



## Research Article

# COMMUNICATION FACTORS: A SOFT POWER INFLUENCING EXTENSION SERVICE

SINGH A.P.<sup>1\*</sup> AND JIRLI B.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agril Extension, Janta College Bakewar, Etawah, 206124, Chhatrapati Shahu Ji Maharaj University, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Department of Extension Education, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, 221005, Uttar Pradesh, India

\*Corresponding Author: Email - [apsbhu7@gmail.com](mailto:apsbhu7@gmail.com)

Received: April 02, 2019; Revised: April 11, 2019; Accepted: April 12, 2019; Published: April 15, 2019

**Abstract:** Communication is the basis of all human contact and affects everyone in respect of modifying and controlling the behavior. Its objectives focused on changing or strengthening the target audience relationship and influencing reasoning, feeling and action of people. On the other hand, Soft power also a way to influence other behaviour or ability to shape the preferences of others in such a way that it leads to the achievement of the targeted purpose. Therefore, soft power and communication are two faces of a same coin. In other words, communication could be seen as an indicator of soft power. Present study was conducted on the 220 respondents in two districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh i.e., Varanasi and Mirzapur. To analyze the Communication of public and private agencies a suitable structured interview scheduled was developed which contained 14 items of Communication factors which further divided into three dimensions such as: communicator related factor, receiver related and message related factor. The scoring pattern was used and based on the score obtained by each respondent, they were grouped into three categories taking mean and standard deviation as measures of check.

**Keywords:** Communication, Behaviour, soft power, extension service

**Citation:** Singh A.P. and Jirli B. (2019) Communication Factors: A Soft Power Influencing Extension Service. International Journal of Agriculture Sciences, ISSN: 0975-3710 & E-ISSN: 0975-9107, Volume 11, Issue 7, pp.- 8233-8235.

**Copyright:** Copyright©2019 Singh A.P. and Jirli B. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

## Introduction

Communication as a process by which two or more persons exchange ideas, facts, impressions in way that each gains a common understanding of the meaning, content and use of message [1]. It may describe as all the procedure by which one mind can affect another [2]. It acts as glue that holds a society together. Further on the basis of this study it can also be noticed that the ability to communicate enables people to form and maintain personal relationships and the quality of such relationships depends on the caliber of communication between the parties [3]. The brand positioning is actively communicated through specific communication objectives focused on changing or strengthening the brand image or brand-[target audience] relationship [4]. It promotes exchange of ideas and knowledge among farmers which is instrumental in influencing the reasoning, feeling and action on the information under discussion [5]. A more effective communication provided by agricultural extension staff will contribute to agricultural development as such communication will enhance the noticing, problem solving, questioning, and comprehension abilities of the extension members [6]. One of the most inhibiting forces to organizational effectiveness is a lack of effective communication [7]. The social media and digital communication affected the communication process in organization [8]. Every person's communication skills affect both personal and organizational effectiveness [9]. Soft power is a new form of power, described as the ability to influence other behaviour or ability to shape the preferences of others in such a way that it leads to the achievement of the targeted purpose. He has also described soft power as the "ability to influence other behaviour" or "ability to shape the preferences of others what others want" without using hard or coercive power [10]. Soft power is basically relies on the ability to shape the preferences of others, ability to get what you want from others only through attraction rather than coercion or payment [11]. From the above reviews it can be concluded that communication is the basis of all human contact and affects everyone. It acts as the glue and the basic thread that holds a society together and through communication we make known our needs,

our wants, our ideas, and our feelings. Its objectives focused on changing or strengthening the target audience relationship. It is dynamic interaction process in which both the sender and receiver are active participants and its elements determine the quality of communication and influence the behaviour of people and public relation. It enhances and sustains the interest of the audience. It influences the reasoning, feeling and action on the information under discussion. Overall communication is all the procedure by which one mind can affect another in respect of modifying and controlling the behavior of other individuals. On the other hand, Soft power also a way to influence other behaviour or ability to shape the preferences of others in such a way that it leads to the achievement of the targeted purpose. Thus, we can say, soft power and communication are two faces of a same coin. In other words, communication could be seen as an indicator of soft power. Therefore, we can select communication factors as an indicator of extension soft power.

## Material and Methods

This is very new study in discipline of extension and there has never been done a regional study of soft power in India before. So the researcher selects Eastern U.P. for conducting the research because of having familiarity with social conditions, local language and culture of them people, which could help in extracting information from respondents. The research was conducted in two districts of Eastern Uttar Pradesh i.e., Varanasi and Mirzapur, which were selected purposively. The geographical area and population density of the district were the selection criteria; two development blocks i.e., Harahua from district Varanasi and Narainpur from district Mirzapur were selected by simple random selection; four Panchayat were selected from each selected block by simple random selection. The respondents were selected proportionately according to the population of village. Thus, a total of 220 respondents were selected for the purpose of study. The respondents were the beneficiaries of public and private extension services.

Table-1 Communication factors in Public extension service, n=220

Statements	Public sector					Level of Communication
	Yes (F)	%	No (F)	%	Mean	
Communicator related factors						
Ineffective environment during programme	95	43.18	125	56.81	0.43	M
Disorganized way to deliver message	89	40.45	131	59.54	0.40	M
Lack of knowledge and skill to convince people	56	25.45	164	74.54	0.25	M
Non –availability of information in time	69	31.36	151	68.63	0.31	M
Non co-operative attitude of extension worker	67	30.45	153	69.54	0.30	M
Use of unsuitable language, symbol etc	44	20	176	80	0.2	L
Receiver related factors						
Low attention of the farmer during programme	129	58.63	91	41.36	0.59	H
Not considering and adopting the information after getting	112	50.90	108	49.09	0.51	H
No any feedback after getting message	105	47.72	115	52.27	0.48	M
Message related factors						
Provided unclear information	72	32.72	148	67.27	0.33	M
Provided uninterested information	103	46.81	117	53.18	0.47	M
Provided unimportant information	62	28.18	158	71.81	0.28	M

Table-2 Communication factors in Private extension service, n=220

Statements	Private sector					Level of Communication factors
	Yes (F)	%	No (F)	%	Mean	
Communicator related factors						
Ineffective environment during programme	86	39.09	134	60.90	0.39	M
Disorganized way to deliver message	77	35	143	65	0.35	M
Lack of knowledge and skill to convince people	62	28.18	158	71.81	0.28	M
Non –availability of information in time	55	25	165	75	0.25	M
Non co-operative attitude of extension worker	63	28.63	157	71.36	0.29	M
Use of unsuitable language, symbol etc	38	17.27	182	82.72	0.17	L
Receiver related factors						
Low attention of the farmer during programme	123	55.90	97	44.09	0.56	H
Not considering and adopting the information after getting	127	57.72	93	42.27	0.58	H
No any feedback after getting message	89	40.45	131	59.54	0.40	M
Message related factors						
Provided unclear information	58	26.36	162	73.63	0.26	M
Provided uninterested information	96	43.63	124	56.36	0.44	M
Provided unimportant information	49	22.27	171	77.72	0.22	L

Table-3 Comparison of communication factor between public and private extension service, n=220

	Public Sector mean	Level of factor	Private Sector mean	Level of factor
Communicator related factors				
Ineffective environment during programme	0.43	M	0.39	M
Disorganized way to deliver message	0.40	M	0.35	M
Lack of knowledge and skill to convince people	0.25	M	0.28	M
Non –availability of information in time	0.31	M	0.25	M
Non co-operative attitude of extension worker	0.30	M	0.29	M
Use of unsuitable language, symbol etc	0.2	L	0.17	L
Receiver related factors				
Low attention of the farmer during programme	0.59	H	0.56	H
Not considering and adopting the information after getting	0.51	H	0.58	H
No any feedback after getting message	0.48	M	0.40	M
Message related factors				
Provided unclear information	0.33	M	0.26	M
Provided uninterested information	0.47	M	0.44	M
Provided unimportant information	0.28	M	0.22	L

The research used explanatory research designs which focus on the discovery of ideas and insights and conducted prior to the main investigation. Comparative research method was selected. This study was based only on primary data and the data were collected through personal interview method was classified, tabulated and analyzed in the light of the objective of the study. To analyze the Communication factor of public and private extension agencies a suitable structured interview scheduled was developed and presented to the ten experts of the area for examining the suitability of the items included in the scale, and to check the inter scorer reliability of the schedule. Communication factors contained 14 items which further divided into three dimensions such as: communicator related factor, receiver related and message related factor. The scoring pattern was used and based on the score obtained by each respondent; they were grouped into three categories taking mean and standard deviation as measures of check.

### Observations and Analysis

Table 1 dealt with the results of the different indicators of communication factors in public sectors extension services. As stated above the communication related factors are divided into three category i.e. communicator, receiver and message related factors. Most of the communicator related factors are at medium level of ability to influence the people softly because these dimensions are lies on the middle of the effectiveness. While using unsuitable language symbol has high degree of soft power because it has been reported as low factors by most of the respondents. A minimum level of soft power has been found in the receiver related factor because it is the highly reported factors of the communication. Message related factor has medium level of efficiency to affect the people softly because it lies on the middle of the effectiveness. Table 2 reported the findings of communication related factor in private sectors.

Like the public sector the communication related factors in private sector is divided into three parts *i.e.*, Communicator related factors, Receiver related factors and Message related factors. Results are same for the private sector extension services in terms of communication related factors. All the communicator related factors fall on the middle of the continuum. So, they have middle level of ability to influence the other person behavior softly. Thus we can say communicator related factor has medium soft power. Minimum amount of soft power has been reported in receiver related factor. Similar to the findings of communicator related factor the message related factor has also medium level of effectiveness. So, they have medium level of effectiveness to affect the other people behavior softly in terms of message related factors. According to the comparison table 3 most of the communicator related factors are falls in the medium category of effectiveness in both public and private sector extension services. So we can say that they have same intensity of soft power to influence the people behavior in terms of communicator related factors. Receiver related factor is the reported factors most in both the sectors due to this they fall in the lower category of effectiveness. Means they have least ability to influence the people softly in public and private sectors both. The message related factor is belongs to the medium category of effectiveness. Thus, we can say that they have medium level of soft power to influence the other people behavior or activity in both *i.e.* public and private sectors.

### Conclusion

Communication is all the procedure by which one mind can affect another in respect of modifying and controlling the behavior of other individuals. On the other hand, Soft power also a way to influence other behaviour or ability to shape the preferences of others in such a way that it leads to the achievement of the targeted purpose. Thus, we can say, soft power and communication are two faces of a same coin. In other words, communication could be seen as an indicator of soft power. Therefore, we can select communication factors as an indicator of extension soft power. Communication related factors are divided into three category *i.e.* communicator, receiver and message related factors in relation to communicator related factor and message related factors, public sector has high soft power. Receiver related factor has low level of soft power. In private sector the communicator related factor and message related factor have high level of soft power. In receiver related factor the intensity of soft power is low. Both the sectors were having same level of soft power in most of the communicator related factors. Similarly the receiver related factor has also same intensity of soft power in both the sector. Finally both public and private sectors have different ability to influence the people softly in message related factors.

**Application of research:** The term soft power is a very new concept in our discipline, because there are hardly any studies on soft power in agricultural extension. This research is very useful to the academic purpose as well as it also very helpful in planning, implementing and achieving the extension objectives by incorporating communication factors as an indicator of soft power.

**Research Category:** Extension Education

**Acknowledgement / Funding:** Authors are thankful to Department of Extension Education, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, 221005, Uttar Pradesh, India

**\*Research Guide or Chairperson of research:** Dr B Jirli

University: Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, 221005, Uttar Pradesh, India

Research project name or number: PhD Thesis, Soft power of extension services and its effectiveness in Eastern UP

**Author Contributions:** All authors equally contributed

**Author statement:** All authors read, reviewed, agreed and approved the final manuscript. Note-All authors agreed that- Written informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to publish / enrolment

**Study area / Sample Collection:** Varanasi and Mirzapur, Uttar Pradesh

**Cultivar / Variety name:** Nil

**Conflict of Interest:** None declared

**Ethical approval:** This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

Ethical Committee Approval Number: Nil

### References

- [1] Leagans J. P. (1961) *The Communication Process. Extension Education in Community Development*, 364.
- [2] Shannon C. E. & Weaver W. (1949) *The mathematical theory of communication*. Urbana, Ill. Univ. Illinois Press, 1, 17.
- [3] Brennan J. (1974) *The Conscious Communicator: Making Communication Work in the Work Place*.
- [4] Aaker D. A. (1996) *Building strong brands: Building, measuring, and managing brand equity*.
- [5] Isife B. J. & Ofuoku A. U. (2008) *Communication in agricultural extension and rural development: concepts and methods*. Owerri: Springfield publishers Ltd.
- [6] Kizilaslan N. (2010) *International Journal of Agricultural Research*, 5(10), 843-850.
- [7] Sandvik P. & Sypher B. D. (Eds.) (2010) *Destructive organizational communication: Processes, consequences, and constructive ways of organizing*. Routledge.
- [8] Verhoeven P. Tench R., Zeffass A., Moreno A. & Verčič D. (2012) *Public Relations Review*, 38(1), 162-164.
- [9] Brun J., & Cooper C. (2016) *Missing pieces: 7 ways to improve employee well-being and organizational effectiveness*. Springer.
- [10] Nye J. S. (1990) *Soft power. Foreign policy*, (80), 153-171.
- [11] Nye Jr, J. S. (2004) *The benefits of soft power. Harvard Business School Working Knowledge*, 2, 3.