

A PROFILE ANALYSIS OF ANIMAL HUSBANDRY ENTERPRISE HOLDERS OF FARMER'S INTEREST GROUPS (FIGS) OF NAVSARI DISTRICT

M. Kumari¹, C. K. Timbadia² and A. M. Pandya³

1 & 3 PG Student, Department of Extension Education, N.M. College of Agriculture, NAU, Navsari - 396450

2 Senior Scientist & Head, KVK, NAU, Navsari - 396450

Email: mkumari0418@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Rearing farm animals besides agriculture is routine activity of farming community in India and a large number of farmers depend on animal husbandry for their livelihood. Animal husbandry plays an important role in the rural economy of our country. The present study was carried out in Navsari district of south Gujarat state with the objective of profile analysis of animal husbandry enterprise holders of Farmer's Interest Groups (FIGs). A sample of 120 FIGs members was selected for the study. The ex- post facto research design of social science was used for the present investigation. The findings of the study revealed that majority of the FIGs members belonged to middle age category, educated above secondary level of education, belonged to category of small family size, medium to higher level of animal husbandry experience, active social participation, small size of land holding, medium to large size of livestock possession, low to medium level of innovativeness, possessed medium to higher level of risk orientation, scientific orientation and economic motivation.

Keywords : FIGs, animal husbandry enterprise

INTRODUCTION

Rearing farm animals besides agriculture is routine activity of farming community in India and a large number of farmers depend on animal husbandry for their livelihood. In addition to supplying milk, meat, eggs, bones, hooves, horns, skins, hides etc. they also provide a variety of byproducts. Manures can be used as a source of nutrients for various crops. Animals, mainly bullocks are the major source of power for farmers. Thus, animal husbandry plays an important role in the rural economy of our country. India is the largest milk producing country in the world and also owns the largest livestock population. India possessed one fourth of the bovine population of the world. Agriculture and allied sectors contributed approximately 13.9 per cent of India's GDP during 2013-14 (Annual report, 2013-14) and the overall contribution of livestock sector in total GDP was nearly 4.11 per cent during 2012-13 (Anonymous, 2015). This fact reveals that it is one of the biggest sectors and a large number of rural farmers have been engaged actively in animal husbandry enterprise for their livelihood. Average contribution of livestock towards Gross State Domestic Products (GSDP) of Gujarat is nearly about 5.0 per cent of total GSDP. This shows that livestock plays an important and valuable role in the economic growth and development of the

state. It provides livelihood support to the millions of poor household, not only in employment and income generation but, also as a major source of nutritive food rich in animal protein, manures, fuel and as a wealth. It becomes the best insurance for farmers against vagaries of nature like drought and other natural calamities.

OBJECTIVE

To know the profile of animal husbandry enterprise holders of farmer's interest groups FIGs of Navsari district

METHODOLOGY

A well-structured, easily approachable Animal Husbandry Department of Gujarat along with Vanbandhu College of Veterinary Science and Animal Husbandry have shown their significant presence in Navsari district. Farmers of this region have considered dairy as subsidiary occupation and they possessed varied range as well as potential dairy animals. The famous Vasudhara Dairy is supported by all these milk-co-operative societies. Moreover, the western rail and road services are passing through the middle part of the district hence, the transportation of farm produce and milk towards Surat-Ahmadabad - Delhi or Mumbai is become easy for the dairy entrepreneurs. Considering all these facts,

the Navsari district was purposively selected for the present study. This district has six talukas viz., Chikhli, Gandevi, Jalalpore, Khergam, Navsari and Vansda. The list of FIGs obtained from Project Director, ATMA, Navsari and from that the FIGs classified under animal husbandry selected. All the six taluka were selected and from each taluka two villages were selected randomly. From the said villages the higher milk producer FIGs were obtained and from then after making list of FIGs members, 10 members were randomly selected. Hence a total of 12 villages were covered under this study. From each selected village 1 FIGs containing 10 members were randomly selected to form a total of 120 respondents.

Ex-post facto research design was used in the present investigation. For this study 120 FIGs members

were considered as a sample and termed in this study as respondents. To know the various characteristics of the respondents a structured schedule was developed. For measuring age, education, size of family, size of land holding, livestock possession, annual income, social participation, innovativeness, animal husbandry experience, scientific orientation, economic motivation and risk orientation scale developed by Pandya (2010), Silvakumar (1988), Singh (1977) and Supe (1969) was used with slight modifications. The data were collected with the help of well-structured, pre-tested, Gujarati version interview scheduled through personal contact and data were compiled, tabulated and analyzed to get proper answers for objectives of the study. The statistical tools used were percentage, mean score and standard deviation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table.1 Profile of the animal husbandry enterprise holders of FIGs members

n=120

| Sr. No. | Particulars of Variables | Frequency | Percent |
|----------|---|-----------|---------|
| 1 | Age | | |
| (i) | Young age | 32 | 26.67 |
| (ii) | Middle age | 52 | 43.33 |
| (iii) | Old age | 36 | 30.00 |
| 2 | Education | | |
| (i) | Primary level | 31 | 25.83 |
| (ii) | Secondary level | 80 | 66.67 |
| (iii) | College and above level | 09 | 07.50 |
| 3 | Family size | | |
| (i) | Small family | 79 | 65.83 |
| (ii) | Medium family | 28 | 23.33 |
| (iii) | Big family | 13 | 10.83 |
| 4 | Animal husbandry experience | | |
| (i) | Lower level of animal husbandry experience | 34 | 28.33 |
| (ii) | Medium level of animal husbandry experience | 73 | 60.83 |
| (iii) | Higher level of animal husbandry experience | 13 | 10.83 |
| 5 | Social participation | | |
| (i) | No social participation | 10 | 8.33 |
| (ii) | Poor social participation | 60 | 50.00 |
| (iii) | Moderate social participation | 33 | 27.50 |
| (iv) | Good social participation | 17 | 14.17 |
| 6 | Land holding | | |
| (i) | Small land holding | 80 | 66.67 |
| (ii) | Medium land holding | 24 | 20.00 |
| (iii) | Big land holding | 16 | 13.33 |
| 7 | Livestock possession | | |
| (i) | Small (1 to 2 animal) | 21 | 17.50 |
| (ii) | Medium (3 to 4 animal) | 48 | 40.00 |
| (iii) | Large (Above 4 animal) | 51 | 42.50 |
| 8 | Annual income | | |
| (i) | Above ₹ 2,00,00 | 06 | 05.00 |

| | | | |
|-----------|--|----|-------|
| (ii) | ₹ 1,50,000 to 2,00,000 | 02 | 01.67 |
| (iii) | ₹ 1,00,001 to 1,50,000 | 05 | 04.17 |
| (iv) | ₹ 50,001 to 1,00,000 | 27 | 22.50 |
| (v) | Up to ₹ 50,000 | 80 | 66.67 |
| 9 | Innovativeness | | |
| (i) | Lower level of innovativeness | 57 | 47.50 |
| (ii) | Medium level of innovativeness | 43 | 35.83 |
| (iii) | Higher level of innovativeness | 24 | 16.67 |
| 10 | Risk orientation | | |
| (i) | Lower level of risk orientation | 17 | 14.17 |
| (ii) | Medium level of risk orientation | 89 | 74.17 |
| (iii) | Higher level of risk orientation | 14 | 11.67 |
| 11 | Scientific orientation | | |
| (i) | Lower level of scientific orientation | 13 | 10.83 |
| (ii) | Moderate level of scientific orientation | 76 | 63.33 |
| (iii) | Higher level of scientific orientation | 31 | 25.83 |
| 12 | Economic motivation | | |
| (i) | Lower level of economic motivation | 07 | 05.00 |
| (ii) | Moderate level of economic motivation | 84 | 70.00 |
| (iii) | Higher level of economic motivation | 30 | 25.00 |

The study revealed that majority of the FIGs members (43.33 per cent) belonged to middle age group. This finding supported by the results of Gautam et al., (2007), Desai et al., (2012) and Patel et al., (2013). It was found that majority of the FIGs members (66.67 per cent) were educated upto secondary level followed by 25.83 and 7.50 per cent had primary and college and above level of education respectively. This finding are in line with the results of Biswas et al., (2008) and contrary to the results of Kumar et al., (2011) and Patel et al., (2013). The majority of the respondents (65.83 per cent) were from small family size followed by 23.33 and 10.83 per cent had medium and big family size respectively. This finding partially supported by the outcome of Gautam et al. (2007), Khode et al. (2009), Saha et al. (2010).

It was observed that from Table 1 that majority of the FIGs members (60.83 per cent) had medium level of experience followed by 28.33 per cent of them had lower of animal husbandry experiences and 10.83 per cent of them had higher level of animal husbandry experiences respectively. This indicates that the farmers were much more depended on agriculture and may not have any alternatives to work in other fields than their present enterprise. In case of social participation majority of the FIGs members (91.67 per cent) involved in social activities. It was evident from table

number 1 that majority (66.67 per cent) of the FIGs members possessed to small land holding category followed by 20.00 and 13.33 per cent were in medium and big land holding categories respectively. This finding might be due to inherited deviation of their land from generation to generation and animal husbandry enterprise has been not shown significant viability in the study area. These results are in agreement with the results of Gouda et al. (2013). Majority (42.50 percent) of the FIGs members had large sized livestock possession followed by 40.00 per cent had medium sized and 17.50 per cent had small sized livestock possession. The reason might be that members were aware about the importance of dairying which provides a quick and regular flow of income besides agriculture. It also helps in minimize the influence of risk / failure in agriculture and provides organic manure. The similar findings were reported by Gautam et al. (2007), Saha et al. (2010).

The result presented in table 1 indicated that majority of the FIGs members (66.67 per cent) had annual income up to ₹ 50,000 followed by 22.50, 5.00, 4.17 and 1.67 had annual income Rs. 50,001 to 1,00,000; above ₹ 2,00,000; ₹ 1,00,001 to 1,50,000 and ₹ 1,50,000 to 2,00,000 respectively. The probable reason might be most of them maintained dairy animals for utilization of agricultural byproducts, home

consumption of dairy products and to earn supplementary income. Similar findings were reported by Bhatt (2006) and Rathod *et al.* (2012). As per the innovative was considered majority (47.50 per cent) of the FIGs members had low level of innovativeness followed by 35.00 and 16.67 per cent had medium and higher level of innovativeness respectively. This finding might be due to that the FIGs members were well aware about their resources on hand *i.e.*, level of holding, annual income and livestock possession and therefore, they have had nature to go with new ideas for their improvement. This finding is in conformity with those of Pund (2011), Lawrence and Ganguli (2012), Rathod *et al.* (2012).

When risk orientation was considered, 74.17 per cent belonged to medium risk orientation category followed by 14.17 per cent from low and 11.67 per cent of the respondents reported high risk orientation category. This might be due to truthful information, assured assistances, and surety to get success in their present enterprises develops the risk taking behaviour. Similar findings were also reported by Sharma *et al.* (2011), Upadhyay *et al.* (2013). In case of scientific orientation majority (63.33 per cent) of the FIGs members had moderate level of scientific orientation followed by 25.83 and 10.83 per cent had higher and low level of scientific orientation respectively. The probable reason for the finding might be that they believed in science and also at same level in god. The present finding is in concurrence with the Pandya (2010), Rathod *et al.* (2012), Vinaya *et al.*, (2013) and Upadhyay *et al.* (2013). Majority (70.00 per cent) of the FIGs members had medium level of risk orientation followed by 25.00 and 5.00 per cent had higher to lower level of economic motivation respectively. Similar findings were also reported by Chauhan and Patel (2003), Khin Mar Oo (2005), Vahora *et al.*, (2016) and Reshma *et al.* (2014).

CONCLUSION

Majority of the FIGs members were in middle to old age groups, had above secondary level of education, belonged to category of small family size, had medium to higher level of animal husbandry experience, had active social participation, had small size of land holding, had medium to large size of livestock possession, had medium to higher level of innovativeness, possessed medium to higher level of risk orientation, scientific orientation and economic motivation.

REFERENCES

Khin Maroo, (2005). Knowledge and adoption of improved

dairy management practices by women dairy farmers in Dharwad district. M.Sc. (Agri.) thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad

Annual report (2013-14). Annual report published by Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi. www.agricoop.nic.in

Anonymous (2015). Statistical Year Book, Ministry of statistics and programme implementation, Government of India. www.mospi.nic.in

Bhatt, P.M. (2006). Effect of mass media exposure on dairy farmers regarding animal husbandry practices. Ph.D. (Agri.) thesis. Anand Agricultural University, Anand.

Biswas, S., Sarkar, A. and Goswami, A. (2008). Impact of KVK training on Advance Dairy Farming Practices (ADFPS) in changing knowledge and attitude of prani-bandhu. *J. Dairying, Foods & H.S.*, 27(1): 43-46

Chauhan, N. B. and Patel, R.C. (2003). Entrepreneurial uniqueness of poultry entrepreneurs. *Rural India*, 66(12): 236-239

Desai, M. D., Biradar, N., Manjunath, L., Doddamani, M. T., Mulla, J. A., and Kataraki, P. A. (2012). Livelihood profile of farmers in western region of Maharashtra. *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.*, 25(2): 217-220

Gautam, U. S., Chand, R. and Singh, D. K. (2007). Socio-personal correlation for decision making and adoption of dairy practices. *Ind. Res. J. Extn. Edu.*, 7(2&3): 10-11

Gouda, S., Maraddi, G. N., Meti, S. K. and Hiremath, G. M. (2013). Analysis of existing livelihood systems of respondents in rainfed ecosystem of Koppal district in Karnatak. *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.*, 26(4): 519-523

Khode, N. V., Sawarkar, S. W., Banthia, V. V., Nande, M. P. and Basunathe, V. K. (2009). Adoption of improved dairy cattle management practices under Vidarbha Development Programme Package. *Ind. Res. J. Extn. Edu.*, 9(2): 80-84

Kumar, Shivanand, Veeranna, K. C., Handage, Sushant and Gopala, G. T. (2011). Livelihood security of buffalo rearers through community organisation. *Res. j. Animal Hus. & Dairy Sci.*, 2(1&2): 50-53

- Lawrence, C. and Ganguli, D. (2012). Entrepreneurial behaviour of dairy farmers in Tamil Nadu. *Ind. Res. J. Ext. Edu.*, 12(1): 66-70.
- Pandya, C. D. (2010). A critical analysis of socio-economic status of organic farming followers of South Gujarat. Ph.D. Thesis (Unpublished), NAU, Navsari Campus.
- Patel, N. B., Saiyed, L. H., Rao, T. K. S., Rana, R. S., Modi, R. J. and Sabapara, G. P. (2013). Status and constraints of dairying in the tribal households of Narmada valley of Gujarat – India. *Anim. Sci. Reporter*, 7(3): 83-89.
- Pund, P. B. (2011). Adoption of dairy farming practices and its consequences in tribal areas of Surat districts of Gujarat state. Ms.c. (Agri.) Thesis (Unpublished), NAU, Navsari.
- Rathod, P., Nikam, T. R., Sariput, L. and Amit, H. (2012). Farmers perception towards livestock extension service: a case study. *Ind. Res. J. Ext. Edu.*, Special Issue II: 1-5.
- Reshma, Bheemappa, A., Natikar, K.V., Biradar, N., Mundinamani, S.M. and Havaladar, Y.N. (2014). Entrepreneurial characteristics and decision making behaviour of farm women in livestock production activities. *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.*, 27(2): 173-176
- Saha, D., Akand, A. H. and Hai, A. (2010). Livestock farmers' knowledge about rearing practices in Ganderbal District of Jammu & Kashmir. *Ind. Res. J. Ext. Edu.*, 10(2): 15-19
- Sharma, K., Singh, S. P., and Gautam (2011). Personal attributes affecting training needs perception of buffalo farmers. *Ind. Res. J. Ext. Edu.*, 11(1): 57-61.
- Silvakumar, B. (1988). Information support utilization for awareness, conviction and adoption of cotton whitefly control measures by contact and non-contact farmers. M.Sc.(Agri.) Unpublished Thesis, TNAU, Coimbatore
- Singh, K. (1977). A study of neo marginal farmers and socio-economic impact of new agricultural technology, Ph.D. Unpublished Thesis, IARI, New Delhi
- Supre, S. V. (1969). Factors related to different degree of rationality in decision making among farmers, Ph.D. Thesis (Unpublished), IARI, New Delhi
- Upadhyay, S., Kaur, M. and Desai, C. P. (2013). Constraints analysis of dairy farm women in animal husbandry. *J. of Progressive Agriculture*, 4(2): 63-67
- Vahora, S. G., Thorat, G. N. and Ramjiyani, D. B. (2016). Involvement of Tribal Dairy Women in Health Care Management Practices of Animal Husbandry. *Guj. J. Ext. Edu.*, 27(1): 70-73

Received : September 2017 : Accepted : November 2017