



E-ISSN: 2278-4136  
P-ISSN: 2349-8234  
JPP 2018; 7(3): 3251-3253  
Received: 21-03-2018  
Accepted: 25-04-2018

**Shyam Bihari**  
SMS Animal Husbandary, KVK-  
Churu, Sardarshar, Rajasthan,  
India

**Pratiksha Singh**  
SMS Home Science, MGKVK,  
Gorakhpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

**Pravesh Singh**  
SMS Animal Husbandary, KVK-  
Churu, Sardarshar, Rajasthan,  
India

**Rahul Kumar Singh**  
SMS Home Science, MGKVK,  
Gorakhpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

**Correspondence**  
**Pratiksha Singh**  
SMS Home Science, MGKVK,  
Gorakhpur, Uttar Pradesh, India

## Impact of the technology intervention of naip project on the attitude of goat rearing farmers in Udaipur district of Rajasthan

**Shyam Bihari, Pratiksha Singh, Pravesh Singh, and Rahul Kumar Singh**

### Abstract

This study was conducted in seven adopted villages viz., Mahuwara, Manpura, Shyampura, Dholpura, Oupli katev, Nichli katev and Amarpura of Cluster Kherwara, District Udaipur, Rajasthan. Total 140 goat farmers were selected, In order to assess the impact of Nation Agriculture Innovation Project Component-iii, by KVK – Udaipur. The study was undertaken after conducting transfer of technology programs on different improved goat production practices in above adopted villages of NAIP Project. The adoption of vaccination, deworming, ecto-parasiticides, mineral mixture, concentrate and green fodder feeding were 3.57%, 17.14%, 26.42%, 2.14%, 35.0% and 9.28% respectively. However, after the NAIP Project, intervention i.e. organized animal health camp, training and demonstration, the overall farmers adoption trends were higher in respect to vaccination, deworming, ecto-parasiticides, mineral mixture, concentrate and green fodder feeding as 59.28%, 75.0%, 74.28%, 57.85%, 74.28% and 59.28% respectively. The overall improvement in the attitude of the goat rears with respect to adoption of goat husbandry technologies would be possible through the demonstration of efficient technologies needed for healthy goat rearing which has not only created awareness but also improved the attitude of goat rearers. It results from the study that the awareness regarding the available viable goat husbandry is essentially required to improve the productivity as well as socio-economic condition of the resource poor tribal farmers.

**Keywords:** technology intervention, goat rearing farmers, Rajasthan

### Introduction

Goat husbandry plays a prominent role in the rural economy in supplementing the income of rural house hold particularly the landless, small and marginal farmers. It can profitably be reared with low investment under semi-intensive as well as the extensive systems of management. They provide quick return on account of their short generation intervals, higher rate of prolificacy and marketing of related products can be done at any time easily. Goat's importance is indicated by various functional contributions like milk, meat, skin, socio economic relevance, security, income generation, human nutrition and stability of farming system. Goats are the backbone of rural people economy of arid, semi- arid and hilly regions of our country. The district Udaipur comprised of 8 Tehsil out of which 5 Tehsil are dominated with high percentage of Schedule Tribes. tribals In this tribal belt, poor management practices, adverse climatic condition and poor genetic base are the major constraints faced by the goat rears. Improved management practices have been recommended by various research and development organization to improve the goat production, but for adopting these technologies, the farmers faced many constraints in adoption of these practices (Sharma and Riyazuddin, 1989) [4]. A few studies have been carried out which have direct relevance to the technological intervention. Understanding these facts, faced by the farmers, a questionnaire was formulated and technological intervention strategies were adopted to improve the attitude of goat rears towards various useful goat husbandry practices. The aim of the present study was to investigate the impact of NAIP - Project, in technological intervention on the attitude of goat rearing farmers in Udaipur district of Rajasthan.

### Methodology

In present study, data were collected from 140 goat rearing families dwelling in seven villages of *Kherwara Cluster* viz. *Mahuwada, Manpura, Shampura, Dholpura, Upali Katev, Nichli Katev and Amarpura*. These all villages are adopted by KVK-Udaipur under NAIP Project. The investigation was conducting transfer of technology programmes on different improved goat production practices in above adopted villages. Six improved goat production practices (three health care and three feeding) and seven socio-economic indicators assets were

identified with the help of experts and goat farmers for this study. The data were collected through personal interview with the help of pre-tested structured schedule. The data collected were tabulated and statistical tools like percentage was used for logical conclusion.

## Results and Discussion

### Socio economic

Goat is considered to be associated with the poor sections of the rural society which also proved true in this field of study because 94.17 percent household belonged to resource poor section of the rural population. Socio-economic status of goat rearers is presented in Table-1. Majority of goat rearers 94.28% belonged to middle age group. The results of the study are in agreement with the findings as reported by Pathodiya *et al* (2003) [1]. The participants of young and high age group in the goat rears were found to be 15.0% and 12.50%, respectively. The reasons behind this might be due to difficulties faced by old people in the rainy and adverse climate and engagement of young owns in other personal affairs. Majority of goat rears 67.85% were illiterate and 24.30% goat rearers acquired primary level of education, while 7.85 % having middle and above levels of education in study area. Poor literacy brate may be one of the major reasons not hinder their intervention and poor to adopt the goat rearing technologies in study area. Agriculture and Animal Husbandry is the main occupation of 65.71% goat rearers followed by 22.14, 10.17 and 9.52% agriculture, animal husbandry and service, respectively. Similar results were also reported by Pathodiya *et al* (2003) [1]. The family types of goat rears 61.43% belong to joint family where as 38.57% were from nuclear family. The majority of goat rears were from low and medium income groups 96.43%, which indicated that the poor people kept goat for their livelihood. These results were in concurrence with the findings of Rao and Patro (2002) [3]. Most of the goat rears had less than 1.0 hectare of land, out of which ¾ land was rain fed. In this situation, income from goat rearing plays a major role for their subsistence in such type of a remote place. These results of the study are supported by Rai and Singh (2004) [2]. Most

of the goat rears were either land less or small land holders. It indicated that the major goat rearing practices was followed by small, land less and resource poor farmers of selected villages of the district.

### Nutrition's and health management

Table-2 shows that the results of pre and post intervention of technologies viz. animal health camp, training programme, advisory service and Demonstrations influenced the attitude of goat rearers towards the adoption of recommended technologies for goat husbandry. The proportion of farmers who vaccinate their animal was higher in Amarpura 85.72% followed by Oupli Katev 80.46%, Mahuwara and Dolpura are same 66.67%, Manpura 57.14%, Shyampura 33.33% and Nichli Katev 23.80%. Overall 59.28% farmers adopted the vaccinate schedule. A total of 75% goat rearers followed the deworming practices but 25% did not follow deworming owing to poor economic condition. The ecto-parasiticides were found to be severe in the study area even though only 26.42% treat their animal against ecto- parasiticides regularly during pre intervention of technologies of NAIP Project. After intervention of technologies 74.28% farmers. Adopted ecto parasiticides to treat their animals, only 35% concentrate feeding, 2.14 % mimeral mixture feeding and 9.28% green fodder feeding were followed by the farmers in the study area during survey period, but after technologies intervention, the concentrate feeding raised 74.28%, mineral mixture feeding 57.85% and green fodder feeding 59.28% owing the goat rears by using efficient technologies and extension tools. The overall improvement in the attitude of the goats rears with respect to adoption of animal husbandry technologies would be possible through the demonstration of efficient technologies needed for healthy goat rearing which had not only creating awareness but also improved the attitude of goat rears in relation to scientific goat rearing practices. It results from the study that the awareness regarding the available viable animal husbandry is essentially required to improve the productivity as well as socio- economic condition of the resource poor tribal farmers.

**Table 1:** Socio- Economic Condition of Farmers.

S. No.		Village							
		Mahuwara N=21	Manpura N=14	Shyampura N=21	Dolpura N=21	Oupli katev N=21	Nichli Katev N=21	Amarpura N=21	Overall N=140
1.	Family Profile								
a.	Low(25 years)	3(14.29)	2(14.29)	1(4.76)	4(19.06)	2(9.52)	5(23.80)	4(19.06)	21(15.00)
b.	Medium(26-50Years)	17(80.95)	10(71.42)	18(85.72)	14(66.66)	17(80.95)	16(76.20)	15(71.42)	107(76.42)
c.	High(>50years)	1(4.76)	2(14.29)	2(9.52)	3(14.28)	2(9.52)	00	2(9.52)	12(8.58)
2.	Caste								
a.	SC	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
b.	ST	19(90.48)	14(100)	21(100)	19(90.48)	20(95.24)	21(100)	18(85.72)	132(94.28)
c.	Other	2(9.52)	00	00	2(9.52)	1(4.76)	00	3(14.28)	8(5.72)
3.	Education								
a.	Illiterate	12(57.14)	9(64.28)	16(76.20)	15(71.43)	10(47.60)	20(95.24)	13(61.90)	95(67.85)
b.	Primary	8(38.10)	4(28.58)	3(14.28)	5(23.80)	7(33.34)	1(4.76)	6(28.58)	34(24.30)
c.	Middle and above	1(4.76)	1(7.14)	2(9.52)	1(4.76)	4(19.06)	00	2(9.52)	11(7.85)
4.	Main Occupation								
a.	Agriculture	5(23.80)	4(28.58)	7(33.35)	3(14.28)	5(23.80)	3(14.28)	4(19.06)	31(22.14)
b.	Animal Husbandry	2(9.52)	2(14.29)	5(23.80)	2(9.52)	1(4.76)	1(4.76)	2(9.52)	15(10.17)
c.	Agri.+ Animal Husbandry	14(66.66)	8(57.13)	9(42.85)	16(76.20)	14(66.66)	17(80.96)	14(66.66)	92(65.71)
d.	Service	00	00	00	00	1(4.76)	00	1(4.76)	2(9.52)
5.	Family Type								
a.	Nuclear	8(38.10)	4(28.58)	7(33.34)	9(42.86)	7(33.34)	10(47.60)	9(42.88)	54(38.57)
b.	Joint	13(61.90)	10(71.42)	14(66.66)	12(57.14)	14(66.66)	11(52.40)	12(57.12)	86(61.43)
6.	Annual Income								

a.	Low(below Rs.10,000)	9(42.85)	4(28.58)	17(80.95)	15(71.42)	13(61.90)	15(71.42)	9(42.88)	82(58.57)
b.	Medium(Rs.10,000-20,000)	11(52.39)	10(71.42)	4(19.05)	6(28.58)	6(28.58)	6(28.58)	10(47.60)	53(37.86)
c.	High(above Rs.20,000)	1(4.76)	00	00	00	2(9.52)	00	2(9.52)	5(3.57)
7.	Land Holding								
a.	Landless	1(4.76)	00	00	00	1(4.76)	4(19.06)	00	6(28.58)
b.	Marginal(<0.5 hectare)	18(85.72)	13(92.85)	21(100)	21(100)	16(76.20)	16(76.20)	17(80.95)	122(87.14)
c.	Small(<0.5-2.0 hectare)	2(9.52)	1(7.15)	00	00	4(19.06)	1(4.76)	4(19.05)	12(57.12)

\*Figures in Parenthesis indicate Percentage.

**Table 2:** Health care and Nutritional Practices (Pre and post NAIP Interventions)

S. No	Particulars	Villages															
		Mahuwara (N=21)		Manpura (N=14)		Shyampura (N=21)		Dolpura (N=21)		Oupli katev (N=21)		Nichli Katev (N=21)		Amarpura (N=21)		Overall (N=140)	
		Pre-NAIP	Post-NAIP	Pre-NAIP	Post-NAIP	Pre-NAIP	Post-NAIP	Pre-NAIP	Post-NAIP	Pre-NAIP	Post-NAIP	Pre-NAIP	Post-NAIP	Pre-NAIP	Post-NAIP	Pre-NAIP	Post-NAIP
1.	Vaccination																
	Yes	1 (4.76)	14 (66.67)	1 (7.14)	8 (57.14)	00 (33.33)	7 (33.33)	00 (66.67)	14 (66.67)	2 (9.52)	17 (80.96)	00 (23.80)	5 (4.76)	1 (85.72)	18 (3.57)	5 (59.28)	83
	No	20 (95.24)	7 (33.33)	13 (92.86)	6 (42.85)	21 (100)	14 (66.67)	21 (100)	7 (33.33)	19 (90.48)	4 (19.04)	21 (100)	16 (76.20)	20 (95.24)	3 (14.28)	135 (96.43)	57 (40.72)
2.	Deworming																
	Yes	4 (19.04)	18 (85.72)	4 (28.57)	12 (85.71)	2 (9.52)	12 (57.14)	1 (4.76)	14 (66.67)	8 (38.10)	20 (95.24)	00 (57.14)	12 (23.80)	5 (80.96)	17 (17.14)	24 (75)	105
	No	17 (80.96)	3 (14.28)	10 (71.43)	2 (14.29)	19 (90.48)	9 (42.86)	20 (95.24)	7 (33.33)	13 (61.90)	1 (4.76)	21 (100)	9 (42.86)	16 (76.20)	4 (19.04)	116 (82.86)	35 (25)
3.	Ecto-Parasiticides																
	Yes	5 (23.80)	19 (90.48)	4 (28.57)	13 (92.86)	5 (23.80)	12 (57.14)	6 (28.57)	15 (71.43)	8 (38.10)	19 (90.48)	2 (9.52)	8 (38.10)	7 (33.33)	18 (85.72)	37 (26.42)	104 (74.28)
	No	16 (76.20)	2 (9.52)	10 (71.43)	1 (7.14)	16 (76.20)	9 (42.86)	15 (71.43)	6 (28.57)	13 (61.90)	2 (9.52)	19 (90.48)	13 (61.90)	14 (66.67)	3 (14.28)	103 (73.58)	36 (25.72)
4.	Mineral Mixture Feeding																
	Yes	1 (4.76)	14 (66.67)	1 (7.14)	8 (57.14)	00 (66.67)	14 (66.67)	00 (57.14)	12 (57.14)	1 (4.76)	16 (76.20)	00 (23.80)	5 (57.14)	00 (2.14)	12 (57.85)	3 (57.85)	81
	No	20 (95.24)	7 (33.33)	13 (92.86)	6 (42.85)	21 (100)	7 (33.33)	21 (100)	9 (42.86)	20 (95.24)	5 (23.80)	21 (100)	16 (76.20)	21 (100)	9 (42.86)	137 (97.86)	59 (42.15)
5.	Concentrate Feeding																
	Yes	5 (23.80)	15 (71.43)	6 (42.85)	10 (71.43)	3 (14.28)	12 (57.14)	6 (28.57)	15 (71.43)	13 (61.90)	20 (95.24)	4 (19.04)	12 (57.14)	12 (57.14)	20 (95.24)	49 (35)	104 (74.28)
	No	16 (76.20)	6 (28.57)	8 (57.14)	4 (28.57)	18 (85.72)	9 (42.86)	15 (71.43)	6 (28.57)	8 (38.10)	1 (4.76)	17 (80.96)	9 (42.86)	9 (42.86)	1 (4.76)	91 (65)	36 (25.72)
6.	Green Fodder Feeding (Lucern)																
	Yes	1 (4.76)	15 (71.43)	2 (14.29)	12 (85.71)	2 (9.52)	14 (66.67)	00 (23.80)	5 (33.33)	7 (85.72)	18 (85.72)	00 (23.80)	5 (4.76)	1 (66.67)	14 (9.28)	13 (59.28)	83
	No	20 (95.24)	6 (28.57)	12 (85.71)	2 (14.29)	19 (90.48)	7 (33.33)	21 (100)	16 (76.20)	14 (66.67)	3 (14.28)	21 (100)	16 (76.20)	20 (95.24)	7 (33.33)	127 (90.72)	57 (40.72)

\*Figures in Parenthesis indicate Percentage.

## Conclusion

From the present study, It was conducted that the overall improvement in the attitude of the goats rears with respect to adoption of improved technologies related to goat production would be possible through the demonstration of efficient technologies needed for healthy goat rearing which had not only creating awareness but also improved the attitude of goat rearers.

## References

1. Pathodiya OP, Tailor SP, Nagda RK. Annual Report (2002-2003) of AICRP on goat improvement (Sirohi Gelt Unit) Livestock Research Station, Vallbh Nagar, Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture & Technology, Udaipur, 2003.
2. Rai B, Singh MK. Rearing Practices of Jakhrana Goat in farmers flock. Indian journal of small ruminants. 2004; 90:33-35.
3. Rao PK, Patro BN. Scientist Meet 2002, AICRP on Goat Improvement (Ganjan field unit) Deptt. Animal breeding

and genetics, Collage of Veterinary Science and Animal Husbandry, OUAT, Bhubaneswar, 2002.

4. Sharma NK, Riyazuddin. Survey report on constraints analysis in adoption of improved sheep production technologies of the sheep families in adopted and non-adopted village, CSWRI, Avikanagar, 1989.