PERCEIVED TRAINING PREFERENCES OF LIVESTOCK FARMERS IN KARNATAKA

B.L. Balaraju, Prakash Khandekar, Mahesh Chander,
Prakashkumar Rathod and K. Pachiayappan

Division of Extension Education, IVRI, Izatnagar, Bareilly-243122 (UP)

Received 2.2.2014 Accepted 12.3.2014

Corresponding Author : balaraju606@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

An ex-post-facto exploratory study was conducted using 120 livestock farmers to collect data about the preferred type, venue, method, season, duration, interval and timings of the training in Davangere district of Karnataka on three point continuum viz., most preferred, preferred and least preferred. Majority of livestock farmers preferred one day to less than one week training duration preferably in the evening hours of winter season at their own village in the form of farm visits and demonstrations with one year time interval between successive trainings. Hence, livestock extension agencies have to organize trainings according to farmers' preference for effectiveness of training and increase in livestock productivity.

KEYWORDS: Training preferences, Livestock farmers, Karnataka

INTRODUCTION

Livestock sector plays a prime role in socio-economic development of rural households. Further, enhanced livestock productivity can be brought about by ameliorating the knowledge and skill of farmers on a continuing basis through regular training programmes (Sharma *et al.* 2011). However, before designing such training programmes on large scale and make them more effective, it becomes essential to appraise training needs and preferences of farmers appropriately. Since most of the trainings conducted for livestock farmers are based on the mandates and convenience of institutes or organizations, in many cases the training preferences of farmers and training imparting agencies differ to a greater magnitude. Various studies about training needs of livestock farmers have been conducted till date, but very negligible studies have focused on the livestock farmers' preferences for type, venue, method, season and duration etc. Hence, with this backdrop, the present study is focused to ascertain livestock farmers training preference for designing effective training curriculum.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Fifteen livestock farmers were selected at random from each of 8 gram panchayats under purposively selected Davangere district of Karnataka state making a total sample of 120 respondents. The study was conducted by ex-post-facto and exploratory research design using pre-tested, semi-structured interview schedule for data collection. The livestock farmers' preferences for different dimensions of training *viz.,* type, venue, method, season, duration, interval and time of training was ascertained on three point continuum *viz.,* most preferred, preferred and least preferred, with the score of 3, 2 and 1 respectively. Frequency and percentage for each training dimensions were calculated and ranking was done based on the total weight mean score.

$$\text{Total weighted mean score (TWMS)} = \frac{\text{Total score obtained in each major area}}{\text{Total number of respondents}}$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Preference of livestock farmers for different dimensions of training

Types of training: It is evident from Table 1 that majority of livestock farmers (72.50%) perceived off-campus training as 'most preferred' followed by on-campus (17.5%) and distance learning (5%). The livestock owners felt that they could save time and cost of transportation by attending off-campus trainings, making them much comfortable for participation without much interference to household and agricultural activities. The results are supported by findings of Tekale *et al.* (2013) who reported that training at village was most preferred by farmers.

Table 1: Preferences of livestock owners for types of trainings

Type of training	MP (3)	P (2)	LP (1)	TS	TWMS	Rank
On-campus training	21 (17.5)	58 (48.33)	41 (34.16)	220	1.83	II
Off-campus training	87 (72.5)	30 (25.00)	3 (2.50)	324	2.70	I
Distance learning	6 (5.00)	43 (35.83)	71 (59.16)	175	1.46	III

MP - Most Preferred, P - Preferred, LP - Least Preferred, TS - Total Score, TWMS - Total Weighted Mean Score

Venue of training : Table 2 shows that about 76 per cent respondents perceived their own village as 'most preferred' venue for training followed by Krishi Vigyan Kendra (20.20%), livestock farms (19.17), animal husbandry training center (10) and veterinary colleges (9.17). The distance of training institute from resident village and practical exposures were the two important factors which were influential for farmer's responses on preference for venue. The results are in line with findings of Pagaria (2012) and Tekale *et al.* (2013).

Table 2: Preferences of livestock owners for venue of training

Venue of training	MP (3)	P (2)	LP (1)	TS	TWMS	Rank
Own village	91 (75.83)	29 (24.17)	0 (0.00)	331	2.76	I
KVK	25 (20.83)	51 (42.50)	44 (36.67)	221	1.84	III
Animal husbandry training centres	12 (10.00)	54 (45.00)	54 (45.00)	198	1.65	IV
Livestock Farms	23 (19.17)	56 (46.67)	41(34.17)	222	1.85	II
Veterinary colleges	11 (9.17)	24 (20.00)	85 (70.83)	166	1.38	V

Methods of training: Majority of livestock farmers preferred farm visits method (57.50%) followed by demonstrations (54.17%) and study tours (45.00%) as shown in Table 3. Other methods like exhibition, film show, lecture and group discussion, had 'preferred' to 'least preferred' option for the farmers. More than 50 per cent of respondents preferred practical oriented trainings than class room training. The results are in line with the findings of Singh et al. (2013a).

Season of training: Table 4 reveals that majority of the respondents (50.83 %) perceived winter as 'most preferred' season followed by summer (49.17 %) and rainy season (1.67%). The respondents perceived that winter season would be pleasant to participate in training since they have lesser agriculture operations in winter season. The results are in line with findings of Pagaria

Table 3: Preferences of livestock owners for method of training

Methods of training	MP (3)	P (2)	LP (1)	TS	TWMS	Rank
Lecture	13 (10.83)	66 (55.00)	41 (34.17)	212	1.77	VI
Group discussion	3 (2.50)	58 (48.33)	59 (49.17)	184	1.53	VII
Farm visits	69 (57.50)	44 (36.67)	7 (5.83)	302	2.52	I
Study tour	54 (45.00)	42 (35.00)	24 (20.00)	270	2.25	III
Demonstration	65 (54.17)	43 (35.83)	12 (10.00)	293	2.44	II
Exhibitions/Mela	39 (32.50)	42 (35.00)	39 (32.50)	240	2.00	IV
Film shows	24 (20.00)	50 (41.67)	46 (38.33)	218	1.82	V

(2012) and Singh et al. (2013a) who reported that January to April month was the preferred season for training.

Table 4: Preferences of livestock owners for season of training

Season of training	MP (3)	P (2)	LP (1)	TS	TWMS	Rank
Summer season	59 (49.17)	54 (45.00)	7 (5.83)	292	2.43	II
Winter season	61 (50.83)	55 (45.83)	4 (3.33)	297	2.48	I
Rainy season	2 (1.67)	21 (17.50)	97 (80.83)	145	1.21	III

Duration of training: Table 5 indicates that about 57 per cent of farmers perceived one day training as most preferred, followed by less than one week (45.00%) compared to long duration trainings. The results are in concurrence with findings of Sasikala (2013) who reported that majority of farmers preferred one day training while Pagaria (2012) observed that majority of farmers preferred 2-3 days training programme.

Table 5: Preferences of livestock owners for duration of training

Duration of training	MP (3)	P (2)	LP (1)	TS	TWMS	Rank
One day	68 (56.67)	42 (35.00)	10 (8.33)	298	2.48	I
< one week (2 -6days)	54 (45.00)	55 (45.83)	11 (9.17)	283	2.36	II
One week	13 (10.83)	48 (40.00)	59 (49.17)	194	1.62	III
Two weeks	0 (0.00)	11 (9.17)	109 (90.83)	131	1.09	IV
Two – four weeks	0 (0.00)	7 (5.83)	113 (94.17)	127	1.06	V

Interval of training: Majority (50%) of the respondents preferred 'annual' interval training followed by 'biannual' trainings while short training intervals were least preferred by livestock farmers (Table 6). Hence, one day training at annual interval was highly preferred duration and training interval respectively. The results are similar to findings of Singh et al. (2013b) and Patil et al. (2009).

Table 6: Preferences of livestock owners for interval of training

Interval of training	MP (3)	P (2)	LP (1)	TS	TWMS	Rank
Monthly	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	120 (100)	120	1.00	V
Trimester	1 (0.83)	10 (8.33)	109 (90.83)	132	1.10	IV
Biannual	16 (13.33)	32 (26.67)	72 (60.00)	184	1.53	III
Annual	60 (50.00)	49 (40.83)	11(9.17)	289	2.41	I
Biennial	55 (45.83)	56 (46.67)	9 (7.50)	286	2.38	II

Timings of training: Majority (45.83%) of respondents perceived evening time as 'most preferred' followed by afternoon (25%), forenoon (19.17%) and any time (15.83%) as shown in Table 7. Evening time was ranked first because majority of the farmers perceived off-campus training, within their residential village as most preferred and hence could complete their work between morning to afternoon and would be free during evening time to attend training.

Table 7: Preferences of livestock owners for timings of training

Timings for training	MP (3)	P (2)	LP (1)	TS	TWMS	Rank
Forenoon	23 (19.17)	26 (21.67)	71 (59.17)	192	1.60	III
Afternoon	30 (25.00)	58 (48.33)	32 (26.67)	238	1.98	II
Evening	55 (45.83)	46 (38.33)	19 (15.83)	276	2.30	I
Any time	19 (15.83)	4 (3.33)	97 (80.83)	162	1.35	IV

MP - Most Preferred, P - Preferred, LP - Least Preferred, TS - Total Score, TWMS - Total Weighted Mean Score

CONCLUSION

Majority of livestock farmers preferred short duration trainings of one day to less than one week, mainly off-campus at their own village during evening hours of winter season. Farm visits and demonstration were most preferred methods with annual intervals between successive trainings. Hence, the training agencies have to design curriculum according to farmers' preference to enhance the effectiveness of livestock training programmes for improved livestock productivity.

REFERENCES :

Pagaria, P. (2012). Agri. Update. **7(1&2)**: 133-135.

Patil, A.P., Gawande, S.H., Gobade M.R. and Nande M.P. (2009). Vet. World. **2(5)**: 187-190.

Sasikala, V. (2013). Development and evaluation of a need based multimedia training module on integrated farming systems in North Western zone of Tamil Nadu. Ph.D. Thesis, IVRI, Izatnagar, India. 126 p.

Sharma, K., Singh, S.P. and Gautam. (2011). Indian. Res. J. Ext. Edu. **11(1)**: 57-61.

Singh, B., Rai, R.B., Dhama, K., Ali, H., Damodaran, T., Chakraborty, S. and Singh, A.K. (2013a). Int. J. Curr. Res. **5(8)**: 2279-2282.

Singh, R.N., Ganguli, D., Rewani, S.K. and Pandey, A.K. (2013b). Indian. J. Dairy Sci. **66(3)**: 262-264.

Tekale, M., Deshmukh, D.S., Rathod, P and Sawant, M. (2013). Indian. Res. J. Ext. Edu. **13(2)**: 67-71.

❑