Constraints Faced in Adoption of Social Forestry Technology by Tribal and Non-Tribal Members of Farm Forestry Co-operative Societies

1   2   3
S.S. Shekhawat,   M.S. Chouhan   and N.B. Chauhan

INTRODUCTION

India's strategy for forestry development reflects two priorities, firstly through social forestry programmes to supply fuelwood, fodder, small timber and minor forest products to the rural population and secondly to develop production forestry to supply the growing needs of the nation. Social forestry programme (S F P) primarily aims to bring community participation in developing innovative programme for the people by their own co-operation and active support.

Although social forestry project in Rasjthan is under implernentation since 1985-86, involving several government and non-government organisations, it is still in its infancy. Therefore, to identify the constraints faced in the adoption of social forestry technology by the tribal and non-tribal members of farm-forestry co-operative societies, the present study was undertaken.

METHODOLOGY

The study was purposively conducted in one farm-forestry co-operative society having maximum number of members in each of the tribal (Girwa) and non-tribal (Mavli) Panchayat Samities of Udaipur district of Rajasthan. A List of members of Sangwa farm-forestry co-operative society (Non-tribal) having two villages Sangwa and Devali and pipal was farm forestry Co-operative society (Tribal) having villages Pipalwas and Kumari-Khera was obtained from IFFCO Office in Udaipur. On basis of this list, 30 members were selected randomly from each village. Thus, the sample comprised of 120 respondents.

The constraints were categorised into five categories, viz. physical, resources, economic, management and socio-phychological constraints. To measure the constraints, the responses were recorded on a four-point continuum viz. most often, often, seldom and never with scores of 3, 2, 1 and 0 respectively.

Comparison of constraints within the tribal and non-tribal villages and between the villages was done by analysis of variance.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The constraints in adoption of SFP perceived by tribal and non-tribal members are presented in Table 1.

1. Ph.D. Scholar, department of Extension Education, Raj. College of Agriculture, Raj. Agril. University Campus, Udaipur.
2. Assistant Professor, College of Technology and Agricultural Engineering, Raj. Agril. University Campus, Udaipur.
3. Assistant Extension Educationist, BA College of Agriculture, GAU, Anand.

Table 1 : Rank order of constraints according to their importance as perceived by farmers of tribal and non-tribal villages

Constraints	Non-Tribal (N=60)		Tribal (N=60)	
	Mean Score	Rank	Mean Score	Rank
Physcial	4.95	3	5.60	3
Resource	6.51	2	6.95	2
Economic	7.81	1	8.83	1
Management	2.73	4	2.00	4
Socio-Psychological	0.50	5	0.20	5

A perusal of data presented in Table-1 reveals that the constraints in adoption of SFP indentified by the tribal and non-tribal members received identical rank.

Table 2 : Analysis of variance for overall constraints in adoption of social forestry by the farmers of tribal and non-tribal villages

Sources of variation	d.f.	S.S	M.S.S.	`F' Value
Within N T (NTV$_1$ Vs NTV$_2$)	1	30.81	30.81	3.055(NS)
Within T (TV$_1$ Vs TV$_2$)	1	0.8173	0.8173	0.0810(NS)
Between (NT Vs T)	1	34.132	34.132	3.3844(NS)
Error	116	1169.94	10.085	

N S = Non-significant

As evident from Table-2 no significant difference was found within the tribal and non-triabal villages or between tribal and non-tribal villages

Table 3 : Mean sum of square for different constraints in social forestry programme.

Source variation	d.f.	Physcial constraints	Resource Constraints	Economic Constraints	Managment Constraints	Socio-psychological constraints
Within N T (NTV$_1$ Vs NTV$_2$)	1	29.40*	33.756*	28.02*	96.27*	1.66*
Within T (TV$_1$ Vs TV$_2$)	1	00.150	2.016	8.07*	1.06	1.06
Between NT and T	1	14.007*	5.627*	30.99*	16.127*	2.7*
Error	116	1.76	2.173	2.010	2.693	0.3955

* Significant at 0.05 level of probability.

However, when the constraints were compared separately with the help of ANOVA (Table 3), it was found that there was significant difference in all the constraints viz., `physical constraints', (Degreaded land, marginal land, difficulty in approach, lack of soil and water conserationmeasures),`Resource Constraints' (Non-availability of suitable pant and seed materials, implements, plant protection measures, water,rnanures and fertilizers), `Economic Constraints', `Management Constraints' and `Socio-psychological Constraints' within the non-tribal villages Sangwa ($NTV_1$) and Devali ($NTV_2$) and also between the tribal and non-tribal villages. Whereas, within villages Pipalwas ($TV_1$), Kumari-Khera ($TV_2$), significant difference was observed in only `economic constraints'.

The reason for the differences can be understood from table 1, which shows that the mean scores of constraints perceived by tribals were comparatively higher than those perceived by non-tribals. The results indicate that the above constraints were perceived in higher intensity by tribals than non-tribals, because the socio-economic condition of tribals was very poor as compared to non-tribals.

The difference in constraints faced within farmers of non-tribal villages Sangwa and Devali may be due to the fact that Devali is a remote non-tribal village with the conditions similar to a tribal village.

CONCLUSIONS

It was found that the constraint identified by tribals and non-tribals were identical in importance. `Economic constraints' were perceived as most important followed by `Resource Constraints' and `Socio-psychological Constraints' at second, third, fourth and fifth position, respectively.

No significant difference was observed in the constraints of farmers of tribal and non-tribal villages in adoption of social forestry programme.