

Socio-economic Status of Livestock farmers of Narasapura Village - A Benchmark Analysis

K. Sathyanarayan, V. Jagadeeswary*, V. Chandrashekhar Murthy, S. Wilfred Ruban and G. Sudha

Department of Veterinary & A.H Extension,
Veterinary College, KVAFS University, Hebbal, Bangalore - 24

* Corresponding author

Abstract

The study was conducted following exploratory research design to ascertain the profile characteristics of livestock farmers. Findings indicated that majority of the farmers had low to medium profile. Hence efforts should be undertaken by the Government, Veterinary Universities and other extension agencies in providing information on livestock farming practices so that they could bring about change in their living and improve the socio-economic status of livestock farmers.

Keywords: Livestock Farmer, Socio-economic change, Analysis, Veterinary Extension.

Introduction

Livestock sector plays pivotal role in providing nutritive food rich, in animal protein and also helps in supplementing family incomes and generating gainful employment in the rural sector. Presently, India has a huge population of 485 million livestock and 489 million poultry population, holding the second highest position in cattle strength. It possesses the highest strength of buffaloes, third highest number of sheep, holds second highest position in goat population, fifth highest number of chicken (Basic Animal Husbandry Statistics, 2003) and accounts for 4.5 % of GDP. Though India possesses the richest animal wealth in the world, the productivity in the livestock sector is less than its optimum.

Differences in socio-economic condition of the livestock farmers could possibly be a reason for this. In this context, the present study was to undertake a benchmark analysis on socio-economic status of livestock farmers.

Materials and Methods

The study was conducted in Bangalore North taluka of Karnataka state. Following exploratory research design one village namely the Narasapura village was selected randomly. A sample of 65 farmers were selected randomly. Then the pre-tested interview schedule was used for collection of data and the data was analyzed by using appropriate statistical methods.

Results and Discussion

Personal, Socio-economic Characteristics of Livestock Farmers: It could be observed from table 1

that more than half (63.08%) of the livestock farmers lived in nuclear type family followed by joint family (36.92%) type. So, it can be concluded that the advantages of joint family system is not being aware and this system is slowly declining in due course of time even in rural villages.

More than half (53.85%) of the livestock farmers belonged to medium family size category followed by small (40.00%) and large family size (6.16%) categories (Table 1). This indicated that they were just aware of the advantages of family planning but not implementing it at right time. Similar trend was observed by Kavitha and Reddi, 2007.

Further it was found from table 1 that more than three fourths (81.54%) of the respondents were men who were the decision makers of the family, followed by women (15.39%) and together (3.08%) (Table 1). The findings were in consonance with the findings of Sathyanarayan et al., (2009). Farmers should be encouraged to discuss and take decisions together which would strengthen the family bondage as well as help them to take right decisions and feel united also.

It is a good sign observed in Table 1, that majority of the farmers (18.46%) had membership in cooperative societies followed by self help groups (16.92%), sthree sakthi (9.23%), gram panchayat (6.15%) and youth club (3.08%). Cattle being one of the major livestock reared, most of them would have been members of cooperative societies.

It was found that majority (96.92%) of the respondents belonged to low family income and an equal percentage of respondents belonged to medium (1.54%) and high (1.54%) family income categories.

Table -1. Personal, Socio-economic Characteristics of Livestock Farmers

Sl.No	Personal, Socio-economic characteristics	F (%)
1.	Family Type Nuclear family Joint family	41 (63.08) 24(36.92)
2.	FamilySize Small (1-4) Medium (5-8) Large (9 >)	26 (40.00) 35 (53.85) 4 (6.16)
3.	Decision maker of the family Men Women Together	53 (81.54) 10 (15.39) 2 (3.08)
4.	Social Participation Gram Panchayat Co-operative society Self Help Groups Youth Club Sthree shakti	4 (6.15) 12 (18.46) 11 (16.92) 2 (3.08) 6 (9.23)
5.	Income Low Medium High	63 (96.92) 1 (1.54) 1 (1.54)

So efforts should be made to strengthen the occupations for the livestock farmers, increasing their awareness on scientific practices and improving their risk taking ability so that their income levels are raised with livestock activities. The results were in conformity with that of Ravikumar (2007) and Jagadeeswary (2009).

Land holding and Cropping Pattern of Livestock farmers: It could be observed from table 2 that majority (92.30%) of the respondents were holding small acres of rainfed land followed by medium (6.17%) and large (1.53%). Similarly, majority (96.94%) of the livestock farmers had small irrigated land holding and an equal percentage of the respondents had medium (1.53%) and large irrigated land holding (1.53%). It was revealed from the Table 2 that the majority of the respondents (69.23%) were growing ragi followed by vegetables (10.77%), arecanut (6.15%), flowers (6.15%), jowar (6.15%), banana (4.62%), horsegram

(4.62%), eucalyptus (3.08%) and neem (3.08%). The possible reason could be that since ragi is the traditional crop and it is eaten as main staple food it may be grown by majority of the respondents.

Livestock holding and feeding pattern of livestock: Hundred percentage of the livestock farmers possessed poultry followed by rabbits (64.61%), crossbred cattle (38.46%), dogs (36.92%), goat (33.84%), indigenous cattle (33.84%), non descript cattle (16.92%), buffaloes (7.69%), sheep (7.69%) and none possessed fishery and piggery units (Table 3). Since least investment is required to rear backyard poultry and rabbit and this could even be managed by women at home, it could be the possible reason for possessing poultry and rabbit by majority of the farmers. But the size of their holdings are medium and it was expressed that the farmers were reducing their number of animals because of the factors like lack of labour availability, poor veterinary facilities, lack of

Table - 2: Land holding and Cropping Pattern of Livestock farmers

Sl.No	Land holding and Cropping Pattern									F (%)
1.	Rainfed land holding									
	Small (0-6) acres	Medium (7-13) acres	Large (14 >) acres							
	60 (92.30%)	4 (6.17%)	1 (1.53%)							
2.	Irrigated land holding									
	Small (0-2.5)	Medium (3-5.5)	Large (6>)							
	63 (96.94%)	1 (1.53%)	1 (1.53%)							
3.	Types of crops grown									
	Ragi	Arecanut	Banana	Flowers	Vegetables	Jowar	Horsegram	Eucalyptus	Neem	
	45 (69.23%)	4 (6.15%)	3 (4.62%)	4 (6.15%)	7 (10.77%)	4 (6.15%)	3 (4.62%)	2 (3.08%)	2(3.08%)	

Table -3: Livestock holding and Feeding Pattern of Livestock

Sl.No	Livestock holding and Feeding Pattern	F (%)
1.	Livestock Possession	
	Non descript cattle	11 (16.92)
	Indigenous breeds of cattle	22 (33.84)
	Crossbred cattle	25 (38.46)
	Buffaloes	5 (7.69)
	Sheep	5 (7.69)
	Goat	22 (33.84)
	Pigs	0 (0.00)
	Poultry	65 (100.00)
	Rabbits	42 (64.61)
	Fishery	0 (0.00)
Dogs	24 (36.92)	
2.	Green fodder	
	Low (0-16.5)	60(92.30)
	Medium (17-33.5)	4(6.17)
	High (>34)	1(1.53)
	Dry fodder	
	Low (0-13.5)	60(92.30)
	Medium (14-27.5)	2(3.09)
	High (>28)	3(4.61)
	Concentrates	
	Low (0-5.5)	59(90.76)
	Medium (6-11.5)	5(7.70)
High (>12)	1(1.54)	
Sheep & Goat grazing Hours		
Small period (0-3.5)	43(66.15)	
Medium period (4-7.5)	13(20.00)	
Long Period (>8)	9(13.85)	

good price for their produce, poor marketing facilities and poor risk taking capacity etc. So, the results clearly indicated the need to take up proper measures for mitigating the problems of farmers in the livestock farming which in turn would lead the farmers to maintain large numbers and productive animals.

Low level of green fodder (92.30%), followed by low level of dry fodder (92.30%) and low level of concentrates (90.76%) was the common feeding trend observed among the farmers of the study area. This can be attributed to their low income level. Small (66.15%) grazing hours followed by medium (20.00%) and long (13.85%), were observed among the respondents of the study area (Table 3) and this may be attributed to the minimum availability of grazing land and fodder.

Milk Production details of livestock: Low production level (93.84%), followed by medium (4.63%) and high milk production levels (1.53%) was observed from the Table 4. It was found that, consumption was also low (90.86%), followed by medium (7.69%) and high (1.55%). Similarly sale was also low (92.31%), followed by medium (4.62%) and high (3.07%). This may be attributed to 38 per cent of cattle holding in the study area. These results were in conformity with the findings of Sathyanarayan et al., (2009).

It is a bad sign that majority of the farmers (18.46%) had expressed fodder problem as the major problem facing in livestock rearing system followed by insufficient space (16.92%), middleman exploitation (7.69%), health problem (6.15%), finance problem (4.62%), predator problem (3.08%) and labour problem (3.08%) (Table 5). The possible reason might be the depleting land allocation for agriculture and the interior geographical situation of the area under study, from the town.

Data in Table 6 revealed that majority (44.62%)

Table- 4. Milk Production Details of Livestock

Sl.No	Milk Production Details	F (%)
1.	Milk Production	
	Low (0-12.5)	61 (93.84)
	Medium (13-25.5)	3 (4.63)
2.	High (>26)	1 (1.53)
	Consumption	
	Low (0-5.5)	59 (90.86)
3.	Medium (6-11.5)	5 (7.69)
	High (>12)	1 (1.55)
3.	Sale	
	Low (0-1.5)	60 (92.31)
	Medium (2-3.5)	3 (4.62)
	High (>4)	2 (3.07)

Table - 5. Constraints in Livestock rearing

Sl.No	Constraints in livestock rearing	F (%)
1.	Health Problems	4 (6.15)
2.	Middleman exploitation	5 (7.69)
3.	Labour Problem	2 (3.08)
4.	Insufficient space	11 (16.92)
5.	Predator Problem	2 (3.08)
6.	Finance Problem	3 (4.62)
7.	Fodder Problem	12 (18.46)

had interest for expansion in poultry units, an equal percentage of the farmers had interest for expansion of their farm in dairy (36.92%) and sheep farming (36.92%), followed by goat farming (24.62%), rabbit rearing (18.46%), fisheries (3.08%) and piggery units (1.54%). The probable reason for above trend may be that the farmers might have felt poultry rearing to be easy and less time and cost involved and dairy and sheep farming to be more remunerative.

Acknowledgement

The authors are thankful to the University and Veterinary College, Bangalore, KVAFSU for providing support and facility to conduct the following study.

References

1. Basic Animal Husbandry Statistics, (2006): Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture,

Table- 6. Interested Livestock activity of the farmers for expansion

Sl.No	Livestock rearing	F (%)
1.	Dairy farming	24 (36.92)
2.	Backyard Poultry	29 (44.62)
3.	Sheep rearing	24(36.92)
4.	Goat rearing	16 (24.62)
5.	Rabbit rearing	12 (18.46)
6.	Piggery	1 (1.54)
7.	Fisheries	2 (3.08)

- Department of Animal husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries, New Delhi.
2. Jagadeeswary, V. (2009): Ethnoveterinary Practices of tribal farmers - An exploratory study. Ph.D Thesis (Unpublished), Acharya N.G.Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad.
 3. Kavitha, L. and Reddi, M. S. (2007): Personal and Socio-Economic Characteristics of Farm Women. *Journal of Research*, ANGRAU 35(1): 79 – 83.
 4. Ravikumar, S. (2007): Livestock Service delivery by state department of Animal Husbandry in Andhra Pradesh- A critical analysis. Ph.D Thesis, Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, Uttar Pradesh.
 5. Sathyanarayan, K. et.al.(2009): A benchmark analysis on Livestock Activities. *Mysore Journal of Agricultural Sciences*.
