P-ISSN: 2618-0723
E-ISSN: 2618-0731

NAAS Rating: 5.04
www.extensionjournal.com

International Journal of Agriculture Extension and Social Development

Volume 8; Issue 7; July 2025; Page No. 429-432

Received: 21-05-2025
Accepted: 27-06-2025

Indexed Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal

Socio-economic status of Rice respondents in Azamgarh district of Uttar Pradesh

[1]Alok Kumar, [2]NR Meena, [3]RK Doharey, [4]DK Singh and [1]Aditya Singh

[1]M.Sc. Scholar, ANDUAT, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

[2]Assistant Professor ANDUAT, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

[3]Professor ANDUAT, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

[4]Professor, ANDUAT, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.33545/26180723.2025.v8.i7f.2187

Corresponding Author: Alok Kumar

Abstract

The study was conducted in 2024-25 Azamgarh District of Uttar Pradesh, there are seventy-five districts out of these districts, Azamgarh District is selected purposively for the study to understand the ground reality of rice production technology with respect to the issues in the village. Azamgarh district has Twenty-two block out of these blocks, two block Jahanaganj and Rani ki Sarai were selected to the study because socio-economic status of the farming community of this area is poor and less aware with the advancement in agriculture technology. selection of respondents was done by random sampling method and 10 respondents were selected from each identified 20 villages to make a total sample size of 200 respondents. Descriptive research design was followed for the present study. For the analysis of data Arithmetic mean, Standard deviation, Frequency, Percentage, Minimum and Maximum value were used. Analysis of data reveals that majority of the respondents 60.00 Per cent belonged to middle age group (33-54) years, majority of respondents 38.50 Per cent belonged to General caste category, majority of respondents 90.50 Per cent belonged to Hindu religion category, majority of the respondents 94.50 Per cent were literate, majority of respondents 61.50 Per cent belonged to the annual income of Rs. (02.08 to 03.49 Rs.), majority of respondents 68.00 Per cent belonged to (1.01- 2.0 ha.) small farmers category, majority of respondents 55.00 Per cent belonged to no participation in any organization, majority of respondents 53.50 Per cent belonged to mixed housing pattern categories, maximum 59.00 Per cent of respondents was belonged to medium level of risk orientation, majority of 78.00 Per cent of respondents found in medium level of scientific orientation, majority of 59.00 Per cent respondents having medium level of economic motivation, maximum respondents contact to Gram Pradhan, got at 1st rank in formal sources, maximum respondents contact with family members, got at 1st rank in informal sources, majority respondents used mobile, got at 1st rank in mass media exposure of extension contacts.

Keywords: Socio-economic, rice respondents, literate, arithmetic mean, standard deviation etc.

Introduction

The Rice plant (*Oryza sativa* L) is belonged to the *Poaceae* family. India is the second largest rice producing country after China, Rice is the most important cereals food crop of India, rice is a good source for the dietary requirements of the people, and contains a low percentage of Calcium and primarily a high-energy or high calorie food, rice is the first cultivated crop in Asia and it is also a plant of Asian origin, the cultivated rice plant is an annual which usually grows to a height of (0.5-2 meter) but there are certain varieties that grow much taller (6-9 meter). Rice plant can be divided into two main parts, namely root system and shoot system, the genus *Oryza* includes 24 species, of which 22 are wild and 2 are namely *Oryza sativa* and *Oryza glaberri*ma are cultivated, the temperature essential for proper growth of rice varies from 15 ℃ to 33 ℃. most suitable soil for rice loam to clay loam soils. the soils enrich in clay and organic matter having good water holding capacity are ideal for puddle rice cultivation. It prefers the soils, which have 5.5 and 6.5 pH of soils. Rice is also known as king of cereals. It is a primary grain crop for more than 50 Per cent of the world population. Rice is the main vital and drastically grown meals crop in India and it's far the staple meals for greater that ½ of the sector populace. Rice is a dietary staple for about 62.80 Per cent of the inhabitants on the planet and accounts for 20 Per cent of the calorie intake for the world population, in Asia it accounts for 29.30 Per cent (Timmer, 2010). India covered an area about 47.82 million hectares of land under rice cultivation with the production of 1378.25 LMT in 2023-24 year. (Department of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare (DA&FW) 2023-24). The major states that produce rice are Uttar Pradesh, Telangana, West Bengal, Punjab, Chhattisgarh, Odisha, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh. In year 2022-2023 Uttar Pradesh covered an area about 5.90 million hectares of land under rice cultivation with production of 16.14 million tones (Agricultural Statistics at a Glance 2022-23). Rice is one of the principal commercial crops of districts- Azamgarh, Shahjahanpur, Barabanki, Siddharth Nagar, Bahraich, Maharajganj, are major district of rice growing area of Uttar Pradesh. (https://data.desagri.gov.in). In year 2021-22 Azamgarh district covered an area under rice cultivation

212,383 hectare with production of 5080 metric tons. (updes.up.nic.in).

Research methodology

Azamgarh district is selected purposively for the study to understand the ground reality of rice production technology with respect to the issues in the village. Azamgarh district has Twenty-two block out of these blocks, two block Jahanaganj and Rani ki Sarai were selected to the study because socio-economic status of the farming community of this area is poor and less aware with the advancement in agriculture technology. selection of respondents was done by random sampling method and 10 respondents were selected from each identified 20 villages to make a total sample size of 200 respondents. descriptive research design was followed for the present study. Primary data were collected through interview schedule. data was classified, tabulated and analyzed to make the findings meaningful for interpretation various statistical methods Arithmetic mean, Standard deviation, Frequency, Percentage, Minimum and Maximum value were used accordingly.

Results and Discussion

The findings and discussion of the study are being presented with respect to the variable of age, caste, religion, education, annual income, land holding, social participation, housing pattern, risk orientation, scientific orientation, economic motivation, extension contact. The frequency and distribution of rice respondents according to selected independent variables has been presented as under:

1. Age

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

S. No.	Categories	Respondents	
		f	%
1.	Young (up to 33)	38	19.00
2.	Middle (34 to 54)	120	60.00
3.	Old (55 and above)	42	21.00
	Total	200	100.00

Mean= 44.82, S.D.= 10.91, Min.= 29, Max.= 74, f= Frequency,%= Percentage

The above table- 1. reveals that majority of respondents 60.00 Per cent belonged to middle age group (34 to 54) followed by 21.00 Per cent of respondents belonged to old age group (55 and above) and only 19.00 Per cent of respondents belonged to the young age group (up to 33), respectively. The mean age of respondents ranged from 44.82 years. A similar finding was also reported that majority of the respondents was observed in the middle age category (Shamna 2015) [9].

2. Caste

Table 2: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of their caste

S. No.	Categories	Respondents	
		f	%
1.	General caste	77	38.50
2.	Other Backward caste	63	31.50
3.	Scheduled caste	60	30.00
	Total	200	100.00

f= Frequency,%= Percentage

The above table- 2. reveals that the majority of the respondents 38.50 Per cent belonged to general caste category, followed by other backward caste 31.50 Per cent and scheduled caste 30.00 Per cent, respectively. Thus, it may be concluded that the General caste was found dominantly engaged in rice production technology in this area of study.

3. Religion

Table 3: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of their religion

S.no.	Categories	Respondents	
		f	%
1.	Hindu	181	90.50
2.	Muslim	19	05.50
	Total	200	100.00

f= Frequency,%= Percentage

The table- 3. reveals that the majority of the respondents 90.50 Per cent belonged to Hindu religion category, followed by Muslim religion 05.50 Per cent, respectively.

4. Education

Table 4: Distribution of respondents on the basis of their education

S. no.	Categories	Respondents	
		f	%
1.	Illiterate	11	05.50
2.	Literate	189	94.50
i	Can read and write only	25	12.50
ii	Primary school	30	15.00
iii	Middle school	40	20.00
iv	High school	31	15.50
v	Intermediate	35	17.50
vi	Graduate & Post graduate	28	14.00
	Total	200	100.00

f= Frequency,%= Percentage

The table- 4. reveals that the majority of the respondents 94.50 Per cent were literate and 05.50 Per cent illiterate further, the educational level was worked out and given in ascending order as 12.50 Per cent, 14.00 Per cent, 15.00 Per cent, 15.50 Per cent, 17.50 Per cent, and 20.00 Per cent, can read and write, graduate & post graduate, primary school, high school, intermediate, middle school, respectively.

5. Annual income

Table 5: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of their annual income (Rs.)

S.no.	Annual Income	Respondents	
		f	%
1.	Low (up to 2.07)	40	20.00
2.	Medium (2.08-3.49)	123	61.50
3.	High (3.50 and above)	37	18.50
	Total	200	100.00

Mean= 2.78, S.D.= 0.71, Min.= 1.5, Max.= 06, f= Frequency,%= Percentage

Table- 5. reveals that maximum number of the respondents 61.50 Per cent were belonged to the annual income range of medium (2.08 to 3.49 lakh) while, 20.00 Per cent and 18.50

Per cent respondents belong to annual income range of low (up to 2.07 lakh) and high (3.50 lakh and above), respectively.

6. Land holding

Table 6: Distribution of respondents on the basis of their land holding (hectares)

S.no.	Categories	Respondents	
		f	%
1.	Marginal (below 1.0)	43	21.50
2.	Small (1.01-2.0)	136	68.00
3.	Medium (2.01-10)	21	10.50
	Total	200	100.00

Mean= 1.67 S.D.= 0.50, Min.= 0.5, Max.= 3, f= Frequency,%= Percentage

The table- 6. reveals that 68.00 Per cent of respondents were having less than 2 hectare of land who belonged to small category, followed by 21.50 Per cent and 10.50 Per cent respondents belonged to marginal and medium categories, respectively. The average size of land holding was found to be 1.67 hectare. therefore, it may be said that the small and marginal farmers were mostly there in the study area.

7. Social participation

Table 7: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of their social participation

S. no.	Participation	Respondents	
		f	%
1.	No participation	110	55.00
2.	Participation in one organization	86	43.00
3.	Participation in two organization	04	02.00
	Total	200	100.00

Mean= 1.47, S.D.= 0.53, f= Frequency,%= Percentage

Table- 7. reveals that majority of 55.00 Per cent respondents have no participation in any organization, followed by 43.00 Per cent respondents has participation in one organization, while were 02.00 Per cent respondents has participation in two organization, respective.

8. Housing pattern

Table 4.1.8: Distribution of respondents on the basis of their housing pattern

S.no.	Housing pattern	Respondents	
		f	%
1.	Kaccha	05	02.50
2.	Mixed	107	53.50
3.	Pucca	88	44.00
	Total	200	100.00

Mean= 2.41, S.D.= 0.54, f= Frequency,%= Percentage

The table- 8. reveals that 53.50 Per cent of respondents were belonged to Mixed housing pattern category and remaining respondents belonged to pucca and kaccha housing pattern categories were 44.00 Per cent and 02.50 Per cent, respectively, the average size of housing pattern was found to be 2.41. therefore, it may be said that the mixed and pucca housing pattern were mostly there in the study area.

9. Risk orientation

Table- 9: Distribution of respondents on the basis of their risk orientation

S.no.	Categories	Respondents	
		f	%
1	Low (up to 19)	23	11.50
2	Medium (20 - 22)	118	59.00
3	High (23 and above)	59	29.50
	Total	200	100.00

Mean= 21.58, S.D.= 1.59, Min.= 15, Max.= 26, f= Frequency,%= Percentage

Table- 9. reveals that majority of respondents 59.00 Per cent was found in medium level of risk orientation while 25.33 Per cent and 10.67 Per cent respondents were found in high and low level of risk orientation categories, respectively. the average mean of scores of risk orientation observed to be 21.58. Hence it can be concluded that the most of the respondents have average interest to bear the risk relating to improved farming.

10. Scientific orientation

Table 10: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of their scientific orientation

S.no.	Categories	Respondents	
		f	%
1	Low (up to 19)	19	09.50
2	Medium (20-21)	97	48.50
3	High (22 and above)	84	42.00
	Total	200	100.00

Mean= 21.24, S.D.= 1.45, Min.= 17, Max.= 26, f= Frequency,%= Percentage

Table- 10. reveals that majority of respondents 48.00 Per cent were found in medium level of scientific orientation while, 42.00 Per cent high and 09.50 Per cent respondents were found in the categories of high level of scientific orientation, respectively. The average mean of scores of scientific orientations observed to be 21.24.

11. Economic motivation

Table- 11: Distribution of the respondents on the basis of economic motivation

S. no.	Categories	Respondents	
		f	%
1	Low (up to 17)	17	08.50
2	Medium (18-19)	118	59.00
3	High (20 and above)	65	32.50
	Total	200	100.00

Mean= 18.93, S.D.= 1.10, Min.= 16, Max.= 22, f= Frequency,%= Percentage

Table- 11. reveals that majority of respondents 59.00 Per cent was found having medium level of economic motivation followed by 32.50 Per cent and 08.50 Per cent respondents were such who had high and low level of economic motivation respectively. the average mean of scores for economic motivation was observed to be 18.93.

12. Extension contacts

Table 12: Distribution of respondents on the basis of their extension contact

S. no.	Source of Information	Respondents	
		MSV	RANK
A.	**Formal Sources**		
1	B.D.O.	1.01	VII
2	A.D.O.	1.025	VI
3	V.D.O.	2.515	III
4	Gram Pradhan	6.37	I
5	Co-operatives	01	VIII
6	Agriculture College/University	1.525	IV
7	Fertilizer/Seed Stores	3.77	II
8	Agriculture Scientists	1.525	V
	Average	2.34	
B.	**Informal Sources**		
1	Family Members	5.75	I
2	Neighbours	5.73	II
3	Friends	4.685	III
4	Relatives	3.25	V
5	Local Leaders	3.33	IV
6	Progressive farmers	2.505	VI
	Average	4.23	
C.	**Mass media exposure/Contact**		
1	Radio	5.71	IV
2	T.V.	5.245	V
3	News paper	5.98	III
4	Agri. books	4.845	VI
5	Field day	2.12	VIII
6	Mobile	6.8	I
7	Farmer fair	2.27	VII
8	Demonstration	2.04	IX
9	Folders	1.75	X
10	Internet	6.01	II
	Average	4.27	
	Total Average (mean)	3.62	

Table-12. Extension contact of respondents with different Information sources were categorized into three categories namely formal sources, informal sources, and mass media exposure/contact So, contact with formal sources was concerned, Gram Pradhan, followed by Fertilizer/Seed Stores, V.D.O., Agriculture College/University, Agriculture Scientist, and A.D.O., B.D.O., Co-operative Society, got the rank order 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, respectively. The mean scores of all formal sources are 2.34.

Contact with informal sources was concerned, family members, followed by neighbours, friends, local leaders, and relatives, progressive farmers got rank order is 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, respectively. The mean scores of all informal sources are 4.23.

Among the mass media exposure mobile, followed by Internet, newspaper, radio, T.V., agriculture books, farmer fair, field day, demonstration, and folders, got rank order is 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, respectively. The mean scores of all mass media exposure/contact are 4.27.

Hence, it can be deduced that mass media exposure/contact sources of information seemed to be most important as generally utilized by most of the respondents. The formal and informal information sources were also utilized by respondents with considerable extent. The overall mean of scores for formal, informal and mass media exposure/contact information sources are 3.62.

Conclusion

Study focuses on socio-economic status of rice respondents. The study indicated, that Majority of farmers were middle aged, Hindu religion, literate categories. General Caste respondents were found dominantly. Majority of respondents belonged to medium annual income category. they had annual income between Rs. 2,08000/- to 3,49000/. Majority of respondents are found in small category of land holding; they have less than 2.0 hectare of land. Majority of respondents have no participation in any organization. Majority of respondents belonged to Mixed housing pattern category. Majority of respondents was found in medium level of risk orientation. Majority of respondents found in medium level of scientific orientation. Majority of respondents was having medium level of economic motivation. Majority of respondents concerned with Gram Pradhan in formal sources, family members in informal sources and maximum respondents used mobile in mass media exposure of extension contacts.

References

1. Arathy B. Constraint analysis of rice farmers of Trissur district of Kerala [MSc thesis]. Hyderabad: Acharya N G Ranga Agricultural University; 2011.
2. Arya, Roshani. Utilization pattern of indigenous technical knowledge regarding rice cultivation among the tribal farmers in Nagod block of Satna district (Madhya Pradesh) [MSc thesis]. Jabalpur: Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya; 2018.
3. Dutta BP. A study on the adoption behaviour of rice farmers towards alternate wetting and drying (AWD) technology in Puri district of Odisha [MSc thesis]. Bhubaneswar: Orissa University of Agriculture and Technology; 2015.
4. Hadi S, Wijaya I, Prayag H. Socio-economic analysis of hybrid rice variety “Optima” farming in district of Banyuwangi to increase income. Budapest Int Res Critics Inst J (BIRCI-Journal). 2018;1(3):236-43.
5. Iqbal T, Nanda R, Pishin R, Bagel YS. A study on socio-economic status of Gujjars and Backcrawls of Jammu division of India. Asian J Agric Ext Econ Sociol. 2019;29(1):1-6.
6. Nirmala K. A study on diffusion status and adoption of system of rice intensification (SRI) in Mahaboob Nagar district of Andhra Pradesh [MSc thesis]. Hyderabad: Acharya N G Ranga Agricultural University; 2012.
7. Punwar, Sunil. Factors influencing adoption of hybrid rice production technology among the hybrid rice growers of Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh [MSc thesis]. Jabalpur: Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya; 2017.
8. Sadvi P, Raddy MJM, Rao IS. A study on profile characteristics of hybrid rice seed growers. Res J Agric Sci. 2015;6:1768-71.
9. Sharma K, Dhaliwal NS, Kumara J. Analysis and adoption of constraints perceived by small paddy growers in rice production technologies in Muktsar, Punjab, India. Indian J Ext Educ. 2015;15(2):86-92.
10. Tengli S, Sharma VK. Adoption of improved paddy cultivation practices by farmers of South Gujarat. Res J Agric Sci. 2017;8:1358-61.