of Haryana Agricultural Extension Services; Ph.D. Thesis, Division of Agricultural Extension, I.A.R.I., New Delhi, 1973.
- Akhouri MMP. Communication Behaviour of Extension Personnel, an Analysis of Haryana Agricultural System. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Division of Agril. Extension, IARI, New Delhi, 1973.
- Dimri Adita, Sujana DK. A study of communication behaviours, folk culture and oral traditions in Garhwal division of Uttar Pradesh. Unpublished M.Sc. thesis, Department of Agricultural Communication, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pant Nagar, 1986.
- Gaikwad VK, Tripathi BL, Bhatnagar GS. Opinion leaders and communication in India villages: Centre of Management in Agriculture; Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, 1972.
- Jacobson Thomas L. *Theories as Communication Communication Theory*. 1991; 1(2):145-150.
- Jha PK, Chauhan JPS. Correlates of interpersonal communication behaviour of dairy farmers in north

- Bihar. Journal of Dairying, Foods and Home Sciences. 1999; 18(1):55-57.
9. Kadian KS, Kumar Ram. Information processing pattern of dairy farmers of Kangra Valley. India Journal of Extension Education. 2003; XXXVIII(1&2):65-70.
  10. Martinez Ruiz J, Sanchez Izquierdo MA. Communication as a means of making growers participants in sustainable development. Sustainable irrigation in areas of water scarcity and drought. Proceedings of the International Workshop, Oxford, U.K., 1997, 14-22.
  11. Mehta SK, Sardana P, Mehta UP. Communication behaviour of cotton growing farmers in Haryana. Crop Research Hisar. 1996; 11(1):120-127.