

Agriculture Update

Volume 8 | Issue 3 | August, 2013 | 519-520



Research Note

Study on socio-techno-economic changes of maize growers

■ JASWANT MATWA, N.V. SONI AND GIRISH DESHMUKH

ARTICLE CHRONICLE:
Received:

13.05.2013; Accepted:

17.07.2013

SUMMARY: Regarding the desirable consequences due to the effect of ATMA project, it generates economic benefits which ultimate result in many changes not only in the farming aspect alone, but also in the social aspects. The assessments of benefits in monetary and social values of these aspects have been termed as socio-techno economic consequences (changes). It is evident that effect of ATMA project on maize growers generates tangible agronomical and socio-economic aspects of living.

How to cite this article: Matwa, Jaswant, Soni, N.V. and Deshmukh, Girish (2013). Study on socio-techno-economic changes of maize growers. *Agric. Update*, 8(3): 519-520.

KEY WORDS:
Change, FIGs, ATMA

ATMA is a society of key stakeholders involved in agricultural activities for sustainable agricultural development in the district. It is a focal point for integrating research and extension activities and decentralizing day-to-day management of the public agricultural technology system (ATS). It is a registered society responsible for technology dissemination at the district level. As a society, it would be able to receive and expend project funds, entering into contracts and agreements and maintaining revolving accounts that can be used to collect fees and thereby recovering operating cost.

Maize is the third largest cultivated crop in India after rice and wheat. *Kharif* maize contributes to over 80 per cent of the maize output in the country. About twelve states in India produce maize in significant areas and the yield levels range from 650 kg per hectare to 1650 kg. Maize in India is slowly expanding its presence due to incessant promotion by private companies and animal feed market, to the extent that it is now contributing close to 7 per cent of the national foodgrain basket.

Socio – techno – economic changes (Consequences):

Rogers (1983) defined consequences as the changes that occur to an individual or to a social

system as a result of adoption or rejection of an innovation. He further stated that the increased farm production and higher income were variables.

An innovation has little effect until it is distributed among members social system and put to use by them. Thus, innovation and diffusion are means ultimate end. The consequences following from adoption of an innovation. Consequences have not been studied adequately because (1) change agencies have overemphasized adoption per se, assuming that the consequences will be positive, (2) the usual survey research method may be inappropriate for investigating consequences and (3) difficulties in quantifying consequences.

Consequences are classified as (1) desirable versus undesirable, (2) direct versus indirect and (3) anticipated versus unanticipated. Desirable consequences are the functional effect on an individual or to a social system. Undesirable consequences are dysfunctional effects to an innovation to an individual or to a social system. It is often difficult to avoid value judgments when evaluating, consequences as desirable or undesirable. In fact, many innovations cause both positive and negative consequences and it is thus, erroneous to assume that the desirable impacts can be achieved without

Author for correspondence:

GIRISH DESHMUKH

Junagadh Agricultural University, JUNAGADH (GUJARAT) INDIA Email: girishdeshmukh@ live.in

See end of the article for authors' affiliations

separatibility which frequently occurs. It is usually difficult or impossible to manage the effects of an innovation so as to separate the desirable from the undesirable consequences.

Direct consequences are the changes in an individual or a social system that immediate response to an innovation. Indirect consequences are the changes in an individual or a social system that occurs as a result of the direct consequences of an innovation. Anticipated consequences are changes due to an innovation that are recognized an intended by the members of a social system. Unanticipated consequences are changes due an innovation that are neither intended nor recognized by the members of a social system. The undesirable, indirect and unanticipated consequences of innovations usually go together as do the desirable, direct and anticipated consequences.

Keeping in the view the significance of the sociotechno-economic changes, present investigation was attempted to study the consequences of ATMA project on maize growers.

The present investigation was undertaken in Dahod district which comes under the jurisdiction of Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat. This district is comprised of eight talukas. Out of these, three talukas namely Dahod, Zalod and Limkheda were purposively selected for the study as they have maximum number of farmer interest groups (FIGs) than other talukas. Total 8 FIGS were randomly selected from eight village of each taluka. Thus, total 24 FIGs were selected from 24 villages. From each FIGs of village, five farmers were randomly selected. Hence, total 120 farmers were selected and were interviewed with a structural pre-tested Gujarati version interview schedule with a aim to study the socio-techno-economic changes. Analysis was done on the basis of 120 maize growers.

The findings of the study have been discussed below:

Socio-techno-economic changes

Socio-techno-economic changes are the changes that occur to an individual or a social system as a result of adoption or rejection of an innovation. It is the assessment of changes in terms of socio-techno-economic change aspect. In this study the resultant changes occurred among the maize growers as a result of adoption of maize production technology in the form of socio-techno-economic changes have been taken into account as consequences of ATMA project. The socio-techno-economic changes were measured in terms of eleven aspects namely-change in house hold possession, change in farm machinery, change in saving and

investment, change in food habits, change in clothing pattern, change in housing condition, change in self-sufficiency, change in cropping intensity and crop production, change in annual income, change in land use and change in irrigated area.

From the Table 1 data observed that more than half (57.50 per cent) of maize growers had medium level of sociotechno-economic changes whereas 22.50 and 20.00 per cent had low and high level of socio-techno-economic changes, respectively.

Table 1: Distribution of the maize growers according to their level of socio-techno-economic changes $(n=120) \label{eq:normalization}$

socio tecimo tecinome cintinges			()
Sr. No.	Level of socio-techno-economic changes	Number	Per cent
1.	Low (below 41.87 score)	27	22.50
2.	Medium (between 41.87 to 80.25 score)	69	57.50
3.	High (above 80.25 score)	24	20.00
	Total	120	100.00
Mean= 61.06		S.D. = 19.19	

Thus, it can be said that a more than two third (77.50 per cent) of the maize growers were medium to high level of socio-techno-economic changes. This finding is in line with the finding supported by Patel (2005).

Conclusion:

The findings of this study revealed that majority of the maize growers had medium level of socio-techno-economic changes. That shown the positive impact of ATMA project on FIGs of maize growers. The similar study will be carried out after some interval, More number of FIGs should be formed through NGOs, ATMA etc. for the rural upliftment of the farmers.

Authors' affiliations:

JASWANT MATWA, Department of Agricultural Extension, Anand Agricultural University, ANAND (GUJARAT) INDIA

N.V. SONI, Directorate of Extension Education, Anand Agricultural University, ANAND (GUJARAT) INDIA

REFERENCES

Patel, **B.S.** (2005). Peasantry modernization in integrated tribal development area of Dahod district of Gujarat state. (Ph.D.) Thesis, Anand Agicultural University, Anand, GUJARAT (INDIA).

Rogers E.M. (1983). *Diffusion of innovations* (3rd Ed.)The free press, a division of Macmillan publishing corporation, Inc., NEW YORK, U.S.A.

