

Study on Socio-economic, Socio-psychological Profile Along with Constraints Perceived by Tribal People in Relation to Animal Husbandry Practices in The State of Tripura, India

Bipasha Paul⁽¹⁾, Arunasis Goswami⁽²⁾, S.M. Nanda⁽³⁾, Sukanta Biswas*⁽⁴⁾

⁽¹⁾M.V.Sc. Scholar, ⁽²⁾Professor, ⁽³⁾Ph.D. Scholar, ⁽⁴⁾Associate Professor, Department of Veterinary and A.H. Extension Education, West Bengal University of Animal and Fishery Sciences, Kolkata.

(Received: 11th April 2025 | Accepted: 7th June 2025)

Abstract

The current study about "Socio-personal and Socio-psychological profile and Constraints" was conducted with objectives to determine the socio-economic characteristics and constraints faced by tribal people for creating sustainable livelihoods and suggestions to overcome. Total 120 nos. of sample population from four tribal groups were collected randomly from four blocks under Dhalai and Sepahijala district of Tripura, India. The data was collected with the help of pre-tested designed interview schedule, complied, tabulated and analysed through statistical tools with the help of IBM SPSS 25.0 software for conclusion. The finding depicted that the All four tribes were mostly from med-large category with mixed house and belongs to nuclear family with the family size up to five members and "High cost of inputs" was the main constraints perceived by the four tribes in the study area of Tripura, India.

Keywords: Socio-economic, Socio-psychological, Animal Husbandry, Tribal, Tripura.

Introduction:

A tribe is a group of people who live in rural or peri-urban areas of the rainforest. They are fully restricted to their own village, illiterate, underprivileged, barefoot, often dark and weak. For their vegetarian diet, they hunt and forage for roots, shoots, and fruits, while roasting animals for their non-vegetarian fare. They actively reject any development initiatives and are totally oblivious to the political and economic circumstances of their nation. In India, there are 698 tribal clans. They are essentially present in every state and union territory. Tribes are found in the area, which is also the area that is the most impoverished. They frequently live in isolated villages or hamlets. There are differences in the socio-economic, educational, and cultural development of tribal tribes. Some tribal tribes have adopted a modern way of life, while others continue to live in a primitive way. The study of socio-personal and socio-psychological profile and Constraints of tribal farmers on animal husbandry practices is of utmost important in order to identify and mitigate the gap in between the required knowledge and possessed knowledge. Bankey et al. (2012) observed that majority of tribal respondents were 26-50 years (63%). Chauhan et al. (2022) revealed that 43.33% belonged to the young age group followed by the 39.17% belonged to middle age group and 17.50% belonged to old age group. Indumathy et al. (2013) reported that Jawadhu tribes towards tribal development programmers, where majority of these tribes were middle age group (49%), followed by young (27%) and old aged groups (24%) respectively. Barman et al (2013) who inferred that, agriculture was the main occupation for majority (58.33%) of the tribal

respondents, followed by other occupations such as agriculture labourer (37.50%), service (2.50%) and business (1.67%), respectively. Bora (2020) found that in the study area, 55% having read up to middle school and more than 45% of the family have attained education from high school to graduation in the study. Deb et al. (2019) who found that, less than 5 members were found only in 29% households, (72.38%) most of the households constitutes with a at least 5 members. Tochhawng and Rewani (2013) revealed that, more than one-third of the pig farmers had low mass media exposure. Singh et al. (2012) found that 41.66% of the tribal families were landless, around 39.16% owned less than 1 acre, and 12.50%, with 1-2 acres land and only 6.67% had more than 2 acres of land. Hajong et al. (2010) revealed that, 43.33% in Banswara owned between 5.1-10 acres land and 38.33% had owned more than 10 acres of land and rest of the respondents were having less than 5 acres of land. Similar trend was observed in Dungapur district where majority of farmers of farmers (51.67%) were under the category 5.1-10 acres followed by 31.67% respondents having more than 10 acres of land. Ram et al. (2013) who indicates that, majority of the respondents were living in Kutch house (76.67%). Rana et al. (2019) revealed that, majority of diversified farming practicing farmers (32.00%) were possess kutch type housing pattern, followed by 25.00% had semipucca type housing pattern, 24% had pucca and 19% had hat type housing pattern. Barua and Wason (2014) observed that economic constraint was the most significant followed by promotional, infrastructural and social constraints. Mohanty et al. (2013) observed that technical constraints,

socio-economic constraints, socio-personal and organizational constraints. Patra et al. (2014) revealed that 81.06% high cost of concentrate feed, 72.97% non-availability of veterinary health care, 60.36% high cost of initial inputs and lack of piglet, frequent outbreak of disease (46.85%), 45.95% lack of availability good breeding boar, lack of market linkages (45.04%) etc. Tochhawng and Rewani (2013) revealed that 52.22% difficulty in obtaining semen for artificial insemination, 56.67% difficulty in vaccination schedule, 84.44% high cost of feeds were perceived as the most serious constraints respectively. Yadav et al. (2014) observed that, major constraints reported by majority of farmers was lack of grazing pasture land, poor production status of livestock, repeat breeding problem, poor economic condition of family and high cost of treatment for diseased.

Materials and Methods:

The present research was conducted in the month of September to October of 2022 in the state of Tripura. The respondents were interviewed, and their responses were gathered in accordance. Prior to the interview, some time was spent getting to know the responders in each hamlet. For the study, a total of 120 respondents were chosen. The respondents having some exposure to animal husbandry farming were selected randomly. Considering these criteria, 30 respondents each from Reang and Chakma were selected from Dhalai district and 30 each from Debbarma and Jamatia were selected from Sepahijala district. In this way, total 120 numbers of respondents were selected from the sample of the study. Livelihood Security of the respondents was the dependent variable and a total of 18 independent variables were selected for the present study. The statistical methods used in the study include ANOVA and correlation analysis. The software used was IBM-SPSS 25.0 for analyzing the data.

The constraint was analyzed using Garrett's ranking technique.

$$100 \times (R_{ij} - 0.5)$$

$$\text{Per cent position} = \frac{100 \times (R_{ij} - 0.5)}{N_j}$$

Where,

R_{ij} = Rank given to i th constraints by the j th individual and

N_j = Number of constraints ranked by the j th individual.

The estimated percent positions were converted into scores using Garrett's table.

The mean score values estimated for each factor were arranged in the descending order. The constraints with the

highest men value were considered as the most important one and the others followed in that order.

Results and Discussion:

Comparative study on Socio-personal and Socio-economic components

According to the table 1, the majority of respondents in each of the four tribes (4 no's) were from medium age, and a similar pattern was observed in the overall sample also. Majority of respondents fell into the medium category, because they normally married and have children at this period, which requires a greater income to cover both ends. In the present study majority of respondents in each of the three tribes i.e. Reang (83.3%), Debbarma (56.7%), and Chakma (83.3%), were mostly male; only Jamatia (63.3%) had a majority of female respondents. Overall data also revealed that 65% of the respondents depended on cultivation compared to respondents with illiterate and middle school degrees of 16.7% and 33.3% respectively. The overall value showed that, majority of the respondent's belonged to middle school (30.8%) followed by primary school (28.3%) and illiterate (24.2%) level. The majority of respondents in Reangtribe (36.7%) and Chakma tribe (43.3%) could read up to primary school, maximum of respondents (99.2%) had nuclear family followed by 0.8% having joint family. Over all it can further be seen that majority (95.8%) of the respondents are married followed by (1.7%) divorced category among the entire respondent. Greater number of respondents (43.3%) was in med-large category and 9% having small landing category in overall data. In overall category, the findings of the table depicted that, majority (47.5%) of the respondents belongs to income group between Rs. 5001/-10,000/- per month and only 0.8% in low-income group i.e. Below Rs. 2000/- in the study. Overall, it is also clear from the table that 51.7% have mixed house and only 6.7% have Pucca house.

Comparative study on Communication and Socio-psychological components

Regarding the overall value, it was noted that the majority (72.5%) of respondents never read the newspaper, but only 4.2% occasionally read the newspaper; it shows that, the vast majority of respondents (98.3%) never listen to radio. According to the total sample the vast majority (99.2%) of respondents, had never viewed television programming about animal husbandry because they may not be aware of the programmes relating to animal husbandry that are broadcasted, 100% respondents never read magazines, leaflets, or bulletins about farming and they had not viewed the exhibits. Overall, the data showed that 95 % of individuals polled claimed they had never spoken with a group contact; however, only 5% of respondents said they had done so occasionally. The fact also shows that

while 84.2% of respondents said that they had not, only 1.7% of respondents reported routinely attending extension training programmes. Most responders (96.7%) indicated that they avoided the demonstration. Despite 97.5% of survey participants claiming they never do field visits, only 1% regularly attended group meetings, with 78% never attending. All respondents (100%) had never participated in an exhibition. Absolutely no respondents indicated that they had gone on an educational tour as it was observed that the majority (100%) of respondents never participate in extension activities. that the overall majority of respondents (6.7%) attended one or two training sessions on dairy production extension during the previous five years, as opposed to (93.3%) of those who did not. According to the research, the majority of respondents (95%) made decisions after consulting with their husbands.

Constraints as perceived by the tribal respondents in the state of Tripura

The constraints as opined by the respondents of the Debbarma tribe in order of importance are depicted in the Table 2. It can be seen that the parameter "High cost of inputs" has been ranked first with a mean value of (24.27), followed by "non-availability of expert advice" (21.04) and "Lack of proper technical information" (19.06), taking ranks 2 and 3, respectively. Other constraints with descending ranks are "lack of awareness as poor HRD facility" (14.63), "lack of credit facility" (14.02), and "prevalence of disease as epidemic" (9.38). The table shows the constraints in the order of priority as determined by the respondents from the Reang tribe. This can be seen that the parameter "high cost of inputs," which has a mean value of 24.57, is rated first, followed by "lack of expert guidance (18.57)" and "lack of adequate technical information (15.45), which are ranked second and third, respectively. Other constraints in descending order are a poor transportation system (13.35), a lack of awareness as a poor HRD facility (11.55), a lack of credit (10.68), a lack of an organized marketing system (10.31), a lack of a remunerative price for produce (7.76), a lack of inputs or resources (7.18), and the prevalence of disease as epidemic (5.542) etc. The table lists the problems in the order of importance as indicated by the Jamatia respondents. As can be observed, the parameter "High cost of inputs" is rated top with a mean value of (24.58), followed by "Non availability of expert advice "(23.10) and "the lack of sufficient technical knowledge"(20.31) which are ranked second and third, then Lack of awareness as poor HRD facility(16.24), Prevalence of disease as epidemic (10.96) , Lack of remunerative price of produce (8.68) , Non-availability of credit facility (7.65) , Lack of Inputs/resources (5.87), Lack of organized marketing system (4.90) and Poor transportation (2.66) system

respectively. According to the Chakma respondents' ranking of priority, the restrictions are listed in the table. It can be seen that the parameter High cost of inputs is rated highest, with a mean value of (24.47); followed by the parameters Non availability of expert advice (21.86) and inadequate technical Knowledge (19.69), which are ranked second and third and others are Lack of awareness as poor HRD facility (14.31), Non-availability of credit facility (10.78), Lack of remunerative price of produce (9.12), Prevalence of disease as epidemic (8.40) , Poor transportation system (6.27), Lack of organized marketing system (5.85) and Lack of Inputs/resources (4.52) respectively.

Mostly similar results were obtained for all the tribes i.e. "High cost of inputs" ranked first owing to the fact that, the tribes are not aware of the scientific feeding practices by which they can reduce the cost of nutrition, which is the major share in inputs required for advanced animal husbandry. Due to lesser number of available veterinary doctors, the respondents have opined that they are unable to get expert advice. More number of qualified veterinarians must be recruited to manage this issue. Lack of inputs was ranked below, which signified that they have adequate resources, but they must be given proper training to help them using their resources in a better manner.

Conclusions:

The findings can be very useful for the planners and policy makers of the functional area of the state developing competent Human resources through training of the stake holders in order to enhance their knowledge and skills on different animal husbandry practices. The field veterinarians posted in the areas of study must be duly solicited for making the farmers aware of the advanced practices. It was also noted that Debbarma is a progressive tribe and Reang and Chakma were comparatively backward. Therefore, special attention must be given to these tribes for mainstreaming their better socio-economic development. Similar research can also be conducted in other tribes in the state of Tripura, India.

Conflict of Interest:

Not applicable.

Ethical Approval:

Not applicable

Author Contributions:

BP: Conducted the research; **SB:** Supervision and guidance; **AG:** Proofreading of the article; **SMN:** Analysed the data. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements:

The authors thankfully acknowledge the Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR), New Delhi for financial assistance and WBUAFS, Kolkata for technical assistance of the first author during the whole course of her post graduate (MSc) study.

References:

Bankey B, Rajesh K, Kamta P, Sundarambal P. Role performance and knowledge level of tribal women farmers in Meghalaya. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*. 2012;12(1): 60-62.

Barman S, Pathak K, Pathak PK. Training need of Tribal farmers in Rapeseed production technology of Upper Brahmaputra Valley Zone of Assam. *Journal of Academia and Industrial Research*. 2013; 1(11): 686-688.

Barua S, Wason M. Gender Participation and Constraints Analysis for Implementation of Tribal Sub Plan in West Bengal. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu.* 2014; 14(3): 55-8.

Bora D. Determinants of livelihood diversification among Rabha tribes of Assam. *Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt*. 2020; 17(7). ISSN 1567-214x.

Chauhan JK, Meena BS, Meena HR, Bhakat C, Upadhyay, AD, Lahiri B, Pal P, Tengli MB, Kumar S, Chandegara AK, Koreti K. Assessment of Livelihood Security and Diversification of Tribal Dairy Farmers in NEH Region of India. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*. 2022; 22(3): 182-7.

Deb RK, Mahato A, Darlong JL. Changing livelihood pattern of tribal farmers in Tripura. *IAHRW International Journal of social sciences*, 2019; 7(2): 249-58.

Hajong D, Sharma JP. Socio-psychological correlates of Tribal Entrepreneurship Development. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu.* 2010; 10(3).

Indumathy K, Manoharan PM, Sangeetha S, Mary MVKJ. Relationship between socio-psychological characteristics and attitude of Jawadhu tribes towards tribal development programmes. *J. Ext. Edu.* 2013; 25(4): 5154-59.

Mohanty AK, Lepch B, Kumar A. Constraints Analysis in Adoption of Vegetable Production Technologies for livelihood Perspective of Tribal Farmers in North Sikkim. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu.* 2013;13(2).

Patra MK, Begum, Deka BC. Problems and Prospects of Traditional Pig Farming for Tribal Livelihood in Nagaland. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu.* 2014;14(4).

Ram D, Chaudhary KP, Sunanda T. Livelihoods pattern of Loktak lake islanders in Bishnupur district of Manipur. *Agriways*. 2013; 1(2): 70-77.

Rana KK, Kumar A, Verma J, SinghSRK. Socio-economic, communicational and psychological profile of tribal farmers for their livelihood status in West Nimar region of MadhyaPradesh. India. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol. App.Sci.* 2019; 8(8): 1564-69.

Singh A, Sadangi BN. Livelihood pattern and resource base of tribals in Koraput and Rayagada districts of Odisha. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education* 2012; special issue vol 1.

Tochhawng L, Rewani, SK. Constraints Analysis of Backward Pig Farming in Tribal Areas of Mizoram. *Indian. Es. J. Ext. Edu.* 2013; 13(2).

Yadav ML, Rajput DS, Chand S, Sharma NK. Constraints in Livestock Management Practices Perceived by Tribal livestock Owners of Answara District of Rajasthan. *Indian. Es. J. Ext. Edu.* 2014 14(4): 37-41.

Table1: Socio-personal and Socio-economic characteristics of the Tribal communities (4nos) in terms of percentage (%) distribution from Tripura state in India

| Sl. No | Items | Debbarma | | Reang | | Jamatia | | Chakma | | Overall | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|----------|------|-------|-------|---------|------|--------|------|---------|------|
| | | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % |
| 1. Age | Upto 25years | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13.3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3.3 |
| | 26-50 years | 21 | 70.0 | 22 | 73.3 | 20 | 66.7 | 25 | 83.3 | 88 | 73.3 |
| | 51-75 years | 9 | 30.0 | 8 | 26.7 | 6 | 20.0 | 5 | 16.7 | 28 | 23.3 |
| 2. Sex | Male | 17 | 56.7 | 25 | 83.3 | 11 | 36.7 | 25 | 83.3 | 78 | 65.0 |
| | Female | 13 | 43.3 | 5 | 16.7 | 19 | 63.3 | 5 | 16.7 | 42 | 35.0 |
| 3. Occupation | Labour | 4 | 13.3 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 40.0 | 3 | 10.0 | 19 | 15.8 |
| | Caste occupation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Business | 9 | 30.0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10.0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 10.0 |
| 4. Education | Independent | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.7 |
| | Cultivation | 9 | 30.3 | 30 | 100.0 | 12 | 40.0 | 27 | 90.0 | 78 | 65.0 |
| | Service | 7 | 23.3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7.5 |
| | Illiterate | 9 | 30.3 | 9 | 30.0 | 6 | 20.0 | 5 | 16.7 | 29 | 24.2 |
| 5. Family type | Can read only | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 1 | .8 |
| | Can read and write | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 3 | 2.5 |
| | Primary | 7 | 23.3 | 11 | 36.7 | 3 | 10.0 | 13 | 43.3 | 34 | 28.3 |
| | Middle | 11 | 36.7 | 6 | 20.0 | 10 | 33.3 | 10 | 33.3 | 37 | 30.8 |
| 6. Family size | High school | 3 | 10.0 | 2 | 6.7 | 10 | 33.3 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 12.5 |
| | Graduate and above | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .8 |
| | Nuclear | 29 | 96.7 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 119 | 99.2 |
| | Joint | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .8 |
| 7. Marital status | Small | 15 | 50.0 | 16 | 53.3 | 24 | 80.0 | 28 | 93.3 | 83 | 69.2 |
| | Medium | 13 | 43.3 | 14 | 46.7 | 6 | 20.0 | 2 | 6.7 | 35 | 29.2 |
| | Large | 2 | 6.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.7 |
| 8. Material possession | Married | 26 | 86.7 | 30 | 100 | 29 | 96.7 | 30 | 100 | 115 | 95.8 |
| | Unmarried | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Widow | 2 | 6.7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.5 |
| | Bullock Cart | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. Land holding | Cycle | 9 | 30.0 | 1 | 3.3 | 9 | 30.0 | 8 | 26.7 | 27 | 22.5 |
| | Radio | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .8 |
| | Television | 20 | 66.7 | 7 | 23.3 | 20 | 66.7 | 21 | 70.0 | 68 | 56.7 |
| | Improve Agril. Implements | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.5 |
| 9. Land holding | Nothing | 1 | 3.3 | 18 | 60.0 | 1 | 3.3 | 1 | 3.3 | 21 | 17.5 |
| | Landless | 17 | 56.7 | 1 | 3.3 | 13 | 43.3 | 9 | 30.0 | 40 | 33.3 |
| | Marginal | 2 | 6.7 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16.7 | 10 | 33.3 | 17 | 14.2 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|-----------------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|
| 10. | Gross family Income/Month | Small | 6 | 20.0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10.0 | 2 | 6.7 | 11 | 9.2 |
| | | Med- large | 5 | 16.7 | 29 | 96.7 | 9 | 30.0 | 9 | 30.0 | 52 | 43.3 |
| | | Below 2000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .8 |
| | | 2001-5000 | 7 | 23.3 | 24 | 80.0 | 5 | 16.7 | 5 | 16.7 | 41 | 34.2 |
| | | 5001-10,000 | 11 | 36.7 | 6 | 20.0 | 19 | 63.3 | 21 | 70.0 | 57 | 47.5 |
| | | 10001 and above | 12 | 40.0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16.7 | 4 | 13.3 | 21 | 17.5 |
| 11. | House type | No house | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Hut | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Kutcha house | 4 | 13.3 | 15 | 50.0 | 12 | 40.0 | 19 | 63.3 | 50 | 41.7 |
| | | Mixed house | 25 | 83.3 | 11 | 36.7 | 15 | 50.0 | 11 | 36.7 | 62 | 51.7 |
| | | Pucca house | 1 | 3.3 | 4 | 13.3 | 3 | 10.0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6.7 |
| | | Mansion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Communication and Socio-psychological characteristics of the Tribal communities (4nos) in terms of percentage (%) distribution from Tripura state in India

| Sl. No | Items | Debbarma | | Reang | | Jamatia | | Chakma | | Overall | | |
|--------|--|--------------|----|-------|----|---------|----|--------|----|---------|-----|-------|
| | | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | |
| 1. | Reading newspaper | Daily | 2 | 6.7 | 2 | 6.7 | 4 | 13.3 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6.7 |
| | | Occasionally | 2 | 6.7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7 | 1 | 3.3 | 5 | 4.2 |
| | | Rarely | 5 | 16.7 | 2 | 6.7 | 6 | 20.0 | 7 | 23.3 | 20 | 16.7 |
| | | Never | 21 | 70.0 | 26 | 86.7 | 18 | 60.0 | 22 | 73.3 | 87 | 72.5 |
| 2. | Listening to radio | Daily | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Occasionally | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .8 |
| | | Rarely | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .8 |
| | | Never | 29 | 96.7 | 30 | 100 | 29 | 96.7 | 30 | 100 | 118 | 98.3 |
| 3. | T.V. Program related to A.H. Practices | Daily | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Occasionally | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .8 |
| | | Rarely | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Never | 30 | 100.0 | 29 | 96.7 | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100.0 | 119 | 99.2 |
| 4. | Reading farm related magazines | Daily | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Occasionally | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Rarely | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Never | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100.0 | 120 | 100.0 |
| 5. | Leaflets and Bulletins | Daily | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Occasionally | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Rarely | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Never | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 120 | 100.0 |
| 6. | Films/Exhibitions | Daily | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Occasionally | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Rarely | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Never | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 120 | 100.0 |
| 7. | Group contact | Regular | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|------------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-------|------|
| | | Occasional | 1 | 3.3 | 2 | 6.7 | 3 | 10.0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.0 |
| | | Never | 29 | 96.7 | 28 | 93.3 | 27 | 90.0 | 100 | 30 | 114 | 95.0 |
| 8. Training programme | Regular | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.7 | |
| | Occasional | 6 | 20.0 | 4 | 13.3 | 2 | 6.7 | 5 | 16.7 | 17 | 14.2 | |
| | Never | 24 | 80.0 | 24 | 80.0 | 28 | 93.3 | 25 | 83.3 | 101 | 84.2 | |
| | Regular | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9. Demonstration | Occasional | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10.0 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3.3 | |
| | Never | 30 | 100.0 | 27 | 90.0 | 29 | 96.7 | 100 | 30 | 116 | 96.7 | |
| | Regular | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10. Field Visits | Occasional | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6.7 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.5 | |
| | Never | 30 | 100.0 | 28 | 93.3 | 29 | 96.7 | 100 | 30 | 117 | 97.5 | |
| | Regular | 1 | 3.3 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.7 | |
| 11. Group meetings | Occasional | 6 | 20.0 | 3 | 10.0 | 10 | 33.3 | 5 | 16.7 | 24 | 20.0 | |
| | Never | 23 | 76.7 | 26 | 86.7 | 20 | 66.7 | 25 | 83.3 | 94 | 78.3 | |
| | Regular | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 12. Exhibitions | Occasional | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Never | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 120 | 100.0 | |
| | Regular | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13. Education tour | Occasional | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Never | 30 | 100.0 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 120 | 100.0 | |
| | None | 28 | 93.3 | 27 | 90.0 | 28 | 93.3 | 28 | 93.3 | 111 | 92.5 | |
| 14. Number of trainings | 1-2 | 2 | 6.7 | 3 | 10.0 | 2 | 6.7 | 2 | 6.7 | 9 | 7.5 | |
| | 3-4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 5 and above | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | No response | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15. Decision making pattern | Husband only | 26 | 86.7 | 30 | 100 | 28 | 93.3 | 30 | 100 | 114 | 95.0 | |
| | Collective decision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.8 | |
| | Joint decision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Independent by wife | 4 | 13.3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.2 | |

Table 2: Constraints as perceived by the tribal respondents in the state of Tripura

| Sl. No. | Constraints | Reang | | Debbarma | | Jamatia | | Chakma | |
|---------|-------------------------------------|-------|------|----------|------|---------|------|--------|------|
| | | Mean | Rank | Mean | Rank | Mean | Rank | Mean | Rank |
| 1 | Lack of Inputs/resources | 7.18 | 9 | 5.10 | 9 | 5.87 | 8 | 4.52 | 10 |
| 2 | High cost of Inputs | 24.57 | 1 | 24.27 | 1 | 24.58 | 1 | 24.47 | 1 |
| 3 | Non-availability of credit facility | 10.68 | 6 | 14.02 | 5 | 7.65 | 7 | 10.78 | 5 |
| 4 | Lack of organized marketing system | 10.31 | 7 | 5.76 | 8 | 4.90 | 9 | 5.85 | 9 |
| 5 | Poor transportation system | 13.35 | 4 | 4.27 | 10 | 2.66 | 10 | 6.27 | 8 |
| 6 | Non availability of expert | 18.57 | 2 | 21.04 | 2 | 23.10 | 2 | 21.86 | 2 |

| advice | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|-------|----|-------|---|-------|---|-------|---|
| 7 | Lack of remunerative price of produce | 7.76 | 8 | 7.41 | 7 | 8.68 | 6 | 9.12 | 6 |
| 8 | Lack of proper technical information | 15.45 | 3 | 19.06 | 3 | 20.31 | 3 | 19.69 | 3 |
| 9 | Prevalence of disease as epidemic | 5.54 | 10 | 9.38 | 6 | 10.96 | 5 | 8.40 | 7 |
| 10 | Lack of awareness as poor HRD facility | 11.55 | 5 | 14.63 | 4 | 16.24 | 4 | 14.31 | 4 |

***Corresponding author's email ID:** sbiswasvet@gmail.com

Citation: Paul B, Goswami A, Nanda SM, Biswas S. Study on Socio-economic, Socio-psychological Profile Along with Constraints Perceived by Tribal People in Relation to Animal Husbandry Practices in The State of Tripura, India. Indian Journal of Veterinary Public Health. 2025; 11(1): 99-106.

DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.62418/ijvph.11.1.2025.99-106>