PERCEIVED PROFITABILITY OF DEWORMING TECHNOLOGY - A PERCEPTION

N.Lal[1], H.P.S. Arya[2], Ranjana Gupta[3], N. Srivastava[4] & Subodh Kumar[5]

ABSTRACT

The study was confined to the animal husbandry technology users of a cluster of six villages of Bareilly district of U.P. Deworming with the use of chemical treatment was not fully profitable and easily accessible to the desired extent to majority of middle age group farmers who belong to backward case with low family education status and marginal land holding and had small size if herd. Farmers had low level of perceived profitability score. Farmers did not have positive perception about the technology whereas the scientists considered it highly profitable technology.

Key Words : Animal Husbandry Technology, Deworming

INTRODUCTION :

India is in commanding position on the livestock map of the world, as it own world's 15 percent cattle, 53.3% buffaloes, 20% goats and 6% sheep population world's 15 percent cattle, 53.3% buffaloes, 20% goats and 6% sheep population (Rao, 1997). It has also become number one milk producer in the world. Simultaneously to this, India can surely be the leading milk producer and exporter in milk, which will ultimately change the socio-economic status of our rural population as well as contribute substantially to the national economy (Sharma, 2000). Rather, various technical programme have been initiated by the Government of India to improve the productivity of livestock. Most of these programme aim to generation of marvellous technologies and their dissemination with prophylactic way to the pastorals.

METHODOLOGY :

The study was carried out a cluster of 6 villages of Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh. A maximum of 40 and minimum of 10 respondents were selected from those who had been using the selected animal husbandry technologies advanced by various agencies since last 5 years (1994-98). Thus, 200 livestock owners constituted the sample size for the study. Simultaneously, 50 scientists were also selected as respondents to obtain their perception for the comparison. Data were collected through personal interviews as well as through PRA Techniques, group meeting and analysed by different statistical methods.

The profitability of HS vaccination was operational zed as the farmers or experts perception of profit occurring or which is likely to occur due to this vaccination. The response was taken on a 5 point scale viz. highly profitable, profitable, somewhat profitable, least profitable and not at all profitable.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION :

Data revealed that a large majority of house hold (63.00%) has less than 4 animal worker in their family involved to perform the animal husbandry task in comprehensive ways followed only (2.5%) respondents had more than 7 effective animal worker. Most of the technology users (57.50%) belong to middle age group followed by young (23.00%) and old (19.50). Cluster of the technology users (40.00%) were from OBC category while (33.10%) respondents were from General category. Rest of the respondent belong to Schedule caste and schedule tribes' category. Further, low family education status possessed by (64.0%) respondents whereas only (5.00%) respondents that high level of family education status. Most of them (45.00%) had marginal land holding followed by small (36.5%) and large (18.50%) wherein (55.5%) respondents had area under fodder crop growers like Barseem and Mackchery less than 4 bigha followed by (33.50%) 4-6 bigha and (11.00%) more than 6 bigha level covered in fodder production for their animal good health. Further, some more indicators elited that very view respondents (4.50%) had large size of herd whereas (51.50%) respondents had small size of herd. Majority of respondents (91.50%) had high cropping intensity i.e. 225-240. Only (2.00%) respondents had low cropping intensity i.e. 221-240. Only (2.00%) respondents had low cropping intensity i.e. below 220 %. Sample also revealed that Desi-cattle with majority of respondent (58.40%) were medium milk producer i.e. 4-5 lit. per day followed by (7.10%) respondents had producing more than 5 lit. Majority of crossbred cattle owners (57.44%) comes under high milk producer (i.e. 8 lit per day and above) category while had animals which (29.7%) fall in medium category (i.e. 6-7 lit) and only (14.9%) farmers were having less than 5 lit milk per day.

1,2,3,4&5. Division of Extension Education India Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar (U.P.)

2. Perception of scientists and farmers about the profitability of Deworming Technology

2.1. Level of the perceived profitability

Table-1. Categorization of the respondents according to perceived profitability of use of anti-parasitic drug Deworming Technology

Sl. No.	Profitability (score)	Farmers N=200	Scientists N=50
1	Low (<1)	28 (14.00)	7 (14.00)
2	Medium (2-3)	77 (38.50)	13 (26.00)
3	High (74)	95 (47.50)	30 (60.00)

Figures in parenthesis represents percentage

Manifested that majority of farmers (47.50%) had high score on the perceived profitability followed by medium (38.50%) and low 14.00%) whereas majority of scientists (60.00%) had high score on perceived profitability followed by medium (22.00%) and low (16.00%) level.

2.2. Extent of perceived profitability

The profitability Deworming Technology can be judged through their better utilization and giving higher net income to the farmers. The extent to which the farmers, efficiently and effectively and effectively utilize the deworming drugs under available resources in livestock farming is reflected in the profit with regards to the profitability of deworming, the farmers perceived view was obtain on a fine point continnum were highly profitable, profitable, some what profitable, least profitable and not at all profitable.

Table-2. Extent of perceived profitability of use of anti-parasitic drug - Deworming technology

Sl. No.	Extent of Profitability	Frequency of the Respondents	
		Farmers N=200	Scientists N=50
1	Highly Profitable	90 (45.00)	30 (60.00)
2	Profitable	81 (40.50)	15 (30.00)
3.	Some what profitable	14 (7.00)	2 (04.00)
4	Least Profitable	15 (7.50)	2 (04.00)
5	Not at all profitable	-	-

Figures in parenthesis Represents Percentage

Table 2. Indicate that majority of farmers (45.00) perceived deworming drugs as highly profitable followed (45.00%) perceived deworming drugs as highly profitable followed 40.00%) farmers perceived it as profitable. Rest of farmers perceived as least profitable, only (7.00%) respondents had some what profitable. Majority of scientists (60.00%) envisaged it highly profitable followed by very less percentage of scientists (4.00%) perceived it as some what profitable and least profitable. But none of the farmers had scientists did not considered it as not at all profitable technology.

Comparative Analysis of Profitability score of Deworming Technology between scientists and farmers.

Table 3. Comparative Analysis of Profitability score use of anti-parasitic drug - Deworming Technology between scientists and farmers.

Name of the Technology	Max. possible score	Perceived profitability		"t" test
		Scientists	Farmers	
Use of anti-parasitic drug-Deworming Technology	4	3.70	2.48	9.380**

** Significant at (P<0.05)

** Significant at (P<0.01)

Table-3 Indicates that perception of scientist and farmers regarding the profitability of Deworming Technology. The different between the perception of scientists and farmers was found highly significant (P<0.01) indicated that the perceived scores of profitability for deworming technology was higher (based on "t" value) in case of scientists than farmers.

CONCLUSION :

It can be concluded that with the use of chemical was not easily accessible to the desired extent to majority of the middle aged farmers belonging to backward caste with low family education status and with marginal land holding and had small size if herd. The adoption of technology by the farmers depend on the accessibility of it. Farmers were having low level of perceived profitability score whereas scientists were having high level of perceived profitability score. Significant difference was found between the perceived profitability of deworming technology scientists and farmers. Thus, on the other hand the study gives one indication that suitable interventions are required so that the perception of the farmers may be improved with regard to deworming technology. Once perception is improved, the technology adoption will be improved automatically which is very important. The study, on the other hand, draw the attention of the scientists to verify the technologies. Further in respect of their profitability under farmers situation. On farm research and one farm trials, are, therefore, suggested where the perceived profitability of farmers are low.

■ ■ ■ ■ ■

.