Means of communication and communication behaviour pattern regarding organic farming
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Abstract
Pt. Jawaharal Nehru said that “Everything can wait but agriculture can’t”. So, it is very important to provide right information at right time about organic farming. In India, mostly farmers are unreached from extension workers. So this gap is fulfilled by the media. Media is a source of providing information. By keeping in mind the importance of media in organic farming, the present study was conducted in two districts of Haryana state viz. Sirsa and Hisar with 240 respondents (120 males and 120 females). Result indicates that mostly respondents use Newspaper (61.2%) and books (55.8%) from print media and Mobile (100%) and Television (100%) from Electronic media. Communication behaviour pattern statements were ranked by calculating the Weighted Mean Score. In information input pattern of respondents about organic farming friends from localite sources, “Melas” from cosmopolite sources and television from mass media were ranked as first. In information processing pattern family members and relatives (outside from village) were ranked as first.
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Introduction
As we know about organic farming that it is a natural farming in which there is no use of chemically based or synthetic input like fertilizers (Urea, D.A.P and pesticides) and follow different management practices. So, for these activities, farmers need the right information at right time. In India, for every 2879 farmers, one extension worker is available (Mukherjee and Maity, 2015) [4]. According to statistical analysis, the majority of the farmers still remain unreached. Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) are playing an important role in the extension with the ability to reach a large number of population. Mass media like television and radio have been used for disseminating agricultural information among the farmers (Purushothaman et al., 2003) [5].

Review of literature
Mahoriya (2006) [2] revealed that the majority (62.22%) of sesame growers hardly utilized the information sources to obtain knowledge on production practices. Shakya (2007) [6] reported that majority of growers (68.33%) had medium level of mass media exposure and majority i.e. 44.17 percent gram growers belonged to low social participation. Mishra (2008) [3] reported that majority of the growers had medium mass media exposure on agriculture aspects (65.83%), belonged to medium land holding category (38.33%) and low social participation (61.67%). Lathiya et al. (2015) [1] pointed that facebook, twitter, YouTube, WhatsApp, Linkedin and Agropedia were commonly used by the farmers. The main advantages of social media was that it connect the farmers and agribusiness people around the world, share the new farming techniques, knowledge and articles etc. knowledge can be used and re-used again and again by a large number of farmers at the same time, transformed with new ideas added to it. Sinoriya (2016) [7] conducted study on effectiveness of communication channels on adoption of sesame production and reported that 20.8 percent respondents shared information with neighbor, 18.3 percent with RAEO, 16.7 percent with progressive farmers, whereas mass media communication channels were T.V. (23.3%), newspapers (11.7%) and radio (9.16%).
Methodology
The study was conducted in two districts of Haryana state viz. Sirsa and Hisar. From each district one block and from each block two villages were selected randomly. Sixty respondents (30 males and 30 females) were chosen randomly from each village. Thus, total 240 respondents were selected for the study.

Results
Media is very strong way of communication. People get information very fastly by the use of media. In present study we will discuss, which type of communication media the farmers are using for gathering information about organic farming. In this paper, means of communication and communication behaviour pattern were included. Means of communication contains print and electronic media.

Means of communication

Print media
The data presented in table 1 pointed that more than half of the respondents possessed newspapers (61.2%), followed by the books (55.8%), other magazines (30.0%), leaflets (22.0%), bulletins and pamphlets (18.7%) and farm magazines (15.0%) respectively. Only 10.0 percent respondents possessed newsletters.

Electronic media
Electronic media possession in table 1 reported that cent percent respondents possessed mobile phones and television followed by computer and mobile with internet facility (53.3%), radio (40.0%), computer/laptop (38.8%) and landline phone (17.5%) respectively.

Table 1: Availability of Communication means to respondents

| Sr. No. | Variables                  | F (%) (n=240) |
|---------|---------------------------|---------------|
| 1       | Print media               |               |
|         | Newspapers                | 147 (61.2)    |
|         | Books                      | 134 (55.8)    |
|         | Other magazines            | 72 (30.0)     |
|         | Leaflets                   | 53 (22.0)     |
|         | Bulletins and pamphlets    | 45 (18.7)     |
|         | Farm magazines             | 36 (15.0)     |
|         | Newsletters                | 24 (10.0)     |
| 2       | Electronic media           |               |
|         | Television                 | 240 (100.0)   |
|         | Mobile Phone               | 240 (100.0)   |
|         | Internet connection        | 128 (53.3)    |
|         | Radio                      | 96 (40.0)     |
|         | Computer and Laptop        | 93 (38.8)     |
|         | Landline phone             | 42 (17.5)     |

Multiple response table

Communication behaviour pattern
Communication behaviour of the respondents was measured in terms of information input, information processing and information output pattern by calculating the weighted mean score.
Three points continuum scale was used with categories always scored 3, seldom scored 2 and never scored as 1 respectively to measure all the three aspects of communication behaviour. Weighted mean scores (WMS) were calculated and ranks were assigned to each information sources taken for the study for aspects of communication behaviour. On the basis of WMS information input, processing and output pattern were categorized low, medium and high.

Information input pattern
Data presented in table-2 indicated on the basis of weighted mean score and ranks that T.V. (Rank I with WMS 1.87), were the most frequently used individual source followed by newspapers (Rank II with WMS 1.73), internet connection (Rank III with WMS 1.69), books (Rank IV with WMS 1.37), leaflets (Rank V with WMS 1.29), farm magazines (Rank VI with WMS 1.25), Bulletins and pamphlets (Rank VII with WMS 1.24), radio (Rank VIII with WMS 1.17), other magazines (Rank IX with WMS 1.14) respectively. Newsletters were reported least used by respondents at rank X with WMS 1.13.

Table 2: Information input pattern of respondents about organic farming

| Sr. No. | Sources used       | Extent of utilization (WMS) | Rank |
|---------|--------------------|-----------------------------|------|
| 1       | Friends            | 1.62                        | I    |
| 2       | Neighbour          | 1.61                        | II   |
| 3       | Family members     | 1.55                        | III  |
| 4       | Relatives          | 1.42                        | IV   |
|         | Cosmopolite Sources|                            |      |
| 1       | Melas              | 1.86                        | I    |
| 2       | Meeting            | 1.66                        | II   |
| 3       | Demonstrations     | 1.46                        | III  |
| 4       | Extension personnel| 1.4                         | IV   |
| 5       | Progressive farmers| 1.39                        | V    |
| 6       | Exhibitions        | 1.22                        | VI   |
| 7       | Trainings          | 1.02                        | VII  |
| 8       | Visits to any related organization | 0.83 | VIII |
|         | Mass media         |                            |      |
| 1       | Television         | 1.87                        | I    |
| 2       | Newspapers         | 1.73                        | II   |
| 3       | Internet           | 1.69                        | III  |
| 4       | Books              | 1.37                        | IV   |
| 5       | Leaflets           | 1.29                        | V    |
| 6       | Farm magazines     | 1.25                        | VI   |
| 7       | Bulletins and pamphlets | 1.24       | VII  |
| 8       | Radio              | 1.17                        | VIII |
| 9       | Other magazines    | 1.14                        | IX   |
| 10      | Newsletters        | 1.13                        | X    |

Low 1-1.66 Medium 1.67-2.32 High 2.33-3.00

Regarding localite sources, friends ranked I with WMS 1.62 followed by neighbours (RankII with WMS 1.61) and family members (Rank III with WMS 1.55)respectively. Relatives were reported least used at rank IV with WMS 1.42.
Under the cosmopolite sources, of information Melas (Rank I with WMS 1.86) were the most frequently used source followed by meetings (Rank II with WMS 1.66), demonstrations (Rank III with WMS 1.46), extension personnel (Rank IV with WMS 1.4), progressive farmers (Rank V with WMS 1.39), exhibitions (Rank VI with WMS 1.22), trainings (Rank VII and WMS 1.02) respectively. Visits were reported least used by the respondents at rank VIII with WMS 0.83.

Information processing pattern
Rank wise distribution of the respondents as per weighted mean score indicated that discussions with family members (Rank I with WMS 1.57), followed by friends (Rank II with WMS 1.47), relatives (Rank III with WMS 1.43), progressive farmers (Rank IV with WMS 1.34), Neighbours (Rank V with WMS 1.30) and extension personnel (Rank VI with WMS 1.22) respectively.
Table 3: Information processing pattern of respondents about organic farming  

| Sr. No. | Sources            | Extent of discussion (WMS) | Rank |
|---------|--------------------|---------------------------|------|
| 1       | Family members     | 1.57                      | I    |
| 2       | Friends            | 1.47                      | II   |
| 3       | Relatives          | 1.43                      | III  |
| 4       | Progressive farmers| 1.34                      | IV   |
| 5       | Neighbours         | 1.30                      | V    |
| 6       | Extension Personnel| 1.22                      | VI   |

Information output pattern
The data presented in table 4 revealed that within the village, most of the respondents disseminated information among the family members and friends (Rank I with WMS 1.55) followed by progressive farmers (Rank II with WMS 1.37), neighbours (Rank III with WMS 1.33), among men/women of locality (Rank IV with WMS 1.28), extension personnel (Rank V with WMS 1.24) respectively. Least dissemination of information was reported with relatives in information output pattern at rank VI with WMS 1.00.

The table indicated that outside the village, relatives were ranked as I with WMS 1.31 followed by friends (rank II with WMS 1.04). Progressive farmers were ranked III with WMS 1.00.

Table 4: Information output pattern of respondents about organic farming

| Sr. No. | Sources                        | Extent of dissemination (WMS) | Rank |
|---------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------|
|         | Within the village             |                              |      |
| 1       | Family members                 | 1.55                         | I    |
| 2       | Friends                        | 1.55                         | I    |
| 7       | Progressive farmers            | 1.37                         | II   |
| 3       | Neighbours                     | 1.33                         | III  |
| 2       | Among women/men of locality    | 1.28                         | IV   |
| 4       | Relatives                      | 1.0                          | V    |
|         | Outside the village            |                              |      |
| 1       | Relatives                      | 1.31                         | I    |
| 2       | Friends                        | 1.04                         | II   |
| 3       | Progressive farmers            | 1.0                          | III  |
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