CHAPTER II
An essential part of any investigation is a thorough review of literature. A number of studies have been made by different institutions and universities in India and overseas. These varied in dimensions and examined various aspects of communication in great detail. These studies have revealed the extent of success and failure. Apart from determining the previous researches made the other functions of citing literature are to provide, a basis for interpretation of the findings, an insight into the methods and procedures, and finally, a base for developing a theoretical framework. To perform these functions as best as possible, the available literature has been integrated into the relevant parts of this study. A reckoning of cardinal points of the study becomes important because it has a bearing with the future hope from it. A brief but pertinent review of previous researches is made here as under:

Leavitt (1951) revealed that in parent organization network of communication may differ along a variety of dimensions such as number of connections, symmetry of the pattern of connection, "channel capacity" (how much and what kind of information), and in many other ways. One way in which communication pattern vary, according to him, can be
described by the sum of the neighbours that each individual member has, neighbours being defined as individuals to whom a member has communicative access.

Sharma (1960) identified ten important components of the working environment and ranked them in the order of their importance as per the responses of the judges. The components of the working environment in order of their relative importance were: communication, decision making, local leadership, interpersonal relations, team-work, people's participation, family adjustment, supply and service, guidance and supervision and job-satisfaction.

The finding showed that VLWs and AHEOs were only somewhat satisfied about the most important component of the working environment—the communication. The VLWs were not well informed about the extension programmes and they got limited satisfaction from the freedom to exchange their ideas in the organisation, the instruction given to them, the feedback process and use of communication channels.

Rao, C.S.S. (1965) found out the extent of the usage of various audio visual aids and their comparative effectiveness in popularising the improved practices. Most of the extension personnel reported the availability of audio-visuals but only demonstration by Agriculture Extension officers and charts, graphs and literature by the social
education organiser were used most frequently. To popularize most of the improved agricultural practice, the combination of field trip and result demonstration was the best. There, out of every four extension personnel wanted training in use of audio-visuals.

Pelz (1966), effective communication has been recognised as an important means for meaningful coordination, however, found out in his study that when district official were communicating among themselves, they used writing nearly half the times and personal contacts only one-fifth of the time. They, however, used writing and formal meeting twice as often as they thought desirable for communication with each other and they used to formal meeting and personal talks only half as much as they preferred to. Not surprisingly, therefore, often a lot of time is wasted in the name of coordination with out bringing effective results towards that end.

Indian Institution of Mass communication (1968) in a study rank VLW as first, demonstration as second and other formal personal source was placed on third rank. The source credibility for radio, neighbours, bulletins and leaflets, posters, newspaper, film and relatives were ranked in descending order from 4 m to 10 m credibility ranks.

Reddy (1968) reported that, institute scientist in progressive village and sociometric stars in non-progressive
village had the highest credibility of information sources.

Yadav, J.P. (1971) studied communication patterns and upward communication in C.D. Block Administration. Some of the salient findings are reported here.

The work related to communication among Block Officials of IADP, IAAP and the normal community development were more often vertical than horizontal. The upward communication of VLWs with respect to information, instruction and persuasion was relatively fair, but in the case of evaluation the result was extremely poor. Regarding horizontal communication of VLWs the results was poor in all the three type of communication (up, down and across) of the ADO (Ag) varied from good to poor; and of the BDO both upward and downward were extremely from poor to zero. The examination of the extent of the formality of communication between VLW to ADO (Ag), ADO (Ag) to BDO and BDO to his superiors with respect to upward communication was in the ratio of 40 to 60. A similar result was recorded with reference to downward communication from BDO to ADO (Ag)/ VLW and ADO (Ag) to VLW.

An analysis of the accuracy of upward communication revealed that communication in the normal C.D. Blocks between VLW-ADO (Ag), VLW-BDO and ADO (Ag)-BDO was relatively better than IAAP and IADP block officials. In other words, the accuracy of upward communication was in this order; first
normal C.D. Block officials, second IAAP block officials and third IADP officials.

Singh, I.B. and Sahay, B.N. (1971) reported in their study "communication behaviour of Kosi farmers in relation to high yielding varieties programme" that in progressive village personal cosmopolite (VLW, ADO and BDO) and mass media have been utilized more frequently by the majority of farmers, whereas in the non-progressive village more personal localite and some of the cosmopolite have been utilized most frequently. However the frequency of utilization of media is fairly much higher in case of progressive village as compared to the non-progressive village.

Mathur, P.N. (1972) reported in his study in Delhi territory that the official pattern of downward flow of instruction had not been clearly defined in any of the five blocks of Delhi territory.

Singh (1972) concluded that, the progressive and non-progressive villages differ in use and credibility of different sources of farm information. He further revealed that, formal sources like scientist, radio, progressive farmers were accorded higher credibility in progressive village, but in non-progressive villages demonstration, village level worker were most credible while bulletins, newspapers were least credible sources.
Singh and Prasad (1974) found that, there are different sources which had significant difference in respect of their credibility as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Progressive Villages Source</th>
<th>Total rank score</th>
<th>Non-progressive Villages Source</th>
<th>Total rank score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>VLW</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Friends and neighbours</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>VLW</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>Friends and neighbours</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Leaflets and poster</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>AEO</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>Krishi Gosti</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>AEO</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Magazines and newspapers</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Leaflets and poster</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Krishi Gosti</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Self experience</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Self experience</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Magazines and newspaper</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Singh and Ambastha (1975) pointed out that radio emerged as the most useful channel of information, followed closely by progressive farmers, village level worker and block level officials in the client system. It is, therefore, desirable that the farm radio programme must be preferred in close
collaboration with extension personnel and farm scientist in a simple language to fit in the regional socio-psychological and day to day requirements of the farmers simultaneously the progressive farmers, VLWs and Block level extension personnel should be fed with the latest agricultural innovation for its quick effective dissemination among the farmers. Similarly kharif and Rabi meetings, field days, lecture and farmers exposure to scientists should be made regular feature rather than rare events.

Sanoria, Y.C. and Singh, K.N. (1976) inferred that extension publications emerged as the most used source of information input followed by superiors, officers, meetings, seminar, agriculture University scientist by all the subsystem extension personnel.

Sandhu, A.S. and Lal D., Kalamegam, E.V. and Somasundaran, D. (1976). They grouped the sources of information as personal cosmopolite source, personal localite source and mass media. Personal cosmopolite sources included the VLWs, AEOs and scientists. Personal localite sources included the family members including relatives, friends, neighbours, fellow workers and rural leaders and mass media included farm publication, radio and newspapers.

Choole, R.R. and Rahutkar, W.B. (1978) revealed that mass media like agricultural publication and radio were
perceived to be the less credible by small and big farmers. Whereas, demonstration was given more credibility by both the categories of farmers.

Bhatnagar, C.S. (1978) concluded in a study of evaluation of communication in rural U.P. that mass media had negligible role in disseminating information to the cultivators in both progressive as well as non-progressive districts. Further, he revealed that the printed channels of the communication like-newspapers, magazines, leaflets, and posters were not effective in the rural community in U.P. because of low literacy.

Vijayaraghavan, K. and Subramanayam, V.S. (1980) inferred in their study "communication behaviour of garden land and dry land farmers" that farmers of dry land area got the information mostly through the neighbours and friends, VLWs, other block officials and radio. Whereas, the farmers of irrigated land area were got the information through the radio followed by block officials, VLWs, neighbours and friends.

Sanoria, Y.C. and Singh, K.N. (1981) concluded that in the agricultural extension system, intra-system of communication patterns like communication, opinion leadership and communication network centrally operate to a considerable degree among extension personnel representing
various sub-system.

Singh, H. (1982) found out in his study "An analysis of communication patterns among information generating, information disseminating and information utilizing system of dairy farming in ICDS project" that extension workers mostly used the method 'farm and home visit' system of communication for disseminating the information.

Jamal, S. (1984) reported that university extension personal were considered as most credible source of information.

Mazumdar, A.K. and Pathak, S. (1985) reported that the understandability, accuracy, suitability and receivability were found to be significantly contributed to the prediction of communication fidelity of the respondents.

Reddy, H.N.B. and Nagaraja, N. (1985) concluded in their study relative effectiveness of lecture, tape-recorded lecture and then combinations with selected visuals" that lecture in combination with slide show was found superior to lecture with flannel graph and taped lecture with slide show.

Babu, Ramesh and Sinha, B.P. (1985) reported in their study "communication behaviour of extension personnel with regard to Modern Rice Technology that extension personnel mostly obtained the information through extension
publications, superior officers, meeting - seminars, agricultural Universities scientists and research station in that order. The news-papers, kisan mela and research journals served as the least used source. The information output pattern of extension personnel was found mostly through the farm and home visits, leaflets and folders, office calls, meetings, radio broadcast and demonstration in their order. The circular letter, farmers training and telephone calls as the least used methods.

Singh, N. (1986) reported in his study "content analysis of agricultural programmes broadcast by all India Radio, Rampur, that Pantnagar scientists were considered most reliable source (66%) followed by block officers (22%) state scientists (13%) and farmer's friends (12%).

Prasad, C. and Chaudhary, B.N. (1986) found out in a comprehensive study "Predictive values of the selected factors in contributing towards the variation in the effectiveness of communication that almost 91 percent of the variation in the effectiveness of the communication in fertilizer promotion was explained by 15 independent variables studied in the investigation. And out of these fifteen factors, only seven independent variables namely - trustworthyness of communicator, extent of use of channels, achievement motivation of receiver, communication skill of
communicator, change-proneness of receiver, extent of feedback and frequency of contact of communicator in order of their importance, explained 90 percent of the variation in effectiveness of communication in fertilizer promotion.

Singh, Y.P. and Laharia, S.N. (1986) found out through the study "Interpersonal communication scientific productivity" that interpersonal communication have highest positive correlation with all the indicators of the productivity of the scientists.