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#### Abstract

Women plays a significant and crucial role in agricultural development and allied fields. The central role of women in any society ensures stability, progress and long-term development of a nation. Rice is the stable food of more than half of the world's populations. It is known fact that rural women historically have played and continue to play important role in rice farming activities. Considering the importance regarding the extent of participation of rural women in rice cultivation. Hence the present study was undertaken to find out the extent of participation of rural women in paddy cultivation with respect to socio-economic profile of rural women of Wangoi tehsil in Imphal- West district of Manipur. The study revealed that the relationship between participation and socio-economic profile of respondents were Education( $0.295^{*}$ ), Mass media exposure ( $0.371^{*}$ ), Social participation $\left(0.430^{*}\right)$, Sources of information( $0.300^{*}$ ), Innovative Proneness $\left(0.478^{*}\right)$ and Economic motivation $\left(0.414^{*}\right)$ are positively significant at $0.05 \%$ whereas Age ( -0.164 NS ), Family size( 0.186 NS ), Annual income( 0.177 NS ) and Land holdings( -0.159 NS ) are positive but non-significant at $0.05 \%$ to extend of participation of the respondent respectively.
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## INTRODUCTION

Women are the backbone of agriculture in Manipur. It has a total population of 2570390 and female population constitute of $49.81 \%$ to the total population. Average female's work forces contribution in Manipur is $43.35 \%$. Almost all women in the rural Manipur can be considered as a 'Farmer' in some sense. Comprising the majority of agricultural labourers, they have been putting in labour not only in terms of physical output but also in terms of quality and efficiency, sometimes work as unpaid
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agricultural labour in the family. Women are involved in all aspects of agriculture operations, from crop selection to land preparation to seed selection, planting, weeding, pest control, harvesting, crop storage, handling, marketing and processing. Manipuri women do not stay behind the veil.

## METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

Primary Data Collection: The primary data has been collected through survey and observation. Through schedule, data has been collected from the farmers of selected villages Schedule has been prepared with both close ended and open ended questionnaire.
Secondary Data Collection: The secondary data has been collected through different source of materials, websites and other exiting records, various books, magazines, official records, research paper, internet, journals, news articles and other exiting sources of data.

## STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF DATA

Data collected were qualitative as well as quantitative. Qualitative data were converted into quantitative data. The quantitative data were tabulated on the basis of logical categorization method. Percentage, Coefficient correlation and Microsoft Excel were used for analysis purpose.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

## Distribution of Socio-economic Profile of the respondents

## Table-1: Distribution of the respondents according to their Age.

| S.I. <br> No. | Age (years) | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Young (25-35 years) | 24 | 20.00 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Middle age (36-55) | 78 | 65.00 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Old (above 55) | 18 | 15.00 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

It is seen in the table 1 that 65 per cent of the respondents were of middle age group followed by 20 per cent young age group and 15 per cent old age group respectively.

Table-2: Distribution of the respondents according to their Size of family.

| SI <br> no. | Particulates | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Upto 5 members | 69 | 57.05 |
| 2 | Above 5 members | 51 | 42.05 |
|  | Total | 120 | 100 |

It is evident from the above table that 57.05 per cent of respondents had upto 5 members in the
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family whereas respondents 42.05 per cent respondents had Above 5 members in the family.

## Table-3: Distribution of the respondents according to their Educational attainment.

| SI <br> no. | Particulates | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Illiterate | 50 | 41.66 |
| 2 | Primary school | 29 | 24.16 |
| 3 | High school | 19 | 15.83 |
| 4 | Intermediate | 12 | 10.00 |
| 5 | Graduate | 7 | 5.83 |
| 6 | Post-Graduate | 3 | 2.05 |
|  | Total | 120 | 100 |

The above table shows that 41.66 percent respondents were Illiterate and 24.16 percent respondents were Primary school and 15.83 percent respondents were High school and 10.00 percent respondents were Intermediate and 5.83 percent respondents were Graduate and 2.05 percent respondents were Post-graduate.

Table-4: Distribution of the respondents according to their Land holdings.

| SI <br> no. | Particulates | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Low (below 1 hac) | 77 | 64.16 |
| 2 | Medium (1-2 hac) | 33 | 27.05 |
| 3 | High ( more than 2hac) | 10 | 8.33 |
|  | Total | 120 | 100 |

It is evident from the above table that 64.16 per cent respondents were having below 1 hac. of land, 27.05 per cent respondents were having 1-2 hac. of land and 8.33 per cent were having more than 2 hac. of land.

Table-5: Distribution of the respondents according to their Yearly income.

| SI <br> no. | Particulates | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Low (Rs.30000-50000) | 61 | 50.83 |
| 2 | Medium (Rs.50001-70000) | 45 | 35.05 |
| 3 | High (Rs.70001-90000) | 14 | 11.66 |
|  | Total | 120 | 100 |

It is clear from the above table that 50.83 per cent respondents have Annual income of Rs.
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$30000-50000$, 35.05 per cent respondents have between Rs. $50001-70000$, and 11.66 per cent respondents have income between Rs. 70000-90000.

Table-6: Distribution of the respondents according to their Mass Media Exposure.

| Sl. <br> no. | Particulates | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Low | 63 | 52.05 |
| 2 | Medium | 46 | 38.33 |
| 3 | High | 11 | 9.16 |
|  | Total | 120 | 100 |

It is evident from the above table that 52.05 per cent of the respondents were having low mass media exposure followed by the medium user that is 38.33 per cent of the respondents and their remaining 9.16 per cent of the respondents falls under high mass media exposure.

Table-7: Distribution of the respondents according to their Social Participation.

| Sl. <br> no. | Particulates | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | No membership | 17 | 14.01 |
| 2 | Membership in one organization | 57 | 47.05 |
| 3 | Membership in more than one <br> organization | 20 | 16.06 |
| 4 | Office bearer in one <br> organization | 16 | 13.33 |
| 5 | Office bearer in more than one <br> organization | 10 | 8.33 |
| 6 | Distinctive holder | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | 120 | 100 |

The above table shows that 47.05 per cent of the respondents were under membership in one organization followed by 16.06 per cent having membership in more than one organization and 14.01 per cent of having No membership and 13.33 per cent were office bearer in one organization and 8.33 percent were office bearer in more than one organization and 0 percent falls under the category of distinctive holder.

Table-8: Distribution of the respondents according to their Sources of Information.

| Sl. <br> no | Particulates | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Low | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 0 0}$ |
| 2 | Medium | 47 | $\mathbf{3 9 . 1 6}$ |
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| 3 | High | 13 | 10.83 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Total | 120 | 100 |

Table 8 indicates that majority of the farm women were low user that is 50.00 per cent of information sources, followed by medium user that is 39.16 per cent of information sources and 10.83 per cent were high user of information source.

Table-9: Distribution of the respondents according to their Innovative Proneness.

| Sl. <br> no. | Particulates | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Low | $\mathbf{7 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 . 1 6}$ |
| 2 | Medium | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 8 3}$ |
| 3 | High | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 0 0}$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

It is evident from the above table that majority of the farm women 59.16 per cent had low access of innovative proneness followed by 25.83 per cent of respondents had medium access of innovative proneness; where only 15.00 per cent had high access of innovative proneness.

Table-10: Distribution of the respondents according to their Economic motivation.

| Sl. <br> no. | Particulates | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Low | 21 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 0 5}$ |
| 2 | Medium | 72 | $\mathbf{6 0 . 0 0}$ |
| 3 | High | 27 | $\mathbf{2 2 . 0 5}$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

The table appraises about the distribution of the farm women on the basis of economic motivation. It was found that majority of the respondent 60.00 per cent have medium economic motivation followed by high 22.05 per cent and only 17.05 per cent have low economic motivation.

Table 11. Extent of participation of farm women in rice cultivation.

| Sl. <br> No. | Practices |  |  |  |  |  | Extent of participation |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Full <br> participation |  | Partial <br> participation |  | No <br> participation |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | F | \% | F | \% | F | \% |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Selection of seed | 33 | 27.5 | 75 | 62.5 | 12 | 10.00 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Seed treatment | 29 | 24.16 | 66 | 55.00 | 25 | 20.84 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Cleaning of field | 43 | 35.83 | 60 | 50.00 | 17 | 14.16 |  |  |  |  |

SALONA THINGBAIJAM et al, International Journal of Advances in Agricultural Science and Technology, Vol. 8 Issue.4, April-2021, pg. 1-8

ISSN: 2348-1358
Impact Factor: 6.057
NAAS Rating: 3.77

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | Sowing | 44 | 36.67 | 53 | 44.16 | 23 | 19.17 |
| 5 | Transplanting | 52 | 43.34 | 38 | 31.66 | 30 | 25.00 |
| 6 | Manure and fertilizer <br> application | 17 | 14.17 | 41 | 34.16 | 62 | 51.67 |
| 7 | Weeding | 29 | 24.16 | 57 | 47.05 | 34 | 28.34 |
| 8 | Irrigation | 17 | 14.17 | 41 | 34.16 | 62 | 51.67 |
| 9 | Plant protection measure | 20 | 16.67 | 30 | 25.00 | 70 | 58.33 |
| 10 | Harvesting | 12 | 10.00 | 28 | 23.33 | 80 | 66.67 |
| 11 | Threshing | 10 | 8.33 | 20 | 16.67 | 90 | 75.00 |
| 12 | Winnowing | 10 | 8.33 | 20 | 16.67 | 90 | 75.00 |
| 13 | Post harvest | 21 | 17.05 | 87 | 72.05 | 12 | 10.00 |
| 14 | Transportation | 35 | 29.16 | 62 | 51.67 | 23 | 19.16 |

Table 12. Distribution of overall participation of farm women in rice cultivation.

| Respondents |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Sl. No. | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
| 1 | Low | 21 | 17.05 |
| 2 | Medium | 69 | 57.05 |
| 3 | High | 30 | 25.00 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
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Table 16. Correlation of socio-economic of rural women with their extent of participation of in paddy cultivation.

| Sl.no. | Characteristics | Correlation coefficient (r) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Age | -0.164 NS |
| 2 | Family size | 0.186 NS |
| 3 | Education | $0.425^{*}$ |
| 4 | Annual income | 0.177 NS |
| 5 | Land holding | -0.159 NS |
| 6 | Mass media exposure | $0.371^{*}$ |
| 7 | Social participation | $0.430^{*}$ |
| 8 | Sources of information | $0.300^{*}$ |
| 9 | Innovative proneness | $0.478^{*}$ |
| 10 | Economic motivation | $0.414^{*}$ |

* $=$ Significant at $\mathrm{p}=0.05, \mathrm{NS}=$ Non Sisnificant

The data from the above table shows that Education, Mass Media Exposure, Social Participation, Sources of information, Innovation proneness and Economic motivation are positively significant at $0.05 \%$ whereas Age, Annual income and Land holdings are positive but non-significiant at $0.05 \%$ to extend of adoption of the respondent respectively.

## CONCLUSION:

It can be concluded that most of the respondents (57.05\%) had medium level of Participation followed by high $(25.00 \%)$ and low ( $17.05 \%$ ). The relationship between participation and socio-economic profile of respondents shows that Education(0.295*), Mass media exposure $\left(0.371^{*}\right)$, Social participation( $0.430^{*}$ ), Sources of information( $0.300^{*}$ ), Innovative Proneness $\left(0.478^{*}\right)$ and Economic motivation $\left(0.414^{*}\right)$ are positively significant at $0.05 \%$ whereas Age(-0.164NS), Family size(0.186NS), Annual income(0.177NS) and Land holdings(-0.159NS) are positive but non-significiant at $0.05 \%$ to extend of participation of the respondent respectively. Hence it is imperative that rural women play a pivotal role in paddy cultivation, holding the backbone of their family moreover, government and the experts should take more steps like training, field demonstration, more interaction with the farmers, more government schemes, loans so that more people can participate in farming as it also generates the income for women which will help in the upliftment of society.
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