Evaluation of Procedural Efficiency of Farm Literature Producing Organization

Manjit Singh Nain[1] and R N Trikha[2]

1. Introduction

India's spectacular achievements in the field of newspaper publication have made it a second largest publisher of daily newspapers in world. But it is not similar in case of rural newspapers. A handfull of farm journalists coupled with relatively lesser number of farm publications with a very low circulation are being providing so far only lip-service to mammoth number of farmers. Audience with high cognitive or effective need orientation, value their exposure and involve themselves in the communication process through paying greater attention to the messages. The greater the possibility that the individual derives satisfaction, more fruitful be his post exposure (Levy and Windhai, 1984). The timeliness of the farm message is highly significant which has to be modulated to coincide with the cultural operations in the field. The completeness of the message is also another requirement (Duffy and Kabance, 1982). The effectiveness also lies at production and organizational level. The procedural efficiency refers to the production of satisfactory results without wastage of time in the process. The more efficient the production process, more effective will be the farm literature. The researches related to source of farm literature, processing, gate keeping, feedback functions and the constraints in their operation are lacking. Thus, a study focussing on evaluating the procedural efficiency of farm literature producing organizations and identifying the constraints thereof has been undertaken.

2. Methodology

In order to evaluate the procedural efficiency the production procedure, in all, was divided into nine steps viz. collection of information, selection of information, editing, layout art and photography, proof reading, printing, distribution, storage and feedback as suggested by Mathiazhagan and Mathur (1990). For each step few questions concerning to a particular step, in addition to problems, constraints and suggestion to improve the efficiency were designed. The efficiency of a particular step was measured with the help of three point scale i.e. most efficient, efficient and least efficient and the scores were assigned as 2,1 and 0 respectively. To score the particular procedural step, each question was provided with possible answers and each answer was given a weightage. The efficiency score of particular person was calculated against each step of the publication process. On the basis of maximum score obtainable and the score of an individual the person for that procedural step was ranked as the most efficient, efficient and least efficient. Finally, the number of persons receiving the category for particular step were plotted and weighted mean efficiency score on each procedural step was calculated and hence, the organization was categorized as :

Most efficient	1.34 to 2.00 score
Efficient	0.67 to 1.33 score
Least efficient	Below 0.67 score

The selection of farm periodicals was performed on the basis of two criteria viz. the diversity of organization and periodicity of publication. Thus, six organizations viz. ICAR, New Delhi (Central, Professional Organization); Extension Education and Training Bureau (EE & TB) , Lucknow (State level

1. Assistant Professor (Extension Education), KVK, SKUAST (K), Leh – 194101
2. Department of Agricultural Communication, GBPUA&T, Pantnagar - 263145

rural development organization); CCSHAU, Hisar (State Agril. University); Gramlok publications, New Delhi (Rural, fortnightly); Sakshi publications, New Delhi (Rural, weekly) and Krishi Prabhat Publications Bikaner (Development, daily) were selected for the purpose to have holistic view.

3. Results and Discussion

The mean efficiency scores calculated on the basis of number of persons engaged in a particular procedural step were taken as the criteria of efficiency of that particular step. The scores thus, obtained are shows in table 1.

Table 1 The Overall Efficiency Scores of the Organizations on Various Procedural Steps

	ICAR	EE &TB	CCSHAU	Gramlok	Sakshi	Krishi prabhat
Collection of information	1.33	0.50	1.66	1.00	1.00	2.00
Selection of information	1.23	1.00	1.66	1.00	1.00	2.00
Editing	1.00	1.0	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Proof reading	1.33	1.00	1.66	2.00	2.00	2.00
Layout art and photography	2.00	1.00	1.66	2.00	1.00	2.00
Distribution	1.00	1.33	1.66	1.00	1.50	1.33
Storage	1.00	1.00	1.33	0.33	0.50	1.33
Feed back	0.33	0.00	1.00	0.33	0.00	0.00
Printing	–	1.20	1.83	–	–	2.00
Mean efficiency score	1.166	0.89	1.606	1.207	1.25	1.591

It is clear from the above table that CCSHAU (1.606) and Krishi Prabhat publications (1.591) were found the most efficient organizations. Sakshi (1.25), Gramlok (1.207) and ICAR (1.166) were efficient organizations whereas, Extension, Education and Training Bureau Lucknow was evaluated as least efficient organization in farm periodical production.

The further analysis shows that efficiency of collection of information in descending order were Dainik Krishi Prabhat (2.00) , CCSHAU (1.166), ICAR (1.33), Gramlok (1.00), Sakshi (1.00) and EE & TB (0.50) were respectively.

The efficiency of selection of information in descending order Dainik Krishi Prabhat (2.00), CCSHAU (1.66) ICAR (1.33), EE & TB (1.00), Gramlok (1.00) and Sakshi (1.00) were respectively.

The efficiency of editing was reported CCSHAU (2.00), Gramlok (2.00), Sakshi (2.00)Dainik Krishi Prabhat (2.00), ICAR (1.00) and EE & TB (1.00) respectively in the same order.

In case of proof reading the efficiency were for Dainik Krishi Prabhat (2.00), Sakshi (2.00), Gramlok (2.00) CCSHAU (1.66), ICAR (1.33) and EE &TB (1.00) respectively.

The layout, art and photography efficiency were for ICAR (2.00), Dainik Krishi Prabhat (2.00), CCSHAU (1.66), EE & TB (1.00), Gramlok (1.00) and Sakshi (1.00) respectively in descending order of efficiency.

The efficiency of distribution in descending order were Gramlok (2.00), CCSHAU (1.66), Sakshi (1.50), Dainik Krishi Prabhat (1.33), EE & TB (1.33) and ICAR (1.00) respectively. In case of storage it were CCSHAU (1.33), Dainik Krishi Prabhat (1.00), EE & TB (1.00), ICAR (1.00), Sakshi (0.50) and Gramlok (0.33) respectively.

The efficiency of feedback mechanism of different selected organizations were CCSHAU (1.00), ICAR (0.33), Gramlok (0.33) Sakshi (0.00), Dainik Krishi Prabhat (0.00) and EE& TB (0.00) respectively in descending order.

The printing at ICAR, Gramlok, and Sakshi was being done by private printer whereas the efficiency of Dainik Krishi Prabhat (2.00), CCSHAU (1.83) and EE & TB (1.20) respectively in descending order of efficiency.

The lack of own correspondent, lack of coordination with research scientists and agricultural universities, least information fed by news agencies regarding agriculture, no honorarium to writers, lack of quality content, insufficient space and personnel for storage and feedback, receipt of too lengthy and complex language in manuscript from contributors, delayed responses from referees, administrative bottlenecks, lack of professional training to staff, outdated machinery, lack of proper funding were reported some of the problems in publication and, hence, reasons for low procedural efficiency.

4. Conclusion

The effectiveness of farm publication can be extended to a great extent if long term policies at organizational level regarding the content, editorial staff and their training, source of information, readership survey, feedback mechanism and infrastructure be made. Proper training of the editorial staff and prospective contributors are required in specialized areas of farm journalism. The advertisements should be encouraged to manage the financial aspect. In India, a lot of research is being carried out in the field of agriculture to meet the increasing demand of food grain. It is said that 'Research without extension is a folly and extension without research is a blunder'. Certainly rural papers have to play the role in extension of researches to the ultimate users. This may remain dream if the measures to enhance procedural efficiency of the farm literature production be ignored.

5. References

Duffy, T.N. and Kabance, P. (1982). Costing a Readable Writing: Approach to text revision. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 59 (3) : 358 –364.

Levy, N.R. and Windahl, S. (1984). Audience Activities and Gratification : A conceptual clarifications and Exploration, *Communication Research* 11 : 51-78.

Mathiazhagan, T. and Mathur, P.N. (1990). Measurement of Organizational effectiveness in farm literature production. *Indian Journal of Extension Education.* 25 (1-2) : 13-21.