Socio-economic characteristics of dairy farm women in case of members and non-members of dairy co-operatives in western U.P.

YOGENDRA KUMAR, RAJNEESH, AMIT KUMAR[1] AND ANUJ KUMAR[2]
Department of Animal Husbandry & Dairying, Kisan (P.G.) College, Simbhaoli, Hapur (U.P.),
Email:dryogendrakumarkd@gmail.com

Abstract

The present study was conducted to find out the socio-economic characteristics of dairy farm women in case of members and non-members of dairy co-operatives in Ghaziabad district of western U.P. The study was based on primary data collected by survey from 125 members and 125 non-members families of dairy farm women by personal interview method from selected respondents. An analysis of data revealed that majority 64.40 % of the respondents belonged to lower-middle and upper middle socio-economic status categories. 30 % of the respondents belonged to poor category and 1.20 % to very poor category. Only about 4.40 % belong to high socio-economic strata. None of the respondent belong to upper high class of socio-economic status. In the members dairy co-operatives area (MDC) 27.20 % of the respondent were young and 36.80 % fell in the old age group. In non- members dairy co-operative (NMDC) area comparatively larger numbers of respondent (34.40 %) were in the young age group then in old age group (26.40 %). Respondent belonging to middle age group were 36% and 39.20% in MDC and NMDC area respectively. Dairy farm women from the families belong to all strata of socio-economic status perform their role in dairy animal production at higher levels in both systems. The contribution of women in dairy development should be maximized by implementing solutions to the specific problems they encounter as economic and social stakeholder.

Key words: women, members, non-members, Socio-economic characters, dairy

Introduction

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).

Socio-economic status is a measurement of economic and social position of an individual in the society. It influences the accessibility to the resources, livelihood pattern, food and nutritional security. Women play a significant role in agriculture and contribute one-third of labour force required for farming and animal husbandry related operations. They play an important role not only in maintaining their home, but also managing their farms and animals, depending upon the situational, personal and socio-economic characteristics of the family. 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, economic 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

[1] Professor, Deptt. of L.P.M.,COVAS, S.V.P. University of Ag. & Tech., Meerut (U.P.), 250110

[2] Ph.D. Research Scholar, Deptt. of L.P.M.,COVAS, S.V.P. University of Ag. & Tech., Meerut

employment and income of the families. The socio-economic feature of the family plays an important role in adoption of various livestock management practices. The Indian rural landscape is crowded with images of women engaged in various economic activities. Women are actively participating in the economic and social development. Women's typical role with in a livestock production system is different from region to region and her engagement in dairying is strongly related to social, cultural and economic factors. Therefore, in this paper an attempt has been made to find out the socio-economic characteristics of dairy farm women in case of members and non-members of dairy co-operatives in Ghaziabad district of western U.P.

Materials and Methods

The study was conducted in Ghaziabad district of western Uttar Pradesh. The data were collected through personal interview schedule administered on randomly selected. The 125 dairy farm women from MDC (Members Dairy Co-operative) purposively selected in four villages from the block covered under Ghaziabad Dugdh Utpadak Sahakari Sangh Limited (GDUSSL). Then MDC list was categorised into four groups ie. 26 women from landless (LL), 42 from marginal farmers (MF), 45 from small farmers (SF) and 12 from medium large farmers (MLF) were selected proportionately from the whole list. Similarly, 125 dairy farm women from NMDC (Non-Members Dairy Co-operative) purposively selected in four villages from the block not covered under GDUSSL. Then NMDC list was categorised into four groups ie. 22 women from landless, 45 from marginal farmers, 38 from small farmers and 20 from medium large farmers were selected proportionately from the whole list. The final selection of 250 women respondent was made for the study. The research data were collected from selected respondents. The respondents were contacted at their homes and interview schedule was translated to local language i.e. Hindi. Data thus generated were analysed by different statistical methods including percentage were also applied for better interpretation of the results.

Results and Discussion

Socio-economic and socio-personal characteristics of the respondents:

The characteristics of the respondents affect their involvement in rearing and keeping of dairy animals in a given family, which influence the productivity level of their milch animals.

Table 1: Frequency distribution of respondents according to category of socio-economic status

Socio-economic status	Frequency	Percentage
Lower (score <10)	3	1.20
Lower- middle(scores 10-20)	135	54.00
Middle(scores 21-31)	80	32.00
Upper-Middle(scores 32-42)	20	8.00
Upper (scores 43 & above)	12	4.80
Total	250	100.00

Socio-economic Status:

It was intended to classify the respondents according to socio-economic status into different socio-economic categories viz. lower, lower-middle, middle, upper-middle and upper. The Socio-economic status scale of Trivedi 1963 was used to assign to each of the respondent. The selected respondents were then classified according to the scores obtained by them. The data presented in Table 1 indicated that 86 % of the respondents belonged to lower-middle or middle socio-economic status categories. Only about 12.80 % belonged to upper socio-economic strata and 1.20 % to the lower class. The socio-economic status of the family influences, to a considerable extent, the adoption of improved practices, both directly and indirectly. It may also affect the participation of farm women in animal husbandry activities. According to prevailing norms, the involvement of farm women in animal husbandry tasks decreases with the increase in socio-economic status.

Age:

Age influences behaviour of an individual by exposing to varied situations number of times. Therefore, age of the farm women was considered as an essential aspect in this investigation. The findings depicted in Table 2 indicate that MDC area 27.20 % of respondents were young and 36.80 % fell in the old age group. In NMDC area, comparatively larger numbers of respondents (34.40%) were in the young age group than in old age group (26.40%). Respondents belonging to middle age group were 36.00 % and 39.20 % in MDC and NMDC area respectively. Table 2 indicates that in all categories of farmers, young women were more in farm families of NMDC area except in case of small families they were equal to MDC system. Contrary to it, there were more older women in MDC system in all categories except in case

Table 2: Frequency distribution of respondents according to age   N=250

| Category | Systems | Age | | | Total |
		<30 Yrs. Young	30-45 Yrs. Middle	>45 Yrs. Old	
Landless	MDC	7(5.60)	8(6.40)	11(8.80)	26(20.80)
	NMDC	9(7.20)	7(5.60)	6(4.80)	22(17.60)
Marginal farmers	MDC	9(7.20)	17(13.60)	16(12.80)	42(33.60)
	NMDC	13(10.40)	22(17.60)	10(8.00)	45(36.00)
Small farmers	MDC	15(12.00)	17(13.60)	13(10.40)	45(36.00)
	NMDC	15(12.00)	12(9.60)	11(8.80)	38(30.40)
Medium large farmers	MDC	3(2.40)	3(2.40)	6(4.80)	12(9.60)
	NMDC	6(4.80)	8(6.40)	6(4.80)	20(16.00)
Total	MDC	34(27.20)	45(36.00)	46(36.80)	125(100.00)
	NMDC	43(34.40)	49(39.20)	33(26.40)	125(100.00)

(Figures in parentheses indicate percentage to total)

Table 3: Frequency distribution of respondents according to family land holding   N=250

| Systems | Category | | | | Total |
	LL No. Land	MF Up to 1 ha.	SF 1-2 ha.	MLF 2-4 ha.	
MDC	26(20.80)	42(33.60)	45(36.00)	12(9.60)	125(100.00)
NMDC	22(17.60)	45(36.00)	38(30.40)	20(16.00)	125(100.00)
Total	48(19.20)	87(34.80)	83(33.20)	32(12.80)	250(100.00)

(Figures in parentheses indicate percentage)

of medium-large families where they were equal to NMDC system. The finding confirms the results reported by Chayal (2013).

Land Holding:

Size of land holding refers to the number of hectares of land owned and operated by the family of the respondent were collected and are presented in Table 3 which reveals that 20.80 % of respondent families from MDC and 17.60 % from NMDC system did not own any land. The table also reveals that there is almost same number of families in both systems falls in marginal categories and small categories while there are more medium large families (16.00%) in NMDC system as compared to MDC (9.60%) systems. Similar findings reported by Rathod *et al.* (2011)

Dairy Herd Size:

The number of milch animals possessed by a family influences the quantitative and qualitative aspects of role and responsibilities of the farm women.

Table 4 reveals that 18 landless, 22 marginal, 20 small and 5 medium large families had less than 3 dairy animals in MDC system while 14 landless, 20 marginal, 26 small and 7 medium large families had less than 3 dairy animals in NMDC system. 3 to 4 dairy animals are possessed by 7 landless, 18 marginal, 23 small and 6 medium large families in MDC system and 6 landless, 20 marginal, 10 small and 11 small medium families in NMDC system. 5 to 8 dairy animals are possessed by 1 landless in both MDC and NMDC system, 2 marginal in MDC and 5 marginal in NMDC, 2 small in both MDC and NMDC system and 1 medium large in both MDC and NMDC system. No family possessed 9 and more dairy animals in MDC system while 1 landless and 1 medium large family in NMDC system had 9 and more dairy animals. The data also reveals that 52.80 % of farm families possessed one or two milch animals, 40.40 % kept 3-4 milch animals, 6.00 % possessed 5-8 milch animals and only 0.80 % had more

Table 4: Frequency distribution of respondents according to number of milch animals   N = 250

No. of milch animals	LLMDC	NMDC	MFMDC	NMDC	SFMDC	NMDC	MLFMDC	NMDC	Total
1-2	18(14.40)	14(11.20)	22(17.60)	20(16.00)	20(16.00)	26(20.80)	5(4.00)	7(5.60)	132(52.80)
3-4	7(5.60)	6(4.80)	18(14.40)	20(16.00)	23(18.40)	10(8.00)	6(4.80)	11(8.80)	101(40.40)
5-8	1(0.80)	1(0.80)	2(1.60)	5(4.00)	2(1.60)	2(1.60)	1(0.80)	1(0.80)	15(6.00)
9 and above	0(0.00)	1(0.80)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	1(0.80)	2(0.80)

(Figures in parentheses indicate percentage)

Table 5: Frequency distribution of respondents according to family education index   N=250

Category	System	Family Education Index Score			Total
		<2.5 Low	2.5-3.50 Medium	>3.50 High	
Landless	MDC	16(12.80)	6(4.80)	4(3.20)	26
	NMDC	12(9.60)	6(4.80)	4(3.20)	22
Marginal farmers	MDC	10(8.00)	25(20.00)	7(5.60)	42
	NMDC	12(9.60)	24(19.20)	9(7.20)	45
Small farmers	MDC	8(6.40)	29(23.20)	8(6.40)	45
	NMDC	8(6.40)	23(18.40)	7(5.60)	38
Medium large farmers	MDC	2(1.60)	6(4.80)	4(3.20)	12
	NMDC	4(3.20)	10(8.00)	6(4.80)	20
Total	MDC	36(28.80)	66(52.80)	23(18.40)	125(100.00)
	NMDC	36(28.80)	63(50.40)	26(20.80)	125(100.00)

(Figures in parentheses indicate percentage)

Table 6: Differences in mean scores of socio-personal characteristics of dairy farm women between MDC and NMDC systems

Variables	MDC		NMDC		't' value
	Mean Score	Standard deviation	Mean Score	Standard deviation	
Land Holding	1.44	1.117	1.608	1.249	1.121
Number of Dairy Animals	2.088	1.257	2.08	1.328	0.049
Family Education Index	1.1436	0.848	1.1748	0.875	0.286

than 9 milch animals. This finding is similar to the findings reported by Sharma (2014).

Family Education Status:

Observation of Table 5 showed appreciable differences in the family education system of landless, marginal, small and medium large categories. The table shows that about 53 % of respondents of MDC and 50 % of NMDC had medium level of education system. Low level of family education status was equally observed in both MDC and NMDC system i.e. 28.80 %. About 18 % of respondents of MDC and 20.80 % had high family education score. It was also observed that maximum number (23.20%) of respondents who had medium level of family education score came from small farmer's category. Similar findings were also reported by other workers

Satyanarayan and Jagadeeswary (2009) and Lahoti *et al*. (2012).

Differences in mean scores of independent variables:

In order to test the significance of difference in the mean scores of independent variables between MDC and NMDC systems the 't' value was calculated using decision analyst software. Table 6 reveals no significant differences between the mean scores of respondents from the MDC and NMDC systems with regard to the mean scores of land holding, number of dairy animals and family education index of dairy farm women families.

References

Chayal, K.; Dhaka, B,L.; Poonia, M.K.; Tyagi, S.V.S. and Verma, S.R. (2013). Involvement of farm women in decision-making in agriculture. Studies on Home and Community Sci 7 (1): 35-37.

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.

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.

Lahoti, S.R.; Chole, S.R. and Rathi, N.S. (2012). Role of women in dairy farming. Ind J Dairy Sci 65(5): 442-446.

Rathod, P.K.; Landge, S.; Nikam, T.R. and Vajreshwari, S. (2011). Socio-personal profile and constraints of dairy farmers. Karnataka J Agril Sci 24 (4): 619-621.

Satyanarayan, K. and Jagadeeswary, V. (2009). A study on knowledge and adoption behaviour of livestock farmers. Ind J Animal Res 44(2): 100-106.

Sharma, G.R.K. (2014). Capacity building: correlates of change in attitude among dairy farm women. International Journal of Science Environmental Technology 3(3): 1083-1089.

Trivedi, G. (1963). Measurement and analysis of socio-economic status of rural families: A study conducted in community development block, Kanjhala, Delhi, Ph.D. Thesis, IARI , New Delhi.