**Indian Journal
of Pure & Applied
Biosciences**

Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Open Access Journal

Socio-economic Profile of Post Graduate Students about Mass Media Utilization Pattern in State Agriculture University of Uttar Pradesh

Kamal Kishore[*], R. K. Doharey, Shalu Gutam and N. R. Meena

Department of Extension Education, College of Agriculture, A.N.D.U.A &T.,
Kumarganj, Ayodhya (U.P.)- 224229
*Corresponding Author E-mail: kamalextensionnd@gamil.com

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in year 2018 to 2020 since the investigator is studying in N.D.U.A & T, Kumargunj, Ayodhya. So were done collect the required information from N.D.U.A. & T, Ayodhya, C.S.A.U.A. & T, Kanpur, S.V.P. U.A &T, Meerut and Banda University of Agriculture &Technology, Banda. College of Agriculture from each university was taken for the study purpose. Selection of the respondents purposively was done by simple random sampling method from every agriculture college for each agricultural university in Uttar Pradesh. An it's of all the students studying in P.G. classes in all four agricultural universities were prepared and out of that 30% of the students were selected as sample for study purpose. The total sample size 657 respondents, about the 30% total post graduate students sample size 197respondents were selected randomly all four universities college. The respondents were contacted personally for data collection. The results of the study depicted that the maximum number of the respondents were found in various socio-economic profile characters like, age composition of 22 to 25 years (48.22%), General caste (32.99%), Unmarried respondents (24.36%), Nuclear/ single family system (75.63%), Family size (small up 5 members) (52.79%), Land holding as small (1-2 ha.) (57.36%), House hold materials (cots) (100.0%), Communication and media possession (mobile phone) (100.0%), Farm power (diesel engine) (77.15%), Agriculture implements (Khurpi) (100.0%), Social participation (no participation) (49.74%), Parent Occupation (agriculture main) (70.05%), Annual family income (medium 36001-150000) (49.74%), Housing pattern (pucca) (49.74%), respectively.

***Keywords:** Socio-economic profile, Knowledge, Awareness*

INTRODUCTION

The word "media" is derived from the word medium, signifying mode or carrier. Media is intended to reach and address a large target group or audience. The word was first used in respect of books and newspapers that is print media but with the advent of technology, media now encompasses television, movies, radio and internet. In today's world, media becomes as essential as our daily needs.

Media of today is playing an outstanding role in creating and shaping of public opinion and strengthening of society (Roy, 2015). The term media is derived from Medium, which means carrier or mode. Media denotes an item specifically designed to reach a large audience or viewers. The term was first used with the advent of newspapers and magazines. However, with the passage of time, the term broadened by the inventions of radio, TV, cinemas and Internet. In the world of today, media has become almost as necessary as food and clothing. It is true that media is playing an outstanding role in strengthening the society. Its duty is to inform, educate and entertain the people. It helps us to know current situation around the world. The media has a strong social and cultural impact upon society. Because of its inherent ability to reach large number of public, it is widely used to convey message to build public opinion and awareness. The role of media in education is evident today by the number of computer labs, television sets and libraries that have become part of curriculum in most schools today. Media comes in different forms and each form affects the way students learn and interpret information. Media has brought the world closer (globalization) so that now students from different universities in different parts of the world are connected through a mere internet connection. Amidst the information revolution m ass media has become such a massive part of our lives (2018). India's internet users expected to register double digit growth to reach 627 million in 2019, driven by rapid internet growth in rural areas, market research agency Kantar IMRB Wednesday said. In its ICUBE 2018 report that tracks digital adoption and usage trends in India, it noted that the number of internet users in India has registered an annual growth of 18 percent and is estimated at 566 million as of December 2018, a 40 percent overall internet penetration, it observed. Of the total user base, 87 percent or 493 million Indians, are defined as regular users, having accessed internet in last 30 days. Nearly 293 million active internet users reside in urban India, while there are 200 million active users in rural India, it said. The report found that 97 percent of users use mobile phone as one of the devices to access internet. While internet users grew by 7 percent in urban India, reaching 315 million users in 2018 and digital adoption is now being propelled by rural India, registering a 35 percent growth in internet users over the past year. It is now estimated that there are 251 million internet users in rural India, and this is expected to reach 290 million by the end of 2019, the report said. Increased availability of bandwidth, cheap data plans and increased awareness driven by government programmers seem to have rapidly bridged the digital gap between urban and rural India. Consequently, the penetration in rural India has increased from 9 per cent in 2015 to 25 percent in 2018," it added. Bihar registered the highest growth in internet users across both urban and rural areas, registering a growth of 35 percent over last year. The report also noted that the internet usage is more gender balanced than ever before with women comprising 42 percent of total internet users. (Report - The Economic Times, 2019). The Indian Readership Survey (IRS) data released for Q1 of 2019 reveals that the overall readership of newspapers has grown from 407 million readers in 2017 to 425 million readers at the end of the first quarter of 2019. The report was released by the Media Research Users Council (MRUC) on Friday. While Hindi and regional dailies grew at 3.9 per cent and 5.7 per cent, respectively, English newspapers saw a 10.7 per cent growth, though on a small base. Hindi dailies had 186 million readers, while regional readership stood at 211 million in IRS Q1 2019. English newspaper readership went up from 28 million to 31 million between the 2017 and Q1 2019 surveys. Total readership of magazines was up 9 million to 87 million, according to the latest IRS data, while business dailies too reported a healthy growth. The report is based on a rolling average of the data from last three quarters of IRS 2017 and one fresh quarter from IRS 2019. The sample size for the latest IRS was 324,286 households. The consumption of online newspapers also

saw growth. In IRS 2017, 4 per cent of the total universe consumed online newspapers, while in IRS 2019 the number has grown to 5 per cent. The growth is led by New Consumer Classification System A1 where 27 per cent of the total universe consumed online newspapers. In consumption, the clear outlier was digital as the percentage of people who accessed the internet grew from 19 per cent of the total universe to 24 per cent. TV, radio and magazine consumption showed marginal increase, while newspaper readership and cinema consumption remained flat. However, since the universe of media consumption itself grew, there was growth in newspaper and cinema consumption in absolute numbers. Internet penetration stood at 36 per cent, with urban markets seeing penetration in excess of 50 per cent, and rural markets at 28 per cent. However, in terms of absolute numbers, 50 per cent of internet users came from rural areas. Vikram Sakhuja, group CEO, Madison Media & OOH, Madison World, and IRS technical committee chairman, said, "Overall media consumption, and print in particular, is vibrant and growing. Most stakeholders should be encouraged with this snapshot of how India is consuming media and print.A number of newspapers and periodicals are published in Hindi, English, and Urdu. The Pioneer was founded in Allahabad in 1865 by George Allen. Amar Ujala, Dainik Bhaskar, Dainik Jagran, Rajasthan Patrika and Hindustan Dainik have a wide circulation, with local editions published from several important cities. Major English language newspapers which are published and sold in large numbers are The Telegraph, The Times of India, Hindustan Times, The Hindu, The Statesman, The Indian Express, and Asian Age. Some prominent financial dailies like The Economic Times, Financial Express, Business Line, and Business Standard are widely circulated. Vernacular newspapers such as those in Hindi, Nepali, Gujarati, Odia, Urdu, and Punjabi are also read by a select readership. Doordarshan is the state-owned television broadcaster. Multi system operators provide a mix of Hindi, English, Bengali, Nepali and international channels via cable. Hindi 24-hour television news channels are NDTV India, DD News, Zee News, Aaj Tak, News18 India, and ABP News. All India Radio is a public radio station. There are 32 private FM stations available in major cities like Lucknow, Kanpur, Varanasi, Allahabad, Agra, and Noida. Cell phone providers include Vodafone, Airtel, BSNL, Reliance Jio, Reliance Communications, Telenor, Aircel,Tata Indicom, Idea Cellular, and Tata DoCoMo. Broadband internet is available in select towns and cities and is provided by the state-run BSNL and by private companies. Dial-up access is provided throughout the state by BSNL and other providers.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted in purposely selection of the district Ayodhya, Kanpur, Meerut, and Banda will be done purposively as the agriculture universities are situated in these district of Uttar Pradesh. Since the investigator is studying in N.D.U.A & T, Kumargunj, Ayodhya. So were done collect the required information from N.D.U.A. & T, Ayodhya, C.S.A.U.A. & T, Kanpur, S.V.P. U.A &T, Meerut and Banda University of Agriculture &Technology, Banda. College of Agriculture from each university (Ayodhya, Kanpur, Meerut, &Banda) was taken for the study purpose. Selection of the respondents purposively was done by simple random sampling method from every agriculture college for each agricultural university in Uttar Pradesh. A its of all the students studying in P.G. classes in all four agricultural universities were prepared and out of that 30% of the students were selected as sample for study purpose. The total sample size 657 respondents, about the 30% total post graduate students sample size 197respondents were selected randomly all four universities college. Data were collected with the help of semi-structured interview schedule specially developed on standard scales with some

modifications in the light of objectives and analyzed with suitable statistical methods.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION
Age composition:

Table-1 1Distribution of respondents according to their age.   **N=197**

S. No.	Categories (years)	Respondents	
		F	**%**
1.	Up to 21years	45.00	22.84
2.	22 to 25 years	95.00	48.22
3.	26 years and above	57.00	28.93
	Total	**197.0**	**100.00**

Mean= 32.19, S.D= 2.003489, Min.= 20, Max.= 27

Table-1.1 indicates that the maximum number of respondents (48.22%), was observed in the categories of (22 to 25 years) age followed by (up to 21 years) age is (22.84%), and (above 26 years) age is (28.93), respectively.

Caste composition:

Table-1.2 Distribution of respondents according to their caste.   **N=197**

S. No.	Categories	Respondents		
		F	**%**	
1.	General caste	65.00	32.99	
2.	Other Backward caste	55.00	27.91	
3.	Scheduled caste	42.00	21.31	
4.	Scheduled tribes	23.00	11.67	
5.	Minority	12.00	6.09	
	Total	**197.0**	**100.00**	

Mean= 2.365, S.D= 1.315457, Min.= 1, Max.= 5

Table-1.2 indicates that the maximum number of respondents (32.99%), general caste followed by other backward caste (27.91%), scheduled caste (21.31%), scheduled tribes (11.67%) minority (6.09%), respectively.

Marital status:

Table-1.3 Distribution of respondents according to their marital status.   N= 197

S. No.	Categories	Respondents	
		F	**%**
1.	Married	48.00	24.36
2.	Unmarried	149.0	75.63
	Total	**197.0**	**100.00**

Men= 0.15, S.D= 0.357967, Min.= 0, Max.= 1

Table-1.3 indicates that the maximum number of respondents (24.36%), unmarried and married respondents (24.36%), respectively.

Family type:

Table- 1.4 Distribution of respondents according to their family type.   **N=197**

S. No.	Categories	Respondents	
		F	**%**
1.	Joint family	84.00	42.63
2.	Nuclear/ Single family	113.0	75.63
	Total	**197.0**	**100.00**

Mean= 1.105, S.D=0.307323, Min.= 1, Max.= 2

Table-1.4 indicates that the maximum number of respondents (75.63%), Nuclear/ Single family system while remaining respondents was observed in joint family system (42.63%), respectively.

Family size:

Table- 1. 5Distribution of respondents according to their family size.   N=197

S. No.	Categories (members)	Respondents	
		F	**%**
1.	Small (up to 5)	104.0	52.79
2.	Medium (6-8)	52.00	26.39
3.	Large (9 and above)	41.0	20.81
	Total	**197**	**100.00**

Mean= 5.675, S.D= 2.0731432, Min.= 3, Max.= 1

Table-1.5indicates that the maximum number of respondents (52.79%), belong to the category of those small up to 5members in their families followed by category of medium 6 to 8 members (26.39%), and large family 9 and above members (20.81%), respectively.

Total land holding:

Table-1.6 Distributions of respondents according to their total land holding (ha.) it parent are farmer.

N= 197

S. No.	Categories (hectares)	Respondents	
		F	**%**
1.	Marginal (Less than 1)	32.00	16.24
2.	Small farmers (1-2)	113.0	57.36
3.	Medium farmers (3-4)	38.00	19.28
4.	Large farmers (Above 4)	12.00	6.09
	Total	**197.0**	**100.00**

Mean= 2.64015, S.D=1.412858, Min. = 0.12, Max. = 6.23

Table-1.6 indicates that maximum number of respondents (57.36%), were found in the land holding category as small farmers, in the category as medium farmers (19.28%), in the category of marginal farmers (16.24%), and in the category of large farmers (6.09%), respectively.

Material possession:

Table-1.7 Distribution of respondents according to their material possession at home.

A.   Household material: N=197

S. No.	Household material	Respondents	
		F	**%**
1.	Double Bed	45.00	22.84
2.	Sofa Set	18.00	9.13
3.	Dining Table	15.00	7.61
4.	Dressing Table	70.00	35.53
5.	Gas Stove with Gas Cylinder	190.0	96.44
6.	Electric Press	145.0	73.60
7.	Smokeless Stove	12.00	6.09
8.	Pressure Cooker	185.0	93.90
9.	Chair	189.0	95.93
10.	Fan	195.0	98.98
11.	Cooler	122.0	61.92
12.	Solar light	40.00	20.30
13.	Heater	62.0	31.47
14.	Cots	197.0	100.00
15.	Sewing machine	175.0	88.83
16.	Wall watch	162.0	82.23
17.	Induction Chula	48.00	24.36

18.	Almari	56.00	28.42
19.	Air-Conditioner (A.C)	09.00	4.56
20.	Electric ketli	16.00	8.12

Note: More than one items have been shown by respondent, hence the total percentage of all items would be more than 197.

Table-1.7 indicates that the maximum number of respondents (100.00%), were reported having cots followed by fan (98.98%), and Gas stove with Gas cylinder (96.44%), chair (95.93%), pressure cooker (93.90%), Sewing machine (88.83%), wall watch (82.23%), electric press (73.60%), cooler (61.92%), dressing table (35.53%), heater (31.47%), almari (28.42%), induction Chula (24.36%), dual bed (22.84%), solar light (20.30%), sofa set (9.13%), electric Ketli (8.12%), dining table (7.61%), smokeless stove (6.09%), Air-Conditioner (4.56%), respectively.

Communication media possession:

Table-1.8 Distribution of respondents according to their communication and media possession.

N=197

S.N.	Communication media possession	Respondents	
		F	**%**
1.	T.V./ L.C.D	190.0	96.44
2.	Radio	08.00	4.06
3.	Mobile/Cell phone	197.0	100.00
4.	Telephone	05.00	2.53
5.	Tape-recorder	42.00	21.31
6.	Agricultural journals	64.00	32.48
7.	Agricultural Magazines	167.0	84.77
8.	D.T.H	185.0	93.90
9.	V.C.D/D.V.D player	15.00	7.61
10.	Agriculture books	197.0	100.00
11.	News paper	188.0	95.43
12.	Internet	192.0	97.47
13.	Desktop	56.00	28.42
14.	Laptop	143.0	72.58
15.	Printers	79.00	40.10
16.	Tablet	12.00	6.09

Note: More than one items have been shown by respondent, hence the total percentage of all items would be more than 197.

Table-1.8 indicates that the maximum number of respondents (100%), were observes possessing mobile Phone and agriculture books (100%) with them. The rest of respondents who had other communication media were in descending order as Internet (97.47), T.V/L.C.D. (96.44%), newspaper (95.43%), D.T.H. (93.90%), agriculture magazine (84.77%), laptop (72.58%), printer (40.10%), agricultural journal (32.48%), desktop (28.42%), tape-recorder (21.31%), V.C.D./DVD player (7.61%), tablet (6.09%), radio (4.06%), and telephone (2.53), respectively.

Farm power:

Table- 1.9 Distribution of respondents according to their farm power..

N=197

S.N.	Farm power	Respondents	
		F	**%**
1.	Tractor	92.00	46.70
2	Power tiller	75.00	38.07
3	Diesel engine	152.0	77.15
4	Electronic motor	118.0	59.89
5	Tube-well	88.00	44.67
6	Solar energy pump	12.00	6.09
7	Electronic grinder	62.00	31.47

Note: More than one items have been shown by respondent, hence the total percentage of all items would be more than 197.

Table-1.9 indicates that the maximum number of respondents (77.15%), having their diesel engine, followed by Electronic motor (59.89%), tractor (46.70%), tube well (44.67%), power tiller (38.07%), electronic grinder (31.47%), solar energy pump (6.09%), respectively.

Agriculture implements:

Table-1.10 Distribution of respondents according to their agriculture implements.

N=197

S. No.	Agriculture implements	Respondents	
		F	**%**
1.	Deshi Plough	52.00	26.39
2.	Cultivator	92.00	46.70
3.	Disc Plough	88.00	44.67
4.	Seed Drill	80.00	40.60
5.	Rotawater	75.00	38.07
6.	Cane Cutter Planter	32.00	16.24
7.	Chaff Cutter	182.0	92.38
8.	Combine Harvester	13.00	6.59
9.	Thresher	85.00	43.14
10.	Cane Crusher	98.00	49.74
11.	Leveler	89.00	45.17
12.	Sprayer	112.0	56.85
13.	Duster	35.00	17.76
14.	Kudal	167.0	84.77
15.	Shovel	155.0	78.68
16.	Khurpi	197.0	100.00
17.	Sickle	190.0	96.44
18.	Pata	99.00	50.25

Note: More than one items have been shown by respondent, hence the total percentage of all items would be more than 197.

Table-1.10 indicates that the maximum number of respondents (100%), was reported having khurpi, followed by sickle (96.44%), chaff cutter (92.38%), kudal (84.77%), shovel (78.68%), sprayer (56.85%), pata (50.25%), cane crusher (49.74%), cultivator (46.70%), leveler (45.17%), disc plough (44.67%), thresher (43.14%), seed drill (40.60%), rotawater (38.07%), deshi plough (26.39%), duster (17.76%), cane cutter planter (16.24%), combine harvester (6.59%), respectively.

Social participation:

Table- 1.11 Distribution of respondents according to their social participation.

N=197

S. No.	Participation	Respondents	
		F	%
1.	No participation	98.00	49.74
2.	Participation in one organizations	60.00	30.45
3.	Participation in two organizations	24.00	12.18
4.	Participation in more than two organizations	15.00	7.67
	Total	**197.0**	**100.00**

Mean= 0.18, S.D=0.564974, Min.= 0, Max.= 3
Table-1.11 indicates that the overwhelming maximum number of respondents (30.45%), participates in one organization followed by (49.74%) respondents did not take participation in any organization, (12.18%) respondents in two organizations and (7.67%) respondents in more than two organization respectively.

Parent occupation:

Table-1.12 Distribution of respondents according to parent occupation.

N=197

S. No.	Occupation	Main		Subsidiary	
		No.	%	No.	%
1.	Agriculture labor	04	2.03	07	3.55
2.	Caste based occupation	09	4.56	13	6.59
3.	Services	23	11.67	19	9.64
4.	Agriculture	138	70.05	108	54.82
5.	Business	08	4.06	27	13.70
6.	Agro based enterprise	15	7.61	23	11.67
	Total	197	**100.00**	197	**100.00**

Note: More than one items have been shown by respondent, hence the total percentage of all items would be more than 197.
Table-1.12 indicates that the maximum number of respondents (70.05%), was observed such who had their main occupation as agriculture, business (4.06%), Caste based occupation (4.56%), service (11.67%), agriculture labor (2.03%), and Agro based enterprise (7.61%) respectively. Than the maximum (54.82%), respondent were observed such who had their subsidiary occupation as agriculture, agriculture labor (3.55%), respondents service (9.64%), business (13.70%), caste based occupation (6.59%), and agro based enterprises (11.67%), respectively.

Family income:

Table- 1.13 Distribution of the respondents according to their annual family income (Rs.).

N=197

S. No.	Annual family income	Respondents	
		F	%
1.	Small(up to 36000)	52.00	26.39
2.	Medium(36001- 150000)	98.00	49.74
3.	High(150001 and above)	47.00	23.85
	Total	**197.0**	**100.00**

Mean= 76535, S.D=0.36793, Min.= 36000, Max.= 24000
Table-1.13 indicates that the maximum number of the respondents (49.79%), belong to the annual income medium followed by small income (26.39%), and high income (23.85%), respectively.

Housing pattern:

Table-1.14 Distribution of the respondents according to their hosing pattern

N= 197

S. No.	Housing pattern	Respondents	
		F	%
1.	Kachcha	12.00	6.09
2.	Mixed	84.00	42.63
3.	Pucca	98.00	49.74
4.	Hunt	03.00	1.52
	Total	197.0	100.00

Mean= 1.93, S.D= 0.255787, Min.= 1, Max.= 2

Table-1.14 indicates that the maximum number of respondents (49.74%), reported having pucca type houses followed by, mixed houses (42.63%), kachcha house (6.09%), and hunts (1.52%), respectively.

CONCLUSION

So, it is conclude knowledge about different variable the maximum number of respondents were found in the categories of (22 to 25 years) age group (48.22%), followed by General caste (32.99%), Unmarried respondents (24.36%), Nuclear/ single family system (75.63%), Family size (small up 5 members) (52.79%), Land holding as small (1-2 ha.) (57.36%), House hold materials (cots) (100.0%), Communication and media possession (mobile phone) (100.0%), Farm power (diesel engine) (77.15%), Agriculture implements (Khurpi) (100.0%), Social participation (no participation) (49.74%), Parent Occupation (agriculture main) (70.05%), Annual family income (medium 36001-150000) (49.74%), Housing pattern (pucca) (49.74%), respectively.

Acknowledgement

REFERENCES

Balaji, N. G., & Ragavan, S. S. (2016). Information seeking behaviour of faculty members and research scholars of Bangalore University: A Case Study. *International Journal of Research in Library Science, 2*(2), 38-43.

Baym, N. K., Zhang, Y. B., & Lin, M. (2004). Social interactions across media. *New Media & Society, 6*(3), 299-318.

Gupta, S.L. (1992). "Mass Media and Social Change" Interaction, *12*(2), 38-47.

Giffords, E. (2009). The internet and social work: The next generation. Families in Society. *Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, *90*(4), 413-418.

Josephson, W.L. (1987). Television violence and children's aggression: Testing the priming, social script, and disinhibition predictions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *5*(53), 882–890.

Kumar, A., & Maurya, A. S. (2018). Role of Media in Indian Education System, International Conference "Advances in Agricultural, Biological and Applied Sciences for Sustainable Future, *34*(2), 5-9.

Kakade, O., & Raut, N. (2012). The role of mass media in promoting education. *Research, Analysis and Evaluation*, *4*(36), 10-14.

Lohar, M., & Kumbar, M. (2008). Use of CDROMS and internet resources by the students in JNN college of engineering Shimoga: A survey. *Journal of Information Management, 45*(2), 12-17.

Mbugua, S. (2004). Shocking rise in rape cases unveiled. *The Daily Nation Newspapers, Nairobi:* Nation Media Group.

Pempek, T. A., Yermolayeva, Y. A., & Calvert, S. L. (2009). College students' social networking experiences on facebook. *Journal of applied developmental psychology*, *30*(1), 227-238.

Singh, S.N., Sonkar, S.P., Doharey, R.K., Singh, R.K., & Kumar, M. (2017). Use of Motivational Sources of State Agricultural University Students about Career Preferences. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences, 6*(1), 933-940.

Shao, G. (2009). Understanding the Appeal of User-Generated Media: A Uses and Gratification Perspective. *Internet Research. 19*, 7-25.

Tanwar, K. C., & Priyanka (2016). Impact of Media Violence on Children's Aggressive Behaviour: PARIPEX.

Indian Journal of Research, 5 (6), 250-1991.

Treapat, L. (2017). The Influence of Mass-Media Upon Students' Education, A Two-Edged Sword, Romania: *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences, 6*(2), 5-10.

Trivedi, R. (2016). Does university play significant role in shaping entrepreneurial intention? A cross-country comparative analysis. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 23*(3), 790–811.