



ISSN (E): 2277-7695  
ISSN (P): 2349-8242  
NAAS Rating: 5.23  
TPI 2023; 12(3): 4860-4864  
© 2023 TPI

[www.thepharmajournal.com](http://www.thepharmajournal.com)

Received: 08-01-2023

Accepted: 14-02-2023

**Pawan Saini**

M.V.Sc. Scholar, Department of  
Veterinary and Animal  
Husbandry Extension,  
Rajasthan, India

**Tikam C Goyal**

Assistant Professor, Incharge-  
Pashu Vigyan Kendra, Dholpur,  
Rajasthan, India

**Rohitash Kumar**

Teaching Associate, Pashu  
Vigyan Kendra, Ladnun,  
Nagour, Rajasthan, India

**Pooja Thakan**

M.V.Sc. Scholar, Department of  
Veterinary and Animal  
Husbandry Extension,  
Rajasthan, India

**Lokesh Gautam**

Assistant Professor, Department  
of Animal Breeding and  
Genetics, Rajasthan, India

**Manisha Singodiya**

Teaching Associate, RAUVAS,  
Bikaner, Rajasthan, India

**Umesh Choudhary**

Teaching Associate, Pashu  
Vigyan Kendra, Ratangarh,  
Churu, Rajasthan, India

**Corresponding Author:**

**Pawan Saini**

M.V.Sc. Scholar, Department of  
Veterinary and Animal  
Husbandry Extension,  
Rajasthan, India

## Socio-economic profile of livestock owners in Udaipur District of Rajasthan

**Pawan Saini, Tikam C Goyal, Rohitash Kumar, Pooja Thakan, Lokesh Gautam, Manisha Singodiya and Umesh Choudhary**

### Abstract

The study was conducted in Udaipur district of Rajasthan state selected purposely since the district has highest livestock population in Southern Rajasthan. It was observed that majority of the respondents were from middle age group, middle level of education, medium family size and medium dairy experience. Further, majority of the respondents had not attended any training related to livestock farming. Majority of the respondents were having medium level of economic motivation, extension contact and mass media exposure. Based on the findings it is suggested that awareness about right to education, livestock training programmes should be carried out to educate, enhance knowledge and skills of livestock owners.

**Keywords:** Socio-economic status, livestock owners, Udaipur

### Introduction

Livestock plays an important role in Indian economy. About 20.5 million people depend upon livestock for their livelihood. Livestock contributed 16 per cent to the income of small farm households as against an average of 14 per cent for all rural households. It also provides employment to about 8.8 per cent of the population in India. Livestock sector contributes 4.11 per cent GDP and 25.6 per cent of total Agriculture GDP. India's livestock sector is one of the largest in the world and vast in livestock resources. In recent years, the livestock sector has emerged as an important segment of an expanding and diversifying agricultural sector in the Indian economy (Tisdell and Gali, 2000) [17]. Economic survey (2020) reported that livestock sector has grown at a compound annual growth rate of 7.9 per cent during last five years. Livestock income has become an important secondary source of income for rural families and has expected an important role in achieving the goal of doubling farmers' income.

The livestock farming is a very important socio-economic activity in Indian agriculture, as milk is the second largest agricultural commodity, next only to rice (Sarkar and Ghosh, 2010) [14]. Goat and sheep are known as the poor man's cow or bank on hooves which can survive with least resources. The livestock provides nutrient-rich main food products such as milk, meat and eggs for human consumption, draught power, dung as organic manure and domestic fuel, hides and skin and are a regular source of cash income for rural households. They are a natural capital, which can be easily reproduced to act as a living bank with offspring as interest and an insurance against income shocks of crop failure and natural calamities.

Livestock service delivery system is an agency or institution that delivers various inputs and services pertaining to livestock production to the intended clientele either free of cost or charging according to service rendered. Livestock services can be classified in four categories: a) curative services b) preventive services c) production services and d) human health protection, (Umali and De Haan, 1992). Delivery of quality and affordable veterinary services is one of the effective means of enhancing livestock productivity. These services make an indispensable contribution to the physical, mental and social welfare of livestock keepers (Prabhakaran, 2000). However, access to these vital services is inadequate as public resources are insufficient to serve the entire population. Lack of personnel, shortage of inputs (drugs, vaccines and equipment), poor mobility and one size-fits-all model animal health service delivery system lets the nation to be with in a limited coverage (Abebe, 2003 and Admassu, 2010). Keeping these into consideration, the present study was conducted to know the socio-economic profile of livestock owners in Udaipur district of Rajasthan.

## Research methodology

The study was conducted purposively in Udaipur district of Rajasthan. Out of 15 tehsils, four tehsils *viz.*, *Jhadol, Salumbar, Vallabhnagar and Mavli* were selected purposely based on higher livestock population and different livestock service delivery systems like dairy cooperative societies, public and private livestock service delivery systems, private dairies, milk vendors, veterinary public health centers and other agencies. In the next stage of sampling, three villages were selected randomly from each of the selected tehsils. Thus, total 12 villages were selected for the study. From each village, 12 livestock owners availing the services of different livestock service providers were selected randomly. Thus, total 144 respondents were selected for the present study. The data were collected through structured interview schedule from the respondents. The collected data were tabulated and analyzed by using appropriate statistical appropriate tools. To identify the socio-economic status of the respondents, they were categorized into 12 categories on the basis of their personal attributes namely age, education, occupation, family size, land holding, herd size, annual gross income, experience in livestock farming, extension contact, mass media exposure, social participation and economic motivation.

## Results and discussion

The results pertaining to socio-economic profile of respondents are presented here under in following sub-heads and Table.

### 1. Age

The data presented in the Table 1 indicates that majority of the respondents (67.36%) belonged to middle age group ranging from 36 to 54 years followed by young (18.05%) and old (14.59%) age group. It was observed from the data that a very high percentage of respondents were middle aged in the study sample. This may be due to the fact that the middle-aged people are more active member of the family with enough experience in livestock farming and are more interested about the health and production services of farm animals. These findings are in line with the findings of Jagadeeswary (2003) [5] and Ravikumar *et al.* (2006) [11]. The average age of the respondents was found to be 44.52 years.

### 2. Education

Education leads to desirable changes in the knowledge and skills of individuals. A perusal of data presented in the Table 1 reveals that majority of the respondents (28.47%) were illiterate followed by up to primary level (24.30%), up to middle level (16.67%), up to high school level (14.58%), up to intermediate level (10.42%) and graduate and above (5.56%) and in support with the finding of Jagadeeswary (2003) [5].

### 3. Occupation

It was observed that half of respondents had major occupation of livestock farming while 34.02 per cent of the respondents had agriculture, 6.94 per cent respondents had labour (agricultural/non-agricultural), 4.17 per cent of the respondents had service (Govt./private), 3.48 per cent of the respondents had other occupations (driver, etc.) and only 1.39 per cent of the respondents were having trade and commerce as their occupation. The findings are in line with the findings of Tekale *et al.* (2013) [16], Bhosale *et al.* (2014) [2] and Raina

*et al.* (2016) [8] who found that majority of the respondents were belonged to livestock and agriculture category of occupation.

### 4. Family size

Majority of respondents (45.84%) have medium family size *i.e.*, 5-8 members, while 34.02 and 20.14 per cent respondents belonged to small (up to 4 members) and large (>8 members) family size, respectively. This may be due to the impact of family planning and welfare programs run by the government that might have motivated dairy entrepreneurs to maintain medium size of families. Furthermore, the literacy and education might have contributed positively in keeping families of medium and small size. The findings are similar with the findings of Rathod *et al.* (2011) [10], Tekale *et al.* (2013) [16], Bhosale *et al.* (2014) [2] and Raina *et al.* (2016) [8].

### 5. Land holding

Majority (52.78%) of the respondents belonged to medium category of land holding *i.e.*, 1.1 to 2.0 hectares, followed by 29.85 per cent respondents who had small sized land *i.e.*, up to one hectare in possession. 14.59 per cent and 2.78 per cent of respondents were belonged to large (above 2 hectares) category and no land (landless) of land holding, respectively. The average land holding of the respondents was found to be 1.66 hectares. The reason to fell in small to medium category of land holding by majority of respondents could be due to subdivision and fragmentation of land because of breaking down of joint families in to nuclear ones. The findings are in conformity with the findings of Chaurasiya (2015) [3], Meena (2016) [7], and Kumar (2017) [6].

### 6. Herd size

It was found that majority of livestock owners (72.23%) possessed medium herd size *i.e.*, 7-18 animals, while 14.58 and 13.19 per cent of the respondents had small and large herd size, respectively. The average herd size of the respondents was found to be 11.83 animals. The findings are in line with the findings of Tekale *et al.* (2013) [16], Bhosale *et al.* (2014) [2], Sarita *et al.* (2016) [13] and Kumar (2017) [6] who found that majority of the respondents had medium herd size.

### 7. Annual gross income

Annual income indicates the socio-economic position of an individual in the community and affects the adoption behaviour of an individual. The data presented in Table 1 points out that two-third of the respondents (66.67%) fell in the medium level of annual income group while 19.44 and 13.89 per cent of respondents were having high and low annual income, respectively. The average annual gross income of respondents was 1,22,993.06 in rupees per year. It is encouraging to note that majority of respondents had good economic status that indicates that they can buy improved breeds of livestock. The findings are in line with the findings of Ahuja (2015) [1], Meena (2016) [7], and Kumar (2017) [6].

### 8. Experience in livestock farming

Experience in livestock farming directly reflects the knowledge level and adoption behaviour of livestock owners towards scientific practices of livestock farming. A look into the Table shows that majority of respondents (71.53%) had medium (16.92 to 38.54 years) experience in livestock farming followed by high (>38.54 years) and low (<16.92

years) (12.50%) experience which accounts 15.97 per cent and 12.5 per cent, respectively. The average experience in livestock farming of respondents was 27.73 years. These findings are in line with that of Jagadeeswary (2003) [5]. The average livestock farming experience of respondents was 20.18 years.

### 9. Extension contact

Most of the respondents (66.66%) had medium level of extension contacts, followed by similar number of high and low (16.67% each) level of extension contacts. The average score of the extension contact among the livestock owners was 8.43. The distribution of the respondents in the study area on the possession of this attribute can said to be skewed. The findings are in line with the findings of Chaurasiya (2015) [3], Ahuja (2015) [1] and Gaikwad (2010) [4].

### 10. Mass media exposure

It is evident from data in Table 1 that majority of the respondents were found in the medium level of mass media exposure category with 63.19 per cent while 21.54 and 15.27 per cent of them were hailed to low and high level of mass media exposure category, respectively. The average score of

the mass media exposure among the livestock owners was 4.85. The findings are in line with the findings of Sah (2005) [12], Gaikwad (2010) [4] and Chaurasiya (2015) [3] who found that majority of the respondents had medium level of mass media exposure.

### 11. Social participation

It was observed that majority of respondents (57.64%) had a medium level of social participation followed by low (22.92%) and high (19.44%) level of social participation. The average score of the social participation among the livestock owners was 1.96. The present findings are supported by the findings of Singodia *et al.* (2019) [15].

### 12. Economic motivation

A look to the data in Table 1 indicates that majority of respondents (60.42%) had a medium level of economic motivation followed by low (25.69%) and high (13.89%) level of economic motivation. The average score of the Economic motivation among the livestock owners was 12.21. The above finding is in consonance with the earlier findings of Rathod *et al.* (2014).

**Table 1:** Distribution of respondents according to their personal attributes (n=144)

S. No.	Personal attributes	Frequency (f)	Per cent (%)
1.	<b>Age</b>		
	Young (Up to 35 years)	26	18.05
	Middle (36 to 54 years)	97	67.36
	Old (Above 54 years)	21	14.59
	Mean $\pm$ S.D.	44.52 $\pm$ 9.52	
2.	<b>Education</b>		
	Illiterate	41	28.47
	Upto Primary level	35	24.30
	Upto Middle level	24	16.67
	Upto High school level	21	14.58
	Upto Intermediate level	15	10.42
	Graduate & above	08	5.56
3.	<b>Occupation</b>		
	Agriculture	49	34.02
	Livestock farming	72	50.00
	Labour (Agricultural/ Non-agricultural)	10	6.94
	Trade & commerce	02	1.39
	Service (Govt./Private)	06	4.17
	Others	05	3.48
4.	<b>Family size</b>		
	Small (Up to 4 members)	49	34.02
	Medium (5 to 8 members)	66	45.84
	Large (Above 8 members)	29	20.14
	Mean $\pm$ S.D.	5.88 $\pm$ 1.82	
5.	<b>Land holding</b>		
	No land (Landless)	4	2.78
	Small (Up to 1 hectare)	43	29.85
	Medium (1 to 2 hectares)	76	52.78
	Large (Above 2 hectares)	21	14.59
	Mean $\pm$ S.D.	1.66 $\pm$ 0.98	
6.	<b>Herd size</b>		
	Small (Below 6)	21	14.58
	Medium (6 to 18)	104	72.23
	Large (Above 18)	19	13.19
	Mean $\pm$ S.D.	11.83 $\pm$ 6.23	
7.	<b>Annual gross income</b>		
	Low (Below 30313.11)	20	13.89
	Medium (30313.11 to 215673.01)	96	66.67
	High (Above 215673.01)	28	19.44

	Mean $\pm$ S.D.	122993.06 $\pm$ 92679.95	
8.	<b>Experience in livestock farming</b>		
i	Low (Below 16.92 years)	18	12.50
	Medium (16.92 to 38.54 years)	103	71.53
	High (Above 38.54 years)	23	15.97
	Mean $\pm$ S.D.	27.73 $\pm$ 10.81	
9.	<b>Extension contact</b>		
i	Low (Below 5.13)	24	16.67
	Medium (5.13 to 11.73)	96	66.66
	High (Above 11.73)	24	16.67
	Mean $\pm$ S.D.	8.43 $\pm$ 3.30	
10.	<b>Mass media exposure</b>		
i	Low (Below 2.78)	22	15.27
	Medium (2.78 to 6.92)	91	63.19
	High (Above 6.92)	31	21.54
	Mean $\pm$ S.D.	4.85 $\pm$ 2.07	
11.	<b>Social participation</b>		
i	Low (Below 1.31)	33	22.92
	Medium (1.31 to 2.61)	83	57.64
	High (Above 2.61)	28	19.44
	Mean $\pm$ S.D.	1.96 $\pm$ 0.65	
12.	<b>Economic motivation</b>		
i	Low (Below 10.10)	37	25.69
	Medium (10.10 to 14.32)	87	60.42
	High (Above 14.32)	20	13.89
	Mean $\pm$ S.D.	12.21 $\pm$ 2.11	

### Summery and Conclusion

It can be concluded that majority of the respondents were having middle age group, middle level of education, medium family size and medium dairy experience. It was also observed that majority of the respondents had not attended any training related to livestock farming. Majority of the respondent were having medium level of economic motivation, extension contact and mass media exposure. Based on the study results it is suggested that there is a need for conducting need-based training programmes by the extension agencies in the study area. Latest information related to livestock farming should be disseminated through mass media like radio and television, farm literatures, etc. may be prepared having impact points of livestock farming on scientific grounds in simple and local language and distributed free of cost to the livestock owners.

### References

- Ahuja V, Redmond E. Livestock services and the poor. *Tropical Animal Health and Production*. 2015;36:247-268.
- Bhosale SR, Deshmukh AN, Godse SK, Shelake PS. Entrepreneurial behaviour of dairy farmers. *Advance Research Journal of Social Science*. 2014;5(2):171-174.
- Chaurasiya KK. A study on entrepreneurial behaviour of dairy farmers in Gwalior district of Madhya Pradesh. Ph.D. Thesis submitted to Rajmata Vijayaraje Scindia Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Gwalior (M.P.); c2015.
- Gaikwad. Dairy animal productivity enhancement programme in Ahmednagar district of Maharashtra: An exploratory study. M.Sc. Thesis submitted to NDRI (Deemed University), Karnal, Haryana; c2010.
- Jagadeeswary V. Establishing private veterinary clinics in Andhra Pradesh: An opinion study, M.V.Sc., Thesis, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad; c2003.
- Kumar R. Information seeking behaviour of tribal livestock owners in Sirohi district of Rajasthan. Thesis submitted to RAJUVAS, Bikaner; c2017.
- Meena O. Impact analysis of dairy co-operative in jaipur Zila Dugdh Utpadak Sahakari Sangh Ltd. - A comparative study. M.V.Sc. Thesis submitted to RAJUVAS, Bikaner; c2016.
- Raina V, Bhushan B, Bakshi P, Khajuria S. Entrepreneurial Behaviour of Dairy Farmers. *Journal of Animal Research*. 2016;6(5):947-953.
- Rathod PK, Nikam TR, Landge S, Hatey A. Farmer's perception towards livestock health care service delivery by dairy cooperatives: A case study of Western Maharashtra. *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2014;27(1):95-96.
- Rathod P, Nikam TR, Landge S, Hatey A. SWOT analysis of Dairy Cooperatives: A case study of Western Maharashtra. *International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management*. 2011;2(8):35-41.
- Ravikumar S, Reddy KVR, Sudhakar Rao B. Farmer's choice for cost recovery of veterinary services in different livestock holding systems: A case study of India. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*. 2006;19:Article-66.
- Sah AK. A descriptive study of existing dairy farming practices and constraints in adoption of dairy farming practices in Banka district (Bihar). M.Sc. Thesis, NDRI (Deemed University), Karnal (Haryana); c2005.
- Sarita, Singh SP, Malik A, Sharma M, Ahuja R. Socioeconomic and Psychological characteristics of dairy farmers of Hisar district. *International journal of science, environment and technology*. 2016;5(5):3466-3472.
- Sarkar D, Ghosh BK. Milk marketing under cooperative and no cooperative marketing channels: Evidence from West Bengal. *Econ. Annals, LV (187)*; c2010 Oct-Dec.
- Singodia M, Rewani S, Rajoria S, Singh V, Saini G. Perception of Livestock Farmers Towards Existing Livestock Service Delivery Systems in Jaipur District of Rajasthan, India. *International Journal of Livestock Research*. 2019;9(8):111-119.

16. Tekale VS, Bhalekar DN, Shaikh JI. Entrepreneurial Behaviour of Dairy farmers. Inter. J Ext. Edu. 2013;9:32-36.
17. Tisdell C, Gali J. Trends and developments in India's livestock industry. Econ. Ecol. and Env. Working paper; c2000, 43 (Aug).