SKUAST Journal of Research 27(4): 512-522; (2025)
(*DOI No. 10.5958/2349-297X.2025.00061.7*); NASS rating: 4.88

Research Paper

Socio-economic profile of maize growers in Kashmir valley of union territory of Jammu and Kashmir

Aamir Hamid Shah[1]*, Lyaqet Ali[2], Shijaatt Husain Bhat[1], Fehim Jeelani Wani[3]
Sajad Abdullah Saraf [3] and Tariq Iqbal[4]

[1]Division of Agriculture Extension and Statistics, SKUAST-K, Shalimar; [2]Directorate of Extension, FoA, Wadura; [3]Division of Agriculture Economics and Communication, FoA, Wadura; [4]KVK, Kulgam, Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Kashmir, Shalimar-190025, Jammu and Kashmir
*e-mail: *amirshah11989@gmail.com*

(Received May 28, 2025; accepted July 18, 2025)

ABSTRACT

A study on socio-economic profile of the maize growers was carried out in three districts Budgam, Anantnag and Baramulla purposively selected on the basis of having maximum area under maize cultivation and a total sample size of 298 maize growers was taken for the study. The results revealed that nearly half (48.00 %) of the maize growers were middle aged, one forth (26.51 %) of maize growers had middle level of education, nearly half of the maize growers (45.31 %) had agriculture as their main occupation, nearly half (48.00 %) of the maize growers had medium family size and majority (51.00 %) of the maize growers had small land holding, majority (65.44 %) had small area under maize cultivation, majority (50.67 %) belonged to annual income group II, nearly half (47.99 %) had medium experience in maize cultivation. Nearly half (48.66 %) had low level of material possession, majority (53.70 %) belonged to medium level of livestock possession. majority (66.45 %) of the maize growers had medium level of economic motivation, half of the maize growers (50.00 %) had medium level of innovative proneness. Nearly half of the maize growers (47.65 %) had medium level of source of information, one third (35.58 %) of the maize growers had medium level of extension contacts.

Key words: Extension contacts, maize cultivation, maize rowers, scientific orientation, socio economic profile

Maize (*Zea mays*) is one of the most important food grain crops in world agricultural economy. It is utilized as human food, livestock and poultry feed, raw material for a large number of industrial products and as fodder. It is a staple food in 22 countries, two thirds of the produce is consumed as feed, and a very large number (>3500) products/bye-products can be derived from it (ICAR-IIMR, 2023). As maize has yield potential far higher than any other cereal, it is referred to as the miracle crop or the 'Queen of Cereals'. Globally maize is highly valued for its multifarious use as food, feed, fodder and raw material for large number of industrial products. Maize with its wide adaptability can be grown with elevation ranging from sea level to up to 3000 m above mean sea level. Maize is grown on an area of 188 million hectares in more than 170 countries across the globe with 1423 million metric tonnes of production (Patil, 2018). Worldwide China has maximum area under maize the USA, both together representing 39 % of world maize area. The USA is the top maize producer China, contributing 36 % and 25 % of

world maize production. However, India remained among the top 10 producers of maize in the World since 1961 and presently ranks 6th with annual output of 31.65 million metric tonnes. The United States is by far the largest producer and exporter of maize, with production in the marketing year 2022-2023 pegged 346 million metric tonnes China 260 million metric tonnes and Brazil 115 million metric tonnes. (FOA, STAT 2023). The India's maize production for the year 2022-2023 stands at 35.67 million tonnes on the area of 9.9 million hectares. Madhya Pradesh being the leading producer of maize in India having production of 41.31 lakh tonnes with area 12.77 lakh hectares Karnataka 37.58 lakh tonnes with area 13.40 lakh hectares and Bihar 24.83 lakh tonnes with area 6.69 lakh hectares (ICAR-IIMR,2023). The consumption pattern for maize produced in India includes human food 24 %, livestock 11 %, poultry, animal and fish feed 52 %, starch 11 %, brewery one % and one % as seed, area under maize would grow further to meet future food, feed, and other demands, especially in view of the booming livestock and poultry producing sectors in the country. Since opportunities are limited for further expansion of maize area, future increases in maize supply will be achieved through the intensification and commercialization of current maize production systems. (Anonymus, 2023). The Jammu and Kashmir (U.T) is divided into two agro-climatic zones: humid sub-tropical region of Jammu and temperate Kashmir Valley. Each has its own specific geo-climatic condition which determines the cropping pattern and productivity profile. In Jammu province, a small portion of the land lies in the plains along the borders of Punjab while the rest of the area is hilly, dominates both in maize and wheat production. The second agro-climatic zone Kashmir is also known as cultivator's paradise. The region practically depends on irrigation, which is easily available. A large area of level land has alluvial soil. Extensive elevated plateaus of the alluvial or lacustrine material (locally called Karewas) also exist in the Kashmir valley. These Karewas are productive only in the face of sufficient rainfall or adequate irrigation facilities. Rice is the chief crop of this zone, maize and oat. Maize is cultivated over an area of around 3.1 lakh hectares with the production of 52.7 lakh quintals and productivity is around 1.7 tons per hectare (Anonymus, 2023).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Kashmir valley consists of ten districts namely Anantnag, Kulgam, Pulwama, Shopain, Budgam, Srinagar, Ganderbal, Bandipore, Baramulla and Kupwara. The study was conducted in three purposively selected districts namely Budgam, Anantnag, and Baramulla (having maximum area under maize crop) of Kashmir valley. Further these districts represent all the three regions namely central, south and north of Kashmir valley. From each selected district two subdivisions were selected and from each selected subdivision three zones were selected. The selection followed the non-random sampling method i.e. purposive sampling method having more number of registered growers. From the selected districts, a list of registered maize growers having more than two kanals of land under maize cultivation was prepared in consultation with the respective Chief Agriculture Officers. From that list of maize growers, a proportionate random sample of 298 maize growers in proportion to the total population of maize growers was selected and from each selected district a proportionate random sample through proportionate allocation method was selected covering the total sample size of 298 maize growers. Final selection of the maize growers was done randomly falling under villages of selected zones.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Age: The data presented in the Table-1 illustrates that from district Budgam, 46.00 % of the maize growers belonged to middle category, 34 % to old age group and 20.00 % of the maize growers belonged to young age category. From district Anantnag, 48.32 % belonged to middle age category, 37.08 % of the maize growers in old age category and 14.60 % to young age category. From district Baramulla, 49.54 % of the maize growers belonged to middle age category 34.86 % in old age category and 15.60 % to young age category. However majority of the maize growers 48.00 % were in middle age category 35.23 % in the old age category whereas, minimum number of maize growers 16.77 % were in the young age category.

Table-1: Distribution of respondents according to their age

S. No	Age (Years)	District			
		Budgam	Anantnag	Baramulla	Total
1.	Young (18-35 years)	20 (20.00)	13 (14.60)	17 (15.60)	50 (16.77)
2.	Middle (35-55 years)	46 (46.00)	43 (48.32)	54 (49.54)	143 (48.00)
3.	Old (55 & above years)	34 (34.00)	33 (37.08)	38 (34.86)	105 (35.23)
Total		100 (100.00)	89 (100.00)	109 100.00)	298 100.00)

Education: The data presented in the Table-2 illustrates that from district Budgam majority of the maize growers 33.00 % had middle level of education 23.00 % with high school level of education and 19.00 % were illiterate, 14.00 had primary level of education. 8.00 % of the maize growers with graduate level of education. Only 3.00 % had post graduate level of education. From district Anantnag majority of the maize growers 25.85 % had middle level of education, 21.34 per with high school level of education, 19.10 % were having primary level of education, 14.60 % had graduate level of education which were illiterate 11.24 %, small percentage 7.87 % of the maize growers had post graduate level of education. From district Baramulla majority of the maize growers 30.27 % of had high school level of education. Middle and illiterate people were in equal percentages 21.10 % and 16.52 % had primary level of education 6.42 % with graduate level of education and small percentage 4.59 % had post graduate level of education. However overall look at the table showed that majority of the maize growers 26.51 % had middle level of education 25.17 % with high school level of education, illiterate 17.44 %. Further 16.44 % of the maize growers had primary level of education, whereas minimum number of maize growers 9.40 % and 5.04 % had graduate and post graduate level of education respectively.

Table 2: Distribution of respondents according to their education

S. No	Education	Districts			
		Budgam	Anantnag	Baramulla	Total
1.	Illiterate	19 (19.00)	10 (11.24)	23 (21.10)	52 (17.44)
2.	Primary	14 (14.00)	17 (19.10)	18 (16.52)	49 (16.44)
3.	Middle	33 (33.00)	23 (25.85)	23 (21.10)	79 (26.51)
4.	High school	23 (23.00)	19 (21.34)	33 (30.27)	75 (25.17)
5.	Graduate	8 (8.00)	13 (14.60)	7 (6.42)	28 (9.40)
6.	Post Graduate	3 (3.00)	7 (7.87)	5 (4.59)	15(5.04)
Total		100 (100.00)	89 (100.00)	109 (100.00)	298 (100.00)

Occupation: The data presented in the Table-3 illustrates that from district Budgam majority of the maize growers that is 54.00 % had agriculture as their main occupation, 23.00 % with agriculture and services as their main occupation, 12.00 % of the maize growers with agriculture and business as their main occupation and only few 11.00 % of the maize growers had agriculture and casual labour as their main occupation. From district Anantnag majority of the maize growers that is 37.09 had agriculture as their main occupation 28.09 with agriculture and services as their main occupation 20.22 % of the maize growers with agriculture and casual labour as their main occupation and only few 14.60 % of the maize growers had agriculture and business as their main occupation. From district Baramulla majority of the maize growers 45.31 had agriculture as their main occupation 25.50 with agriculture and services as their main occupation 16.10 % of the maize growers with agriculture and casual labour as their main occupation and only few that is 13.09 % of the maize growers had agriculture plus business as

their main occupation. However overall look at the table indicated that majority of the maize growers 45.31 had agriculture as their main occupation 25.50 % with agriculture and services as their main occupation. The table also revealed that 16.10 % of the maize growers had their occupation as agriculture and casual labour, 13.09 % with agriculture and business as their main occupation.

Table 3: Distribution of respondents according to their occupation

S. No	Occupation	Districts			
		Budgam	Anantnag	Baramulla	Total
1	Agriculture	54 (54.00)	33 (37.09)	48 (44.03)	135 (45.31)
2	Agriculture and Services	23 (23.00)	25 (28.09)	28 (25.69)	76 (25.50)
3	Agriculture and Business	12 (12.00)	13 (14.60)	14 (12.85)	39 (13.09)
4	Agriculture and Casual Labour	11 (11.00)	18 (20.22)	19 (17.43)	48 (16.10)
Total		100 (100.00)	89 (100.00)	109 (100.00)	98 (100.00)

Family size: The data presented in the Table-4 illustrates that from district Budgam majority 46.00 % of the maize growers had medium family size (4-9 members), 29.00 % had small family size (less than 4 members) and 25.00 % had large family size (9 and above members). From district Anantnag majority of the maize growers 48.32 % had medium family size (4-9 members), 37.08 % had small family size (less than 4 members) and 14.60 % had large family size (9 and above members). From district Baramulla majority of the maize growers 49.54 % had medium family size (4-9 members), 33.55 % had small family size (less than 4 members) and 18.45 % had large family size (9 and above members). However, overall look at the table revealed that majority of the maize growers 48.00 % had medium family size (4-9 members) 33.55 % with small family size (less than 4 members) and 18.45 % of the maize growers had large family size (9 and above members).

Table 4: Distribution of respondents according to their family size

S. No	Family Size	Districts			
		Budgam	Anantnag	Baramulla	Total
1	Small (< 4 members)	29 (29.00)	33 (37.08)	38 (34.86)	100 (33.55)
2	Medium (4-9 members)	46 (46.00)	43 (48.32)	54 (49.54)	143 (48.00)
3	Large (9 & above members)	25 (25.00)	13 (14.60)	17 (15.60)	55 (18.45)
Total		100 (100.00)	89 (100.00)	109 (100.00)	298 (100.00)

Land holding: The data presented in the Table-5 illustrates that from district Budgam majority of the maize growers 48.00 % had land holding of (less than 0.30 hectares) 43.00 % with land holding of (0.30 to 1.45 hectares) and only 9.00 % of the maize growers had land holding of (1.45 and above hectares). From district Anantnag majority of the maize growers 57.30 % had land holding of (less than 0.30 hectares), 34.84 % having land holding of (0.30 to 1.45 hectares) and only 7.86 % of the maize growers had land holding of (1.45 and above hectares). From district Baramulla majority of the maize growers 48.62 % had land holding of (less than 0.30 hectares), 35.78 % having land holding of (0.30 to 1.45 hectares) and 15.60 % of the maize growers had land holding of (1.45 and above hectares). However overall look at the table revealed that majority of the maize growers 51.00 % had land holding (less than 0.30 hectares), 37.92 % with land holdings of (0.30 to 1.45 hectares) and 11.08 % had land holding (1.45 and above hectares).

Table 5: Distribution of respondents according to their land holding

S. No.	Land Holding (Hectares)	Selected Districts			
		Budgam	Anantnag	Baramulla	Total
1.	(< 0.30 hectares)	(48.00)	51 (57.30)	53 (48.62)	152 (51.00)
2.	(0.30 -1.45 hectares)	(43.00)	31 (34.84)	39 (35.78)	113 (37.92)
3.	(1.45 & above hectares)	9 (9.00)	7 (7.86)	17 (15.60)	33 (11.08)
Total		(100.00)	89(100.00)	109 (100.00)	298 (100.00)

Area under maize cultivation: The data presented in the Table-6 illustrates that from district Budgam majority 69.00 % of the maize growers had (less than 0.25 hectares) of land under maize cultivation, 17.00 % with (0.25 to 0.67 hectares) of land under maize cultivation and 14.00 % of the maize growers had (0.67 and above hectares) of land under maize cultivation. From district Anantnag majority 57.30 % of the maize growers had (less than 0.25 hectares) of land under maize cultivation, 23.60 % with (0.25 to 0.67 hectares) of land under maize cultivation and 19.10 % of the maize growers had (0.67 and above hectares) of land under maize cultivation. From district Baramulla majority 68.81 % of the maize growers had (less than 0.25 hectares) of land under maize cultivation, 25.69 % having (0.25 to 0.67 hectares) of land under maize cultivation and 5.50 % of the maize growers had (0.67 and above hectares) of land under maize cultivation. However overall look at the table revealed that majority 65.44 % of the maize growers had (less than 0.25 hectares) of land under maize cultivation, 22.15 % with (0.25 to 0.67 hectares) of land under maize cultivation and 12.41 % had (0.67 and above hectares) of land under maize cultivation.

Table 6: Distribution of respondents according to their area under maize cultivation

S. No.	Area under maize cultivation (Hectares)	Selected Districts			
		Budgam	Anantnag	Baramulla	Total
1.	(< 0.25 hectares)	69 (69.00)	51 (57.30)	75 (68.81)	195 (65.44)
2.	(0.25-0.67 hectares)	17 (17.00)	21 (23.60)	28 (25.69)	66 (22.15)
3.	(0.67 & above hectares)	14 (14.00)	17 (19.10)	6 (5.50)	37 (12.41)
Total		100 (100.00)	89 (100.00)	109 (100.00)	298 (100.00)

Annual income: The data presented in the Table-7 illustrates that from district Budgam majority 49.00 % of the maize growers had annual income of (4.10 to 8.37 lakhs), 46.00 % had annual income of (up to 4.10 lakhs) and 5.00 % had annual income of (8.37 and above lakhs).

Table 7: Distribution of respondents according to their annual income

S. No.	Annual income	Selected Districts			
		Budgam	Anantnag	Baramulla	Total
1.	Income Group I (< 4.10 Lakhs)	46 (46.00)	37 (41.58)	49 (44.96)	132 (44.30)
2.	Income Group II (4.10-8.37 Lakhs)	49 (49.00)	49 (55.05)	53 (48.62)	151 (50.67)
3.	Income Group III (8.37 & above Lakhs)	5 (5.00)	3 (3.37)	7 (6.42)	15 (5.03)
Total		100 (100.00)	89 (100.00)	109(100.00)	298 (100.00)

From district Anantnag majority 55.05 % of the maize growers had annual income of (4.10 to 8.37 lakhs), 41.58 % had annual income of (less than 4.10 lakhs) and 3.37 % had annual income of (8.37 and above lakhs). From district Baramulla majority 48.62 % of the maize growers had

annual income of (4.10 to 8.37 lakhs), 44.96 % had annual income of (less than 4.10 lakhs) and 6.42 % had annual income of (8.37 and above lakhs). However overall look at the table revealed that majority of the maize growers 50.67 % had annual income of (4.10 to 8.37 lakhs), 44.30 % had annual income of (less than 4.10 lakhs) and 5.03 % had annual income of (8.37 and above lakhs).

Experience in maize cultivation: The data presented in the Table-8 illustrates that from district Budgam majority 46.00 % of the maize growers had medium experience (6.7-15.7 years), 34.00 % with high experience (15.7 and above years) and 20.00 % with low experience (less than 6.7 years) in maize cultivation. From district Anantnag majority 48.31 % of the maize growers had medium experience (6.7-15.7 years), 37.08 % with high experience (15.7 and above years) and 14.61 % with low experience (less than 6.7 years) in maize cultivation. From district Baramulla majority 49.54 % of the maize growers had medium experience (6.7-15.7 years), 34.86 % with high experience (15.7 and above years) and 15.60 % with low experience (less than 6.7 years) in maize cultivation. However overall look at the table revealed that majority of the maize growers had medium experience (6.7-15.7 years), 35.23 % had high experience (15.7 and above years) and 16.78 % had low experience in maize cultivation (less than 6.7 years).

Table 8: Distribution of respondents according to their experience maize cultivation

S. No.	Experience in maize Cultivation	District			
		Budgam	Anantnag	Baramulla	Total
1.	Low (< 6.7 years)	20 (20.00)	13 (14.61)	17 (15.60)	50 (16.78)
2.	Medium (6.7-15.7 years)	46 (46.00)	43 (48.31)	54 (49.54)	143 (47.99)
3.	High (15.7 & above years)	34 (34.00)	33 (37.08)	38 (34.86)	105 (35.23)
Total		100 (100.00)	89 (100.00)	109 (100.00)	298 (100.00)

Material possession: The data presented in the Table-9 illustrates that from district Budgam majority 45.00 % belonged to low category of material possession (less than 4 implements), 36.00 % to medium category of material possession (4 to 8 implements) and 19.00 % to high category of material possession (8 and above implements). From district Anantnag majority 52.80 % belonged to low category of material possession (less than 4 implements), 37.08 % to medium category of material possession (4 to 8 implements) and 10.12 % to high category of material possession (8 and above implements).

Table 9: Distribution of respondents according to their material possession

S. No.	Material possession	District			
		Budgam	Anantnag	Baramulla	Total
1.	Low (< 4 implements)	45 (45.00)	47 (52.80)	53 (48.62)	145 (48.66)
2.	Medium (4 - 8 implements)	36 (36.00)	33 (37.08)	39 (35.78)	108 (36.24)
3.	High (8 & above implements)	19 (19.00)	9 (10.12)	17 (15.60)	45 (15.10)
Total		100 (100.00)	89 (100.00)	109 (100.00)	298 (100.00)

From district Baramulla majority 48.62 % belonged to low category of material possession (less than 4 implements), 35.78 % to medium category of material possession (4 to 8 implements) and 15.60 % to high category of material possession (8 and above implements). However overall look at the table revealed that majority 48.66 % of the maize growers belonged to low category of material possession (less than 4 implements), 36.24 % to medium category of material possession (4 to 8 implements) and 15.10 % to high category of material possession (8 and above

implements).**Livestock possession:** The data presented in the Table-10 illustrates that from district Budgam majority 49.00 % belonged to medium category of livestock possession (5 to 10 livestock), 42.00 % to large category of livestock possession (10 and above livestock) and 9.00 % to small category of livestock possession (less than 5 livestock). From district Anantnag majority 60.67 % to medium category of livestock possession (5 to 10 livestock), 34.83 % belonged to large category of livestock possession (10 and above livestock) and 4.50 % belonged to small category of livestock possession (less than 5 livestock). From district Baramulla majority 52.30 % belonged to medium category of livestock possession (5 to 10 livestock), 41.28 % to large category of livestock possession (10 and above livestock) and 6.42 % to small category of livestock possession (less than 5 livestock). However overall look at the table revealed that majority of the maize growers 53.70 % belonged to medium category of livestock possession (5 to 10 livestock), 39.59 % to large category of livestock possession (10 and above livestock) and 6.71 % to small category of livestock possession (less than 5 livestock).

Table 10: Distribution of respondents according to their livestock possession

S. No.	Livestock possession	District			
		Budgam	Anantnag	Baramulla	Total
1.	Small (< 5 livestock)	9 (9.00)	4 (4.50)	7 (6.42)	20 (6.71)
2.	Medium (5-10 livestock)	49 (49.00)	54 (60.67)	57 (52.30)	160 (53.70)
3.	Large (10 & livestock)	42 (42.00)	31 (34.83)	45 (41.28)	118 (39.59)
Total		100 (100.00)	89 (100.00)	109(100.00)	298 (100.00)

Economic motivation: The data presented in the Table-11 illustrates that from district Budgam majority 63.00 % of the maize growers belonged to medium category (12.13 to 24.37) of economic motivation, 30.00 % to high category (24.37 and above) of economic motivation and 7.00 % belonged to low category (less than 12.13) of economic motivation. From district Anantnag majority 64.04 % of the maize growers belonged to medium category (12.13 to 24.37) of economic motivation, 25.58 % to high category (24.37 and above) of economic motivation and 10.11 % to low category (less than 12.13) of economic motivation. From district Baramulla majority 71.56 % of the maize growers belonged to medium category (12.13 to 24.37) of economic motivation, 19.27 % to high category (24.37 and above) of economic motivation and 9.17 % to low category (less than 12.13) of economic motivation. However overall look at the table showed that majority 66.45 per of the maize grower's cent belonged to medium category (12.13 to 24.37) of economic motivation, 24.83 % to high category (24.37 and above) of economic motivation and 8.72 % to low category (less than 12.13) of economic motivation.

Table 11: Distribution of respondents according to their economic motivation

S. No.	Economic motivation	District			
		Budgam	Anantnag	Baramulla	Total
1.	Low (< 12 .13)	7 (7.00)	9 (10.11)	10 (9.17)	26 (8.72)
2.	Medium (12.13- 24.37)	63 (63.00)	57 (64.04)	78 (71.56)	198 (66.45)
3.	High (24.37 & above)	30 (30.00)	23 (25.85)	21 (19.27)	74 (24.83)
Total		100 (100.00)	89 (100.00)	109 (100.00)	298 (100.00)

Innovative proneness: The data presented in the Table-12 illustrates that from district Budgam majority 49.00 % of the maize growers belonged to medium category (5.42 to 9.68) of innovative proneness, 30.00 % to high category (9.68 and above) of innovative proneness and 21.00 % to low category (less than 5.42) of innovative proneness. From district Anantnag majority 49.44 %

of the maize growers belonged to medium category (5.42 to 9.68) of innovative proneness, 30.34 % to high category (9.68 and above) of innovative proneness and 20.22 % belonged to low category (less than 5.42) of innovative proneness. From district Baramulla majority 51.38 % of the maize growers belonged to medium category (5.42 to 9.68) of innovative proneness, 29.35 % to high category (9.68 and above) of innovative proneness and 19.27 % belonged to low category (less than 5.42) of innovative proneness. However overall look at the table showed that majority 50.00 % of the maize growers belonged to medium category (5.42 to 9.68) of innovative proneness, 29.87 % to high category (9.68 and above) of innovative proneness and 20.13 % belonged to low category (less than 5.42) of innovative proneness.

Table 12: Distribution of respondents according to their innovative proneness

S. No.	Innovative proneness	District			
		Budgam	Anantnag	Baramulla	Total
1.	Low (< 5.42)	21 (21.00)	18 (20.22)	21 (19.27)	60 (20.13)
2.	Medium (5.42-9.68)	49 (49.00)	44 (49.44)	56 (51.38)	149 (50.00)
3.	High (9.68 & above)	30 (30.00)	27 (30.34)	32 (29.35)	89 (29.87)
Total		100 (100.00)	89 (100.00)	109 (100.00)	298 (100.00)

Source of information: The data presented in the Table-13 illustrates that from district Budgam majority 47.00 % belonged to medium category (6.64 to 10.76) of source of information, 30.00 % to low category (less than 6.64) of source of information and 23.00 % to high category (10.76 and above) of source of information. From district Anantnag majority 47.20 % belonged to medium category (6.64 to 10.76) of source of information, 30.33 % belonged to low category (less than 6.64) of source of information and 22.47 % to high category (10.76 and above) of source of information. From district Baramulla majority 48.63 % belonged to medium category (6.64 to 10.76) of source of information, 29.36 % to low category (less than 6.64) of source of information and 22.01 % to high category (10.76 and above) of source of information. However overall look at the table showed that majority 47.65 % of the maize growers belonged to medium category (6.64 to 10.76) of source of information, 29.86 % to low category (less than 6.64) of source of information and 22.49 % to high category (10.76 and above) of source of information.

Table 13: Distribution of respondents according to their source of information

S. No.	Source of information	District			
		Budgam	Anantnag	Baramulla	Total
1.	Low (Up to 6.64)	30 (30.00)	27 (30.33)	32 (29.36)	89 (29.86)
2.	Medium (6.64-10.76)	47 (47.00)	42 (47.20)	53 (48.63)	142 (47.65)
3.	High (10.76 & above)	23 (23.00)	20 (22.47)	24 (22.01)	67 (22.49)
Total		100 (100.00)	89 (100.00)	109 (100.00)	298 (100.00)

The data presented in the Table-13.1 revealed that majority 49.67 % of the maize growers were never getting any information regarding agriculture from their neighbors/friends, 29.87 % were frequently getting information from their neighbors/friends and 20.46 % were occasionally getting information from their neighbors/friends. Majority 53.02 % of the maize growers were listening to radio occasionally, 19.46 % were never listening to radio and 27.52 % were frequently listening to radio. Majority 56.04 % of the maize growers were watching television occasionally, 25.84 % were never watching television and 18.12 % were watching television occasionally for getting information on agriculture. Further, the data revealed that the maize growers who occasionally visited Agriculture Scientists were 37.91 % 33.90 % who never visited Agriculture Scientists. Whereas, 28.19 % of the maize growers were frequently visiting

Agriculture Scientists for getting information on agriculture. Data also revealed that 37.92 % of the maize growers participated in kisan mela/farmers day occasionally, 31.20 % never participated in in kisan mela/farmers day and 30.88 frequently participated in kisan mela/farmers day. Among all the information sources majority 39.26 % were frequently getting information from social media, 36.24 % were never getting any information from social media and 24.49 % were occasionally getting information from social media regarding agriculture.

Table 13.1: Distribution of respondents according to their overall source of information

S. No.	Source of information	Degree of getting information		
		Never	Occasionally	Frequently
1.	Neighbor/friends	148 (49.67)	61 (20.46)	89 (29.87)
2.	Radio	58 (19.46)	158 (53.02)	82 (27.52)
3.	Television	77 (25.84)	167 (56.04)	54 (18.12)
4.	Agriculture Scientists (SKUAST-K)	101 (33.90)	113 (37.91)	84 (28.19)
6.	Participated in Kissan Mela/Farmers Day	93 (31.20)	113 (37.92)	92 (30.88)
7.	Social media	108 (36.24)	73 (24.49)	117 (39.26)

Extension contacts: The data presented in the Table-14 illustrates that from district Budgam majority 41.00 % belonged to medium category (4.29 to7.33) of extension contacts, 30.00 % to low category (less than 4.29) of extension contacts and 29.00 % to high category (7.33 and above) of extension contacts. From district Anantnag majority 35.95 % belonged to low category (less than 4.29) of extension contacts, 34.84 % to medium category (4.29 to 7.33) of extension contacts on and 29.21 % to high category (7.33 and above) of extension contacts. From district Baramulla majority 38.53 % belonged to low category (less than 4.29) of extension contacts, 31.19 % b to medium category (4.29 to7.33) of extension contacts on and 30.28 % to high category (7.33 and above) of extension contacts. However overall look at the table showed that majority 35.58 % of the maize growers belonged to medium category (4.29 to 7.33) of extension contacts, 34.89 % to low category (less than 4.29) of extension contacts and 29.53 % to high category (7.33 and above) of extension contacts.

Table 14: Distribution of respondents according to their extension contacts

S. No.	Extension contacts	District			
		Budgam	Anantnag	Baramulla	Total
1.	Low (Up to 4.29)	30 (30.00)	32 (35.95)	42 (38.53)	104 (34.89)
2.	Medium (4.29-7.33)	41 (41.00)	31 (34.84)	34 (31.19)	106 (35.58)
3.	High (7.33 & above)	29 (29.00)	26 (29.21)	33 (30.28)	88 (29.53)
Total		100 (100.00)	89 (100.00)	109 (100.00)	298 (100.00)

The data presented in the Table-14.1 showed that majority 37.58 % of the maize growers obtained information regarding agriculture frequently from Junior Agriculture Extension Officers (JAEOs), 36.24 % obtained information regarding agriculture occasionally from Junior Agriculture Extension Officers (JAEOs) and 26.18 % never obtained any information regarding agriculture from Junior Agriculture Extension Officers. Data also revealed that majority 51.00 % of the maize growers never obtained any information regarding agriculture from Agriculture Extension Officers (AEOs), 33.22 % obtained information regarding agriculture occasionally from Agriculture Extension Officers (AEOs) and 15.78 % obtained information regarding agriculture frequently from Agriculture Extension Officers (AEOs). The data also depicted that

majority of the maize growers 51.00 % were occasionally obtaining information regarding their livestock from Veterinary Assistant Surgeon (VAS)/Sheep Officer, 27.85 % were never pertaining any information regarding their livestock from Veterinary Assistant Surgeon (VAS)/Sheep Officer and 21.14 % were frequently pertaining information regarding their livestock from Veterinary Assistant Surgeon (VAS)/Sheep Officer.

Table 14.1: Distribution of respondents according to their overall extension contacts

S. No.	Extension contacts	Degree of contact		
		Never	Occasionally	Frequently
1.	JAEOs	78 (26.18)	108 (36.24)	112 (37.58)
2.	AEOs	152 (51.00)	99 (33.22)	47 (15.78)
3.	VAS/Sheep officer	83 (27.85)	152 (51.00)	63 (21.14)

CONCLUSION

Regarding socioeconomic profile of the respondents, the study concluded that majority of the maize growers were middle aged, had medium level of education, having agriculture as their main occupation and also had medium family size. Majority had land holding of less than 0.30 hectares, had annual income between Rs. 4.10-8.37 Lakhs, having medium experience in maize cultivation, low material possession and medium livestock possession. Majority had medium economic motivation, innovative proneness, and source of information and extension contacts respectively.

CONFLIT OF INTEREST

All the authors affirm that there is no conflict of interest among them. All research activities comply with relevant legal, institutional and ethical standards.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

All the authors contributed equally in the present study.

REFERENCES

Anonymous, 2023 a. Temperate Maize Cultivation-Bhumi Publishing. 2020. Retrieved on 20-03-2023 *(https://www.bhumipublishing.com).*

Aparna. 2014. Measurement techniques in social sciences. Agrotech. Publishing Academy, Udaipur.

Dalvi, M. V. and Pandya, C. D. 2017. Study on socio-economic status of maize contract farmers of Navsari district. *Gujrat Journal of Extension Education,* **5**: 412-431.

Dheeraj, M. and Kalyaan, G. 2015. A study on socio-economic profile of maize farmers in eastern Uttar Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Agriculture and Allied Sciences,* **1**: 25-28.

Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations. 2020. Retrieved on 21-03-2023. *https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#home*

ICAR- Indian Instititute of Maize Research. 2023. Retrieved on 15-03-23. *https://iimr.icar.gov.in/*

Mwidege, A.M. and Mcharo, A.C.2014. Socio-economic factors affecting knowledge transfer to maize growers in Kilindi District, Tanzania. *International Journal of Marketing and Technology*, 4:35-39.

Patil, C. 2018. A study on profile of maize growers in karnataka. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences,* **8**: 411-425.

Petry, N. M. 2002. A Comparison of Young, Middle aged and older adult treatment Seeking Pathological G. *The Gerontological Society of America,* 42: 92-99.

Slovin's 1960. Slovins forula: what is it and when do I use it. Retrieved on 10-01-2023. *https://www.statisticshowto.com-use-slovins-formula/*

Supe, S.V. 2007. Measurement techniques in social sciences. Agrotech. Publishing Academy, Udaipur.

Moulik, T.K. 1965. A study of the productive value of some factors of adoption of nitrogenous fertilizers and the influence of the source of information on adoption behaviour of farmers. Ph.D. Thesis. Indian Agriculture Research Institute, New Delhi.