

Exploring the Socio-personal and Socioeconomic Profile of Livestock Owners in Jabalpur Division of Madhya Pradesh, India

Sarita Paradkar^{1*}, Shobhana Gupta², Siddharth Namdeo³, Dileep Kumar Jatav¹ and Toran Lal Nishad¹

¹Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Extension Education, RVSKVV, Gwalior (Madhya Pradesh), India.

²Associate Professor and Head, Department of Extension Education, RVSKVV, Gwalior (Madhya Pradesh), India.

³Contractual Teacher, Department of Extension Education, RVSKVV, Gwalior (Madhya Pradesh), India.

(Corresponding author: Sarita Paradkar*)

(Received: 09 October 2024; Revised: 21 November 2024; Accepted: 07 December 2024; Published online: 11 January 2025)

(Published by Research Trend)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.65041/BiologicalForum.2025.17.1.11>

ABSTRACT: A study was conducted to determine the socio-personal and socioeconomic status of the livestock owners in Jabalpur Division of Madhya Pradesh. Through multistage random sampling with a sample size 240 livestock owners. To explore the socio-personal and socioeconomic status of Livestock owners, ten criteria were used in order to establish a baseline. It was observed that a sizeable group of the respondents (52.50%) were found in middle age category, majority of the respondents (53.75%) were male in gender category, maximum number of the respondents (47.08%) belonged to Other Backward Caste, majority of the respondents *i.e.*, 59.20 per cent were belonged to nuclear family type, majority of the respondents (52.50 %) were having medium family size, a sizable (44.17%) of the respondents had educated up to primary school level, majority of the respondents (55.00%) had primary occupation, maximum number of the respondents (40.00%) were marginal farmers (<1 hectares), majority (59.17%) of the respondents had small level livestock possession (Up to 3 Animal), majority of the respondents (52.91%) were earn annual incomes ranging from between Rs. 50,000 to ₹1 lakh.

Keywords: Livestock owners, socio-personal, socio-economic, profile, India.

INTRODUCTION

Livestock is one of the fastest-growing sub-sectors of agriculture. According to the economic survey 2020-2021, the livestock sector rose at a compound annual growth rate of 8.24 per cent from 2014-15 to 2018-19 (at constant price). Whereas agricultural growth in India is decelerating every year (12.89 % in 1975 to 2.10 % in 2017). The share of livestock in total agriculture and allied sector gross value added (at constant price) has increased from 24.32 per cent in 2014-15 to 28.63 per cent in 2018-19. According to the National Accounts statistics (NAS) 2020 projections for sector-wise GVA of agriculture and allied sector. In 2018-19, livestock sector accounted for 4.19 per cent of total GVA (Press Information Bureau, 2021). In recent years, livestock sector has emerged as an important segment of an expanding and diversifying agricultural sector in the Indian economy (Tisdell and Gali 2000).

The livestock sector is vital to the rural economy because it supplements family income and provides productive work, especially for landless, small and marginal farmers, as well as women. This sector provides nutrient rich food products, drought power, dung as organic manure, domestic fuel, hides and skin. It is also regular source of income for rural households (Chinnadurai *et al.*, 2018). As livestock distribution is

more egalitarian than land, demand driven development in livestock production will enable millions of poor people to break free from poverty. The allocation of livestock resources is more equitable, with 48.00 per cent of marginal farmers owning more than one-half of the cattle and two-third of the small ruminant, compared to their 24.00 per cent share of land (NABARD, 2018). Livestock provides a living from two-third of the rural population in India, as well as employment for approximately 8.80 per cent of the population (Annual report 2018-19, Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries). Evidence from the National Sample Survey Office's (NSSO) 70th round survey showed that 23 per cent of agricultural households with very small land holding of less than 0.01 hectare reported livestock as their principle source of income. With 209 million tonnes of milk exhibiting an annual growth rate of 5.81 per cent and producing up to 23 per cent of the world's milk annually. India is the largest milk producer in the world (Tomar *et al.*, 2023). Livestock has changed India's rural economy and the development of livestock-based livelihood initiatives plays an important role in job creation, income production, poverty reduction, migration control, and socioeconomic development (Upton, 2004). Livestock is a substantial source of income for 22.90 per cent of

landless people and 9.60 per cent of marginal and small farmers (Bhanwala, 2018). Livestock is essential to smallholder sustenance in various Indian states (Pali *et al.*, 2013).

The livestock farming is a very important socio-economic activity in Indian agriculture, as milk is the second largest agricultural commodity, next only to rice (Sarkar and Ghosh 2010). The socioeconomic status of livestock owners in Madhya Pradesh is influenced by a myriad of factors. These encompass the size of land holdings, the accessibility of resources and technology, the fluctuation in the market, government policies, level of education and the presence of social support systems. Moreover, environmental factors like climate and the availability of natural resources contribute significantly to the dynamics of the livestock farming in this locality.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

In Jabalpur Division of Madhya Pradesh, Balaghat and Chhindwara districts were selected for the study. Two blocks were selected in each district. In Balaghat district Balaghat and Lanji and in Chhindwara Amarwara and Bichhua blocks were selected for the study. Each blocks three villages were randomly selected and finally from each village twenty livestock owners were randomly selected to make a total sample size of 240 livestock owners were selected by multistage random sampling technique. For the purpose of present study any farmer who is rearing at least two milch animal (Large Ruminants) for at least three year were taken as livestock owners. The data was collected through personal interview technique.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-personal and socioeconomic profile of livestock owners.

The socio-personal and socioeconomic profile of livestock owners in Balaghat and Chhindwara districts (Table 1) are discussed below: **Age.** Table 1 depicts that a sizeable group of the respondents (52.50%) were found in middle age category. followed by 28.75 percent and 18.75 percent of respondents belonging to old age and young age group, respectively. The findings of the present study are in consonance with the findings of Chandrasekar *et al.* (2017) in their study on relationship between socioeconomic and psychological factors of dairy farmers with days open-a study in rural Karnataka. Revealed that, among the respondents majority belonged to the middle age group (58.00%). Revealed that, the mean average stands at 43.83 years, unequivocally signifying that the dairy farmers in the region predominantly belong to the middle age category.

Gender. Table 1 presents a revealing a comprehensive overview of the gender distribution among selected livestock owners. Reveals that majority of the respondents (53.75%) were led by males, while the (46.25%) were female. These findings align with the observations made by Shadap *et al.* (2017) in their study on "Influence of pig farming in livelihood improvement of farmers in Meghalaya. Revealed that majority of the pig farmers (58.00%) were male category. Revealed that, 72 per cent of these farms were

led by males. And Chandegara *et al.* (2024) in their study on "A comparative analysis of livelihood security among fish and dairy farmers in Tripura, India. concluded that male farmers dominate in both sectors, constituting 78.75% of fish farmers and 72.50% of dairy farmers, as compared to female farmers.

Caste. Table 1 depicts that maximum number of the livestock owners (47.08%) belonged to Other Backward Caste followed by General category (20.83%), Schedule Tribe (17.92%), and Schedule Caste (14.17%) respectively. This observation is supported by similar findings reported by Lal *et al.* (2015) in their study on Change in livestock holdings, and livelihood security of the farmers affected by national calamity in Bihar. Found that more than one-half (52.50 %) of the respondents belong to OBC category and Potdar *et al.* (2019) in their study on Socioeconomic Status and Livestock Study of Bihar, India. Revealed that the highest respondent were from OBC (59.4%) class.

Education. Table 1 identified that a sizable (44.17%) of the respondents had educated up to primary school level, followed by 13.33 per cent were illiterate, 13.33 per cent were middle school level, 11.25 percent were in the category of read and write, 5.84 percent were in the category of can write only, 10.00 per cent had completed their high school level and only a few *i.e.*, 2.08 per cent had studied up to graduation level. These findings align with the observations made by Lal *et al.* (2015) in their study on "Change in livestock holdings, and livelihood security of the farmers affected by national calamity in Bihar. concluded that majority (28.12 %) of the respondents had primary level of education. Revealed that maximum number of dairy farmers had primary level of education.

Family type. Table 1 reveals that majority of the respondents *i.e.*, 59.20 per cent were belonged to nuclear family type and remaining (40.80%) belonged to joint family type of the respondents. This observation is supported by similar findings reported by Reddy *et al.* (2017) in their study Socioeconomic Status of Livestock Farmers of Ibrahimpur Village, North Goa District: A Benchmark Analysis. Found that majority of the livestock farmers (59.00%) had a nuclear family. Yadav *et al.* (2017) in their study on Socioeconomic Status of Dairy Based Women Self Help Group Members under SGSY in Rewari District of Haryana, India. Reported that majority of respondents (94.44%) were having nuclear family system.

Family size. Table 1 identified that majority of the respondents (52.50 %) were having medium family size, followed by a considerable percentage (32.08 %) having small family size and only 15.42 percent of respondents had large size family. The findings of the present study are in consonance with the findings of Somtiya *et al.* (2024) in their study on Exploring the Profile of Dairy Farmers in Jabalpur District, Madhya Pradesh, India. Revealed that majority of the commercial dairy farmers (47.29 %) had a medium family size. Gour *et al.* (2015) in their study on Assessing Knowledge of Tribal Farmers Regarding Scientific Animal Husbandry Practices. Found that

majority of the respondents (69.33%) belonged to medium family size category.

Occupation. Table 1 found that majority of the respondents (55.00%) had primary occupation and 45.00 per cent had secondary occupation. This observation is supported by similar findings reported by Yadav *et al.* (2017) in their study on socioeconomic Status of Dairy Based Women Self Help Group Members under SGSY in Rewari District of Haryana, India. Reported that majority of respondents (94.44%) were practicing dairy as major occupation. Bansod *et al.* (2022) in their study on socioeconomic Profile and Constraints faced by Dairy Farmers of Udham Singh Nagar District of Uttarakhand, India. The main occupation for 72.80% of the farmers was agriculture which included animal husbandry.

Land holding. The Table 1 revealed that maximum number of the respondents (40.00%) were marginal farmers (<1 hectares), followed by those who were small farmers (1-2hectares) (27.60%), (10.85%) landless farmers (no land), (8.80%) possessing Medium category farmers (4.1-<10 hectare), (8.35%) possessing semi medium category (2.1-4 hectares) of land holdings, and (4.40%) Large farmers (>10 hectare) category of land holding. The findings of the present study are in consonance with the findings of Somtiya *et al.* (2024) in their study on Exploring the Profile of Dairy Farmers in Jabalpur District, Madhya Pradesh, India. Found that most commercial dairy farmers

(50.25%) were in the category of marginal farmers, with land holdings up to 1 hectare.

Livestock possession. Table 1 revealed that majority (59.17%) of the respondents had small level livestock possession (Up to 3 Animal), followed by a sizable percentage (28.33%) had Medium level of livestock possession (4-6 Animal) and 12.50 per cent of them had large livestock possession (> 6 Animal), respectively. This observation is supported by similar findings reported by Yadav *et al.* (2017) in their study on socioeconomic Status of Dairy Based Women Self Help Group Members under SGSY in Rewari District of Haryana, India. Reported that majority of respondents (86.67%) had small herd size.

Annual Income. Table 1 identified that majority of the respondents (52.91%) were earn annual incomes ranging from between Rs. 50,000 to ₹1 lakh, while 21.25 per cent of the respondents earning annual incomes between Rs. 1 lakh to ₹ 1.50 lakh, with 18.33 per cent earning between less than Rs. 50000, with 4.17 per cent earn annual income between Rs.1.50- ₹2 lakh and only 3.34 per cent earning annual income between more than ₹2 lakh. This observation is supported by similar findings reported by Chauhan *et al.* (2022) in their study on Assessment of livelihood security and diversification of tribal dairy farmers in NEH region of India. Found that maximum of the dairy farmers, 44.17 per cent respondents had annual income of between Rs. 50,000 to Rs. 1 lakh.

Table 1: Socio-personal and socioeconomic profile of livestock owners.

Sr. No.	Parameter	Frequency N=240	Percentage	
1.	Age	Young (Up to 35 Years)	45	18.75
		Middle (36 to 50 Years)	126	52.50
		Old (> 50 Years)	169	28.75
2.	Gender	Male	129	53.75
		Female	111	46.25
3.	Caste	Schedule Tribe	43	17.72
		Schedule Caste	34	14.17
		Other Backward Caste	113	47.08
		General	50	20.83
4.	Education	Illiterate	32	13.33
		Can write only	14	5.84
		Can read and write	27	11.25
		Primary	106	44.17
		Middle	32	13.33
		High school	24	10.00
5.	Family type	Graduation	5	2.08
		Nuclear family	142	59.20
6.	Family size	Joint Family	98	40.80
		Low	77	32.08
		Medium	126	52.50
7.	Occupation	High	37	15.42
		Livestock as primary	132	55.00
		Livestock as secondary	108	45.00
8.	Land holding	Landless (No land)	26	10.85
		Marginal (Below 1 hectare)	96	40.00
		Small (1-<2 hectare)	66	27.60
		Semi-medium (2-<4 hectare)	20	8.35
		Medium (4-<10 hectare)	21	8.8
		Large (>10 hectare)	11	4.40
9.	Livestock possession	Small (Up to 3 Animal)	142	59.17
		Medium (4-6 Animal)	68	28.33
		Large (>6 Animal)	30	12.50
10.	Annual income	Less than Rs. 50000	44	18.33
		Rs. 50000 - ₹1 lakh	127	52.91
		Rs.1- ₹1.50 lakh	51	21.25
		Rs.1.50- ₹2 lakh	10	4.17
		Above Rs. 2 lakh	8	3.34

CONCLUSIONS

The present study on socio-personal and socioeconomic profile of livestock owners in Jabalpur division of Madhya Pradesh. Revealed that the majority of the livestock owners in the present study were middle aged males, with most of them belong to OBC category and the educational level most of livestock owners were at the primary level. Most of the respondents lived in nuclear family with medium family size. Most of the respondents are marginal farmers with small land holdings, relying heavily on livestock farming as their main occupation. On an average, the selected farms had a small size number of animal. However, their annual incomes up to a certain threshold. These findings underscore the diverse nature of livestock farming in the region and highlight areas for potential intervention and support to enhance productivity and sustainability.

Acknowledgement. The authors thankful to RVSKVV, Gwalior Madhya Pradesh, India for providing necessary research facilities.

Conflict of Interest. None.

REFERENCES

- Annual Report (2018-19). Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries. Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Govt. of India.
- Bansod, K., Palod, J., Kumar, S., Singh, C. B., Singh, S. K., Kumar, S. & Singh, N. K. (2022). Socioeconomic Profile and Constraints faced by Dairy Farmers of Udham Singh Nagar District of Uttarakhand, India. *Biological Forum - An International Journal*, 14(1), 824-828.
- Bhanwala, H. K. (2018). Livestock a lifeline for small farmers. *Business Line* March 09, 2018. <https://www.thehindubusinessline.com/opinion/livestock-a-lifeline-for-small-farmers/article21328347.ece1>
- Chandegara, A. K., Chauhan, J. K., Upadhyay, A. U., Lahiri, B., Pandey, D. K., Pal, P. & Reena, H. (2024). A comparative analysis of livelihood security among fish and dairy farmers in Tripura, India. *Indian J. Fish.*, 71(1), 135-143.
- Chandrasekar, G. K., Satyanarayan, K., Jagadeeswary, V. & Shree, J. S. (2017). Relationship between socioeconomic and psychological factors of dairy farmers with days open—a study in rural Karnataka. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Bioscience*, 5(1), 171-177.
- Chauhan, J. K., Meen, B. S., Meena, H. R., Bhakat, C., Upadhyay, A. D., Lahiri, B. & Koreti, K. (2022). Assessment of livelihood security and diversification of tribal dairy farmers in NEH region of India. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu.*, 22 (3), 0972-2181.
- Chinnadurai, M., Ashoka, K. and Ambarasan, R. (2018). Allied sector as catalyst of economic growth. *Kurukshetra*, 66(3), 9-13
- Economic survey 2020-2021, Economic Division, Department of Economic affairs, Ministry of affairs, Government of India. https://www.indiabudget.gov.in/economic_survey_ebook_es2021/index.html
- Gour, S., Mandal, M. K. & Singh, R. (2015). Assessing knowledge of tribal farmers regarding scientific animal husbandry practices. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*, 15(2), 90-94.
- Lal, S. P., Kadian, K. S., Jha, S. K., Sharma, A. K., Goyal, J., Kumar, R. S. & Singh, S. P. (2015). Change in livestock holdings, adaptation strategies and livelihood security of the farmers affected by national calamity in Bihar, India. *Indian Journal of Dairy Science*, 68(1), 83-90.
- NABARD Sectoral paper on Animal Husbandry (2018). Available at <https://www.nabard.org/auth/writereaddata/tender/1103195107AH%20Final.pdf>.
- NSSO 70th round. Key Indicators of Situation of Agricultural Households in India, Ministry of statistics and programme implementation, Government of India.
- Pali, P., Rware, H., Poole, J., Jarial, S. & Padmakumar, V. (2013). Enhancing livelihoods through livestock knowledge systems (ELKS) in Jharkhand, Uttarakhand and Nagaland: Knowledge Attitude and Practice (KAP) baseline report 2013. ILRI (aka ILCA and ILRAD).
- Potdar, V. V., Khadse, J. R., Joshi, S. A., Swaminathan, M., Phadke, N. L. & Gaundare, Y. S. (2019). Socioeconomic status and livestock study of Bihar, India. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci.*, 8(5), 1240-1248.
- Press Information Bureau, (2021). Indian Agriculture contributes to green shoots of the Indian Economy with growth Rate of 3.4 Per Cent despite COVID-19 Pandemic. Recent Agricultural reforms a remedy, not a Malady says Economic Survey. Available at <https://pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=1693205>
- Reddy, V. K., Mahajan, G. R., Paramesh, V. & Singh, N. P. (2017). Socio-economic Status of Livestock farmers of Ibrahimpur village, north Goa district: A benchmark Analysis. *Economic affairs*, 62(2), 335-340.
- Sarkar, D. & Ghosh, B. K. (2010). Milk marketing under cooperative and non-cooperative marketing channels: evidence from West Bengal. *Economic Annals*, 55(187), 87-108.
- Shadap, F. R., Saharia, K. K., Bora, L., Debbarman, C., Chakraborty, A. & Pyrtuh, R. (2017). Influence of pig farming in livelihood improvement of farmers in Meghalaya. *International Journal of Livestock Research*, 7(7), 261-268.
- Somtiya, A., Naberia, S., Rajan, P., Shrivastava, A. & Singh, U. (2024). Exploring the Profile of Dairy Farmers in Jabalpur District, Madhya Pradesh, India. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*, 42(6), 317-325
- Tisdell, C. & Gali J. (2000). Trends and development in India's Livestock industry. Econ. Ecol. And Env. Working Paper No. 43.
- Tomar, D. S., Lathwal, S. S., Singh, P. & Devi, I. (2023). Socioeconomic Factors Influencing the Adoption of Scientific Dairy Animal Feeding and Breeding Practices: A Case of Muzaffarnagar in Uttar Pradesh, 15(2), 768-773.
- Upton, M. (2004). The role of livestock in economic development and poverty reduction. Pro Poor Livestock Policy Initiative (PPLPI). Working paper No.10.
- Yadav, R., Sagar, M. P., Kumar, P., Yadav, J., Singh, D. & Kumar, A. (2017). Socio-Economic Status of Dairy Based Women Self Help Group Members under SGSY in Rewari District of Haryana, India. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Science*, 6(11), 5385-5390.

How to cite this article: Sarita Paradkar, Shobhana Gupta, Siddharth Namdeo, Dileep Kumar Jatav and Toran Lal Nishad (2025). Exploring the Socio-personal and Socioeconomic Profile of Livestock Owners in Jabalpur Division of Madhya Pradesh, India. *Biological Forum – An International Journal*, 17(1): 74-77.