VOLUME - 12, ISSUE - 10, OCTOBER - 2023 • PRINT ISSN No. 2277 - 8160 • DOI : 10.36106/gjra

Original Research Paper

Commerce

A STUDY ON REASON AND VARIOUS DETERMINANTS TOWARDS PADDY FARM MECHANIZATION IN ERODE DISTRICT

Dr. K. M. Deepa — Professor, Department of Commerce, Gobi Arts and Science College (Autonomous), Gobichettipalayam-638 453

Ms. P. Maheswari — Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Gobi Arts and Science College (Autonomous), Gobichettipalayam-638 453

ABSTRACT

Paddy farm mechanization has gained significant importance in modern agriculture due to its potential to enhance productivity, reduce labor dependency, and mitigate the effects of changing demographics and climate patterns. This study aims to explore the reasons and determinants influencing the adoption of mechanized techniques in paddy farming. A sample of 253 paddy farmers was selected, and a structured questionnaire was used for data collection. Gender, marital status, educational status, nature of family, experience, annual income, occupation and no. of earning members of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation. However, age and family size of paddy farmers has impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation. Land size, cropping pattern, labor shortage, subsidy from the government and total cost of equipment are the most important determinants of farm mechanization in paddy farms.

KEYWORDS : Farmers, Paddy Cultivation, Farm Mechanization, Reasons, Determinants.

1. INTRODUCTION

Paddy farming plays a significant role in global agriculture, particularly in regions where rice cultivation is a staple food source. In recent years, there has been a growing interest in mechanizing paddy farming processes to increase productivity, improve efficiency, and reduce labor-intensive practices. Numerous factors contribute to the decision-making process of farmers regarding farm mechanization. The factors include the cost-benefit analysis of mechanization, access to financial resources, and market dynamics for paddy crops. Studies have examined various determinants of farm mechanization in different agricultural contexts. However, limited research specifically focuses on the determinants of paddy farm mechanization and the unique challenges and opportunities associated with rice cultivation. Understanding these determinants is vital as paddy farming involves specific requirements and practices that differ from other crop cultivation systems. This research aims to address this gap by exploring the determinants of paddy farm mechanization. Through examining the economic, technological, social, and institutional factors that influence the adoption of mechanization in paddy farming, people can gain insights into the barriers and drivers of its implementation. The findings from this study will provide valuable information to policymakers, researchers, and farmers, facilitating evidence-based decision-making and the development of targeted interventions to promote sustainable and efficient paddy farming systems. The study will delve into the literature and theoretical frameworks related to farm mechanization and explore the specific determinants that shape the adoption of mechanization in paddy farming. Through a comprehensive analysis, we aim to contribute to the existing body of knowledge and provide practical recommendations for enhancing paddy farm mechanization practices.

2. Statement of the Problem

Paddy farming is a vital agricultural activity that plays a crucial role in global food security. However, the adoption of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation remains uneven across different regions, and the factors influencing this adoption are not well understood. Farm mechanization in general agriculture, there is a gap in knowledge regarding the unique factors that shape the decision-making process of farmers when it comes to paddy cultivation. The specific problem to be addressed in this research is to identify and understand the economic, technological, social, and institutional factors that affect the adoption of paddy farm mechanization. This notion arises from the need to develop effective strategies and interventions that can facilitate the widespread adoption of mechanization in paddy farming systems. Through understanding the determinants, policymakers, researchers, and farmers can develop targeted interventions and strategies to promote the adoption of mechanization in paddy farming. This, in turn, can contribute to increased productivity, efficiency, and sustainability in paddy cultivation, leading to enhanced food security and rural development.

3. Review of Literature

Understanding the determinants of paddy farm mechanization is essential for promoting sustainable and efficient farming practices in the paddy sector (Hasbi et al., 2022). The theme at hand is the lack of comprehensive research on the specific determinants that influence the adoption of mechanization in paddy farming. The adoption of farm mechanization in the paddy sector varies across different regions and is influenced by various factors (Dhruw, 2022). Understanding the determinants of paddy farm mechanization is crucial for policymakers, agricultural researchers, and farmers alike (Rangasamy et al., 2002). Identifying the key factors that drive or hinder the adoption of mechanization can inform the development of appropriate strategies and interventions to promote its effective implementation in paddy farming systems (Kumar et al., 2017). Technological factors encompass the availability and affordability of suitable machinery, maintenance and repair services, and the compatibility of mechanization with prevailing farming practices (Chandra et al., 2017). Social factors, on the other hand, involve farmers' perceptions, attitudes, and knowledge about mechanization, as well as their willingness to adopt new technologies (Mayank, 2012). Cultural norms, traditions, and the availability of skilled labor in rural areas also influence the adoption of farm mechanization. Institutional factors encompass the policies, regulations, and support systems provided by governments, non-governmental organizations, and agricultural extension services (Wahyuningsih et al., 2021). These factors play a critical role in shaping the enabling environment for paddy farm mechanization (Ani et al., 2018).

4. Research Objectives

The study is commenced to test the following objectives.

1. To scrutinize the demographic profile of paddy farmers in Erode district.
2. To examine the reasons for the low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.
3. To measure the various determinants of paddy farm mechanization.

4. To ascertain the level of farm mechanization in paddy farms.

5. Research Methodology

The study aims to explore the determinants of paddy farm mechanization. The sample size for this study is 253 paddy farmers. Simple random sampling is used to select paddy farmers from the target population. This sampling technique ensures that each member of the population has an equal chance of being included in the study, minimizing bias and increasing the representativeness of the sample. Questionnaire is used as the primary data collection instrument and it is designed to gather information on the various determinants of paddy farm mechanization. The questionnaire will consist of both closed-ended and open-ended questions, allowing for quantitative and qualitative data collection. The questionnaire is developed based on an extensive review of existing literature and theoretical frameworks related to paddy farm mechanization.

The questions are designed to capture relevant information on the determinants of mechanization, such as farmers' perceptions, attitudes, knowledge, economic considerations, technological constraints, and institutional support. The questionnaire is pre-tested with a small group of respondents to ensure clarity and validity. The data collection process will involve distributing the questionnaire to the selected sample of paddy farmers. The researchers will personally visit the study area and approach the participants to administer the questionnaire.

They will explain the purpose of the study, assure confidentiality of responses, and answer any queries from the participants. The respondents are given adequate time to complete the questionnaire, and any assistance required is provided by the researchers. Simple percentage, cross-tab, chi-square test, and Garrett ranking techniques are used for data analysis.

6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

6.1. Analysis of Demographic Profile

The farmers' demographic profile is analyzed and its outcomes are depicted in table 1.

Table 1: Analysis of Demographic Profile

Demographic Profile	Distribution	Number	Percentage
Age	Up to 30 years	116	45.85%
	31 to 50 years	84	33.20%
	Above 50 years	53	20.95%
Gender	Male	179	70.75%
	Female	74	29.25%
Marital Status	Married	113	44.66%
	Unmarried	140	55.34%
Educational Status	Illiterate	27	10.67%
	School	54	21.34%
	College	95	37.55%
	Professional	77	30.44%
Family Size	Up to 3 members	60	23.72%
	4-6 members	140	55.34%
	Above 6 members	53	20.94%
Nature of Family	Joint Family	88	34.78%
	Nuclear Family	165	65.22%
Experience in Farming	Below 10 years	145	57.31%
	11 years to 20 years	66	26.09%
	Above 20 years	42	16.60%
Annual Income	Up to Rs.1,00,000	53	20.95%
	Rs.1,00,001 to Rs.3,00,000	155	61.26%
	Above Rs.3,00,000	45	17.79%
Occupation	Business	103	41.90%
	Profession	59	23.33%
	Government employee	37	14.63%
	Private employee	35	13.83%
	Others	19	7.51%
No. of Earning Members in the Family	One	130	51.39%
	Two	75	29.64%
	Three and Above	48	18.97%

Source: Primary Data

Table 1 exhibits the demographic distribution of paddy farmers. Age consists of 45.85% of farmers are in up to 30 years, 33.20% of farmers are in 31 to 50 years, and 20.95% of farmers are in above 50 years. Gender discloses that 70.75% of farmers are male and 29.25% of farmers are female farmers. Marital status confirms that 44.66% of farmers are married farmers and 55.34% of farmers are unmarried farmers. Educational status reveals that 10.67% of farmers are illiterate, 21.34% of farmers are completed school education, 37.55% of farmers are completed college education, and 30.44% of farmers are completed professional education. Family size discloses that 23.72% of farmers are in up to 3 members' family, 55.34% of farmers are in 4-6 members' family, and 20.94% of farmers are in above 6 members' family. Nature of family reveals that 34.78% of farmers are belonging to joint family and 65.22% are belonging to nuclear family. Experience in farming clearly indicates that 57.31% of farmers have below 10 years of experience, 26.09% of farmers have 11 to 20 years of experience, 16.60% of farmers have above 20 years of experience. Annual income confirms that 20.95% of farmers are in up to Rs.1,00,000, 61.26% of farmers are in Rs.1,00,001 to Rs.3,00,000, and 17.79% of farmers are in above Rs.3,00,000. Occupation of paddy farmers shows that 41.90% of farmers are in business, 23.33% of farmers are in profession, 14.63% of farmers are government employees, 13.83% of farmers are private employees, and 7.51% of farmers are engaged in other activities. Number of earning members in the family reveals that 51.39% of farmers have only one earning member, 29.64% of farmers have two earning member, and 18.97% of farmers have three and above earning members.

6.2. Reasons for the Low Level of Farm Mechanization in Paddy Cultivation

Farm mechanization in paddy cultivation is practiced much lower due to several reasons. The reasons are categorized in to smaller and scatter landholding, hilly topography, poor –socio economic condition, high transportation cost, diversified cropping pattern, highly fluctuating market price, high initial investment cost, and higher cost of maintenance. Furthermore, it includes that lack of demand for round the year use, lack of access to institutional credit stands, lack of technical knowledge, lack of road facility, and mindset. The impact of demographic variables on reasons for the low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation are taken into account to test at 5% significance level using Chi-square test. Therefore, it proposes the null hypothesis stating that demographic profile (age, gender, marital status, educational status, family size, nature of family, experience in farming, annual income, occupation, and no. of earning members in the family) of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation. Accordingly, its results are furnished below.

Impact of Age on Low Level of Farm Mechanization

The impact of age of paddy farmers on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation is tested with the null hypothesis of age of paddy farmers has no impact on low level

of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Table 2: Age and Farm Mechanization

Age		Agreement		Total	Chi-Square
		High	Low		
Up to 30 years	Count	76	40	116	Value = 12.819; Df = 2; Sig. = 0.002
	%	65.5%	34.5%	100.0%	
31 to 50 years	Count	57	27	84	
	%	67.9%	32.1%	100.0%	
Above 50 years	Count	21	32	53	
	%	39.6%	60.4%	100.0%	
Total	Count	154	99	253	
	%	60.9%	39.1%	100.0%	

Source: Primary Data

Table 2 exhibits that majority of paddy farmers in age group have expressed higher agreement on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation. The computed chi-square value (12.819; $p<0.002$) rejects the null hypothesis, therefore, age of paddy farmers has impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Impact of Gender on Low Level of Farm Mechanization

The impact of gender of paddy farmers on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation is tested with the null hypothesis of gender of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Table 3: Gender and Farm Mechanization

Gender		Agreement		Total	Chi-Square
		High	Low		
Male	Count	111	68	179	Value = 0.335; Df = 1; Sig. = 0.563
	%	62.0%	38.0%	100.0%	
Female	Count	43	31	74	
	%	58.1%	41.9%	100.0%	
Total	Count	154	99	253	
	%	60.9%	39.1%	100.0%	

Source: Primary Data

Table 3 exhibits that majority of paddy farmers in gender group have expressed higher agreement on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation. The computed chi-square value (0.335; $p>0.563$) accepts the null hypothesis, therefore, gender of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Impact of Marital Status on Low Level of Farm Mechanization

The impact of marital status of paddy farmers on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation is tested with the null hypothesis of marital status of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Table 4: Marital Status and Farm Mechanization

Marital Status		Agreement		Total	Chi-Square
		High	Low		
Married	Count	65	48	113	Value = 0.961; Df = 1; Sig.= 0.327
	%	57.5%	42.5%	100.0%	
Unmarried	Count	89	51	140	
	%	63.6%	36.4%	100.0%	
Total	Count	154	99	253	
	%	60.9%	39.1%	100.0%	

Source: Primary Data

Table 4 exhibits that majority of paddy farmers in marital status group have expressed higher agreement on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation. The computed chi-square value (0.961; $p>0.327$) accepts the null hypothesis, therefore, marital status of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Impact of Educational Status on Low Level of Farm Mechanization

The impact of educational status of paddy farmers on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation is tested with the null hypothesis of educational status of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Table 5: Educational Status and Farm Mechanization

Educational Status		Agreement		Total	Chi-Square
		High	Low		
Illiterate	Count	12	15	27	Value = 7.074; Df = 3; Sig. = 0.070
	%	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%	
School	Count	32	22	54	
	%	59.3%	40.7%	100.0%	
College	Count	55	40	95	
	%	57.9%	42.1%	100.0%	
Professional	Count	55	22	77	
	%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	
Total	Count	154	99	253	
	%	60.9%	39.1%	100.0%	

Source: Primary Data

Table 5 exhibits that majority of paddy farmers in educational status group have expressed higher agreement on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation. The computed chi-square value (7.074; $p>0.070$) accepts the null hypothesis, therefore, educational status of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Impact of Family Size on Low Level of Farm Mechanization

The impact of family size of paddy farmers on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation is tested with the null hypothesis of family size of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Table 6: Family Size and Farm Mechanization

Family Size		Agreement		Total	Chi-Square
		High	Low		
Up to 3 members	Count	32	28	60	Value = 8.014; Df = 2; Sig. = 0.018
	%	53.3%	46.7%	100.0%	
4-6 members	Count	81	59	140	
	%	57.9%	42.1%	100.0%	
Above 6 members	Count	41	12	53	
	%	77.4%	22.6%	100.0%	
Total	Count	154	99	253	
	%	60.9%	39.1%	100.0%	

Source: Primary Data

Table 6 exhibits that majority of paddy farmers in family size group have expressed higher agreement on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation. The computed chi-square value (8.014; $p<0.018$) rejects the null hypothesis, therefore, family size of paddy farmers has impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Impact of Nature of Family on Low Level of Farm Mechanization

The impact of nature of family of paddy farmers on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation is tested with the null hypothesis of nature of family of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Table 7: Nature of Family and Farm Mechanization

Nature of Family		Agreement		Total	Chi-Square
		High	Low		
Joint Family	Count	50	38	88	Value = 0.930; Df = 1; Sig. = 0.335
	%	56.8%	43.2%	100.0%	
Nuclear Family	Count	104	61	165	
	%	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%	

Total	Count	154	99	253	
	%	60.9%	39.1%	100.0%	

Source: Primary Data

Table 7 exhibits that majority of paddy farmers in nature of family group have expressed higher agreement on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation. The computed chi-square value (0.930; p>0.335) accepts the null hypothesis, therefore, nature of family of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Impact of Experience in Farming on Low Level of Farm Mechanization

The impact of experience in farming of paddy farmers on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation is tested with the null hypothesis of experience in farming of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Table 8: Experience in Farming and Farm Mechanization

Experience in Farming		Agreement		Total	Chi-Square
		High	Low		
Below 10 years	Count	89	56	145	Value = 3.685; Df = 2; Sig. = 0.158
	%	61.4%	38.6%	100.0%	
11 years to 20 years	Count	35	31	66	
	%	53.0%	47.0%	100.0%	
Above 20 years	Count	30	12	42	
	%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	
Total	Count	154	99	253	
	%	60.9%	39.1%	100.0%	

Source: Primary Data

Table 8 exhibits that majority of paddy farmers in experience in farming group have expressed higher agreement on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation. The computed chi-square value (3.685; p>0.158) accepts the null hypothesis, therefore, experience in farming of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Impact of Annual Income on Low Level of Farm Mechanization

The impact of annual income of paddy farmers on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation is tested with the null hypothesis of annual income of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Table 9: Annual Income and Farm Mechanization

Annual Income		Agreement		Total	Chi-Square
		High	Low		
Up to Rs.1,00,000	Count	38	15	53	Value = 3.398; Df = 2; Sig. = 0.183
	%	71.7%	28.3%	100.0%	
Rs.1,00,001 to Rs.3,00,000	Count	89	66	155	
	%	57.4%	42.6%	100.0%	
Above Rs.3,00,000	Count	27	18	45	
	%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%	
Total	Count	154	99	253	
	%	60.9%	39.1%	100.0%	

Source: Primary Data

Table 9 exhibits that majority of paddy farmers in annual income group have expressed higher agreement on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation. The computed chi-square value (3.398; p>0.183) accepts the null hypothesis, therefore, annual income of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Impact of Occupation on Low Level of Farm Mechanization

The impact of occupation of paddy farmers on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation is tested with the null hypothesis of occupation of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Table 10: Occupation and Farm Mechanization

Occupation		Agreement		Total	Chi-Square
		High	Low		
Business	Count	65	38	103	Value = 8.584; Df = 4; Sig. = 0.072
	%	63.1%	36.9%	100.0%	
Profession	Count	29	30	59	
	%	49.2%	50.8%	100.0%	
Government employee	Count	20	17	37	
	%	54.1%	45.9%	100.0%	
Private employee	Count	25	10	35	
	%	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%	
Others	Count	15	4	19	
	%	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%	
Total	Count	154	99	253	
	%	60.9%	39.1%	100.0%	

Source: Primary Data

Table 10 exhibits that majority of paddy farmers in occupation group have expressed higher agreement on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation. The computed chi-square value (8.584; p>0.072) accepts the null hypothesis, therefore, occupation of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Impact of No. of Earning Members in the Family on Low Level of Farm Mechanization

The impact of no. of earning members in the family of paddy farmers on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation is tested with the null hypothesis of no. of earning members in the family of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

Table 11: No. of Earning Members in the Family and Farm Mechanization

No. of Earning Members in the Family		Agreement		Total	Chi-Square
		High	Low		
One	Count	79	51	130	Value = 1.533; Df = 2; Sig. = 0.465
	%	60.8%	39.2%	100.0%	
Two	Count	49	26	75	
	%	65.3%	34.7%	100.0%	
Three and Above	Count	26	22	48	
	%	54.2%	45.8%	100.0%	
Total	Count	154	99	253	
	%	60.9%	39.1%	100.0%	

Source: Primary Data

Table 11 exhibits that majority of paddy farmers in no. of earning members in the family group have expressed higher agreement on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation. The computed chi-square value (1.533; p>0.465) accepts the null hypothesis, therefore, no. of earning members in the family of paddy farmers has no impact on low level of farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

6.3. Determinants of Paddy Farm Mechanization

Mechanization in paddy farms is vastly determined by several factors, these are ranked using Garrett ranking analysis, it table 12.

Table 12: Determinants of Paddy Farm Mechanization

S. No	Determinants	Garret Mean Score	Rank
1	Land Size	14813.15	1
2	Cropping Pattern	14577.86	2
3	Market Price of Crops including minimum support price	13535.50	6

4	Labour Shortage	14087.04	3
5	Total Cost of equipment	13581.04	5
6	Subsidy from the government	13922.59	4
7	Economy / Owned by high land	13401.41	7
8	High labour rate	12310.98	10
9	More Yield	12194.60	11
10	Time save	12364.11	9
11	Convenience	12470.37	8
12	Loan Facility	11860.64	12
13	Price, Quality, Discount and Offer	11341.99	14
14	High Rent Paid	11455.84	13
15	Low cost compare to manual	9097.09	15
16	Weather Change	8704.95	16

Source: Primary Data

Table 12 exhibits that land size is the main determinant with regard to adoption of farm mechanization, it is ranked first with 14813.15 mean score points. Cropping pattern is also determining the farm mechanization, it fetches second rank with 14577.86 mean score points. Labor shortage plays crucial role in determining farm mechanization, it is ranked third with 14087.04 mean score points. Subsidy from the government for farm mechanization confirms its usage, it is ranked fourth with 13922.59 mean score points. Total cost of equipment ranked fifth with 13581.04 mean score points towards farm mechanization in paddy farms. Market price of crops including minimum support price ranked sixth with 13535.50 mean score points. Economy/ owned by high land gets seventh rank with 13401.41 mean score points. It is followed by convenience (12470.37), time save (12364.11), high labour rate (12310.98), more yield (12194.60), loan facility (11860.64), high rent paid (11455.85), price, quality, discount and offer (11341.99), low cost compared to manual (9097.09) and weather change (8704.95) are ranked subsequently towards determining farm mechanization in paddy cultivation.

6.4. Level of Farm Mechanization

Level of farm mechanization by using various machines, tools, and equipment required for paddy cultivation is furnished in table 13.

Table 13: Level of Farm Mechanization

S. No	Level	Level of Mechanization	
		Frequency	Percentage
1	MB plough	185	73.12
2	Harrow	166	65.61
3	Cultivator	137	54.15
4	Rotavator	229	90.51
5	Power tiller	116	45.85
6	Puddler	97	38.34
7	Paddy transplanter	65	25.69
8	Cage Wheel	201	79.45
9	Cono – Weeder	91	35.97
10	Sprayer	249	98.42
11	Combine harvester	113	44.66
12	Thresher	224	88.54
13	Drone	43	17.00
14	Tractor	250	98.81

Source: Primary Data

Table 13 exhibits that 73.12% of farmers are using MB plough, 65.61% are using harrow, 54.15% are using cultivator, 90.51% are using rotavator, 45.85% are using power tiller, and 38.34% are using puddler. Similar to that 25.69% are using paddy transplanter, 79.45% are using cage wheel, 35.97% are using cono-weeder, 9842% are using sprayer, 44.66% are using combine harvester, 88.54% are using thresher, 17.00% are using drone, 98.81% are using tractor for paddy cultivation.

CONCLUSION

The reasons and various determinants towards paddy farm mechanization play a significant role in shaping the agricultural landscape and driving advancements in rice production. The need to enhance productivity, increase efficiency, reduce labor dependency, and mitigate the effects of changing demographics and climate patterns has driven the adoption of mechanized techniques in paddy farming. Mechanization allows farmers to achieve higher yields by enabling timely operations, such as land preparation, sowing, irrigation, fertilization, and harvesting. This results in increased productivity and improved farm profitability, ensuring food security in many regions. Moreover, mechanization helps alleviate labor shortages, which have become a significant challenge in many agricultural areas. As rural populations migrate to urban areas in search of alternative livelihoods, farmers face difficulties in securing an adequate workforce for manual farming tasks. Mechanized technologies offer a solution by reducing the reliance on human labor, thereby increasing efficiency and reducing production costs. The drive for increased productivity, labor scarcity, technological advancements, demographic shifts, and environmental sustainability have collectively contributed to the widespread adoption of mechanized techniques in paddy farming. As we move forward, continued research and development in agricultural machinery, coupled with effective policies and support systems, will be crucial in harnessing the full potential of paddy farm mechanization and ensuring a sustainable future for rice production.

REFERENCES

1. Ani, P., Eka, R.A., Yati, A. and Akira, I. (2018). Factors affecting paddy farmers' perception of utilizingagricultural machines in Indonesia. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, 10*(8), 150-157.
2. Chandra, N.B., Nam, Y.S., Durrul H.M., Rahman, M.M., Ali, P. and Paul, S. (2017). Status and Constrainfor Mechanization of Rice Harvesting System in Bangladesh. *Agricultural Sciences, 8*(6), 492-506.
3. Dhruw, U.K. (2022). Agricultural mechanization enhancement in Chhattisgarh state. *The Pharma Innovation Journal, 11*(3), 1238-1240.
4. Hasbi, H., Tunggal, T. and Rahmaniar, C. (2022). Management of agricultural equipment and machinery to increase food self-sufficiency in Musi Rawas district, South Sumatra Province. *Earth and Environmental Science, 995,* 1-6.
5. Kumar, M.S., Vasantha, R., Sailaja, A. and Supriya, K. (2017). Attitude of paddy and irrigated dry crop growers towards the use of agricultural implements and machinery attitude of paddy and irrigated dry crop growers towards the use of agricultural implements and machinery. *International Journal of Farm Sciences, 4,* 107-109.
6. Mayank, S. (2012). Farmer's attitude towards adoption of recommended technology. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education, 14*(1), 19-23.
7. Rangasamy, K., Muthamil, M., Selvan, S. and Ramana, C. (2002). Role of mechanization in boosting productivity. *Kisan World, 2*(7), 47-57.
8. Wahyuningsih, P., Susilo, A. and Wisnujati, N.S. (2021). Farmers' attitude and rice added value based on agricultural mechanization in East Java of Indonesia. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences, 112*(4), 110-120.