

Impact on Socio- Economic Condition on the Participation of the Decision Making of Rural Women in Animal Husbandry Enterprise in Durg District of Chhattisgarh

Bikas Kirtonia¹, (Dr.) Jahanara²

¹M.Sc.(Ag.) Extension, Department of Agricultural Extension & Communication, Sam Higginbottom University of Agricultural Technology and Sciences Allahabad (U.P) India

²Professor, Department of Agricultural Extension & Communication, Sam Higginbottom University of Agricultural Technology and Sciences Allahabad (U.P) India

Abstract: This study explores the impact of socio-economic condition on the participation in decision making of rural women in animal enterprises. Animal Husbandry, Dairying along with agriculture, continue to be an integral part of human life, the activities have contributed not only to the food basket and draught animal power but also by maintaining ecological balance. They further also play a significant role in generating gainful employment in the rural sector, particularly among the landless, small and marginal farmers and women, besides providing cheap and nutritious food to millions of people. The study was conducted in Durg district of Chhattisgarh. The area of study was selected purposively. Data were collected from 120 rural women using structured interview schedule. Study highlighted that rural women took independent decisions in the aspects of fodder management and milking whereas decisions in respect of economic aspects were taken jointly with their male counterparts. Majority of the women whose income level was higher had higher level of participation in decision making in, vaccination, animal breed and selling milk etc were taken by men.

Keywords: Participation, Decision-making, Animal Husbandry

1. Introduction

Women are the backbone of the development of rural and national economics. Women play a significant role in agriculture and contribute one-third of labour force required for farming and animal husbandry related operations. Livestock sector plays a significant role in the socio-economic development of India. Livestock helps in generating a continuous flow of income and employment. The sector empowers women as they perform a large number of activities related to livestock production. According to the working group report on animal husbandry and dairying 12th five year plan (2012-17), animal husbandry helps in improving gender equity. More than three-fourth of the labour requirement in livestock production is met by women.

India continues to be the largest producer of milk in world. Several measures have been initiated by the Government to increase the productivity of livestock, which has resulted in increasing the milk production significantly from the level of 102.6 million tonnes at the end of the Tenth Plan (2006-07) to 127.9 million tonnes at the end of the Eleventh Plan (2011-12). Milk production during 2014-15 and 2015-16 is 146.3 million tonnes.(N.D.D.B) and 155.5 million tonnes.(N.D.D.B) The per capita availability of milk is around 337 grams per day in 2015-16.

2. Materials and Methods

A study on decision making pattern and participation of rural women in animal husbandry enterprise in durg district of Chhattisgarh, covering two purposively selected blocks

(Durg and Dhamdha), eight purposively selected villages viz. Anjora, Anda, Chandkhuri, Nagpura, Borsi, dhaba, funda and hardi. and 120 respondents selected randomly. The data were collected by personal interview method. The collected data were, tabulated, analyzed and interpreted with the help of appropriate statistical tools. The independent and dependent variables were measured by using suitable scales and procedures adopted by various researchers.

3. Results and Discussion

Socio-personal profile of respondents involved in animal husbandry

Table 1: Distribution of age of respondents (n=120)

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
Young (up to 30 years)	26	21.66
Middle (31 to 45 years)	74	61.67
Old (above 45 years)	20	16.67

Table 1 From the table, it is clear that the majority of the respondents (61.67%) belonged to the middle age group (between 31 to 45 years), followed by 21.66 per cent of young age group (up to the age of 30 years) whereas only 16.67 per cent of the respondent belonged to old age group (also 45 years). Chand et al. (2011), Hai et al. (2011), and Lad et al. (2012) also observed similar findings, were found in this study.

Table 2: Distribution of education of respondents, (n=120)

Education	Frequency	Percentage
Illiterate	53	44.17
Primary school (1st to 5th)	30	25.00
Middle school (6th to 8th)	21	17.50
High School (9th to 10 th)	10	08.33
Higher Secondary School (11th to 12th)	04	03.33
Graduate and above	02	01.67

Table.2.Indicate the education status reveal that the most of selected rural women were illiterate (44.17%). However, 25.00 per cent of selected rural women were having primary level of education, followed by 17.50per cent were middle passed, 8.33 per cent were high school passed, only 3.33 per cent respondents had passed higher secondary level of education and very few of them about 01.67 per cent were graduate and above. **Bellukar et al. (2003), Khin (2005), Kavitha and Reddy (2007)** also observed similar findings in their study.

Table 3: Distribution of caste of respondents, (n=120)

Caste	Frequency	Percentage
Scheduled caste	02	01.67
Scheduled tribes	03	02.50
Other backward class	85	70.83
General	30	25.00

Table.3. Indicates the Majority (70.83%) of the selected rural women belonged to other backward class, followed by 25 per cent of the respondents were belonging to general category. The respondents belonged to scheduled tribes was (2.5%). and scheduled caste was(1.67%). It can be concluded that majority of the respondents belonged to other backward class.

Table 4: Distribution of family of respondents, (n=120)

Type of family	Frequency	Percentage
• Nuclear	94	78.33
• Joint	26	21.67

Table.4. Indicates Majority (78.33%) of the rural women belonged to nuclear family followed by 21.67per cent belonged to joint family. **Savitha (2004), Chand et al. (2011), Lad et al. (2012) and Koundal (2012)** also noted almost similar findings.

Table 5: Distribution of family of respondents, (n=120)

Size of family	Frequency	Percentage
• Small(up to 5 members)	44	36.67
• Medium (6 to 10 members)	68	56.67
• Large (above 10 members)	08	06.66

Table.5. Indicates Majority 56.67 per cent of the respondents were having medium size of family (6 to 10 members), followed by 36.67per cent of respondents had small size of family (up to 5 members) and only 06.66 per cent of the respondents had big size of family (above 10 members). **Kavitha and Reddy (2007) and Lad et al. (2012)** also found almost similar findings.

Socio-economic profile of respondents involved in animal husbandry

Table 6: Distribution of land holding of respondents, (n=120)

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Land holding		
• Landless farmer	73	60.83
• Marginal (up to 1 ha)	40	33.33
• Small (1.1 to 2 ha)	05	04.17
• Medium (2.01 to 4 ha)	02	01.67
• Big (above 4 ha)	00	00.00

The data in Table.6. reveal that the majority of the respondents 60.83 per cent were landless, followed by 33.33 per cent of them having up to 1 ha of land holdings (marginal farmers), 4.17% of them had 1.1 to 2 ha of land holdings (small farmers),while only 1.67% had 2 to 4 ha of land(medium farmers) and none of them had more than 4 ha land. **Kumari (1999) and Balasubramanian (1995)** also observed almost similar findings.

Table 7: Distribution of annual incomeof respondents, (n=120)

Annual income	Frequency	Percentage
• Low (up to Rs. 32,500)	05	04.17
• Medium (Rs.32,501 to Rs.65,000)	43	35.83
• High (above Rs.65,000)	72	60.00

Table 7. indicates 60.00% of respondents were having their income in the range of above Rs. 65,000, followed by 35.83 per cent of respondents had their annual income in the range between Rs. 32,501 to Rs. 65,000 while, only 4.17 per cent of the respondents had obtained income up to Rs. 32,500. The results conclude that majority of the respondents belonged to above Rs.65, 000 annual income group. **Pushpa (2006)** also noted similar findings in her study.

Table 8: Participation in decision making process in different animal husbandry activities (n=120)

Decision activities	male		female		decision making jointly(M+F)	
	Freq.	(%)	Freq.	(%)	Freq.	(%)
Breeding of animals	18	15.00	03	02.50	99	82.50
Selection of animal breed	72	60.00	02	01.66	46	38.34
Fodder management	38	31.67	02	01.67	80	66.66
Purchase of feed and fodder	32	26.67	01	00.83	87	72.50
Feeding of animals	05	04.16	55	45.83	60	50.00
Grazing of animals	20	16.67	02	01.67	98	81.66
Sanitary management	17	14.17	30	25.00	73	60.83
Cattle shed/Yard management	11	09.17	33	27.50	76	63.33
Care the sick animals	19	15.83	01	00.83	100	83.33

Taking the animal for vaccination	84	70.00	01	00.83	35	29.17
Purchase and sale of animals	51	42.50	02	01.67	67	55.83
Cleaning of animal and animals shed	06	05.00	33	27.50	81	67.50
Milking of animal	41	34.16	01	00.83	78	65.00
Selling of milk and milk products	52	43.33	18	15.00	50	41.67
Selling of FYM, dung cake and other by products	39	32.50	06	05.00	75	62.50
Insurance of animals	09	07.50	00	00.00	111	92.50
Loan for purchase of animal	08	06.67	01	00.83	111	92.50
Repayment of loan	20	16.67	06	05.00	93	78.33

Table 8 presents Participation in decision making process in different animal husbandry activities. Majority that animal husbandry related decision were independently taken by male members, such as, taking the animal for vaccination (70.00%), selection of animal breed (60.00%), selling of milk and milk products (43.33%) and purchase and sale of animals (42.50). The involvement of female in these activities was quite low. Insurance of animals (93.33%), loan for purchase of animals (91.67%), care the sick animal (83.33%), breeding of animals (82.50%) and grazing of animals (81.66%), repayment of loan (78.33%), purchase of feed and fodder (72.50%), fodder management (66.66%), cleaning the animals and animal shed (67.50%) and selling of FYM, dung cake and other by products (62.50%) are some of the important areas were jointly decided by male and female members. The important independent female decisions up to some extent included feeding of animals (45.83%), cattle shed management (27.50), sanitary management (25.00%) and cleaning of animal and animal sheds (27.50%). On an average the decision making process was mainly performed jointly by male and female or by male. The female was responsible for deciding up to some extent in few activities only.

Table 9: Distribution of respondents according to their overall involvement in decision making process in animal husbandry practices, (n=120)

Decision making	Level of Decision making			
	Nil	Low (Up to 33.33%)	Medium (33.34- 66.66%)	High (Above 66.66%)
Men	5 (04.17)	60 (50.83)	49 (40.83)	3 (02.50)
Women	31 (25.84)	72 (60.00)	14 (11.66)	3 (02.50)
Joint	00 (00.00)	08 (06.66)	44 (36.67)	68 (55.67)

The extent of participation of respondents in decision making process was analysed and result have been presented in Table 9. The findings reveals that 50.83, 40.83 and 2.50 per cent of the male members of the respondent's family had low, medium and high level of participation in decision making process, respectively. While, majority of the women (60.00%) had low level of participation. About 25.84 per cent of women had no participation in animal husbandry practices. Majority of the families had joint decision making pattern about various activities of animal husbandry.

Table 10: Correlation and multiple regression analysis of independent variables with the participation of recommended animal husbandry practices followed by rural women

Independent variables	Correlation coefficient 'r' value
X ₁ Age	-0.0652
X ₂ Education	0.0325
X ₃ Caste	0.1820**
X ₄ Size of family	0.0321
X ₅ Type of family	0.1561
X ₆ Land holding	-0.3754**
X ₇ Annual income	0.2495**
X ₈ Scientific orientation	-0.0921
X ₉ Cosmopolitaness	-0.1825**
X ₁₀ Knowledge about recommended animal husbandry practices	-0.1021
X ₁₁ Source of information	0.2654**
X ₁₂ Contact with extension personnel	0.0865**
X ₁₃ Experience in animal husbandry enterprise	0.0785
X ₁₄ Herd size	0.0800
X ₁₅ Number of milch animals	0.0710
X ₁₆ Animal breed	0.0825
X ₁₇ Milk production	0.2561**
X ₁₈ Type of animal house	-0.0254
X ₁₉ Participation in decision making	0.4562**

From the table 10. It's was concluded that out of all selected 19 independent variables, only 6 variables i.e. caste, annual income, source of information, contact with extension personnel, milk production and participation in decision making were found positive and significantly correlated with extent of participation of women in animal husbandry practices. Land holding and Cosmo politeness was also found significant but negatively correlated with extent of participation Remaining 11 variables did not indicate any significant relationship with the extent of participation of women in animal husbandry practices

4. Conclusions

Present study indicated that the rural women significantly contributed in animal husbandry occupation. Majority of the rural women were of middle age and illiterate, more than two fifth (25%) of the farm women had farming and animal husbandry as their major occupation for their livelihood. Management aspect and milking had taken by female independently and economic aspects decision taken jointly. Low participation of farm women was observed in decision making about economic aspects where execution is carried out by them. So there is need to make them aware about financial regulation, loans and insurance of animals and marketing structure. Channels of information, credit, inputs and access to markets have to be aimed at women as they

played a very important role in keeping and decisions related to livestock productions. The training programmes related to increase the adoption level. and scientific technology need to be organized for skill development of rural women so that their earning potential may be increased and improve the efficiency. Rural women should be encouraged regarding clean milk production and preparation of value added products so that productivity of milk and their income can be enhanced. Annual income, source of information, participation in decision making, were significant correlated with extend of participation, where as others didn't have any signification relationship.

References

- [1] **Bellurkar, C.M., Wakle, P.K. and Gholve, M.A. 2003.** A Study on Decision Making Pattern and Participation of Rural Women in Animal Husbandry and Dairying Enterprise. Maharashtra Journal of Extension Education 22(3): 81-85.
- [2] **Chand, P., Smita, S. and Rathi, D. 2011.** Assessment of Women Empowerment in Dairying: A Study of Semi-arid Rajasthan. Indian J. Dryland Agric. Res. And Dev. 26(2): 28-32.
- [3] **Hai, A., Akand A.H., Shanaz S. and Bulbul K.H. 2011.** Contribution of farm Women Towards Dairy Enterprise in Ganderbal District of Kashmir Valley. J. Dairying, Foods & H.S. 30(2): 140-146.
- [4] **Kavitha, L. and Reddy, M. S. 2007.** Personal and Socio-Economic Characteristics of farm Women. J. Res. ANGRAU 35 (1): 79-83.
- [5] **Lad, A.S., Wattamwar, V.T. and Bothikar, G.R. 2012.** Correlates of Participation of Farm Women in Decision Making. Agri. Sci. Digest 32(1): 52-54.
- [6] **Savitha, S.S. 2004.** Role of Rural Women in Animal Husbandry. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad.