

Constraints in Adoption of clean and safe milking techniques by dairy farmers in Kerala :An assessment

Abstract

Aim: The constraints involved in the adoption of clean and safe milk production practices were identified from a sample of 210 farmers covering three major districts of Kerala i.e. Kollam, Thiruvananthapuram, and Palakkad randomly. Average adoption score of 65 out of 95 practices indicated the need to sensitize the farmers for adoption of clean and safe milk production practices.

Methodology: constraints involved in the adoption of clean and safe milk production practices were identified and ranked using Garrett's ranking technique. Kendall rank correlation was used to estimate the ordinal association of the rank given to constraints by the farmers.

Results: Lack of information about clean and safe milk production practices was identified to be the major constraint faced by the farmers followed by high cost of inputs, lack of finance, lack of infrastructure and constraints on the availability of land. Lack of finance, high cost of inputs and constraints on the availability of land were found to be strongly correlated to each other, having a cumulative adverse effect on the adoption of Clean and Safe Milking Practices.

Keywords : constraints, Garrett's ranking, Kendall coefficient,

Introduction

India is the largest milk producing nation in the world arena and anticipated would account for more than half the growth in global milk production over the next twenty years[1]. With an increase in income per capita of the country the consumption of milk and milk products is expected to increase[2]. More over the dairying has become an integral secondary source of income for the rural farmers engaged in livestock and agriculture[3]. The central government had laid more emphasis in the growth of dairy industry as one of the pertinent route to double farmers' incomes and contribute to national Gross Domestic Product[4]. Since ages the consumption of milk is associated with health benefits. Milk intake can be a proxy for good overall nutrition, and dairy products provide access to nutrients (e.g., calcium in milk), which promote the growth and development of young children[5]. Most of the milk produced in India is consumed domestically as either milk or milk products (butter/clarified butter/ghee, yoghurt/curd, cheese/paneer, flavoured milk and ice cream etc.). Clean milk produced from healthy animal characterized by normal flavour, devoid of dirt, and essentially free from adulterants, various toxins, abnormal residues[6]. The state currently represents the twelfth largest dairy market in India. The volume of dairy market in

terms of production and sales are high in Kerala as per Dairy Development Department, Government of Kerala the volume of 2.5 billion liter of bovine milk production in the year 2019. At the same times, studies have proven that there is a huge gap between the desired and achieved milk quality in Kerala [6]. Clean and Safe Milk Production Index (CSMPI) was constructed after broadly considering the following parameters viz. Practices related to hygiene, Practices related to storage, Practices related to animal health and milking environment, Practices related to risk of contamination hazard [7]. The present study was an attempt to analyze the adoption behaviour of different clean and safe milk production practices by dairy farmers in Kerala.

Method and materials

Kerala state covers an area of 38,863 km² in the southern part of the country and bounded along, by the Western Ghats to the east and the Arabian Sea to the west. It is surrounded by the states of Tamil Nadu to the east and Karnataka to the north, as well as the Arabian Sea to the south and west. It is situated between 8° 18' and 12° 48' north latitude and 74° 52' and 77° 22' east longitude. Three districts, Kollam, Thiruvananthapuram, and Palakkad were randomly selected. 70 farmers from each district cumulating total of 210 farmers were selected for the study. The primary data were collected from 210 farmers by an exhaustive schedule covering all the information needed for the study. Part 1 of the schedule pertained to Socio-economic characteristics and assets related to livestock. Section 2 of the schedule related to the adoption of clean and safe milk production practices, milk marketing and constraints faced in adoption. A random dairy farm's choice to adopt different clean and safe milk production practices are governed by non-observable utility function that is dependent on observed covariates (Z).

$$U_i^* = f(Z_i, \eta_i) \text{ where } U_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } U_i^* > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \dots (13)$$

where, U_i^* is utility indicator for dairy farm's choice to adopt clean and safe milk production practice, Z_i is the set of observed covariates viz. Age, Education, Herd composition (ratio of cross-bred to indigenous), Herd size etc., and η_i is random error term explaining unobserved utility benefits for i^{th} individual dairy farmer [8].

Let us assume the outcome functions where the farmer faces two regimes: (1) to be an adopter, and (2) to be a non-adopter, can be represented as follows:

$$\text{Regime 1: } Y_{2i} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 U_i + \varepsilon_{2i} \quad \text{if } U_i = 1 \dots (14)$$

$$\text{Regime 2: } Y_{2i} = X_{2i} \beta_2 + \varepsilon_{2i} \quad \text{if } U_i = 0 \dots (15)$$

Where Y_{2i} and Y_{1i} are outcome variables, which represent the economic parameter (yield/income) per animal obtained under regimes 1 and 2 and X_i symbolizes a vector of covariates included in Z , and β is a vector of the parameters to be estimated. All the farmers having adoption score less than mean adoption score were taken as non-adopters and farmers having adoption score above the mean value were considered adopters [9]. To identify constraints in adoption of clean and safe milk production practice at farm level as perceived by farmer, determinants will be identified and prioritized using Garrett's ranking technique from primary data collected and will be validated.

Percentage position = $\frac{100(R_{ij} - 0.50)}{N_j}$, where, R_{ij} = Rank given for the i^{th} item by the j^{th} individual, N_j = Number of items ranked by the j^{th} individual.

Kendall τ test is a non-parametric hypothesis test for statistical dependence based on the τ coefficient. Kendall rank correlation coefficient, (Kendall's τ coefficient) will be used to measure the ordinal association between identified constraints.

$$\tau = \frac{(\text{number of concordant pairs} - \text{number of discordant pairs})}{\binom{N}{2}}; \text{ where, } \binom{N}{2} \text{ is the}$$

binomial coefficient for the number of ways to choose two items from N items.

The constraints involved in the adoption of clean and safe milk production practices were identified and ranked using Garrett's ranking technique. Kendall rank correlation was used to estimate the ordinal association of the ranks given to constraints by the farmers.

Results and discussion

The constraints faced by the farmers in the adoption of clean and safe milk production practices were identified (Table 2) and prioritized using Garrett's ranking technique. The biggest constraint was ranked 1 and vice versa for others. Using Garrett's ranking technique, Lack of information about clean and safe milk production practices was identified to be the major constraint faced by the farmers as observed by [10] on the Hazards Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) and food safety programs (FSPS) employed by the dairy industry in Aydin, Turkey and identified lack of knowledge regarding HACCP and high costs involved as main barriers in its implementation. 46.5 per cent of the respondents reported really

Comment [W1]: as

Comment [W2]: delet

Comment [W3]: was

Comment [W4]: a lack

knowing what HACCP was, while 35.8 percent reported that it was too expensive.

Further the dairy farmers in Kerala also mentioned the high cost of inputs, lack of finance, lack of infrastructure and constraints on the availability of land. High cost of feed, followed by high cost of veterinary medicine were identified as major constraints as suggested by [11] as lack of education of the managers, small volumes of milk handled by the firms in Turkey, limited availability of resources, processors reluctant to apply the regulations set up by the government, etc., were identified as the major constraints by [12].

Comment [W5]: However a high

Association among constraints

Lack of finance, high cost of inputs and constraints on the availability of land were found to be strongly correlated to each other, having a cumulative adverse effect on the adoption of CSMP. Using Garrett's ranking technique; lack of information about clean and safe milk production practices was identified as the major constraint faced by the farmers followed by high cost of inputs, lack of finance, lack of infrastructure and constraints on the land availability etc. Lack of finance, high cost of inputs and constraints on the availability of land were found to be strongly correlated to each other, having a cumulative adverse effect on the adoption of CSMP [7].

Comment [W6]: That a

Comment [W7]: In using

Comment [W8]: That a

Comment [W9]: Which shows

Conclusions

Lack of knowledge about CSMP was found to be the major constraint. It was also observed that, better institutional support to dairy farmers and increasing awareness through training programs will help in increasing the extent of clean and safe milk production in the state. Paying higher price for milk by cooperatives, as a price support can act as an incentive for the adoption of CSMP practices as we have seen from the study that adoption of Dairy Cooperative marketing channel encourages clean and safe milk production. Lack of knowledge about clean production practices was identified as the major constraint in the study, thus indicating the significance of training programs in the state.

Comment [W10]: delete

Comment [W11]: full stop

References

1. Kumar A, Mishra A K, Saroj S, Sonkar V K, Thapa G, and Joshi P K. Food safety measures and food security of smallholder dairy farmers: empirical evidence from Bihar, India. *Agribusiness*. 2020; 36(3), 363-384.
2. Ghodsi M, and Stehrer R. Non-Tariff Measures and the quality of

- imported products. *World Trade Review*. 2022;21(1), 71-92
3. Kumar A, Saroj S, and Mishra A K. Crop insurance and crop productivity: Evidence from rice farmers in Eastern India (Vol. 1996). International Food Policy Research Institute 2021.
 4. Dagne M, Fischer C, and Terefe D. The determinants and economic impacts of membership in coffee farmer cooperatives: recent evidence from rural Ethiopia. *Journal of Rural Studies*. (2017: 50, 84-94).
 5. Krishnan, A and Joy, B. Production practices of milk in Kerala with special reference to Kottayam district. *Muktshabd journal*. 2020: 9(4), 1977-1992.
 6. Thomas S, Prasad A, Alan Stephen V, Azeez A B, Arunima T S and Johnson D. Efficacy of clean milk production protocol on quality of milk in smallholder production system. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*. 2021;10(7):1193-1196
 7. Smitha S, Devi M C A, Devi G L, and Subash S. Analysis of constraints in dairy farming in Kerala multistakeholder perspective. *Indian Journal of Dairy Science*. 2019:72(3), 342-346.
 8. Prajapati M C, Makwana A K, Gurjar M D, and Kamani K C. Analysis of Current Indian Dairy Export Scenario: Opportunities and Challenges. In Kalamkar S.S. and Sharma H. (Eds.) *Emerging Global Economic Situation: Impact on Trade and Agribusiness in India*. Allied Publishers, India. 2019. pp.173.
 9. Dongol P, Thapa G, and Kumar A. Adoption of milk safety measures and its impact on milk acceptance by buyers in Nepal. *Agricultural Economics Research Review*. 2017: 30(347), 93-103.
 10. Demirbaş N, and Karagoezlue C. Constraints in meeting food safety and quality requirements in the Turkish dairy industry: a case study of Izmir province. *Journal of food protection*. 2008: 71(2), 440-444.
 11. Farid K S, Tanny N Z, and Sarma P K. Factors affecting adoption of improved farm practices by the farmers of Northern Bangladesh. *Journal of the Bangladesh Agricultural University*. 2015:13(452), 291-298.
 12. Kumar A, Thapa G, Joshi P K, and Roy D. Adoption of food safety measures among Nepalese milk producers: Do smallholders benefit? (Vol. 1556). International Food Policy Research Institute 2016..

Table 1: Different practices of clean and safe milk production

Practices related to Hygiene	Practices related to Storage	Practices related to Animal health and milking environment	Practices related to risk of contamination hazard
Cattle milked separately from the stall	Milk from diseased animals kept separately	No faeces in the animal body	Floor of stall feed area kept well drained daily
The floor of milking area kept well-drained daily	Milk from seriously diseased/infected animals discarded	Diseased animals isolated	Floor of stall feed area kept clean daily
Floor of milking area cleaned daily	Milk stored separately from the animal shed	Animals washed regularly	Dung disposed immediately after excretion
Hands washed before milking	Floor of milk storage area dried regularly	Animal drinks clean water	Urine drained immediately after excretion
Hands dried before milking	Milk storage areas swept regularly	Dry cow therapy	Chemicals used in dairy area
Hands sanitized before milking	Milk storage area washed regularly		Chemicals used as per instruction
Utensils without joints	Milk storage area kept free of pests		Workers wear suitable clean clothes
Utensils dried before milking	Milk containers used for bulking without joints		Nails trimmed regularly
Utensils cleaned before milking	Milk containers used for bulking washed regularly		Cuts/wounds covered with appropriate waterproof dressing
Utensils sanitized	Powder/baking soda mixed before selling milk		Dairy farm inspected regularly
Utensils washed immediately after milking			Store empty containers/utensils
Milk thrown after use of medicine			
Udders/teats cleaned before milking			
Udders/teats dried before milking			
Udders sanitized			
Milk pasteurized and labeled			

Table 2 Constraints identified, with the ranks and scores obtained

Constraints	Ranks	Scores
Lack of knowledge about clean milk production practices	1	102.74
High cost of inputs	2	101.89
Lack of finance	3	97.43
Lack of infrastructure	4	96.62
Constraints on the availability of land	5	94.98

Table 3 Kendall rank correlation among the scores of identified constraints

	Hygiene related CSMPI	Health and milking environment related CSMPI	Storage related CSMPI	Risk of Contamination Hazard related CSMPI
Hygiene related CSMPI	1.000			
Health and milking environment related CSMPI	0.025	1.000		
Storage related CSMPI	0.280***	0.374***	1.000	
Risk of Contamination Hazard related	0.161***	0.118**	0.290***	1.000

atedCSMPI				
-----------	--	--	--	--

Table4: Weightsassignedto PracticesforHygiene forIndexdevelopment

Sl.no	Practice	Weightageoutof100
1.	Cattlemilkedseparatelyfromstall	10
2.	Thefloorof milking areakept well-drained daily	5
3.	Floorofmilkingareacleaned daily	3
4.	Handswashedbeforemilking	8
5.	Handsdried beforemilking	4
6.	Handssanitizedbeforemilking	10
7.	Utensilswithout joints	10
8.	Utensilsdriedbeforemilking	2
9.	Utensilscleanedbefore milking	8
10.	Utensilssanitizedbefore milking	10
11.	Milkthrown afteruseof medicine	10
12.	Udders/teats cleanedbeforemilking	10
13.	Udders/teatsdriedbeforemilking	5
14.	Udderssanitizedbefore milking	5
Totalweightage		100

Table5: WeightsassignedtoPracticesforStorageforIndexdevelopment

SlNo	Practice	Weightageoutof100
1.	Milkfrom diseasedanimal kept separately	15
2.	Milk from seriously diseased/ infected animalsdiscarded	10
3.	Milkstoredseparatelyfromtheanimalshed	10
4.	Floorofmilkstorage areadried regularly	10
5.	Milkstorage areasweptregularly	2
6.	Milkstorage areawashedregularly	8
7.	Milkstorage areakeptfreeofpests	20
8.	Milkcontainersused forbulkingwithoutjoints	10
9.	Milkcontainersusedforbulkingwashedregularly	10
10.	Powder/bakingsodamixed before-sellingmilk	5
Totalweightage		100

Table6: WeightsassignedtoPracticesforAnimalHealthandMilkingenvironmentforIndex development

Sl.No	Practice	Weightageoutof100
1.	Nofaeces in theanimal body	25
2.	Diseasedanimalsisolated	30
3.	Animalswashedregularly	20
4.	Animaldrinks cleanwater	5
5.	Drycowtherapy	20
Totalweightage		100

Table7:WeightsassignedtoPracticesforRiskofContaminationHazardforIndex development

Sl.No	Practice	Weightageoutof100
1.	Dungdisposedimmediatelyafter excretion	10
2.	Urine drainedimmediatelyafter excretion	10
3.	Chemicalsusedindairyarea	10
4.	Chemicalsusedasperinstruction	20
5.	Workerswearsuitablecleanclothes	5
6.	Nailstrimmedregularly	20
7.	Cuts/woundscoveredwithappropriatewaterproofdressing	10
8.	Dairyfarminspectedregularlytoensuresafetyofoverallfarm	10
9.	Storeemptycontainers/utensilsin refrigerator	5
Totalweightage		100