

Comparative Study of Socio-Economic Status and Constraints Faced by Members and Non-Members Milk Producers of Dairy Cooperatives in Rajasthan

Hemant Sharma^{1*}, S. S. Kalamkar², M. C. Makwana³ and T. B. Parihar³

¹Assistant Professor, Agro Economic Research Centre, SPU, VVN, Anand, Gujarat, INDIA

²Director & Professor, Agro Economic Research Centre, SPU, VVN, Anand, Gujarat, INDIA

³Research Associate, Agro Economic Research Centre, SPU, VVN, Anand, Gujarat, INDIA

*Corresponding Author: sharmah007@gmail.com

How to cite this paper: Sharma, H., Kalamkar, S. S., Makwana, M. C., & Parihar, T. B. (2020). **Comparative Study of Socio-Economic Status and Constraints Faced by Members and Non-Members Milk Producers of Dairy Cooperatives in Rajasthan.** *International Journal of Livestock Research*, 10(12), 226-234.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5455/ijlr.20200828071844>

Received : Aug 17, 2020
Accepted : Nov 04, 2020
Published : Dec 31, 2020

Copyright © Sharma *et al.*, 2020

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

The present study conducted in four milk union/ district of Rajasthan. The total sample size of milk producers of dairy cooperative society (DCS) and Non-member dairy cooperative society (NDCS) in the State was 240. All the related primary data were collected during year 2017-18. About 80 per cent selected household belongs to other backward class. The operational land holding of DCS member have higher than NDCS i.e., 5.19 ha. of DCS and 4.17 ha. of NDCS. The low milk production yield and unavailability of feed and fodder throughout year were major constraint faced by DCS household. In NDCS category also faced some other constraint like unavailability of vaccine and veterinary service. In concerns of economics constraints, majority of the dairy farmers faced high cost of feed and fodder, veterinary service and low-price offer of milk and lack of loan facility. Regarding marketing constraints, few were faced less knowledge about marketing strategies and lack of facility less advance payment for milk. Regarding technical constraints, most of the respondents, opined to have inadequate guidance of AI, feeding and health care of animal, high genetic merit bull as their constraint. The lack of purchasing power is serious social constraint followed by lower socio-economic condition faced by NDCS. There is needed to make greater efforts to educate and assist the milk producers in respect to latest breeding, feeding and animal management technique.

Keywords: Constraint, Milk Producer, Dairy Cooperatives Society, Socio Economic

Introduction

Dairying has full-grown to the standing of an Industry. Co-operative unions and corporate bodies in India have come into being to organize the Dairy Industry in India. The co-operatives all over the country have played an important role in the Dairy industry and of late the companies have come into being in the private sector. The country is the world's largest milk producer and consumer, accounting for more than 18.5 per cent of world's total milk production. The progress in dairy sector will result in a more balanced development of the rural economy. Rajasthan with a geographical area of 3,42,239 sq. kms is India's largest state with population of 56 million and a density of 165 persons per sq. kms. The state is characterized by different topography ranging from arid region and semi-arid regions of western Rajasthan to the greener belts east of the Aravalli and the hilly tribal tracts in the south-east. Agriculture is dependent on rainfall and failure of monsoon causes severe drought and scarcity conditions. It is deficient in water (the state has only 1% of total surface water). Ground water at many places is unfit for human & livestock consumption. After agriculture, cattle and other livestock are the most important sources of livelihood in the state, especially for the poor. In the western regions of the state, with limited farming potential, livestock provides livelihood security. Animal husbandry is a more stable source of livelihood than farming since it is less affected by failure of rains than is agriculture. Agriculture and dairying have always been inter-dependent in the state. The cultivator depends largely on bullock power for tillage, irrigation and carting. Milk and milk products constitute the only source of animal protein for a sizable vegetarian population. Milk is also an item of cultural importance. Milk products are an integral constituent of religious ceremonies (<http://www.sarasmilkfed.rajabsthan.gov.in/stateprofile.aspx>). Rajasthan is the second largest milk producing state of India contributing 11 % of the total milk production of India. It was noted that Dairy cooperatives sector in Rajasthan state is well-established at present. The state government policy is to support the dairy development through co-operative sector. Despite of significant growth in the various parameters of dairy, cooperative sector in Rajasthan, there are few weaknesses in the present milk cooperative structure. There are areas of concern that constraints the realization of the full potential of this sector. Therefore, the present study was undertaken in the state of Rajasthan with the following objectives.

- To highlight socio economic status of the member and non-member of dairy cooperatives society.
- To identify the constraints in dairy development faced by the member and non-member of dairy cooperatives society.

Materials and Methods

Out of 21, four milk unions/district milk unions/districts in Rajasthan were selected for the study. Selection of the district based on the list of potential districts (high, medium, low) of respective dairy cooperative were prepared by NDDB, Anand. Four milk union/district were selected one from each categories of high, medium, low potential district/union and one from either non-categorized/from region not covered were selected. Two villages were selected as a dairy cooperative member and two village were selected as without dairy cooperative member so, total four villages were selected from each milk union/ district. The data on parameters related Socio Economic status and constraint faced by milk producers was collected from 15 milk producers (5 from each category, small (1-2 milch animals), medium (3-3 milch animals and large (> 5 milch animals) from each village. The total sample size of milk producers in the state was 240 (Table1).

Table 1: Total numbers of selected DCS and NDCS Milk Producers in the Rajasthan

DU/D	Hanumangarh				Ajmer				Bharatpur				Jalour			
Rank	High				Moderate				Low				Not Classified/Low			
Villages	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	V6	V7	V8	V9	V10	V11	V12	V13	V14	V15	V16
DC/NDC	DC	NDC	DC	NDC	DC	NDC	DC	NDC	DC	NDC	DC	NDC	DC	NDC	DC	NDC
Small	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Medium	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Large	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Total sample	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
	60				60				60				60			
	240															

DCS (Dairy Cooperatives Society), NDCS (Non-Dairy Cooperatives Society)

The primary data regarding constraints faced in procurement were collected from the milk producer members of village dairy cooperative societies as well as non member of dairy cooperative societies with the help of well structured and comprehensive schedule prepared for the study. All the related primary data were collected during year 2017-18. The constraints were ranked by using Garrett's ranking technique (Garret and Woodworth, 1969). As per this method, respondents have been asked to allocate the rank for all constraints and the results of such ranking have been transformed into score value with the help out of the following formula:

$$\text{Percent Position} = 100 (R_{ij} - 0.5) / N_j$$

Where R_{ij} = Rank given for the i th variable by j th respondents; N_j = Number of variables ranked by j th respondents.

With the help of Garrett's Table, the percent position estimated is converted into scores. Then for each factor, the scores of each individual are added and then total value of scores and mean values of score is calculated. The factors having highest mean value is considered to be the most important factor.

Results and Discussion

Socio Economic Characteristics about Sample Households

The socio-economic characteristics of the farmers also have an important bearing on the decision to cultivate with rearing milch animal. The data reveals from Table 2 that the majority of decisions were taken by male farmers in the case of about 94.17 per cent of our sample HHs. Only 8 per cent sample HHs had females as decision makers under DCS member while in NDCS member about 11.67 per cent HH had females as decision maker. The cast composition of selected farmers as shown in Table that about 80.0 per cent sample households (HHs) belonged to OBC category, 17.50 percent HHs belonged to general category and 2.50 percent HHs belonged to SC category. In NDCS, the same trend found that about 82.50 per cent sample households (HHs) belonged to OBC category, 12.50 percent HHs belonged to general category and 2.50 percent HHs belonged to SC category remaining 2.5 per cent HHs belonged to ST category. As the community wise selected households 95.83 and 86.67 belongs to Hindu religion in DCS and NDCS HH, of which dominance of OBC population was observed in Both DCS and NDCS category followed by general category. The main occupation of the selected households was agriculture comprised of cultivation of land as a farmer along with supportive allied activity of animal husbandry and dairying. The data on operational land holding indicates that selected households in DCS member have more land of 5.19 hectare as compared to NDCS members (4.17 hectare). The irrigated area under DCS member having more as compared to NDCS member. The income level of both DCS and NDCS member as around 82-85 percent of households are categorized above poverty line. The trend was observed in case of dwelling structure where about 66 per cent households of DCS member have pucca structure while in non-DCS category only 52.50 per cent household has pakka house structure.

The family profile of selected sample households is presented in Table 3. It can be seen from this table that the selected household average size was 6.42 members which was found similar in both categories (DCS and NDCS households). Across selected sample size wise (small, medium and Large), same trend was found in both categories, while household size was relatively large in categories of small and medium in DCS as compared to NDCS (around 5.2 members). The family composition indicates that around 2.63 member were male, followed by 2.32-member female and remaining were children. The proportion of female members was lowest (2.08 person) in small farmer category of households and was highest (2.55 person) in medium farmer category of DCS households. The average no. of respondents of overall categories was around 94 per cent, which was relatively higher in DCS than respondents having 88 per cent in NDCS. The average age of male and female respondents of DCS categories was around 42.92 and 41.68 years, which was relatively lower than NDCS respondents having age between 43.92 and 41.87 years. But, in case of average family age, it was around 29.87 years in DCS and 28.83 years in NDCS. The figures on average level of education of respondents indicate that lower rate of literacy was found in DCS (7.21 year) than NDCS households (8.44 year). Sah (2005), Srilatha (2005) and Sarangi (2006) in their respective studies were reported similar trend *i. e.* higher percentage of low literacy rate. The average no. of family members engaged in dairy work overall categories was around 3.92 persons in DCS, which was relatively higher than NDCS member family (3.31 persons).

Table 2: Socio-economic characteristics of selected households

S. No.	Particulars	Rajasthan State							
		DCS (n=120)				NDCS (n=120)			
1	Gender of Decision Maker (%)	Small	Medium	Large	Overall	Small	Medium	Large	Overall
	Male	92.5	97.5	92.5	94.17	82.5	92.5	90	88.33
	Female	7.5	2.5	7.5	5.83	17.5	7.5	10	11.67
2	Religion (% to total)								
	Hindu	92.5	95	100	95.83	90	80	90	86.67
	Muslim	0	5	0	1.67	0	0	0	0
	Christian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Sikh	7.5	0	0	2.5	10	20	10	13.33
3	Social Group (% to total)								
	Scheduled Tribe	0	0	0	0	5	2.5	0	2.5
	Scheduled Caste	0	7.5	2.5	3.33	0	7.5	0	2.5
	Other Backward Class	82.5	77.5	80	80	82.5	77.5	87.5	82.5
	General/Open	17.5	15	17.5	5.83	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5
	Occupation (%)								
4	Main/Principal								
	Cultivator	87.5	92.5	92.5	90.83	80	87.5	82.5	83.33
	AH & Dairying	12.5	7.5	7.5	9.17	17.5	5	12.5	11.67
	Service	0	0	0	0	2.5	7.5	5	5
	Subsidiary								
	Cultivator	10	7.5	2.5	6.67	12.5	7.5	15	11.67
	AH & Dairying	82.5	82.5	80	81.67	80	92.5	82.5	85.83
	Agri. Labour	7.5	10	17.5	11.67	5	0	2.5	2.5
5	Av. Operational land holding (area in ha)								
	Irrigated	4.15	4.73	4.04	4.31	2.9	3.03	3.58	3.17
	Un irrigated	0.7	0.55	1.39	0.88	0.85	1.09	1.06	1
	Total	4.85	5.28	5.43	5.19	3.75	4.12	4.64	4.17
6	Av. Experience in Dairy (years)	15.1	18.5	14.5	16.03	20.1	18.4	15.2	17.9
7	Income Group (%)								
	BPL	20	10	22.5	17.5	20	20	2.5	14.17
	APL	80	90	77.5	82.5	80	80	97.5	85.83
8	House Structure (%)								
	Pucca	57.5	67.5	72.5	65.83	47.5	45	65	52.5
	Semi-Pucca	20	17.5	15	17.5	15	35	15	24.17
	Kuccha	22.5	15	12.5	16.67	30	20	20	23.33

DCS (Dairy Cooperatives Society), NDCS (Non-Dairy Cooperatives Society)

Table 3: Family profile of selected households

S. No.	Particulars	Rajasthan							
		DCS (n=120)				NDCS (n=120)			
		Small	Medium	Large	Overall	Small	Medium	Large	Overall
1	Av. Household Size (Nos.)								
	Male	2.28	2.88	2.73	2.63	2.2	2.43	2.73	2.45
	Female	2.08	2.55	2.33	2.32	2.1	2.23	2.33	2.22
	Children (Below 15 Year)	1.5	1.53	1.38	1.47	1.45	1.75	2.1	1.77
	Total	5.86	6.96	6.44	6.42	5.75	6.4	7.15	6.43
2	Gender of Respondent/HH (%)								
	Male	92.5	97.5	92.5	94.17	82.5	92.5	90	88.33
	Female	7.5	2.5	7.5	5.83	17.5	7.5	10	11.67
3	Av. Age of respondent (years)								
	Male	42.55	44.81	41.4	42.92	43.78	44.86	43.11	43.92
	Female	32.25	40.15	52.66	41.68	40.37	50	35.25	41.87
4	Av. Age of family (years)	30.5	30.55	28.56	29.87	29.31	28.56	28.64	28.83
5	Av. Education of respondent (years)	7.75	6.85	7.05	7.21	7.03	9.02	9.28	8.44
6	Av. No. of Family members works in dairy	3.67	4	4.1	3.92	2.94	3.2	3.78	3.31

DCS (Dairy Cooperatives Society), NDCS (Non-Dairy Cooperatives Society)

Infrastructural Constraints by DCS and NDCS categories of Milk Producers

Infrastructural constraints faced by the dairy farmers in different categories of the dairying were recorded and are presented in the Table 4. Regarding Infrastructural constraints, the lack of training facilities was major constraints and ranked first. It may be unawareness and lack of technical staff in the milk union. The lack of improved equipment for dairy business was the second most serious constraint followed by infrequent visit of veterinary staff, low average milk yield of the milk animals and Unavailability of green fodder/ dry fodder throughout the year. Rathod *et al.* (2011) also highlighted the non-availability of adequate veterinary services and high cost of medicine as major constraints among health care services. In category small and medium milk producers have given most of same ranked by faced constraint but large milk producer has high purchasing power they have improved equipment but number of animal high with low productivity have major constraints. In case of NDCS category in table 5 major constraints about respondent had always faced the lack of training facilities followed by Infrequent visit of veterinary staff, Unavailability of emergency veterinary services, Low average milk yield of the milk animals and Occasional Availability of semen at the AI centre. Thus, there was lack of training facility under both the categories are major constraints. About most of milk producer under DCS as well as NDCS respondent of both the categories had never faced the irregular & inadequate supply of cattle feed, unsuitability of the time of delivery of milk during winters due to bitter cold in early hours of the day. The vaccines were in plenty as reported by milk producer of DCS and never faced the problem but in NDCS respondent had always faced the unavailability of vaccines. Most of milk producer had responded under both DCS and NDCS categories that sometime there were faced the unavailability of green/ dry fodder throughout the year and low average milk yield of milk animals. Thus, on an overall there severe infrastructural constrains in both the categories of milk producers in Rajasthan state.

Economic Constraints Faced by DCS and NDCS Categories of Milk Producers

The economic constraints faced by selected DCS and NDCS household are presented in Table 4 and 5. It can be seen in table that under DCS category of milk producers was major constraints faced high cost of veterinary medicine and ranked first followed by low price of milk offered. The findings are in agreement with Maity and Sidhu (2001). Jayalaxami *et al.* (1997) reported the low price of milk as a foremost constraint. In NDCS Category, High cost if fodder seed was major constraints and ranked first due to non-availability seed at subsidized rate. The high cost of cattle feed and mineral mixture was also major constrains. Similar finding was also reported by Misra and Pal (2003), Singh and Chauhan (2006), Kaur *et al.* (2011). Thus, the rearing of milch animals more costly for

NDCS as compared to DCS due to high cost of cattle feed and mineral mixture. Thus, there were high severe economic constraints faced by NDCS respondent as compared to DCS milk producers in the Rajasthan.

Table 4: Garrett's ranking for different constraints faced by members of dairy Cooperatives society

S. No.	Constraints	Small (n=40)		Medium (n=40)		Large (n=40)	
A	Infrastructural Constraints	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
1	Lack of improved equipments	63.9	2	60.58	3	54.35	5
2	Irregular & inadequate supply of cattle feed	46.15	9	48.1	7	51.83	6
3	Unavailability of emergency veterinary services	48.18	7	47	9	41.93	10
4	Infrequent visit of veterinary staff	61.58	3	61.25	2	61.85	3
5	Unavailability of vaccines	44.63	11	47	9	46.2	9
6	Occasional availability of semen at the AI centre	50.15	5	49.53	6	47.6	8
7	Lack of training facilities	66.6	1	69.78	1	65.33	1
8	Unsuitability of the time of delivery of milk during winters due to bitter cold in early hours of the day	47.18	8	47.83	8	47.75	7
9	Unavailability of green/ dry fodder throughout the year	58.7	4	58.13	4	60.75	4
10	Unavailability of cattle feed and fodder seed on credit	45.23	10	41.43	11	41.68	11
11	Low average milk yield of the milk animals	49.73	6	51.4	5	62.75	2
B	Economics Constraints						
1	High cost of fodder seed	60.7	3	60.95	3	61	3
2	Delay in payment of milk	42.53	10	44.2	9	46.38	9
3	Low price of milk offered	68.9	2	68.4	2	70.48	2
4	High cost of crossbreed cow	57.98	4	56.28	5	55.18	6
5	High cost of veterinary medicines	70.13	1	69.9	1	72.85	1
6	High cost of cattle feed and mineral mixture	55.2	6	55.63	6	56.35	4
7	Low provision of loan in society or govt. for purchasing cattle	50.03	7	50.75	7	46.58	8
8	Low incentives or bonus for supplying milk	49.35	8	50.58	8	50.73	7
9	High charges of emergency veterinary services	56.98	5	56.3	4	55.2	5
10	High charges for insurance	43.23	9	42.03	10	40.28	10
C	Marketing Constraints						
1	Irregular sell of milk	58	6	60.15	5	59.13	5
2	Lack of time for marketing	66.58	4	67.6	3	68.38	2
3	Less knowledge about marketing strategies	66.65	3	67.975	2	67.68	3
4	Low risk-taking behavior	72.35	1	72.35	1	72.38	1
5	No or less advance payment for milk by society/vendors	66.88	2	63.525	4	64.65	4
6	Inability to market for value-added products	59.55	5	58.65	6	56.05	6
D	Technical Constraints						
1	Lack of technical guidance	67.35	2	67.6	2	66.7	2
2	Unavailability of high genetic merit bull	76.5	1	76.38	1	78.18	1
3	Poor conception rate through artificial insemination	65.6	4	64.8	4	66.35	3
4	Poor knowledge about feeding and health care	66.1	3	66.4	3	64.95	4
5	Lack of knowledge about cheap & scientific housing of animal	62.45	5	62.83	5	61.83	5
E	Social Constraints						
1	Lower socioeconomic conditions	69.85	2	69.85	2	61.55	4
2	Lack of purchasing power	72.73	1	70.2	1	66.33	3
3	Lack of time due to busy in domestic /agricultural work	67.18	3	68.3	3	75.35	1
4	Lack of cooperation and coordination among members	61.5	4	62.08	4	59.18	5
5	Milk producers are meant for influential people	59.6	5	59.05	6	69.2	2
6	Milk of crossbred cow has poor acceptability	59.15	6	60.53	5	58.4	6

Table 5: Garrett's ranking for different constraints faced by members of Non-dairy Cooperatives society

S. No.	Constraints	Small (n=40)		Medium (n=40)		Large (n=40)	
A	Infrastructural Constraints	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
1	Lack of improved equipment's	56.93	4	53.18	5	53.83	6
2	Irregular & inadequate supply of cattle feed	47.6	9	49.95	8	48.2	9
3	Unavailability of emergency veterinary services	58.43	3	57.2	3	57.05	3
4	Infrequent visit of veterinary staff	62.98	1	65.2	2	62.53	2
5	Unavailability of vaccines	54	6	50.78	7	50.35	8
6	Occasional availability of semen at the AI centre	51.48	7	46.95	9	56.53	4
7	Lack of training facilities	59.9	2	65.35	1	65.03	1
8	Unsuitability of the time of delivery of milk during winters due to bitter cold in early hours of the day	44.15	10	41.85	11	40.43	11
9	Unavailability of green/ dry fodder throughout the year	54.8	5	51.45	6	54.2	5
10	Unavailability of cattle feed and fodder seed on credit	42.3	11	44.4	10	40.93	10
11	Low average milk yield of the milk animals	49.45	8	55.7	4	52.95	7
B	Economics Constraints						
1	High cost of fodder seed	68.33	1	69.7	1	67.8	2
2	Delay in payment of milk	50.33	8	48.7	7	51.38	7
3	Low price of milk offered	67	2	64.3	3	69.58	1
4	High cost of crossbreed cow	56.1	5	57.68	4	57.95	5
5	High cost of veterinary medicines	63.55	3	64.63	2	63.03	3
6	High cost of cattle feed and mineral mixture	59.1	4	56	5	59.25	4
7	Low provision of loan in society or govt. for purchasing cattle	50.98	7	48.43	8	48.38	8
8	Low incentives or bonus for supplying milk	45.95	9	46.53	9	43.73	9
9	High charges of emergency veterinary services	53.33	6	55.65	6	53.45	6
10	High charges for insurance	40.35	10	43.4	10	40.48	10
C	Marketing Constraints						
1	Irregular sell of milk	62.03	4	59.6	5	64.45	4
2	Lack of time for marketing	67.53	2	69.1	2	63.7	5
3	Less knowledge about marketing strategies	73.33	1	71.88	1	71.03	1
4	Low risk taking behaviour	66.98	3	67.38	3	67.73	2
5	No or less advance payment for milk by society/vendors	61.6	5	63.65	4	65.93	3
6	Inability to market for value-added products	58.55	6	58.4	6	57.18	6
D	Technical Constraints						
1	Lack of technical guidance	73.48	1	75.33	1	73.73	1
2	Unavailability of high genetic merit bull	65.33	3	65.93	4	66.73	4
3	Poor conception rate through artificial insemination	71.23	2	68.88	2	67.78	3
4	Poor knowledge about feeding and health care	64.45	4	66.73	3	69.53	2
5	Lack of knowledge about cheap & scientific housing of animal	63.53	5	61.15	5	60.25	5
E	Social Constraints						
1	Lower socio-economic conditions	70.75	2	70.05	2	61.5	4
2	Lack of purchasing power	72.43	1	72.08	1	67.63	3
3	Lack of time due to busy in domestic /agricultural work	65.2	3	66.68	3	68.83	2
4	Lack of cooperation and coordination among members	57.5	6	58.08	6	59.98	6
5	Milk producers are meant for influential people	62.08	4	61.23	5	60.18	5
6	Milk of crossbred cow has poor acceptability	62.05	5	61.9	4	71.9	1

Marketing Constraints

The nonexistence of a capable market is a difficult for feed inputs as well as for the industry's output of milk. The marketing constraints faced by DCS and NDCS are presented in Table 4 and 5. It can be seen in the table major constraints faced Low risk taking behaviour and ranked first. In case of NDCS responded faced the less knowledge about marketing strategies was major constraints reported followed by Low risk taking behaviour and No or less advance payment for milk by society/vendors. No or little provision for the advance payment for milk was also

reported by Sarkar and Gosh (2010).

Technical Constraints

The technical constraints faced by DCS and NDCS are presented in Table 4 and 5. It can be seen in table 4 that the unavailability of high genetic merit bull major constraints faced and ranked first followed by lack of technical guidance and poor knowledge about feeding and health care. But in NDCS milk producers had given first rank to lack of technical guidance followed by poor conception rate through AI and Poor knowledge about feeding and health care. The lack of technical guidance was the severe constraint for members of all types of farms were reported by Sarkar and Ghosh (2010), Dabas *et al.* (2004) and Prakash Kumar Rathod *et al.* (2011). DCS milk producer's farmers benefitted by technical and feeding and health guidance under the scheme of Ration Balancing Program under NDP-1.

Social Constraints

Social constraints faced by both farm DCS and NDCS presented in Table 4 and 5. It can be seen in the Table 4 that the small and medium milk producers have given the first rank to lack of purchasing power followed by Lower socio-economic conditions but in case of large farmers, lack of time due to busy in agricultural work was major constraint faced and ranked first. Same constraints faced by NDCS category, major constraint faced was lack of purchasing power by small and medium milk producer but in case of large milk producer, milk of crossbred cow has poor acceptability was major constraint faced and ranked first. For 6 of socio-psychological constraints, two were severe for the members of all types of farms; these were: lack of time due to busy in domestic / agricultural work and lack of purchasing power was reported by Sarkar and Ghosh (2010). Same time the lack of purchasing power was serious social constraint followed by lower socio-economic condition faced by both DCS and NDCS. About more than 65 per cent respondent of DCS were reported that lack of cooperation and coordination among members and meant for influential people was not a serious problem.

Conclusion

The varying topographic features of Rajasthan justify the selection of four unions from four regions. The selected sample house hold about 80 per cent sample house hold belongs to other backward class. The average family size of selected household were 6.42 members with average age of respondents of between 40 to 44 years. Around three members from each family engaged in dairy activity. The operational land holding indicates that selected households in DCS member have more land of 5.19 hectare as compared to NDCS members (4.17 hectare). Constraints are studied under five categories i.e., Infrastructural, economic, marketing, technical and socio psychological constraints. Regarding infrastructural constraints, it was observed that majority of the respondents were facing the constraint of low milk production yield and unavailability of feed and fodder throughout year. In NDCS category also faced some other constraint like unavailability of vaccine and veterinary service. In the view of economics constraints, majority of the dairy farmers faced high cost of feed and fodder, veterinary service and low-price offer of milk and lack of loan facility. Regarding marketing constraints, few were faced less knowledge about marketing strategies and lack of facility less advance payment for milk. Regarding technical constraints, most of the respondents, opined that to have inadequate guidance of AI, feeding and health care of animal, high genetic merit bull as their constraint. The lack of purchasing power were serious social constraint followed by lower socio-economic condition faced by NDCS. There is needed to make greater efforts to educate and assist the milk producers in respect to latest breeding, feeding and animal management technique.

Conflict of Interests

There is no conflict of interest.

Publisher Disclaimer

IJLR remains neutral concerning jurisdictional claims in published institutional affiliation.

References

1. Dabas, Y. P. S., Bardhan, D. and Shabeena, M. (2004). Constraints in adoption of dairy technology by rural woman in Tarai area of Uttaranchal, *Indian Dairyman*, 56 (3): 25-28.
2. Garrett, H. E. and Woodworth, R.S. (1969). Statistics in psychology and education. *Vakils, Feffer and Simons Pvt. Ltd.*, Bombay. p.329.
3. Jayalaxmi, G., Shailaja, S. and Sobhana, G. (1997). Constraints Experienced by Women Entrepreneurs, *Journal of Extension Education*. 8: 1752- 1754.
4. Kaur I, Dhidsa SS, Harpreet K, Prabhjot S. (2011). Various constraints of dairy farming in central zone of Punjab, *Journal of Dairying, Foods and Home sciences*. 30(4):242-245.
5. Maity, M. and Sidhu, D. S. (2001). Adoption of clean milk production and health care practices –A study among dairy farm women, *Journal of Dairying, Foods & Home Sciences*. 20: 232-234.
6. Mishra RK, Pal PK. (2003). Prospect and constraints of dairying in Rural Bengal. A Case Study, *Indian Dairyman* 55(12):55-59.
7. Rathod, P.K., Landge, S., Nikam, T.R. and Vajreshwari, S. (2011). Socio-personal profile and constraints of dairy farmers, *Karnataka Journal of Agriculture Science*. 24: 619-621.
8. Sah A. K. (2005). Entrepreneurship among milk producers in northern region of India Ph.D. Thesis, NDRI (Deemed University), Karnal. India.
9. Sarangi A, (2006). Knowledge management for improving CMP prices among land less dairy women of Haryana through interactive multimedia. Ph.D. Thesis NDRI (Deemed University) Karnal, India.
10. Sarker, Debnarayan and Bikash Kumar Ghosh (2010) Constraints of Milk Production: A Study on Cooperative and Non-cooperative Dairy Farms in West Bengal. *Agricultural Economics Research Review* 23 July-December pp 303-314.
11. Singh M, and Chauhan A. (2006). Constraints faced by dairy owners in adoption of scientific dairy farming practices, *Indian Journal of Dairy Sciences*. 59(1):49-51.
12. Srilatha P, (2005). A study of beneficiaries & non- beneficiaries of dairy clinics running under argil clinics in Rajasthan. Ph.D. Thesis, NDRI (Deemed University) Karnal.
