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#### Abstract

Bishop of Kenya stressed. "Train a man and you train an individual. Train a woman and you build a nation". A Woman has always been an important and prominent partner in agriculture sector. Since ages women continues as important stakeholder in farming activities in India. Woman directly or indirectly influenced the course of agriculture and animal husbandry. Hence the present study was undertaken to find out the socio-economic profile of respondents of Chittoor district of Andhra Pradesh. The study reveals that although women's agricultural labour force is high but there has not been any significant changes in the status of women farmers.
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## Introduction

According to Swaminathan, the famous agricultural scientist, some historians believe that it was woman who first domesticated crop plants and thereby initiated the art and science of farming. While men went out hunting in search of food, women started gathering seeds from the native flora and began cultivating those of interest from the point of view of food, feed, fodder, fibre and fuel. Women are considered to be pioneers in all sorts of development, as they play a key role in shaping the character of young generation whom we call as the future of the nation. Women contribute nearby equally along with men. In the economic development of our country and hence the prosperity and growth of a nation depends on the status and development of women.
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Rural Women are engaged in farm operations as cultivators, assistants to male cultivators and agricultural labourers. Singh and Sharma (2003) pointed that women are involved in presowing, post-sowing, harvesting and post-harvesting operations as well as allied activities. Khare and Jaiswal (2001) shows involvement of women in planning, decision-making and supervisory activities. However, despite their major role, men have reported continued to dominate farm decision making, even in areas where women are the largest providers of farm labour.

## METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

Secondary Data Collection: The secondary data has been collected through different source of materials, portals, websites and other exiting records. The other relevant data has been collected from various books, magazines, official records, research paper, internet, journals, news articles and other exiting sources of data.

Primary Data Collection: The primary data was collected with the help of a structured interview schedule through personal interview method. The collected data was distributed and subjected to statistical analysis and the results were presented.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data are analyzed in qualitative and quantitative methods. Statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, ranking technique, chi-square and Microsoft excel has been used for analysis of data.

Table.1: Distribution of the respondents according to their age.

| S.no. | Categories | Number of respondents | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Old | 42 | 35 |
| 2. | Middle | 53 | 44.16 |
| 3. | Young | 25 | 20.83 |
|  | Total | 120 | 100.00 |
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The age of respondents was considered as length of time that a person has lived. The data presented in table 1 shows that majority of the respondents 44.16 per cent were of middle age group followed by old age group 35 per cent and young age group 20.83 per cent respectively.

Table.2: Distribution of the respondents according to their education.

| S.no. | Categories | Number of respondents | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Illiterate | 49 | 40.83 |
| 2. | Primary | 40 | 33.33 |
| 3. | Secondary and above | 31 | 25.83 |
|  | Total | 120 | 100.00 |

Education was considered as the standard of education acquired by the respondents, which may affect the decision making process and development of agriculture as a business. The data in table 2 shows that majority of the farm women $40.83 \%$ were illiterate followed by primary education $33.33 \%$ and secondary education and above $25.83 \%$ respectively.

Table.3: Distribution of the respondents according to their caste.

| S.no. | Categories | Number of respondents | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | SC/ST | 44 | 36.67 |
| 2. | Backward | 47 | 39.16 |
| 3. | General | 29 | 24.16 |
|  | Total | 120 | 100.00 |

Caste was considered as one of the factor, which might be influenced the decision making process. It can be easily depicted from table 3 shows that majority of the farm women belongs to backward caste $39.16 \%$ followed by SC/ST and general caste i.e. $36.67 \%$ and $24.16 \%$ respectively.
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Table. 4: Distribution of the respondents according to their Family type.

| S.no. | Categories | Number of respondents | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Individual | 86 | 71.67 |
| 2. | Joint | 34 | 28.33 |
|  | Total | 120 | 100.00 |

Type of family describes the nature of living and taking food under the one roof with the family members together. It may be jointly or individual in one house periphery. The data in table 4 shows that the majority of respondents $71.67 \%$ belonged to individual families followed by joint family $28.33 \%$ respectively.

Table. 5: Distribution of the respondents according to their Family size.

| S.no. | Categories | Number of respondents | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Small | 47 | 39.17 |
| 2. | Medium | 43 | 35.83 |
| 3. | Large | 30 | 25.00 |
|  | Total | 120 | 100.00 |

Family size contributes the work force, which helps in family and farm occupation and effect on the efficiency and nature of work. The data in table 5 shows that $39.17 \%$ of the respondents had small size family followed by medium size family $35.83 \%$ and large size of family $25 \%$ respectively.

Table. 6: Distribution of the respondents according to their land holding.

| S.no. | Categories | Number of respondents | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Small | 46 | 38.33 |
| 2. | Medium | 43 | 35.84 |
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| 3. | High | 31 | 25.83 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 120 | 100.00 |

Size of land holding is directly co-related with the size of business, their production level and social status of farm women. The data in table 6 shows that out of the total farm women $38.33 \%$ had small size of land holding. The next category belongs to medium size of land holding $35.84 \%$, which followed by large category $25.83 \%$.

Table. 7: Distribution of the respondents according to their social participation.

| S.no. | Categories | Number of respondents | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Low | 48 | 40.00 |
| 2. | (No participation in organization) |  | 30.83 |
| 3. | Medium | 37 | 29.17 |
|  | Hember in 1 organization) |  |  |
|  | TMember in more than 1 organization) |  | 100.00 |

The level of social participation or involvement in society reflected their contribution towards development of related enterprise. The data in table 7 shows that out of the total farm women, $40 \%$ had low level of social participation, followed by $30.83 \%$ farm women had medium level of social participation and $29.17 \%$ found to have high level of social participation.

Table. 8: Distribution of the respondents according to their Extension contact

| S.no. | Categories | Number of respondents | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Low | 46 | 38.33 |
| 2. | Medium | 41 | 34.17 |
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| 3. | High | 33 | 27.50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 120 | 100.00 |

Extension contact can be considered as instrument for motivation to human being towards adoption of needed technology which required high decision making power. The table 8 shows that out of total farm women $38.33 \%$ found to in the low level of extension contact categories followed by medium level of extension contact category $34.17 \%$ and high level of extension contact category was $27.50 \%$ respectively.

Table 9: Distribution of the respondents according to their level of Risk orientation

| S.no. | Categories | Number of respondents | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Low | 28 | 23.34 |
| 2. | Medium | 69 | 57.50 |
| 3. | High | 23 | 19.16 |
|  | Total | 120 | 100.00 |

It can be seen from the data presented in table 9 that nearly three-fifth (57.50\%) of the respondents had medium level of risk orientation. Whereas, 23.34 and $19.16 \%$ of the respondents had low and high level of risk orientation, respectively.

Table 10 Distribution of the respondents according to their level of scientific orientation

| S.no. | Categories | Number of respondents | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Low | 46 | 38.34 |
| 2. | Medium | 58 | 48.33 |
| 3. | High | 16 | 13.33 |
|  | Total | 120 | 100.00 |

The results in table 10 indicate that ( $48.33 \%$ ) of the respondents had medium scientific orientation, followed by low ( $38.34 \%$ ) scientific orientation and high ( $13.33 \%$ ) scientific orientation.
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Table 11: Distribution of the respondents according to their level of Economic motivation

| S.no. | Categories | Number of respondents | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Low | 43 | 35.83 |
| 2. | Medium | 42 | 35 |
| 3. | High | 35 | 29.17 |
|  | Total | 120 | 100.00 |

Economic motivation may be considered as the motivation of firms that operate so as to maximize their profits. The data in table 11 shows that out of the total farm women $35.83 \%$ found to low economic motivation category, followed by medium and high economic motivation categories i.e. $35 \%$ and $29.17 \%$ respectively.

## CONCLUSION

On the basis of results in the study it may be concluded that high number of farm women were found to have overall high level of participation in agricultural operations. On the other hand, the farm women participated in decision making process in each and every farm activities. The data clearly indicated that the higher number of farm women were observed in low category of decision making process. Study revealed that age, education, size of the family, family type, size of land holding, social participation, extension contact, economic motivation and risk orientation factors had significantly influenced the participation and decision making pattern of farm women.
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