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SUMMARY: Four villages of Arajilines block of Varanasi district were selected for the survey and collected information on employment against farmers. The employment against farmers were observed as service, mixed farming, service plus farming, service plus livestock farming and service plus mixed farming, in 9.24, 20.08, 11.65, 5.69 and 53.41 per cent, respectively. Significant (P<0.05) difference between various modes of employment was observed.

How to cite this article: Prakash, Om (2016). Focus on mode of employment in Arajilines block of Varanasi, U.P. Agric. Update, 11(1): 84-86.

Rural India is the backbone of the country and it provides food to feeds the entire population of the country. The present contribution of livestock to the national gross domestic product (GDP) to be Rs. 1702 billion, which was 3.26 per cent of total and 29.64 percent agricultural GDP (National Accounts Division, 2010). The agricultural sector is growing at an annual rate of 3.3 per cent, which is the lower than the growth of livestock sector (5.6 %). The importance of livestock goes beyond its food production function (Birthal et al., 2002). Livestock plays an important role in the national economy as well as in the socio economic development by augmenting family incomes and generating gainful employment in the rural areas, particularly for the land less, small and marginal farmers and women. Over 73 per cent India’s rural households own bovine and derive supplementary income and nutrition by producing tending, grazing, feeding and milking cow and buffalo. It is one of the largest sources of productive employment in rural India. Indian rural household spend 4.3 labour hours per day per bovine. It generates 14.8 crores employment in feeding, grazing, milking and tending cows and buffaloes alone. Keeping above aspect in the mind, this study was conducted to assess the mode of employment in the four villages of Arajilines block of Varanasi.

For present investigation, four villages of Arajilines block, Varanasi (U.P.) were selected. The proforma for survey were based on containing a number of searching question on various subjects like containing personal information, dairy bovine information, breeding, feeding, production, income and expenditure. Each village was selected within a radius of...
13 km from the block headquarter and situated in four directions namely, North, South, East and West. The villages namely Parmanandpur (A), Banipur (B), Shahanshahpur (C) and Darekhu (D) were also selected on the basis of the most populated villages of each direction of the Arajilines block. Number of houses and family heads were selected making a study of 10 per cent family of each village. The selection started from the centre of the village and covered houses of all directions. The family heads or some responsible members of the family were contacted in the morning or at time in the evening. The raw data so obtained have been arranged in various tables denoting the number and percentage of each type of information. After tabulation the information has been narrated in terms of number and percentage of each village and also on the basis of the combined studies families of the four villages. In some cases the information has also been interpreted as maximum, minimum and the average, wherever possible they have been statistically analyzed for estimation of proximate principles as per procedures recommended by AOAC (1990). The collection of data and interviews with the farmers continued for two months.

As already stated before, a survey of 10 per cent farmers populated in the four villages namely – Parmanandpur (A), Benipur (B), Shahanshahpur (C) and Darekhu (D) has been done. Present study reveals that mode of employment in village Parmanandpur (A) was of 6 (12%) serviceman, 3 (6%) mixed-farming, 9 (18%) service and agriculture farming, 2 (4%) service and cattle farming and 30 (60%) labour and mixed farming (Table 1).

In village Benipur (B) there were 1 (1.16%) serviceman, 14 (16.28%) mixed farming farmers, 8 (9.31%) service plus farming farmers, 5 (5.81%) service plus cattle farming farmers, 58 (67.44%) service plus mixed farming farmers. In Village Shahanshahpur (C) there were 12 (16.22%) serviceman, 16 (21.62%) mixed farming farmers, 10 (13.51%) service plus agriculture farming farmers, 5 (6.76%) service plus cattle farming farmers, and 31 (41.89%) service plus mixed farmers. In village Darekhu (D) there were 4 (10.28%) serviceman, 17 (43.59%) mixed farming farmers, 2 (5.13%) service plus agriculture farming, 2 (5.12%) service plus bovine farming farmers, and 14 (35.90%) service plus mixed farming farmers. The combined employment wise position of farmers in four selected villages indicated serviceman 23 (9.24%), mixed farming farmers 50 (20.08%), service plus agriculture farming farmers 29 (11.65%), service plus bovine farming farmers 14 (5.69%) and service plus mixed farming farmers 133 (53.25%). The study of analysis of variance table shows that there is significant difference among the various categories of employment classified as service farmer, mixed farming farmers, service plus agriculture farming farmers, service plus bovine farming farmers and service plus mixed farming farmers (treatments). It was also found (on the basis of combined farmer population) the highest percentage of service plus mixed farming type farmer (53.41%) and the lowest was of only service farmers (9.24%). The highest service farmers were found in village Shahanshahpur (C) and the lowest in the village Benipur (B). The maximum mixed farming farmers have been found in the village Darekhu (D) while the minimum mixed farming farmers were observed in village Parmanandpur (A). The Shahanshapur had maximum number of minimum number of such type of farmers. The service plus cattle farming farmers were maximum in Shahanshahpur (C) village and minimum in village Parmanandpur (A). The Shahanshapur (C) had maximum number of service plus mixed farming farmers and Darekhun (D) had minimum number of such type of farmers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment in village</th>
<th>Service (%)</th>
<th>Mixed farming (%)</th>
<th>Service + farming (%)</th>
<th>Service + Livestock (%)</th>
<th>Service + Mixed farming (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>F. Cal</th>
<th>F. Tab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6 (12.0)</td>
<td>3 (6.0)</td>
<td>9 (8.0)</td>
<td>2 (4.0)</td>
<td>30 (60.0)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1 (1.16)</td>
<td>14 (16.28)</td>
<td>8 (9.31)</td>
<td>5 (5.81)</td>
<td>58 (67.44)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12 (16.22)</td>
<td>16 (21.62)</td>
<td>10 (13.51)</td>
<td>5 (6.71)</td>
<td>31 (6.76)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4 (10.28)</td>
<td>17 (43.59)</td>
<td>2 (5.13)</td>
<td>2 (5.13)</td>
<td>14 (35.90)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23 (9.24)</td>
<td>50 (20.08)</td>
<td>29 (11.65)</td>
<td>14 (5.69)</td>
<td>133 (53.25)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean
5.75
12.50
7.25
3.50
33.25

* indicates significance of value at P<0.05
Difference between means with dissimilar superscription is significant.
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