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#### Abstract

Mobile telephony is one of the most significant developments ever since taken place in the telecommunications industry. The present study had focused on understanding the impact of mobile phones among the users. The purpose of the research was to study the personal and socio-economic profile of mobile phone users, their knowledge about different function of mobile phones, the utilization pattern of mobile phones used by respondents and the state of use of mobile for different contacts through mobile phones. The ex-post facto research design was used for the study. The study was conducted in the Varanasi district where in as per the objectives BHU was selected purposively as locale of study. The variable selected were age, sex, occupation of parents, annual income of parents, vehicle possession of respondents, awareness and utilization pattern.The data was collected with the help of standard questionnaire. Most of the respondents knew various functions of mobile phone. They were frequently using mobile phone for various purposes. By using the cellular device with skilled and courteous behavior, the respondents (students) can increase the benefits of the device while diminishing the frustrations. The long term affects of this technology on our society have yet to be determined.
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## I. Introduction

In the world of telecommunications, which involves the transmission of one or more signals of voice, data (high-speed and low-speed), video, Internet and fax over short and long distances, there exists three competing and complementary technologies: wired (copper, coaxial-cable and fiber-optics), wireless (fixed and mobile) and satellite The world is fast becoming a global village and a very important tool for this process is communication of which telecommunication is a key player; the quantum developments in the telecommunications industry all over the world is very rapid as one innovation replaces another in a matter of weeks; a major breakthrough is the wireless telephone which comes in either fixed wireless telephone lines or the Global System of Mobile (GSM) communication; communication is undoubtedly a major driver of any economy, emerging trends in socio-economic growth shows a high premium being placed on information and communication technology (ICT) by humans, organizations and nations (NigeriaBusinessinfo.com, 2003).

India is one of the fastest growing economies all over the world and a live example which depicts the development is the growth of the telecommunication industry in India, especially in the field of mobile communication. The Indian telecommunications industry is the world's fastest growing telecommunications industry, with 742.12 Million telephone (landlines and mobile) subscribers and 706.69 Million mobile phone connections as of Oct 31st 2010. It is also the second largest telecommunication network in the world in terms of number of wireless connections after China. The Indian Mobile subscriber base has increased in size by a factor of more than one hundred since 2001 when the number of subscribers in the country was approximately 5 million to 706.69 Million by Oct 2010.

As the fastest growing telecommunications industry in the world, it is projected that India will have 1.159 billion mobile subscribers by 2013. Furthermore, projections by several leading global consultancies indicate that the total number of subscribers in India will exceed the total subscriber count in the China by 2013. The industry is expected to reach a size of 344,921 crore (US $\$ 74.85$ billion) by 2012 at a growth rate of over 26 per cent, and generate employment opportunities for about 10 million people during the same period. According to analysts, the sector would create direct employment for 2.8 million people and for 7 million indirectly. In 2008-09 the overall telecom equipments revenue in India stood at 136,833 crore (US $\$ 29.69$ billion) during the fiscal, as against 115,382 crore (US\$25.04 billion) a year before.

## Role of distance communication tools in human life

Communication is the activity of conveying meaningful information. Communication requires a sender, a message, and an intended recipient, although the receiver need not be present or aware of the sender's intent to communicate at the time of communication; thus communication can occur across vast distances in time and space. Communication is the invisible thread that connects humans. Humans feel connected through
technology only because connection is the main element of technology which speeds up, intensifies and widens communication. The fact that humans are connected in a virtual world through various devices is an invaluable contribution that technology has given to society. Society and technology are in an inseparable state. Society without technology may not accomplish all that it desires but it can be sustained, whereas to uphold technology without society is something next to impossible. Technology has the power to influence society but to what extent, is again dependent on to what extent society can make use of technology.

People have two-fold relationship with technologies, first, the way technologies create people's identities and, secondly, the way people make sense of technologies (Caronia, 2005).

There are various types of distance communication tool. Chief modes of communication were the mail runner, horse courier or special speedy horse carriages drawn by fast-paced stallions, used at times of grave importance and emergency. Then came postal letters, telegraphs, basic telephony and now a days the mobile phones.

## Mail runners

The racial profile of mail runners was confined to mewras or harkaras or sturdy messengers belonging to lower strata of the caste system or tribal origin. Harkara used to wear anklets and the sound of which indicated their arrival. But they took lots of time. Usually there was delay in delivery of message. Messages did not reach to the people in intended time. For urgent letters people had to make their own arrangements at personal cost or await the arrival of the regular messengers and prevail upon them to carry the same.

## Postal communication

After that system of postal communication introduced. The structure was developed as centralized postal machinery with nodal agencies called post offices. The post offices system was divided into separate departments that operated independently, servicing the needs of security, intelligence, supervision and military. Thus, communication needs were categorized according to urgency, secrecy and nature of missive. Modes of conveyance and division of postal work were also fixed accordingly. Postal rules and reforms were created. While transparency was introduced with a system of an open register in public offices for record of all information and reports reaching through post offices, there were plenty of undercover operations and recruits involved at the same time.

## Telegraph

In 1837, Samuel Morse invented the first American telegraph. The telegraph was a device that allowed a message to be sent electrically over a wire. His assistant Alfred Vail invented the Morse code, which became the standard for telegraphic messages. The Morse code uses a standardized system of long and short elements to communicate. In the case of telegraph it was how long the electrical signal was sent. Though use of telegraphs has declined the use of Morse code is quite prevalent even today. Sir William Fothergill Cooke invented the first commercially used electrical telegraph in 1839. Inventors did not rest with the invention of the telegraph. The main problem that plagued inventors was that only one message could be sent at a time by telegraph. This barrier not only limited the number of messages being sent, it contributed in increasing the cost per message. Inventors thus were concerned with harmonic telegraphy, also known as acoustic telegraphy. This involved sending simultaneous messages over the same telegraphic wire. It was this quest that eventually led to the invention of the telephone system.

## Basic telephony

When asked, most people would say that Alexander Graham Bell is the father of the telephone. In reality, however, the invention of the telephone system is credited to a number of people. These included Antonio Meucci, Alexander Graham Bell, Elisha Gray, and Johann Philipp Reiss. Of the four, it was Alexander Graham Bell who managed to successfully patent the telephone as an "apparatus for transmitting vocal or other sounds telegraphically".

Then telephone was invented for the speedy and direct communication. The telephone is something that has become part and parcel of our life. A telephone is any device that is capable of transmitting sound over distances. Before the advent of the electronic phone system or cellular technologies and its offshoots,-instant messaging such as SMS and MMS-man had invented basic mechanical devices that could transport sound via physical media. Early devices in China were built to transport speech through pipes. Another well known device is the string telephone system, which was created by connecting two cups or diaphragms with a string. However the real predecessor of the telephone system was the telegraph system.

The telephone is not only personal, in the sense that private letters are, but it has far greater significance, for the simple reason that human conversations are possible. Conversation is an essential human relationship. It has enabled members of the family to travel, or even to emigrate, not only with increased
security, but with less personal distress. A telephone conversation means far more to, say, a mother, than any letter arriving after three days' delay or even a telegram; a call can resolve uncertainties, doubts, or anxieties and give greater assurance; even if the news told is bad, the truth can be made known. The telephone has contributed to personal mobility in a way no other medium has because the traveller does not have to stay in one place, waiting for an answer, but may continue his journey and telephone later from a callbox or hotel. (Cherry 1974, p. 116). Henry Boettinger notes that 'the telephone was the first device to allow the spirit of a person expressed in his own voice to carry its message directly without transporting his body' (in Pool 1977, p. 205). Alan Wurtzel and Colin Turner note that: 'immediate personal interaction is, in fact, the very form and content of the telephonic medium within the realm of mediated experience no other mode of exchange combines the attributes of instantaneousness and real person-to-person contact' (Wurtzel \& Turner 1977, p. 260). But on the other hand Donald Ball (1968) notes that the telephone is an insistent medium: it is difficult to resist its persistent ringing. Many people feel a sense of urgency in going to answer it. Edward Hall notes that 'Since it is impossible to tell from the ring who is on the other end of the line, or how urgent his business is, people feel compelled to answer the phone' (Hall 1966, pp. 131-2). People who prefer to be alone with their thoughts or families tend to regard the phone as more of an interruption and may consider callers pushy and rude when they could have written a letter instead.

## Mobile phone

With advances in technology, man has progressed from the basic telephone system. Now we have the developed mobile phones. These phones are considered to be cheaper and are cost effective when calling people over long distances. The technologies behind phones continue to grow in leaps and bounds.

## Social impacts the mobile phone has had on society

Mobile telephony is without doubt one of the most explosive developments ever to have taken place in the telecommunications industry. Without doubt, mobile telephony offers enormous advantages and added convenience, greater personal security, and the ability to take advantage of 'dead' time to do business on the move. But the picture isn't all rosy. Like most young technologies, mobile telephony is experiencing its share of teething troubles, including concerns about environmental impact, health and safety, and, of course, the social changes being wrought by a technology which, by making us permanently contactable, is having a profound effect on our interpersonal interaction.

Many cities around the world are becoming blighted by a gaggle of ugly mobile antennae, which spoil once-pleasant views, detract from the authenticity of historical areas, and exacerbate the often already overwhelming presence of intrusive urban infrastructure such as electricity poles, telephone lines, traffic management equipment and signage.

Predictably, environmental complaints have been the loudest in developed countries, where zoning laws, property rights and environmental obligations are often more strictly enforced, and where reliable access to a range of communications services is, in any case, largely taken for granted. Communities in developing countries are, conversely, often so grateful for modern communications infrastructure that they are happy enough (for the moment at least) to turn a blind eye to environmental aesthetics.

## Problem statement

Mobile phone is not just an accessory, but it has replaced many other items as it has become a multiutility device. From maintaining time to setting reminders, from capturing images and sound bites to providing light, its usage is bound to grow further. Mobile phones are now ubiquitous in our lives. On one hand it has many uses like it is used for calling or connecting with people, sending SMSs, contacting family, friends, etc. On other hand it has abuses also. What is cell phone abuse? Let's say one is in a public place trying to concentrate on something or having a face-to-face conversation or just enjoying a peaceful moment when a stranger 5-10 feet away starts talking on his or her cell phone. If, as a result, one's concentration is broken or conversation is interrupted or peaceful 1 moment ruined or one is otherwise disturbed, then consider oneself the victim of cell phone abuse. So to find out the answers of the questions like-what is the purpose of mobile phone use? What are the benefits of mobile phones? What type of problems one have to face during use of mobile phones? What are the states of use of mobile phones? and like. Therefore to get the answers of these unanswered questions and after discussion with the supervisor the present study was entitled as "Use and abuse of mobile phones". The objectives of study are as follow:

## Objectives of study

1. To study the personal and socio-economic profile of mobile phone users (respondents).
2. To study the knowledge about different function of mobile phones among respondents.
3. To study the utilization pattern of mobile phones used among respondents.
4. To study the state of use of mobile for different contacts through mobile phones.

## Significance of Study

The findings of the study may throw light on different uses and abuses of mobile phones. The results of this study will provide guidance for students as well professional workers of all types with respect to acceptable practices of cell phone use in the workplace. By establishing clear guidelines concerning phone etiquette and defining what levels of connectivity are necessary for specific levels of responsibility, methods and expectations of workplace communications can be managed effectively. The findings may lead suggestions for improvement in use of mobile phones and to escape from abuses.

## Limitations of the study

The entire sociological and academic researchers are subjected to certain limitations, where present study is not an exception. Following barriers are faced during the study of use and abuse of mobile phones:

1. The study had the limitation of time as it being an academic research under a degree programme.
2. The locale of study is in BHU campus among undergraduate students of one institute of city area of Varanasi.
3. Limitation of finances and resources available at the disposal of a single investigator.
4. Present study was based upon individuals' perception and expressed opinions of the respondents.

## II. Result And Discussions

The chapter presents the results and discussion of study. The collected data was classified and tabulated systematically and scientifically in view of the objectives of the study. The data presented in tables are discussed. The results on the basis of processing the collected data have been presented in following sections objective wise.
Section-1 Personal and socio-economic profile of respondents.
Section-2 Knowledge about different function of mobile phones.
Section-3 The utilization pattern of mobile phones used by respondents.
Section-4 The state of use of mobile for different contacts through mobile phones.

## Section-1 Personal and socio-economic profile of respondents.

The section deals with the Personal and socio-economic profile of the selected respondents. The relevant variables were selected based upon the discussion made with eminent sociological as well as extension scientists. The relevant data according to the selected variables were tabulated and analysed and presented as here under.

### 4.1.1 Age category

Age is an important factor in acquisition of awareness and maturity in thinking among individual. There are two types of ages - mental age and chronological age.

Here under the study Chronological age was taken into account for the measurement in view of Objectives of study. The collected data on the age of respondents was tabulated in four groups. Since the respondents were students therefore their age was varied between 17 to 25 years. The distribution of the respondents according to their age category has been presented in Table No.4.1.1

Table No.4.1.1: Distribution of respondents according to their age group

| S.N. | Age category (Years) | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }^{\text {st }} \text { year }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ |
| 1. | 17-19 | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (17.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | 20-22 | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (74.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \\ (90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | 23-25 | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (8.55) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \hline 35 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)

The Table 4.1.1 indicates that the age category between17-19 years were represented by only from B.Sc. Ag. $1^{\text {st }}$ year students and their percentage were 17.17 only. The age category between 20-22 years was of B.Sc. Ag. $2^{\text {nd }}$ year followed by first, third year and fourth year. Their percentage was $90,74.18,70$, and 40, respectively. The respondents' age between 23-25 years was maximum found among fourth year and then percentage was 60 followed by 30 per cent respondents of third year, 10 per cent from second year and 8.55 per cent from first year. It may be concluded that there was representation from all this three age categories which was logical and balanced for the study.

### 4.1.2 Sex category

The sex is most important factor which reflects the sample has been selected with care to have the representation of both the group- male and female. It also refers the state of awareness about use and abuse of mobile phones among both groups.

Table 4.1.2: Distribution of respondents according to their sex category

| S.N | Sex category | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 1^{\text {st }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| 1. | Male | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (51.45) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (53.84) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Female | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (48.55) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (46.15) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.99) \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
The Table 4.1.2 reveals that majority 53.84 per cent of respondents of all four years were male followed by 46.15 per cent respondents were female. As far as year wise distribution was concerned, 70 per cent respondents of second year were males followed by 60 per cent respondents of fourth year, 51.45 per cent respondents of first year and 40 per cent respondents of third year were male. As far as year wise distribution of females was concerned majority 60 per cent respondents of third year were female followed by 48.55 per cent respondents of first year, 40 per cent respondents of fourth year and 30 per cent respondents of second year. It may be concluded that there was scientifically justified and balanced representation of respondents of every selected sex category.

Table 4.1.3: Distribution of respondents according to their parental occupation

| S.N | Parental occupation Category | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. 1 }^{\text {st }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ |
| 1. | Farming | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (22.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Business | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (5.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Govt./Private Service | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (71.42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.98) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)

Table 4.1.3 represents that the farming as major occupation was found among the parents of respondents of fourth year and third year followed by first year and second year. Their percentage was 30,30 , 22.85 and 20, respectively. The parents of the respondents of first year had service as major occupation followed by the respondents of fourth year, second year and third year. Their percentages were 70,40 and 30, respectively. The parents of the respondents of third year had business as major occupation followed by the respondents of second year, third year and fourth year. Their percentages were $50,30,5.71$, and 0 , respectively. This clearly indicates the selected sample had balanced representation of the entire professional category.

Table 4.1.4: Distribution of respondents according to their Annual parental income

| S.N | IncomeCategory(Annual in Rs.) | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. }{ }^{\text {st t }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ |
| 1. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Low } \\ <15,000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (11.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Medium $15,000-30,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 14 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | High Above 30,000 | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (48.57) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
The Table 4.1.4 shows that the low income was found among majority of the respondents of second year followed by third year, first year and fourth year. Their percentages were $60,40,11.42$ and 10 , respectively. As far as medium income group was concerned, maximum 70 per cent were of B.Sc. Ag.fourth year followed by 60 per cent of third year, 40 per cent from first year and 30 per cent from second year. The high incomes among the parents of respondents were found maximum among first year followed by fourth year, second year and third year. Their percentages were $48.57,20,10$ and 0 , respectively. So this is clearly stated that sample had balance and fulfils view of respondents in their income category.

Table No.4.1.5: Distribution of respondents according to their possession of vehicle

| S.N | Vehicle | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } \text { 1 }^{\text {st }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Two wheeler | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (11.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (13.8) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Bicycle | $\begin{gathered} \hline 24 \\ (68.57) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46 \\ (70.76) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | None | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (15.38) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.99) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.94) \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
The Table 4.1.5 reveals that the majority 70.76 per cent of respondents of all the four years had the bicycle followed by 13.8 per cent respondents had the motorized two wheeler and 15.18 per cent respondents had no personal conveyance. As far as the year wise distribution of conveyance was concerned, 80 per cent each of respondents of the third year and fourth year had the bicycle. Whereas 68.75 per cent and 60 per cent
respondents of first year and second year had bicycle, respectively. It may be concluded that 80 per cent of respondents of first year and second year had their own conveyance where as 100 per cent and 90 per cent of third year and fourth year respectively had their own conveyance.

Table No.4.1.6: Distribution of respondents according to their parental possession of landline connection

| S.N | Landline connection | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=35)}{ } \mathrm{B.Sc}^{\text {st }} \text { year }$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } \mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (n=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Have | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (8.57) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (12.30) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Don't have | $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (91.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \\ (90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \\ (90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57 \\ (87.69) \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
The Table 4.1.6 shows that only 12.3 percent respondents had the landline connection. As far as year wise distribution was concerned 30 per cent respondents of fourth year had the landline connection followed by 10 per cent each of respondent of second year and third year and only 8.57 per cent respondent of first year had landline connection. It may be concluded that, since the majority of respondents are from rural background in the specific discipline of agriculture they do not have the facility of landline connection one or the other reasons and of alternate mobile connection of correspondence were found most common among the parents of respondents.

Table No.4.1.7: Distribution of respondents according to make of mobile in their possession

| S.N | Make of mobile | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{ }{ }^{\text {B.Sc. } 1^{\text {st }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. 2 }{ }^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Nokia | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (65.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46 \\ (70.76) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Samsung | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (20.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (12.30) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Others | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (14.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (16.92) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.91) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
The Table 4.1.7 reveals that the majority 70.76 per cent of respondents of all the four years had the nokia model followed by 12.30 per cent respondents had the Samsung model and 16.92 per cent respondents had other models of mobile phones such as Lg , Motorola, sony ericsson etc. As far as the year wise distribution of mobile phone model was concerned, 80 per cent each of respondents of the second year and third year had nokia mobile. Whereas 70 per cent and 65.71 per cent respondents of fourth year and first year had nokia mobile, respectively. It may be concluded that nokia mobile was more popular among the respondents.

Table No.4.1.8: Distribution of respondents according to their possession of network of mobile

| S.N | Mobile phone Network | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | B.Sc. ${ }^{\text {st }}$ year ( $\mathrm{n}=35$ ) | B.Sc. $2^{\text {nd }}$ year ( $\mathrm{n}=10$ ) | B.Sc. $3^{\text {rd }}$ year ( $\mathrm{n}=10$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| 1. | Bsnl | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (20.40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (9.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (21.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 19 \\ (21.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Idea | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (16.32) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (9.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (26.31) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (17.97) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Vodafone | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (10.20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5.26) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (6.74) \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Airtel | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (16.32) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (27.27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (14.60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | Reliance cdma | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (9.09) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (3.37) \end{gathered}$ |
| 6. | Reliance gsm | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (22.44) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (27.27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (15.78) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (23.57) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 7. | Tata docomo | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (4.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (9.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.52) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (5.61) \end{gathered}$ |
| 8. | Tata indicom | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (9.09) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.12) \end{gathered}$ |
| 9. | Any other | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (8.16) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (6.74) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 49 \\ (99.99) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (99.99) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 19 \\ (99.95) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 89 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
The Table 4.1.8 highlights that the majority 23.57 per cent of respondents of all the four years had the reliance gsm network closely followed by 21.34 per cent respondents had the bsnl network, 17.97 respondents had idea network, 14.60 per cent respondents had airtel network, 6.74 per cent respondents had Vodafone network, 5.61 per cent respondents had tata docomo network, 3.37 per cent respondents had reliance cdma network and only 1.12 per cent respondents had the tata indicom network. As far as the year wise distribution of mobile phone network was concerned, 40 per cent respondents of third year had reliance gsm network followed by 31.42 per cent respondents of first year had reliance gsm network and 30 per cent each of respondents of the second year and fourth year had reliance gsm network. It may be concluded that reliance gsm network was most preferred mobile network among the respondents.

Table No.4.1.9: Distribution of respondents according to their satisfaction with current mobile network

| S.N | Satisfaction | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institite of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 1^{\text {st }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| 1. | Satisfied | $\begin{gathered} \hline 29 \\ (82.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 55 \\ (84.61) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Dissatisfied | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (7.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (15.38) \end{gathered}$ |
|  Total 35 10 10 10 <br>   $(99.99)$ $(100)$ $100)$ 65 <br>   $(100)$ $(99.99)$   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
The Table 4.1.9 shows that the majority 55 per cent of respondents of all the four years was satisfied from their mobile phone network and only 15.38 per cent of respondents were not satisfied by their mobile phone network. As far as the year wise distribution of respondents according to the satisfaction from mobile phone network was concerned, 100 per cent each of respondents of the second year and fourth year were satisfied. Whereas 82.65 per cent and 60 per cent respondents of first year and third year were satisfied from their mobile phone network, respectively. It may be concluded that the respondents were satisfied from their mobile network.

Table No.4.1.10: Distribution of respondents according to their possession of number of mobile phone connection

| S.N | Number of mobile phone connection | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. } \text { 1 }^{\text {st t }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } \mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | 1 | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (57.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 41 \\ (63.07) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | 2 | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (34.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (27.69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | >2 | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (8.57) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (9.23) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
The Table 4.1 .10 shows that the majority 63.07 per cent of respondents of all the four years had singe mobile connection followed by 27.69 per cent respondents had two mobile connection and only 9.23 per cent respondents had more than two mobile phone connections. As far as the year wise respondents was concerned, 100 per cent respondents of the third year had single mobile connection followed by 70 per cent from second year, 57.14 per cent from first year and 40 per cent from fourth year had single mobile phone connection, respectively. It may concluded that majority of respondents used to had single mobile connection

Table No.4.1.11: Distribution of respondents according to frequency of change of mobile phone

| S.N | Duration | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. } \mathbf{1}^{\text {st }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } \mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Every 2-3 year | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (37.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (36.9) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Every other year | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (12.30) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Every other month | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.53) \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Every other week | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.53) \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | Always have the same phone | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (54.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (47.69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
The Table 4.1 .11 shows that the majority 47.69 per cent of respondents of all the four years always had the same mobile phone followed by 36.90 per cent respondents changed their mobile phone every 2-3 year, 12.30 per cent respondents had changed mobile phone every other year and each of 1.53 per cent respondents had changed their mobile phone either every other month or every other week. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 60 per cent respondents of the second year had always the same mobile phone followed by 54.28 per cent from first year, 50 per cent from third year and 10 per cent from fourth year always had same mobile phone. It may be concluded that majority of respondents do not change mobile phone.

Table No.4.1.12: Distribution of respondents according to the number of person communicated through mobile phones

| S.N | No. of persons | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | B.Sc. $1^{\text {st }}$ year ( $\mathrm{n}=35$ ) | B.Sc. $2^{\text {nd }}$ year ( $\mathrm{n}=10$ ) | B.Sc. $3^{\text {rd }}$ year ( $\mathrm{n}=10$ ) | B.Sc. $4^{\text {th }}$ year ( $\mathrm{n}=10$ ) | Total |
| 1. | 1-10 | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (71.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 49 \\ (75.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | 11-20 | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (14.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (13.84) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | >21 | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (14.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (10.76) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.98) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.98) \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table No.4.1.12 shows that the majority 75.38 per cent of respondents of all the four years communicated with 1-10 persons followed by 13.84 per cent respondents communicated with 11-20 persons and only 10.76 per cent respondents communicated with more than 21 persons. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 80 per cent each of respondents of the second year, third year and fourth year were communicated with 1-10 persons by 71.42 per cent from first year, communicated with 1-10 persons. It may be concluded that majority of respondents do not communicate with more than ten person.

Table No.4.1.13: Distribution of respondents according to according to their interest in reading their itemized bills that list their communication

| S.N. | Interest | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }}{ }^{\text {st thear }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Yes in details | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (17.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 13 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Yes to see how I communicate | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (23.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (18.46) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Only to check if the bill is correct | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (22.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (21.53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | No | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (34.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 26 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.1.13 highlights that the majority 40 per cent of respondents of all the four years were not interested in reading their itemized bills that list their communication followed by 21.53 per cent respondents were interested only to check the bills was correct closely followed by 20 per cent of respondents were interested in reading their itemized bills in details, 18.46 per cent of respondents were interested in reading their itemized bills to saw how they communicate. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 80 per cent respondents of second were not interested in reading their itemized bills followed by 34.28 per cent respondents of first year were not interested in reading their itemized bills, 30 per cent respondents of the third year and 20 per cent of respondents from fourth year were not interested in reading their itemized bills. It may be concluded that respondents were not interested in reading their itemized bills that list their communication.

Table No.4.1.14: Distribution of respondents according to the money spent on mobile services per month

| S.N | Money | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | B.Sc. $1^{\text {st }}$ year ( $\mathrm{n}=35$ ) | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| 1. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Low } \\ & <250 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (68.57) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (61.53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Medium } \\ & 250-500 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (22.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (32.30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { High } \\ & >500 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (8.57) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (6.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)

Table 4.1.14 shows money spent on mobile services per month by the respondents. The money spent on mobile services per month were categorized as low (<Rs.250), medium (Rs. 250-500) and high (> Rs. 500). This table depicts that maximum number of respondents spent less than Rs. 250 on mobile services per month and percentage was 61.53 . While 32.30 per cent respondents spent Rs.250-500 on mobile services per month and only 6.15 per cent respondents spent more than Rs. 500 on mobile services per month. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 70 per cent respondents of second year spent less than Rs. 250 on mobile services per month followed by 68.57 per cent of respondents from first year, 60 per cent of respondents from fourth year and 30 per cent of respondents from third year spent less than Rs. 250 on mobile services per month. It may be concluded that respondents were not interested in reading their itemized bills that list their communication.

Table No.4.1.15: Distribution of respondents according to the essentiality of mobile phones in their life

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.1.15 highlights that for the majority 86.15 per cent of respondents of all the four years mobile phones were very much essential where as for the 13.84 per cent of respondents mobile phones were not much essential. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, for the 100 per cent respondents of third year mobile phones were very much essential followed by for the 90 per cent respondents of second year, 85.71 per cent respondents of the first year and 70 per cent of respondents from fourth year mobile phones were very much essential. It may be concluded that mobile phone was very much essential for the respondents.

Table No.4.1.16: Distribution of respondents according to their habit of giving miss call

| S.N | Habit of giving miss call | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }^{\text {st t }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. }^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | yes | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (51.42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (53.84) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |


| 2. | No | 17 <br> $(48.57)$ | 5 <br> $(50)$ | 1 <br> $(10)$ | 7 | $(70)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.1.16 shows that the majority 53.84 per cent of respondents of all the four years had habit of giving miss call where as 46.15 per cent respondents had not habit of giving miss call. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 90 per cent respondents of third year had habit of giving miss call followed by for the 51.42 per cent respondents of first year, closely followed by 50 per cent respondents of the second year and 30 per cent of respondents from fourth year had habit of giving miss call. It may be concluded that most of the respondents had the habit of giving miss call.

Table No.4.1.17: Distribution of respondents according to purpose of giving miss call

| S.N | Purpose | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }} \text {. st year }$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. 2 }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } \mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. }{ }^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ |  |
| 1. | Convey good morning | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (8.31) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (16.67) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (15.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (10.86) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Convey good night | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (8.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (15.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (8.69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Please call back | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (66.66) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (66.66) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (69.23) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (69.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | any other | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (16.66) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (16.67) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (10.86) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (99.94) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46 \\ (99.91) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.1.17 reveals that the majority of 69.50 per cent of respondents of all the four years gave miss call for purpose of call back followed by each of 10.86 per cent respondents gave miss call to convey good morning message and 8.69 per cent of respondents gave miss call to convey good night message. It may be concluded that main purpose for giving miss call was for call back.

Table No.4.1.18: Distribution of respondents according to habit of receiving unknown numbers

| S.N | Acceptance of unknown calls | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }^{\text {st }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Accepted | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (68.57) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45 \\ (69.23) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Not accepted | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (31.42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (30.72) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.95) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.1.18 reveals that the majority 69.23 per cent of respondents of all the four years accepted unknown numbers where as 30.27 per cent respondents did not accept unknown numbers. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 80 per cent respondents of third year were accept unknown numbers followed by 70 pe rcent respondents of second year, 68.57 per cent respondents of the first year and 60 per cent of respondents from fourth year respectively accepted unknown numbers. It may be concluded that respondents accept unknown numbers.

Objective- 2 : To study the knowledge about different function of mobile phones.
Table No. 4.2.1 Distribution of respondents according to purpose of use of mobile phones

| S.N | Purpose of use | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. 1 }{ }^{\text {st }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| 1. | Call | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (53.57) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (52.63) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (45.45) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ (51.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Sms | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (37.49) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \\ (45) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (47.36) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (45.45) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49 \\ (41.88) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Wap (mobile internet) | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (8.92) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (9.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (6.83) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Mms | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 56 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (99.90) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 117 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.2.1 reveals that the majority of 51.28 per cent of respondents of all the four years had used mobile phone for call purpose, followed by 41.88 per cent respondents had used mobile phone for sms and 6.83 per cent respondents had used mobile phone for internet purpose. It may be concluded that the mobile phones by the respondents were mainly used for the purpose of call.

Table No. 4.2.2: Distribution of respondents according to their fluency in using mobile

| S.N | Fluency | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. } \mathbf{1}^{\text {st }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | More proficient | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (17.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 15 \\ (23.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Proficient | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (62.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (53.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Less proficient | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (23.06) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.2.2 reveals that the majority 53.80 per cent of respondents of all the four years were proficient in use of mobile phones followed by 23.07 per cent respondents were more proficient in use of mobile phones and 23.06 per cent respondents were less proficient in use of mobile phones. As far as the year wise distribution of was concerned, 80 per cent respondents of the third year were proficient in use of mobile phones followed by 62.85 per cent respondents of first year , 40 per cent respondents of fourth year and only 10 per cent respondents were proficient in use of mobile phones. It may be concluded that majority of respondents were proficient in use of mobile phones.

Table No.4.2.3: Distribution of respondents according to their interest in updating of mobile phones (both terminal and application)

| S.N | Interest in updating | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }^{\text {st }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } \mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Very much | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (22.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (15.38) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Much | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (17.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 13 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Least | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (42.54) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 23 \\ (35.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Not interested | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (17.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (29.20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  Total 35 10 10 10 65 <br>  $(99.95)$ $(100)$ $(100)$ $(100)$ $(99.98)$  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.2 .3 presents that the majority 35.38 per cent of respondents of all the four years was least interested in updating mobile phones (both terminal and application) followed by 29.20 per cent respondents were not interested in updating mobile phones, 20 per cent respondents were much interested in updating mobile phones and 15.38 per cent respondents were very much interested in updating mobile phones. As far as the year wise distribution of was concerned, 42.54 per cent respondents of the first year were least interested in updating mobile phones (both terminal and application) closely followed by 40 per cent respondents of second year, and 20 per cent each of respondents of third year and fourth year were least interested in updating mobile phones (both terminal and application). It may be concluded that the respondents were least interested in updating mobile phones.

Table No 4.2.4: Distribution of respondents according to their opinion towards useless function facility personal usage
$N=65$

| S.N | Function facility | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } \text { 1 }^{\text {st }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{ } \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Bluetooth | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (5.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (10.76) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Connectivity with pc | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (17.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (24.61) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Others | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (25.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (26.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Nothing | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (51.42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (38.46) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.2.4 shows that the majority 38.46 per cent of respondents of all the four years felt no function facility of mobile phones were useless for their personal usage followed by 26.15 per cent respondents felt that some function facility other than Bluetooth and connectivity with pc were useless for their personal usage, 24.61 per cent respondents felt that the function facility connectivity with pc was totally useless and 10.76 per cent respondents felt that the function of Bluetooth was useless for their personal usage.

Table No 4.2.5: Distribution of respondents according to their habit of storing the phone number in the phone book
$\mathrm{N}=65$

| S.N | Response | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }^{\text {st t }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } \mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| 1. | Most | $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (88.56) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ \{90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ (58.46) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Some | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (8.57) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (6.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | None | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (7.61) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \hline 35 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.2.5 presents that the majority 58.46 per cent of respondents of all the four years stored most of the phone number of their contacts in the phonebook followed by 7.61 per cent did not store any phone number in the phone book and 6.15 per cent respondents stored only some of the their contacts in the phonebook. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 100 per cent respondents of the second year stored most of the phone number of their contacts in the phonebook followed by 90 per cent respondents of third year, 88.56 per cent respondents of first year and 60 per cent respondents of fourth year stored most of the phone number of their contacts in the phonebook. It may be concluded that not some or few but most of the numbers were stored in the phonebook by the respondents.

Table No 4.2.6: Distribution of respondents according to their habit of storing pictures on their mobile phone

| S.N | Response | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{ }$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | All I have | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (11.42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (15.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Most | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (45.71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (33.84) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Few | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (19.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (25.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | None | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (22.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (24.61) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.2.6 reveals that the majority 33.84 per cent of respondents of all the four years stored most of pictures in their mobile phones followed by 25.14 per cent respondents stored only few pictures in their mobile phones and this is closely followed by 24.61 per cent respondents had not store any picture in their mobile phones. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 45.71 per cent respondents of the first year stored most of pictures in their mobile phones. Whereas 30 per cent respondents of the fourth year, 20 per cent respondents of the third year and 10 per cent respondents of second year, respectively stored most of pictures in their mobile phones. It may be concluded that not all the pictures but most of the pictures were stored by the respondents in their mobile phone.

Table No 4.2.7: Distribution of respondents according to type of ring tone set in their mobile phone

| S.N | $\begin{gathered} \text { Type of } \\ \text { ringtone set } \end{gathered}$ | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }^{\text {st t }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Song | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (22.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (21.53) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Music | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (61.53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Others | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (17.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (16.92) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \hline 35 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.2.7 shows different type of ringtones set by the respondents. It indicates that majority 61.53 per cent of respondents of all the four year set music as their ringtone followed by 21.53 per cent respondents set song as their ringtone and 16.92 per cent respondents set some other type of ringtone. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 80 per cent respondents of the second year set music as their ringtone followed by each of 60 per cent of respondents of first year and fourth year and 50 per cent respondents of third year set music as their ringtone. It may be concluded that music as ringtone were preferred by the respondents.

Table No 4.2.8: Distribution of respondents according to the mode of ring tone set

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } \mathbf{1}^{\text {st }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| 1. | Factory setting | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (7.69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | One from the menu in the phone | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (42.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (53.89) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Bought or downloaded | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (51.42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (35.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Own creation | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (3.07) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.2.7 shows mode of ringtone set by the respondents. Majority 53.89 per cent respondents of all the four year set ringtone one from the menu in the phone followed by 35.38 per cent respondents set ringtone which are bought or downloaded, 7.69 per cent respondents use factory set ringtone and 3.07 per cent respondents set ringtone created by the respondents themselves. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 80 per cent respondents of the fourth year set ringtone one from the menu in the phone followed by 70 per cent respondents of third year, 50 per cent respondents of second year and 42.85 per cent respondents respectively set ringtone one from the menu in the phone. It may be concluded that generally respondents used to set ringtone of their choice from menu.

Table No 4.2.9: Distribution of respondents according to the mode of color scheme set

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }{ }^{\text {st }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. }{ }^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } \mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Factory setting | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (6.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | One from the menu in the phone | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (71.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45 \\ (69.23) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Bought or downloaded | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (16.92) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Own creation | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (5.71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (3.07) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | Not applicable | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (4.61) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.2 .9 shows mode of colour scheme set by the respondents. Majority 69.23 per cent respondents of all the four year had set the colour scheme one from the menu in the phone followed by 16.92 per cent respondents had set their colour scheme which were bought or downloaded, 6.15 per cent of respondents had set the colour scheme as per factory setting and only 3.07 per cent of respondents had their own created colour scheme. While in case of 4.16 per cent respondents this application was not applicable. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 71.42 per cent respondents of the first year had set the colour scheme one from the menu in the phone followed by each of 70 per cent respondents of second year and third year, and 60 per cent respondents of fourth year respectively had set the colour scheme one from the menu in the phone It may be concluded that generally respondents used to set ringtone of their choice from menu.

Table No 4.2.10: Distribution of respondents according to the mode of background set of mobile phones

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }}{ }^{\text {st }} \text { year }$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. 2 }{ }^{\text {nd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Factory setting | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (4.61) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | One from the menu in the phone | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (71.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47 \\ (72.30) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Bought or downloaded | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (13.84) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Own creation | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (5.71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (6.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | Not applicable | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (3.07) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.2.10 reveals majority 72.30 per cent respondents of all the four year set their background one from the menu in the phone followed by 13.84 per cent of respondents had set bought or downloaded background, 6.15 per cent respondents had set their own created background and 4.16 per cent respondents had factory set background. Whereas in case of 3.07 per cent respondents this function was not applicable. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 80 per cent respondents of the second year had set the background one from the menu in the phone followed by 71.42 per cent respondents of first year and each of 70 per cent
respondents of third year and fourth year, respectively had set the colour scheme one from the menu in the phone. It may be concluded that generally respondents used to set background of their choice from menu.

Table No 4.2.11: Distribution of respondents according to the type of screen saver set in the mobile phones
$\mathrm{N}=65$

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }^{\text {st }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Time | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (36.84) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (37.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (35.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Date | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (10.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (33.33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (15.78) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Photo | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (44.73) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (18.75) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (41.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (38.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Other | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (7.89) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (18.75) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (10.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 76 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.2.11 reveals majority 38.15 per cent respondents of all the four year had set photo as their screen saver closely followed by 35.52 per cent respondents had set time as their screen saver, 15.78 per cent respondents had set date as their screen saver and 10.52 per cent respondents had set some other type of screen saver. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 44.73 per cent respondents of the first year had set photo as their screen saver followed by 41.6 per cent respondents of fourth year, 40 per cent respondents of third year and only 18.75 per cent respondents of second year, respectively had set photo as their screen saver. It may be concluded that photo were mostly set as screen saver by majority of respondents.

Table No 4.2.12: Distribution of respondents according to the mode of screen saver set of mobile phones

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }^{\text {st }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Factory setting | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (6.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | One from the menu in the phone | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (6.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45 \\ (69.23) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Bought or downloaded | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (25.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (21.50) \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Own photo/creation | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (5.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (3.08) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.96) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.2.12 reveals that majority 69.23 per cent respondents of all the four year set screen saver in mobile phone one from the menu in the phone followed by 21.50 per cent of respondents had set bought or downloaded screen saver, 6.15 per cent respondents had factory set screen saver and 3.08 per cent respondents had own photo or own creation as their screen saver. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 80 per cent respondents of the third year had set screen saver one from the menu in the phone followed by 70 per cent each of respondents of second and fourth year and only 6.85 per cent respondents of first year, respectively had set the screen saver one from the menu in the phone.

Table No 4.2.13: Distribution of respondents according to have further options for personalization in general

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. 1 }{ }^{\text {st }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \\ \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| 1. | Would love to try them | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (22.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (15.38) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Interested if it fits my needs | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (54.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (55.38) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Interested but seems too expensive | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (6.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Do not care for personalization at all | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (23.07) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.2.13 shows interests of respondents in personalization of mobile phones. Majority 55.38 per cent respondents of all the four years were interested in personalization of mobile phone if it fit with their needs followed by 23.07 per cent respondents did not care for personalization at all, 15.38 per cent respondents were ready to try them and only 6.15 per cent of respondents were interested in personalization in general but they seem too expensive. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 80 per cent respondents of the third year were interested in personalization of mobile phone if fit with their needs followed by 54.28 per cent respondents of first year, 50 per cent respondents of fourth year and 40 per cent respondents of second year, respectively were interested in personalization of mobile phone if it fit with their needs.

Objective 3: To study the utilization pattern of mobile phones used by respondents
Table No. 4.3.1: Distribution of respondents according to subject of mobile communication

| S.N | Subject | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. 1 }{ }^{\text {st }} \text { year } \\ (n=35) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } \mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Finance | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (3.47) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Academic Matters | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (27.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ ((20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (45) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 42 \\ (29.16) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Family Matters | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (35.71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \\ (60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 59 \\ (40.77) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Social Matters | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (22.61) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (16) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (18.74) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | Politics | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.19) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 6. | Sports | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (7.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (5.55) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 7. | Religious Matters | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (5.95) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (3.47) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 84 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 144 \\ (100.05) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.3.1 reveals that the majority 40.77 percent of respondents of all the four years had communication on mobile on family matters followed by for 29.16 per cent respondents had communication on mobile on academic matters, 18.74 per cent respondents had communication on mobile on social matters, 5.55 per cent respondents had communication on sports and 3.47 per cent each of respondents had communication on religious matters and finance, respectively. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned for 60 per cent respondents of second year had communication on family matters followed by 50 per cent respondents of fourth
year, 40 per cent respondents of third year and for 35.71 per cent respondents of first year had communication on family matters. It may be concluded that the subject of mobile communication was family matters among the majority of respondents.

Table No 4.3.2: Distribution of respondents according to length of time period of using mobile phone

| S.N | Time period | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. 1 }^{\text {st }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| 1. | 1month or less | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | 3 month | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (5.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (3.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | 6 month | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | 1 year | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (5.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (3.07) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | 2 year | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (25.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 13 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ |
| 6. | More than 2 years | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (62.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \\ (90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46 \\ (70.76) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (98.43) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.3.2 highlights that the majority 70.76 per cent respondents of all the four years were using mobile phone for more than 2 years followed by 20 per cent respondents were using mobile phone for 2 year, each of 3.07 per cent respondents were using mobile phone for 3 months and 1 year and 1.53 per cent respondents were using mobile phone for last 6 months. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 90 per cent respondents of the fourth year were using mobile phone for more than 2 years followed by 80 per cent respondents of third year, 70 per cent respondents of second year and 62.85 per cent respondents of first year, were using mobile phone for more than 2 years. It may be concluded that respondents were not the new users of mobile phones.

Table No.4.3.3: Distribution of respondents according to their perceived benefits of mobile phone

| S.N | Benefits from mobile phone | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. 1 }{ }^{\text {st }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \\ \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Limited the need to travel | $\begin{gathered} \hline 22 \\ (19.29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4.54) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (6.45) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (16.66) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (15.22) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Promoted interpersonal relationships | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (23.68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (36.36) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (19.35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (16.66) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 46 \\ (23.35) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Assisted me in obtaining academic information quickly | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (19.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (9.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (16.12) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (16.66) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (17.25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Helped me to exchange information anytime the need arose | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (22.80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (36.36) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (32.25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (23.33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51 \\ (25.88) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | Helped me to send messages anywhere there is mobile/telephone coverage | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (14.91) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (13.63) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (25.80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (26.66) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (18.27) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | total | $\begin{gathered} 114 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 197 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)

Table 4.3 .3 shows majority 25.88 per cent respondents of all the four years were benefitted from mobile phone in sharing of information anytime according to the need arose followed by 23.35 per cent respondents were benefitted from mobile phone in promotion of their interpersonal relationships, 18.27 per cent respondents were benefitted from mobile phone in sending messages, 17.25 per cent respondents were benefitted from mobile phone in obtaining academic information quickly and 15.22 per cent respondents were benefitted from mobile phone as mobile phone limited the need to travel. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 36.36 per cent respondents of the second year were benefitted from mobile phone in sharing of information anytime according to the need arose followed by 32.25 percent respondents of third year, 23.33 per cent respondents of fourth year and 22.80 per cent respondents of first year, respectively were benefitted from mobile phone in sharing of information anytime according to the need arose. It may be concluded that the main benefit of mobile phone was sharing of information.

Table No.4.3.4: Distribution of respondents according to problems experienced in the use of mobile phones

| S.N | Problems | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. 1 }^{\text {st }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| 1. | Frequent network/call failure | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (14.56) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (2.87) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (10.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (16.30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | High cost of recharge cards/airtime | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (18.44) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (18.76) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (13.79) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (17.39) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Limited area of coverage | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (8.73) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (10.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (8.69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Occasional scarcity of recharge cards | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (8.73) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (3.12) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (6.89) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (6.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | Lack of privacy in mobile phone shops/booths/kiosks | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (2.31) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (10.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (3.80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 7. | Interconnectivity problems | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (8.73) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (12.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (3.44) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (7.60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 8. | Delay in delivery of text messages | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (16.70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (9.37 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (6.89) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (13.04) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 9. | Queuing up for turn/congestion in mobile phone shops/booths/kiosks | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (4.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (6.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (20.68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (8.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| 10. | Handset interception through duplication of sim cards | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (2.91) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (6.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (3.44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (3.26) \end{gathered}$ |
| 11. | Theft of handsets | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (13.58) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (2.87) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (13.79) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (15.21) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \hline 103 \\ (99.94 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 184 \\ (99.96) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.3.4 revels that the problem experienced by the majority 17.39 per cent respondents of all the four years was high cost of recharge or airtime followed by 16.30 per cent respondents had faced frequent network failure, 15.21 per cent respondents had faced the problem of the theft of handsets, 13.04 per cent respondents had face the problem of delay in delivery of text messages, 8.69 per cent respondents had faced the problem of limited area of coverage, 8.15 per cent respondents had faced the problem of congestion in mobile phone, 7.60 per cent respondents had faced interconnectivity problems, 6.52 per cent respondents had faced the occasional scarcity of recharge cards, 3.80 per cent respondents had faced the problem of lack of privacy in mobile phone shops/ booths/ kiosks and 3.26 per cent respondents had faced the problem of handset interception through duplication of sim card. As far as the year wise distribution of problems faced was concerned 18.76 per cent respondents of the third year had faced the problem of high cost of recharge card or airtime followed a very close 18.44 per cent respondents of first year, 15 per cent respondents of second year and 13.79 per cent respondents of fourth year, respectively had faced the problem of high cost of recharge cards or airtime. It may be concluded that respondents the main problem faced by the respondents was of high cost of recharge cards or airtime.

Table No 4.3.5: Distribution of respondents according to their knowledge about mobile number portability
$\mathrm{N}=65$

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }{ }^{\text {st }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } \mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Know | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (82.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 52 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | Don't know | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (17.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.3.5 highlights that the majority of 80 per cent respondents of all the four years had awareness about mobile number portability whereas only 20 per cent respondents did not know about mobile number portability. As far as the year wise distribution about awareness about mobile number portability was concerned 82.85 per cent respondents of first year were aware about mobile number portability, followed by 80 per cent respondents of each of second year and fourth year and 70 per cent respondents of third year, respectively were aware about mobile number portability. It may be concluded that respondents were aware about the mobile number portability.

Table No 4.3.6: Distribution of respondents according to their opinion about benefits of mobile number portability

| S.N | Opinion | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }^{\text {st t }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } \mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | Yes | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (80.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51 \\ (78.46) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | No | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (20.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (21.53) \end{gathered}$ |
|  Total 35 <br> $(100)$ 10 <br> $(100)$ 10 <br> $(100)$ $(100)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.3.6 reveals majority for 78.46 per cent respondents of all the four years found mobile number portability was beneficial whereas only 21.53 per cent respondents did not find mobile number portability beneficial. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned 80 per cent each of respondents of first year, second year and fourth year found mobile number portability was beneficial followed by 70 per cent respondents of third year were found mobile number portability was beneficial. It may be concluded mobile number portability was found beneficial by the respondents.

Objective 4: To study the state of use of mobile for different contacts through mobile phones.
Table No 4.4.1: Distribution of respondents according to use of mobile phone to call
$\mathrm{N}=65$

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. 1 } \\ (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | several times per week or more | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (51.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ (56.92) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | From time to time | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (48.57) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (41.53) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Once or less per week | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.53) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.99) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.98) \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.4.1 shows majority 56.92 per cent respondents of all the four years call either several times per week or more followed by 41.53 per cent respondents call from time to time and only 1.53 per cent respondents called once or less per week. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned 80 per cent respondents of fourth year call either several times per week or more, followed by70 per cent respondents of second year, 51.42 per cent respondents of first year and 40 per cent respondents of third year call either several times per week or more. It may be concluded that respondents call several times per week.

Table No 4.4.2: Distribution of respondents according to use of mobile phone to be called

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }^{\text {st }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } \mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | several times per week or more | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (71.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44 \\ (67.69) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | From time to time | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (28.57) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (30.76) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Once or less per week | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.53) \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Once | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | Never | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.4.2 shows the use of mobile phone by respondents to be called. Majority of 67.69 per cent of respondents were called several times per week or more followed by 30.76 per cent of respondents were called from time to time and remaining 1.53 per cent respondents were called once or less per week. Whereas not a single respondents were called either once or never. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned, 80 per cent respondents of fourth year were called several times per week or more followed by 71.42 per cent respondents of first year, 70 per cent respondents of second year and 40 per cent respondents of third year were called several times per week. It may be concluded that respondents were called several times per week or more.

Table No 4.4.3: Distribution of respondents according to use of mobile phone for sending SMS

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | B.Sc. $1^{\text {st }}$ year ( $\mathrm{n}=35$ ) | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. } \text { 4 }^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| 1. | several times per week or more | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (40.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44 \\ (67.69) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | From time to time | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (31.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (30.76) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Once or less per week | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (8.56) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (1.53) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.99) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.4 .3 shows majority 67.69 per cent respondents of all the four years sent sms several times per week or more followed by 30.76 per cent respondents sent sms from time to time and only 1.53 per cent respondents sent sms once or less per week. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned 70 per cent respondents of third year sent sms several times per week or more followed by 50 per cent each of respondents of second year and fourth year and 40 per cent respondents of first year sent sms several times per week or more. It may be concluded that respondents sent sms several times per week or more.

Table No 4.4.4.: Distribution of respondents according to use of mobile phone for receiving SMS

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. }{ }^{\text {st }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| 1. | several times per week or more | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (28.75) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 41 \\ (63.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | From time to time | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (31.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 21 \\ (32.30) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Once or less per week | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (4.60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.99) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.97) \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.4.4 shows majority 63.07 per cent respondents of all the four years received sms several times per week or more followed by 32.30 per cent respondents received sms from time to time and only 4.60 per cent respondents received sms once or less per week. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned 70 per cent of each of respondents of second year and third year received sms several times per week or more followed by 30 per cent respondents received sms several times per week or more and 28.75 per cent respondents of first year received sms several times per week or more. It may be concluded that respondents received sms several times per week or more.

Table No. 4.4.5: Distribution of respondents according to use of mobile phone for Sending MMS

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }^{\text {st }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(\mathrm{n}=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | several times per week or more | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (5.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (3.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | From time to time | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (8.57) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (10.76) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Once or less per week | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (5.71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (6.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Once | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (6.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | Never | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (77.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48 \\ (73.84) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.4 .5 shows majority 73.84 per cent respondents of all the four years never sent $\mathrm{mms} /$ used mobile phone for sending mms followed by 10.76 percent respondents sent sms from time to time, 6.15 per cent respondents used mobile phone for sending mms once and another 6.15 per cent used mobile phone for sending mms once or less per week. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned 77.14 per cent respondents of first year never sent mms followed by 70 per cent respondents of second year, 40 per cent respondents of fourth year and 10 per cent respondents of third year never sent mms. It may be concluded that mobile phone were not used by the respondents for sending mms .

Table No. 4.4.6: Distribution of respondents according to use of mobile phone for receiving MMS

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }}{ }^{\text {st }} \text { year }$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \\ \text { year }(n=10) \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| 1. | several times per week or more | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (5.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (3.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | From time to time | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (5.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (6.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Once or less per week | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (14.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (10.76) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Once | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (3.07) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | Never | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (74.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (76.92) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.4.6 reveals majority 76.92 per cent respondents of all the four years never received mms followed by 10.76 per cent respondents received mms once or less per week, 6.15 per cent respondents received mms from time to time, 3.07 per cent respondents received mms once and another 3.07 per cent respondents received mms several times per week or more. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned 100 per cent respondents of third year never received mms followed by 74.28 per cent respondents of first year and 70 per cent each of respondents of second year and fourth year never received mms. It may be concluded that mobile phone were not used by the respondents for receiving mms.

Table No.4.4.7: Distribution of respondents according to use of mobile phone for using mobile data services

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }^{\text {st }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year }}$ | Total |
| 1. | several times per week or more | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (14.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (10.76) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | From time to time | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (28.75) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (26.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Once or less per week | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (5.71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (9.23) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Once | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | Never | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (48.57) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.4.7 presents majority 40 per cent respondents of all the four years never used mobile data services followed by 26.15 per cent respondents used mobile data services from time to time, 10.76 per cent respondents used mobile data services several times per week or more, 9.23 per cent respondents used mobile data services once or less per week and only 1.53 per cent respondents used mobile data services only once. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned 50 per cent respondents of second year never used mobile data services followed by 48.57 per cent respondents of first year, 20 per cent each of respondents of third year and fourth year never used mobile data services. It may be concluded that mobile phone data services were not used by the respondents.

Table No.4.4.8: Distribution of respondents according to use of mobile phone for buying ring-tones / logos / games

| S.N | Particulars | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | B.Sc. $1^{\text {st }}$ year ( $\mathrm{n}=35$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| 1. | several times per week or more | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (8.57) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (7.69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | From time to time | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (20.00) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (21.53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Once or less per week | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.53) \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Once | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (14.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (7.69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 5. | Never | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (57.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (80) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (61.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.97) \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.4.8 reveals majority 61.5 per cent respondents of all the four years never bought ring-tones / logos / games followed by 21.53 per cent respondents bought ring-tones / logos / games from time to time, 7.69 per cent respondents bought ring-tones / logos / games several times per week or more and another 7.69 per cent respondents bought ring-tones / logos / games once and only 1.53 per cent respondents bought ring-tones / logos / games once or less per week.. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned 80 per cent respondents of third year never bought ring-tones / logos / games followed by 60 per cent each of respondents of second year and fourth year and 57.14 per cent respondents of first year never bought ring-tones / logos / games. It may be concluded that the respondents never bought ring-tones / logos / games.

Table No.4.4.9: Distribution of respondents according to their posture in use of mobile phone

| S.N | State of use | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{(n=35)}{\text { B.Sc. }^{\text {st }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year }}$ | $\underset{(n=10)}{\text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| 1. | Sitting | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (37.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (8.33) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (31.57) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (28.57) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (29.88) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | resting ahead | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (33.33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (26.31) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (42.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (22.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | Walking | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (45.71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (49.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (10.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (23.80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (36.78) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 4. | Driving | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (14.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (8.33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4.76) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (10.34) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (99.97) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 21 (99.98) | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.98) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.4 .9 shows majority 36.78 per cent respondents of all the four years talked on mobile phone while walking followed by 29.88 per cent respondents talked on mobile phone while sitting, 22.98 per cent respondents talked on mobile phone while resting ahead and 10.34 per cent respondents talked on mobile phone while driving. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned 49.99 per cent respondents of second year talked on mobile phone while walking followed by 45.71 per cent respondents of first year, 23.80 per cent respondents of fourth year and 10.52 per cent respondents of third year talked on mobile phone while walking. It may be concluded that majority of the respondents do not talk on mobile phone while driving but they preferred to talk on mobile phone while sitting.

Table No 4.4.10 : Distribution of respondents according to duration of call maked normally

| S.N | Duration | Frequency of respondents |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institute of Agricultural Sciences, B.H.U |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. }^{\text {st }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 2^{\text {nd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.Sc. } 3^{\text {rd }} \text { year } \\ (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.Sc. } 4^{\text {th }} \text { year } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=10) \end{aligned}$ | Total |
| 1. | < 30 min . | $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (88.57) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ (50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45 \\ (69.20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2. | 30-60 min. | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ (10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (15.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 3. | > 60 min . | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (8.57) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (15.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (99.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (99.96) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

(Figures in Parentheses indicate percentage)
Table 4.4.10 reveals majority 69.20 per cent respondents of all the four years used to talk on mobile for less than 30 minutes followed by each of 15.38 per cent respondents used to talk on mobile phone for 30-60 minutes and more than 60 minutes. As far as the year wise distribution was concerned 88.57 per cent respondents of first year used to talk on mobile phone for less than 30 minutes followed by 70 per cent respondents of second year, 50 per cent respondents of third year and 20 per cent respondents of fourth year talked on mobile phone mobile phone for less than 30 minutes. It may be concluded that majority of the respondents used to talk on mobile phone for less than 30 minutes.

## III. Summary And Conclusion

Man cannot live in isolation or vacuum. The behavior of human association and relationship is integral part of life process. Science and technology has projected number of electric and electronic gadgets to make the communication fast and converting this world a global village. The dream of global village has come true with mobile phone, internet and like. The present study had focused on understanding the impact of mobile phones among the users. Mobile telephony is without doubt one of the most significant development ever since taken place in the telecommunications industry.

Without doubt, mobile telephony offers enormous advantages - added convenience, greater personal security, and the ability to take advantage of 'dead' time to do business on the move. But the picture isn't all glowing. Like most young technologies, mobile telephony is experiencing its share of teething troubles, including concerns about environmental impact, health and safety, and, of course, the social changes being shaped by a technology which, by making us permanently contactable, is having a profound effect on our interpersonal interaction.

The positive use of mobile technologies lies largely in the hands of government, when it comes to environmental issues and safety regulations; in the hands of operators, who can do much to ensure the smooth integration of the technology into our society, both in terms of equipment design and aesthetics, and through initiatives which help train people in mobile phone etiquette; in the hands of employers, who can take pains to ensure staff with corporate mobiles are not abused; and ultimately, in the hands of users, who need to cultivate a greater level of awareness and work to ensure that their phone use does not negatively impact the lives of those around them.

With a little effort on everyone's part, the benefits of mobile use and connectivity should serve to enhance our experience of life, offering us more freedom, and ultimately creating a better society in which people really do feel closer together.
In view of such the present study entitled "use and abuse of mobile phone" was undertaken with following objectives:

1. To study the personal and socio-economic profile of mobile phone users.
2. To study the knowledge about different function of mobile phones among the respondents.
3. To study the utilization pattern of mobile phones used by respondents.
4. To study the state of use of mobile for different contacts through mobile phones.

The ex-post facto research design was used for the study. The study was conducted in the Varanasi district where in as per the objectives BHU was selected purposively as locale of study. Thereafter, undergraduate students from B.sc first year, second year, third year and fourth year of Institute of Agricultural Sciences of B.H.U was selected on the basis of stratified random sampling method. The variable selected were age, sex, occupation of parents, annual income of parents, vehicle possession of respondents, awareness and utilization pattern. The data was collected with the help of standard questionnaire.

## Salient findings

1) The lowest age category 17-19 years was found only from first year and the highest age category 23-25 years was maximum found from fourth year. (Table 4.1.1)
2) Majority of respondents were male. Where majority respondents were from fourth year and majority female respondents were found from third year. (Table 4.1.2)
3) Majority of respondents' parental occupation was service. Farming as major occupation was found among the parents of respondents from fourth year and third year.( 4.1.3)
4) The highest income were found among the majority parents of respondents of first year and the low income were found among the majority respondents of second year. (Table 4.1.4)
5) 80 percent of respondents of first year and second year had their own conveyance where as 100 percent and 90 percent of third year and fourth year respectively had their own conveyance. Bicycle was found as the main conveyance. (Table 4.1.5)
6) The majority of respondents were from rural background in the specific discipline of agriculture they do not have the facility of landline connection one or the other reasons and of alternate mobile connection of correspondence were found most common among the parents of respondents. (Table 4.1.6)
7) Majority of respondents had nokia mobile. Nokia mobile was more popular among respondents as compared to Samsung and other mobile. After nokia mobile phone Samsung mobile was popular among respondents. (Table 4.1.7)
8) Reliance gsm network was most preferred mobile network among the respondents. Majority of respondents had reliance gsm network followed by bsnl network. The least preferred mobile network among respondents was tata Indicom network. (Table 4.1.8)
9) Mobile network connection was good so majority of respondents were satisfied with their network. (Table 4.1.9)
10) The majority of respondents had singe mobile connection but few respondents also had two or more mobile connection. (Table 4.1.10)
11) The majority of respondents of all the four years were not interested in reading their itemized bills that list their communication, some respondents were interested only to check the bills was correct and only few respondents were interested in reading their itemized bills to saw how they communicate. (Table 4.1.15)
12) Majority of respondents had spent less money i.e less than Rs. 250 on mobile services per month whereas only few respondents spent more than Rs. 500 on mobile services. (Table 4.1.16)
13) Mobile phones were very useful among the respondents. However majority of the respondents of third year responded that the mobile phone was very essential. (Table 4.1.17)
14) Majority of respondents had habit of giving miss call which was found among third year and minimum respondents who had habit of giving miss call was found among fourth year. (Table 4.1.18)
15) Respondents were in habit of giving miss call for various purposes but the main purpose of giving miss call was to call back. Maximum number of miss call was given by the respondents of fourth year.(Table 4.1.19)
16) Majority of respondents accepted unknown numbers. The habit of receiving unknown numbers was found maximum among the respondents of third year and habit of receiving unknown numbers was found minimum among the respondents of fourth year. (Table 4.1.20)
17) The main purpose of use of mobile phones among respondents was to call whereas very little number of respondents had used mobile for internet purpose. (Table 4.2.1)
18) Respondents of third year were more proficient in use of mobile phones whereas respondents of second year were less proficient in use of mobile phones. (Table 4.2.2)
19) The majority of respondents of all the four years were least interested in updating mobile phones (both terminal and application).Only a few number of respondents were very much interested in updating of mobile phones. (Table 4.2.3)
20) Majority of respondents of all the four years felt that all the function facility of mobile phones were useful for their personal usage. Some of respondents found some function facility of mobile phones such as bluetooth, connecticity with pc were useless for their personal usage. ( Table 4.2.4)
21) Majority of respondents had stored most of the contacts number in their phonebook. Minimum number of respondents stored only some of their contacts in the phonebook. (Table 4.2.5)
22) Respondents had a habit to store pictures in their mobile phones. Majority of respondents who stored most of pictures in their mobile phones were from first year and the respondents of third year do not store any picture in their mobile phone.( Table 4.2.6)
23) Different types of ringtones were set by the respondents. Music was found as the most preferred type of ringtone set by the respondents. Maximum number of respondents who set music as ringtone were from second year.( Table 4.2.7)
24) The ringtones which were found in the menu were set as the ringtone by the majority of the respondents. Majority of respondents who set ringtone from menu was from fourth year. The ringtones created by the respondents were also set by the minimum number of respondents. ( Table 4.2.8)
25) Majority of respondents of all the four year had set their background one from the menu in the phone followed by the respondents who set bought or downloaded background in their mobile phone. (Table 4.2.9)
26) Majority of respondents of all the four year had set photo as their screen saver closely followed by few respondent who had set time as their screen saver. Screen saver other than time, date, Photo were set by the minimum number of respondents.( Table 4.2.11)
27) Majority of respondents of all the four years were interested in personalization of mobile phone if fit with their needs. Maximum number of respondents who were interested in personalization of mobile phone if fit with their needs were from third year. The percentage of respondents who were interested in personalization in general but they seem personalization too expensive was minimum.(Table 4.2.13)
28) The main topic or subject of communication found among the respondents was family matters whereas the least important topic of communication found among the respondents was politics. (Table 4.3.1)
29) Majority of respondents were using mobile phone for more than 2 years whereas number of respondents who were using mobile phone for 6 months were minimum.(Table 4.3.2)
30) Respondents were benefited in several ways by the mobile phones. The most important advantage of mobile phone found by the respondents was exchange of information anytime the need arose. (Table 4.3.3)
31) The main problem faced by the respondents in use of mobile phone was high cost of recharge cards/airtime whereas frequent network/call failure was another important problem faced by the respondents. (Table 4.3.4)
32) Majority of respondent were aware of mobile number portability. They knew about the mobile number portability. Only a few number of respondents did not know about mobile number portability. (Table 4.3.5)
33) Mobile number portability was found beneficial by the majority of the respondents. (Table 4.3.6)
34) Majority of respondents had used mobile phone to call several times per week or more. However majority of respondents who called several times per week or more were found from fourth year. (Table 4.4.1)
35) Majority of respondents were called several times per week whereas only a few respondents were called once or less per week. (Table 4.4.2)
36) Majority of respondents of all the four years were sent sms several times per week whereas only few respondents sent once or less per week. (Table 4.4.3)
37) Majority of respondents of all the four years received sms several times per week or more and the number of respondents who received sms once or less per week were few. (Table 4.4.4)
38) Majority of respondents had never used mobile phone for sending mms whereas only few respondents used mobile phone for sending mms. (Table 4.4.5)
39) Majority of respondents never received any kind of mms however only few respondents received mms once or less per week. (Table 4.4.6)
40) Use of Mobile data services was not found popular among the respondents. Majority of respondents never used mobile phone data services. (Table 4.4.7)
41) Majority of respondents of all the four years never bought ring-tones / logos / games. (Table 4.4.8)
42) Majority of respondents used to talk on mobile phone while walking. however majority of respondents who used to talk on mobile phone while walking was found among second year and leas number of respondents who used to talk on mobile phone while walking was found among third year.(Table 4.4.9)
43) The maximum duration of call by the respondents was more than 60 minutes and the minimum duration of call by the respondents were less than 30 minutes. Majority of respondents who talk on mobile phone for maximum duration was found among the third year. (Table 4.4.10)

## Conclusion

Our society has adopted the use of cell phone technology at a historically rapid rate. Teens, in particular, have embraced this new technology and show no signs of abandoning it. The long term affects of this technology on our society have yet to be determined. The goal of this study is to verify and draw attention to trends that may be affecting the communication habits and skills of college students. Most of the respondents knew various functions of mobile phone. They were frequently using mobile phone for various purposes. By using the cellular device with skilled and courteous behavior, the respondents (students) can increase the benefits of the device while diminishing the frustrations.

## Recommendation

On the basis of findings of the study the following recommendations may be made:

1. The radiations of mobile we are exposed to be directly related to the time spend talking on mobile phone. For longer calls it is safer and cheaper to call from regular phone.
2. Children should only use mobile phones for essential purposes and keep all calls short.
3. Text messaging is safer than talking on the phone; opt for that whenever possible.
4. Do not use mobile phone while driving. Stop at a safe place and talk.
5. Do not use mobile phone in places where there is lot of electrical equipment, such as hospital and aircraft.
6. Do not bathe with your mobile phone.
7. By covering large areas of mobile phone with our hand we reduce its ability to receive and send signals. The phone than increases its power and transmit stronger radiation to compensate this. So hold the phone as far down as possible.
8. When you are carrying your cell phone, keep the back part where the battery is away from your body, with the keypad side facing your body.
9. Keep mobile phone away from your body when it is in standby mode
10. Use a hands free set. The further away from the body the phone is, the less radiation body is exposed to.
11. Find out the specific absorption rate (SAR) of a mobile phone before you buy it. This is how much radio wave energy is absorbed into the body from the mobile phone. SAR can vary between different types of phones. Mobile phone retailers have a responsibility to make this information available to you before you buy.
12. Only use phone when the reception is strong - this is often indicated by bars of energy on your phone screen. Weak reception causes the phone to use more energy to communicate with the base station.
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