The Pharma Innovation Journal 2022; SP-11(9): 1927-1929

www.ThePharmaJournal.com

The Pharma Innovation

ISSN (E): 2277-7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2022; SP-11(9): 1927-1929

www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 12-06-2022
Accepted: 25-07-2022

Gurunath Pasare
PG Scholar, Department of LPM, Veterinary College Bidar, KVAFSU Bidar, Karnataka, India

Prashant G Waghmare
Associate Professor & Head, Department of LFC, Veterinary College Bidar, KVAFSU Bidar, Karnataka, India

Vivek M Patil
Associate Professor & Head, Department of LPM, Veterinary College Bengaluru, KVAFSU Bidar, Karnataka, India

Satish Chandra Biradar
Associate Professor & Head, Department of LPM, Veterinary College Bidar, KVAFSU Bidar, Karnataka, India

Prakashkumar Rathod
Assistant Professor, Head, LRIC (Deoni), KVAFSU, Bidar, Karnataka, India

Shrikant Dodamani
Assistant Professor, Department of AGB, Veterinary College Bidar, KVAFSU Bidar, Karnataka, India

Corresponding Author:
Gurunath Pasare
PG Scholar, Department of LPM, Veterinary College Bidar, KVAFSU Bidar, Karnataka, India

Socio-economic status of farmers maintaining indigenous cattle in Bidar district of Karnataka State

Gurunath Pasare, Prashant G Waghmare, Vivek M Patil, Satish Chandra Biradar, Prakashkumar Rathod and Shrikant Dodamani

Abstract
The study was conducted to document the Socio Economic Status of indigenous cattle farmers, total of 150 farmers were selected randomly. Ten variables viz. age, education, family size, occupation, category, landholding, herd size, dairy farming experience and annual income were selected to assess the SES. Data was collected through a structured interview schedule by personal interview method and found that 64% of respondents are belong to middle age group and most were having education up to primary level (41.33%). Majority of them found having nuclear family (72.67%) with medium family size (58%). Agriculture was the sole occupation of 75.33% farmers whereas others had subsidiary occupations like labour, shop keeping, driving etc. Further, 65.33% of the respondents belongs to backward category. The majority of farmers (38.67%) own marginal landholding up to one hectare and most were having a small herd size (69.33%). The respondents had high dairy farming experience of more than 10 years. Most of the farmers had medium level of annual income (60.67%).

Keywords: Socio economic status, Indigenous cattle farmer

Introduction
Socio-economic status (SES) is a combined measurement of economic and social position of an entity compared to others in society. It influences the accessibility to the resources, livelihood pattern, food & nutritional security etc. It often predicts the psychological and behavioural components of a sample viz. knowledge, attitude, perception, adoption, change-proneness, level of aspiration, risk bearing ability, economic motivation etc. Present study tried to investigate SES of farmers maintaining indigenous cattle to correlate it with their adoption of improved dairy farm practices which were meant for higher yield, return, proper utilization of natural resources, sustainable livelihood security and nutritional enrichment.

Materials and methods
The study was conducted in Bidar district of Karnataka State in India during 2021- 22. Bidar district has an area of 5448 square kilometres and lies between 17º35 and 18º25 North latitude and 76º42 and 77º39 East longitude. The climate of Bidar district is characterized by general dryness throughout the year, except during the southwest monsoon. The summer season commence from the middle of February to the first week of June. This is followed by the southwest monsoon season, which continues till the end of September. Fifteen villages were selected randomly and total 150 indigenous cattle holders were selected as primary respondents. The data were collected with the help of semi-structured interview schedule developed exclusively for the study by personal meeting with respondents and direct observation in the study area.

Results and Discussion
Age
A perusal of Table 1 showed that 64% of the respondents were in medium age category (26-50 years), followed by 28% belonging to old age category of above 50 years and 8% are under young age category (below 25 years). The results were in line with the findings of Chandrasekar *et al.* 2017 [2]. The result of this study was contrasting with the findings of Mahla *et al*. (2015) [6].

Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to their age (n=150)

Sl. no	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Young age (0- 25 yrs)	12	8
2	Middle age (25-50 yrs)	96	64
3	Old age (>50 yrs)	42	28

Education

The Table 2 revealed that majority of the farmers studied up to primary level followed by illiterate, secondary and higher level of education 41.33, 28.00, 21.33 and 9.33%, respectively. The findings of the study were in agreement with the findings of Rathod *et al.* (2020) [11] who reported that majority of the farmers were educated up to primary level. Further, the results obtained in the present study were contrary to the findings of Bhanotra *et al.* (2016) [1] who reported that majority of the livestock farmers were literate in Kathua district of Jammu and Kashmir.

Table 2: Distribution of respondents according to their education level (n=150)

Sl. no	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Illiterate	42	28
2	Primary level (Up to 7th class)	62	41.33
3	Secondary level (8^{th}-10^{th} class)	32	21.33
4	Higher level (PUC and above)	14	9.33

Family type and size

The Table 3 revealed that 72.67% of indigenous cattle farmers lived in nuclear family while the rest (27.33%) lived in joint family. Further, 58% of respondents belong to medium sized family with 58% 5 to 7 members followed by 26.67% having < 5 members were categorised as small family and 15.33% belong to large family having more than 8 members. This was in conformity with the studies of Chandrasekar *et al.* (2017) [2] who found that majority of the families had small family size up to 4 members. The findings of Pathade *et al.* (2017) [8] are in contrast to the present results. The results obtained in the study might be indicative of the present trend of keeping the family sizes within the economically manageable proportions and also the trend of influence of urbanization.

Table 3: Distribution of respondents according to their family type and size (n=150)

Sl. no	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Family type			
1	Nuclear Family	109	72.67
2	Joint Family	41	27.33
Family size			
1	Small (≤ 4)	40	26.67
2	Medium (5-7)	87	58
3	Large (≥ 8)	23	15.33

Social status

The Table 4 revealed that 65.33% of the farmer's belonged to backward community followed by 17.33% of general category, 12% of them were from Schedule Caste and 5.33% were from Schedule Tribe community. This result was similar to the findings reported by Potdar *et al.* (2019) [9], Mahesh *et al.* (2020) [5] and Jagadeeswary *et al.* (2010) [3] who reported that majority of the farmers belong to backward community. The results might be attributed to the age-old and traditional nature of livestock rearing by certain communities.

Table 4: Distribution of respondents according to their social status (n=150)

Sl. no	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	General	26	17.33
2	SC	18	12
3	ST	8	5.33
4	OBC	98	65.33

Occupation

The Table 5 revealed that majority of the respondents had agriculture as their primary occupation with 75.33%, followed by agricultural labour, animal husbandry, business and salaried job with 10.67, 9.33, 2.00 and 2.67%, respectively. The findings were similar to the results of Chandrasekar *et al.* (2017) [2], Mahesh *et al.* (2020) [5] and Rathod *et al.* (2020) [11]. Who reported that agriculture was the primary occupation for a majority of the respondents? In contrast to the present findings, Prasad *et al.* (2001) [13] revealed that dairying was the main occupation for 64% of milk producers in the urban area of Hyderabad.

Table 5: Distribution of respondents according to their occupation (n=150)

Sl. no	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Agriculture	113	75.33
2	Animal husbandry	14	9.33
3	Agricultural labour	16	10.67
4	Business	3	2
5	Salaried job	4	2.67

Land holding

The Table 6 revealed that 10% of the farmers were landless. Whereas 38.67% of farmers called as marginal land holders possess less than or equal to one hectare followed by small (1-2 hectares) and large (more than 2 hectares) land holder with 35.33 and 16%, respectively. These findings are in line with the findings of Rathod *et al.* (2012) [10] who reported that most of the dairy farmers were small farmers.

Table 6: Distribution of respondents according to their land holding (n=150)

Sl. no	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Landless	15	10
2	Marginal (< 1ha)	58	38.67
3	Small (1-2 ha)	53	35.33
4	Large (> 2ha)	24	16

Herd size

The Table 7 revealed that 69.33% of the cattle farmers had small herd size (less than 3 animals) followed by 22% of medium herd size (4-7 animals) and 8.67% cattle farmers had large herd size (more than 8 animals). These findings were similar to the reports of Mane *et al.* (2016) [7] who found that majority of the farmers possessed small herd size.

Table 7: Distribution of respondents according to their herd size (n=150)

Sl. no	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Small (≤ 3 animals)	104	69.33
2	Medium (4-7 animals)	33	22
3	Large (≥ 8 animals)	13	8.67

Annual Income

The results indicated that the maintenance of dairy animals was undertaken as an additional source of income supplementing the income obtained through agriculture. Moreover, the small size of herd might be indicative of the lack of availability of resources as well as the lack of remunerative price for desi cow milk in the rural areas. The financial status of the cattle farmers was categorized as low (Rs. < 50000), medium (Rs.50000-100000) and high (Rs.> 100000) comprising 22.67, 60.67 and 16.67%, respectively. These results were similar to the findings of Rathod *et al.* (2012) [10] and Mahesh *et al.* (2020) [5] who stated that majority of cattle farmers belong to medium group.

Table 8: Distribution of respondents according to their annual income (n=150)

Sl. no	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Low (< 50000)	34	22.67
2	Medium (50000-100000)	91	60.67
3	High (>100000)	25	16.67

Conclusions

The above study provides a glimpse of socio-economic profile of farmers maintaining indigenous cattle in Bidar district and ascertains their socio-economic status. It also indicates the socio-economic variables which are associated with the adoption behaviour. The highly correlating socioeconomic variable have to be considered first before offering any technology for adoption and technology should be developed in such a manner so that it creates a symphony with the existing socio-economic status of the intended people.

References

1. Bhanotra A, Gupta J, Singh M. Socio-economic status and communication behaviour pattern of the dairy farmers in Kathua district of Jammu and Kashmir. International Journal of Farm Sciences. 2016;6(1):37-42.
2. Chandrasekar GK, Satyanarayan K, Jagadeeswary V, Shree JS. Relationship between Socio-Economic and Psychological Factors of Dairy Farmers with Days Open–A Study in Rural Karnataka. International Journal of pure and Applied Bioscience. 2017;5(1):171-177.
3. Jagadeeswary VK, Sathyanarayan V, Chandrashekhar Murthy S, Wilfred Ruban, Sudha G. Socio-economic Status of Livestock farmers of Narasapura Village: A Benchmark Analysis. Veterinary World. 2010;3(5):215-218.
4. Khode NV, Sawarkar SW, Banthia VV, Nande MP, Basunathe VK. Adoption of improved dairy cattle management practices under Vidarbha development programme package. Indian Res. J Ext. Edu. 2009;9(2):81-84.
5. Mahesh M, Kumar KA, Satishkumar K, Umesh B, Sreenivas BV. Socio-economic profile analysis of dairy farmers of Yadgir district of Kalyana Karnataka region. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2020;9(4):350-353.
6. Mahla V, Choudhary VK, Saharan JS, Yadav ML, Kumar S, Choudhary S. Study about socio-economic status and calf rearing management practices adopted by cattle keepers of Western Rajasthan, India. Indian J Agric. Res. 2015;49(2):189-192.
7. Mane DU, Dhumal MV, Siddiqui MF, Kochewad SA, Meena LR, Kumar S. Knowledge of Dairy Farmers about Improved Animal Management Practices. Young. 2016;45:22-50.
8. Pathade SS, Sawant MN, Sadashive SM, Pordhiya KI, Ramesh N. Study of Socio-Economic and Psychological Characteristics of Self-Help Group Members. Indian Research Journal of Extension Education. 2017, 97-100.
9. Potdar VV, Khadse JR, Joshi SA, Swaminathan M, Phadke NL, Gaundare YS. Socioeconomic Status and Livestock Study of Bihar, India. Int. J Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. 2019;8(5):1240-1248.
10. Rathod P, Nikam TR, Landge Sariput, Amit Hatey. Perceived constraints in livestock service delivery by dairy cooperatives. A case study of Western Maharashtra, India. Ind. J Dairy Sci. 2012;65(5):423-430.
11. Rathod P, Dixit S, Davala M, Patil M. Development of livestock sector in the semi-arid regions of Karnataka. Status and Strategies. International Journal of Livestock Research. 2020;10(2):1-19.
12. Prasad A, Prasad P. The empire of organizations and the organization of empires: Postcolonial considerations on theorizing workplace resistance. In Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: A critical engagement. Palgrave Macmillan, New York; c2003. p. 95-119.