Constraints affecting livestock development in southern Rajasthan

[1]   [2]
F.L. Sharma and S.L. Intodia

INTRODUCTION

With the increasing pressure on land, agriculture alone cannot provide gainful employment to all in the rural areas. Therefore, allied activities like animal husbandry and dairying have to be viewed as effective instruments of social change for supplementing the income and providing employment to weaker sections of people in rural areas. Special emphasis has been given to various livestock development projects for increasing the productivity of various species of livestock through improvement and better health care. Alongwith it, adequate attention is also being given to feed and fodder production aspects by intergrating them into mixed farming systems and evolving effective producer oriented cooperative marketing systems. These programmes are intended to form an integral part of dry farming systems and area development projects for rainfed,drought prone, hilly, desert and tribal areas. Dairy development assumes the importance in the context of providing balanced diet in general and protein food in particular, lacking in the diet of an average Indian. The National Commission on Agriculture 91976) has recommended that the main aspect of the livestock development is to raise the socio-economic status of the weaker sections of the population, such as small farmers, marginal farmers, landless labourers, scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. With this point of view, the present study was undertaken with the following specific objectives:

1. To identify the constraints affecting in livestock development in Southern Rajasthan.

2. To find out the association of selected variables with constraints faced by respondents in livestock development.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in three districts of Southern Rajasthan, namely Banswara, Dungarpur and Udaipur, having highest percentage of scheduled tribe population. Three tehsils, namely, Gatol (Banswara), Dungapur (Dungarpur) and Girwa (Uadipur) were taken up for the study. Three developed and three under-developed villages were selected from each identified tehsil. For the selection of respondents, ten tribal and ten non-tribal livestock keepers were selected randomly from each identified village. Thus, the total respondents in the study were 360. Data were collected through personal interview technique. For testing the relationship, the Chi-Square (X^2) test was used.

1. Research Investigator, Deptt. of Extension Education, Rajasthan College of Agriculture, Udiapur.
2. Professor & Head, Deptt. of Extension Education, Rajasthan College of Agriculture, Udaipur-313 001.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

An attempt has been made to identify the breeding, feeding, management, health care and marketing constraints affecting in livestock development. The mean score of each constraints was worked out. It was noted from the study that poor result with A.I. practice (2.22), inadequate housing for animals (2.15), expensive diesase treatment (2.14), lack of improved breeding bull (2.14), lack of knowledge of common contagious diseases, their causes and control measures (2.02), unsatisfactory price for milk (1.99), irregular mode of payment (1.97), lack of drinking water for animals (1.97), lack of money for management of animals (1.92), shortage of water for green fodder production (1.91), unavailability of cheap and timely medicines (1.88), non-availability of cheap-timely concentrate for animals (1.88), lack of knowledge about cheap and scientific housing (1.85), lack of knowledge of keeping record of milk production (1.85), treatment facilities not readily available in

camps (1.80), shortage of feeds and fodder for animals (1.77), inefficient services of A.I. centre/hospital (1.68) and insufficient marketing facilities for milk (1.59) were realised as the important contraints in livestock development by the livestock keepers. The constraints perceived by the livestock keepers were grouped under three categories, namely high medium and low with the help of mean and standard deviation of constraint scores of the respondents.

It was clearly found (Table 1) that nearly 68 per cent of the respondents from both developed and underdeveloped villages were in medium group. Only 15 per cent farmers were observed to have low level and nearly 17 per cent were found to have high level of constraints about livestock development. Within underdeveloped villages, about 11 per cent non-tribal respondents were from lower group, while nearly 95 percent tribal respondents were either in high or medium group. In case of developed villages only 5.6 per cent of the non-tribal livestock keepers were from high

Table 1 : Distribution of respondents according to level of constraints in livestock development

Level of const raints	Under-developed villages						Developed villages						Grand Total	
	Tribal		Non Tribal		Total		Tribal		Non Tribal		Total		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Low(78)	04	4.4	10	11.1	14	7.8	13	14.4	27	30.0	40	22.2	54	15.0
Medium (78-100)	63	70.0	60	66.7	123	68.3	63	70.0	58	64.4	121	67.2	244	67.8
High (100)	23	25.6	20	22.2	43	23.9	14	15.6	05	5.6	19	10.6	62	17.2
Total	90	100	90	100	180	100	90	100	90	100	180	100	360	100

F = Frequencies

group and remaining from medium and lower group. Between developed and underdeveloped villages, more or less equal number of dairy farmers were from medium group, while differences were observed in low and high constraints group.

The fingings get support from the findings of Kherde et al (1986) where it was clearly found that more than 50 percent of the respondents from both urban and rural setting were either in high or medium group.

Selected personal variables, namely age, education, size of land holding, income level, family size and herd size were studied to find out their influence on constraints faced by the dairy farmers in livestock development. The results of which are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 : Association between the personal characteristics and constraints perceived by dairy farmers.

Variables	Under-developed villages		Developed villages		Overall
	Tribal	Nontribal	Tribal	Nontribal	
1. Age	0.76NS	0.19NS	2.27NS	2.89NS	1.93NS
2. Education	2.49NS	0.02NS	0.58NS	3.56NS	0.37NS
3. Size of land holding	3.59NS	5.05NS	2.19NS	0.48NS	5.12NS
4. Income level	0.88NS	7.16*	3.53NS	1.59NS	5.40NS
5. Size of family	1.97NS	0.75NS	0.19NS	0.68NS	0.37NS
6. Herd size	6.65*	2.97NS	1.55NS	3.78NS	8.14*

* Significant at 5 per cent level of probability
NS Non significant at 5 per cent level of probability

As observed from Table 2, there was no association between age, education, size of land holding and family size with constraints expressed by either tribals or non-tribals of under developed as well as developed villages and overall too. The findings get support from the study conducted by Sharma (1987) and Kapse (1976).

A study of table further indicates that significant association was observed between herd size and constraints perceived by the tribals of under-developed villages and overall. While, herd size was not associated with constraints expressed by the non tribal farmers of underdeveloped villages and tribal and non tribal dairy farmers of developed villages too.

The non-significant association was found between income and constraints expressed by tribals of underdeveloped villages, tribals and non-tribals of developed villages and overall. The research studies reported by Sharma (1987) also indicated similar trend. In the case of non-tribals of underdeveloped villages, the income was associated with constraints perceived by them in livestock development.

110

Table 3 : Comparison of constraints perceived by the respondents of selected group of villages.

| Problems areas | `F' Value | C.D. | Mean values | | | |
| | | | Underdeveloped villages | | Developed villages | |
			Tribal	Non tribal	Tribal	Nontribal
1. Breeding	6.35**	1.05	18.98	17.76	17.37	16.58
2. Feeding	4.91**	1.34	24.47	23.23	24.29	22.16
3. Management	0.75NS	0.82	13.98	14.47	14.11	14.42
4. Health care	17.31**	1.08	19.33	19.16	17.22	15.96
5. Marketing	72.31**	0.78	16.62	17.34	16.14	14.70

NS   = Non-significant at 5 per cent level of probability
**   = Significant at 1 per cent level of probability.

Table 3 shows that calculated `F' value was greater than its table value in four areas of constraints in livestock developent,namely breeding, feeding, health care and marketing. This points out that there is significant difference in constraints between the respondents of selected groups regards to the aforesaid four areas. Whereas, in case of management constraints, there was no significant difference between the respondents of four groups.

Further analysis of table indicates that tribal and non-tribal respondents of under developed villages had higher mean value as compared to the farmers of developed villages. This reveals that live stock keepers of under-developed had realised more problems than respondents of developed villages in livestock development.

CONCLUSION

The policies and programmes for the development of animal husbandry over the years have produced good results for bringing white revolution in the country

The intrdouction of beneficiary oriented programmes have provided considerable impetus to animal husbandry development and established this occupation as poor man's enterprise to enable him to rise above the subsistance level. In spite of the achievements in this sector, the results are not commensurate with the efforts and resources gone into it. As revealed by empirical evidence in the analysis of this study, 85 per cent of cattle owners either in high or medium level of constraints. Moreover, the constraints can be overcome through action of individual farmers as well as partly by extension agencies and Government policies. Among the personal characteristics, age, education, size of land holding and family size of respondents were not related with constraints. While, income level of non-tribal and herd size of tribals of under developed villages were associated with constraints perceived in livestock development.

111

REFERENCES

Kapse, S.S. 1976. Adoption of selected dairy husbandry practices by cattle owners in the ICDP area of Dhulia. M.Sc.(Ag) Thesis, NDRI, Karnal.

Kherde, K.L., Misra, S.P. and B.S. Malik 1986. Dairy farming training for human resource development. Indian J. of Ext. Edu., 22 (3&4) : 54.

Sharma, F.L. 1987. A study on problems of tribals under MADA of Panchayat Samiti Mavli, Distt. Udaipur (Rajasthan). M.Sc. (Ag) Thesis, Raj. Agril. Univ. Campus Udaipur.

Fashions are like human beings.

They come in, nobody knows when, why or how;

and they go out, nobody knows when, why or how?

- **Charles Dickens**