

ANALYSIS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF MAIZE GROWERS IN KANKER DISTRICT OF CHHATTISGARH

K.S. Dhruw, R.S. Sengar, Kedar Nath Yadaw and R.K. Suryawanshi

Department of Agricultural Extension, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur – 492012
(C.G.), India

Email: k2gdnr_03@yahoo.com

Abstract : The present study was carried out in Kanker district of Chhattisgarh to assess the socio-economic profile of maize growers. 120 farmers were considered as respondents for this study. Respondents were interviewed through pre-tested and well structured interview schedule. Collected data were analyzed with the help of suitable statistical methods. The study revealed that the majority (53.33%) of the respondents were found in middle age group and educated up to primary school 35.83 per cent. The maximum (50.00%) number of the respondents had medium size of family and maximum (41.66%) number of respondents had membership in one organization. 42.50 per cent of the farmers were engaged in farming + labours. The maximum (40.83%) number of the respondents was having annual income between Rs. 20,001 to 40, 000.

Keywords : Chhattisgarh, Maize growers, Socio-economic profile, Tribal farmers

INTRODUCTION

Maize (*Zea mays*) is one of the most important crops in world agricultural economy grown over an area of 159 million hectares with a production of 817 million tonnes. In India, it is an important crop next only to rice and wheat and has an acreage around 8.36million ha with a production of 16.72 million tonnes. India ranks fourth in area and sixth in production of maize. As it has yield potential far higher than any other cereal, it is sometimes referred to as the miracle crop or the 'Queen of Cereals' (Anonymous, 2011). The consumption pattern for maize produced in India at present includes poultry feed 52 per cent, human food 24 per cent, animal feed 11 per cent, starch 11 per cent, brewery 1 per cent and seed 1 per cent (Sain Dass *et.al.*, 2007). In our country with the growth in demand of poultry feed the demand for maize is also going up. It is the crop with the highest per day productivity. Some estimates indicate that India may have to produce 55 million tonnes of maize to meet its requirement for human consumption, poultry, piggery, pharma industry and fodder by 2030.

The present study was undertaken with specific objectives to assess the socio-economic profile of the respondents about recommended maize production technology among the tribal farmers of Chhattisgarh.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

The present study was carried out in Kanker district of Chhattisgarh state. Kanker district has 7 blocks, out of which, 4 blocks namely Bhanupratappur, Antagarh, Narharpur, Koyaliberha were selected purposively because maize crop is grown by the maximum number of farmers in these blocks. A list of maize growers of the selected blocks were obtained from the office of the agricultural department of Kanker district and three villages were selected randomly from each block hence a total

number of 12 villages namely Badetopal, Kodagaon, Kalgaon, Shalhe, Dumarkot, Iragaon, Pakhanjur, Devpur, Koygaon, Narharpur, Sarena and Devgaon were selected for this study. 10 farmers from each village were selected randomly. In this way a total of 120 farmers were considered as respondents for this study. Respondents were interviewed through personal interview. Prior to interview, respondents were taken in to confidence by revealing the actual purpose of the study and full care was taken in to consideration to develop good rapport with them. For the data collection well designed and pre-tested interview scheduled were used. Collected data were analyzed by the help of various statistical tools i.e. frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, etc.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Socio-personal characteristics of the respondents

Age, education, caste, size of family and social participation were considered as socio-personal characteristics of the respondents. These characteristics are analyzed and presented in table 1.

Age

It is observed from the table that the majority of the respondents (53.33%) were belonged to middle age group (36 to 55 year), 35.00 per cent respondents were under young age group (up to 35 year) and 11.67 per cent respondents were of old age group (more than 55 year) This finding is in conformity to the findings reported by Kazan and Agunga (1997), Deshmukh *et al.* (2007) and Singh *et al.* (2007).

Thus, it may be concluded that the maximum maize growers were belonging to middle age (35 to 50 year).

Education

Education builds the ability of an individual to seek knowledge understand and utilize things better and hence assessment of respondent's education attainment was essential. When we discuss the data

in table 1 the level of education of the respondents, it was found that 35.83 per cent of the respondents were educated up to primary school level followed by 25.00 per cent respondents were found under the category of middle school level whereas 20.83 per cent respondents were illiterate. 13.34 per cent of the respondents had education up to high school and higher secondary level and only 5.00 per cent respondents had education up to college level and above.

The maximum number of maize growers had primary- middle school level education. It may be because of the fact that primary and middle school are found in most of the villages and the maize growers would have acquired, primary to middle level education attending the schools in their village itself without any need to go outside. Finally result clearly indicates that the majority of respondents were having education up to primary to middle level.

Table 1. Distribution of respondents according to their socio-personal characteristics

(n =120)			
S. No.	Characteristics	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Age		
	Young (up to 35 years)	42	35.00
	Middle (36 to 55 years)	64	53.33
2.	Old (above 55 years)	14	11.67
	Education		
	Illiterate	25	20.83
	Primary school	43	35.83
	Middle school	30	25.00
	High school and Higher Secondary school	16	13.34
	College and above		
	Caste	06	05.00
3.	Schedule tribes		
	Schedule caste	82	68.33
	Other backward class	3	2.50
	General	19	15.83
4.	Size of family	16	13.34
	Small (< 5 members)		
	Medium (6 to 10 members)	53	44.16
	Big (> 10 members)	60	50.00
5.	Social participation	07	05.84
	No membership		
	Membership in one organization	30	25.00
	Membership in more than two organization	50	41.66
	Executive / officer bearer	37	30.84
		03	02.50

Caste

As regarded to caste, maximum number of the respondents (68.33%) belonging to schedule tribe's, followed by 15.93 per cent were under other backward caste, 13.34 per cent respondents were from general caste and only 2.50 per cent respondents belonged to schedule caste.

It can be concluded that majority of the respondents were belonged to schedule tribe.

Size of family

Maximum 50.00 per cent respondents had medium size of the family (6 to 10 members) followed by small size of family (up to 5 members) with 44.16 per cent. However, rest of 5.84 per cent respondents had big size of family (more than 10 members) this indicates that the majority of respondents had medium size of family.

Social participation

Social participation gives an idea about the respondent's participation in social activities. As regard to social participation, maximum number of respondents 41.66 per cent had membership in one organization followed by 30.84 per cent of respondents had membership in more than one organization. There were 25.00 per cent respondents who were having his no membership in any organizations and 2.50 per cent belonged to executive/ office bearer category. This finding is similar to the findings of Yadav (2008).

Socio- economic characteristics of respondents

The independent variables i.e. occupation, annual income, size of land holding and credit acquisition were considered as socio-economic characteristics of the respondents.

Occupation

Table 2. Distribution of respondents according to their occupation

(n =120)			
S. No.	Occupation	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Farming	47	39.16
2.	Farming + labour	51	42.50
3.	Farming + service	10	8.33
4.	Farming + animal husbandry	03	2.50
5.	Farming + business + service	02	1.66
6.	Farming + others	07	5.85
	Total	120	100

Regarding the distribution of occupation, it is observed from table 2. that maximum respondents (42.50%) were involved in farming + labours, followed by 39.16 per cent were engaged in farming, 8.33 per cent were engaged in farming + service,

5.85 per cent respondents were involved in farming + others , 2.50 per cent engaged in farming + animal husbandry and only 1.66 per cent were engaged in farming + business + service.

Annual income

Table 3. Distribution of respondents according to their annual income

(n =120)			
S. No.	Annual income (Rs)	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Up to Rs 20,000	15	12.50
2.	Rs 20,001 to 40,000	49	40.83
3.	Rs 40,001 to 60,000	31	25.83
4.	Above Rs 60,000	25	20.84
	Total	120	100

The distribution of the respondents according to their annual income presented in table 3.

It was found that 40.83 per cent respondents were having their annual income between Rs. 20,001 to 40, 000 followed by 25.83 per cent of respondents had their annual income between Rs. 40, 001 to 60,

000, whereas 20.84 per cent respondents had annual income above Rs.60, 000 and only 12.50 per cent respondents had annual income up to Rs.20, 000. The result clearly indicated that maximum number of the respondents belonged to Rs.20, 001 to 40, 000 annual income group.

Size of land holding

Table 4. Distribution of respondents according to their size of land holding

(n =120)			
S. No.	Size of land holding	Frequency	Per cent
1	Marginal (up to 1 ha)	42	35.00
2	Small (1 to 2 ha)	45	37.50
3	Medium (2 to 4 ha)	25	20.83
4	Large (above 4 ha)	8	6.67
	Total	120	100

Table 4 indicates that the maximum number of the respondents (37.50%) had small size of land holding (1 to 2 ha.), followed by 35.00 per cent belonged under marginal category (up to 1 ha.), whereas 20.83 per cent of the respondents were having medium size of land holding (2 to 4 ha.) however only 6.67 per cent respondents had large size of land holding (above 4 ha.).

It could be concluded from the table that maximum number of respondents belonged to small size of land holding category.

Credit acquisition

Table 5 reveals that majority of the respondents (90.84%) acquired credit, whereas, only 9.16 per cent respondents did not acquire the credit. The majority of the respondents (49.09%) taken the short term credit followed by mid term credit (34.54%) and long term credit (16.37%). It is concluded that the maximum respondents had acquired short term credit, the reason is that the respondents wanted to acquired credit for short term because just after harvesting the crop, they use to deposit their entire loan because until and unless they do not deposit the balance amount of loan, they can not get credit (loan) again from credit agency.

Table 5. Distribution of respondents according to their credit acquisition
(n =120)

S. No.	Particulars	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Credit acquisition		
(i)	Not acquired	10	09.16
(ii)	Acquired	110	90.84
2.	Duration of credit (n = 110)		
(i)	Short term credit	54	49.09
(ii)	Mid term credit	38	34.54
(iii)	Long term credit	18	16.37
3.	Source of credit (n = 110)		
(i)	Cooperative society	39	35.45
(ii)	Nationalized bank	55	50.00
(iii)	Money lenders	07	06.37
(iv)	Friends / Neighbours/ Relative / Others	09	08.18
4.	Availability of credits (n = 110)		
(i)	Easy	76	69.09
(ii)	Difficult	34	30.91

The maximum number of the respondents (50.00%) had acquired credit from the nationalized bank followed by 35.45 per cent of respondents who had taken credit from cooperative society while 8.18 per cent respondents had taken credit from friends, neighbours and relatives only 6.37 per cent of respondents taken credit from money lenders. This table also reveals that the respondents were aware about the facilities provided by nationalized banks and co-operative societies. Out of total respondents, 69.09 per cent respondents were acquired credit

easily whereas 30.91 per cent respondents faced much difficulty at the time of obtaining the credit.

Psychological characteristics of the respondents

Economic motivation

The table 6 shows that the distribution of the respondents according to their economic motivation, it was found that 79.16 per cent respondents had medium level of economic motivation, while 11.68 per cent and 9.16 per cent respondents had high and low level of economic motivation respectively.

Table 6. Distribution of respondents according to their economic motivation

(n = 120)

S. No.	Categories	Frequency	Per cent
1	Low level of economic motivation (up to 17 score)	11	09.16
2	Medium level of economic motivation (18-27 score)	95	79.16
3	High level of economic motivation (above 27 score)	14	11.68
	Total	120	100

$$\bar{X} = 22.81, S.D. = 4.83$$

Innovative proneness

Table 7. Distribution of respondents according to their innovative proneness

(n=120)

S. No.	Categories	Beneficiaries	
		Frequency	Per cent
1	Low level of innovative proneness (up to 21 score)	20	16.66
2	Medium level of innovative proneness (22-32score)	81	67.50
3	High level of innovative proneness (above 32 score)	19	15.84
	Total	120	100

$$\bar{X} = 27.00, S.D. = 5.66$$

The result shows in table 7 that 67.50 per cent respondents had medium level and 15.84 per cent had high innovative proneness towards new maize production technology.

Marketing characteristics of respondents

Weighing accuracy

Table 8. Distribution of respondents according to weighing accuracy of maize produce weighted by the mandi personnel

(n=120)			
S. No.	Categories	frequency	Per cent
1	Weighted accurately	48	40.00
2	Not weighted accurately	72	60.00
	Total	120	100

$\bar{X} = 1.29$, S.D. = 0.73

The findings indicate in table 8. The study revealed that the majority of the respondents (60.00%) said that the maize produce was not being accurately weighted while only 40.00 per cent respondents were

expressed their views that maize produced was being weighted accurately.

Distance of market from the village

Table 9. Distribution of respondents according to distance of market from the village about marketing of maize produce

(n=120)			
S. No.	Distance	Frequency	Per cent
1	0-10 kms	37	30.83
2	11-20 kms	66	55.00
3	Above 20 kms	17	14.17
	Total	120	100

$\bar{X} = 1.33$, S.D. = 1.03

Table 9 shows that maximum number of the respondents (55.00%) had 11-20 kms market distance from their villages followed by 33.83 per

cent respondents had 0- 10 kms distance and only 14.17 per cent respondents had more than 20 kms market distance from their villages.

Support price

Table 10. Distribution of respondents according to support price value of their produce

(n=120)			
S. No.	Sources	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Received produce value on support price	44	36.67
2.	Not received produce value on support price	76	63.33
	Total	120	100.00

$\bar{X} = 1.50$, S.D. = 0.86

The data presented in the table 10 shows that the distribution of respondents according to receiving of support price value of produce. The majority of the respondents (63.33%) did not receive produce value

of maize on support price while 36.67 per cent respondents received produce value of maize on support price.

Mediator's interference

Table 11. Distribution of respondents according to mediator's interference at time of marketing

(n=120)			
S. No.	Categories	Frequency	Per cent
1	Interfered	92	76.66
2	Not interfered	28	23.34
	Total	120	100

$\bar{X} = 1.37$, S.D. = 0.62

The data presented in the table 11 shows that majority of the respondents 76.66 per cent reported that mediators interfered in the market at the time of disposal of maize produce while 23.34 per cent

respondents expressed that the mediators did not interfere in the market at the time of disposal of produce.

CONCLUSION

From the above research findings it can be concluded that the majority of the respondents were found in middle age group having primary school level of education belonged to schedule tribes, had medium family size with membership in one organization. Majority of respondents had farming + labour as their main occupation and most of the respondents belonged to the income category of Rs 20,001 to Rs. 40,000, had small size (1 to 2 ha) of land holding and maximum number of farmers acquired credit for short term period from nationalized bank easily. Maximum number of respondents was having medium level of economic motivation and innovative proneness. Majority of the respondents said that weighing of maize was not being done accurately. Maximum number of respondents did not receive produce value of maize on support price. Most of the respondents said that the mediators interference at the time of selling of produce in the market.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous** (2011). Vision 2030. Directorate of Maize Research, Pusa, New Delhi
- Deshmukh, P.R., Kadam, R.P. and Sindhe, V.N.** (2007). Knowledge and adoption of agricultural technologies in Marathwada. *Ind. Res. J. Extn. Edu.*, **7** (1): 40-42.
- Kazan, D.L. and Agunga, R.** (1997). Innovative farmers a challenge for extension systems world. *Indian. J. Extn. Education*, **13** (1): 46-58.
- Sain Dass; Singh, K.P. and Yadav, V.K.** (2007). Present status and potential of maize hybrids in enhancing the productivity. National Conference on "Doubling Maize Production" organized by IFFCO Foundation, ICAR, DMR, DAC & IFFCL at New Delhi from May 08-09, 2007. pp 13-19.
- Singh, D.; Singh, B.K. and Singh, R.L.** (2007). Constraints in adoption of recommended rice cultivation practices. *Ind. Res. J. Extn. Edu.*, **7** (1): 70-73.
- Yadav, R.K.** (2008). A study on technological gap in recommended mushroom production technology among the farmers of Raipur district of Chhattisgarh state. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, IGKV, Raipur.