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ABSTRACT

The present study was carried out in Kandi region of Punjab, India during September, 2021 aimed to study entrepreneurial behavior and constraints faced by farmers in dairy. The entrepreneurs are key persons who promote economic growth and technological changes. The development of entrepreneurship is directly related to the socio-economic development of the society. Entrepreneurship in dairy helps farmers to increase their income or to get additional income from this important allied sector of agriculture. Total 120 farmers’ respondents were selected from four villages. The primary data were collected through pre-tested structure interview schedule. Multistage sampling was used to select respondents. The study revealed that like being own boss is important entrepreneurial behavior of overall farmers. Lack of business skills and innovativeness are important entrepreneurial behavior of marginal, small and semi-medium and large farmers respectively. Lack of business skills had highest mean score 3.77 with t-value 9.58 and p-value<.0001 which was found to be significant at 1% level of significance. Non-availability of certified veterinarian followed by lack of education and training was the important constraints faced by farmers in dairy. Innovativeness was important entrepreneurial behavior of semi-medium and large dairy farmers. There are lots of scopes for dairy entrepreneurship in Kandi region of Punjab. Proper training and education are required to the farmers mainly for marginal and small farmers for dairy entrepreneurship.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Livestock production is one of the promising sectors of entrepreneurship development in India (Bandopadhyay, 2007). Milk production in the country has increased from 146.3 mt in 2014–15 to 198.4 mt in 2019–20. Dairy has an important secondary source of income for millions of rural people especially for marginal and women farmers (Anonymous, 2020). According to department of animal husbandry Punjab government the total number of cows and Buffalos population was highest in Hoshiarpur district, followed by highest number of population of cow and Buffalo in Pathankot and Rupnagar district respectively.

Ahuja et al. (2016) found that majority (63.75%) of farmers that had medium level of entrepreneurial behavior. Standardization milk has been found most profitable among all types of milk pouches (Gautam et al., 2018). Lyngkhoi et al. (2022) concluded that, the present result forecasts that milk production will increase in the coming years. Manpower are required to accomplish various activities such as milking, feeding, visual identification of estrus detection etc. (Sarangi et al., 2016, Heema et al., 2022).

Adoption of scientific dairy technologies such as breeding, feeding, health and hygiene, and marketing was quite low to medium. Yadav and Naagar (2021) and Sharma et al. (2021) concluded higher level of adoption was observed in feeding practices (54.14%) while lower level of adoption was observed in milking (24.05%). Shafi and Chauhan (2021) concludes that majority (67.50%) of the dairy farmers’ sons had a very high extent of essential knowledge to be successful dairy farmers. Singh and Rampal (2016) concluded that majority of trained dairy farmers possessed above average knowledge and the untrained dairy farmers possessed below average. Kumar et al. (2016) concluded that majority of the dairy farmers belonged to medium level entrepreneurial behavior group followed by high level and low level. High cost of concentrates and non-availability of veterinary services were the important problems (Kumar and Kondeti, 2014). Singh et al. (2022) studied education, land holding, material possession, occupation, annual income and sources of information were significantly affecting the entrepreneurial behavior of skilled youth. Manivannanan and Tiripathi (2007) revealed respondents with high level of self-confidence were quicker in making and implementing the right decisions at the right time. Food safety is positively linked with profit (Dixit et al., 2022). Diya and Sethi (2019) concluded that economic constraint was perceived as major constraint for women in entrepreneurship. Mani, (2011) found that relationship among entrepreneurship and personality traits namely decision making and risk taking ability (Pouria et al., 2021) economic motivation, managerial ability, problem recognition was significant.

Koutouzidou (2022) verified that dairy cattle farms of entrepreneurial mindset have the potential to rise to the future economic, environmental and social challenges that will affect the survival of the sector. Lack of communications, infrastructure, marketing facilities, lack of timely market information is important constraints in farming (Kahan, 2012). Entrepreneurship comprises of innovation, risks and solution that leads to growth and development of business (Saghaian, 2022). There is a negative and significant association between barriers to starting a business and the rate of firm exit (OREilly, 2022).

Participation in training programme, technical guidance and consultancy (Rathore and Mathur, 2018) are the major and direct sources of exploiting business opportunities in farming (Yaseen, 2018). Anna et al. (2022) found entrepreneurial behavior showed positive and significant correlation with their Piggery farming experiences. This study aimed to study entrepreneurial behavior and constraints faced by farmers in dairy were the main objectives of the study.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was conducted in Kandi region of Punjab, India during September, 2021. Multistage sampling was used for selection of respondents. The information from the respondent was collected by personal interview methods and their responses were considered for the purpose of present study. Data regarding entrepreneurial behavior of dairy farmers and constraint of dairy farmers in dairy were collected through pre-designed and pre-tested questionnaire. Respondents were asked to provide response on five-point Likert scale ranging from 1–5 where 1 represents “strongly agree” and 5 represents “strongly disagree”. Mean score, Percent and t-test used for analyzing the data. Total 120 farmers’ respondents were selected. The detail of sample and respondents presented in the table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Tehsil</th>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nawashahr</td>
<td>Balachaur</td>
<td>(1) Thopia</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Takarla</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Kalar</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Thanwala</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mean Score)= (∑WiFi)/n  .........................(1)
Where, i=1–5, Wi=weight attached, Fi=associated frequency, n=number of respondents.
(t-test) t=((x-μ)/n)/S  .........................(2)
3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Age of the respondents presented in the table 2 majority of farmers’ age was up to 30 years (37.50%) followed by 31–40 years (27.50%) age group. Education level of the farmers also revealed in the table 2, majority of the farmers had education up matric level (39.16%) similar results reported (Sharma and Tengli, 2017) by followed by educated up to middle level (16.66%).

Table 2: Demographic profile of the farmers (n=120)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particular</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>(Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of the farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 30 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–40 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–50 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level of farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Sec</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual income of the farmers (₹)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 50,000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–60,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61–70,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71–1,00000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 1,00000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land size in (ha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal less than 1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small more than 1–2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi medium more than 2–4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium more than 4–10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Primary data)

Annual income of the farmers revealed in the table 2 majority of the farmers’ income was up to ₹ 50,000 (26.66%) followed by ₹ 61–70,000 (20.00%). Only 11.66% farmers’ income was more than ₹ 1,00000. Majority of the farmers were marginal (29.16%) followed by small farmers land size was more than one to two (26.66%) followed by semi medium (20.00%) followed by medium (15.83%) and least farmers were large (8.33%) (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Source of income from different enterprises

The number of dairy animal own by farmers and total milk marketed by farmers presented in the table 3 majority of the farmers own one to two number (43.75%) of animals followed by 11–20 number (32.45%) of animals. Majority of farmers’ market 1–20 l milk (35.00%) followed by 21–50 l milk (25%) market day⁻¹. Least (6.25%) farmers market more than 150 L milk.

Table 3: Dairy animal own and total milk marketed day⁻¹ by farmers (n=120)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particular</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of dairy animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk marketed by farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–20 l</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–50 l</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–100 l</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101–150 l</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 150 l</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Primary data)

Total daily milk production in the study area presented in the table 4 milk production in village Takarla was highest around 4000–5000 kg day⁻¹ followed by village Thopia around 3000–4000 kg day⁻¹ followed by village Kalar around 2000–3000 kg day⁻¹ and village Thanwala around 2000–2500 kg day⁻¹.

Mean score and standard deviation of each variable presented in the table 5. The mean have been compared with mid value (test value 3). In context of important entrepreneurial behavior of farmers lack of business skills had highest mean score 3.77 with t-value 9.58 and p-value
Table 4: Total daily milk production in selected villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Milk production in (approx. kg day(^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Thopia</td>
<td>3000–4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Takarla</td>
<td>4000–5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Thanwala</td>
<td>2000–2500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Entrepreneurial behavior of dairy farmers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like being own boss</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self confidence</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to take risk</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very competitive</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to learn from failure</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never quit attitudes</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of business skills</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p=0.01%

.<.0001 which was found to be significant at 1% level of significance. Willingness to take risk had second important entrepreneurial behavior of farmers with t-value 5.47 and p-value <.0001 which was found to be significant at 1% level of significance.

Constraints faced by farmers in dairy entrepreneurship revealed in the table 6 non-availability of certified veterinarian was the major constraint reported as ranked first, followed by lack of education and training as ranked second finding in line of support of findings of (Jodoun, 2021 and Kaur et al., 2022). Non-availability of improve Artificial Insemination was reported as third constraint finding in line of finding of Singh et al. (2022) and Singh et al. (2015), lack of credit availability was fourth constraint faced by farmers and low price of milk was ranked fifth important constraints faced by them. Similar results were reported by Singh et al. (2015). Low price of milk, costly feed and fodder, shortage of quality breed animal were major constraints (Rani et al., 2015, Meena et al., 2016). High cost of concentrate feed was the major constraint in economic constraints (Patel et al., 2015). Meena et al. (2015) identified were inadequate awareness about reproductive stages of dairy animals (57.33%). Youth and progressive farmers are more likely to have higher levels of entrepreneurial orientation (Xhoxhi et al., 2021). Marketing facilities for the products are the push factor underlying agri-enterprise (Deepthi et al., 2020)

Entrepreneurial behavior of dairy farmers revealed in the table 7 like being own boss had highest per cent with rank I for marginal, small, semi-medium and large farmers category. Lack of business skill ranked II for marginal and small farmers followed by ability to learn from failure had ranked III. Innovativeness had ranked II in case of semi-medium and large farmers followed by very competitive attitude had ranked III. Self- confidence had IV ranked in case of semi-medium and large farmers. The findings of the study are also in line with the findings of Raina et al. (2016) and Kumar and Goyal (2021) majority (68.40%) of dairy farmers had medium level entrepreneurial behavior. Chaurasiya et al. (2016) and Lawrence and Ganguli (2012 majority of the respondents were belonged to medium category of risk orientation. Majority of the farmers'...
respondents had medium category of decision making ability and lowest in case of innovativeness (Ram et al., 2013, Raut and Sankhala, 2014). Majority trained farmers had medium to high and untrained farmers had medium to low level of entrepreneurial behavior (Singh and Kumar, 2020). Porchezhiyan et al. (2015) respondents had medium level of risk orientation (65.8%). Raval and Chandawat (2011) revealed that majority of the respondents had medium knowledge about improved animal husbandry practices in dairy farming. Singh et al. (2016) reported overall entrepreneurial behavior index for small farmers was 53.66. The higher index value was found 72.93 for trained entrepreneur (Channal and Natikar, 2022) (Figure 2).

4. CONCLUSION

Entrepreneurial behavior of dairy farmers in Kandi region of Punjab, India. The finding of study showed that majority of the farmers faced constraints of non-availability of certified veterinarian followed by lack of education training availability, Non-availability of improve AI and low price of the milk. Like being own boss was important entrepreneurial behavior of the overall dairy farmers followed by lack of business skills for marginal and small farmers.
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