

ISSN: 2454-132X Impact factor: 4.295 (Volume 4, Issue 4)

Available online at: www.ijariit.com

Personal characteristics of rural youth in cattle management practices

D. P. Dorkar

<u>dhiraj.agricos@gmail.com</u>

Shriram College Of Agriculture Paniv,
Paniv. Maharashtra

J. I. Shaikh

mehjabin1323@gmail.com

Shriram College Of Agriculture Paniv,

Paniv, Maharashtra

V. T. Dawane

vijayaranidawane@gmail.com

College of Agriculture and Shreemant Shivajiraje College Of Horticulture Phaltan, Sastewadi, Maharashtra

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study is to be taken as a participation of rural Youth in cattle management practices in relation to their personal characteristics in the selected areas of Latur. The study was carried out at the twelve villages of Latur District. From each village 10, rural youth were selected with the purpose of the study and data were collected from them by direct interview. This indicates that personal characteristics of rural youth in cattle management on the Distribution of the respondents according to their level of education, land holding, cosmopoliteness, family size, extension contact, a source of information, social participation.

Keywords: Personal characteristics, Rural youth, Cattle management

1.INTRODUCTION

Latur is a country of rural-based subsistence agricultural farming system. Such this developing Country, rural sector plays a vital role because most of the people (80.50 percent) of this country live in rural areas. Therefore, the policy makers have recognized rural development as the enterprise of national development. We can see of this situation with the active participation of our rural youth with various Cattle management practices. Cattle of Latur are an inseparable part of the agricultural farming system.

These shortfalls are encouraging due to lack of optimum level of nutrition, disease control, proper housing management practices, and efficient reproductive performance and well thought systematic breeding programme, etc. These animals are kept mainly in the stall with limited grazing on the roadside;

Dairy enterprise provides additional income and Gainful Employment to the members of the family throughout the year are being practiced by many rural youths. Therefore, the present study was undertaken in Latur to know the Participation of rural youth in cattle management practices with their personal characteristics.

2.MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was a field survey to investigate the participation of rural youth in cattle management in a selected area of Latur in M.S. (2010-2011). A total of twelve villages selected for the study. Participation of Rural youth in cattle management practices in a Selected Area of Latur. The total cattle population of Latur district is 2, 99,301(2001 census). Out of eight districts of Marathwada region, one district viz. Latur was purposively selected. There are ten talukas of Latur district of which three talukas namely Chakur, Latur and Renapur were randomly selected. For the purpose of the study, four villages from each selected taluka and ten respondents from each village were randomly selected.

Those ten rural youth from each village were selected and from each village, ten respondents were drawn by purposively. Thus, 120 rural youths were taken from the sample 12 villages for the study.

The interview schedule was developed in two parts. The first part constituted questions related to the selected personal characteristics of the respondents such as education, land holding, type of family, cosmopoliteness, social participation, family

Dorkar Dhiraj Prabhakar et. al; International Journal of Advance Research, Ideas and Innovations in Technology size, extension contact, sources of information. The second part was related to the dependent variable viz. Participation of rural youth in cattle management practices.

The interview schedule was prepared in local Marathi language to enhance the convenience in data collection. Prior to an interview , the purpose of the study was explained to the respondents. The basic instrument used for collection of required data was an interview schedule. The information was collected through personal interview. Personal interview technique was used for the data collection. Selected respondent was contacted at their homes either in the morning or in the evening. Thus, by developing a rapport with the youth, interviews were conducted personally by the researcher and responses were marked in the schedule.

A list of rural youth cattle while participated in cattle management practices. Was presented with help of are. All the interview schedules were transferred to a master sheet to facilitate tabulation. Thus we are found by the personal characteristics of rural youth and their overall participation in cattle management practices.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Personal characteristics of the rural youth in cattle management practices.

Table 1: Various aspect of personal characteristics of the rural youth as follows: N=120

S. No. Category Frequency Percentage Education 1 Illiterate 2 1.66 2 Can read and write only 3 2.5 3 Primary school 5 4.16 4 Middle school 42 35.00 5 Higher secondary education 51 42.50 6 Graduate / Post graduate 17 14.16 Landholding 1 Marginal farmers 46 38.33 2 Small farmers 30 25.00 3 Semi-medium farmers 26 21.66 4 Medium farmers 18 15.00 5 Big farmers 0 0 Type of family 1 Nuclear 12 10 2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66 2 Medium 40 33.33	
1 Illiterate 2 1.66 2 Can read and write only 3 2.5 3 Primary school 5 4.16 4 Middle school 42 35.00 5 Higher secondary education 51 42.50 6 Graduate / Post graduate 17 14.16 Landholding 1 Marginal farmers 46 38.33 2 Small farmers 30 25.00 3 Semi-medium farmers 26 21.66 4 Medium farmers 18 15.00 5 Big farmers 0 0 Type of family 1 Nuclear 12 10 2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66	entage
2 Can read and write only 3 2.5 3 Primary school 5 4.16 4 Middle school 42 35.00 5 Higher secondary education 51 42.50 6 Graduate / Post graduate 17 14.16 Landholding 1 Marginal farmers 46 38.33 2 Small farmers 30 25.00 3 Semi-medium farmers 26 21.66 4 Medium farmers 18 15.00 5 Big farmers 0 0 Type of family 1 Nuclear 12 10 2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66	
3 Primary school 5 4.16 4 Middle school 42 35.00 5 Higher secondary education 51 42.50 6 Graduate / Post graduate 17 14.16 Landholding	
4 Middle school 42 35.00 5 Higher secondary education 51 42.50 6 Graduate / Post graduate 17 14.16 Landholding 1 Marginal farmers 46 38.33 2 Small farmers 30 25.00 3 Semi-medium farmers 26 21.66 4 Medium farmers 18 15.00 5 Big farmers 0 0 Type of family 1 Nuclear 12 10 2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66	
5 Higher secondary education 51 42.50 6 Graduate / Post graduate 17 14.16 Landholding 1 Marginal farmers 46 38.33 2 Small farmers 30 25.00 3 Semi-medium farmers 26 21.66 4 Medium farmers 18 15.00 5 Big farmers 0 0 Type of family 1 Nuclear 12 10 2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66	
6 Graduate / Post graduate 17 14.16 Landholding 1 Marginal farmers 46 38.33 2 Small farmers 30 25.00 3 Semi-medium farmers 26 21.66 4 Medium farmers 18 15.00 5 Big farmers 0 0 Type of family 1 Nuclear 12 10 2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66	
Landholding 1 Marginal farmers 46 38.33 2 Small farmers 30 25.00 3 Semi-medium farmers 26 21.66 4 Medium farmers 18 15.00 5 Big farmers 0 0 Type of family 1 Nuclear 12 10 2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66	
1 Marginal farmers 46 38.33 2 Small farmers 30 25.00 3 Semi-medium farmers 26 21.66 4 Medium farmers 18 15.00 5 Big farmers 0 0 Type of family 1 Nuclear 12 10 2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66	
2 Small farmers 30 25.00 3 Semi-medium farmers 26 21.66 4 Medium farmers 18 15.00 5 Big farmers 0 0 Type of family 1 Nuclear 12 10 2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66	
3 Semi-medium farmers 26 21.66 4 Medium farmers 18 15.00 5 Big farmers 0 0 Type of family 1 Nuclear 12 10 2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66	
4 Medium farmers 18 15.00 5 Big farmers 0 0 Type of family 1 Nuclear 12 10 2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66	
5 Big farmers 0 0 Type of family 1 Nuclear 12 10 2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66	
Type of family 1 Nuclear 12 10 2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66	
1 Nuclear 12 10 2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66	
2 Joint 108 90 Cosmopolites 1 Low 38 31.66	
Cosmopolites 38 31.66	
1 Low 38 31.66	
2 Medium 40 33.33	
2 Medium 95.55	
3 High 42 35.00	
Social participation	
1 Low participation 34 28.33	
2 Medium participation 36 30.00	
3 High participation 50 41.66	
Family size	
1 Small 34 28.33	
2 Medium 53 44.16	
3 Big 22 18.33	
4 Very big 11 9.16	
Extension contact	
1 Low extension contact 30 25.00	
2 Medium extension contact 26 21.66	
3 High extension contact 64 53.33	
Source of information	
1 Low 40 33.33	
2 Medium 04 3.33	
3 High 76 63.33	

It was observed in Table 1 that 42.50 per cent of the respondents were educated up to higher secondary education, 41.66 per cent respondents were up to middle school education, 14.16 per cent were educated up to graduate and postgraduate level, 4.16 per cent were educated up to primary school level, 2.5 per cent were in a position to read and write i.e. functionally literate, and 1.66 per cent were illiterate respectively. It is noticed from findings that 38.33 percent of the respondents were having a marginal land holding, 25.00 percent of the respondents were having small farmers, 21.66 percent of the respondent's semi medium, and 4.16 percent were having a medium landholding.

It can be observed that majority of respondents i.e. 90.00 per cent belonged to joint family and 10.00 per cent respondents belonged from nuclear family category It is noticed from the findings reported that majority i.e. 35.00 per cent of the respondents

Dorkar Dhiraj Prabhakar et. al; International Journal of Advance Research, Ideas and Innovations in Technology were having high cosmopoliteness followed by 33.33 per cent medium and 31.66 per cent were having low cosmopoliteness, respectively.

It can observe from the data that majority 41.66 percent of the respondents had a high level of social participation followed by 30.00 percent had medium and 28.33 percent had low social participation. Social participation of rural youth can be high level these are very good results in this Latur districts. Latur districts maintain the educational merit in the state as a lot of the state as a social, economic, educational and communication organizations are operating in the district.

It was revealed in the study that 44.16 per cent of the respondents had a medium family size, while 28.33 per cent respondents had small family size and 18.33 per cent were from big family size whereas 3.33 per cent respondents were from very large family size and majority of the respondents had high level of extension contact; followed by 21.66 percent respondents had medium extension contact, while 25.00 percent of the respondents had medium extension contact.

This clearly indicates that the rural youth used only a few sources of information about the cattle management. This might be the limited opportunities available to rural youth to maintain contacts with outside people and non availability of leisure time and should carry the responsibilities.

It was noticed that 63.33 percent of the respondents had medium use of a source of information followed by 33.33 percent having a low level of use of sources of information and 3.33 percent had a medium level of use of sources of information.

4. CONCLUSION

If we can see that Majority of the respondents were educated up to higher secondary education and very few numbers were illiterate. Most of them were having a marginal land holding, most of them were having respondents were having small farmers, a low number of the respondent's semi medium and few numbers of rural youth were having a medium landholding. And the majority of respondents belonged to the joint family.

It was observed that majority of the respondents were having a high cosmopoliteness high level of social participation, medium family size, high level of extension contact; and the majority of the respondents had medium use of a source of information.

It can see that most of the rural youth did not participate in the selection of milch animals and the majority of the rural youth not participated in taking a loan for purchasing animals fodder and construction of byre. About the one-third of respondents taking care of newly born calf and animals at the time of calving.

Majority of the respondents had (55.00 percent) high level of participation in cattle management while (25.00 percent) had a medium level of participation and 20.00 percent of the respondents had low participation and. This indicates that in general rural youth had high to low level of participation in cattle management.

Majority of rural youth participated in feeding activities viz.feeding green leaves, roughages, concentrate and preparing feeding mixture. About one-fourth of respondents taking care of newly born calf and animals at the time of calving. Such that we are found by the Personel characteristics of rural youth in cattle management practices and their overall participation in cattle management practices.

The present article is the outcome of the research work carried out under the College of Agriculture Latur- Project on 'Participation of rural youth in cattle management practices.

5. REFERENCES

- [1] Bellurkar, C.M; Wakle, P.K., and Gholve, M.A. (2003). A study on decision-making pattern and participation of rural women in animal husbandry and dairying enterprises. Maharashtra J. Extn. Edu, XXII (2):81-85.
- [2] Gade Manisha. (2004) Participation of farm women in decision making.M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, M.P.K.V., Rahuri (M.S.).
- [3] Patki, Alka, and Nikhade, D.M. and Thote, S.G. (2000) Role performance of rural women in animal husbandry practices. Maharashtra J.Extn. Edu, 19:246-248.
- [4] Shinde, S.M. (2007) Participation of farm women in animal management. M.Sc. (Agri) Thesis MAU, Parbhani.