

RESEARCH NOTE

Constraints Faced By Livestock Farmers in Utilization of Livestock Services in Jaipur District of Rajasthan, India

Manisha Singodia¹, Sanjay Kumar Rewani², Ashok Baidha³,
Subhash Chand⁴, Sunil Rajoria⁵ and Virendra Singh⁶

1. Asstt. Prof., Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Veterinary College, Jaipur, Rajasthan. 2, 3 & 4. Asstt. Prof., (Vet. and AH Ext. Edu.), Post Graduate Institute of Veterinary Education and Research, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

5&6. Teaching Asso., Veterinary University Training & Research Center, Dungarpur, Rajasthan.

Corresponding author e-mail: manishasingodia27@gmail.com

Paper Received on February 16, 2019, Accepted on May 21, 2019 and Published Online on July 01, 2019

ABSTRACT

An exploratory study was conducted in Jaipur district of Rajasthan to find out the constraints faced by livestock farmers in utilization of different livestock service delivery systems and their suggestions for overcoming these constraints. Data were collected from 120 randomly selected livestock farmers through structured interview schedule. The study revealed that non (or disgraceful) availability of A.I./P.D. at doorstep (79.16%), no provision of subsidy on local animals (74.16%), non availability of staff during night (68.33%), inappropriate working timings of hospital facilities (58.33%) and high expenses of medicines and treatment (45.84%) were perceived as 'most serious constraints' by livestock farmers. High cost of private veterinary services (62.50%), less availability of qualified specialists (58.33%) and non (or improper) availability of emergency treatment at doorstep (54.16%) were perceived as 'serious constraints' by them. Among the 'less serious constraints' were deficient medicines and other infrastructural facilities of hospitals (75.00%), non-availability of feed and input material and fodder seeds (51.66%) and inadequate facilities for deworming and vaccination (50.00%). A great majority of the livestock farmers were in agreement with the suggestions like provision of adequate medicines and infrastructure facilities (97.50%), provision of improved A.I. and P.D. facilities at farmers' doorstep (93.33%), provision of emergency treatment at doorstep (91.66%) and making services available round the clock (89.16%).

Keywords: Constraints; Emergency treatment; Livestock service delivery systems; Vaccination;

Indian livestock sector makes up for a significant position and amount of world's livestock resource. It not only helps in catering the nutritional needs of people but also acts as a major livelihood option for rural households. It contributes to rural livelihoods, employment and poverty relief, integrating with and complementing crop production, acting as a savings bank and providing a buffer against risks (Sen and Chander, 2003). Livestock is essential assets for livelihoods which help to move out of poverty, as a way into lucrative markets, as a source of foreign exchange, as important socio-economic resources and as means of saving.

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 humans. An effective and efficient livestock service delivery system is of paramount importance to mitigate these effects. However, access to these vital services is inadequate as public resources are insufficient to serve the entire country. Lack of personnel, shortage of inputs (drugs, vaccines and equipment), poor mobility and one-size-fits-all model livestock service delivery system lets the nation to be within a limited coverage of the services.

Since independence in India, the livestock service delivery is under the control of public sector and the major agencies dealing with livestock extension service are Directorate of Extension (Ministry of Agriculture), Indian Council of Agricultural Research, National Dairy

Development Board, Krishi Vigyan Kendra, State Agricultural and Veterinary Universities and State Department of Animal Husbandry. In addition, national and regional level extension services are also provided by private agencies, Dairy Cooperatives and NGOs (GOI, 2006). The livestock service delivery by dairy cooperatives in India is getting attention during the past few decades since they are very helpful in overcoming access barriers to assets, information, services and the markets for small-holders (Rathod et al., 2011; Nishi et al., 2011). In this background, it was felt important to know the bottlenecks faced by the livestock farmers in utilizing the services of existing service delivery systems in order to formulate an appropriate strategy to make the service delivery system more effective.

METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted in purposively selected Jaipur district of Rajasthan. Out of 16 tehsils of Jaipur district, four tehsils viz. Phulera, Amber, Chomu and Jamwa Ramgarh were selected purposively on the basis of higher livestock population and presence of different livestock service delivery systems like dairy cooperative societies, public and private livestock service providers, private dairies, milk vendors, public veterinary health centers and other agencies. In the next stage of sampling, three villages were selected randomly from each selected tehsils making a total of 12 villages. Ten livestock farmers availing the services of different livestock service providers were selected randomly from each village. Thus a total of 120 respondents were selected and interviewed personally through a structured interview schedule. Twenty one possible constraints and fifteen suggestions of livestock farmers for improving the services of livestock service delivery systems were enumerated after reviewing the reliable sources like dairy cooperative offices, NGOs, veterinary dispensaries and private dairies etc. They were also listed by direct questioning with the livestock farmers. The identified constraints were measured on a four point continuum i.e. most serious constraint, serious constraint, less serious constraint and not a constraint with a scoring system of 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively. The identified suggestions were measured on a three point continuum i.e. agree, neutral and disagree with a scoring system of 3, 2 and 1 respectively. Following the tabulation and necessary sorting, statistical analysis viz. frequency and

percentage were used to draw the inferences. Mean score for each reason was calculated and the reasons were ranked based on the mean score.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Constraints faced by livestock farmers in utilization of livestock service delivery systems: It is clear from Table 1 that non (or disgraceful) availability of A.I./P.D. at doorstep, no provision of subsidy on local animals, non availability of staff during night, inappropriate working timings of hospital facilities and high expenses of medicines and treatment were perceived as 'most serious constraints' by 79.16, 74.16, 68.33, 58.33 and 45.84 per cent livestock farmers, respectively. These findings are in agreement with the findings of Rathod et al. (2014), Taylor et al. (2012), Kumar et al. (2009) and Meena and Fulzele (2006).

High cost of private veterinary services (62.50%), less availability of qualified specialists (58.33%), non (or improper) availability of emergency treatment at doorstep (54.16%), lack of awareness about developmental programmes of different service providers (53.33%), more distance of VH/ care-center (43.33%), inaccessibility of veterinarians or para-veterinary staff (37.50%), inadequate training and extension services (35.00%) and lack of proper advisory services on scientific management (33.33%) were perceived as 'serious constraints' by livestock farmers. These findings are similar with findings of Yadav et al. (2016), Kebede et al. (2014), Rathod et al. (2014) and Bhagat et al. (2005).

Among the 'less serious constraints' were deficient medicines and other infrastructural facilities of hospitals (75.00%), non-availability of feed and input material and fodder seeds (51.66%), inadequate facilities for deworming and vaccination (50.00%), ignorance of information about drug and treatment facilities (46.66%), improper marketing and non-remunerative prices to products (37.50%). These findings are in agreement with the findings of Rajput and Tripathi (2010) and Rahman et al. (2005). Unavailability of information booklets and non-availability of services other than production/preventive services were perceived as 'not a constraint' by 54.16 and 41.66 per cent of livestock farmers, respectively.

Based on the mean values, the constraints were ranked and it was observed that 'non (or disgraceful)

Table 1. Constraints faced by livestock farmers in utilization of livestock service delivery systems (N=120)

Constraints	Most serious		Serious		Less serious		Not constraint		MS	Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Deficient medicines and other facilities	10	8.33	15	12.50	90	75.00	5	4.17	2.25	XVIII
Inappropriate working timings of hospital	70	58.33	40	33.33	8	6.67	2	1.67	3.48	III
Non availability of staff during night	82	68.33	20	16.67	9	7.50	9	7.50	3.45	IV
More distance of VH/ care-center	40	33.33	52	43.33	26	21.67	2	1.67	3.08	VI
Non availability of emergency treatment	22	18.33	65	54.16	17	14.17	16	13.34	2.77	XII
Inaccessibility of veterinarians staff	30	25.00	45	37.50	25	20.83	20	16.67	2.70	XIII
Lack of proper advisory services	29	24.17	40	33.33	27	22.50	24	20.00	2.61	XIV
Less availability of qualified specialists	27	22.50	70	58.33	15	12.50	8	6.67	2.96	IX
Non availability of A.I and P.D.	95	79.16	11	9.17	11	9.17	3	2.50	3.65	I
High expenses of medicines	55	45.84	21	17.50	41	34.16	3	2.50	3.06	VII
Lack of awareness about programmes	36	30.00	64	53.33	8	6.67	12	10.00	3.03	VIII
Lack of services other than services	15	12.50	14	11.68	41	34.16	50	41.66	1.95	XX
Improper marketing	44	36.67	19	15.83	45	37.50	12	10.00	2.79	XI
High cost of private veterinary services	34	28.33	75	62.50	8	6.67	3	2.50	3.16	V
Inadequate training and extension services	38	31.67	42	35.00	31	25.83	9	7.50	2.90	X
Ignorance of drug and treatment facilities	15	12.50	32	26.67	56	46.66	17	14.17	2.37	XVII
Lack of deworming and vaccination facilities	16	13.33	34	28.34	60	50.00	10	8.33	2.46	XV
Lack of feed and input material	9	7.50	40	33.34	62	51.66	9	7.50	2.40	XVI
Unavailability of information booklets	20	16.67	29	24.17	6	5.00	65	54.16	2.03	XIV
Lack of credit facilities	31	25.83	38	31.67	36	30.00	15	12.50	2.70	XIII
No provision of subsidy on local animals	89	74.16	16	13.34	14	11.67	1	0.83	3.60	II

Table 2. Suggestions given by livestock farmers for improving the services of livestock service delivery systems

Suggestions	Agree		Neutral		Disagree		MS	Rank
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Provision of adequate medicines and infrastructure facilities	117	97.50	3	2.50	0	0.00	2.97	I
Setting of working times in accordance with farming activities	105	87.50	8	6.67	7	5.83	2.81	V
Making services available round the clock	107	89.16	8	6.67	5	4.17	2.85	III
Establishment of Hospitals nearer to their residence	101	84.16	19	15.84	0	0.00	2.84	IV
Provision of emergency treatment at door step	110	91.66	2	1.67	8	6.67	2.85	III
Regular recruitment of Veterinarians/ para-veterinary staffs	90	75.00	8	6.67	22	18.33	2.56	X
Conduction of trainings for farmers	75	62.50	25	20.83	20	16.67	2.45	XI
Provision of credit facilities to livestock farmers	60	50.00	38	31.67	22	18.33	2.31	XII
Provision of improved A.I. and P.D. facilities at farmers' door	112	93.33	2	1.67	6	5.00	2.88	II
Provision of all services other than production services	50	41.66	30	25.00	40	33.34	2.08	XIV
Distribution of information booklets time to time	40	33.34	55	45.83	25	20.83	2.12	XIII
Setting up of low cost medicine and treatment centres	97	80.83	13	10.83	10	8.34	2.72	VI
Reduction in the cost of private veterinary services	95	79.16	15	12.50	10	8.34	2.70	VII
Subsidy in the utilization of livestock services	89	74.16	14	11.67	17	14.17	2.61	VIII
Implementation of deworming and vaccination programmes	92	76.66	8	6.67	20	16.67	2.60	

availability of A.I and P.D. at door step/ village' was ranked first with the mean score of 3.65 out of maximum possible score of 4. The last constraints faced by livestock farmers in utilization of livestock service delivery systems was 'non-availability of services other than production/ preventive services' with the mean score of 1.95.

Suggestions given by the livestock farmers for improving the services of livestock service delivery systems: Perusal of Table 2 shows that a great majority of the livestock farmers were in agreement with the suggestions like provision of adequate medicines and infrastructure facilities (97.50%), provision of improved A.I. and P.D.

facilities at farmers' doorstep (93.33%), provision of emergency treatment at doorstep (91.66%) and making services available round the clock (89.16%).

Majority of the respondents were also in agreement with the suggestions like setting of working times in accordance with farming activities of farmers (87.50%), establishment of hospitals/care centres nearer to their place of residence (84.16%), setting up of low cost medicine and treatment centres (80.83%), reduction in the cost of private veterinary services (79.16%), implementation of deworming and vaccination programmes (76.66%) and regular recruitment of veterinarians/ para-veterinary staffs for enhancement in livestock services (75.00%).

Based on the mean values, the suggestions were ranked and it was observed that 'provision of adequate medicines and infrastructure facilities' was ranked first with the mean score of 2.97 out of maximum possible

score of 3. The last suggestions given by livestock farmers for improving the services of livestock service delivery systems was 'provision of all services other than production services related to animal husbandry' with the mean score of 2.08.

CONCLUSION

Livestock farmers were facing lot of problems in utilizing the services of different livestock service delivery systems. Most important among them were non (or disgraceful) availability of A.I./P.D. at doorstep, no provision of subsidy on local animals, non availability of staff during night, inappropriate working timings of hospital facilities and high expenses of medicines and treatment in the study area. Therefore, appropriate actions should be taken by the concerned authorities of different service providers by keeping in mind the suggestions of the livestock farmers to mitigate these constraints.

REFERENCES

- Bhagat, R. L.; Gokhale, S. B. and Phadke, N. L. (2005). Farmers perception regarding crossbred rearing in western Maharashtra. *Indian Vet. J.*, **82** (11):1217-1218.
- Government of India. (2006). Planning Commission working papers of eleventh five year plan 2007-2011, New Delhi.
- Kebede, H.; Melaku, A. and Kebede, E. (2014). Constraints in animal health service delivery and sustainable improvement alternatives in North Gondar, Ethiopia. *Onderstepoort J Vet. Res.*, **81** (1): 1-10.
- Kumar, S.; Hindustani, S.; Kateryar, K. M. and Sankhala, G. (2009). Constraints perceived by farmers in adopting scientific dairy farming practices in Banka district of Bihar. *Indian J. of Dairy Sci.*, **62** (2): 131-134.
- Meena, H. R. and Fulzele, R. M. (2006). Constraints perceived by Meena tribes in adoption of improved dairy farming practices. *Indian Res. J. of Ext. Edu.*, **6** (1-2): 52-54.
- Nishi; Sah, A. K. and Kumar, R. (2011). Dairy farmers' satisfaction with dairy cooperative societies: A case study. *Indian Res. J. of Ext. Edu.*, **11** (1): 25-27.
- Rahman, S.; Kalita, G. and Sharma, K. (2005). Improved dairy practices adopted by Mizo Farmers. *Agril. Ext. Review*, **17** (3): 15-16.
- Rajput, D. S. and Tripathi, H. (2010). Constraints perceived by field veterinarians for providing animal health services in arid zone of Rajasthan. *Vet. Practitioner*, **11**(2): 158-161.
- Rathod, P. K.; Nikam, T. R.; Landge, S. and Hatey, A. (2014). Farmers' perception towards livestock health care services delivery by dairy cooperatives: A case study of Western Maharashtra. *Karnataka J. of Agril. Sci.*, **27** (1): 95-96.
- Rathod, P.; Nikam, T. R.; Landge, S. and Hatey, A. (2011). SWOT analysis of Dairy Cooperatives: A case study of Western Maharashtra. *Intl. J. Res. in Comm. and Mngt*, **2** (8): 35-41.
- Sen, A. and Chander, M. (2003). Privatization of veterinary services in developing countries: A review. *Tropical Animal Health and Prod.*, **3** (3): 223-236.
- Tailor, R.; Meena, G. L.; Sharma, L. and Sharma, F. L. (2012). Constraints faced by the tribal farmers in dairy farming in Udaipur district. *Rajasthan J. of Ext. Edu.*, **20** : 187-189.
- Yadav, M. L.; Rajput, D. S.; Chand, S. and Sharma, N. K. (2016). Constraints in livestock management practices perceived by tribal livestock owners of Banswara district of Rajasthan. *Indian Res. J. of Ext. Edu.*, **14** (4): 37-41.

