

Sectoral Impact of Poverty on Production of Livestock Products in India

Firdous Ansari

Abstract: *Background:* One of the studies revealed that livestock products contribute 17 per cent to kilocalorie consumption and 33 per cent to protein consumption globally, but large differences were also reported between rich and poor countries [1,2] (Philip K2010, Rosegrant et al. 2009). In 2014, the official poverty threshold for a family of four was an annual income of \$24,008 in U.S. [3] (Bernstein SF, 2018) and 14.8% of the population lived below the poverty threshold [4] [DeNavas-Walt C, 2015]. *Methodology:* For this study the data is taken from Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and the World Food Programme 2019, India. The literature was searched using PubMed and Google. Using SPSS data was analyzed. Data was analyzed for rural as well as urban sectors using regression analysis. After analysis, results and discussion was made. *Results:* Rural and Urban sectors showed non-significant association while monthly per capita incomes as well as percent of persons were considered. *Discussion:* Monthly per capita income and percent of persons have their influence on production on milk, egg, meat and fish. For the declinment of poverty work should be done.

Keywords: Poverty, livestock products, India

1. Introduction

Livestock sector plays a vigorous role in socio-economic progress of rural families [5]. According to one study the livestock sector is increasingly organized in long market chains that employ at least 1.3 billion people globally and directly support the livelihoods of 600 million poor smallholder farmers in the developing world [6]. In our study we observed sectoral impact of poverty on production of livestock products in India.

2. Methodology

For this study the data is taken from Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and the World Food Programme 2019, India. The literature was searched using PubMed and Google. Using SPSS data was analyzed. Data was analyzed for rural as well as urban sectors using regression analysis. Poverty line and percentage of population below poverty line by states was considered for the year, 2011-12 and estimates on production of major livestock products (milk, egg, meat and fish) were considered for the year 2016-17. Monthly per capita income as well as percent of persons were considered as dependent variable and milk, egg meat and fish were taken as predictors. After analysis, results and discussion was made.

3. Results

Table 1-4 are showing that rural and urban sectors showed non-significant association while monthly per capita incomes as well as percent of persons were considered.

Table 1: ANOVA table for rural sector while concerning monthly per capita income

Model	Sum of Squares	d. f.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	573253.56	4	143313.39	0.883	.488 ^a
Residual	4055275.9	25	162211.04		
Total	4628529.5	29			

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Fish, Milk, Egg, Meat
b. Dependent Variable: Monthly per capita income

Table 2: ANOVA table for rural sector while concerning percent of persons

Model	Sum of Squares	d. f.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	247.271	4	61.818	0.263	.899 ^a
Residual	6809.355	29	234.805		
Total	7056.626	33			

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Fish, Milk, Egg, Meat
b. Dependent Variable: Percent of Persons

Table 3: ANOVA table for urban sector while concerning monthly per capita income

Model	Sum of Squares	d. f.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	49894.206	4	12473.552	0.809	.531 ^a
Residual	385316.99	25	15412.68		
Total	435211.2	29			

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Fish, Milk, Egg, Meat
b. Dependent Variable: Percent of persons

Model	Sum of Squares	d. f.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	49894.206	4	12473.552	0.809	.531 ^a
Residual	385316.99	25	15412.68		
Total	435211.2	29			

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Fish, Milk, Egg, Meat
b. Dependent variable: Monthly per capita income

Table 4: ANOVA table for urban sector while concerning percent of persons

Model	Sum of Squares	d. f.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	260.586	4	65.146	0.979	.434 ^a
Residual	1929.466	29	66.533		
Total	2190.051	33			

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Fish, Milk, Egg, Meat
b. Dependent Variable: Percent of persons--

4. Discussion

Monthly per capita income and percent of persons have their influence on production on milk, egg, meat and fish. For the declinment of poverty work should be done.

References

- [1] Philip K. Thornton. Livestock production: recent trends, future prospects. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B.*2010; 365, 2853–2867 doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0134
- [2] Rosegrant, M. W. et al. 2009 Looking into the future for agriculture and AKST (Agricultural Knowledge Science and Technology). In *Agriculture at a crossroads* (eds B. D. McIntyre, H. R. Herren, J. Wakhungu & R. T. Watson), pp. 307–376. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- [3] Bernstein SF, Rehkopf D, Tuljapurkar S, Horvitz CC. Poverty dynamics, poverty thresholds and mortality: An age-stage Markovian model.2018.PLoS ONE 13(5): e0195734. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0195734>
- [4] DeNavas-Walt C, Proctor BD. Income and Poverty in the United States: 2014. *Current Population Reports*, US Census Bureau. 2015; P60–252.
- [5] VasuJalari and M. Devarajulu. Impact of livestocksectorforrural poverty alleviation in chittoor district *Asian Journal For Poverty Studies* 3(1): 24 - 29
- [6] Thornton, P. K. et al. 2006 Mapping climate vulnerability and poverty in Africa. Nairobi, Kenya: ILRI. See <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/research/mapping-climate.pdf>.