



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695

ISSN (P): 2349-8242

NAAS Rating: 5.03

TPI 2020; 9(1): 452-453

© 2020 TPI

www.thepharmajournal.com

Received: 06-11-2019

Accepted: 10-12-2019

Shreyansh Hosure

M.V. Sc. Scholar, Department of Veterinary and Animal, Husbandry Extension Education, Veterinary College Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

Pavithra GN

M.V. Sc. Scholar, Department of Veterinary and Animal, Husbandry Extension Education, Veterinary College Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

Pradeep kumar S

M.V. Sc. Scholar, Department of Veterinary and Animal, Husbandry Extension Education, Veterinary College Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

Satyanarayan K

Professor and Head, Department of Veterinary and Animal, Husbandry Extension Education, Veterinary College Hebbal, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

Jagdeeswary V

Associate Professor, Department of Veterinary and Animal, Husbandry Extension Education, Veterinary College Hebbal, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

Corresponding Author:

Shreyansh Hosure

M.V. Sc. Scholar, Department of Veterinary and Animal, Husbandry Extension Education, Veterinary College Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

Constraints faced by men and women farmers involved in livestock production in Karnataka

Shreyansh Hosure, Pavithra GN, Pradeep Kumar S, Satyanarayan K and Jagdeeswary V

Abstract

The present study aimed at identifying the constraints faced by both men and women farmers involved in livestock production in Karnataka. An exploratory research design was adopted for the study. Twenty men farmers and twenty women farmers were selected each from Bengaluru, Davangere and Belagavi district of Karnataka, thus a total of 120 farmers were selected and interviewed. The result from the study revealed that the constraints faced by majority of women farmers were transportation of fodder (75.00%) and dominance by men in taking decision (73.00%). In case of men farmers lack of time to participate in social activities (77.00%) and lack of training facilities on livestock management (50.00%) were major constraints. In India, livestock production is largely in the hands of women. Besides considerable involvement and contribution of women, considerable gender inequalities do exist in Indian villages. Therefore, efforts are needed to increase the capacity of women to meet their strategic needs.

Keywords: Constraint, Karnataka, livestock

Introduction

Agriculture is the basis of Indian rural economy. Livestock production plays a dynamic and multipurpose role in the nation's agriculture system. The livestock sector alone contributes nearly 25.60% of value of output at current prices of the total value of output of agriculture. The overall contribution of livestock sector to total GDP (Gross Domestic Production) is nearly 4.11% at current prices during 2012-13 (Basic Animal Husbandry and Fisheries Statistics, 2014) [1].

India being agriculture based country, livestock sector is an integral component of it and livestock is generally considered a key asset for rural livelihoods. It offers advantages over other agricultural sectors and is an entry point for promoting gender balance in rural areas. In most societies, all household members have access to livestock and are involved in production and livestock production systems offer the potential for introducing a wide range of project activities to both genders (Patel *et al.*, 2016) [7].

The cultures of rural India are largely gender stratified and male dominated, that exclude women. Gender discrimination, gender inequality and patriarchal domination go hand in hand. It dwells not only outside the household but also centrally within it. The essence of gender discrimination is unequal power relations. The social instruments for perpetuating such unequal power relations is restricting access to property, land, credit and inputs, technology and skill development opportunities, education, employment and training, social access and control over resources and assets, basic needs like food, sanitation and health care (Milch Paul and Acharya, 2014) [6].

Gender analysis is the process of analyzing information in order to ensure development benefits and resources, effectively and equitably targeting to all members of the society. This is to successfully anticipate and avoid any negative impacts on development interventions which on gender relations (Patel *et al.*, 2016) [7].

There are 75 million women engaged in dairying as against 15 million men and 20 million in animal husbandry as compared to 1.5 million men (Ghosh and Arindam Ghosh, 2014) [4].

In recent years gender has picked attention never before has there been such momentum around the issue of gender parity on the global stage (Evan Jeckonia, 2013) [3]. In spite of so much of attention still gender issues have remained unsolved and different governments though have formulated policies and strategies yet are struggling to alleviate these gender differences. Keeping the above facts in mind, present study was conducted with objective of

Identifying the constraints faced by men and women farmers in livestock production.

Methodology

The study was undertaken in Bengaluru, Davangere and Belagavi districts of Karnataka. An exploratory research design was adopted for the study. Total of 120 farmers were selected for the study, comprising 60 men farmers and 60 women farmers selected through proportionate random sampling. The selected respondents were interviewed personally with the help of a structured pre tested interview schedule and their responses were recorded. The analysis of data is done through using statistical tools *viz.* frequency and percentage.

Results and Discussion

Constraints faced by both men and women farmers

The constraints faced by men and women farmers are given in Table 1. It showed that major constraints faced by men farmers were lack of time to participate in social activities (77.00%) followed by lack of training facilities on livestock management (50.00%), lack of support from family members to participate in social activities (30.00%), lack of awareness

of A H programmes (30.00%), increased stress due to dual responsibilities (28.00%), work load to participate in social activity (25.00%), dominance in taking the decisions (21.66%), difficulty in consulting veterinary officers (21.66%), difficulty to take milk to society (18.33%) and transportation of fodder (16.66%).

These findings are in partial agreement with Arun kumar *et al.* (2016).

In case of women farmers, the major constraints faced were transportation of fodder (75.00%) followed by dominance in taking the decisions (73.33%), work load to participate in social activity (71.66%), lack of training facilities on livestock management (66.66%), lack of time to participate in social activities (60.00%), increased stress due to dual responsibilities (46.66%), difficulty in consulting veterinary officers (45.00%), difficulty to take milk to society (38.33%), lack of unawareness of A H programmes (36.66%), lack of support from family members to participate in social activities (25.00%).

These findings are in partial agreement with Kumari *et al.* (2010) [5], reported that most vital constraints faced by rural women farmers were dominance of male in decision taking (90.00%).

Table 1: Constraints faced by both men and women farmers

Sl. no	Constraints faced	Men (N=60)		Women (N=60)	
		F	%	F	%
1	Increased stress due to dual responsibilities	17	28.00	28	46.66
2	Dominance of the other gender in taking the decisions	13	21.66	44	73.33
3	Lack of support from family members to participate in social activities	18	30.00	15	25.00
4	Lack of time to participate in social activities	46	77.00	36	60.00
5	Lack of awareness of Animal Husbandry programmes	18	30.00	22	36.66
6	Difficulty to take milk to society	11	18.33	23	38.33
7	Work load to participate in social activity	15	25.00	43	71.66
8	Difficulty in consulting veterinary officers	13	21.66	27	45.00
9	Transportation of fodder	10	16.66	45	75.00
10	Lack of training facilities on livestock management	30	50.00	40	66.66

Conclusion

It is concluded from the result that women farmers were facing major constraints in transportation of fodder and in dominance of men over women in taking decision and men were facing lack of time to participate in social activities.

These constraints have to be reduced to involve more number of women in the livestock sector. Steps are needed to be taken to empower women involved in livestock sector both at the household level and at the social level. Availability and transport facility of fodder should be addressed.

Resources like cattle, shed and other subsidies should be given in the name of women to empower them. They should be more incorporated in social decision making activities at the local government level. Also trainings especially focussed on personality building, confidence enhancement and entrepreneurship development has to be given to women. This may be possible mainly by revamping the animal husbandry sector in a gender friendly style.

References

1. Arun Kumar P, Sujeet Kumar J, Parameswara Naik J. Constraints as perceived by the dairy based women self-help groups regarding their participation in dairy management practices and functioning of SHG's. *International Journal of Agriculture Sciences*. 2016; 8:5.
2. Basic Animal Husbandry and Fisheries Statistics, Government of India AHS Kseries, 2014, 15.

3. Evan Jeckonia. Gender analysis on milk value chain: A case of Tanga city and Iringa municipality. A dissertation submitted to University of Agriculture Morogoro., Tanzania, 2013.
4. Ghosh M, Arindam Ghosh. Analysis of Women Participation in Indian Agriculture. *International Journal of Gender and Women's Studies*. 2014; 2:271-281.
5. Kumari Maya, Srivastava AK, Sinha Nidhi. Extent of knowledge of farm women on nutrition. *Indian research journal of Extension Education*. 2010; 10:65-68.
6. Milcah Paul M, Acharya NG. Gender wise analysis of access to and control over assets and resources in rural households of Andhra Pradesh. Master's Thesis, Acharya N.G. Ranga, Agricultural University, Hyderabad, 2014.
7. Patel SJ, Patel MD, Patel JH, Patel AS, Gelani RN. Role of women gender in livestock sector. *J Livestock Sci*. 2016; 7:92-96.