**CONSTRAINTS FACED BY PADDY GROWERS IN USING INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES**

**ABSTRACT**

**Aims:** A study on “Constraints faced by Kaithal and Fatehabad paddy growers in using Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs)” was conducted in Kaithal and Fatehabad district of Haryana. The objectives of the present study were to identify the constraints faced by Kaithal and Fatehabad paddy growers in using ICTs.

**Study Design:** Exploratory research design of the study.

**Place and Duration of Study:** Department of Extension Education and Communication Management, I.C. College of Community Science, Choudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, between October 2020 to December 2024.

**Methodology:** This study was conducted in the Kaithal and Fatehabad districts of Haryana with a sample size of 240 paddy growers from six villages (40 from each village), Kalayat block from Kaithal district and Tohana block from Fatehabad district was selected randomly for the present study. Three villages from the Kalayat block and three villages from the Tohana block were selected randomly. The data was collected regarding dependent and independent variables with the help of a developed interview schedule. To identify the constraints faced by the paddy growers were studied in four categories i.e. technical, financial, personal and social constraints. To study the constraints perceived by the paddy growers from each category, the Henry Garret Ranking Technique was adopted, as the preference of particular constraints of each category was different from respondent to respondent.

**Results:** The result showed that in technical constraints rank 1st was given to ‘clarification of the message is difficult, if any doubt arises’ with (Garrett score- 8782) by the Kaithal paddy growers and ‘reliability of the content cannot be understood’ rank 1st was given by the Fatehabad paddy growers with (Garrett score- 9207). In terms of financial constraints rank 1st was given to ‘high cost of ICT gadgets like smartphones, computers *etc*.’ with (Garrett scores- 9080 and 9155) by both Kaithal and Fatehabad paddy growers. In terms of personal constraints rank 1st was given to ‘insufficient training and practical exposure towards ICTs’ with (Garrett score- 9251 and 9124) by both Kaithal and Fatehabad paddy growers. In terms of social constraints rank 1st was given to ‘farmers get confused with a lot of information obtained from the ICT’ with (Garrett score-8922 and 9286) by both Kaithal and Fatehabad paddy growers, respectively.

**Conclusion:** Perceived constraints faced by the paddy growers in the study area were clarification of the message is difficult if any doubt arises, the reliability of the content cannot be understood, high cost of ICT gadgets like smartphones, computers *etc,* insufficient training and practical exposure towards ICTs.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

Nearly half of India's national GDP comes from agriculture, which dominates the country's economy. The growth of India's agricultural and related industries is essential to its success (Kumar and Vijayakuma, 2015). In the majority of less developed nations, agricultural growth is crucial for both feeding expanding people and promoting economic development (Adegbidi *et al.*, 2012). ICT enhances market activity, facilitates the exchange of pertinent information and increases profitability (Lokeswari, 2016). Approximately 70% of people in Haryana work in agriculture. Wheat and rice are the principal crops (Kumar, 2023). The person in the center of agricultural output, which is the primary occupation in rural areas is typically referred to as a "farmer" (Ajayi *et al.,* 2018).

 Information is essential for enabling these farmers to raise their standard of living. Crucial knowledge about planting, enhancing soils, negotiating the greatest price for their produce and preventing pests and illnesses all help farmers make better decisions (Armstrong and Gandhi, 2012). ICT use in agriculture is therefore becoming increasingly significant and pervasive in the modern era (Anand *et al.,* 2020). These circumstances include "high rates of illiteracy, inadequate technology infrastructure and a need for smartphone-based technology that very few smallholder farmers in the developing world can take advantage (Alant and Bakare, 2021). ICT tools are essential for filling up knowledge gaps in agriculture. These tools include social media, internet-based platforms, mobile phones, and agricultural apps (Aker, 2011). Several ICT projects have been introduced in India to improve the distribution of information to farmers, including e-Choupal, Kisan Call Centers and mobile apps like Kisan Suvidha and IFFCO Kisan (Chandra *et al.,* 2019). Paddy cultivation is a labor-intensive crop that requires prompt and accurate interventions, and the districts of Kaithal and Fatehabad in Haryana are well-known for their significant involvement in this practice (Kumar *et al.*, 2020). ICTs can help paddy farmers deal with issues including pest infestations, water management, and volatile market pricing but their uptake in rural regions is still quite low (Meera *et al.,* 2019).

 Paddy farmers in Kaithal and Fatehabad face several obstacles to the successful adoption and application of ICTs. Access to technology is hampered by socioeconomic factors such as poor literacy rates, a lack of digital literacy and financial difficulties (Singh *et al.,* 2020). The problem is made worse by infrastructure issues like poor internet connectivity, spotty cell network coverage, and restricted access to electricity (Dasgupta *et al.,* 2011). However, creating focused solutions requires an awareness of the particular difficulties experienced by paddy farmers in particular situations (Hazarika and Subramanian, 2020).

1. **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

The study was conducted in the Kaithal and Fatehabad districts of Haryana, India under the Department of Extension Education and Communication Management, I.C. College of Community Science, CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, Haryana, India. As per the research problem, rice is grown in 18 districts of Haryana state. Out of eighteen districts under rice productivity, the Kaithal and Fatehabad districts were selected randomly because it has a high area under rice crops. Kaithal district is also divided into seven community blocks. Out of them Kalayat block was selected randomly for the present study. Fatehabad district is administratively divided into seven community blocks. Out of them Tohana block was selected randomly. A list of all villages in the selected block *i.e.,* Tohana and Kalayat, was procured from the block headquarters. From each of the selected blocks, three sample villages were selected with a random sampling technique. Akanwali, Kullan and Bosti villages were randomly selected from the Tohana block and Kailram, Chausala and Balu villages were randomly selected from the Kalayat block. For the present study, a total sample of 240 paddy growers was taken by random sampling method (40 paddy growers from each village) for the final data collection and implementation of the objectives of the present study. The interview schedule was used to collect the required information from the respondents. After collecting the data from 240 respondents, they were transferred to the work table and tally sheet then processed, analyzed and subjected to randomly selected. The data were interpreted in the light of the objectives of the study. Hennery Garrett's rank was used to explore the paddy growers' constraints.

**Henry Garret Ranking Technique**

 Henry Garret Ranking Technique was used to prioritize the constraints faced by the paddy growers in using ICTs. As per this method, the paddy growers had been asked to assign the rank for all constraints and the outcomes of such ranking have been converted into score value with the help of the following formula:

$$Percent position=\frac{100(R\_{ij}-0.5)}{N\_{j}}$$

Where,

$R\_{ij}$= Rank given for the ith constraint by jth paddy growers

$N\_{j}$= Number of constraints ranked by the jth paddy growers

 The percent position was then transformed into Garret score values using the Garret Ranking Conversion Table, as indicated in the Garret Ranking Table. To get the Garret mean score for each constraint, the Garret scores from the total number of respondents for that specific constraint were then added up and divided by the number of respondents. Similarly, the Garret mean scores for all the constraints were determined. Each limitation was assigned a final rank based on the Garret mean score derived from all respondents. The limitations that are deemed most significant are those with the greatest mean Garret ratings. Thus, the rank highlighted the constraints faced by the paddy growers in using ICTs *i.e.,* technical, financial, personal and social constraints.

**Calculating Garrett Ranking**

**List 1- Percent position value and Garret score value of financial constraints**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **100 (Rij- 0.5)/ Nj** | **Calculated percent value** | **Percent position value** | **Garret score value** |
| 100 (1-0.5)/3 | 16.67 | 16.69 | 69 |
| 100 (2-0.5)/3 | 50 | 50.00 | 50 |
| 100 (3-0.5)/3 | 83.33 | 83.31 | 31 |

**List 2- Percent position value and Garret score value of technical constraints**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **100 (Rij- 0.5)/ Nj** | **Calculated percent value** | **Percent position value** | **Garret score value** |
| 100 (1-0.5)/10 | 5 | 5.51 | 81 |
| 100 (2-0.5)/10 | 15 | 15.44 | 70 |
| 100 (3-0.5)/10 | 25 | 25.48 | 63 |
| 100 (4-0.5)/10 | 35 | 34.25 | 58 |
| 100 (5-0.5)/10 | 45 | 45.97 | 52 |
| 100 (6-0.5)/10 | 55 | 54.03 | 48 |
| 100 (7-0.5)/10 | 65 | 65.75 | 42 |
| 100 (8-0.5)/10 | 75 | 74.52 | 37 |
| 100 (9-0.5)/10 | 85 | 85.75 | 29 |
| 100 (10-0.5)/10 | 95 | 95.08 | 18 |

**List 3- Percent position value and Garret score value of financial constraints**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **100 (Rij- 0.5)/ Nj** | **Calculated percent value** | **Percent position value** | **Garret score value** |
| 100 (1-0.5)/3 | 16.67 | 16.69 | 69 |
| 100 (2-0.5)/3 | 50 | 50.00 | 50 |
| 100 (3-0.5)/3 | 83.33 | 83.31 | 31 |

**List 4- Percent position value and Garret score value of personal constraints**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **100 (Rij- 0.5)/ Nj** | **Calculated percent value** | **Percent position value** | **Garret score value** |
| 100(1- 0.5)/9 | 5.56 | 5.55 | 81 |
| 100(2- 0.5)/9 | 16.67 | 16.66 | 69 |
| 100(3- 0.5)/9 | 27.78 | 27.15 | 62 |
| 100(4- 0.5)/9 | 38.89 | 38.06 | 56 |
| 100(5- 0.5)/9 | 50 | 50.00 | 50 |
| 100(6- 0.5)/9 | 61.11 | 61.94 | 44 |
| 100(7- 0.5)/9 | 72.22 | 72.85 | 38 |
| 100(8- 0.5)/9 | 83.33 | 83.31 | 31 |
| 100(9- 0.5)/9 | 94.44 | 94.49 | 19 |

**List 5-Percent position value and Garret score value of Social Constraints**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **100 (Rij- 0.5)/ Nj** | **Calculated percent value** | **Percent position value** | **Garret score value** |
| 100 (1-0.5)/5 | 10 | 10.06 | 75 |
| 100 (2-0.5)/5 | 30 | 30.61 | 60 |
| 100 (3-0.5)/5 | 50 | 50.00 | 50 |
| 100 (4-0.5)/5 | 70 | 69.39 | 40 |
| 100 (5-0.5)/5 | 90 | 90.83 | 24 |



**Fig 1- Garrett ranking conversion table**

1. **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**
	1. ***Technical constraints faced by paddy growers in using ICT tools***

 The result from Table 1 showed that in technical constraints rank 1st was given to ‘clarification of the message is difficult, if any doubt arises’ with (Garrett score- 8782) by the Kaithal paddy growers followed by ‘reliability of the content cannot be understood’ with (Garrett score-8758) rank 2nd, ‘lack of feedback’ with (Garrett score- 7210) rank 3rd, ‘quick response for the queries is difficult’ with (Garrett score- 6377) rank 4th, ‘poor & inadequate network connectivity’ with (Garrett score- 6249) rank 5th, ‘no relevant information is received’ with (Garrett score- 5814) rank 6th, ‘difficult to find the origin of the information generated’ with (Garrett score- 4760) rank 7th, ‘frequency of broadcasting and time of broadcasting is not convenient’ with (Garrett score- 4362) rank 8th, ‘high threats of the virus’ with (Garrett score- 3909) rank 9th and ‘difficult to follow the hyperlinks’ with (Garrett score- 3305) rank 10th, respectively.

 Rank 1st was given to ‘reliability of the content cannot be understood’ with (Garrett score- 9207) by the Fatehabad paddy growers followed by ‘clarification of the message is difficult, if any doubt arises’ with (Garrett score-8336) rank 2nd, ‘lack of feedback’ with (Garrett score- 6953) rank 3rd, ‘quick response for the queries is difficult’ with (Garrett score- 6883) rank 4th, ‘poor & inadequate network connectivity’ with (Garrett score- 6466) rank 5th, ‘no relevant information is received’ with (Garrett score- 5740) rank 6th, ‘difficult to find the origin of the information generated’ with (Garrett score- 5208) rank 7th, ‘high threats of virus’ with (Garrett score- 4162) rank 8th, ‘frequency of broadcasting and time of broadcasting is not convenient’ with (Garrett score- 4033) rank 9th and ‘difficult to follow the hyperlinks’ with (Garrett score- 2652) rank 10th, respectively.

**Table 1: Technical constraints faced by paddy growers in using ICT tools**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SN** | **Constraints** | **Kaithal (n1=120)** | **Fatehabad (n2=120)** |
| **Total Garrett Score** | **Garrett MS** | **Rank** | **Total Garrett Score** | **Garrett MS** | **Rank** |
|  | Poor and inadequate network connectivity | 6249 | 52.08 | V | 6466 | 53.88 | V |
|  | Clarification of the message is difficult, if any doubt arises | 8782 | 73.18 | I | 8336 | 69.47 | II |
|  | No relevant information is received | 5814 | 48.45 | VI | 5740 | 47.83 | VI |
|  | High threats of virus | 3909 | 32.58 | IX | 4162 | 34.68 | VIII |
|  | Reliability of the content cannot be understood | 8758 | 72.98 | II | 9207 | 76.73 | I |
|  | Quick response for the queries is difficult | 6377 | 53.14 | IV | 6883 | 57.36 | IV |
|  | Difficult to find the origin of the information generated | 4760 | 39.67 | VII | 5208 | 43.40 | VII |
|  | Lack of feedback | 7210 | 61.03 | III | 6953 | 57.94 | III |
|  | Frequency of broadcasting and time of broadcasting is not convenient | 4362 | 36.35 | VIII | 4033 | 33.61 | IX |
|  | Difficult to follow the hyperlinks | 3305 | 27.54 | X | 2652 | 22.10 | X |

* 1. ***Financial constraints faced by paddy growers in using ICT tools***

An overview of Table 2 indicated that in financial constraints rank 1st was given to ‘high cost of ICT gadgets like smart phones, computers *etc*.’ with (Garrett score- 9080 and 9155) by both Kaithal and Fatehabad paddy growers followed by ‘no subsidies available to buy ICT tools’ with (Garrett score-6079 and 8266) rank 2nd and ‘inadequate infrastructure facilities for maintenance of ICT tools’ with (Garrett score- 3363 and 6079) rank 3rd, respectively.

**Table 2: Financial constraints faced by paddy growers in using ICT tools**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SN** | **Constraints** | **Kaithal (n1=120)** | **Fatehabad (n2=120)** |
| **Total Garrett Score** | **Garrett MS** | **Rank** | **Total Garrett Score** | **Garrett MS** | **Rank** |
|  | High cost of ICT gadgets like smart phones, computers *etc*. | 9080 | 75.67 | I | 9155 | 76.29 | I |
|  | Inadequate infrastructure facilities for maintenance of ICT tools | 3363 | 28.03 | III | 6079 | 50.66 | III |
|  | No subsidies available to buy ICT tools | 6079 | 50.66 | II | 8266 | 68.88 | II |

* 1. ***Personal constraints faced by paddy growers in using ICT tools***

 Results portrayed in Table 3 indicated that in personal constraints rank 1st was given to ‘insufficient training and practical exposure towards ICTs’ with (Garrett score- 9251 and 9124) by both Kaithal and Fatehabad paddy growers followed by rank 2nd was given to ‘lack of skills in operating ICT tools’ with (Garrett score-8431 and 8364), rank 3rd given to ‘difficult to operate the ICT tools’ with (Garrett score-7699 and 7457), rank 4th given to ‘no user friendly softwares & programs’ with (Garrett score-7079 and 6739), rank 5th given to ‘lack of time to spend on ICT’ with (Garrett score-6220 and 6612), rank 6th given to ‘difficult to read the content’ with (Garrett score-5340 and 5335), rank 7th given to ‘lack of awareness about ICTs’ with (Garrett score-5050 and 5015), rank 8th given to ‘difficulties in understanding standard language’ with (Garrett score-4054 and 4967), rank 9th given to ‘low educational level’ with (Garrett score-4476 and 4507), respectively.

**Table 3: Personal constraints faced by paddy growers in using ICT tools**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SN** | **Constraints** | **Kaithal (n1=120)** | **Fatehabad (n2=120)** |
| **Total Garrett Score** | **Garrett MS** | **Rank** | **Total Garrett Score** | **Garrett MS** | **Rank** |
|  | Difficult to operate the ICT tools | 7699 | 64.16 | III | 7457 | 62.14 | III |
|  | Insufficient training and practical exposure towards ICTs | 9251 | 77.09 | I | 9124 | 76.03 | I |
|  | Lack of awareness about ICTs | 5050 | 42.08 | VII | 5015 | 41.79 | VII |
|  | Lack of skills in operating ICT tools | 8431 | 70.26 | II | 8364 | 69.70 | II |
|  | Low educational level | 4476 | 37.30 | IX | 4507 | 37.56 | IX |
|  | No user friendly softwares & Programs  | 7079 | 58.99 | IV | 6739 | 56.16 | IV |
|  | Lack of time to spend on ICT | 6220 | 51.83 | V | 6612 | 55.10 | V |
|  | Difficult to read the content | 5340 | 44.50 | VI | 5335 | 44.46 | VI |
|  | Difficulties in understanding standard language | 4054 | 33.78 | VIII | 4967 | 41.39 | VIII |

* 1. ***Social constraints faced by paddy growers in using ICT tools***

 It is evident from Table 4 that in social constraints rank 1st was given to ‘farmers get confused with a lot of information obtained from the ICT’ with (Garrett score-8922 and 9286) by both Kaithal and Fatehabad paddy growers followed by rank 2nd given to ‘insufficient servicing centers of ICTs in villages’ with (Garrett score-8325 and 8570), rank 3rd given to ‘lack of location-specific information’ with (Garrett score-7689 and 7759), rank 4th given to ‘no special policies and schemes for ICT’ with (Garrett score-7229 and 6833), rank 5th given to ‘different cultural background’ with (Garrett score-6715 and 6432), respectively.

**Table 4: Social constraints faced by paddy growers in using ICT tools**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SN** | **Constraints** | **Kaithal (n1=120)** | **Fatehabad (n2=120)** |
| **Total Garrett Score** | **Garrett MS** | **Rank** | **Total Garrett Score** | **Garrett MS** | **Rank** |
|  | Insufficient servicing centers of ICTs in villages | 8325 | 69.38 | II | 8570 | 71.42 | II |
|  | No special policies and schemes for ICT | 7229 | 60.24 | IV | 6833 | 56.94 | IV |
|  | Farmers get confused with a lot of information obtained from the ICT | 8922 | 74.35 | I | 9286 | 77.38 | I |
|  | Different cultural background | 6715 | 55.96 | V | 6432 | 53.60 | V |
|  | Lack of location specific information | 7689 | 64.08 | III | 7759 | 64.66 | III |

**Conclusion:**

 The study revealed that perceived constraints faced by the paddy growers were assessed by discussing with farmers in the farming system. The result showed that in technical constraints rank 1st was given to ‘clarification of the message is difficult, if any doubt arises’ with (Garrett score- 8782) by the Kaithal paddy growers and ‘reliability of the content cannot be understood’ rank 1st was given by the Fatehabad paddy growers with (Garrett score- 9207). In terms of financial constraints rank 1st was given to ‘high cost of ICT gadgets like smartphones, computers *etc*.’ with (Garrett scores- 9080 and 9155) by both Kaithal and Fatehabad paddy growers. Regarding personal constraints rank 1st was given to ‘insufficient training and practical exposure towards ICTs’ with (Garrett score- 9251 and 9124) by both Kaithal and Fatehabad paddy growers. In terms of social constraints rank 1st was given to ‘farmers get confused with a lot of information obtained from the ICT’ with (Garrett score-8922 and 9286) by both Kaithal and Fatehabad paddy growers, respectively.
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