

Singh Jayati *et al*, International Journal of Advances in Agricultural Science and Technology, Vol.6 Issue.5, May-2019, pg. 1-7 ISSN: 2348-1358 Impact Factor: 6.057

NAAS Rating: 3.77

A Study On Association Between Usage Pattern Of ICT Tools And Socio-Economic Characteristics Of Farmers In Ikauna Block Of Shrawasti District, U.P

Singh Jayati¹; Prof. (Dr.)Jahanara²

¹M.Sc. Scholar, <u>jayatisingh3094@gmail.com</u> ²Head of the Department Department of Agricultural Extension & Communication Sam Higginbottom Institute of Agricultural Technology & Sciences, Prayagraj

ABSTRACT: This study was conducted to find out the impact of ICT tools on the agricultural development among farmers of Shrawasti district of UP of India. A total of 120 farmers were randomly selected for the study during November 2018 to May 2019. The results showed that majority of the farmers owned mobile phones as well as television and radio. The most frequently used ICT was mobile phone. Mobile phones were widely used by the farmers for social communication, contacting middle men for the marketing of produce and contacting experts on real time basis for getting agricultural advisories. The present study aims to study the agriculture development with the emergence of the new communication technology. The study is being undertaken to know how agriculture development is possible through an effective communication tools that is ICT (Information and Communication Technology). Major problems in the use of ICTs by the farmers were lack of confidence in operating ICTs, erratic power supply, low network connectivity and lack of awareness of the benefits of ICTs. KEYWORDS- ICT, Agriculture, Farmers, Impact, usage pattern

Introduction-

India is a growing economy with agriculture forming the backbone of the Indian economy. Despite the concentration of industrialization, agriculture remains in a place of pride. Agriculture in India has an extensive background which goes back to ten thousand years. At present, India holds the second position in the world in agricultural production. As ICT access continued to increase among farming communities and information services continued to adapt and flourish, the scope existed for a much better rural productivity impact in the future.(Kumar 2016)

ICTs in agriculture have the potential to facilitate greater access to information that drive or support knowledge sharing. ICTs essentially facilitate the creation, management, storage, retrieval, and dissemination of any relevant data, knowledge, and information that may have been already been processed and adapted (Bachelor 2002; Chapman and Slay maker 2002; Rao 2007; Heeks 2002). ICTs have been a significant contributor to growth and socio-economic development in business sectors, countries and regions where they are well adopted and integrated. Nearly 40 percent of the global population has access to the Internet, and among the bottom fifth of the poor, out of 10 households have a mobile phone.1 The large adoption and integrated new revenue streams and saved resources.



Singh Jayati *et al*, International Journal of Advances in Agricultural Science and Technology, Vol.6 Issue.5, May-2019, pg. 1-7 ISSN: 2348-1358 Impact Factor: 6.057 NAAS Rating: 3.77

Role of ICT in Agriculture

Information and Communicational Technology (IT) has many roles to perform for agricultural development starting from decision support system to the trading of crops. ICT has a great role as decision support system to the farmers. Through ICT, farmers can be updated with the recent information about agriculture, weather, new varieties of crops and new ways to increase production and quality control.

ICT has the great potential to widen marketing horizon of farmers directly to the customers or other appropriate users for maximum benefit. Farmers may connect directly with many users and may get information about current prices for their commodities. They can get access to the market sitting at home. Further, it will curtail the middle profit also which will be beneficial for the farmers. ICT technologies can help for strengthening farming communities through wide networking and collaborations with various institutes, NGO's and private sectors. Further, farmers may enhance their own capacities through updated information and wide exposure to scientific, farming and trade community.

Information and Communication Technology (ICT) can revolutionize Indian farming sector and can benefit all farmers including small landholders. Agriculture is the most important sector with the majority of the rural population in developing countries depending on it. The traditional approaches of agriculture being adapted, has numerous challenges in terms of production, marketing, profit etc. (Lokeswari 2016)

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study is to find the association between usage pattern of ict tools with socio-economic characteristics of the respondents. The specific objectives are-

- 1) To ascertain the socio economic characteristics of the respondents.
- 2) To find the association between socio economic characteristics and usage pattern of ICT tools.

Research Methodology

The present study has been completed with collecting both primary as well as secondary data. The study area is Ikauna block of district Shrawasti (U.P.).

Secondary Data Collection: The secondary data has been collected through different source of materials, portals, websites and other exiting records. The other relevant data has been collected from various books, magazines, official records, research paper, internet, journals, news articles and other exiting sources of data.

Primary Data Collection: The primary data has been collected through two methods survey and observation. Through schedule, data has been collected from the farmers of selected villages Schedule has been prepared with both close ended and open ended questionnaire.

Sample Size: The size of the sample consist of 120 respondents

Selection of respondents: The sample was drawn through simple random sampling methods. Through stratified random sampling methods 12 farmers have been selected from each village, and 10 villages was selected



Singh Jayati *et al*, International Journal of Advances in Agricultural Science and Technology, Vol.6 Issue.5, May-2019, pg. 1-7 ISSN: 2348-1358 Impact Factor: 6.057

MAAS Rating: 3.77

Data Analysis-

Data are analyzed in qualitative and quantitative methods. Data collected from both panchayat are average analyzed. To know the difference a comparative analysis has also been done. Statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, ranking technique, chi-square and Microsoft excel has been used for analysis of data.

| S.no. | Variables | Category | Frequency (percentage) |
|-------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| 1. | Age | Young (21-35) | 19 (15.83) |
| | | Middle (36-55) | 68(56.66) |
| | | Old (56 & above) | 33(27.50) |
| 2. | Education | Illiterate | 27(22.50) |
| | | Primary | 21(17.50) |
| | | Secondary | 29(24.16) |
| | | High school | 12(10.00) |
| | | Intermediate | 23(19.17) |
| | | Graduation & above | 08(6.67) |
| 3. | Occupation | Farming system | 76(63.33) |
| | | F.S + subsidiary | 44(36.67) |
| 4. | Annual income | Below 1 lac | 17(14.17) |
| | | 1 lac- 2.5 lac | 63(52.50) |
| | | 2.5 lac -5 lac | 17(14.17) |
| | | Above 5 lac | 23(19.16) |
| 5. | Family type | Nuclear | 73(60.83) |
| | | Joint | 47(39.17) |
| 6. | House type | Thatched house | 17(14.17) |
| | | Semi-cemented | 58(48.33) |
| | | Cemented | 45(37.50) |
| 7. | Land holding | Below 1 ha | 21(17.50) |
| | | 1-4 ha | 77(64.16) |
| | | Above 4 ha | 22(18.34) |
| 8. | Extension contact | Low (4-6) | 19(15.83) |
| | | Medium(6-8) | 69(57.50) |
| | | High (8-10) | 32(26.67) |
| 9. | Mass media exposure | Low (6-11) | 14(11.67) |
| | | Medium (11-16) | 72(60.00) |
| | | High (16_21) | 34(28.33) |

Table I- Distribution of respondents according to their socio -economic characteristics-

In the above table, the data reveals that the majority (56.67%) of the farmers belonged to middle age group and 27.50 per cent were of old age and 15.83 per cent belonged to young age. In education, about 22.50 per cent of the respondents were illiterate and 17.50 per cent of the respondents had primary school level of education and 24.17 per cent respondents had secondary school education whereas 10 per cent had up to high school followed by 19.17 per cent of respondents having intermediate level of education and 6.66 per cent respondents were graduate and above education respectively. 63.33% of the respondents are practicing farming (agriculture) as their major occupation followed by farming and subsidiary (36.67%) respectively. 52.50 percent of the respondents are coming to the category range of 1 lac- 2.5 lac followed by income of above 5 lac (19.16%) followed by 2.5lac-5 lac (14.17%) and 14.17 percent of the respondents have annual income below 1 lac. The above table shows that 60.83per cent of the respondents are in Nuclear family, followed by the joint family (39.17%) respectively.14.17



Singh Jayati *et al*, International Journal of Advances in Agricultural Science and Technology, Vol.6 Issue.5, May-2019, pg. 1-7 ISSN: 2348-1358 Impact Factor: 6.057

NAAS Rating: 3.77

percent of respondents had thatched house whereas 48.33 percent respondents had semi-cemented house and remaining 37.50 percent had cemented house. The data regarding land holdings indicated that the majority (64.17%) of respondents belonged to the category of small farmers (1-4 hectare) followed by 18.33 per cent of respondents belongs to large farmers (above 4 hectare). While, only 17.50 per cent of respondents belongs to the category of medium & large farmers (below1 hectare). Majority (57.50%) of the respondents were having medium extension contact, 26.67 per cent had high, whereas 15.83 per cent of the respondents were found with high extension contact.

| S.no | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|------|----------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Low (9-15) | 24 | 20.00 |
| 2. | Medium (15-21) | 59 | 49.17 |
| 3. | High (21-27) | 37 | 30.83 |
| 4. | Total | 120 | 100 |

Table.I.(a) socio-economic characteristics of the respondents

From the above table I(a), we can analyze that the socio- economic characteristics of the respondents has been divided into three category i.e. low, medium, high.

The above table shows that 20.00 percent of respondents belongs to low category, 49.17 percent belongs to medium category & 30.83 percent of respondents belong to high category.



| Table II. | Usage pattern | of ICT tools | by the | respondents j | for the | information | of farming | system |
|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------|---------------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|
|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------|---------------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|

| S.No. | Area of information | Al | ways | Some | times | Ne | ever | Tot | tal |
|-------|----------------------|----|-------|------|-------|----|-------|-----|-----|
| | | F | P% | F | P% | F | P% | F | P% |
| 1. | Land preparation | 07 | 5.83 | 79 | 65.83 | 34 | 28.34 | 120 | 100 |
| 2. | Selection of variety | 21 | 17.50 | 66 | 55.00 | 33 | 27.50 | 120 | 100 |



Singh Jayati *et al*, International Journal of Advances in Agricultural Science and Technology, Vol.6 Issue.5, May-2019, pg. 1-7 ISSN: 2348-1358

Impact Factor: 6.057 NAAS Rating: 3.77

| 3. | preparation of seedling | 12 | 10.00 | 71 | 59.17 | 37 | 30.83 | 120 | 100 |
|-----|--------------------------|----|-------|----|-------|----|-------|-----|-----|
| 4. | Sowing | 07 | 5.83 | 67 | 55.83 | 46 | 38.33 | 120 | 100 |
| 5. | Fertilizer management | 33 | 27.50 | 61 | 50.83 | 26 | 21.66 | 120 | 100 |
| 6. | Weed management | 09 | 7.50 | 69 | 57.50 | 42 | 35.00 | 120 | 100 |
| 7. | Irrigation management | 11 | 9.17 | 70 | 58.33 | 39 | 32.50 | 120 | 100 |
| 8. | Plant protection measure | 36 | 30.00 | 67 | 55.83 | 17 | 14.17 | 120 | 100 |
| 9. | Harvesting & PHT | 28 | 23.33 | 63 | 52.50 | 29 | 24.17 | 120 | 100 |
| 10. | Marketing | 19 | 15.83 | 71 | 59.17 | 30 | 25.00 | 120 | 100 |
| 11. | Supportive facts | 22 | 18.33 | 64 | 53.33 | 34 | 28.34 | 120 | 100 |

Table II shows the usage pattern of ICT tools by the respondents for the information of farming system, it is concluded that 5.83 percent of respondents always use ICT tools for land preparation information while 65.83 percent use it sometimes and 28.34 percent never use it. Similarly for selection of variety information, 17.50, 55.00 27.50 percent of respondents use always, sometimes & never respectively. In taking information for ssedling preparation, respondents use 10.00 percent always, 59.17 percent sometines and 30.83 percent never. For sowing purpose percentage of always, sometimes and never are 5.83, 55.83 & 38.83 respectively. 27.50 percent of respondents always use ICT tool for fertilizer management information, 50.83 percent use sometimes and 21.66 percent never use it. For weed management, 7.50 percent always take help from ICT tools while 57.50 take help sometimes and 35.00 never take help regarding information. For further practices, like irrigation management 9.17 percent respondents use always, 58.33 percent use sometimes, and 32.50 percent never use it. 30.00 percent respondents shows positive attitude towards use of ICT tools regarding plant protection measure, 55.83 use it sometimes and 14.17 never use it. For harvesting & PHT 23.33 percent of respondents always use ICT tools for information whereas 52.50 and 24.17 pecent use it sometimes and never repectively. Similarly for marketing purposes 15. 83 and 59.17 percent use it always and sometimes respectively while only 25 percent never use it. Last statement related to support i facts like, weather forecasting, subsidies, agricultural loans in which 18.33 percent of respondents always use ICT tools while 53.33 pecent use it sometimes and 28.34 percent never use it.

Table II. (a) Overall table for usage pattern of ICT tools for the information of farming practices

| S.no | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|------|----------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Low (11-17) | 33 | 27.50 |
| 2. | Medium (17-23) | 68 | 56.67 |
| 3. | High (23-29) | 19 | 15.83 |
| 4. | Total | 120 | 100 |

Table II.(a) shows that 56.67 percent of respondents have medium level of usage for the information of farming practices followed by 27.50 and 15.83 percent low and high usage respectively.



Singh Jayati *et al*, International Journal of Advances in Agricultural Science and Technology, Vol.6 Issue.5, May-2019, pg. 1-7 ISSN: 2348-1358 Impact Factor: 6.057





Analysis:

Chi square test-

Test to determine whether two attributes are independent by comparison of observed frequencies related to expected frequencies.

| Table III. Association between | independent variable and dependent variable (| usage pattern) |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------|
| | of respondents: | |

n = 120

| Category | Usage pattern (dependant variable) | S.E.S. (independant variable) | Row total |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| Low | 33 (a) | 24 (b) | 55 |
| | $(28.50) = E_{(a)}$ | $(28.50) = E_{(b)}$ | R1 (a+b) |
| Medium | 68 (c) | 59 (d) | 126 |
| | $(63.50) = E_{(c)}$ | $(63.50) = E_{(d)}$ | R2 (c+d) |
| High | 19 (e) | 37 (f) | 59 |
| | $(28.00) = E_{(e)}$ | $(28.00) = E_{(f)}$ | R3 (e+f) |
| Column total | 120 | 120 | 240=N |
| | | | |

 $E_{(a)=}$ expected value of a

(a)= observed value

Expected cell frequency = (row total) x (column total)



Singh Jayati *et al*, International Journal of Advances in Agricultural Science and Technology, Vol.6 Issue.5, May-2019, pg. 1-7 ISSN: 2348-1358 Impact Factor: 6.057

NAAS Rating: 3.77

 $X^2 = \sum \sum (\text{ observed value} - \text{ expected value})^2 \text{ with } d.f. = (R-1) (C-1)$

Expected value Where, Σ = summation overall differences R= no. of rows C= no. of columns By calculating, $X^2_{2(5\%)}$ = 5.99 (tabulated value) X^2 = 7.82 (calculated value)

Since, the calculated value of chi- square test is greater than the tabulated value of X^2 on 2 degree of freedom and at 5% probability level, so our null hypothesis will be rejected, therefore it can be concluded from above calculated data that there is significant association between socio economic condition & usage pattern of ICT tools.

As shown in Table III, education, household size, age and other given socio economic characteristics were found to be associated to the respondents usage to ICT. Education plays a significant role in creating awareness and interest in innovations. It is also fundamental to the understanding of the usage, and functionalities of ICT.

Conclusion –

Socio-economic status (SES) is a broad concept that includes such factors as educational attainment, occupation, income, wealth, and other few factors. This study was embarked upon with a view to assessing the association between socio economic status & usage pattern of ICT tools among farmers of Shrawasti district. Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that there is significant association between socio economic characteristics like age, education, income, mass media exposure etc. it can be concluded that by ICT tools helps in the upliftment of socio economic status of the farmer. Results also show that ICT can helpful to produce the productive knowledge of related to their farming system.

Suggestions - Our findings suggest that more the availability and usage of ICT in agricultural sector, more the efficiency will increase in the production of agriculture. After analyzing all the results we conclude that ICT brings a positive impact the upliftment of socio economic status of farmer.

References

- Duncombe R. and Heeks R.(2004) Information & Communication Technologies (ICTs), Poverty Reduction and Micro, Small & Medium-scale Enterprises (MSMEs), Institute for Development Policy and Management (IDPM) The University of Manchester.
- [2]. Melkote. S. R. & Steves. H. L (2001). Communication for Development in third World. New Delhi: Sage Publication.
- [3]. K. Lokeswari (2016) A Study Of The Use Of Ict Among Rural Farmers, International Journal Of Communication Research, Volume 6.
- [4]. Kumar R. (2016) Impact Of Information Communication And Technology (ICTs) On Agriculture In Haryana, pg 57-59.