

Communication Pattern of Rural Poors for Rural Development Programmes

RAM KARAN SINGH AND J.P. SRIVASTAVA¹

Krishi Vigyan Kendra (S.V.B.P. Univ. of Agri. & Tech.) Dhamora, Rampur, U.P.

Abstract

The present study was conducted in Rampur district of Uttar Pradesh to analyze communication pattern of rural poors for rural development programmes in terms of their awareness of the programmes, knowledge about target people/goal/benefits of the programme as well as manner of acquiring information about programmes and processing them. Besides above, rural poors participation and dissemination of such information to others were also studied. A sample of 275 rural poors (living below poverty line) was selected for the study. Rural poors are mostly aware about Indira Awas Yojana followed by Rural Water Schemes and Ambedkar Gram Vikas Yojana. However, in general majority have only partial knowledge about rural development programmes implying there by that details are really not forthcoming. Ignorance of rural poors about details also hinder in effective utilization of benefits. Rural poors discuss with Fellow Farmers and Beneficiaries to get clarity on the procedures of programmes, benefits, target people etc. They do contact Other Farmers/Poors after availing benefits. Thus, the pattern of communication shows over dependence on localite sources and incomplete knowledge there by indicating need for planning strategy of communication.

Key words: Communication Pattern, Awareness, Acquisition, Processing, Participation, Dissemination,

Introduction

Rural development is the most important challenge before the developing nations. In India, development of rural areas has been the focus of planners and policy makers ever since pre-independence. There have been a multitude of rural development programmes of different nature which includes multipurpose programmes, target and area specific programmes and mono purpose rural development programmes. However, an over view of various developmental efforts revealed various missing links in their planning and implementation. Despite the series of development programmes, the much desired change among rural people did not happen in the country. The problems facing the rural people are many. Rural development, today focuses not only to economic development but stands for series of quantitative and qualitative changes both in living conditions of rural people. This also includes the notion of larger and deeper social transformation. Rural development, usually involves a planned and serious attempts to introduce and diffuse new technologies and innovation among rural people as rapidly and efficiently as possible. Thus, the present study was conducted in Rampur

District of Uttar Pradesh to analyse communication pattern of rural poors for rural development programmes in terms of their awareness of the programmes, knowledge about target people/goal/benefits of the programme as well as manner of acquiring information about programmes and processing them. Besides above, rural poors participation and dissemination of such information to others were also studied.

Materials and Methods

The study was carried out in Rampur District of Uttar Pradesh. Rampur District of U.P. was selected purposively. There are six development blocks in Rampur District out of which three least developed blocks namely Shahabad, Milak & Suar were purposively selected on the basis of selected parameters such as weaker persons population, low level of literacy and un conducive means of transportation and communication. The entire block area was divided in four segments and from each segment one average Village Panchyat was elected. Thus, a total of twelve Village Panchayats were included in the present study for selecting the respondents. Census was conducted in each selected village panchayat i.e. house hold wise lists were

¹ Deptt. of Agril. Ext., Kulbhaskar Ashram Degree College, Allahabad, U.P.

prepared in each Village Panchayat. Further from the list thus prepared weaker persons (living below poverty line) were identified and arranged according to the occupation and from each occupational group 30 per cent house holds were selected randomly. Hence, a sample of 275 respondents was selected for the study. The respondents were interviewed with the help of pre tested structured interview schedule developed for the purpose of study.

Results and Discussion

Awareness about Rural Development Programmes

Table 1 reveals that majority of respondents are aware about Indira Awas Yojana (55.27%) followed by Rural Water Schemes (48%), Ambedkar Gram Vikas Yojana. (35.27%), Sunishchit Rozgar Yojana (30.18%), Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (25.09%), Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (20.00%) and National Bio-gas Development Programme (7.27%). Thus, it can be say that Indira Awas Yojana (IAY) is quite popular in the area under study.

Knowledge about Rural Development Programmes

An attempt was made to find out if the respondents knew, about goals, target group of beneficiaries and benefits to be occurred from the programmes. Rural poors

had been asked through open-ended questions on each of these items and their responses were classified as 'completely known' (in case of totally correct answer) and 'Partially Known' (in case of some correct answer) as depicted in Table 2.

The Table 2 revealed that majority of respondents knew about goals of IAY (30.54%) followed by goals of RWS (25.09%), SGSY (15.27%), JGSY (9.82%), SRY (7.64%). AGVY (7.27%) and NBDP (1.45%). However, most of the respondents had only partial knowledge in each case. As far as poor peoples' knowledge regarding target people of different rural development programmes was concerned, majority of respondents knew about IAY (31.27%) followed by RWS (28.00%), SGSY (16.73%), JGSY (10.91%), SRY (7.64%), AGVY (6.18%) and NBDP (1.09%). Most of these respondents had partial knowledge about the target people. Complete Knowledge about the target people of the programmes was possessed by only 17.09 per cent respondents in case of IAY followed by RWS (7.27%) and SGSY (6.18%).

As for as poor peoples' knowledge of benefits available in various rural development programmes was concerned, majority of the respondents had knowledge

Table 1: Respondents Awareness of Rural Development Programmes (N = 275)

Rural Development Programmes	Frequency	percentage
Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY)	69	25.09
Jawahar Gram- Sam r-idhi Yojana (JGSY)	55	20.00
Sunishchit Rozgar Yojana (SRI)	83	30.18
Indira Awas Yojana (IAY)	152	55.27
Rural Water Schemes (RWS)	132	48.00
National Bio-gas Development Programme (NBDP)	20	7.27
Ambedkar Gram Vikas Yojana (AGVY)	97	35.27

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents According to their Level of Knowledge Regarding Rural Development Programmes

Rural Development Programmes	Goal			Target People			Benefits		
	Completely Known	Partially Known	Total	Completely Known	Partially Known	Total	Completely Known	Partially Known	Total
SGSY	18(6.55)	24(8.73)	42(15.27)	17(6.18)	29(10.55)	46(16.73)	11(4.00)	27(9.82)	38(13.82)
JGSY	06(2.18)	21(7.64)	27(9.82)	12(4.36)	18(6.55)	30(10.91)	08(2.91)	14(5.09)	22(8.00)
SRY	06(2.18)	15(5.45)	21(7.64)	04(1.45)	17(6.18)	21(7.64)	07(2.55)	10(3.64)	17(6.18)
IAY	21(7.64)	63(22.91)	84(30.54)	47(17.09)	39(14.18)	86(31.27)	23(8.36)	47(17.09)	70(25.45)
RWS	30(10.91)	39(14.18)	69(25.09)	20(7.27)	57(20.73)	77(28.00)	26(9.45)	44(16.0)	70(25.45)
NBDP	01(0.36)	03(1.09)	04(1.45)	01(0.36)	02(0.73)	03(1.09)	01(0.36)	02(0.73)	03(1.09)
AGVY	06(2.18)	14(5.09)	20(7.27)	06(2.18)	11(4.00)	17(6.18)	06(2.18)	11(4.00)	17(6.18)

Figures in Parenthesis indicate Percentage

Table 3: Efforts Made by Respondents for Acquisition of Information Regarding Rural Development Programmes

Rural Development Programmes	No. of Contacts with Fellow Farmers				No. of Contacts with Extension Personnel			
	< 5	5-10	>10	Total	<5	5-10	>10	Total
SGSY	23(8.36)	17(6.18)	06(2.18)	46(16.73)	28(10.18)	09(3.27)	01(0.36)	38(13.82)
JGSY	17(6.18)	08(2.91)	05(1.82)	30(10.91)	18(6.55)	10(3.64)	0	28(10.18)
SRY	12(4.36)	06(2.18)	03(1.09)	21(7.64)	15(5.45)	05(1.82)	0	20(7.27)
IAY	30(10.91)	46(16.72)	10(3.64)	86(31.27)	61(22.18)	18(6.55)	01(0.36)	80(29.09)
RWS	28(10.18)	33(12.00)	09(3.27)	70(25.45)	54(19.64)	10(3.64)	0	64(23.27)
NBDP	03(1.09)	01(0.36)	0	04(1.45)	04(1.45)	0	0	04(1.45)
AGVY	12(4.36)	08(2.91)	0	20(7.27)	12(4.36)	07(2.55)	0	19(6.91)

Figures in Parenthesis indicate Percentage

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents According to their First Information Source for Rural Development Programmes.

Information Sources	Rural Development Programmes								Cumulative Scores	Rank
	SGSY	JGSY	SRY	IAY	RWS	NBDP	AGVY			
Friends/Relatives	06(2.18)	08(2.91)	15(5.45)	22(8.00)	0	02(0.73)	0	53(19.27)	V	
Fellow Farmers	08(2.91)	06(2.18)	04(1.45)	13(4.73)	44(16.00)	0	31(11.27)	106(38.55)	II	
Local Leader	0	07(2.55)	04(1.45)	17(6.18)	16(5.82)	0	07(2.55)	51(18.55)	VI	
Extension Personnel	10(3.64)	10(3.64)	04(1.45)	47(17.09)	35(12.73)	01(0.36)	21(7.64)	128(46.55)	I	
Radio	02(0.73)	05(1.82)	19(6.91)	10(3.64)	05(1.82)	0	07(2.55)	45(17.45)	VII	
TV	01(0.36)	01(0.36)	02(0.73)	05(1.82)	02(0.73)	0	0	11(4.00)	VIII	
Newspaper	03(1.09)	10(3.64)	19(6.91)	17(6.18)	15(5.45)	0	31(11.27)	95(34.55)	IV	
Poster	01(0.36)	01(0.36)	01(0.36)	03(1.09)	0	0	0	06(2.18)	X	
Meeting	0	07(2.55)	0	01(0.36)	0	0	0	08(2.91)	IX	
Beneficiaries	37(13.45)	0	15(5.45)	17(6.18)	15(5.45)	17(6.18)	0	101(36.73)	III	
Bank	01(0.36)	0	0	0	0	0	0	01(0.36)	XI	

Figures in Parenthesis indicate Percentage

of IAY and RWS 25.45% each) followed by SGSY (13.82%), JGSY (8.00%), SRY and AGVY (6.18% each) and NBDP (1.09%). However, majority of the respondents were in the category of partially known in case of IAY (17.09%) followed by RWS (16.00%), SGSY (9.82%), JGSY (5.09%), AGVY (4.00%), SRY (3.64%) and NBDP (0.73%). About 9.45 per cent respondents had complete knowledge about benefits of RWS followed by IAY (8.36%) and SGSY (4.00%). In Case of rest other programmes less than three per cent respondents had complete knowledge. Thus, it can be said that majority of respondents had knowledge about RWS and IAY. However, they knew only partially about most programmes, complete knowledge was found in case of RWS by 9.45% respondents.

Acquisition

One of the queries about communication behaviour has been the way rural poor acquires, process and store information. An attempt has been made to analyze and report the acquisition behavior of rural poor in terms of efforts made by respondents,

as well as the information sources used for rural development programmes.

Efforts Made by Respondents

Table 3 revealed that respondents had made contact with Fellow Farmers as well as Extension Personnel for acquisition of information about rural development programmes. Majority of respondents had made contacts with Fellow farmers in case of IAY (31.27%) followed by RWS (25.45%), SGSY (16.73%), JGSY (10.91%), SRY (7.64%), AGVY (7.27%) and NBDP (1.45%). In terms of number of contacts made, majority of respondents made five to ten contacts with Fellow Farmers in case of IAY (16.72%) and RWS (12.00%). For the other rural development programmes viz SGSY, JGSY, SRY, AGVY and NBDP majority of the respondents made less than five contacts with Fellow farmers. Respondents had more than ten contacts with Fellow Farmers in case of IAY (3.64%), RWS (3.27%), SGSY (2.18%), JGSY (1.82%) and SRY (1.09%).

As for as respondents contact with extension personnel for acquisition of information was concerned

Table 5: Utilization of Sources for Detailed Information Regarding Rural Development Programmes

Information Sources	Rural Development Programmes Cumulative							Scores	Rank
	SGSY	JGSY	SRY	IAY	RWS	NBDP	AGVY		
Friends/Relatives	15(5.45)	13(4.73)	04(1.45)	27(9.82)	10(3.64)	0	08(2.91)	77(28.00)	IV
Fellow Farmers	22(8.00)	08(2.91)	06(2.18)	32(11.64)	12(4.36)	03(1.09)	14(5.09)	97(35.27)	III
Shopkeeper	07(2.55)	02(0.73)	0	02(0.73)	0	0	0	11(4.00)	X
Local Leader	18(6.55)	14(5.09)	02(0.73)	33(12.00)	24(8.73)	0	07(2.55)	98(35.64)	II
Extension Personnel	25(9.09)	12(4.36)	14(5.09)	45(16.36)	24(8.73)	07(2.55)	11(4.00)	138(50.18)	1
Radio	15(5.45)	13(4.73)	07(2.55)	09(3.27)	0	04(1.45)	10(3.64)	58(21.09)	VIII
TV	0	03(1.09)	02(0.73)	0	01(0.36)	0	0	06(2.18)	XI
Newspaper	11(4.00)	09(3.27)	12(4.36)	12(4.36)	0	07(2.55)	08(2.91)	59(21.45)	VII
Pamphlet	02(0.73)	01(0.36)	0	0	02(0.73)	0	0	05(1.82)	XII
Poster	0	01(0.36)	0	03(1.09)	0	0	0	04(1.45)	XIII
Meeting	08(2.91)	07(2.55)	0	0	0	0	0	15(5.45)	IX
Beneficiaries	30(10.91)	01(0.36)	08(2.91)	19(6.91)	05(1.82)	0	0	63(22.91)	V
Bank	21(7.64)	03(1.09)	14(5.09)	12(4.36)	10(3.64)	0	0	60(21.82)	VI

Figures in Parenthesis indicate Percentage

Table 6: Respondents Perception of Useful Information Sources for Rural Development Programmes

Information Sources	Rural Development Programmes Cumulative							Scores	Rank
	SGSY	JGSY	SRY	IAY	RWS	NBDP	AGVY		
Friends/Relatives	05(1.82)	0	04(1.45)	16(5.82)	03(1.09)	0	0	28(10.18)	VII
Fellow Farmers	09(3.27)	06(2.18)	04(1.45)	10(3.64)	03(1.09)	01(0.36)	05(1.82)	38(13.82)	III
Shopkeeper	03(1.09)	02(0.73)	02(0.73)	0	0	0	0	07(2.55)	X
Local Leader	0	08(2.91)	02(0.73)	18(6.55)	06(2.18)	0	02(0.73)	36(13.09)	IV
Extension Personnel	18(6.55)	12(4.36)	32(11.6)	47(17.09)	15(5.45)	06(2.18)	05(1.82)	135(49.09)	I
Radio	03(1.09)	03(1.09)	06(2.18)	02(0.73)	01(0.36)	0	0	15(5.45)	IX
TV	0	01(0.36)	01(0.36)	0	0	0	0	02(0.73)	XII
Newspaper	05(1.82)	09(3.27)	13(4.73)	10(3.64)	0	05(1.82)	05(1.82)	47(17.09)	II
Pamphlet	02(0.73)	01(0.36)	0	0	01(0.36)	0	0	04(1.45)	XI
Poster	08(2.91)	07(2.55)	0	01(0.36)	0	0	0	16(5.82)	VIII
Meeting	08(2.91)	0	10(3.64)	13(4.73)	04(1.45)	0	0	35(12.73)	V
Beneficiaries	08(2.91)	02(0.73)	09(3.27)	12(4.36)	0	0	0	31(11.27)	VI

Figures in Parenthesis indicate Percentage

highest frequency was in case of IAY (29.09%) followed by RWS (23.27%), SGSY (13.82%), JGSY (10.18%), SRY (7.27%), AGVY (6.91%) and NBDP (1.45%). Further, majority of the respondents made less than five contacts with Extension personnel in case of IAY (22.18%), followed by RWS (19.64%), SGSY (10.18%), JGSY (6.55%), SRY (5.45%), AGVY (4.36%) and NBDP (1.45%). In the category of five to ten contacts with Extension personnel, highest frequency was in case of IAY only 6.55 per cent followed by RWS and JGSY (3.64% each), SGSY (3.27%), AGVY (2.55%) and SRY (1.82%).

However, only one respondent had made contact with Extension personnel numbering more than ten in the case of SGSY and IAY each and putting blank in

case of the other rural development programmes. Thus, respondents made contacts mostly with Fellow farmers followed by Extension personnel in order to acquire information about rural development programmes. Maximum number of contacts with Fellow farmers made by the majority was five to ten contacts in case of IAY where as less than five contacts was made by majority with Extension personnel.

First Information Sources among Respondents

The table 4 clearly indicated that Extension personnel (46.55%) were at the top in use hierarchy followed by Fellow farmers (38.55%), Beneficiaries (36.73%), Newspaper (34.55%), Friends/Relatives (19.27%), Local Leader (18.55%), TV (4.00%), Meeting (2.91%), Poster (2.18%) and Bank (0.36%). Further, Beneficiary was the first information source for the majority of the respondents in case of SGSY (13.45%) and NBDP (6.18%). Extension personnel

TV (4.00%), Meeting (2.91%), Poster (2.18%) and Bank (0.36%). Further, Beneficiary was the first information source for the majority of the respondents in case of SGSY (13.45%) and NBDP (6.18%). Extension personnel and Newspaper (3.64% each) were the first information source for JGSY. Extension personnel were also mentioned as first source of information by majority of respondents in case of IAY (17.09%). Radio and Newspaper (6.91% each) were the first information source for SRY. Newspaper and Fellow farmers (11.27% each) were the first information sources for AGVY. In case of RWS, Fellow farmers (16.11%) were the first information source for majority of respondents. Thus, Extension personnel, Fellow farmers and Beneficiaries were most sought source of information.

Source used for Detailed Information

Data pertaining to other information sources used by respondents for acquisition of information related to rural development programmes have been presented in Table 5. Table 5, clearly revealed that Extension personnel (50.18%) were the most used source ranked at the top followed by Local leader (35.64%) and Fellow farmers (35.27%) at the second and third ranks, respectively. The other sources were Friend/Relatives (28.00%), Beneficiaries (22.91%), Bank (21.28%), Newspaper (21.45%), Radio (21.09%), Meeting (5.45%) and Shopkeeper (4.00%), respectively. The sources at the bottom three places were TV (2.18%), Pamphlet (1.82%) and Poster (1.45%) with eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth places, respectively.

Table 7: Suggested information Sources for Rural Development Programmes

Information Sources	Rural Development Programmes							Scores	Rank
	SGSY	JGSY	SRY	IAY	RWS	NBDP	AGVY		
Fellow Farmers	05(1.82)	16(5.82)	08(2.91)	13(4.73)	0	02(0.73)	04(1.45)	48(17.45)	VI
Shopkeeper	0	03(1.09)	0	0	02(0.73)	0	0	05(1.82)	XIII
Local Leader	04(1.45)	04(1.45)	10(3.64)	09(3.27)	10(3.64)	02(0.73)	03(1.09)	42(15.27)	VIII
Extension Personnel	04(1.45)	02(0.73)	05(1.82)	21(7.64)	08(2.91)	03(1.09)	04(1.45)	47(17.09)	VII
Radio	09(3.27)	08(2.91)	10(3.64)	55(20.00)	28(10.18)	03(1.09)	07(2.55)	120(43.64)	II
TV	01(0.36)	02(0.73)	01(0.36)	23(8.36)	09(3.27)	01(0.36)	04(1.45)	41(14.91)	IX
Video	0	03(1.09)	0	04(1.45)	0	0	04(1.45)	11(4.00)	XII
Newspaper	03(1.09)	04(1.45)	09(3.27)	05(1.82)	07(2.55)	02(0.73)	0	30(10.91)	X
Pamphlet	01(0.36)	04(1.45)	09(3.27)	27(9.82)	20(7.27)	05(1.82)	07(2.55)	73(26.55)	III
Poster	03(1.09)	04(1.45)	04(1.45)	33(12.00)	18(6.55)	03(1.09)	06(2.18)	71(25.82)	IV
Meeting	02(0.73)	06(2.18)	21(7.64)	44(16.00)	35(12.73)	04(1.45)	08(2.91)	124(45.09)	I
Beneficiaries	04(1.45)	0	02(0.73)	39(14.18)	0	03(1.09)	07(2.55)	55(20.00)	V
Bank	14(5.09)	06(2.18)	0	04(1.45)	0	0	0	24(8.73)	XI

Figures in Parenthesis indicate Percentage

Table 8: Distribution of Respondents According to Procedure used for Processing of Information Related to Rural Development Programmes

Rural Development Programmes	Processing of Information					Others
	Discussed with Friends/Relatives	Discussed with Farmers	Discussed with Beneficiaries	Discussed with Local Leaders	Discussed with Extension Personnel	
SGSY	10(3.64)	26(9.45)	30(10.91)	0	16(5.82)	11(4.00)
JGSY	06(2.18)	08(2.91)	04(1.45)	12(4.36)	10(3.64)	0
SRY	0	06(2.18)	12(4.36)	0	12(4.36)	09(3.27)
IAY	31(11.27)	39(14.18)	30(10.91)	20(7.27)	30(10.91)	16(5.82)
RWS	22(8.00)	13(4.73)	20(7.27)	0	14(5.09)	06(2.18)
NBDP	03(1.09)	03(1.09)	06(2.18)	0	07(2.55)	0
AGVY	02(0.73)	15(5.45)	0	07(2.55)	08(2.91)	02(0.73)
TOTAL	74(26.91)	110(40.00)	102(37.09)	39(14.18)	97(5.27)	44(16.00)

Figures in Parenthesis indicate Percentage

Table 8: Distribution of Respondents According to Procedure used for Processing of Information Related to Rural Development Programmes.

Rural Programmes	Processing of Information					
	Discussed with Friends/Relatives	Discussed with Farmers	Discussed with Beneficiaries	Discussed with Local Leaders	Discussed with Extension Personnel	Others
SGSY	10(3.64)	26(9.45)	30(10.91)	0	16(5.82)	11(4.00)
JGSY	06(2.18)	08(2.91)	04(1.45)	12(4.36)	10(3.64)	0
SRY	0	06(2.18)	12(4.36)	0	12(4.36)	09(3.27)
IAY	31(11.27)	39(14.18)	30(10.91)	20(7.27)	30(10.91)	16(5.82)
RWS	22(8.00)	13(4.73)	20(7.27)	0	14(5.09)	06(2.18)
NBDP	03(1.09)	03(1.09)	06(2.18)	0	07(2.55)	0
AGVY	02(0.73)	15(5.45)	0	07(2.55)	08(2.91)	02(0.73)
TOTAL	74(26.91)	110(40.00)	102(37.09)	39(14.18)	97(5.27)	44(16.00)

Figures in Parenthesis indicate Percentage

Table 9: Distribution of Respondents According to their Participation in Rural Development Programmes

Rural Development Programmes	Duration (years)			Total	Participation Needed
	<5	5-10	>10		
SGSY	14(5.09)	0	0	14(5.09)	50(18.18)
JGSY	0	0	0	0	26(9.45)
SRY	10(3.64)	0	0	10(3.64)	25(9.09)
IAY	38(13.82)	10(3.64)	01(0.36)	49(17.82)	55(20.00)
RWS	18(6.55)	10(3.64)	0	28(10.18)	08(2.91)
NBDP	0	0	0	0	06(2.18)
AGVY	0	0	0	0	48(17.45)

Figures in Parenthesis indicate Percentage

Further, Beneficiaries were the most used source for SGSY (10.19%). Extension personnel were most used source in case of IAY (16.36%). However, Local leader was the most used source for JGSY (5.09%). Banks and Extension personnel (5.09% each) were the most used source for SRY. Local leader and Extension Personnel (8.73% each) were most used source for detailed information in case of RWS. Extension personnel and Newspaper (2.55% each) were the most used source for NBDP. Fellow Farmers were most used source in case of AGVY (5.09%). Thus, Extension personnel were used most for detailed information about rural development programmes followed by Local Leaders.

Useful Information Sources

An attempt was made to gauge rural peoples' perception of useful information sources for rural development programmes, as presented in Table 6. It is clear from the table that Extension personnel (49.09%) were perceived as most useful source followed by Newspaper (17.09%) and Fellow farmers

(13.82%), respectively. Local leader. (13.09%), Beneficiaries (12.73%), Bank (11.27%) and Friends/Relatives (10.18%) were the other sources placed in the descending order of their usefulness. However, sources at bottom five places were Meeting (5.82%), Radio (5.45%), Shopkeeper (2.55%), Pamphlet (1.45%) and TV (0.73%).

Further, it was revealed that Extension personnel were perceived as useful source by majority of respondents for most of the rural development programmes viz. SGSY (6.55%), JGSY (4.36%), SRY (11.6%), IAY (17.09%), RWS (5.45%) AND NBDP (2.18%). However, in case of AGVY-Extension personnel, Newspaper and Fellow farmers (1.82% each) were perceived as useful source by majority of respondents.

Suggested Information Sources

Table 7 revealed that meeting (45.09%) was the source suggested by majority of respondents at the first place followed by Radio (43.64%) and Pamphlet (26.55%). The other suggested sources in the hierarchy

Table 10: Distribution of Respondents According to their Post Programme Contact (Dissemination of Information) Made with Others

Rural Development Programmes	No. of Contacts with Fellow Farmers				No. of Contacts with Extension Personnel			
	<5	5-10	>10	Total	<5	5-10	>10	Total
SGSY	22(8.00)	19(6.91)	06(2.18)	47(17.09)	25(90.9)	11 (4.00)	0	30 (13.09)
JGSY	10(3.64)	11 (4.00)	12(4.36)	33 (12.00)	18 (6.55)	03 (1.09)	01 (0.36)	22 (8.00)
SRY	12(4.36)	10(3.64)	03(1.09)	25 (9.09)	14 (5.09)	09(3.27)	02 (0.73)	25 (9.09)
IAY	33(12.00)	20 (7.28)	17 6.18)	70(25.45)	32 (11.64)	18(6.55)	05 (1.82)	55 (20.00)
RWS	26(9.45)	19(6.91)	16(5.82)	61 (22.18)	25 (9.09)	13 (4.73)	0	38 (13.82)
NBDP	02(0.73)	01 (0.36)	0	03 (1.09)	02 (0.73)	0	0	02 (0.73)
AGVY	09 (3.27)	12(4.36)	03(1.09)	24 (8.73)	10 (3.64)	03 (1.09)	0	13(4.73)
TOTAL	114	92	57	263	126	57	08	191

Figures in Parenthesis indicate Percentage

were Poster (25.82%), Beneficiaries (20.00%), Fellow farmers (17.45%), Extension Personnel (17.09%), Local leader (15.27%), TV (14.91%), Newspaper (10.91%), Bank (8.73%), Video (4.00%) and Shopkeepers (1.82%).

Programme-wise, Bank (5.09%) was suggested as desirable source for SGSY by a large majority. Meeting was the suggested source by majority in case of SGSY (2.18%), JGSY (2.18%), SRY (7.64%), IAY (16.00%), RWS (12.73%), NBDP (1.45%) and AGVY (2.91%) Radio had been suggested as desirable source for SGSY (3.27%), JGSY (2.91%), SRY (3.64%), IAY (20.00%), RWS (10.18%), NBDP (1.09%) and AGVY (2.55%). In case of JGSY, Fellow farmers had been suggested by 5.82 per cent respondents. Beneficiaries were suggested as desirable source for IAY by 14.18 per cent respondents.

Processing

After acquisition of information about rural development programmes poor peoples do process information and store for future use. Table 8 revealed that for the processing of rural development information, discussion with Fellow farmers (40.00%) was the most used method among respondents followed by discussion with Beneficiaries (37.09%). However, about 35.27 per cent respondents had discussion with Extension personnel. The other used methods for processing of information were discussion with Friends / Relatives (26.91%), discussion with Local leader (14.18%) and others (16.00%) like bank, visit at sites, reference materials etc.

Further, it is also clear that methods of processing do differ for various rural development programmes. Programme-wise, discussion with Beneficiaries was the most used source for SGSY (10.91%) and SRY

(4.36%). Discussion with Local Leader used most in case of JGSY (4.36%). Discussion with Fellow farmers used most in case of IAY (14.18%) and AGVY (5.45%). Discussion with Friend/Relatives in case of IAY (11.27%) and RWS (8.00%) followed by discussion with Extension personnel for SRY (4.36%) and NBDP (2.55%).

Participation

Table 9 containing data regarding participation of poor peoples in rural development programmes indicated that respondents had participated in only four major rural development programmes. However, the frequency of participation was higher in IAY (17.82%) followed by RWS (10.18%) and SGSY (5.09%). Only 3.64 per cent respondents had indicated their participation in SRY. In rest of the rural development programmes viz JGSY, NBDP and AGVY, there was no participation at all.

Further, data regarding duration-wise participation indicated that majority of the respondents had participated during last five years in case of IAY (13.82%) followed by RWS (6.55%), SGSY (5.09%) and SRY (3.64%). In IAY and RWS both 3.64 per cent respondents were participated for 5-10 years duration. In case of IAY, 0.36 per cent respondents had participated for more than ten years duration.

When respondents were asked for their willingness to participate in the various rural development programmes highest frequency of respondents indicated preference for IAY (20.00%) followed by SGSY (18.18%), AGVY (17.45%), JGSY (9.45%), SRY (9.09%), RWS (2.91%) and NBDP (2.18%).

Dissemination

Rural poors do contact Fellow Farmers and

Extension Personnel in order to get clear about the programmes and remove contradiction.

With Farmers

Table 10 revealed that highest frequency of respondents i.e. about 25.45 per cent had their post programme contact with other farmers in case of IAY followed by RWS (22.18%), SGSY (17.09%), JGSY (12.00%), SRY (9.09%), AGVY (8.73%) and NBDP (1.09%). Further, according to the number of contracts, majority of the respondents were in the category of less than five contacts followed by contacts ranging between five to ten. In comparison to other rural development programmes, IAY had highest frequency in all the categories viz. less than five and between five to ten and above ten contacts.

With Extension Personnel

Table 10 revealed that 20.00 per cent respondents had made contact with Extension personnel in case of IAY followed by RWS (13.82%), SGSY (13.09%), SRY (9.09%), JGSY (8.00%), AGVY (4.73%) and NBDP (0.73%). Further, in the category of less than 5 contacts, the highest frequency was in case of IAY (11.64%) followed by RWS and SGSY (9.09% each), JGSY (6.55%), SRY (5.09%), AGVY (3.64%) and NBDP (0.73%). In case of 5 to 10 contacts with Extension personnel, IAY (11.64%) was again at top. However, only less than 2 per cent respondents were in the category of more than 10 contacts for IAY, SRY and JGSY.

Rural poors in general had awareness about Indira Awas Yojana and Rural Water Schemes. However, they did not have complete information. This fact has earlier been reported (Narayan, 1991). Thus, rural development programmes require sustained efforts to create awareness among rural poors at large.

Majority of rural poors had contacted Fellow farmers followed by Extension personnel in order to know about the programmes. Extension personnel were also the first source as well as source for detailed information for most rural poors. Besides, Extension personnel were also perceived as useful source for knowing about rural development programmes. This fact has earlier been reported (Pandey, 1997). Now that Indira Awas yojana has been around for more than one and half decades people have seen the

benefits in the community. Thus, they seek Extension personnel who visit or are available at Village Panchayat or Block head quarters for getting detailed information.

Meetings in the villages and Radio were suggested as effective source for knowing about rural development programmes. This fact has earlier been reported (Rangacharyaula, 1984). However, rural poors tried to know more and clarify doubts by discussion with Fellow Farmers and Beneficiaries of rural development programmes. Rural poors evaluate pros and cons of information through discussion with Fellow Farmers and Beneficiaries of rural development programmes to decide on further action. They have trust in the fellow beings and experiences of Beneficiaries are valued. This reflects the pattern of communication of the rural poor which follow a horizontal route due to cultural similarity. Majority had just known about the programmes and not done anything to store information. Only about less than one third of respondents had memorized information. This indicates that reason why precious details regarding programmes are not known to the rural poors when needed. Any attempt to help in effective use of development messages, must include ways and means of preserving useful details in some permanent form.

References

- Nayan, S. (1991). Impact of IRDP on Socio - economic status of the beneficiaries -with special reference to Rudrapur block in Nainital district. Unpublished M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Department of Agril. Communication, G.B. Pant Univ. of Agri. and Tech., Pantnagar. Flow of credit and subsidy under IRDP-A Study in Bihar. *Journal of Rural Development*, 3 (5): 388.
- Pandey, R.K. (1997). Information sources and communication pattern of farmers for rural development programmes: A Study in U.P. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Agril. Communication, G.B. Pant Univ. of Agri. Tech., Pantnagar.
- Rangacharyaula, S.V. (1984). Beneficiaries Meeting-A monitoring mechanism for IRDP. *Journal of Rural Development*. 3 (6) : 632.