

Participation and Practices in Livestock Care and Management by Rural Female Members in Salt Affected Area

SAIF-UR-REHMAN AND GULGOONA YOUNIS

Department of Rural Sociology, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad-38040, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this study was to find out the extent of female participation in livestock care and management in a salt affected area of Faisalabad. The available studies and general observation of rural family life show that the women in rural areas lack appropriate knowledge regarding feeding, breeding managing and treatment of livestock.

Key Words: Livestock care; Females; Salt affected areas

INTRODUCTION

Livestock brings cash money to the rural families, bringing protection against the social depressions in addition to providing the food products of high nutritional values such as milk, beef, mutton, poultry meat and eggs. General observation of rural family life reveal that females, besides their household responsibilities they participate in livestock care and management. In the rural areas, majority of house wives are supposed to be engaged in care and management of livestock. The present study was therefore, undertaken to investigate the participation of rural female members in livestock care and management in salt effected areas of Faisalabad.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Universe of the present study was female head of the families from four villages Chak No. 32/G.B., Chak No. 89/G.B, Chak No. 26/G.B. and Chak No. 117/G.B. of Faisalabad in Satiana area. Simple random sampling method was used to select the sample in selected villages. 25 respondents were selected from each selected village. Before the collection of actual data "pre-testing" techniques were used to test the workability of the schedule. The data were statistically analysed with percentage, mean and chi-square methods.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the study have been presented in Tables I, II and III. Majority (86.9%) of the respondents were illiterate. It was found that none of the respondents in the sample were without milch animals, 53.2% and 41.1% had 1-2 and 3-5 milch

animals, respectively. However, remaining 5.6% of the respondent were having six and above milch animals which include cows and buffaloes. About 21.5% of the respondents' families were not having meat animals, while 34.5 and 38.3% had 1-2 and 3-5 meat animals, respectively.

As to the draft animals 37.3% of the respondents families were keeping 1-2 bulls and 40.1% respondents had 1-2 donkeys almost all the families did not own camel and horses. Majority of the respondents who kept one or two milch animals and also goat/sheep, it was observed that 92.5% females were looking after their animals daily. As regards man hours spent per day for the livestock care and management activities 49.5% respondents spent 3-6 hours, 32.7% spent 6-10 hours and 17.8% spent 1-3 hours per day. The results are in line with the findings of Saeed (1966), Bajwa (1979) and Freeman and Wai (1988).

An inquiry into the feeding of animals the highest percentage of the respondents i.e. 71.0% were using concentrates mostly cotton seed cake. About 14.0% of the respondents were using green fodder. The rest 15.0% of the respondent were also giving concentrates in different forms. It was reported that due to the shortage of water and salinity in the area most of the farmers could not grow more fodder which is comparatively a cheaper source of feeding. On the other hand it was found that 43.9% of the respondents indicated better health of animals and 42.0% reported more butter fat with the use of concentrates. It was further observed that 60.7% of the respondents had soil constraints, climatic constraints which includes water availability and farmer's own economic problems, respectively.

Table I. Distribution of respondents according to their number of animals

Animals	Nil		1-2		3-5		6 and above		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Milch animals										
Buffalo	-	-	57	53.2	44	41.1	6	5.6	107	100.0
Cows	77	72.0	27	25.2	2	1.9	1	0.9	107	100.0
Meat animals										
Sheep/goat	23	21.5	37	34.5	41	38.3	6	5.6	107	100.0
Draft animals										
Bull	60	56.1	40	37.3	7	6.5	-	-	107	100.0
Donkey	63	58.9	43	40.1	1	0.9	-	-	107	100.0
Horse	106	99.1	1	0.9	-	-	-	-	107	100.0
Camel	107	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	107	100.0

Table II. Distribution of female respondents according to their contribution in livestock management activities

Activities	Mostly		Occasionally		Not at all		Not applicable		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Fodder cutting	13	12.1	5	4.7	31	75.7	8	7.4	107	100.0
Fodder transportation	13	12.1	3	2.8	89	83.2	2	1.8	107	100.0
Fodder chapping	43	40.2	14	13.1	50	46.7	-	-	107	100.0
Feeding	83	77.6	15	14.0	9	8.4	-	-	107	100.0
Making roughages	89	83.2	9	1.9	3	2.8	6	5.6	107	100.0
Watering	89	83.2	15	14.0	3	2.8	-	-	107	100.0
Grazing	9	8.4	2	1.9	50	46.7	46	42.1	107	100.0
Housing	87	81.3	12	11.2	8	7.5	-	-	107	100.0
Milking	87	81.3	11	10.3	9	8.4	-	-	107	100.0
Milk processing	107	100.	-	-	-	-	-	-	107	100.0
Cleaning cattle shed	96	89.7	5	4.7	6	5.6	-	-	107	100.0
Bathing	77	72.0	20	18.7	10	9.3	-	-	107	100.0
Dung cake	100	93.5	2	1.9	5	4.7	-	-	107	100.0
Making										

Table III. Association between the educational status of the respondents and extent of their participation in livestock care and management activities

Extent of females participation								
Educational status of the respondents	Low (1-3 hours)		Medium (3-6 hours)		High (6-10 hours)		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Illiterate	15	16.1	47	50.5	31	33.3	93	86.9
Literate	4	28.5	6	42.8	4	28.5	14	13.0
Total	19	17.8	53	49.5	35	32.7	107	100.0

 $\chi^2=1.290$; d.f.= 2.0; Significant level at 5%; (Non-significant)

