

Educational Attainment, and Milk Production in the Kavrepalanchok District of Nepal

Devraj Regmi, PhD

Research Expert, Nepal Philosophical Research Center, Kathmandu, Nepal
regmidevraj37@gmail.com

Received: August 28, 2022; Revised & Accepted: September 25, 2022

Copyright: Regmi (2022)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

Abstract

On July 28, 2016, the Nepali government recognized the Kavrepalanchok district to be the first in the nation to become self-sufficient in milk production. The study's main objective was to assess the educational status (Quality education) in the community of the Kavrepalanchok district based on a geographical perspective. Therefore, 400 dairy farmers were chosen using a straightforward random selection method. The study was based on both qualitative and quantitative data. Because 59.2 percent of respondents agreed that they could afford to pay for their child's education from the income of milk production. The majority of respondents were able to do so using the income from raising livestock. As a result, the vast majority of the respondent's economic development was extremely satisfying, and it was discovered that the Kavrepalanchok district was starting to reach the stage of access to technological progress.

Keywords: *Educational attainment, milk production, rural community, technological development.*

Introduction

Education is that institution that helps to develop our personality and shape our carrier. Therefore, it can be said that education is a socially and personally essential part of human life. Moreover, education plays a vital role in shaping the personality and future of children. Therefore, children's future carrier will be sure by their education at a younger age and have given the eyes and trained them to see society, nation, people, and everything.

In the context of Nepal, children's education is directly linked with the status of their parents. Nepal's education system is divided into two schools system one is a public school run by the Nepal government, and another one is a private school run by an individual. The private school takes a tremendous amount of money from parents and gives qualitative education to their children; on the contrary, the public school has no concern for qualitative education except for their salary. Similarly, the Nepal education system is based on the traditional Indian scenario where schooling is finished only after ten years of primary and secondary, followed by four years of college-level studies and two years of master's level studies. According to a Himalayan Times article, "underprivileged students attend low-quality community schools, whereas parents who can afford to send their children to schools that provide a relatively higher-quality education. As a result, they send their children to schools that provide a relatively higher-quality education. As a result of missed opportunities and poor evaluation of underprivileged students, the poverty cycle never ends" (The Himalayan Times, 2017).

Sufficiency of income to bear the cost of education of children/family

Year of involvement and bearing cost of education

Children's education directly depends upon their parent's income status. In Nepal afforded parents sent their children to private school, and poor people cannot even send their single children to public school, even though educational fees are free in school. The study area resulted that most respondents were able to pay the education fee of their child from the livestock income because following data support and 59.2% of respondents agreed with the ability to pay the cost of education.

Table 4. 1: Year of involvement and bearing cost of education

	Year of Involvement					Total (N = 400)	Pearson Chi-Square (P-value)
	Up to 10 years (N = 30)	11-20 Years (N = 134)	21-30 Years (N = 146)	31-40 Years (N = 74)	41-50 Years (N = 16)		
Yes	66.7%	61.2%	58.9%	54.1%	56.2%	775	
No	33.3%	38.8%	41.1%	45.9%	43.8%		
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Source: Field survey, 2017

Thus, given a definite statement of livestock farmers' involvement and improved income sources showed positive results, and here in up to 10 years of participation in livestock, 66.7% of respondents were able to pay the educational fee of respondents. In the same way, 61.2% of respondents from 11 to 20 years of involvement in livestock farming were shown they improve income sources by paying their children's school fees. Similarly, after 21 to 30 years of livestock farming, 58.9% of respondents had increased their income from livestock farming and were able to pay their children's educational expenses. Similarly, 54.1 percent of respondents with 31 to 40 years of experience in livestock farming agreed to improve their financial ability from livestock farming due to this. In addition, they were able to pay their

child's fees. Finally, after 41 to 50 years of involvement in livestock farming, 56.2 percent of respondents agreed that livestock farming had improved their economic situation and that livestock farming had enabled them to pay their child's fees. The statistical analysis of the Pearson Chi-Square test showed no significant association between years of involvement and improved economic factors that help produce the educational cost of their children because $P=.775$, which is greater than the .05 significant level.

Annual income and bearing cost of education

The given table justified that the majority of respondents had minimum NPRs. 50000 annual income or above NPRs. 200000 annual incomes were sent to their children and able to pay their children's education fees, which was proven by the given table because 59.2% the majority of number was agreed that the annual income of livestock farming was sufficient to pay the cost of education of their children. They were also well known for the value of education to their children.

Materials & Method

The study was conducted among 400 dairy farmers. The farmers were selected from the simple random sampling technique. The study was based on quantitative data so analyzed data was presented in tabular form. A structured questionnaire survey was used to collect the information. The data was statistically analyzed before being presented in a tabular format. The farmers were selected from the simple random sampling technique. There is a need to identify the contribution of a specific product to the educational development of rural people of the Kavrepalanchowk district. The study area has adequate grazing land for domestic animals, which has made the farmers raise the animals and launch livestock farming.

Result & Discussion

Educational status in the community

Table 1: Education of children

No. of children going to school	Year of Involvement					Total	Pearson Square value)	Chi-(P-
	Up to 10 years (N = 30)	11-20 Years (N = 134)	21-30 Years (N = 146)	31-40 Years (N = 74)	41-50 Years (N = 16)			
No any	3.3%	4.5%	2.7%	4.1%		3.5%	.058	
One child	46.7%	30.6%	18.5%	13.5%	25.0%	24.0%		
Two Children	43.3%	53.0%	67.1%	62.2%	56.2%	59.2%		
Three children	3.3%	3.7%	3.4%	5.4%		3.8%		
Four and more children	3.3%	8.2%	8.2%	14.9%	18.8%	9.5%		
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

The given table justified that after spending years in livestock income farming, at least one child was sent to school because 3.5% of respondents from 10 years to 50 years of involvement in such activity were not sending their children to school. Thus, up to 10 years of participation in livestock farming, 3.3% of respondents said they did not send their children to school to get a higher education. In this respect, not sending children shows the respondents' unawareness or use of their children for household activities. Similarly, with 11 to 20 years of involvement in livestock farming, 4.5% of respondents said they did not allow their children to go to school, and some did not have children. Likewise, 2.7% of the respondent did not send their children even after 21 to 30 years of involvement in livestock farming income. Similarly, 4.1 percent of respondents did not send their children to school despite working in livestock farming for 31 to 40 years. Similarly, 24.0 percent of respondents who sent at least one child for education were classified based on their income source.

According to the table, approximately half of the respondents, or 46.7 percent, sent their only child to school during their first ten years of livestock farming. Similarly, 30.6 percent of respondents spent their only child's education in school even after working in livestock farming for 11 to 20 years. Again, only 18.5 percent of respondents sent their only child to school after 21 to 30 years of livestock farming. Similarly, even after 31 to 40 years of involvement in livestock farming, 13.5 percent of respondents sent their only child. Finally, even after 41 to 50 years of participation in livestock farming, 25.0 percent of respondents sent their only child to school. Likewise, 59.2% of respondents sent at least two children to school even after ten years to 50 years of involvement. Therefore, it shows the positive results of sending at least two children to school. However, here in respect, the uplift of livestock farmer lifestyle and this economic uplift could either send their child to school or use them for household activities. Even after 10 to 50 years of involvement in livestock farming, 3.8 percent of respondents sent at least three children to school because the total number of respondents in each group was less than 49.0 percent. In the same way, only 9.5% of respondents could send at least four children to school even after spending their years in livestock farming income.

As a result of the respondents' age range of 41 to 50 years of involvement in livestock farming, 18.8% of them sent their four children to school. After 31 to 40 years of livestock farming, 14.9 percent of respondents decided to send their four children to school. After 11 to 30 years of livestock farming, 8.2 percent of respondents send their children to school. Finally, 3.3 percent of respondents with up to ten years of livestock farming experience could send their four or more children.

Conclusion

The study was conducted to identify the education status of farmers from a geographical perspective. The study district is rich in natural resources like grazing land, water resource, and adequate agricultural land to produce grass forest animals. The study shows that most respondents were able to pay the education fee of their children from the livestock income

because 59.2% of respondents sent at least two children to school even after ten years to 50 years of involvement. Therefore, it shows the positive results of sending at least two children to school.

References

- Guragain, M. (2016, Nov 26). Success story. Retrieved Sep 22, 2017, from My Republica: <http://www.myrepublica.com/news/9871/>
- Joshi, B. K., Acharya, A. K., Gauchan, D., Singh, D., Ghimire, K. H., & Sthapit, B. R. (2017). Geographical Indication: A Tool to Support On-Farm Crop Landrace Conservation and Rural Development. Proceedings of the 2nd National Workshop on Agricultural Plant Genetic Resources Conservation and Utilization in Nepal (50-62). NAGRC, FDD, DoA, and MoAD are all located in Kathmandu, Nepal.
- B. K., K.C., H. B., & Acharya, A. K. (2017). In Nepal, agricultural plant genetic resources are being conserved and used. In Nepal. Proceedings of 2nd National Workshop on Agrobiodiversity for securing our lives. Dhulikhel: NAGRC, FDD, DoA and MoAD.
- Samarth-Nepal Development Programme. (2015). Nepal's Dairy Industry: A Post-Earthquake Market Analysis SAMARTH. World Intellectual Property Organization. (2017). Geographical Indication: Introduction. WIPO. Retrieved from https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/geographical/952/wipo_pub_952.pdf
- Zhang, C. Liu, C. Hutton, and H. L. Koirala. (2018). Where and How Did Poverty Change Geographically in Nepal between 2005 and 2011? Sustainability, 10(2055), 1-24. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/su10062055>