Print ISSN : 0972-8813
e-ISSN : 2582-2780

[Vol. 18(3), Sept-Dec, 2020]

Pantnagar Journal of Research

(Formerly International Journal of Basic and Applied Agricultural Research ISSN : 2349-8765)

G.B. Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, Pantnagar

ADVISORYBOARD

Patron
Dr. Tej Partap, Vice-Chancellor, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India
Members
Dr. A.S. Nain, Ph.D., Director Research, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. A.K. Sharma, Ph.D., Director, Extension Education, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. S.K. Kashyap, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agriculture, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. N.S. Jadon, Ph.D., Dean, College of Veterinary & Animal Sciences, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. K.P. Raverkar, Ph.D., Dean, College of Post Graduate Studies, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Sandeep Arora, Ph.D., Dean, College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Alaknanda Ashok, Ph.D., Dean, College of Technology, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Alka Goel, Ph.D., Dean, College of Home Science, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. R.S. Chauhan, Ph.D., Dean, College of Fisheries, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. R.S. Jadaun, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agribusiness Management, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

EDITORIALBOARD

Members
Prof. A.K. Misra, Ph.D., Chairman, Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board, Krishi Anusandhan Bhavan I, New Delhi, India
Dr. Anand Shukla, Director, Reefberry Foodex Pvt. Ltd., Veraval, Gujarat, India
Dr. Anil Kumar, Ph.D., Director, Education, Rani Lakshmi Bai Central Agricultural University, Jhansi, India
Dr. Ashok K. Mishra, Ph.D., Kemper and Ethel Marley Foundation Chair, W P Carey Business School, Arizona State University, U.S.A
Dr. B.B. Singh, Ph.D., Visiting Professor and Senior Fellow, Dept. of Soil and Crop Sciences and Borlaug Institute for International Agriculture, Texas A&M University, U.S.A.
Prof. Binod Kumar Kanaujia, Ph.D., Professor, School of Computational and Integrative Sciences, Jawahar Lal Nehru University, New Delhi, India
Dr. D. Ratna Kumari, Ph.D., Associate Dean, College of Community / Home Science, PJTSAU, Hyderabad, India
Dr. Deepak Pant, Ph.D., Separation and Conversion Technology, Flemish Institute for Technological Research (VITO), Belgium
Dr. Desirazu N. Rao, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Biochemistry, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India
Dr. G.K. Garg, Ph.D., Dean (Retired), College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agric. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Humnath Bhandari, Ph.D., IRRI Representative for Bangladesh, Agricultural Economist, Agrifood Policy Platform, Philippines
Dr. Indu S Sawant, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Research Centre for Grapes, Pune, India
Dr. Kuldeep Singh, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India
Dr. M.P. Pandey, Ph.D., Ex. Vice Chancellor, BAU, Ranchi & IGKV, Raipur and Director General, IAT, Allahabad, India
Dr. Martin Mortimer, Ph.D., Professor, The Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Food Systems, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom
Dr. Muneshwar Singh, Ph.D., Project Coordinator AICRP- LTFE, ICAR - Indian Institute of Soil Science, Bhopal, India
Prof. Omkar, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Zoology, University of Lucknow, India
Dr. P.C. Srivastav, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Soil Science, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India
Dr. Prashant Srivastava, Ph.D., Cooperative Research Centre for Contamination Assessment and Remediation of the Environment, University of South Australia, Australia
Dr. Puneet Srivastava, Ph.D., Director, Water Resources Center, Butler-Cunningham Eminent Scholar, Professor, Biosystems Engineering, Auburn University, U.S.A.
Dr. R.C. Chaudhary, Ph.D., Chairman, Participatory Rural Development Foundation, Gorakhpur, India
Dr. R.K. Singh, Ph.D., Director & Vice Chancellor, ICAR-Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, U.P., India
Prof. Ramesh Kanwar, Ph.D., Charles F. Curtiss Distinguished Professor of Water Resources Engineering, Iowa State University, U.S.A.
Dr. S.N. Maurya, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Department of Gynecology & Obstetrics, G.B. Pant University of Agric. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Sham S. Goyal, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Faculty of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, University of California, Davis, U.S.A.
Prof. Umesh Varshney, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Microbiology and Cell Biology, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India
Prof. V.D. Sharma, Ph.D., Dean Academics, SAI Group of Institutions, Dehradun, India
Dr. V.K. Singh, Ph.D., Head, Division of Agronomy, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, India
Dr. Vijay P. Singh, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor, Caroline and William N. Lehrer Distinguished Chair in Water Engineering, Department of Biological Agricultural Engineering, Texas A& M University, U.S.A.
Dr. Vinay Mehrotra, Ph.D., President, Vinlax Canada Inc., Canada

Editor-in-Chief
Dr. Manoranjan Dutta, Head Crop Improvement Division (Retd.), National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India

Managing Editor
Dr. S.N. Tiwari, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Entomology, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Assistant Managing Editor
Dr. Jyotsna Yadav, Ph.D., Research Editor, Directorate of Research, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Technical Manager
Dr. S.D. Samantray, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

PANTNAGAR JOURNAL OF RESEARCH

Vol. 18(3) September-December, 2020

CONTENTS

Marker assisted selection for aromatic and semi-dwarf segregants in cross of aromatic Katarni rice **188**
SUNDARAM BHARTI, P.K. SINGH, KUMARI SUVIDHA, SATYENDRA, S. P. SINGH, ANAND KUMAR and MANKESH KUMAR

D^2 and principal component analysis for variability studies in *Vigna* and *Phaseolus* species **193**
PRIYANKA BHARETI, R. K. PANWAR, ANJU ARORA and S. K. VERMA

Assessment of genetic parameters in F_5 recombinants derived from *Indica* rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) line Pusa 6A **198**
PRACHI PRIYA, MANKESH KUMAR, TIRTARTHA CHATTOPADHYAY, BISHUN DEO PRASAD, SWETA SINHA, ANAND KUMAR and SATYENDRA

Genetic diversity analysis by D^2 clustering of fodder yield and its related traits in forage sorghum **203**
HARSH DEEP, INDRANI CHAKRABORTY, SATYAWAN ARYA, PUMMY LAMBA, S. K. PAHUJA and JAYANTI TOKAS

Genetic diversity for morpho-physiological and seed vigour traits in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) **209**
PUNEET KUMAR, Y.P.S. SOLANKI, VIKRAM SINGH and ASHISH

***In vitro* plant regeneration from mature embryo using different plant growth regulators in wheat genotype HD 3059** **215**
SWATI SHARMA, ASHWANI KUMAR, ANIL SIROHI, R. S. SENGAR, KAMAL KHILARI, MUKESH KUMAR and MANOJ K. YADAV

Weed management and crop geometry effect on nutrient uptake and yield in aerobic rice **222**
VASUNDHRA KAUSHIK, S. P. SINGH, V. P. SINGH, TEJ PRATAP and B. S. MAHAPATRA

Studies on sucker control in natu tobacco (*Nicotiana tabacum* L.) under rainfed vertisols **228**
S. JAFFAR BASHA, P. PULLI BAI, S. KASTURI KRISHNA and C. CHANDRASEKHARA RAO

Seed and oil yield of bidi tobacco (*Nicotiana tabacum* L.) varieties as influenced by planting geometry and fertilizer levels under rainfed vertisols **232**
S. JAFFAR BASHA, P. PULLI BAI, S. KASTURI KRISHNA and C. CHANDRASEKHARA RAO

Comparison of non-linear models on area, production and productivity of sugarcane crop in Uttar Pradesh **237**
JHADE SUNIL and ABHISHEK SINGH

Performance of improved varieties of true Cinnamon (*Cinnamomum verum* J. Presl.) in Andaman Islands, India **243**
AJIT ARUN WAMAN, POOJA BOHRA and R. KARTHIKA DEVI

Changing climate and its effect on rice yield in Meghalaya **249**
DEOTREPHY K. DKHAR, SHEIKH MOHAMMAD FEROZE, RAM SINGH and LALA I.P. RAY

Age related changes in morphometrical studies on ductus deferens of guinea fowl *(Numida meleagris)* **257**
TAMILSELVAN S, B. S. DHOTE and MEENA MRIGESH

Occurrence of gastrointestinal nematodes in goats slaughtered at Rewa, India **261**
D. MARAVI, A. K. DIXIT and POOJA DIXIT

Autoimmune haemolytic anaemia in a dog-A case report **265**
NEERAJ KUMAR, MUNISH BATRA and R.S. CHAUHAN

Erythrocytic anaplasmosis with *Fasciolosis* in a cross-bred cattle: A case report **269**
NEERAJ KUMAR and MUNISH BATRA

Modification and evaluation of Pant-ICAR controlled traffic seed-cum-deep fertilizer applicator for multi-crop seeder-cum-deep placement of fertilizers applicator **272**
MANISH KUMAR, T.C THAKUR, MANOJ KUMARand SATYA PRAKASH KUMAR

Drying characteristics of shrimp (*Metapenaeus dobsoni)* in electrical dryer **281**
D.S. ANIESRANI DELFIYA, S. MURALI, P.V. ALFIYA and MANOJ P. SAMUEL

Baur dam breach analysis using various Manning's roughness values **286**
MEENAKSHI RAMOLA, JYOTHI PRASAD and H. J. SHIVA PRASAD

Study of constipation and related factors among female students of Pantnagar **290**
RITA SINGH RAGHUVANSHI, NIDHI JOSHI, DIKSHA SINGH, SHIKHA SINGH, MEENAL and DASHRATH BHATI

Work -related musculoskeletal disorders among chikankari workers in Lucknow (U.P.) **297**
POONAM SINGH and KATYAYNI

Technology adoption and productivity enhancement in groundnut cultivation: An impact assessment of farm women groups **302**
K.UMA, T. NIVETHA and S. PRAVEENA

Health hazard and constraints of chikankari worker in Lucknow (U.P.) **310**
POONAM SINGHand KATYAYNI

Studies on Indigenous Agricultural Technical Knowledge prevalent among the farmers of Assam for the management of common pests and diseases in major crops **315**
DEVAMITRA TARAFDAR and NIRMAL MAZUMDER

Television viewing pattern among students of CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar **325**
ANIL KUMAR MALIK, KRISHAN YADAV and SUNIL KUMAR

Media content development and it's standardization for farmers **331**
REETA DEVI YADAV, GEETAMATI DEVI and RITA GOAL

Analysis of learning behavior and pattern of online learners on a MOOC platform **338**
G.R.K. MURTHY, SEEMA KUJUR, S. SENTHIL VINAYAGAM, YASHAVANTH B.S., CH. SRINIVASA RAO, P. S. PANDEY, VANITA JAIN and INDRADEVI T.

Television viewing pattern among students of CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar

ANIL KUMAR MALIK[1], KRISHAN YADAV[2] and SUNIL KUMAR[3]

[1, 2] Directorate of Extension Education, C.C.S. Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar-125004, [3]Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Sirsa

ABSTRACT: Television is a versatile technological tool used by the students for multiple purposes *viz.*, disseminating information, education and entertainment. Considering its importance, an exploratory study was carried out with 200 agricultural students selected from three constituents' colleges of CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar through proportionate random sampling method using structured interview schedule. Empirical data were tabulated and analyzed with the help of appropriate statistical tools by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Findings of the study revealed that majority of the students (53.28%) watched television daily for '31min^{-1} h per day'. Moreover, most of the students (82.50%) watched television for entertainment purpose compared to academic and professional purpose. Study also revealed that age, education, medium of schooling, schooling, parental income, family education, scientism, job preference, annual expenditure, mass media exposure, information seeking behavior and risk orientation had positive and significant correlation with their television viewing pattern at 0.05 level of probability.

Key words: Students, television, viewing pattern

Higher education plays a key role in the development of a country, as it is viewed as a powerful means to build knowledge-based society. Over the years, higher education imparted by Indian Universities is facing challenges in terms of access, equity and quality. Use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for promoting education and development has always been a part of policy and plan documents on education (National Education Policy, 2020). ICT is a relatively new term that includes any communication device or application, encompassing: radio, television, cellular phones, computer and network hardware and software, satellite systems and so on, as well as the various services and applications associated with them, such as video conferencing and distance learning (Khan *et al.,* 2015). In the time of COVID-19 pandemic, ICT tools are of great importance for institutions, teachers and students.

Television (TV), the base of ICT, overcomes some of the most challenging issues related to educational system especially access, equity and quality. TV is the electronic carpet that transports millions of persons each day to faraway places and regarded as a valuable information source used both as an educational resource and as a leisure activity, which makes it an indispensable tool for academia and research. In recent times, one can watch television via the internet, by means of mobile phones and with the help of little pocket TV sets. It is everywhere and for everyone. Moreover, TV has made educators to exert a lot of efforts to help the learners to get interactive content that is full of multimedia as it has been proven that it has a significant effect on the process of learning (Abrol, 1991).

Now-a-days, TV acts as an adaptable tool and follows different approaches when used in different educational situations. The medium is used for formal, non-formal and informal education. In formal education, TV usually functions as supportive and reinforcement tool. It can be attached with college curriculum and time tables. When systematically organized it takes the form of college broadcast. Whereas in case of informal education, it is used as multimedia communication tool that directly or indirectly teach the subject matter. In addition to this, open and distance education systems in India use Educational Satellite (EDUSAT) and other T.V. channels for delivering content. Moreover, the use of TV for educational purposes has several advantages over traditional learning for all higher education stakeholders. These advantages include, but are not limited to, facilitating distance education, enhancing learning outcomes, motivating students, overcoming shortages of skilled and experienced instructors, facilitating student-centered learning, facilitating constructivist learning environments, promoting lifelong learning, promoting a knowledge-based economy and taking account of individual differences. The real challenge of the present era is not producing information or storing information, but rather getting people to use the information (Malik *et al.,* 2020).

Therefore, educational systems have a great deal to offer in pointing the way for increasing the use of knowledge and information in the future through the TV.

Keeping in view the above facts and importance, the study was conducted with the objective to assess the television viewing pattern among students of CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was carried out among three constituent colleges of CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, Haryana, i.e., College of Agriculture, College of Agricultural Engineering & Technology and Indira Chakravarty College of Home Sciences. In this research, Under-Graduate (Pre-final & Final year) and Post-Graduate (M.Sc. & Ph.D.) students of the colleges registered during the session of 2017-18 were selected as the sample of the study. There were 994 students registered in U.G. (162 Pre-final year and 178 final year) and P.G. programme (363 M.Sc. and 291 Ph.D.) from these three colleges. Out of them, 200 students were selected through proportionate random sampling. Further, out of 200 students selected only 137 students were watching television for various purposes. The data were collected through personal interview technique with the help of well-structured and pre-tested interview schedule. Empirical data were tabulated and analyzed with the help of appropriate statistical tools using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The descriptive statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, mean, rank order, standard deviation and correlation and regression analysis were computed using SPSS software. Later on, using the code sheet and SPSS, tables were prepared in MS Excel. The observation with the highest score among all other observations was assigned as Rank-I to compute the rank order means.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Frequency and extent of time spent daily for watching

Table1: Frequency and extent of time spent daily for watching television **(n=137)**

S.No.	Frequency of watching T.V.	Students			TS	Rank	Mean	SD
		UG (n=57)	PG (n=80)	OA(n=137)				
		F (%)	F (%)	F (%)				
1.	Daily	33 (57.89)	40 (50.00)	73 (53.28)	292	I	3.14	1.02
2.	3-4 days in a week	07 (12.28)	14 (17.50)	21 (15.32)	63	III		
3.	1-2 days in a week	14 (24.56)	19 (23.75)	33 (24.08)	66	II		
4.	Rarely	03 (05.26)	07 (08.75)	10 (07.29)	10	IV		
Extent of time spent daily (n=137)								
S.No.	**Time spent**	**F (%) (n=57)**	**F (%) (n=80)**	**F (%) (n=137)**	**TS**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**SD**
1.	0-30 Min/day	14 (24.56)	27 (33.75)	41 (29.92)	164	II	2.92	0.91
2.	31min^{-1} h/day	21 (36.84)	35 (43.75)	56 (40.87)	168	I		
3.	>1-2 h/day	17 (29.80)	12 (15.00)	29 (21.16)	58	III		
4.	>2 h/day	05 (08.77)	06 (07.50)	11 (08.02)	11	IV		

Note: UG- Under-Graduate, PG-Post-Graduate, OA- Overall, F-Frequency, TS-Total score, SD-Standard deviation

Table 2: Purpose of watching television **(n=137)**

S. No.	Items	Students			Rank
		UG(n=57)	PG(n=80)	OA(n=137)	
		F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	
1.	News Channels	47 (82.45)	52 (65.00)	99 (72.26)	II
2.	Entertainment (Music, movies, etc.)	51 (89.47)	55 (68.75)	106(77.37)	I
3.	Health related information	14 (24.56)	29 (36.25)	43 (31.38)	VI
4.	Current affairs information	42 (73.68)	34 (42.50)	76 (55.47)	III
5.	Religious information	13 (22.80)	23 (28.75)	36 (26.27)	VIII
6.	For particular programme (Serials)	36 (63.15)	21 (26.25)	57 (41.60)	V
7.	Information (Discovery, etc.)	27 (47.36)	14 (17.50)	41 (29.92)	VII
8.	Event (Matches, etc.)	33 (57.89)	30 (37.50)	63 (45.98)	IV
9.	Others (Agriculture)	09 (15.78)	08 (10.00)	17 (12.40)	IX

Note: UG- Under-Graduate, PG-Post-Graduate, OA- Overall, F-Frequency, Data are based on multiple responses.

television

Table 1 explains that more than half of the respondents (53.28%) watched television 'daily' followed by '3-4 days in a week' (15.32%) and '1-2 days in a week' (24.08%). Interestingly, 07.29 per cent of the total respondents watched television 'rarely'.

When further asked about extent of time spent in a day on television, more two-fifth of the respondents (40.87%) spent '31 min^{-1} h per day' for watching television followed by 'up to 30 min per day' (29.92 %), 'more than 1-2 h per day'(21.16%) and 'more than 2 h per day' (08.02%).

This showed that most of the respondents watched television daily. But they generally spent '31 min^{-1} h per day' for watching it. The possible reason behind this may be due to the fact that most of the respondents were hosteller and they mostly preferred to watch television after their meals. Contrary to above findings, Khanna (1992) reported that, on an average, a child watched T.V., 2-3 h daily during week days and 3-4 h during weekends.

Purpose of watching television

From the perusal of Table 2, it can be seen that the majority of the respondents (77.37%) watched television for entertainment (rank I) followed by news channels (72.26%), current affairs information (55.47%), events

Table 3: Channels preference of student **(n=137)**

S. No.	Channels	Channels preference		
		UG (n=57)	PG (n=80)	OA(n=137)
		F (%)	F (%)	F (%)
1.	**News channels**			
(a).	DD News	08 (14.03)	13 (16.25)	42 (30.65)
(b).	ABP News	40 (70.17)	47 (58.75)	87 (63.50)
(c).	Aaj Tak	39 (68.42)	52 (65.00)	91 (66.42)
(d).	Zee News	36 (63.15)	32 (40.00)	68 (49.63)
(e).	NDTV	23 (40.35)	39 (43.75)	62 (45.25)
(f).	BBC	12 (21.05)	19 (23.75)	31 (22.62)
(g).	Others (Regional news channels)	21 (36.84)	31 (38.75)	52 (37.95)
2.	**Sports channels**			
(a).	Ten sports	22 (38.59)	27 (33.75)	49 (35.76)
(b).	Star sports	29 (50.87)	24 (30.00)	53 (38.68)
(c).	Others (Neo sports, ESPN, etc.)	12 (21.05)	11 (13.75)	23 (16.78)
3.	**Entertainment channels**			
(a).	DD-1	05 (08.77)	13 (16.25)	38 (27.73)
(b).	Star Plus	30 (52.63)	51 (63.75)	81 (59.12)
(c).	Zee TV	36 (63.15)	37 (46.25)	73 (53.28)
(d).	Sony	34 (59.64)	43 (53.75)	77 (56.20)
(e).	Colors	29 (50.87)	34 (42.50)	63 (45.95)
(f).	Star Gold	47 (82.45)	37 (46.25)	84 (61.31)
(g).	Zee Cinema	26 (45.61)	42 (52.50)	68 (49.63)
(h).	Set Max	44 (77.19)	43 (53.75)	87 (63.50)
(i).	Star Movies	16 (28.07)	37 (46.25)	53 (38.68)
(j).	Channel V	38 (66.66)	59 (73.75)	97 (70.80)
(k).	UTV Bindaas	34 (59.64)	29 (36.25)	63 (45.98)
(l).	MTV	24 (42.10)	41 (51.25)	65 (47.44)
(m).	9XM	34 (59.64)	47 (58.75)	81 (59.12)
(n).	Others (9XM Tashan, etc.)	21 (36.84)	29 (36.25)	50 (36.49)
4.	**Informative and other channels**			
(a).	National Geography	39 (68.42)	25 (31.25)	64 (46.71)
(b).	Discovery	43 (75.43)	35 (43.75)	78 (56.93)
(c).	Cartoon Network	20 (35.08)	13 (16.25)	59 (43.06)

Note: UG- Under-Graduate, PG-Post-Graduate, OA- Overall, F-Frequency

(45.98%), for particular programme (41.60%), health related information (31.38%), information (29.92%), religious information (26.27%) and other purposes (12.40%) with ranks II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII and IX, respectively. When further analyzed, data revealed that about 90 per cent of the UG respondents watched television for entertainment (89.47%), which was more than that of PG respondents (68.75%).

It reflected that most of the respondents watched TV for various purposes in their day-to-day life e.g. entertainment, information, etc. It is being extensively used for sharing information about people, products, services, international affairs, etc. (Khare *et al.,* 2007). Similarly, Abrol (1991)

Table 4: Television viewing pattern **(n=137)**

S.No.	Items		Viewing pattern			TS	WMS	Rank order	SD
			Frequently	Occasionally	Never				
(a).	News	UG (n=57)	18 (31.57)	36 (63.15)	03 (05.26)	169	1.23	II	0.55
		PG (n=80)	23 (28.75)	51 (63.75)	06 (07.50)				
		OA (n=137)	41 (29.92)	87 (63.50)	09 (06.56)				
(b).	Entertainment (Music, television serial, movies, etc.)	UG (n=57)	23 (40.35)	28 (49.12)	06 (10.52)	180	1.31	I	0.63
		PG (n=80)	33 (41.25)	40 (50.00)	07 (08.75)				
		OA (n=137)	56 (40.87)	68 (49.63)	13 (09.48)				
(c).	Sports programmes	UG (n=57)	16 (28.07)	28 (49.12)	13 (22.80)	144	1.05	IV	0.67
		PG (n=80)	19 (23.75)	46 (57.50)	15 (18.75)				
		OA (n=137)	35 (25.54)	74 (54.01)	28 (20.43)				
(d).	Agricultural programmes	UG (n=57)	03 (5.26)	12 (21.05)	42 (73.68)	81	0.59	VII	0.74
		PG (n=80)	18 (22.50)	27 (33.75)	35 (43.75)				
		OA (n=137)	21 (15.32)	39 (28.46)	77 (56.20)				
(e).	Current affairs information	UG (n=57)	12 (21.05)	35 (61.40)	10 (17.54)	157	1.14	III	0.61
		PG (n=80)	25 (30.48)	48 (60.00)	07 (08.75)				
		OA (n=137)	37 (27.00)	83 (60.58)	17 (12.40)				
(f).	Political events	UG (n=57)	04 (07.01)	21 (36.80)	32 (56.14)	86	0.62	VI	0.67
		PG (n=80)	11 (13.75)	35 (43.75)	34 (42.50)				
		OA (n=137)	15 (10.94)	56 (40.87)	66 (48.17)				
(g).	Educational purpose	UG (n=57)	10 (17.54)	35 (61.40)	12 (21.05)	140	1.02	V	0.74
		PG (n=80)	29 (36.25)	27 (33.75)	24 (30.00)				
		OA (n=137)	39 (28.46)	62 (45.25)	36 (26.77)				

Note: UG-Under-Graduate, PG-Post-Graduate, OA-Overall, TS-Total score, SD-Standard deviation, WMS-Weighted mean score, Figures in parentheses indicate percentage.

Table 5: Relationship between respondents' personality traits with their television viewing pattern (n=137)

S. No.	Personality traits	Correlation coefficient 'r' value	Regression coefficien t'b' value	't' values
1.	Age	0.272*	0.344	2.424*
2.	Sex	0.008^{NS}	-0.173	-0.363^{NS}
3.	Education	0.519*	1.350	2.831*
4.	Medium of schooling	0.442*	0.556	3.580*
5.	Schooling	0.231*	0.231	1.992^{NS}
6.	Parental income	0.218*	1.387	1.861^{NS}
7.	Family education	0.169*	0.995	1.179^{NS}
8.	Scientism	0.329*	0.295	3.318*
9.	Job preference	0.182*	0.028	0.786^{NS}
10.	Annual expenditure	0.321*	0.331	2.895^{NS}
11.	Mass media exposure	0.472*	2.935	2.796*
12.	Information seeking behavior	0.529*	3.149	3.199*
13.	Risk orientation	0.209*	2.395	2.948*

Note: *Significant at p = 0.05 level, NS= Non-Significant, R^2=0.5815

reported that television was being viewed more as a source of entertainment than education and information.

Channels preference of students

The findings regarding channels preferred in television by the respondents are presented in Table 3.
Results pertaining to news channels showed that majority of the respondents (66.42%) watched 'Aaj Tak' followed by 'ABP News' (63.50%), 'Zee News' (49.63%), 'NDTV' (45.25%), 'DD News' (30.65%) and 'BBC News' (22.62%). On the other hand, nearly two-fifth of the respondents (37.95%) had preference for 'other' news channels. It also depicts that 'Aaj Tak' was the most preferred news channel between UG and PG respondents with 68.42 and 65.00 per cent, respectively.

As regards to sports channel, more than one-third of the respondents (38.68%) watched 'Star sports' channel followed by 'Ten sports' (35.76%) and 'Other' sports channels (16.78%). When further analyzed, the data revealed that half of UG respondents (50.87%) preferred to watch 'Star sports' channel, whereas in case of PG respondents, one-third of them preferred to watch 'Ten sports' channel (33.75%).

Regarding entertainment channels, almost two-third of the respondents (70.80%) watched 'Channel V' followed by 'Set Max' (63.50%), 'Star Gold' (61.31%), '9XM' (59.12%), 'Star Plus' (59.12%), 'Sony' (56.20%), 'Zee TV' (53.28%), 'Zee Cinema' (49.63%), 'MTV' (47.44%), 'UTV Bindaas' (45.98%), 'Colors' (45.95%), 'Star Movies' (38.68%), 'Others' (36.49%) and DD-1 was the least watched T.V. channel among these channels (27.73%). But when compared across the bar, more than two-third of the PG respondents (73.75%) preferred to watch 'Channel V', which was more than that of UG respondents (66.66%).

With regard to informative and other channels, more than half of the respondents (56.93%) watched 'Discovery' channel followed by 'National Geography' (46.71%) and 'Cartoon Network' (43.06%). When further analyzed, the data revealed that majority of the UG respondents (75.43%) preferred to watch 'Discovery' channel, which was more than that of PG respondents (43.75%).

This showed that most of the respondents preferred to watch Aaj Tak, Star sports, Channel V and Discovery channels. This might be due to the fact that these channels were leading in their respective fields for their aggressive journalism, innovative programming and cutting edge reporting.

Television viewing pattern

Data in Table 4 showed that majority of the students watched television for entertainment purpose ranked 1st with highest weighted mean score (WMS) 1.31. This was followed by news, current affair information, sports programmes, educational purpose, political events and agricultural programmes ranked 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th with WMS 1.23, 1.14, 1.05, 1.02, 0.62 and 0.59, respectively. It reflected that most of the students watched television for entertainment purposes as compared to agricultural and academic purposes. However, students who watch television heavily for entertainment purposes have the potential to affect their academic performances, as they tend to spend long hours on television which makes feel them tired and miss their class the next day (Kubey *et al.,* 2011).

Relationship between respondent's personality traits with their television viewing pattern

It is clear from the Table 5 that the 'correlation coefficient' between the student's personality traits like age, education, medium of schooling i.e., either English or Hindi, schooling (urban/rural), parental income, family education, scientism, job preference, annual expenditure, mass media exposure, information seeking behavior and risk orientation exhibited positive and significant correlation at 0.05 level of probability with their television viewing pattern, while sex of the respondent did not show any significant association. While in case of the 'partial regression coefficient'; age, education, medium of schooling, scientism, mass media exposure, information seeking behavior and risk orientation were found significant. However, sex, schooling, parental income, family education, job preference and annual expenditure did not significantly contribute with their television viewing pattern**.** These findings were partially supported by the report of Murali and Venkatamaiah (2008).

Further, it was also revealed that all the thirteen independent variables in the study jointly contributed 58.15% variation in the television viewing pattern when other factors were kept constant. This means that only 58.15% (r^2=0.5815) of the variation in the dependent variable was due to these independent variables and remaining 41.85% variation was due to other extraneous variables.

CONCLUSION

In current world, television is the electronic carpet that transports millions of persons each day to faraway places. It is a valuable information source used both as an

educational resource and as a leisure activity, which makes the TV an indispensable tool for students. In recent times, one can watch television via the internet, by means of mobile phones and with the help of little pocket TV sets. It is everywhere and for everyone. The results of the study indicated that majority of the students watched TV daily for 31min^{-1} h/day. However, most of the students watched TV for entertainment purpose compared to academic and professional purpose. Therefore, Government and other stakeholders, in the media and educational sector should ensure that quality programmes that promote academic and professional activities are transmitted through various television stations. Moreover, teachers should assist students in evolving a positive patterned viewing habit that would enable them to manage their time rewardingly and develop taste for academic and professional programmes, Workshops, trainings, seminars, etc. should also be organized by education regulating bodies for producers of educational programs and other programs targeting college students to enlighten them on the need not to make profit their priority but to be concerned with values embedded in such programme packages.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors wish to acknowledge the Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar and all students who participated in the study and made the study successful.

REFERENCES

Abrol, U. (1991). Television viewing among children of Delhi school: A recent report. Nipcco, New Delhi. *Communicator*, 27 (2): 14-19.

Khan, M. S., Khan, I., Din, S., Ismail, H. M. and Rafid. K. (2015). The Impacts of ICT on the students' performance: a review of access to information. *Re. Human So. Sci*., 18(2): 24-30.

Khanna, V. (1992). Effeciveness of three modes of communication for presenting information on household sanitation to rural women. M.Sc. Thesis, submitted to PAU, Ludhiana.

Khare, K. S., Thapa, N. and Sahoo, C. K. (2007). Internet as source of information: A survey of Ph.D. scholars. *Ann. Lib. Inf. Stu*., 54: 201-206.

Kubey, R .W., Lavin , M. J. and Barrows, J. R. (2011). Internet use and collegiate academic performance decrements: Early findings. *Journal of Communication,* 51(4): 366-382.

Malik, A.K., Godara, A.K., Yadav, K. and Kumar, S. (2020). Internet usage behavior among agricultural students in Haryana. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 90(7): 1315-1318.

Murali, G. V. and Venkataramaiah, P. (2008). Relationship between profile characteristics of students with their exposure to agricultural websites. *Indian Psychological Review,* 70(2): 91-94.

National Education Policy. (2020). Report to the Farmers. Kisan Ayog. Government of India: New Delhi.

Received: July 25, 2020
Accepted: October 9, 2020