

A Study on Socio-Economic Profile of Farm & Non-Farm Women of Jagatsinghpur District of Odisha

Bijaya Laxmi Sahu, Dr. Baruna Mitra

Scientist, (Home Science) Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Sundargarh-II, Rourkela, Odisha.

Former Reader in Home Science, Ramadevi Womens College, Bhubaneswar, Odisha.

Corresponding Author: Bijaya Laxmi Sahu

ABSTRACT: Recently, social scientist has begun to study the link between socioeconomic status and health outcomes. Lower socioeconomic status has been connected to increases in health risks, including greater levels of stress, malnutrition, morbidity with lowered productive capacity. While there are no direct correlations, people of lower socioeconomic status frequently lack access to proper nutrition, decent medical care, education etc. than individuals of higher Socio economic profile. Parameters like age, education, income, occupation, family size, occupation, land holding, material possessions have been studied to assess the socioeconomic parameters of rural women residing Jagatsinghpur district of Odisha state.

Date of Submission: 22-11-2018

Date of acceptance: 07-12-2018

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this socio-economic profile is to describe the demographics, jobs and income, housing, and poverty and education etc. of a population which is a key element in social assessment. The socioeconomic factors that determine health include: employment, education, and income. Socioeconomic refers to society related economic factors. These factors relate to and influence one another. It is a way of looking at how individuals or families fit into society using economic and social measures that have been shown to impact individuals' health and well being. Socio-economic status and health condition are closely related, and Socio-economic status can often have profound effects on a person's health due to differences in ability to access health care as well as dietary and other lifestyle choices that are associated with both finances and education. Socio-economic status can be developed in many ways, one of the development would be handicapped as long as village population remain less important, illiterate, powerless, and deprived the just and equitable status most important being education. Now days, literacy and education among rural population has come to mean a more efficient fulfillment of the changing role and status, better quality of life, freedom from ignorance, diseases, poverty, malnutrition etc. Lastly healthy and balanced growth of the nation depends on the proper socio-economic development of a nation. Development is a whole process; its ecological, cultural, social, economic, institutional and political dimensions must be understood and interrelated. For example, your employment will dictate your income. In this paper an attempt is made to present socio, demographic and economic profile of sample farm and non farm women of Sundargarh district of Odisha. The discussion includes aspects such as the distribution of head of households according to their age, size of the households, literacy, economic aspects like land holdings, details of structure and value of assets.

Data base and methodology

Jagatsinghpur district of orissa is selected purposively. Stratified two stage random sampling method will be adopted for the selection of the sample respondents of the rural areas of Jagatsinghpur district. Out of eight blocks of Jagatsinghpur district three blocks are to be selected randomly. In the second stage 100 women from each block out of which 50 Nos from farm sector and 50 Nos. from non farm sector are to be selected randomly. All total 300 women are to be selected for this study. The socio-economic drivers in our study are age, education, occupation, income, family size, land holding and maternal possession. Furthermore, they have been wisely used while analysing the results.

Socio economic Characteristics

Age

Age is one of the most common demographic questions asked in surveys. How old a person is will often determine his/her knowledge and experience with the focus of the study. Asking a respondent about Age is often one of the first demographic questions asked in survey. It has been shown in various scientific disciplines that opinions on a vast number of topics differ between different age groups. Age might be a sensitive topic for

some people. Hence, we have used non-overlapping categories as a result each data point can only fall in one category. The age-wise distribution of the sample has been presented in the following Table-1.1

Table-1.1: Age-wise Distribution of the Sample Respondents.

Sl. No.	Age Groups	Farm Women (N=150)		Non-Farm Women (N=150)		Total (N=300)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
1.	Below 25 Years	50	33.3%	37	24.7%	87	29.0%
2.	25-35 Years	52	34.7%	60	40.0%	112	37.3%
3.	35-45 Years	32	21.3%	35	23.3%	67	22.3%
4.	Above 45 Years	16	10.7%	18	12.0%	34	11.3%

Table-1.1 demonstrates the age-wise distribution of the sample respondents who have shared their views on this study. 33.3% and 24.7% of the farm and non-farm women are below 25 years of age. Similarly, in 25-35 years age group, 34.7% are farm and 40.0% are non-farm women. Taking in to consideration of the total, majority of the respondents (more than 60%) are within 35 years of age. Therefore, comparatively younger people have responded.

1.1.2 Education

Education is linked with the mental and physical ability of an individual to understand and adopt new ideas and practices. Further, education is a process of bringing desirable changes in the behavior of human beings particularly knowledge, skill and attitude. More often than not there are clear differences in opinion between respondents with a different educational level. Moreover, educational level – generally asked as ‘the highest level of education completed’. Asking a respondent about his/her highest level of education completed is often found on surveys. Respondents who completed a four-year degree at a college or university may answer questions differently than those whose education ended in high school. The education-wise distribution of the sample has been presented in the following Table-1.2.

Table-1.2: Education-wise Distribution of the Sample Respondents.

Sl. No.	Educational Level	Farm Women (N=150)		Non-Farm Women (N=150)		Total (N=300)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
1.	Illiterate	9	6.0%	0	0.0%	9	3.0%
2.	Able to Sign	8	5.3%	4	2.7%	12	4.0%
3.	Below Primary	24	16.0%	13	8.7%	37	12.3%
4.	Upto 8th Std.	56	37.3%	60	40.0%	116	38.7%
5.	Upto Higher Secondary	45	30.00%	56	37.30%	101	33.70%
6.	Above Higher Secondary	8	5.30%	17	11.30%	25	8.30%

Table-1.2 above presents the distribution of the sample respondents on the basis of their highest educational level. It may be seen that the highest number of farm (37.3%), non-farm (40.0%) and pooled (38.7%) women respondents have highest educational qualification upto 8th standard. This is followed by upto higher secondary category as 30.0%, 37.3% and 33.7% correspondingly. Rest of the education groups have very less respondents in each category. Illiterates are the least among all. Hence, majority of the sample respondents have highest educational qualification upto higher secondary level.

1.1.3 Occupation

Occupational background often indicates the financial background of a family. Questions relating to occupation are often asked in demographic surveys. Occupation refers to the specific job or work/business that a person is engaged in for most of the time. Usual activity/ occupation is the person’s principal means of earning

for livelihood. He/she may be working for pay; for profit in his/her own farm, business, private practice of a profession or trade; or without pay on his/her own family farm or business. Questions on occupation may allow researchers to factor in respondents' experiences or biases when analyzing results. For example, a financial advisor is likely to answer questions about money and financial management differently than someone from another profession. The distribution of the sample on the basis of different occupations is presented in Table-6.3.

Table-1.3: Occupation-wise Distribution of the Sample Respondents.

Sl. No.	Occupation	Farm Women (N=150)		Non-Farm Women (N=150)		Total (N=300)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
1.	Agriculture	36	24.0%	0	0.0%	36	12.0%
2.	Agriculture+Livestock	64	42.7%	0	0.0%	64	21.3%
3.	Service	0	0.0%	26	17.3%	26	8.7%
4.	Entrepreneur	3	2.0%	13	8.7%	16	5.3%
5.	Cultivation	20	13.30%	0	0.00%	20	6.70%
6.	Daily Labour	27	18.00%	10	6.70%	37	12.30%
7.	Household Activity	0	0.00%	101	67.30%	101	33.70%

Table-6.3 depicts the distribution of the sample respondents on the basis of their occupation which has been classified as agriculture, agriculture + livestock, service, entrepreneur, cultivation, daily labour and household activity. In the farm women category, maximum have agriculture + livestock (42.7%) as occupation whereas in non-farm community maximum are engaged in household activity (67.3%). But, in pooled data, maximum have household activity as their occupation (33.7%). On the other hand, it may be seen that maximum have agriculture related occupation if we consider agriculture, cultivation and agriculture + livestock together.

1.1.4 Income

Income is one of the most important dimensions of socio-economic studies. This also depicts the economic status and strength of a household. Total income refers to the sum of the incomes from all sources of all household members earned. Income of a family influence the decision making habit of the individual and the family. The goal and aspiration are more or less regulated by the income. Hence, opinion of higher income groups may be different from those in lower income groups at certain points. Income might be a sensitive topic for some people. Hence, we have used non-overlapping categories as a result each data point can only fall in one category. The income-wise distribution of the sample has been presented in the following Table-6.4.

Table-1.4: Income-wise Distribution of the Sample Respondents.

Sl. No.	Income	Farm Women (N=150)		Non-Farm Women (N=150)		Total (N=300)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
1.	Below Rs. 10,000	41	27.3%	2	1.3%	43	14.3%
2.	Rs. 10,000 - 15,000	60	40.0%	20	13.3%	80	26.7%
3.	Rs. 15,000 - 20,000	32	21.3%	57	38.0%	89	29.7%
4.	Above Rs. 20,000	17	11.3%	71	47.3%	88	29.3%

From Table-1.4 on income-wise distribution of the sample, it may envisaged that maximum of farm women have income between Rs. 10,000-15,000 (40.0%) whereas maximum of the non-farm women have income more than Rs. 20,000/- (47.3%). In the pooled data, the better three income groups have distribution more or less equally poised. More specifically, majority of farm women have opined to have income within Rs. 15,000/- whereas majority of non-farm women have income at least Rs. 15,000/-.

1.1.5 Family Size

A family or a proximate household is a social unit consisting of a person living alone or a group of persons who: (1) sleep in the same housing unit and (2) have a common arrangement for the preparation and consumption of food. In most cases, a household consists of persons who are related by kinship ties, like parents and their children. In some instances, several generations of familial ties are represented in one household; in other instances, even more distant relatives are members of the household. Household helpers, boarders and non-relatives are considered members of the household provided they sleep in the same housing unit, have common arrangements for the preparation and consumption of food and do not usually go home to their families at least once a week. On this basis, the number of members in a family may be defined. Accordingly, number of members in the respondent's family has been classified in to two categories as (1) upto 5 members and (2) 6 or more members.

Table-1.5: Distribution of the Sample Respondents on the Basis of Number of Family Members.

Sl. No.	No. of Family Members	Farm Women (N=150)		Non-Farm Women (N=150)		Total (N=300)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
1.	Upto 5	95	63.3%	86	57.3%	181	60.3%
2.	6 or more	55	36.7%	64	42.7%	119	39.7%

From Table-6.5 on distribution of the sample on the basis of number of family members, it may envisaged that maximum of farm women (6.3%) and non-farm women (57.3%) hail from families with less than 5 members. In the pooled data, similar trend is also observed (60.3%). More specifically, majority of respondents are from small families.

1.1.6 Land Holding

The size of land holding indicates the extent of landed property owned by the respondent / family. Respondents having landed properties up to 1 hectare, between 1-2 hectares, 2-4 hectares and above 4 hectares are classified as marginal, small, medium and big farmers respectively. Land holding is one of the important aspects of socio-economic status because its outputs contribute to income. Hence, the distribution of the sample on this basis has been presented in the following Table.

Table-1.6: Farmer Category-wise Distribution of the Sample Respondents.

Sl. No.	Type of Farmer	Farm Women (N=150)		Non-Farm Women (N=150)		Total (N=300)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
1.	Marginal Farmer	101	67.3%	77	51.3%	178	59.3%
2.	Small Farmer	43	28.7%	59	39.3%	102	34.0%
3.	Medium Farmer	6	4.0%	9	6.0%	15	5.0%
4.	Big Farmer	0	0.0%	5	3.3%	5	1.7%

Table-1.6 above depicts the distribution of the sample on the basis of category of farmers as per the classifications cited above. It is crystal clear that majority of the respondents are marginal farmers as in farming, non-farming and pooled sample maximum has been obtained as 67.3%, 51.3% and 59.3% correspondingly. The frequency of respondents decreases as the land holding increases.

1.1.7 Material Possession

Possession of household articles also indicates the status of a family. Data collected from the respondents in this regard have been analysed and presented in the following Table-1.7

Table-1.7: Farmer Category-wise Distribution of the Sample Respondents.

Sl. No.	Type of Farmer	Farm Women (N=150)		Non-Farm Women (N=150)	
		N	%	N	%
1.	Radio / TV	34	22.67	136	90.67
2.	Vehicle	24	16.00	12	8.00
3.	Farm Implements	4	2.67	4	2.67
4.	Milch Cattle	26	17.33	2	1.33
5.	Goat / Sheep	70	46.67	0	0.00

From the above Table-1.7, it may be observed that majority of the farm women keep goat/ sheep (46.67%) as it may be an alternative income. In contrast, the non-farm women possess TV/Radio in majority (90.67%) for their entertainment basically. It may not be mandatory for possessing only one item. Hence, in view of the probability of possessing more than one item of the above, the results are presented.

II. CONCLUSION

The above study reveals that the socio-economic well being of village is not satisfactory. Time has come to go our way to help women to grow and attain livelihood security as soon as possible. The women who suffer from high percentage of illiteracy, discrimination and lack of livelihood support need more attention in terms of extension service and infrastructural facilities and development interventions to be planned. It may be noted here that low economic level is the main cause of discontentment among the village resulting social tension and other problems.

Suggestions

- A new approach to education is essential to improve the status of women.
- Small and medium scale enterprise such as agro-based enterprises like nursery raising, fish farming, ornamental fish production, mushroom cultivation, processing and value addition activities should be encouraged at village level. The necessary skills and other facilities should be provided to the rural women through trainings, demonstration and personal guidance to help them to be economically independent.
- Credit guidelines, rural and community banking facilities should be provided.
- Fare prices food shop, road and rural infrastructure should be providing by the government.
- Provide better life for rural women and family planning programme.
- Income oriented programme generated at village level.
- Create awareness about Fisheries, animal husbandry, forestry, poultry farming among the villagers.
- Special programme for target group should be introduced for economically disadvantage family.
- Vocational training should be popularly launched.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Lynch, J., & Kaplan, G. (2000). Socio-economic position. In L. F. Berkman, & I. Kawachi (Eds.), *Social epidemiology* (pp. 13-35). New York: Oxford University Press.
- [2]. Chen, E., Matthews, K. A., & Boyce, W. T. (2002). Socio-economic differences in children's health: How and why do these relationships change with age? *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 295-329.
- [3]. Mohanty SR, Das B, Moahanty T (2013)
- [4]. PruthiS (2014)
- [5]. Chen, E., Matthews, K. A., & Boyce, W. T. (2002). Socio-economic differences in children's health: How and why do these relationships change with age? *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 295-329.
- [6]. White KR. 1982. The relation between socio-economic status and academic achievement. *Psychol. Bull.* 91:461-81.
- [8]. Krieger N, Williams DR, Moss HW. (1997). Measuring social class in US public health research:

Bijaya Laxmi Sahu "A Study on Socio-Economic Profile of Farm & Non-Farm Women of Jagatsinghpur District of Odisha" *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention(IJHSSI)*, vol. 07, no. 11, 2018, pp. 35-39