

## **Socio-economic characteristics of weaker section's families of members and non-members of dairy co-operatives in Saharanpur district of western U.P.**

YOGENDRA KUMAR, GAJENDRA KUMAR AND AMIT KUMAR<sup>1</sup>

*Department of Animal Husbandry & Dairying, Kisan (P.G.) College, Simbhaoli, Hapur*  
*E.mail: dryogendrakumard@gmail.com*

### **Abstract**

*The study was undertaken in Saharanpur district of western U.P. to compare the socio-economic characteristics of weaker section's families of members and non-members milk producer of dairy co-operatives. The data were collected by survey method from 150 sample respondents (75 members and 75 non-members) by personal interview method. The socio-economic status of members and non-members of dairy co-operatives were compared by taking different variables i.e. size of family, education, economic status, size of animal holding and milk production. An analysis of data revealed that the size of family was small in case of members as compared to non-members. The illiteracy is more in both cases. In the study area educational level was not good, average number of milch animals were smaller for both members and non-members of dairy co-operatives. The average milk production per family was higher in members of dairy co-operatives than the non-members. Thus, it is felt that for overall development of milk producers there is a need to educate the families in general but particularly in non-members families.*

**Key Words:** *members, non-members, Socio-economic characteristics, Families, Dairy*

### **Introduction**

In India milk production continues to be a small farm activity. Most of our rural milk producers are small, marginal farmers and landless labourers and many of them are women. They have one or two heads of milch animals. The milch animals are fed with agricultural wastes and crop residues despite its subsistent nature. India has emerged as the largest producer of milk in the world surpassing the US and the European countries. Our rural milk producers have transformed dairying in India. They have proved that the given command over the resources they create, they can and will produce miracles (Kurien, 2004).

India is predominantly an agrarian economy with more than 75 per cent of the population in villages, depending on agricultural, animal husbandry and allied activities for their livelihood. Among many livestock enterprise, dairying is the most ancient occupation established in the rural setting of our country. Dairy sector contributes significantly in generating

employment opportunities and supplementing the income of small and marginal farmers and landless labourers of rural India, besides providing food security (Kadirvel, 2002).

Dairy farming is an important activity of rural people in India. It has an important role in the sustenance of landless and poor people in the village economy. The government of India has started dairy co-operative societies to enable proper remuneration of milk and milk products to people. Dairy co-operative societies are joint ventures of the government and the local people for the daily collection of milk from dairy farmers. These co-operatives are not only an important channel for milk collection from grassroots level but also supply the collected milk to other parts of the state ensuring regular supply to the urban consumers (Khan et al, 2014).

Uttar Pradesh is a leading state in terms of agricultural productions and dairy farming has a significant contribution to agricultural production. Dairy farming is increasingly more practiced by the small and marginal farmers because these farmers have very

---

<sup>1</sup>COVAS, S.V.P. University of Ag. & Tech. Meerut

small land to fulfill their needs, so they domesticate animals (Bhaskaran, 1996). Although dairy farming is not a specialized commercial activity in India but it provides regular income for the farmers throughout the year and has a significant role in generating employment for women (Manish and Tanaka, 2007).

The attitude of the farmer is to be changed fast with new demands and preferences, viz., quality, quantity and cost. In most cases, farmers differ in their individual characteristics, access to and utilization of information from different sources. Such diversity among farmers could be related to various personal, social, economical, or institutional factors (Gopi et al., 2017). Socio-economic features of the families include the size of the family, labour composition, farm size, type of milch animals and number of milch animals which may affect the employment and income of the families. The socio-economic feature of the family play an important role in adoption of various livestock management practices. Therefore, in this paper an attempt has been made to find out the socio-economic characteristics of members and non-members families of dairy co-operatives in Saharanpur district of western U.P.

**Materials and Methods**

The present study was confined to Saharanpur Zila Dugdh Utpadak Sahakari Sangh Ltd. (S.Z.D.U.S.S.) Saharanpur of western U. P. Out of eleven blocks which were covered by S.Z.D.U.S.S., Saharanpur two blocks were selected randomly. Since, S.Z.D.U.S.S., Saharanpur was working in these blocks with highest number of milk producing co-operative societies. After selection of blocks, a list of milk producing co-operative societies working in different villages was prepared with the help of supervisor and other official staff of sahakari samiti. Out of these societies, only five societies were selected randomly for the study. The list of milk producing co-operative societies falling in the blocks was prepared and five milk producing co-operative societies were selected randomly for the study from the whole list. After selection of milk producing co-operative societies a separate list of members and non-members (keeping milch animals) of small, marginal and landless categories (weaker section’s families) were prepared for the selected societies. In which 75 cases from members (15 small, 25 marginal and 35 landless) and 75 cases from non-members (12 small, 24 marginal and 39 landless) were selected for the present study. The final selection of cases of members and non-members of milk producer’s community was made

purely on random basis. The present study was based upon the primary data. The primary data were collected with the help of pre-prepared schedule and questionnaire by personal interview method. The data were related to the year 2008-09.

**Results and Discussion**

*Family composition and economic status:*

Socio-economic characteristics of the member and non-member families have been find out and the data furnished in the table-1 shows that in case of members the overall average number of members per family came to 6.10 persons constituted by 1.61 male (26.39%), 1.38 female (22.63%) and 3.11 children (50.98 percent). While, the overall average number of members per family in non-members was 6.65 persons constituted by 1.66 male (24.96 percent), 1.45 female (21.80 percent), 3.54 children (53.24). There was no much difference in the average size of family in case of members and non-members. The table further shows that in case of members, the overall average number of earners per family came to 1.36 (22.30%), helpers 1.68 (27.54%) and dependents 3.06 (50.16 percent). While, in case of non-members, the overall average numbers of earners, helpers and dependents per family came to 1.44 (21.65%), 2.13 (32.03%) and 3.08 (42.32%), respectively. It can be concluded from the table that number of helpers was more in case of members as compared to non-members and the number of earners and dependents was lowest in case of members in comparison to non- members. It may be due to bigger size of family in case of non-members. These findings were similar to earlier researcher Singh et al., (2005) and Tanwar, (2014).

Table 1: Distribution of families according to family composition and economic status in members and non-members of dairy co-operatives

Characteristics	Members		Non-members	
	No.	%tage	No.	%tage
<b>Family composition</b>				
Male	1.61	26.39	1.66	24.96
Female	1.38	22.63	1.45	21.80
Children	3.11	50.98	3.54	53.24
Total	6.10	100	6.65	100
<b>Economic status of family members</b>				
Earnar	1.36	22.30	1.44	21.65
Helper	1.68	27.54	2.13	32.03
Dependent	3.06	50.16	3.08	46.32
Total	6.10	100	6.65	100

*Education, land holding and milch animals according to breed:*

The table 2 shows that the overall average number of illiterate persons came to 4.15 (68.03 percent) and literate persons per family was 1.95 (31.97 percent) in case of members. While, the overall average number of illiterate persons came to 4.68 (70.38 percent) and literate persons per family came to 1.98 (29.62 percent) in case of non-members. The table further indicates that in case of members the overall average number of literate persons per family came to 54.87 percent as having the primary education, 21.54 percent as having junior high school, 16.41 percent having high school education, 6.15% were having intermediate education and 1.03 percent were graduates. The table further shows that the overall average number of literate persons per family in case of non-members came to 57.57, 21.72, 16.16, 4.04 and 0.50 percent was having primary level education, junior high school, high school, intermediate and graduate education, respectively. It can be concluded

Table 2: Distribution of families according to education, land holding and milch animals according to breed in members and non-members of dairy co-operatives.

Characteristics	Members		Non-members	
	No.	%tage	No.	%tage
Proportion of literacy level per family				
Illiterate	4.15	68.03	4.68	70.38
Literate	1.95	31.97	1.98	29.62
a) Primary	1.07	54.87	1.14	57.57
b) Junior High school	0.42	21.54	0.43	21.72
c) High School	0.32	16.41	0.32	16.16
d) Intermediate	0.12	6.15	0.08	4.04
e) Graduate	0.02	1.03	0.01	0.50
Total	6.10	100	6.65	100
Distribution of families according to land holdings				
Small	15	20	12	16
Marginal	25	33.33	24	32
Landless	35	46.67	39	52
Total	75	100	75	100
Distribution of milch animals according to breed				
Buffalo				
Murrah	50	28.41	35	21.74
Non-descript/local	119	67.62	123	76.40
Cow				
Cross Bred	3	1.70	1	0.62
Non-descript/local	4	2.27	2	1.24
Total	176	100	161	100

from the table that members have higher education than non-members. The education made the dairy animal owners progressive minded and made them to adopt newer technologies. Education also helps in development of understanding, awareness and strong belief on scientific practices which leads to adoption of dairy animal husbandry practices. These findings are similar with the results of (Sabapara et al., 2016).

Distribution of farmers according to land holding revealed that 46.67 percent families were landless followed by small (20%) and marginal (33.33%) in member families. While, in case of non-member landless, marginal and small families were 52, 32 and 16 percent, respectively. It was concluded that majority of families in the both categories were landless followed by marginal and small. The table further indicates that the number of buffaloes were more in comparison to cows in members families, accounting 96.03 percent of total milch animals. While, in case of non-members 98.14 percent having buffaloes in comparison to cows. As regarding breeds of buffalo 28.41 percent buffaloes were Murrah and 67.62 percent buffalo were non-descript/local in members. While, in case of non-members 76.40 percent was non-descript/local buffaloes and 21.74 percent were Murrah buffaloes. It can be concluded that buffalo were more liked by members and non-members families. It may be due to higher fat and S N F percent in buffalo milk as compare to cow milk. It can also be concluded from table that significant higher number of non-descript (119) were reared by members families than non-members families (123).

*Milch animals according to land holdings and milk production:*

The Table 3 indicates that overall milch animals reared by members families were 176. In different categories indicates that maximum numbers milch animals were reared by landless families (82 animals) followed by marginal farms (61 animals) and small farms (33 animals). The Table further shows that in case of non-members total numbers of milch animals were 161. Categorywise analysis indicates that maximum numbers of milch animals were kept by landless farmers (83) and minimum number of animals was reared by small farmers due to lack of resources. It can be concluded that members families were kept higher number of milch animals than non-members families. The table further indicates that the overall average milk production per family in case of members was 4321.45 liters. The categorywise milk production

Table 3: Distribution of milch animals according to land holdings and milk production per family in members and non-members of dairy co-operatives

Characteristics	Members			Non-members		
	No. of milch animals	Average no. of milch animals	Milk production per family (litre)	No. of milch animals	Average no. of milch animals	Milk production per family (litre)
Distribution of Milch animals according to land holdings						
Small	33 (18.75)	2.20	4651.41	25 (15.52)	2.08	3754.56
Marginal	61 (34.65)	2.44	4490.36	53 (32.92)	2.20	3893.60
Landless	82 (46.59)	2.34	4058.11	83 (51.55)	2.12	3415.75
Total/Overall	176 (100)	2.34	4321.45	161 (100)	2.14	3622.67

(Figure in parenthesis is percentage to total)

came to 4651.41 liters on small farms, 4490.36 liters on marginal farms and 4058.11 liters in landless families. It concluded that per family milk production was highest in small farms and was lowest on landless families. It was due to better care of animals in small farms. The table further shows that the overall average production of milk per family in case of non-members was 3622.67 liters. The milk production on small farms was 3754.56 liters whereas, on marginal farms and landless families, it was 3893.60 liters, and 3415.75 liters, respectively. It was noted that milk production was highest on marginal farms and lowest on landless families. It was due to better care of milch animals on marginal farms. It can be concluded from the table, the milk production per family was higher in all categories of members as compared to non-members. It was due to better care of milch animals and higher milk production in case of members on the one hand and better quality of animals of the other hand.

It concluded that socio-economic characteristics of members families was better than non-members. Socio-economic parameters of members and non-members of dairy co-operatives of Saharanpur district reveals that there is a scope for further improvement in socio-economic status, which ultimately lead to animal husbandry development.

### References

- Bhaskaran, S. (1996). Culture's consequences: dairy market opportunities in India, *Marketing Bulletin*, 7: 39-50.
- Gopi, R., Narmatha, N., Sakthivel, K.M., Uma, V. and Jothilakshmi, M. (2017). Socio-economic characteristics and its relationship with information seeking pattern of dairy farmers in Tamilnadu, India. *Asian J. Dairy & Food Res*, 36 (1): 16-20.
- Kadirvel, R. (2002). Limited investment but consistent growth. *The Hindu Survey of Indian Agriculture*, pp.147-150.
- Kurien, V. (2004). Dairy Cooperatives: Some Issues, *The Cooperator*, 41(7): 282 – 283.
- Khan, N., Parashari, A.K. and Salman, M.S. (2014). Role of dairy co-operatives in socio-economic development of dairy farmers in Moradabad district: A case study. *Research Forum: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 2 (1):1-8.
- Manish, S. and Tanaka, H. (2007). The impact of dairy co-operatives on women empowerment- A case of Kishan dairy co-operative in West Bengal, India. *Sabaragamuwa University Journal*, 17 (1): 64-77.
- Sabapara, G P., Fulsoundar, A.B. and Kharadi, V.B. (2016). Profile of dairy farmers and relationship with adoption of improved dairy husbandry practices in southern Gujarat, *India Livestock Research International*. 4(1):36-40.
- Singh, S.P., Singh, M. and Kumar, Y. (2005). A comparative study of milk marketing through dairy cooperative and other agencies in Etah district of U.P. *The J. Rural and Agricultural Research*, 5(1&2): 23-25.
- Tanwar, P.S. and Kumar, Y. (2014). Socio-economic characteristics of member and non-member families of dairy cooperatives in Semi-Arid Rajasthan. *The Journal of Rural and Agricultural Research*, 14(1): 1-4.