

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF MEMBERS AND NON-MEMBERS IN DAUSA AND JAIPUR DISTRICTS DAIRY FARMERS – A COMPARATIVE STUDY#

O.P. Meena¹, N.K. Sharma², N.K. Jeph³ and R.K. Dhuria⁴

Department of Veterinary and Animal Husbandry Extension Education, College of Veterinary and Animal Science
Rajasthan University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Bikaner-334 001, Rajasthan, India

ABSTRACT

Received Revised on: 19.10.2017

Accepted on: 18.03.2018

The present study was conducted in Dausa and Jaipur districts of Rajasthan. The primary data collected randomly by survey 80 members and 80 non-members of dairy co-operatives by personal interview method. An analysis of data revealed that majority (51.2% and 35 %) of members and non-members belonged to middle age group (40-55 year). That majority of (52.5% and 43.8%) members and non-members of respondent had medium level of family education status. That majority of members (68.8%) and non-members (51.2 %) respondents were living in nuclear family. An analysis of data revealed that majority (55% and 38.8%) of the members and non-members belonged marginal category of land holding. The results revealed that majority of the members (52.5%) had animal husbandry as their main occupation whereas, majority of the non-members (86.3%) had agriculture as their main occupation. That majority of members (60%) had medium size of herd while, 50 per cent non-members had medium size of the herd. The results revealed that majority (46.3%) of members had medium experience of dairy farming while majority (42.5%) of non-members had low experience. Overall members had membership of co-operative organizations whereas, 37.5 per cent non-members had membership of the co-operative organization.

Key words: Dairy co-operative, socio-economic status, members, non-members

Introduction

The livestock sector is an important sub-sector of the agriculture of Indian economy. It forms an important livelihood activity for most of the farmers, supporting agriculture in the form of critical inputs, contributing to the health nutrition of the household, incomes and offering employment opportunities and finally being a dependable "bank on hooves" in times of need. It is estimated that about 70 million rural households own livestock of one to two species or the other.

Women constitute about 69% of the workforce engaged in livestock sector (DAHDF, 2014). It acts as a supplementary and complementary enterprise. Farmers of marginal, small and semi-medium operational holdings (area less than 4 ha) own about 87.7% of the livestock. According to estimates from the Central Statistics Office (CSO, 2014), the gross value added from livestock sector at current prices was about 1 4,06,035 crores during 2013-14 which is about 21.58% of the gross value added from total agriculture, forestry and fishing sector at current prices and 22.75% at constant prices (2011-12). The livestock sector is contributing about 3.88% of total gross value added of the country at current prices and about 3.92% at constant prices (2011-12). The livestock sector was expanded by 5.5% during 2013-14 against the total agriculture, forestry and fishing sectors growth of 3.7% during the same period at 2011-12 prices (DAHDF, 2014). Rajasthan stand at 2nd rank in the country with annual milk production more than 16) million tonnes and per capita availability is 540 g/day (Dept. of A.H., Rajasthan, 2016). The socio-economic status of the family plays an important role in the adoption of various livestock management practices.

Materials and Methods

The present study was conducted in the Dausa and Jaipur district of Rajasthan in four different blocks of the districts named

Dausa, Lalsot, Amber and Chomu during September to November 2016. These districts were selected purposively for the present investigation. In both districts Livestock owners were associated with Jaipur dairy (Jaipur Zila Dugdh Utpadak Sahakari Sangh Ltd.) for about last four decades, during this period of time, many socio-economic and psychological changes might have taken place due to the intervention of dairy co-operatives. The study was confined to both the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of dairy co-operative i.e. members and non-members of dairy co-operative in the study area. A total of 80 respondents, who were an active member of Jaipur dairy at least ten years were selected from eight villages. Similarly, another 80 non-member respondents were selected from these villages.

Thus, a total sample size of 160 respondents, who possessed of livestock for their livelihood, were selected for the purpose of study. The Ex-post facto research design was used for the study. Respondents were categorized low, medium, high on the basis of equal class intervals between maximum and minimum scores. The data were analyzed using frequency and per centage distribution method.

Results and Discussion

1. Age: Among the members majority of dairy farmers (51.2%) belonged to middle age group (40-55 year) followed by young (33.8%) and old age (15%) and among non-members results revealed that majority of dairy farmers (50%) belonged to young age group followed by middle (35%) and old age (15%). More numbers of members were found in a middle age group in comparison to non-members due to awareness about dairy co-operative services and benefit. These findings are in conformation with Chand *et al.* (2011) who reported that more than half of the respondents (50.83%) belonged to middle age group followed by young age group (32.50%) and old age group (16.67%).

#1Part of M.V. Sc. Thesis and corresponding author present address: Teaching Associate, VUTRC, Tonk, RAJUVAS, Bikaner E mail: mr.o.p.meena@gmail.com; ²Asstt. Professor, Dept. of Vet. & A.H. Extension Education, CVAS Bikaner, RAJUVAS, Bikaner; ³Asstt. Professor, VUTRC Tonk, RAJUVAS, Bikaner; ⁴Professor, Deptt. Animal Nutrition, CVAS Bikaner, RAJUVAS, Bikaner.

2. Caste: The data presented in Table 1 indicated that majority of members belonged to Other Backward Class (36.3%) followed by Schedule Tribe (33.8%), General Caste (21.3%) and Special Backward Caste (8.8%). However, in the case of non-members majority of respondents were belonged to Schedule Tribe (33.8%) followed by General Caste (26.3%), Other Backward Class (20%), Special Backward Caste (16.3%), and Schedule Caste (3.8%). Other Backward Class and Schedule Tribe are more involved in dairy farming because major landholdings of the villages are owned by them and they find it economical to feed their livestock from the fodder obtained from their fields. Further, the food habits of these caste involve more milk intake. Thus, they find it more convenient to have livestock for a regular supply of milk for household demand. These findings have got substantial support from the findings of Khan *et al.* (2014) reported that majority of respondents 41.33 per cent belonged OBC followed by General castes with a proportion of 32.66 per cent and SC was in least proportion of (27.33%) total people involved in dairy farming.

3. Education status of dairy farmers: The results showed that majority of members (27.5%) belonged to illiterate class. However 16.3, 16.3, 13.8, 8.8, 6.3 and 6.3 per cent were educated up to the middle, secondary primary, read and write, graduate and senior secondary level, respectively. Only 5 per cent were educated above graduate level. The revealed that 23.8 per cent non-members were found secondary level. However, 20, 18.8, 11.3, 10, 8.8 and 5 per cent were educated up to illiterate, middle, graduate, senior secondary, primary and read and write, respectively. Only 2.5 per cent were educated above graduate level.

4. Family education status of dairy farmers: Among the members majority (52.5%) of respondents had medium level of family education status followed by low (28.8 %) and high level (18.8 %) and among non-members, majority (43.8 %) had medium level of family education status followed by low (45 %) and high level (11.3 %). It could be concluded that more number of literate person were higher in member families in comparison to non-member families. These findings are substantially supported by findings of Gautam *et al.* (2007) reported that majority of the respondent (66.7%) had a medium level of education status followed by, 18.3 per cent lower level and 15 per cent upper level of education status.

5. Family structure: That majority of the member (68.8%) and non-member (51.2 %) respondents were living in the nuclear family while 48.8 per cent non-member and 31.3 per cent members were living in joint family. These findings were an approximation to the finding of Gulkari *et al.* (2014) observed that majority (56.87%) of the respondents were living in a nuclear family and 43.13 per cent in a joint family. The data further showed that majority of members (77.5%) had small size (< 9 members) family followed by medium (13.8%) and large (8.8%) size families. Unlike in the case of non-members majority of respondents (58.8%) had small size family followed by medium (28.7%) and large (12.5%) size of the family. On the basis of results majority of dairy farmers of both category were living in the nuclear and small family due to more freedom to decision-making process.

6. Land holding size:- The data presented in Table 1 revealed that majority (55%) of the members were belonged marginal category (< 1 ha.) followed by small (20%), medium (18.8) and large size (5%) land holding. Only 1.3 per cent members were found landless. In the case of non-members that majority of (38.8%) were belonged marginal category followed by small (22.5 %), large (17.5 %) and medium (12.5 %) category, respectively whereas,

8.8 per cent, non-members were found landless. On the basis of the above results, it can be concluded that majority (>75%) of the dairy farmers had only 1 to 4 hectares of land. This might be due to high density of population in both districts. Industrialization and urbanization may also have played an important role in the reduction of per capita availability of land. These findings are similar to findings of Tanwar and Kumar (2014) observed that majority (46.67%) of families were marginal followed by small (36.66%) and landless (16.67%) in member families, while in case of non-member marginal, small, and landless families were 51.67 per cent, 28.33 per cent, and 20 per cent, respectively.

7. Annual gross income of farmer's (lac Rs/year):- The results indicated that majority of members (55%) had medium income group (1.9-7.7 lacs/year) followed by 32.5 per cent high-income group and 12.5 per cent low-income group. Whereas, 60 per cent non-members had medium income group followed by 25 per cent high-income group and 15 per cent low-income group. It could be concluded that more numbers of non-members were found in medium income group of annual gross income in comparison to members due to the large land holding of non-members dairy farmers. These findings were in line with findings of Mande and Thombre (2009) reported that 45 per cent livestock farmers had medium income category followed by high (30%) and low-income group (25 %) in Latur district of Maharashtra.

8. Annual gross income from animal husbandry (lacs Rs/year): The results shows that majority (55%) of members had medium income group (1.2-4.3 lacs/year) from animal husbandry followed by high income (27.5%) and low income (17.5%) group. About 43 per cent non-members were falling in medium income category from animal husbandry followed by low income (37.5 %) and high-income group (20 %). More numbers of members found in medium category for annual gross income from animal husbandry in comparison to non-members. It may be due to the rearing of better quality animals, adopted better management practices and selling of milk at a remunerative price to the dairy co-operatives by members. These findings were similar to findings of Singh and Sharma (2006). they studied the extent of income generated through dairy enterprise among members and non-members of dairy cooperative societies in Southern Rajasthan and concluded that member respondents had more income from dairy enterprises than non-member respondents.

9. The primary occupation of dairy farmers: The results revealed that majority of the members (52.5%) had animal husbandry as their main occupation followed by agriculture (46.3%) and services (1.3%). Whereas, the majority of the non-members (86.3%) had agriculture as their main occupation followed by animal husbandry (10 %) and service (3.8 %). On the basis of results, it can be concluded that majority of members had the primary occupation of dairy farming in comparison to non-members due to mostly members respondents had marginal and small land holding and their main income source is animal husbandry.

10. Size of Herd: A perusal of Table 1 indicated that majority of members (60%) had medium size (6.7-11.4 animal unit) of herd followed by small size (25%) and large size (15%) while, 50 per cent non-members had medium size of herd followed by small (37.5%) and large size (12.5%). The farmers with large land holding possessed large herd size in comparison to small and medium livestock owners. This is quite encouraging that is indicative of the fact that dairying is an important component of households income generating activities. At the same time, dairy animals are part and parcel of rural life and

rearing of animals is also considered as sustenance farm activity. These findings were similar to findings of Gautam *et al.* (2007) who conducted a study in Varanasi district of Uttar Pradesh and that reported the majority of respondents have medium size herd (60.4%), followed

Table 1: Distribution of Members and Non-members according to their personal attribute

S.No.	Personal attributes	Members (N = 80)		Non-members (N = 80)	
		F	Per cent	F	Per cent
1.	Age group:				
	(i) Young (below 40 year)	27	33.8	40	50
	(ii) Middle (40 – 55 years)	41	51.2	28	35
	(iii) Old (above 55 year)	12	15	12	15
2.	Caste:				
	(i) General category	17	21.3	21	26.3
	(ii) Other backward category	29	36.3	16	20
	(iii) Schedule category	0	0	3	3.8
	(iv) Schedule tribe	27	33.8	27	33.8
	(v) Special backward category	7	8.8	13	16.3
3.	Education status of farmers:				
	(i) Illiterate	22	27.5	16	20
	(ii) Only read & write	11	13.8	4	5
	(iii) Up to primary	7	8.8	7	8.8
	(iv) Up to middle	13	16.3	15	18.8
	(v) Up to secondary	13	16.3	19	23.8
	(vi) Up to senior secondary	5	6.3	8	10
	(vii) Up to graduation	5	6.3	9	11.3
	(viii) Above graduation	4	5.0	2	2.5
4.	Family education status:				
	(i) Low (<3)	23	28.8	36	45
	(ii) Medium (3 - 4.2)	42	52.5	35	43.8
	(iii) High (4.2)	15	18.8	9	11.2
5.	Family structure:				
	(a) Family type:				
	(i) Nuclear family	55	68.8	41	51.2
	(ii) Joint family	25	31.2	39	48.8
	(b) Family size:				
	(i) Small (< 9 members)	62	77.5	47	58.8
	(ii) Medium (10-14 members)	11	13.8	23	28.7
	(iii) Large (>14 members)	7	8.8	10	12.5
	(iv) Medium (2 – 4 ha.)	15	18.8	10	12.5
	(v) Large (> 4 ha.)	4	5.0	14	17.5
6.	Size of land holding:				
	(i) Land less (no land)	1	1.3	7	8.8
	(ii) Marginal (<1 ha)	44	55	31	38.8
	(iii) Small (1– 2 ha.)	16	20	18	22.5
	(iv) Medium (2 – 4 ha.)	15	18.8	10	12.5
	(v) Large (> 4 ha.)	4	5.0	14	17.5
7.	Annual gross income of farmer's (lacs Rs/year):				
	(i) Low (<1.9)	10	12.5	12	15
	(ii) Medium (1.9 - 7.7)	44	55	48	60
	(iii) Large (>7.7)	26	32.5	20	25
8.	Annual gross income from animal husbandry (lacs Rs/year):				
	(i) Low (<1.2)	14	17.5	30	37.5
	(ii) Medium (1.2 – 4.3)	44	55	34	42.5
	(iii) High (> 4.3)	22	27.5	16	20
9.	Primary occupation:				
	(i) Agriculture	37	46.3	69	86.2
	(ii) Animal husbandry	42	52.5	8	10
	(iii) Service	1	1.3	3	3.8
	(iv) Labour	0	0	0	0
	(v) Business	0	0	0	0
10.	Herd size (standard animal unit):				
	(i) Small (< 6.7)	20	25	30	37.5
	(ii) Medium (6.7 - 11.4)	48	60	40	50
	(iii) Large (> 11.4)	12	15	10	12.5
11.	Type of animal house:				
	(i) Kaccha	10	12.5	16	20
	(ii) Pucca	48	60	36	45
	(iii) Mixed	22	27.5	28	35
12.	Experience in dairy farming (year):				
	(i) Low (<10.4)	23	28.7	34	42.5
	(ii) Medium (10.4 - 29.6)	37	46.3	28	35
	(iii) High (> 29.6)	20	25	18	22.5
13.	Social participation:				
	(i) Co-operative organization	80	100	30	37.5
	(ii) Govt. organization	0	0	16	20
	(iii) Private organization	0	0	16	20
	(iv) Not members any organization	0	0	18	22.5

by 22.1 per cent small size and 17.5 per cent large size.

11. Type of animal house: The results showed that majority (60%) of members had pucca animal house followed by mixed type (27.5%) and kaccha (12.5%). In the case of non-members, 45 per cent had pucca animal house followed by mixed type (35%) and kaccha (20%).

12. Experience in dairy farming: The results revealed that majority (46.3%) of members had medium experience (10.4-29.6 year) of dairy farming followed by low (28.7%) and high (25%) while majority of non-members (42.5%) had low experience followed by medium (35%) and high (22.5%). These findings are similar to findings of Shinde (2011) reported that selected households had fairly long experience in dairy farming and had on an average 20 years of experience in milk production activity. One-third of the commercial farmers had less than 10 years of experience.

13. Social participation: Overall members had member of co-operative organizations. Only 37.5% non-members had membership of co-operative organization followed by 20% govt. The organization, 20% private organization and 22.5% livestock owners were not the members of any organization. These findings are similar to findings of Raval and Chandawat (2011) who conducted a study in Kheda district of middle Gujarat and reported that 90% of the dairy farmers had membership/participation in rural social organizations like milk co-operatives society, gram panchayat, village cooperative society etc as important service providing organizations.

References

Anonymous (2014) Annual Report of 2014-15, Dept of Animal Husbandry, Dairying & Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Govt. of India.

Anonymous (2014) Annual Report of 2013-14, Central Statistics Office, Govt. of India.

Anonymous (2015) Annual Report of 2015-16, Department of Animal Husbandry Rajasthan.

Chand P, Sirohi S and Rathi D (2011) Assessment of women empowerment in dairying: A study of semi-arid Rajasthan. *Indian J. Dry Land Agri. Res. Dev.* **26**(2): 28-32.

Gautam US, Chand R and Singh DK (2007) Socio-personal correlation for decision-making and adoption of dairy practices. *Indian J. Ext. Edu.* **7**(2&3): 10-11.

Gulkari KD, Nethravathi G, Phodiyil O V and Gade Y (2014) Profile analysis of dairy farm women in adoption of scientific practices. *Int. J. Agri. Ext.* **2**(03):159-163.

Khan N, Parashari AK and Salman MS (2014) Role of dairy co-operatives in socio-economic development of dairy farmers in Moradabad district: A case study. *Int. J. Social Sci.* **2**(1) : 1-8.

Mande JV and Thombre BM (2009) Adoption of cattle rearing practices by dairy cattle owners in Latur district of Maharashtra. *J. Dairying Foods Home Sci.* **28**(3&4): 176-180.

Raval RK and Chandawat MS (2011) Extent of knowledge of improved animal husbandry practices and socio-economical characteristics of dairy farmers of district Kheda, Gujarat. *Int. J. Farm Sci.* **1**(2): 129-137.

Shinde SV (2011) Socio - economic profile of dairy farmers in Solapur district of Maharashtra state. *Indian Streams Res. J.* **1**: 86-100.

Singh N and FL Sharma (2006) Extent of Income Generated through Dairy Enterprise Among Members and Non-members of Dairy Cooperative Societies in Southern Rajasthan. *Indian Dairyman* **58**(7): 49-54.

Tanwar PS and Kumar Y (2014) Socio-economic characteristics of member and non-member Families of dairy cooperatives in semi- Arid Rajasthan. *J. Rural Agri. Res.* **14**(1): 1-4.