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Abstract
Productivity of dairy animals, generation of employment for the farm women and generation of income for the family are very closely interrelated phenomena, more so under rural socio-economic situations. Dairy co-operatives have emerged a boon for poor milk producers and also played an important and vital role in the success story of dairy development. In Uttar pradesh, dairy cooperative development programme has achieved a remarkable success and the state has emerged as the largest producer of milk in the country. Milk producers with small scale production constitute an important component of dairying. Many technologies have not reached the women at grass root level. The improved technologies, if properly used, can reduce the drudgery of farm women and increase the work efficiency.
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Introduction
The farm women spent a considerable amount of time on animal husbandry activities. In the lean season, the house wives and mother-in-law and daughter-in-law spent the same amount of time (3 hours 20 minutes) while in the cropping seasons, house wives, mother-in-law and daughter-in-law spent almost the same time. But in the peak season, the times devoted by the mother-in-law more time an agricultural activities. Thus, different family position differed significantly in their participation in 23 out of 35 animal husbandry, sub-activities in six gamut’s of animal husbandry, viz., breeding, feeding, health care, management, livestock products making and marketing.

Research Methodology
The study was conducted in Kheri district. Two blocks Gola and Lakhimpur Kheri purposively selected. Total 10 villages were selected for the study purpose. 10 farm women were randomly selected from each village and sample size was 100. Dependent and independent variable such as age, caste, rules constraint, difficulties etc, were used. The statistical tools as weighted mean and correlation were used.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group (years)</th>
<th>Landless</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>9 (30.66)</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>4 (12.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18 (18.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>12 (40.0)</td>
<td>8 (26.66)</td>
<td>8 (25.0)</td>
<td>3 (37.5)</td>
<td>31 (31.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; above</td>
<td>9 (30.33)</td>
<td>16 (53.33)</td>
<td>20 (62.5)</td>
<td>5 (62.5)</td>
<td>51 (51.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figures in brackets denotes percentage to their respective totals)

Age wise distribution of respondents shows that 51.0 per cent of women respondent belonged to age group 40 and above, 31.0 per cent respondents were between 30-40 years and 18.0 per cent between 20-30 years (Table 1) whereas, in case of landless category (40.0%) were age group 30-40 and 33.33% per cent more 40 & above, 62.5 per cent respondents of large land category belonged to age group 40 & above also 62.5 per cent respondents of small land holding households were in age group 40 & above.
Table 2: Caste wise distribution of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>Landless</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>9 (29.0)</td>
<td>3 (33.3)</td>
<td>24 (24.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC</td>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
<td>11 (35.5)</td>
<td>3 (33.3)</td>
<td>24 (24.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>19 (63.3)</td>
<td>19 (63.3)</td>
<td>11 (35.5)</td>
<td>3 (33.4)</td>
<td>52 (52.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figures in brackets denotes percentage to their respective totals)

Caste wise distribution of respondent reveals that 52.0 per cent respondents were SC and 25.0 per cent were of both upper and OBC castes.

In rural area, caste is an important social instruction. Maximum 63.3 per cent SC respondents were landless and having marginal land followed by 35.5 per cent respondents from OBC and SC households have small land holdings (Table 3).

Table 3: Relationship of socio-personal variables with drudgery assigned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>‘r’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.4481*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caste</td>
<td>-0.2234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.1271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of family</td>
<td>-0.1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>-0.1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of house</td>
<td>0.0764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level of significance

Significant and positive correlated with drudgery undertaken by women respondents in animal husbandry practices. It means that women respondents from old age group feel higher drudgery in animal husbandry operations. Similar findings were also reported by Jain (1991).

Table 4: Drudgery assigned by respondents in animal husbandry and dairying animals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Scale value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fodder carrying</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffing/cutting fodder</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed preparation for animals</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milching</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning animal shed</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making dung cakes</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing milk products</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Drudgery was perceived in the selected operations. This is being reported in tabular form as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Drinking fodder from field</td>
<td>Carrying head load of harvested fodder with strained movement of eyes and neck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Chaffing the fodder</td>
<td>Posture of bending for long hours. Chopping the fodder with bent spinal cord and neck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Offering water for animals</td>
<td>Energy required in bringing water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Cleaning of animals</td>
<td>Energy required in cleaning the animal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>preparation of cow dung</td>
<td>Setting on legs for long hours. Strained movement of hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Making milk products</td>
<td>Care and skill in churning the milk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion
The overall involvement of women in animal husbandry operations in landless categories.
On an average women devote more time in animal husbandry activities irrespective of their land holding categories. Thus, it may be inferred that more drudgery prone practices are performed by women.

Recommendations
- Suitable training programmes for the skill development of rural farm women on animal keeping may be organized so that their carrying potential may be increased with the improved efficiency of the farm women. Their participation in such programmes is likely to bring forward the real and practical problems that need immediate attention of the policy makers.
Promoting intensive livestock raising in rural areas may encourage female to participate more in livestock keeping as this practice did not require farm women to take animals for grazing far away from their homes.
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