SOCIO-PERSONAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF LIVESTOCK FARMERS IN TONK DISTRICT OF RAJASTHAN

A.K. Jain[1], N.K. Sharma[2], Devi Singh Rajput[3], Pankaj Mishra[4], Bharti Gujar[5] and A.S. Arora[6]
Department of Veterinary and Animal Husbandry Extension, College of Veterinary and Animal Science
Rajasthan University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Bikaner-334001, Rajasthan

Received revised on: 11.07.2018
Accepted on: 23.10.2018

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted in Tonk district of Rajasthan in order to ascertain the profile characteristics of livestock farmers. A total of 120 livestock farmers were selected as respondents from 8 selected villages of 4 tehsils of the district. The study revealed that majority of the farmers were middle aged, literate, having medium sized family and medium level of possessing material with agriculture as primary and animal husbandry as subsidiary occupation. Majority were having small herd strength with 25 years of farming experience, Rs. 4600-8000 monthly income from livestock and medium level of extension contact, mass media exposure, economic and achievement motivation. Findings indicated that majority of the livestock farmers had low to medium profile.

Key words: Livestock farmer, socio-economic change, motivation

Introduction

Livestock sector plays pivotal role in providing nutritive food rich, in animal protein and also helps in supplementing family incomes and generating gainful employment in the rural sector. Presently, India has a huge population of 512.05 million livestock and 729.2 million poultry population, (19th Livestock census, 2012) and accounts for 4.11% of GDP. Though India possesses the richest animal wealth in the world, the productivity in the livestock sector is less than its optimum. Differences in socio-economic condition of the livestock farmers could possibly be a reason for this. At present, the livestock services in India are provided through a network of 11,101 veterinary hospitals/policlinic, 22,745 veterinary dispensaries and 27,050 veterinary aid centres covering a total livestock population of 512 million heads (Basic Animal Husbandry statistics, 2014). Because of significant efforts of the government, several diseases were controlled effectively and there has been significant increase in livestock population and production (Matthewman and Morton, 1996). Better production of livestock help to improve the farmer's socioeconomic condition. In this context, the present study was to undertake a benchmark analysis on socio-economic status of livestock farmers.

Materials and Methods

The present study was conducted in the Tonk district of Rajasthan. Four tehsils namely Deoli, Toda Rai Singh, Malpura, and Niwai were selected randomly from the district. A total of 8 villages at the rate of two from each of the selected tehsil were selected randomly. Out of all the selected villages a total of 120 livestock farmers at the rate of 15 livestock farmers from each of the village having at least one livestock unit were selected for the study. The primary data were collected through pre-tested semi-structured interview schedule for both types of the respondents after discussion with experts and reviewing relevant literature. After collection data were coded, tabulated and analyzed by using various statistical methods viz. frequency, percentage, equal class interval etc.

Results and Discussion

Socio-personal and socio-economic profile of the livestock farmers

1. Age: It could be observed from Table 1 that majority (58.30%) of the livestock farmers were middle aged followed by young (34.20%) and old (7.50%) age groups. It clearly indicated that more number of farmers from middle age group was being attracted towards livestock farming being a commercial enterprise. These observations are in conformity with the findings of Ravikumar *et al.* (2006) who reported that majority of the respondents were in the middle age group.

2. Livestock farming experience: The results revealed that majority of the livestock farmers had medium experience (58.30%) followed by high (28.30%) and low (13.30%) experience. The medium experience of the majority of the livestock farmers could be attributed to the more number of middle-aged livestock farmers in the study area.

3. Education: The results presented in Table 1 showed that majority of the livestock farmers were illiterate (31.70%) followed by middle school (20.80%), high school (16.70%), graduate and above level (13.30%), intermediate level (7.50%), primary school (3.30) education, can read and write (5.80%) and can read (0.80%) only categories. The poor financial resources of the majority of the livestock farmers, lack of awareness on the benefits of education and the non-availability of educational facilities in the rural areas might be the factors responsible for illiteracy among majority livestock farmers. Similar findings were also observed by and Jagadeeswary (2003).

4. Herd size: A perusal of data presented in Table 1 reveal that majority of the livestock farmers had small herd size (65.00%) followed by medium (23.30%) and large (11.66%).

[#1] Part of M.V.Sc. Thesis submitted to RAJUVAS and corresponding author, email id:atuljain2808@gmail.com; [2] Assistant Professor; [3]Assistant Professor; [4]Teaching Associate; [5,]Veterinary Officer, Animal Husbandry Department, Government of Rajasthan; 6Assistant Professor,Diretorate of Extension Education, RAJUVAS, Bikaner

The data reveal that majority of the livestock farmers had low herd size ranging between 0.5 to 9.5 livestock units, which is not a common and healthy trend. Majority of the farmers in the study area expressed that they were reducing their number of animals because of the factors like lack of labor availability, lack of proper price for milk in case of cattle farmers and poor marketing facilities etc. So, the results clearly indicate the need to take up proper measures for mitigating the problems of farmers in the livestock farming which in turn would lead the farmers to go for larger herd size.

5. Material possession: The results presented in Table 1 indicate that majority (46.66%) of the livestock farmers belonged to medium material possession category followed by 38.33 per cent in low and 15.00 per cent in high category of material possession. The medium material possession of the majority of the livestock farmers could be attributed to their successful livestock farming as well as agricultural farming, which might have enabled them to possess necessary materials required for their comfortable living as well as for farming. The results of the study are in consonance with that of Ravikumar *et al.* (2006) who reported that majority of the livestock farmers belonged to medium material possession category.

6. Income from livestock: The results presented in Table 1 show that majority of the livestock farmers had medium income from livestock (52.5%) followed by low (28.33%) and high income (19.16%) from livestock. The findings are similar with findings of Singh and Tripathi (2009).

7. Annual Gross Income: The results reveal that majority of livestock farmers had medium annual gross income (54.16%) followed by low (35.00%) and high income (10.83%). The moderate annual income derived by majority of the livestock farmers could be attributed to their scale of farming, which is of average size with less risk taking in their enterprise management. The results are in conformity with that of Jagadeeswary (2003).

8. Extension agency contact: A perusal of data presented in Table 1 reveal that majority (55.80%) of the livestock farmers belonged to medium extension agency contact category followed by high (25.00%) and low (19.20%) categories. The results of the study clearly showed that majority of the respondents had veiled the opportunity of contacting various sources for obtaining information on scientific livestock farming practices as well on new technologies to a considerable extent, which is a healthy trend. This might be due to their educational status, improving penetration of information communication technology in country at village level, different information sources from which they can obtain the information regarding livestock farming and also availability of information sources in their near vicinity. These findings are in accordance with the findings of Ranjan *et al.* (2015) who observed that majority of the farmers had medium level of contact with livestock extension agents.

9. Mass media exposure: It could be observed from Table 1 that majority of livestock farmers had medium mass media exposure (35.83%) followed by low (34.16%) and high mass media exposure (30.00%). The results of the mass media exposure appear to be fairly satisfactory with majority of the livestock farmers in medium category. This could be attributed to the majority of the respondents possessing the mass media sources like Television, Radio etc.

10. Economic motivation: A perusal of the data presented in the Table 1 indicate that majority (50.00%) of the livestock farmers had medium level of economic motivation followed by high (43.30%) and low (6.70%) level. The results of the

Table 1: Socio- personal and Socio-economic profile of livestock farmers

S. No.	Category	Livestock farmers (N=120)	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Age (years)		
	Young (<40)	41	34.20
	Middle (40-60)	70	58.30
	Old (>60)	9	7.50
2.	Livestock Farming Experience (years)		
	Low (<23.33)	16	13.30
	Medium (23.33-41.66)	70	58.30
	High (>41.66)	34	28.30
3.	Education		
	Illiterate	38	31.70
	Can read only	1	0.80
	Can read and write	7	5.80
	Primary school	4	3.30
	Middle school	25	20.80
	High school	20	16.70
	Intermediate	9	7.50
	Graduate and above	16	13.30
4.	Herd size (Livestock Unit)		
	Small (0.5- 9.5)	78	65.00
	Medium (9.5-18.5)	28	23.30
	Large (18.5-27.5)	14	11.66
5.	Material possession		
	Low (1-3.66)	46	38.33
	Medium (3.66-6.32)	56	46.66
	High (6.32-9)	18	15.00
6.	Income from livestock (Rs.)		
	Low (15000- 56667)	34	28.33
	Medium (56667- 98334)	63	52.50
	High (98334- 140000)	23	19.16
7.	Annual Gross Income (Rs.)		
	Low (20000- 320000)	42	35.00
	Medium (320000- 620000)	65	54.16
	High (620000-920000)	13	10.83
8.	Extension agency contact		
	Low (6-8.66)	23	19.20
	Medium (8.66-11.32)	67	55.80
	High (11.32-14)	30	25.00
9.	Mass Media Exposure		
	Low (1-4)	43	35.83
	Medium (4-7)	41	34.16
	High (7-10)	36	30.00
10.	Economic Motivation		
	Low (2-5)	8	6.70
	Medium (5-8)	60	50
	High (8-11)	52	43.30
11.	Achievement Motivation		
	Low (6-9)	26	21.33
	Medium (9-12)	58	48.33
	High (12-15)	36	30.00

economic motivation also indicated a healthy trend because majority of the livestock farmers belonged to medium and high categories. These findings are in accordance with the findings of Ranjan *et al.* (2015) who reported that majority of the farmers belong to medium level of economic motivation.

11. Achievement motivation: The results revealed that majority (47.90%) of the livestock farmers belonged to medium achievement motivation followed by high (29.80%) and low (21.50%) level of achievement motivation. This indicates fairly positive attitude of the livestock farmers towards livestock farming and it could be attributed to their medium level of cosmopoliteness, medium level extension agency contact and medium mass media exposure. These observations are in conformity with the findings of Singh *et al.* (2013) who reported that majority respondents had medium level of achievement motivation.

References

Anonymous (2012) 19th Livestock Census All India Report Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi: 11.

GOI (2014) Basic Animal Husbandry Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi: 117.

Jagadeeswary V (2003) Establishing private veterinary clinics in Andhra Pradesh. An opinion Study. M.V.Sc. Thesis (Unpub.) submitted to Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad, India.

Matthewmann R and Morton J (1996) Improving livestock production through Extension: Information needs, Institution and opportunities, Network paper 12, ODI, London.

Ranjan S, Rewani SK, Tochhawng L, Wahlang J and Ganguli D (2015) Farmers' perception towards livestock service delivery of non-governmental organizations in Bihar, India. *Int. J. Dev. Res.* **5**(1): 2880-2882.

Ravikumar S, Reddy KVR and Rao BS (2006) Profile of livestock farmers. *Indian Vet. J.* **83**: 1003-1004.

Singh D and Tripathi H (2009) Veterinary services available to pastoralists in arid zone of Rajasthan. *Vet. Pract.* **10**(2): 185-186.

Singh P, Sharma KC and Dahiya NS (2013) Entrepreneurial behaviour of dairy farmers in western Rajasthan. *Vet. Pract.* **14**(2*):* 390-393.