*Indian J. Anim. Prod. Mgmt. Vol. 29 (1-2) 113-116 (2013)*

# ADOPTION LEVEL OF SHEEP HUSBANDRY PRACTICES IN BHILWARA DISTRICT OF RAJASTHAN

**C.M. YADAV***
**Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Bhilwara-311001,**
**Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture & Technology, Udaipur**
**E- mail: cmyadav_jaipur@yahoo.com**

***(Received : 17.05.2013, Accepted : 11.08.2013)***

**ABSTRACT**

The study was conducted in Bhilwara district by incorporating a total 120 farmers selected from adopted and non-adopted area. Fifteen technologies in sheep husbandry practices were identified to study the adoption level among farmers - selection and purchase of quality sheep (58.33 %), provision of shelter for animals (46.67 %), feeding of colostrums to new born lamb (100 %), period of grazing (100%), feeding of crushed grain (58.33%), feeding of tree leaves in summer (70 %), deworming (73.33%), vaccination of sheep (60%) and marketing of ram lamb at 6 months of age (83.33) were adopted by majority of the participant farmers. In the case of farmers from non-adopted area, period of grazing (100%), feeding of colostrums to new born lamb (70 %) and feeding of tree leaves (50 %) were the practices adopted by farmers, while majority of them were non-adopters to the remaining practices in sheep husbandry. Majority of the adopted area expressed that the reason for non-adoption of recommended practices were lack of knowledge, lack of time and lack of veterinary services and non-availability of inputs.

**Key words** : Adopted, Non-adopted area, Sheep, Husbandry practices, KVK, Rajasthan

Livestock contributes 16% to the income of small farm households as against an average of 14% for all rural household. Amongst the livestock, sheep and goat contributes nearly 150 billion rupees to national economy besides providing enough employment opportunities to rural livelihood. Sheep contributes to the farm households not only by acting as a source of livelihoods and nutritional security, but also as a moving asset, which can be liquidated at times of crises within a short time. The role of sheep is more pronounced as a source of non-vegetarian food. Further, the demand for non-vegetarian food products is on increase and its consumption would be nearly 8.0-9.0 million tonnes by 2020 up from 2.0-3.0 million tonnes in[5]. It is necessary to improve the production and productivity of sheep. Thus, present study was undertaken to study impact of KVK on adoption of sheep husbandry practices.

The study was conducted in Mandel and Suwana panchayat samiti, Bhilwara district by incorporating a total 60 farmers from 4 villages in adopted area and 60 farmers from 4 villages of non-adopted area. Fifteen technologies in sheep husbandry practices were identified to study the adoption level among farmers and also the reason of non-adoption. Data was collected by personal interview method using structured survey questionnaires for the year 2009-2011.

*SMS, AnimalProduction, KVK, Bhilwara

Table 1 revealed that out of the 15 sheep husbandry practices, namely, selection and purchase of quality sheep (58.33 %), provision of shelter for animals (46.67 %), feeding of colostrums to new born lamb (100 %), period of grazing (100%), feeding of crushed grain (58.33%), feeding of tree leaves in summer (70 %), deworming (73.33%), vaccination of sheep (60%) and marketing of ram lamb at 6 months of age (83.33) were adopted by majority of the participant farmers . These findings were in close agreement with that of[5]. The adoption level was poor for upgrading, ligation and disinfections of naval cord, weaning at 2 months of age, ectoparasiticide application, and castration of ram lambs at 2 months of age and isolation of sick animals to prevent spread of diseases due to the skill included in these practices.

In the case of farmers from non-adopted area, period of grazing (100%), feeding of colostrums to new born lamb (70 %) and feeding of tree leaves (50 %) were the practices adopted by farmers, while majority of them were non-adopters to the remaining practices in sheep husbandry. This might due to lack of knowledge, poor economic condition and non-availability of suitable inputs. Similar findings were observed by[1] .With regards to practice of selection and purchase of quality animals, high cost of animals (40%) and non-availability of better breeds (60%) were the reasons expressed by the farmers for non-adoption of recommended practices. With respect to provision of shelter for animals, the participant farmers felt that for few animals the overhang in the house is enough (21.87%) and rest of them opined that construction of separated shed for providing shelter to the animals is a costly affair. With regards to upgrading, lack of knowledge about the scientific breeding practices (53.70%) and non-availability of quality rams (46.30%) were the reasons. In the case of colostrums feeding the farmers (68 %) felt that feeding of colostrums immediately after birth will induce diarrhea and the animal may go down in condition. With regards to ligation and disinfection of naval cord, the non-adopters (50 %) felt that the mother itself will lick the umbilical cord and will heal automatically and hence there is no need to cut and ligate the cord while 50% of the non-adopters expressed their lack of knowledge about this practice.In the case of practice of weaning, lack of knowledge was expressed by 74.07 % of the farmers. With regards to the feeding of the tree leaves in summer, some of the participant (44.44%) farmers expressed their lack of knowledge in feeding of suitable type of leaves, while the remaining (55.56 %) felt that this practice is a time consuming affair.

In the case of deworming, lack of knowledge was expressed by majority of the non-adopters (75%) while the remaining 25% of them stated that inadequacy of dewormers with the local veterinarian and link worker couples as the reason for non-adoption. With regard to ectoparasiticide application, majority (38.89%) of respondents cited time consuming about the practice for their non-adoption. The remaining 33.33 and 27.78% of non-adopters felt that the recommended practice is lack of knowledge and is a costly method, respectively.

Lack of knowledge was the reason expressed by majority (60%) of non-adopters with respect of the practice, castration of ram lambs, followed by lack of veterinary services (40 per cent) in their villages to perform this operation. With respect to the vaccination of sheep 41.67 per cent of non-adopters expressed bitter experience of lack of knowledge leading to mortality of sheep as the major reason, followed by failure of vaccination (33.33%) and wrong notion of deterioration in the condition of animals if vaccinated (25%). With regard to isolation of sick animals, lack of

knowledge (73.68%) and non-availability of isolation space (26.32%) were the reasons cited for non-adoption. In the case of marketing of ram lambs at months of age, the non-adopters expressed that lack of knowledge in organized marketing as the reason for non-adoption.

This indicates that the extent of adoption of practices by beneficiaries was high in the adopted area than in the non-adopted area, due to the fact that KVK organised different transfer technologies for increased awareness through trainings, night camps, group and individual contact, celebration of technology week, field days, mass media exposure and contact with extension personnel would have increased the level of adoption along with knowledge gain regarding sheep husbandry practices. The non-availability of such services and facilities in the non-adopted area would be the main reason for considerable percentage of low adoption. The findings are in agreement with the previous report[2,3]. It may be concluded that most of the participant farmers were having poor adoption in areas such as upgrading of animals, ligation and disinfection of naval cord, practice of weaning, ectoparasiticide application, and castration of ram lambs and isolation of sick animals. In the case of non-participant farmers, majority of them were non-adopters of various recommended practices except in practices such as feeding of tree leaves in summer. Majority of the participant farmers expressed that the reason for non-adoption of recommended practices were lack of knowledge, lack of time, lack of veterinary services and non-availability of inputs.

**Table: 1 Adoption level of sheep husbandry practices**

| S.No. | Technologies | Adopted area | | | | Non-adopted area | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Adopter | | Non-adopter | | Adopter | | Non-adopter | |
| | | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 1. | Selection and purchase of quality sheep breed | 35 | 58.33 | 25 | 41.67 | 06 | 10.00 | 54 | 90.00 |
| 2. | Provision of shelter for sheep | 28 | 46.67 | 32 | 53.33 | 10 | 16.67 | 50 | 83.33 |
| 3. | Upgrading | 06 | 10.0 | 54 | 90.0 | 03 | 5.00 | 57 | 95.00 |
| 4. | Colostrums feeding | 60 | 100.0 | 00 | 0.00 | 42 | 70.00 | 18 | 30.00 |
| 5. | Ligation and disinfection of naval | 40 | 66.67 | 20 | 33.33 | 03 | 5.00 | 57 | 95.00 |
| 6. | Practice of weaning | 06 | 10.0 | 54 | 90.0 | 00 | 0.00 | 100 | 100 |
| 7. | Period of grazing | 60 | 100.0 | 00 | 00.0 | 60 | 100.0 | 00 | 0.00 |
| 8. | Feeding of crushed grains | 35 | 58.33 | 25 | 41.67 | 15 | 25.00 | 45 | 75.00 |
| 9. | Feeding of tree leaves in summer | 42 | 70.0 | 18 | 30.00 | 30 | 50.00 | 30 | 50.00 |
| 10. | Deworming | 44 | 73.33 | 16 | 26.67 | 05 | 8.33 | 55 | 91.67 |
| 11. | Ecto-parasiticide application | 24 | 40.0 | 36 | 60.0 | 03 | 5.00 | 57 | 95.00 |
| 12. | Castration of ram lamb and bucks | 10 | 16.67 | 50 | 83.33 | 02 | 3.33 | 58 | 96.67 |
| 13. | Vaccination of sheep | 36 | 60.0 | 24 | 40.0 | 00 | 0.00 | 00 | 0.00 |
| 14. | Isolation of sick sheep | 22 | 36.67 | 38 | 63.33 | 00 | 0.00 | 00 | 0.00 |
| 15. | Marketing of lamb at 6 months of age | 50 | 83.33 | 10 | 16.67 | 15 | 25.00 | 45 | 75.00 |

## REFERENCES


1. Kumaravel, P. and Krishnaraj, R. 2005. Adoption behaviour of livestock farmers. Indian Journal of Extension Education, 41:117-121.
2. Mohan, B., Sagar, R.L., Singh, K., Tripathi, P. and Vihan, V.S. 2007. Present status of goat rearing under rural condition. Indian Research Journal of Extension Education, 7:43-45.
3. Suresh, A., Gupta, D.C. and Mann, J.S. 2008. Adoption of improved management practices of sheep in the semi arid region of Rajasthan. Indian Journal of Extension Education, 44:100-105.
4. Tajane, S.B., Rajkamal, P.J. and Veeranna, 2005. Work environment of the veterinary surgeons. Indian Journal of Extension Education, 41: 99-101.
5. Taneja, V.K. and Birthal, P.S. 2006. Livestock sector in India: Opportunities and challenges for small holders. Paper presented in the International Workshop on Smallholder Livestock Production in India: Opportunities and challenges. ICAR. International Livestock Research Institute and National Centre for Agricultural Economics and Policy Research. 31 January-1 Feb. New Delhi.


★ ★ ★