



**Socio Economic Status Of The Male And Female Dairy Cooperative Members In
Milkipur Block Of Faizabad, District: A Gender Perspective.**

Tankit Kumar¹, Subodh Kumar², R. R. Yadav³ and Brajmohan⁴

^{1,3}Department of Extension & communication management, College of Home Science, N.D.U.A. &T., Narendra Nagar (Kumarganj), Faizabad (U.P.) - 224 229, India

²Department of Veterinary Extension, College of Veterinary Science and Animal Husbandry, N.D.U.A. &T., Narendra Nagar (Kumarganj), Faizabad (U.P.) - 224 22, India.

⁴Department of Agriculture Engineering, Monad University, Hapur, UP India.

ABSTRACT

India is a developing country with diversified agro-climatic conditions. Agriculture is the main occupation in the country, majority of population still dependent on agriculture and allied sector. Most of the farmers are engaged in agricultural and allied sector like livestock husbandry. Agriculture and livestock husbandry plays crucial role in Indian rural economy. Also Women play a significant role in Agriculture and allied sector like dairy development etc. and stable own entrepreneurs.

Study was conducted on Milkipur block of Faizabad district (U.P.). Selection of block and district was purposively. A total number of respondents were selected through random sampling technique from 10 sample milk cooperative society on the basis of majority of dairy farmers. From each of the selected society an exhaustive list of members was prepared then five women and five men members were selected. Thus a total of 100 members (50 men and 50 women) were finally identified for the purpose of further investigation. The structured schedule was developed keeping in view the objectives & variables under study. Personally contacted to respondent for data collection. The percentage, mean, standard deviation, correlation were used for calculation and drawing the inferences. Age of the respondents was recorded the majority of the respondents as (69%) were found belonging to middle age group of 32-51 years whereas almost equal number of respondents were of young (<31 yrs) and old (> age 52 yrs) age group categories. Cast, In pooled figure almost equal number of the respondents were found belonging to general & schedule castes where as 29 percent were from backward class. In education found fifty percent female cooperative members was illiterate Further 67 percent male cooperative was literate about two third cooperative members were literate out of them majority were found educated upto high school level. majority of the cooperative members (69%) had medium followed 19 percent and 12 percent had large and small size of herd. Surprisingly no respondents of the study area reside in hut or kaccha house. the male cooperative members were significantly ($P < 0.01$) higher in term of extension contact with information sources as compared to female cooperative members the lower mean value of extension contact with information sources for females was might be due to restriction in male dominated families. the comparatively higher mean values for male cooperative members in respect to age, education, cast, marital status, family type, family size, land holding, housing pattern, material possession, social participation, type of animal house and herd size, however the difference was not found significant. It might be become of males and females of the socio economic status belong to some village come forward to join milk cooperatives. Also, extension intervention carried out by the cooperatives might established some sort of equality among rural poor.

Key words: the socio economic status, male and female, cooperative members, education, cast, entrepreneurship.

I. Introduction

India is a vast country with diversified agro-climatic conditions. Agriculture is the main occupation in the country, majority of population still dependent on agriculture and allied sector. Most of the farmers are engaged in agricultural operations for about 8-9 months of a calendar year under such conditions, and livestock husbandry being an integral part of agriculture as a source of extra income. Preferably, it is useful to rear dairy animal which provide an additional source of regular employment and income. In present scenario small land holding is a major problem in rural areas so dairy husbandry may be the only substitutional occupation provides employment and income to the rural farmers. Co-operative societies play important role in entrepreneurship development in India, especially in dairy sector because it improves income, employment and also entrepreneurial behaviour of rural people. Entrepreneur is an individual who owns an enterprise. Women entrepreneurs are the women or group of women who starts plans and runs the enterprise. India is an agriculture based country where in majority of the population still depends on agriculture as a source of livelihood in rural areas.

The contribution of women to national development in the current context and its potential is of greater significance. Involvement of Indian women in national progress at all levels is indisputable reality although the degree of involvement varies from time to time and region to region. In livestock farming, women are the key figures and contribute more than men in various aspects of dairy farming. In this sector women have a multiple roles with regional differences. Their role in dairy development varies from worker to manager. Their activities are widely ranging from care of animals, grazing, fodder collection, cleaning of animal sheds, processing of milk and making milk products.

Amul is a first Indian dairy cooperative, based at Anand in the state of Gujarat, India. The Amul Model is a three-tier cooperative structure. This structure consists of a dairy cooperative society at the village level affiliated to a milk union at the district level which in turn is federated into a milk federation at the state level. Milk collection is done at the village dairy society, milk procurement and processing at the District Milk Union and milk products marketing at the state milk federation. The structure was evolved at Amul in Gujarat and thereafter replicated all over the country under the Operation Flood programme. It is known as the 'AMUL (Anand milk union Ltd.) Model' or 'Anand Pattern' of dairy cooperatives. Other dairy cooperatives like parag also use this three tier structure. In Uttar Pradesh Pradeshik Cooperative Dairy Federation is named as PARAG.

II. Research Methodology

Uttar Pradesh is a leading state in milk production in the country. Co-operative societies plays important role in entrepreneurship development especially in dairy sector. In Faizabad district many milk co-operative societies are functional and playing crucial role in motivating the farmers to adopt dairy enterprise, thus, Faizabad district was selected purposively. District Faizabad comprised of 11 blocks namely Sohawal, Masodha, Purabazar, Mayabazar, Milkipur, Amaniganj, Bikapur, Tarun, Haringtanganj, Rudauli and Mawai. Out of these 11 blocks the Milkipur block was selected purposively for the study because of its easy accessibility and familiarity of researcher with the local language, socio-economic and cultural conditions, which will help in rapport building and authentic data collection.

In milkipur block 28 milk cooperatives societies are constituted under cooperative milk union Faizabad. Out of these, 10 milk cooperative societies were selected randomly. From each of the selected society five women and five men members were selected randomly, Thus a total of 100 members (50 men and 50 women) was finally identified for the purpose of investigation. Personal interview method was applied for collecting the relevant data. The data was collected through observation and secondary sources.

The appropriate statistical tools and techniques were used to analyze the data and draw inferences accordingly.

The relevant variables were selected after reviewing the literatures available and the works done in the field prior to the present investigation. Age, Education, Caste, Type of family, Size of land holding, Housing pattern, Social participation, Type of animal house and Herd size (cattle eq. score) *Yang Index.(1980)*

III. Result and Discussion

The findings and inferences of the study based on the selected socio economic indicators were analyzed using percentage, mean and standard deviation and have been discussed under the following heads:

Socio economic profile of the selected men and women members of milk cooperative societies.

1 Age:

Age of the respondents was recorded categorized and presented in table-1 reveals that in case of male dairy farmers, the maximum numbers of respondents (70%) were observed in middle age category followed by old (24%) and young (6%) categories respectively. Likewise, in case of female dairy farmers, the majority of the respondents (68%) were found in old age category followed by young (24%) and middle age (8%) category respectively. This finding is in concurrence with the finding reported of *Patange et al. (2001)*

Table-1: Distribution of respondents according to age.

S. No.	Categories (years)	Respondents		
		Male n=50	Female n=50	Total N=100
1.	Young (up to 31)	3 (6)	12 (24)	15 (15)
2.	Middle (32 to 51)	35 (70)	34 (68)	69 (69)
3.	Old (52 and above)	12 (24)	4 (8)	16 (16)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

Mean = 41.84 S.D= 10.57796 Min.=20 Max.=70

In pooled data the majority of the respondents as (69%) were found belonging to middle age group of 32-51 years whereas almost equal number of respondents were of young (<31 yrs) and old (> age 52 yrs) age group categories.

2 Caste:

The Table-2 indicates that the maximum number of the male dairy farmers (40%) belonged to general caste followed by backward caste (34%) and the scheduled caste (26%) respectively.

Table- 2: Distribution of respondents according to caste

S. No.	Categories	Respondents		
		Male n=50	Female n=50	Total N=100
1.	Scheduled caste	13 (26)	22 (44)	35 (35)
2.	Other backward caste	17 (34)	12 (24)	29 (29)
3.	General caste	20 (40)	16 (32)	36 (36)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

Whereas among to female dairy farmers, the majority of the respondents (44%) belonged to schedule caste followed by general (32%) and backward cast (24%) respectively. In pooled figure

almost equal number of the respondents were found belonging to general & schedule castes where as 29 percent were from backward class.

3 Education:

Differences were observed in education status of male and female cooperative members. Table - 3 indicates that majority of the male respondent (84%) were literate as compared to only half of the female respondent. Among the literates almost equal number of the respondent of the males and females had education upto high school level. Moreover more male cooperative members were graduate (14%) and postgraduate (12%) whereas only 10 percent female members were graduate and no female had education upto postgraduate level. Further, the educational level of literate men dairy farmers in descending order were found as high school (30%) intermediate (24%) graduate (14%) post graduate (12%) primary (4%), whereas the literacy level of female dairy farmers in descending order were found to be high school (28%), intermediate (12%), and graduate (10%).

Table-3: Distribution of respondents according to education

S. No.	Categories	Respondents		
		Male n=50	Female n=50	Total N=100
A.	Illiterate	8 (16)	25 (50)	33 (33)
B.	Literate	42 (84)	25 (50)	67 (67)
1.	Primary	2 (04)	0 (0)	2 (02)
2.	High school	15 (30)	14 (28)	29 (29)
3.	Intermediate	12 (24)	6 (12)	18 (18)
4.	Graduate	7 (14)	5 (10)	12 (12)
5.	Post graduate	6 (12)	0 (0)	6 (6)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

It shows the social discrimination between male and female in terms of literacy. Pooled figure indicate that about two third cooperative members were literate out of them majority were found educated upto high school level. This finding is in concurrence with the finding reported of *Yadav and Grover (2012)*

4 Family type:

The Table-4 reveals that the majority of the male dairy cooperative members (70%) belonged to joint family while the rest (30%) belonged to nuclear family. In case of female dairy cooperative members majority (74%) belonged to joint family, while the rest (26%) respondents belonged to nuclear family.

Table-4: Distribution of respondents according to family type

S. No.	Categories	Respondents		
		Male n=50	Female n=50	Total N=100
1.	Nuclear family	15 (30)	13 (26)	28 (28)
2.	Joint family	35 (70)	37 (74)	72 (72)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

In pooled data majority of the respondents (72%) were found belonging to joint families as cooperated to (28%) were from nuclear families.

(Hence, the dominance of joint family system was there in both male and female dairy cooperatives members). This finding is in opposite with the finding reported of *Yadav and Grover (2012)*

5 Family size:

Table-5: Distribution of respondents according to family size

S. No.	Categories	Respondents		
		Male n=50	Female n=50	Total N=100
1.	Small (up to 5)	8 (16)	7 (14)	15(15)
2.	Middle (6 to 11)	32 (64)	33 (66)	65(65)
3.	Large (12 and above)	10 (20)	10 (20)	20(20)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

Mean =9.05 S.D. = 3.61 Min=4 Max=19

It can be observed from the table 5 that majority of respondents from both the gender male (64%) and female (66%) were from medium family size 6-11 members. Whereas 16 percent male and 14 percent female had small family size. More over equal number of respondents (10%) were found belonging to large family size (12 or more members) irrespective of them gender.

6. Housing pattern:

The Table-6 revealed that majority of the male (48%) and female (38%) cooperative members had pucca house. Whereas 52 percent males as compound to 62 percent female had mixed type house. Surprisingly no respondents of the study area reside in hut or kaccha house.

Table-6: Distribution of respondents according to housing pattern

S. No.	Categories	Respondents		
		Male n=50	Female n=50	Total N=100
1.	Hut	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
2.	Kaccha	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
3.	Mixed	26 (52)	31 (62)	57 (57)
4.	Pucca	24 (48)	19 (38)	43(43)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

It might be because of various government housing scheme through which rural pas are provided with pucca house at subsidized prices and the rural people able to avail the benefit from government schemes.

7 Animal Housing pattern:

Table-7: Distribution of respondents according to animal housing pattern

S. No.	Categories	Respondents		
		Male n=50	Female n=50	Total N= 100
1.	No house	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
2.	Hut	9 (18)	16 (32)	25 (25)
3.	Kaccha	23 (46)	13 (26)	36 (36)

4.	Mixed	17 (34)	20 (40)	37 (37)
5.	Pucca	1 (2)	1 (2)	2 (2)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

The Table -7 shows majority of the male cooperative members (46%) had kaccha house for their animals in contrast to majority of the female (40%), who provided pucca to their animals. Moreover, 18 percent and 34 percent male member had hut and mixed type animal houses, whereas 32 percent and 26 percent female had hut and kuccha animal houses. Equal number of respondents (2%) provided pucca house to their animal irrespectively of gender interestingly, no such male cooperative member was found who have no house for the animals. It might be because of awareness among the rural people regarding importance of house system in livestock husbandry.

8 Land holding:

The Table-8 indicates that majority (40%) of the male dairy cooperative members were marginal farmers followed by 34 percent and 22 percent were small and medium farmers respectively.

Table-8: Distribution of farmers according to size of land holding

S. No.	Categories (ha.)	Respondents		
		Male n=50	Female n=50	Total N=100
1.	Marginal (Below 1 ha.)	20 (40)	24 (48)	44 (44)
2.	Small (1.1 to 2.0 ha.)	17 (34)	15 (30)	32 (32)
3.	Medium (2.1 to 3.0 ha.)	11 (22)	8 (16)	19 (19)
4.	Large (3.1 ha. And above)	2 (4)	3 (6)	5 (5)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

Likewise, in case of female dairy cooperative members, the majority of the respondents (48%) were marginal farmer followed by 30 percent and 60 percent were small and medium farmers. However very few cooperative members from both gender were large farmers. Pooled data indicates that majority of the respondent (44%) were marginal farmers followed by 32 percent and 19 percent were small and medium farmer's categories respectively. This finding is in concurrence with the finding reported of *Kumar et al. (1999)*

9 Herd size:

Table-9: Distribution of respondents as per their herd size

S. No.	Categories (score)	Respondents		
		Male n=50	Female n=50	Total N=100
1.	Small(up to 3)	8 (16)	4 (8)	12 (12)
2.	Medium (3.1 to 7)	29 (58)	40 (80)	69 (69)
3.	Large (7.1 and above)	13 (26)	6 (12)	19 (19)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

Mean = 5.41 SD= 2.07 Min=1.19 Max= 10.53

Table-9 shows that majority of the male cooperative members (58%) had medium livestock hers size followed by 26 and 16 percent of them had large and small herd size respectively likewise amongst

the female respondent, majority of them (80%) had medium whereas 12 percent and 8 percent had large and small size livestock herd. Pooled data indicates that majority of the cooperative members (69%) had medium followed 19 percent and 12 percent had large and small size of herd. This finding is in concurrence with the finding reported of *Solanki et al. (2005)*

10 Social participation:

The Table-10 indicates that the majority of the male respondents (64%) had participation in two organizations followed by 28 percent in one and 8 percent had participation in more than two organizations. Likewise, in case of female dairy farmers, the majority of them were found (50%) having participation in two organizations followed by (8%) in one and 12 percent females engaged in more than two organizations.

Table-10: Distribution of respondents according to their social participation

S. No.	Categories	Respondents		
		Male n=50	Female n=50	Total N=100
1.	Participation in only one organization	14 (28)	19 (38)	33 (33)
2.	Participation in two organizations	32 (64)	25 (50)	57 (57)
3.	Participation in more than two organizations/office bearer	4 (8)	6 (12)	10 (10)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

Pooled figures indicate that about one third milk cooperative members had participation in only one organization 10 percent participated in more than two organization whereas majority of them (57%) low participation in two organization. It might be become of the extension interventions by the technical staff of milk cooperatives which facilitates the participation of rural people in a social organization.

11. Difference in the mean values of socio-economic variables between male and female cooperative members

Table 5.46: reveals that the male cooperative members were significantly ($P < 0.01$) higher in term of extension contact with information sources as compared to female cooperative members the lower mean value of extension contact with information sources for females was might be due to restriction in male dominated families.

Table no. 11 Deference in the mean values of socio-economic variables between male and female cooperative members.

S. No.	Socio-economic Variable	Mean values		t values
		Male N=50	Female N=50	
1.	Age	44.66	39.02	0.0070 ^{NS}
2.	Education	2.52	1.32	0.0001 ^{NS}
3.	Caste	2.14	1.88	0.1253 ^{NS}
4.	Marital status	2.00	1.96	0.1562 ^{NS}
5.	Type of family	1.70	1.74	0.6598 ^{NS}
6.	Size of family	8.98	9.12	0.8476 ^{NS}
7.	Size of landholding	1.28	0.97	0.0979 ^{NS}
8.	Housing pattern	3.48	3.38	0.3174 ^{NS}

9.	Material possession	42.50	37.02	0.0723 ^{NS}
10.	Social participation	1.80	1.74	0.0005 ^{NS}
11.	Extension contact and participation of extension activities	95.08	74.62	8.710**
12.	Type of animal house	2.20	2.12	0.6303 ^{NS}
13.	Herd size (cattle eq. score)	5.69	5.53	0.7946 ^{NS}

The table further shows the comparatively higher mean values for male cooperative members in respect to age, education, cast, marital status, family type, family size, land holding, housing pattern, material possession, social participation, type of animal house and herd size, however the difference was not found significant. It might be become of males and females of the socio economic status belong to some village come forward to join milk cooperatives. Also, extension intervention carried out by the cooperatives might established some sort of equality among rural poor.

IV. Conclusion

Conclusion that socio economic status of dairy cooperative members mostly majority in medium categories but men batter then women so government makes some policy for dairy entrepreneur owners mostly women dairy cooperative farmers for improving her living standard.

Bibliography

- [1] Amul – The Taste of India. "Welcome to Amul – The Taste of India". Amul.com. Retrieved 12 July 2010.
- [2] Kumar, R.; Jha, S. K. and Singh, J. P. (1999). "Socio-Economic Characteristics of Dairy Farmers, Associated with Village Dairy Cooperatives. *Journal of Dairying, Foods and Home Sciences*. 18 (1):45-48.
- [3] Patange, D.D.; Wangikar, S.D.; Kulakarni. and Kalyankar.(2001). Effect of socio-economic variables on milk production of marathwada buffalo. *Maharashtra journal Extension Education*, 20:92-96.
- [4] Solanki, V.S.; Chauhan, J.; Punekar, S. and Sharma, M.C. (2005). *Emerging role of live stock owner in dairy development. Abstract in national seminar on entrepreneurship development for livelihood security: Experiences, prospectus and strategies for rural India*, held from 29No. to 1 Dec. pp. 12.
- [5] Yadav, P. K. and Grover, I. (2012). Gender analysis of constraints faced by dairy cooperative society members. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*. 12(2):48-54.
- [6] Yang W.Y. (1980). measure crop productivity in method of farm management investigations. FAO Agricultural Development. 80. FAO Rome. 285.