The Pharma Innovation Journal 2021; SP-10(8): 587-590

www.ThePharmaJournal.com

The Pharma Innovation

ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2021; SP-10(8): 587-590

www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 12-07-2021
Accepted: 10-08-2021

Anuj Tiwari
Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Extension Education, A.N.D.University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

NR Meena
Assistant Professor, Department of Extension Education, A.N.D.University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

RK Doharey
Professor, Department of Extension Education, A.N.D.University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

Corresponding Author
Anuj Tiwari
Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Extension Education
A.N.D.University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

Social traits of rice growers in eastern region of Uttar Pradesh

Anuj Tiwari, NR Meena and RK Doharey

Abstract
Rice is principal food grain of India specially in eastern Uttar Pradesh. Rice (Oryza sativa) is one of the major staple food for the major population of the world. The present investigation was conducted with the objective to know the Social traits of rice growers. Six blocks of Ayodhya, Bakabanki and Sultanpur district were selected randomly. Two hundred forty respondents were selected from these twelve villages i.e. 20 respondents from each village. The study concluded that a maximum number of the respondents (67.08 per cent) were finding in the age group *i.e.* middle (37-51 years). The maximum *i.e.* 98.75 per cent of respondents were found to be literate, while 01.25 per cent were illiterate. The majority of the respondents were married (95.41 per cent) against it, (4.58 per cent) respondents were un-married. The maximum number of respondents (79.58 per cent) were large farmers. The maximum 67.50 per cent of the respondents were observed to have agriculture as their main occupation followed by 8.75 per cent service (govt.+ private), 7.91 per cent per cent caste-based occupation, 6.66 per cent Business, 6.25 per cent agro-based enterprise, 1.66 per cent orcharding, 1.25 per cent goat sheep rearing, and 0.83 per cent dairying respectively.

Keywords: rice growers, land holding, orcharding

Introduction
Rice is world's leading staple crop, cultivated over an area of about 155 million hectares with a production of about 596 million tons of paddy. It is second to wheat, in area and production aspect. It provides about 22 per cent of the world supply of calories and 17 per cent of the proteins. Maximum area under rice is in Asia. Among the rice growing countries India has the largest area (44.8 million hectares) followed by China and Indonesia. In respect of production India ranks second with 131 million tons of paddy next to China (200 million tons of paddy). In regards to average yield per hectares Egypt ranks first followed by USA. Average rice yield of India is only 2929 kg per hectare.

Agriculture is the main source of income for families in the state. It has 11.56 million hectare of cultivated area, constituting 70 per cent of the total geographical area. The irrigated area is over 13.43 million hectare. The small and marginal farmers jointly contribute 19.46 per cent of farming household in eastern region against that of 19.11 per cent of Uttar Pradesh.

Majority of the agriculture land is used to grow major cereal crops: rice & wheat. Rice is the major crop in Uttar Pradesh and is grown in about 5.90 Mha which comprises of 13.5 per cent of total rice in India. Uttar Pradesh has favorable and suitable climate, vast areas of fertile soils, sunshine and adequate water resources. The cropping intensity is 153 per cent. The state ranks 3rd in the country in production of rice. (Source: Annual report 2017-18, Department of Agriculture, cooperation and farmer's welfare. Govt. of India)

Methodology
The research was confined to Eastern region of Uttar Pradesh since there was more rice cultivated land. For maintaining the representativeness of the data three districts from Eastern region of Uttar Pradesh surrounding the university i.e. Ayodhya, Barabanki and Sultanpur were selected purposively. Another reason for selection of these districts was the easy accessibility of the investigator to reach that area, people and officials etc. these districts have always been considered to be most climatically suitable for rice cultivation.

The total number of blocks in Ayodhya district is 11 namely, Masodha, Sohawal, Bikapur, Milkipur, Maya Bazar, Pure Bazar, Haringtonganj, Amaniganj, Tarun, Mawai and Rudauli. Out of these, two blocks namely Masodha and Bikapur were selected randomly.

The total number of blocks in Barabanki district is 16 namely, Banki, Masauli, Dewa, Harakh,

Fatehpur, Haidargarh, Dariyabad, Suratganj, Sidhaur, Pure Dalai, Nindura, Trivediganj, Ramnagar, Sirauli Ghauspur and Banikodar. Out of these, two blocks namely Banikodar and Dariyabad were selected randomly.
The total number of blocks in Sultanpur is 14 namely, Dubeypur, Kurebhar, Kurwar, Bhadaiyan, Lambhua, Pratappur Kamaicha, Jaisinghpur, Motigarpur, Karaundi kalan, Kadipur, Dostpur, Akhandnagar, Dhanpatganj and Baldirai. Out of these blocks two blocks namely Kurebhar and Dhanpatganj were selected randomly.

Results and Discussion

1. **Age:** On the basis of basis of their age the respondents were classified into three categories on the basis of mean and standard deviation

Table 1: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of their age=240

S. No.	Category (Years)	Respondents	
		f	Percent
1.	Young age (below 36)	37	15.41
2.	Middle age (37 - 51)	161	67.08
3	Old age(above 52)	42	17.50
	Total	240	100.00

Mean=43.18, S.D. =7.64, Min. =27, Max.=58.

The data presented in table-1 reveals that out of the respondents 67.08 per cent belonged to middle age group (37-51 years) followed by 17.50 per cent of respondents belonged to old age group (above 52) and only 15.41 per cent respondents belonged to young age group (up to 36 years) respectively. The age of the selected respondents ranged from 27 to 58 years. The mean age of the respondents was observed to be 43.18 years.

2. **Education:** To develop an understanding about the level of education of selected respondents they were classified in six categories; i.e. illiterate, literate, primary school, middle school, high school and above high school.

Table 2: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of their education=240

Sr. No.	Category	Respondents	
		f	per cent
1.	Illiterate	03.0	1.25
2.	Literate	237.0	98.75
3.	Primary school	26.0	10.83
4.	Middle school	79.0	32.91
5.	High school	80.0	33.33
6.	Above high school	52.0	21.66
	Total	240.0	100.00

It is evident from the table-2 that 1.25 per cent farmers were in the illiterate group while, 98.75 per cent farmers in the literate group. Further, the educational level was produced in decreasing order as 10.83 per cent, 32.91 per cent, 33.33 per cent, 21.66 per cent primary, middle, high school and above high school respectively. Therefore, it may be stated that the educational level of the respondent farmers was considerably good as compared to average literacy rate of the state and country as such.

3. **Marital status:** On the basis of their marital status the respondents were classified into two categories on the basis of mean and standard deviation.

Table 3: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of their marital status=240

Sr. No.	Category	Respondents	
		f	per cent
1.	Unmarried	11	4.58
2.	Married	229	95.41
	Total	240	100.00

The table-3 reveals that majority of the respondents 95.41 per cent were married followed by 4.58 per cent of the respondents who were unmarried. Thus, it may be concluded that a large number of respondents were married.

4. **Caste:** On the basis of their caste the respondents were classified into these categories.

Table 4: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of their caste=240

Sr. No.	Category	Respondents	
		f	per cent
1.	General caste	110	45.83
2.	Backward caste	48	20.00
3.	Scheduled caste	82	34.16
	Total	240	100

A presented date incorporated in table-4 reveals that out of 240 respondents, 45.83 per cent farmers were from general caste, while 20.00 per cent farmers were from other backward caste category and 34.16 per cent farmers were from schedule caste. Thus it may be concluded that there were majority of people who belonged to general category in the study area.

5. **Type of family:** On the basis of their type of family the respondents were classified into two categories.

Table 5: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of their family type=240

Sr. No.	Family type	Respondents	
		f	per cent
1.	Nuclear family	129	53.75
2.	Joint family	111	46.25
	Total	240	100

Table-5 shows that majority of the respondents were of nuclear family as compared to the joint family members. On the terms of percentage, 53.75 per cent belonged to the nuclear family while the rest of 46.25 per cent were of joint family. Therefore, it may be stated that the nuclear family system was dominant in the study area.

6. **Size of family:** On the basis of their size of family the respondents were classified into three categories.

Table 6: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of their family size=240

Sr. No.	Category	Respondents	
		f	per cent
1.	Small (up to 4)	73	30.41
2.	Medium (5-8)	128	53.33
3.	Large(above 9)	39	16.25
	Total	240	100.00

Mean=6.09, S.D.=2.07, Max.=12, Min=3.

The table-6 reveals that majority of the respondents 53.33 per cent belonged to the medium category of those having 5-8 members in their family followed by 30.41 per cent and 16.25 per cent to the small (up to 4) and large (above 9) members in their family respectively.

7. **Size of land holding:** On the basis of their size of land holding the respondents are classified into three categories on the basis of mean and standard deviation.

Table 7: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of their land holding (hectares) n=240

Sr. No.	Category(hectare)	Respondents	
		f	per cent
1.	Marginal farmers (less than 1 ha.)	04.00	1.66
2.	Small farmers (1-2 ha.)	45.00	18.75
3.	Large farmers (Above 2 ha.)	191.00	79.58
	Total	240.00	100.00

Mean=4.67, S.D. =4.40, Min=0.5, Max=30.

The table-7 shows that 1.66 per cent of the respondents were having less than 1 ha of land that belonged to marginal farmer's category. Respondents belonged to small farmers (1-2 hectare) and large farmers (above 2 ha.) were 18.75 per cent and 79.58 per cent respectively.

8. **Occupation:** On the basis of their occupation the respondents were classified into ten categories i.e. agriculture, agricultural labours, traditional occupation, service, business, agro-based enterprises, dairy, orcharding, goat & sheep rearing and fish production.

Table 8: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of occupation=240

Sr. No.	Occupation	Main		Subsidiary	
		No.	per cent	No.	per cent
1.	Agriculture	162.0	67.50	22.0	09.16
2.	Agricultural labours	03.0	01.25	48.0	20.00
3.	Traditional occupation	19.0	07.91	33.0	13.75
4.	Service	21.0	08.75	38.0	15.83
5.	Business	16.0	06.66	12.0	05.00
6.	Agro- based Enterprises	15.0	06.25	06.0	02.50
7.	Dairy	02.0	00.83	26.0	10.83
8.	Orcharding	04.0	01.66	06.00	02.50
9.	Goat & Sheep rearing	03.0	01.25	16.00	06.60
10.	Fish production	00.0	00.00	03.00	01.25

Table-8 revealed that maximum 67.50 per cent of the respondents were observed to have agriculture as their main occupation followed by 8.75 per cent service (govt.+ private), 7.91 per cent per cent caste-based occupation, 6.66 per cent Business, 6.25 per cent agro-based enterprise, 1.66 per cent orcharding, 1.25 per cent goat sheep rearing, and 0.83 per cent dairying respectively. On the other side, majority of the respondents 20.00 per cent were working as an agricultural labours as a subsidiary occupation followed by 15.83 per cent with service, 13.75 per cent traditional occupation, 10.83 per cent dairy and 9.16 per cent as agriculture.

9. **Social participation:** On the basis of their social participation the respondents were classified on the basis of these sub categories.

Table 9: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of social participation=240

Sr. No.	Particular	Respondent	
		f	per cent
1.	No participation in any organization	137	57.08
2.	Participation in one organization	56	23.33
3.	Participation in two organization	44	18.33
4.	Participation in more than two organization	3	1.25
	Total	240	100.00

The table-9 shows the distribution of the respondents according to their housing pattern. It is clear from the table that majority of respondents 57.08 per cent had no participation in any organization, followed by 23.33 per cent of respondents with participation in one organization, 18.33 per cent of the respondents with participation in two organization and only 1.25 per cent respondents with participation in more than two organizations.

10. **Farming experience:** On the basis of their farming experience the respondents were classified on the basis of these sub categories

Table 10: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of farming experience=240

Sr. No.	Particular	Respondent	
		f	P
1.	Low (Up to 13 years)	39	16.25
2.	Medium (14 to 24 years)	166	69.16
3.	High(25 years and above)	35	14.58
	Total	240	100

The table-10 shows the distribution of the respondents according to their farming experience. It is clear from the table that majority of respondents 69.16 per cent were having medium level of farming experience, followed by16.258 per cent with low level of farming experience and 14.58 per cent with high level of farming experience.

11. **Training received-** On the basis of their training received the respondents were classified on the basis of these sub categories

Table 11: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of training received=240

Sr. No.	Particular	Respondent	
		f	per cent
1.	No training	139	57.91
2.	Medium (1-2 years)	91	37.91
3.	High (above 2 years)	10	4.16
	Total	240	100

The table-11 shows the distribution of the respondents according to training received by them. It is clear from the table that majority of respondents 57.91 percent were having no training followed by 37.91 per cent with medium level of training and only 4.16 per cent of the respondents were having high level of training.

12. **Innovative proneness-** On the basis of their innovative proneness the respondents were classified on the basis of these sub categories

Table 12: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of innovative proneness=240

Sr. No.	Particular	Respondent	
		f	per cent
1.	Low (Up to 5)	76	31.66
2.	Medium (5 to 7)	104	43.33
3.	High(8 and above)	60	25.00
	Total	240	100

Table-12 shows the distribution of the respondents on the basis of innovative proneness of the respondents. It is clear from the table that majority of the respondents 43.33 per cent were having medium level of innovative proneness, followed by 31.66 per cent with low level innovative proneness and 25.00 per cent with high level of innovative proneness.

Conclusion

The study revealed that a maximum number of the respondents (67.08 per cent) were finding in the age group *i.e.* middle (37-51 years). The maximum *i.e.* 98.75 per cent of respondents were found to be literate, while 01.25 per cent were illiterate. The majority of the respondents were married (95.41 per cent) against it, (4.58 per cent) respondents were un-married. The maximum number of respondents (79.58 per cent) were large farmers. The maximum 67.50 per cent of the respondents were observed to have agriculture as their main occupation followed by 8.75 per cent service (govt.+ private), 7.91 per cent per cent caste-based occupation, 6.66 per cent Business, 6.25 per cent agro-based enterprise, 1.66 per cent orcharding, 1.25 per cent goat sheep rearing, and 0.83 per cent dairying respectively. Majority of respondents 57.08 per cent had no participation in any organization, followed by 23.33 per cent of respondents with participation in one organization, 18.33 per cent of the respondents with participation in two organization and only 1.25 per cent respondents with participation in more than two organizations Majority of respondents 69.16 per cent were having medium level of farming experience, followed by16.258 per cent with low level of farming experience and 14.58 per cent with high level of farming experience. Majority of respondents 57.91 percent were having no training followed by 37.91 per cent with medium level of training and only 4.16 per cent of the respondents were having high level of training. Majority of the respondents 43.33 per cent were having medium level of innovative proneness, followed by 31.66 per cent with low level innovative proneness and 25.00 per cent with high level of innovative proneness.

References

1. Babu PR. A study on extent of knowledge and adoption levels of paddy farmers in east godawari district of Andhra Pradesh. Thesis, M.Sc.(Agri.). Acharya N.G.Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad 2014.
2. Barth BC, Pandey S. Rainfed rice production system in eastern India: An on farm diagnosis and policy alternatives. Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics 2005;60(1):110-136.
3. Bhosale US. Participation of rural youth in paddy farming in Anand District of Gujrat State. Thesis, M.Sc. (Agri.). AAU, Anand 2010.
4. Chaudhary MM. A study on pesticide using behavior of paddy growers in Khambat taluka of Anand district. Thesis, M.Sc. (Agri.). AAU, Anand 2010.
5. Deore DP. Study on awareness of farmers regarding organic rice cultivation practices. Thesis, M.Sc.(Agri.). Dr. Punjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola.(M.S.) 2006.
6. Gaikwad JH. A study of agricultural development of Sora tribes in Bolangair district of Orissa state. Thesis, M.Sc.(Agri.). M.P.K.V. Rahuri.(M.S.), 2010.
7. Karangami RS. Adoption of recommended rice cultivation practices by the farmers from palghar district. Thesis, M.Sc.(Agri.). Dr. Babasaheb Sawant Kokan Krishi Vidyapeeth, Dapoli2017.
8. Krishna NS, Shailk NM, Muthuraman P. Dynamics of adoption of recommended rice production technologies among migrant farmers. Manage, Extension Research review 2007;8(1):71-84.
9. Kumawat A. A study on adoption behavior of farmers in system of rice intensification practices of paddy cultivation in plain areas of Suhagpur block of Shahdol District of Madhya Pradesh, Thesis, M.Sc.(Agri.). JNKVV, Jabalpur 2010.
10. Manjunath T. A study on knowledge and adoption of plant protection measures by paddy growers of Raichur district. Thesis, M.Sc.(Agri.). University of Agricultural Science, Dharwad 2010.
11. Mate PS. Study on knowledge and adoption of recommended practices by the farmers in Pune district. Thesis, M.Sc.(Agri.). M.P.K.V., Rahuri, (M.S.) 2005.