Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci (2018) *7*(5): 2273-2279

International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences
***ISSN: 2319-7706* Volume 7 Number 05 (2018)**
Journal homepage: http://www.ijcmas.com

Original Research Article https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2018.705.264

Comparative profile of Communication Behaviour among the Rice growers in Imphal West District of Manipur, India

E. Ravi Goud* and Daya Ram

College of Agriculture, Central Agricultural University, Imphal-795004, Manipur, India

**Corresponding author*

Keywords

Information seeking behavior, Information processing behavior, Information out put or sharing behavior

Article Info

Accepted:
18 April 2018
Available Online:
10 May 2018

A B S T R A C T

A study was conducted in harongsabal block, imphal west district of Manipur with the objective of studying the relationship between selected socio-psychological profile and communication behaviour among the rice growers with a sample size of 120 rice growers. Ex post facto research design was followed. The results showed that, in imphal west district majority (65.00%) of rice growers belonged to medium communication behaviour, 19.17 per cent of them belonged to low communication behaviour and 15.83 per cent of them belonged to high communication behaviour. Further correlation between socio-psychological profile and communication behaviour among the grower's results showed that, out of the twelve variables, education, size of landholding, socio-economic statues, extension contact, mass-media exposer, and sources of information showed a positive and significant association with communication behaviour of rice growers at one per cent level of significant. Other variable, like farming experience showed positive and significant association with communication behaviour of the rice growers at five per cent level of significant. Age, nature of family, annual income, risk preference and innovativeness showed non relationship with communication behaviour. So, Effective communication of scientific findings to millions of farmers is necessary for economic progress of the nation.

Introduction

Agriculture is the primary occupation of the people in most of the developing countries and it plays a vital role in the process of development. To enhance agricultural production, various communication sources are necessary. Communication is the process of exchanging/transmitting news, views, information, etc. and gain common understanding. Rice is one of the important food crops in the world and ranks second in terms of area and production. It is the staple food for about 50 per cent of the population in the world. It is planted on about 11 per cent of the total world's cultivated land. About 90 per cent world's rice is grown and consumed in Asian countries. Paddy (*Oryza sativa L.)* is one of the important cereal crops of India. It has the largest area in the world (43.86 million ha), with a total production of 104.80 million tonnes during 2014-15 and it stood next only to China in the world with respect to production. In Manipur, it is grown in both the hill and plain areas. Rice is the main crop accounting about 95 per cent of total food-

grains production. Although the yield still exists lower than the all India productivity level 3380 kg/ha. It means there is a wide gap to be recovered by increasing the yield potential at farmer's field by adopting scientists recommended production technologies. The increase in productivity of rice will ensure food security of the region. Keeping this in view, the present study was taken up to study the Communication Behaviour among the Rice Growers in Imphal west district of Manipur.

Materials and Methods

The present study was conducted during the year 2016-17 by the following Ex-Post-Facto research design. The investigation was carried out in Imphal West District of Manipur selected purposively as it stands first in rice productivity. Out of two blocks (Wangoi and haorangsabal block) in the district, Haorangsabal block was selected purposively because majority of the farmers are paddy growers and paddy is main crop. And out of 24 GPs in haorangsabal block, only 3 GPs was selected randomly. From each selected GP, two villages were selected through using proportionate allocation random sampling method (3×2=6), total six villages were selected. From these six selected villages, 120 rice growers were selected through using proportionate allocation random sampling. The variables were quantified by taking the frequency and percentage of respondents falling under a given statement. The dependent variable communication behaviour of the rice growers are obtained by quantifying and then taking the frequency and percentage of response falling under the 3 components *viz*. information seeking behaviour, information processing behavior and information sharing or dissemination or output behavior. Communication behaviour was operationally defined as his expression of results from information seeking, information processing and information dissemination behavior (Sandhu, 1993).

Results and Discussion

Communication behavior among the rice growers

The main areas we focusing on the present study were assess the communication behaviour among the rice growers with the help of information seeking, information processing and information sharing behaviour.

Information seeking behaviour

It is clear that table 1 shows, those friends/relatives, progressive farmers and radio (with weight mean score values 2.29, 2.00, 1.94 respectively) plays an important role in information seeking behaviour among the rice growers in this study area. Possible reason might be that, they are frequent contact with them and they are more reliable and trust worthy persons when compare with other sources of information. These findings are line with the findings of Dambazau *et al.,* (2015).

Information processing behaviour

Information processing behaviour of the rice growers we are estimated through the information storage behaviour and information evaluation behaviour. Findings were presented in Table 2 and 3.

Table 2 explain that rice growers store the received information by just knowing (2.20), by memorizing (1.71) and written in note book (1.58) were the most used methods. And followed by maintain of farm publications, newspaper clipping, and capturing a photograph with mean weight scores of 1.46, 1.37, and 0.87 respectively. And no one is using computer as a tool for storing the information.

Table 3 revealed that for evaluating the received information the rice growers mostly discussed with friends/relatives (2.23), discussed with progressive farmers (1.75) and extension personal (1.40), followed by local leaders (1.30) and NGO's/SHG's (1.28).these findings are more or less similar with the findings of Dambazau *et al.,* (2015).

Information sharing behaviour

Table 4 shows that the rice growers always disseminate the information at farm/home sharing with others and conveying to local members were the most used methods, and also very few rice growers disseminate through speaking in local meetings with mean weight scores 2.48, 2.16 and 1.24 respectively.

Overall communication behavior among the rice growers

The Table 5 shows that most of the rice growers were had (75.00%) medium level of information seeking behaviour followed by low (16.67%) and high (8.33%) level information seeking behaviour. The possible reason could be that most of the respondents having medium extension contact, medium mass media exposer, medium sources of information. Hence, most of the growers falling under medium and high information seeking behaviour. These findings are line with the findings of Drulson (2011), Deepa (2016) and Atul *et al.,* (2015).

Table 5 revealed that majority of the rice growers were (72.50%) had medium level of overall information processing behaviour followed by low (15.00%) and high (12.50%) processing behaviour. This finding is line with the findings of Drulson (2011).

Table 5 revealed that the majority of the rice growers were (86.67%) had medium level of information sharing behaviour, followed by low (9.17%) and high (4.16%). These findings are more or less similar with the findings of Drulson (2011) and Aparna *et al.,* (2014).

Table 5 revealed that the majority of the rice growers were (65.00%) had medium level of communication behaviour, followed by low (19.17%) and high (15.83%) communication behaviour among the rice growers.

Table.1 Distribution of the rice growers according to information seeking behavior

N=120

Sl. No	Sources of information	Extent of utilization					
		Always	Some times	Never	Weight score	WMS	Rank
1.	Radio	50.00	33.33	16.67	233	1.94	III
2.	T.V	24.16	55.00	20.84	203	1.69	VI
3.	News paper	15.00	74.16	10.84	204	1.70	V
4.	Extension agents	18.33	36.67	45.00	173	1.44	VII
5.	Friends/relatives	79.16	16.67	4.17	275	2.29	I
6.	Progressive farmers	55.84	30.00	14.16	241	2.00	II
7.	Shopkeepers/input dealers(fertilizer/pesticide shops)	35.00	36.67	28.33	206	1.71	IV
8.	Farm magazines	7.50	31.67	60.83	146	1.21	IX
9.	Internet	0.00	0.00	100	100	0.83	X
10.	SMS of KVKs	9.16	51.67	39.17	170	1.41	VIII

Table.2 Distribution of the rice growers according to information storage behavior

N=120

Sl. No	Sources of information storage	Extent of utilization					
		Always	Some time	Never	Weight score	WMS	Rank
1.	By memorizing	20.00	66.67	13.33	206	1.71	II
2.	By written in note book	15.00	61.67	21.67	190	1.58	III
3.	Keep information on computer memory	0.00	0.00	100.00	100	0.83	VII
4.	Just knowing	66.67	31.67	1.66	265	2.20	I
5.	Maintain farm publications	13.33	30.00	53.34	176	1.46	IV
6.	Newspaper Clipping	5.83	54.17	40.00	165	1.37	V
7.	Captured photograph	0.00	5.00	95.00	105	0.87	VI

Table.3 Distribution of the rice growers according to information evaluation behavior

N=120

Sl. No	Sources of information evaluation	Extent of utilization					
		Always	Some time	Never	Weight score	WMS	Rank
1.	Discussed with friends/relatives	68.33	31.67	0.00	268	2.23	I
2.	Discussed with extension personnel	6.67	55.00	38.33	168	1.40	III
3.	Discussed with progressive farmers	20.00	71.67	8.33	211	1.75	II
4.	Discussed with local leaders	10.00	36.67	53.33	156	1.30	IV
5.	Discussed with NGO's/SHG's	6.66	41.66	51.67	154	1.28	V

Table.4 Distribution of the rice growers according to their information sharing behavior

N=120

Sl. No	Sources of information sharing	Extent of utilization					
		Always	Some time	Never	Weight score	WMS	Rank
1.	Speaking in local meetings	4.20	40.80	55.00	149	1.24	III
2.	Conveying to local members/progressive farmers	61.67	36.67	1.67	260	2.16	II
3.	At farm/home sharing information to others	98.33	1.67	0.00	298	2.48	I
4.	By displaying of agric. Posters	0.00	0.00	100	100	0.83	IV
5.	Writing article through agric. Magazines	0.00	0.00	100	100	0.83	IV

Table.5 Distribution of the respondents according to overall communication behaviour among the rice growers

Sl. No.	Communication Behaviour	Category	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
1.	Information seeking	Low	20	16.67	20.34
		Medium	90	75.00	
		High	10	8.33	
2.	Information processing	low	18	15.00	20.90
		medium	87	72.50	
		high	15	12.50	
3.	Information out put	Low	11	9.17	8.83
		Medium	104	86.67	
		High	5	4.16	
4.	Communication behaviour	Low	23	19.17	50.14
		Medium	78	65.00	
		High	19	15.83	

Table.6 Association of the socio-psychological profile among the rice growers with their communication behaviour

Variable No	Variables	Correlation co-efficient value 'r' value
1.	Age (X_1)	0.096 (NS)
2.	Education (X_2)	0.364**
3.	Nature of family (X_3)	-0.035 (NS)
4.	Size of landholding (X_4)	0.267**
5.	Farming experience (X_5)	0.222*
6.	Socio-economic status (X_6)	0.336**
7.	Annual Income (X_7)	0.133(NS)
8.	Extension contact (X_8)	0.289**
9.	Mass-media exposure (X_9)	0.489**
10.	Risk preference (X_{10})	-0.051 (NS)
11.	Innovativeness (X_{11})	-0.019 (NS)
12.	Sources of information (X_{12})	0.454**

**correlation is significant at the 0.01 level of probability (2-tailed).
*correlation is significant at 0.05 level of probability (2-tailed).
NS- Non Significant.

Table.7 Multiple-Lenoir regression analysis of independent variables with communication behaviour among the rice growers

Sl. No	Characteristics	Beta	Standard error (S.E)	't' value
1.	Age (X_1)	0.138	0.758	1.343
2.	Education (X_2)	0.421	0.330	5.146**
3.	Nature of family (X_3)	-0.007	0.860	-0.083
4.	Size of landholding (X_4)	0.148	0.381	2.049*
5.	Farming experience (X_5)	0.234	0.582	2.186*
6.	Socio-economic status (X_6)	0.068	0.065	0.750
7.	Annual Income (X_7)	0.010	0.655	0.126
8.	Extension contact (X_8)	0.314	0.270	4.206**
9.	Mass-media exposure (X_9)	0.257	0.154	3.396**
10.	Risk preference (X_{10})	-0.041	0.202	-0.513
11.	Innovativeness (X_{11})	-0.018	0.332	-0.272
12.	Sources of information (X_{12})	0.302	0.214	3.939**

**significant at 0.01 level of probability R^2= 0.571 F= 11.862
*significant at 0.05 level of probability

The reason might be that, since most of the respondents have primary and middle school education, medium extension contact, medium mass-medium exposer and medium sources of information so it is quite natural to expect this kind of result. These results line with the results of Drulson (2011). The results in the table 6 exhibit that out of the twelve variables education, size of landholding, socio-economic status, extension contact, mass-media exposure, sources of information showed a positive and significant association with communication behaviour of rice growers at one per cent level of significant. Other variable, like nature of family, farming experience showed positive and significant association with communication behaviour of the rice growers at five per cent level of significant. This finding was support with the findings of Drulson (2011), Atul *et al.*, (2015), Sundar and Manjit (2015), andPriyanka *et al.*, (2016). Also risk preference and innovativeness has nothing to do with communication behavior of the growers these is because individual have free to seek, processed and share information regardless of the risk and innovativeness.

It can be concluded that majority of the rice growers in imphal west district had medium level of communication behaviour in relation to rice crop cultivation. The findings indicate that, still in this technological era also most of the growers getting information through friends and neighbours. The reason might be the functions of extension institutions like KVKs, ATMA, ATIC and other research stations are permitted in to a limited area may be due to inadequate transportation system and also lack of interest from the farmer's side too. Therefore, it may be concluded that there was a need to the policy makers and administrators should take care to design awareness programs regarding internet and

agricultural based web sites and making easy accessibility of these sources at village level to make communication behaviour effective in this era.

Acknowledgment

The authors acknowledge the contributions of E. Ravi Goud, and Daya Ram. College of Agriculture, Central Agricultural University, Imphal, Manipur, India.

References

Aparna, R.K., Metal, S.K. and Goudapa, S.B. (2014). Information Management of Papaya growers of Karnataka. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Educ*., 14 (2): 31-35.

Atul, K.S., Singh, K.K and Raj, D.P. (2015). Information seeking behaviour of soybean growers. *J. of com. Std.*, 33(2): 51-54.

Dambazau, S.A., Srivastava, J.P and Tajudeen, A. (2015). Communication Behaviour of Potato Growers in Allahabad district of Uttar Pradesh. *J. of Com. Std.*, 33(2): 48-55.

Deepa, T. (2016). Assessment of training programs through perception of KVK trainees in imphal east district of Manipur. *M.Sc. (Ag) Thesis*, Department of Extension Education, COA, CAU, Imphal.

Drulson, R. (2011). A study on communication behaviour of potato growers in eastkhasi district of Meghalaya. *M.Sc. (Ag) thesis*, Department of Extension Education, COA, CAU, Imphal.

Priyanka, K., Pankaj, O. and Satya, P. (2016). Communication pattern of Mushroom Growers. *J. of Com. Std.*, 34(1): 69-75.

Sandhu, A.S. (1993). Text book on Agricultural communication process and methods. *Oxford & IBH publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd*: 48-49.

Sreeram, V., S.V. Prasad. and T. Lakshmi. (2015). A Study on Entrepreneurial Behaviour of Kudumbashree, Neighbourhood Group (NHG) Members in Kerala. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Educ*., 15 (2): 123-126.

Sundar, B. and Manjit, S. (2015). Information Source Utilization Behaviour of BhutJolokia Growers in Upper Brahmaputra valley zone of Assam. *J. Com. Std.*, 33(2): 56-61.

How to cite this article:

Ravi Goud, E. and Daya Ram. 2018. Comparative profile of Communication Behaviour among the Rice growers in Imphal West District of Manipur, India. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci.* 7(05): 2273-2279. doi: https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2018.705.264