Madras agric J. 62 (10—12) : 828—830, Oct—Dec., 1975.

Awareness of Farmers to Artificial Insemination for Cattle Improvement

By

V. S. SUBRAMANYAN[1], O. SUNDARAM[2], P. BALAKRISHNAN[3] and S. ANBALAGAN[4]

ABSTRACT

The results of the study show that all the farmers in the sample studied were aware of artificial insemination (AI). Among them 60 per cent adopted AI continuously. The institutionalized source had played an important role in the adoption of AI. Those who adopt AI do so mainly because of higher milk yield with graded animals. Lack of conviction, discouraging trials and wrong notions were found to be important factors associated with the non-adoption of AI.

INTRODUCTION

Since it is impossible to maintain an exotic or graded bull by all dairy farmers, artificial insemination (AI) has become the next alternative fruitful solution. For more than a decade considerable field work has been done in making the farmers adopt this practice. Satyanarayana and Bhaskaran (1966) concluded that a very high proportion of live stock owners (97.28 per cent) had adopted artificial breeding of cattle. Narayana Murthy and Waliullah (1969) stated that among the sources of infortion or agencies responsible, Government agency was rated high over non-institutionalized sources like neighbours and friends as a source of information for AI. Kaher and Narang (1971) stated that cross breeding by AI was adopted because of 3 - 4 times more milk yield than local cows, reduction in sexual maturity from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to $1\frac{1}{2}$ years and short calving intervals and better reproduction efficiency performance than desi cattle. To know how far farmers in Tamil Nadu have responded to AI, the present study was initiated. The objectives of this investigation were to know the extent of adoption of AI practice, to know the extent of influence of various sources of information on the adoption of AI and to analyse the reasons for adoption as well as non-adoption of AI.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was undertaken in the milk collecting centres of the Coimbatore Co-operative Milk Supply Union. Out of 58 village milk collection cen-

1. Assistant Professor of Agricultural Extension, 2 to 4. Post-graduate students in Agricultural Extension, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore-641003.

tres, four were purposively selected. Of the 249 dairy farmers belonging to these four centres, a randum sample of 120 constituted the respondents for this study. Data were gathered with a presented interview schedule.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Extent of adoption of AI: It is evident that all dairy farmers were aware of AI (Table 1).

Table 1. Percentage of farmers at different stages of adoption of AI

(N = 120)

Stages of adoption	Percentage
Farmers being aware of AI	100.0
Farmers continuously using AI	60.0
Farmers discontinued after trial	29.2
Farmers not tried so far	10.8

Of these farmers. only 60 per cent continuously adopted this practice and a sizeable portion of farmers accounting for 40 per cent had either not tried or discontinued after trial. When two-thirds of those who had tried, have gone ahead of the trial stage it is not likely to be difficult for others to cross the trial stage. The extension workers may therefore attempt to alleviate certain difficulties if any for these drop outs. The laggard was found to be one in every ten farmers.

Sources of information: The sources of information were grouped under three heads namely 'Institutionalised', 'Non – institutionalised' and 'Mass–media'. Animal huabandry staff attached to AI centres and village level workers were considered as 'Institutionalised' source. 'Non-institutionalised' source comprised of neighbours, relatives and friends. As regards mass media, radio. films and published materials were considered.

It is clear that for the acceptance of AI, the most utilized source was institutionalised one as 70.8 per cent of farmers were influenced by this source. This was followed by non-institutionalised source accounting for 24.1 per cent. The predominance of the institutionalised source may be due to the necessity of the practical guidance of technical persons since the practice was not a simple one. Mass media rarely had influenced the dairy farmers (Table 2).

Table 2. Sources of information on the adoption of artificial insemination

(N = 120)

Sources of information	Percentage of farmers influenced
Institutionalised	70.8
Non-institutionalised	24.1
Mass media	5.1

Data from Table 3 indicate that getting the animals inseminated free of cost and aspiring for healthy and vigorous calves were upper-most in the minds of about 40 per cent of dairy farmers. Twenty five per cent of farmers had favoured AI because of

the possibility of getting graded milch animals with high milk yielding capacity. About 21 per cent of farmers had adopt AI since good breeding bulls were not available in villages. Six per cent of farmers were of the view that no disease should spread from the

Table 3. Percentage of farmers giving different reasons in favour of AI

(N=72)

Different reasons	Percentage of farmers
Free of cost	41.6
Getting healthy and vigorous calf	40.3
More milk yield	25.0
Getting graded animals	25.0
Non-availability of breeding bulls	20.8
Free medical care	5.5

affected bull to the cow which would otherwise happen in natural service. An analysis of these reasons indicates that the adopters are quite convinced with the relative advantage of AI.

Lack of conviction was the most frequently mentioned reason for non-adoption of AI with 67 per cent of farmers in the sample of 48 giving reasons against the use of AI. The second most frequently reported reason was lack of interest on AI. Among the reasons for non adoption of AI, 19 per cent of dairy farmers felt that the cattle should not be deprived of natural sexual pleasure. Seventeen per cent had expressed certain wrong

Table 4. Percentage of farmers giving different reasons against the use of AI

(n=48)

Different reasons	Percentage of farmers
Lack of conviction	66.6
Not interested	25.0
Discouraging trials	20.8
Not to interfere with nature	18.7
Staff not doing AI properly	16.7
Worng notions	16.7
Somehow unable to take the animal to AI Centres	12.5

notions on AI and also felt that AI was not performed properly at AI centres. Taking the animal to AI centre at the appropriate time was somehow not possible for 12 per cent of farmers. It may be noted that though the reasons were of different kinds, most of them either directly or indirectly reflected lack of conviction on AI.

REFERENCES

SATYANARAYANA, CH and K. BHASKARAN, 1966. A study of the sources of information in the difierent stages of adoption of improved animal husbandry practices in Key village Block, Karimnagar. ***Research Studies in Extension Education*** EEI. APAU, Hyderabad pp. 72-77.

NARAYANA MURTHY, A. and M. WALIULLAH. 1969. A study of some factors influencing adoption of advanced cattle breeding operations in key village Block Kurnool. ***Research Studies in Extension Education*** EEI, APAU, Hyderabad pp. 117-119.

KAHER and NARANG. 1971. Improved cattle breeding. ***Gosamavardhana*** **19** : 17-19.