

Original Research Article

<https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2018.704.417>

## Socio-Economic Profile of Farm Women in Potato Field, Kannauj District, Uttar Pradesh, India

Rashmee Yadav\*, Amisha Kumari, Katyayni and Neelma Kunwar

Department of Extension Education, C.S.A. University of Agriculture and Technology,  
Kanpur-208002 U.P., India

\*Corresponding author

### ABSTRACT

Potato crop not only provide us with nutritional and healthy food, but also generate a cash income to growers. Potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) popularly known as 'The king of vegetables', is grown in more than 100 countries in the world. Uttar pradesh is one of the important Potato growing states in the country grown mainly in the districts Kannauj is important district from potato production point of view. The present investigation was conducted with the objective to know the socio-economics of profile of farm women in potato production. In this study two blocks Kannauj and Chhibramau were randomly selected out of the total blocks in selected district. Three hundred respondents were selected from the ten villages, 30 respondents from each village. The study revealed that a maximum number of 55.3 per cent of farm women belonged to age group 20 to 30 years. 32.0 per cent of farm women were found to be illiterate in the study area, The majority of the respondents were married (41.0%) against it, (35.3%) respondents were un-married. reveals the distribution of farm women according to land holding. Maximum 58.0 per cent of farm women were found to be landless farmers in the study area, followed by 34.0 per cent of respondents who had marginal land holding with mean 1.5 acres and standard deviation 0.6 acres. The majority (41.7%) of the FARM WOMEN were from those families whose annual family income was between Rs. 30,001 – 40,000. And 38.3 per cent of farm women had drought animals, followed by 20.0 per cent respondents who possessed a tube well.

#### Keywords

Potato crop, Socio-economic, *Solanum tuberosum* L.

#### Article Info

##### Accepted:

30 March 2018

##### Available Online:

10 April 2018

### Introduction

Potato (*Solanum tuberosum*) originated in the highlands of South America, where it has been consumed for more than 8000 years. Spanish explorers brought the plant to Europe in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century as a botanical curiosity. By the 19<sup>th</sup> century it had spread throughout the continent, providing cheap and abundant food for the workers of the Industrial Revolution.

Potato was introduced in India in the early part of the 17<sup>th</sup> century by the Portuguese. It was first cultivated in Surat on the West coast. From there it spread to other areas, like Goa, which were under Portuguese influence. In Goa, potato was called "Batata Surrata", pointing towards the likely introduction of Potato from Surat. As early as 1675, Fryer mentions Potato as one of the common garden crops after his survey of Karnataka. The

spread of Potato to the Southern parts of the country was apparently quite rapid. Among vegetables, potato and its products are the most important items of consumption in the world including India. Potato is a major food crop, grown in more than 100 countries in the world. According to FAO (2008), Potato is consumed by more than one billion people in the world. It is a high quality vegetable cum food crop and used in preparing more than 100 types of recipes. The protein content of Potato has a high biological value than cereals and considered to be better than milk. Hence, Potato is supplementing meat and milk products by lowering energy intake and also by reducing food cost.

### **Profile of the study area**

Kannauj District is an administrative district of Uttar Pradesh state in northern India, along the river Ganges. The historic town of Kannauj, northwest of Kanpur, is the administrative centre. The district was carved out of the Farrukhabad district on September 18, 1997. Kannauj is located at 27.07°N 79.92°E. It has an average elevation of 139 metres (456 feet). The Ganges is the main river of the district at the North East border of the district.

Kali River is at the northern border of the district while the Ishan River flows through the District. The climate of the district is characterized by a hot dry summer and a pleasant cold season. The average rainfall of the District is approximately 80 cm. The district is bounded by the districts of Farrukhabad to the north, Hardoi to the northeast, Kanpur Nagar to the east, Kanpur Dehat to the southeast, Auraiya to the south, Etawah to the southwest, and Mainpuri to the west. The district is divided into three tehsils and seven development blocks. The district was split from Farrukhabad on September 18, 1997, and is part of Kanpur Division.

## **Materials and Methods**

### **Research design**

The research design is the plan, structure and strategy of investigations of answering the research question. It is the overall plan or blue print the researchers select to carry out their study. The design used in this study is descriptive design.

### **Pilot study**

Prior to finally deciding the title of the project a pilot survey of the area was conducted. This gave the researcher an idea about the place of the study and nature of the samples that could be drawn along with the type of aspects and problems which could be explored out.

### **Pre-testing of instruments**

Before collecting the necessary data from the finally selected sample of 300 farm women, 100 farm women were identified other than those included in the final sample. These 100 farm women were interviewed with the help of a structured interview schedule developed for collecting the data necessary for the present study. This helped the investigator in making necessary changes and modifications in the instrument to be finally used in their wordings and compositions.

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Age of respondents**

Table 1 reveals the distribution of respondents according to age group. 55.3 per cent of farm women belonged to age group 20 to 30 years with mean age 23 years and standard deviation (S.D.) 5 years, followed by 20.7 per cent of respondents who belonged to 30 to 40 years of age group with mean age 34 years and S.D. 4 years. 14.0 per cent of farm women belonged

to age group 40 to 50 years with mean age 43 years and S.D. 4 years whereas, 10.0 per cent of respondents belonged to 50 years and above age group with mean age 54 years and S.D. 6 years.

**Literacy of respondents**

Table 2 shows the distribution of respondents according to education. 32.0 per cent of farm women were found to be illiterate in the study area, followed by 30.7 per cent of farm women who were educated up to middle level. 26.7 per cent of respondents were educated up to primary level, whereas, 7.3 per cent of farm women were educated up to high school. 2.3 per cent of respondents were educated up to graduate, while only 1.0 per cent respondents passed intermediate.

**Caste**

The table 3 shows the distribution of farm women according to caste. 45.7 per cent of farm women belonged to O.B.C. whereas, 32.6 per cent of respondents belonged to SC/ST category. 21.7 per cent of farm women belonged to general category in the study area.

**Occupation**

Table 4 reveals the distribution of respondents according to occupation. 49.0 per cent of

respondents were engaged in agriculture in the study area whereas, 31.3 per cent of farm women were labour class. 12.0 per cent of farm women were engaged in business occupation, while only 7.7 per cent of farm women were found to be in service class.

**Annul income**

Table 5 indicates the distribution of farm women according to annual income. 41.7 per cent of respondents were earning Rs. 30,001 to Rs. 40,000 annually with mean income of Rs. 35872 and standard deviation Rs. 2730 whereas, 40.3 per cent of farm women were earning Rs. 20,000 to Rs. 30,000 annually with mean income of Rs. 23,148 and S.D. Rs. 3862. 14.3 per cent of farm women earned Rs. 40,001 to Rs. 50,000 annually with mean income of Rs. 46,650, while only 3.7 per cent of respondents earned Rs. 50,001 and above annually with mean income of Rs. 55,420 and standard deviation Rs. 2624.

**Marital status of respondents**

It is obvious from the table 6 reveals the distribution of farm women according to marital status. 41.0 per cent of farm women were found to be married in the study area, whereas, 35.3 per cent of farm women were either single or unmarried. Only 23.7 per cent of respondents were found to be widow.

**Table.1** Distribution of farm women according to age group

N=300

Sl.No.	Age group (years)	Frequency	Per cent	Mean±S.D.
1.	20 – 30	166	55.3	23±5
2.	30 – 40	62	20.7	34±4
3.	40 – 50	42	14.0	43±4
4.	50 and above	30	10.0	54±6
	Total	300	100.0	28±6

**Table.2** Distribution of farm women according to education

N=300

Sl.No.	Education	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Illiterate	96	32.0
2.	Up to Primary	80	26.7
3.	Up to Middle	92	30.7
4.	High School	22	7.3
5.	Intermediate	3	1.0
6.	Graduation	7	2.3
	Total	300	100.0

**Table.3** Distribution of farm women according to caste

N=300

Sl.No.	Caste	Frequency	Per cent
1.	General	65	21.7
2.	O.B.C.	137	45.7
3.	SC/ST	98	32.6
	Total	300	100.0

**Table.4** Distribution of farm women according to occupation

N=300

Sl.No.	Occupation	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Agriculture	147	49.0
2.	Service	23	7.7
3.	Business	36	12.0
4.	Labour	94	31.3
	Total	300	100.0

**Table.5** Distribution of farm women according to annual income

N=300

Sl.No.	Annual income	Frequency	Per cent	Mean±S.D.
1.	20,000 – 30,000	121	40.3	23148±3862
2.	30,001 – 40,000	125	41.7	35872±2730
3.	40,001 – 50,000	43	14.3	46650±3082
4.	50,001 and above	11	3.7	55420±2624
	Total	300	100.0	39296±3926

**Table.6** Distribution of farm women according to marital status

N=300

Sl.No.	Marital status	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Single	106	35.3
2.	Married	123	41.0
3.	Widow	71	23.7
	Total	300	100.0

**Table.7** Distribution of farm women according to land holding

N=300

Sl.No.	Land holding	Frequency	Per cent	Mean±S.D.
1.	Landless	174	58.0	-
2.	Marginal	102	34.0	1.5±0.6
3.	Small	22	7.3	3.7±0.7
4.	Large	2	0.7	5.6±0.9
	Total	300	100.0	2.4±0.8

**Table.8** Distribution of farm women according to farm power and machinery

N=300

Sl.No.	Particular	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Tractor	8	2.7
2.	Potato planter	25	8.3
3.	Potato digger	48	16.0
4.	Automatic potato planter	5	1.7
5.	Potato planter drip	3	1.0
6.	Tube well	60	20.0
7.	Cultivator	40	13.3
8.	Chaff cutter	56	18.7
9.	Sprayer	39	13.0
10.	Drought animal	115	38.3

**Table.9** Distribution of farm women according to number of animals

N=300

Sl.No.	Particular	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Number of animals	288	96.0
2.	Number of milch animals	208	69.3

**Table.10** Distribution of farm women according to type of house

N=300

Sl.No.	Type of house	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Kachcha	144	48.0
2.	Pucca	34	11.3
3.	Mixed	122	40.7
	Total	300	100.0

**Table.11** Distribution of farm women according to social participation

N=300

Sl.No.	Organization	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Block Panchayat	76	25.3
2.	Block Cooperatives	47	15.7
3.	SHGs	53	17.7
4.	NGOs	76	25.3
5.	Mahila Mandal	48	16.0
	Total	300	100.0

### **Land holding**

The table 7 reveals the distribution of farm women according to land holding. Maximum 58.0 per cent of farm women were found to be landless farmers in the study area, followed by 34.0 per cent of respondents who had marginal land holding with mean 1.5 acres and standard deviation 0.6 acres. 7.3 per cent of farm women possessed small portion of land with mean 3.7 acres and S.D. 0.7 acres, while only 0.7 per cent of farm women had large land holding with mean 5.6 acres and standard deviation 0.9 acres.

### **Farm power and machinery**

Table 8 shows the distribution of farm women according to farm power and machinery. 38.3 per cent of farm women had drought animals, followed by 20.0 per cent respondents who possessed a tube well.

18.7 per cent of farm women had a chaff cutter, while only 16.0 per cent of women had a potato digger. 13.3 per cent of women were having cultivator, 13.0 per cent had sprayer, 8.3 per cent of respondents had a potato planter, 2.7 per cent of farm women had a tractor and only 1.7 per cent of farm women possessed an automatic potato planter.

Those farmers who were involved in potato cultivation at commercial level, possessed potato planter (8.3 %), potato digger (16.0 %) and potato planter drip (1.0 %) as it reduced the labour cost and time involved in doing that particular activity.

### **Number of animals (Table 9)**

It is evident from table 9 indicates the distribution of farm women according to animals possessed. 96.0 per cent of respondents had animal whereas, 69.3 per cent of farm women possessed milch animals.

### **Type of house 10**

In table 10 shows the distribution of farm women according to type of house. 48.0 per cent of respondents possessed Kachcha house, whereas, 40.7 per cent of farm women lived in mixed house. Only 11.3 per cent of respondents had a pucca house in the study area. In villages it is seen that mostly villagers live in kachcha houses and pucca houses are only possessed by the upper caste and large farmers. 40.7 per cent of farmers lived in mixed type of houses as they believed that living in both kachcha and pucca house was part of their ritual.

### **Social participation**

Table 11 shows the distribution of farm women according to social participation. 25.3 per cent of respondents participated in block Panchayat and NGOs respectively, while 17.7 per cent of farm women were either members or participated in SHGs and 16.0 per cent of farm women participated in Mahila Mandal in the study area. 15.7 per cent of farm women participated in block cooperative society in the study area.

### **References**

- Fakoya, E.O. and Omoare, A.M. (2014). Impending factors to value addition in the value chain of sweet potato in Osun State, Nigeria”. *Economic and Social Development: Book of Proceedings*: 292-301. Varazdin: Varazdin Development and Entrepreneurship Agency
- Jethi, R. (2008). “Participation of farm women in potato production”. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*; 8(1):63-65.
- Kubrevi, S.S. and Sofi, K.A. (2008). “Knowledge of farmers towards recommended practices of potato

- cultivation". *Environment and Ecology*. 26(4):1688-1690.
- Peer, Q.J. A., Ahmad, N., Kaur, J., Chesti, M. H., Ahmad, H. S., Bhat, A., and Bhat, B. A. (2013). Study on economics of potato growing towards livelihood security. *Afr. J. Agric. Res.* 8(45): 5639-5644

**How to cite this article:**

Rashmee Yadav, Amisha Kumari, Katyayni and Neelma Kunwar. 2018. Socio-Economic Profile of Farm Women in Potato Field, Kannauj District, Uttar Pradesh, India. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci.* 7(04): 3711-3717. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2018.704.417>