

Original Research Article

Livelihood security of Livestock Farmer Producer Groups (Women Self Help Groups) in Telangana state.

ABSTRACT:

The present investigation “Livelihood security of Livestock Farmer Producer Groups (women Self Help Groups) in Telangana state was conducted in Siddipet and Nagarkurnool districts 10 LFPGs were selected randomly from each district and from each group 6 members were selected thus a total of 120 members constituted the respondents of the study. Data was collected using a structured interview schedule which was processed, analysed and interpreted. In the present study livelihood security was assessed by food security, health security, economic security, habitat security, educational security and social network security. In food security majority of the respondents depend upon public distribution system, had three meals per day, daily vegetable intake and consumption of egg and non veg once a week. Regarding health security majority of respondents fell ill only once or twice in a year and afford professional treatment with some difficulty. Regarding economic security about sixty one percent of respondents have 1-2 lakh annual income and income sources are animal husbandry, agriculture and others. In habitat security majority of respondents have their own house with electricity, toilet and drinking water from mineral water plant. Educational security was concerned majority of the respondents were educated up to metric and considered cost of education as expensive. Regarding social network security about ninety three percent of respondents were member of more than one organisation and majority have very strong relation with family members and getting help from them in times of distress

Comment [hj1]:

Comment [hj2]: The good abstract should include;

1. Introduction
 2. Objectives / Purpose of the research
 3. Method
 4. Finding and data analysis
 5. Discussion
 6. Conclusion
- 200 to 250 words

Key words: livelihood security, food security, economic security, educational security, social network security.

INTRODUCTION:

Livestock plays an important role in Indian economy. About 20.5 million people depends upon livestock for their livelihood. Livestock provides livelihood for two-thirds of rural community. It also provides employment to about 8.8% of population in India. Livestock sector contributes 4.11% GDP and 25.6% of total Agricultural GDP.

The farmers in India maintain mixed farming system. i.e., a combination of crop and livestock where the output of one enterprise becomes the input of another enterprise. Livestock serves the farmers in different ways by providing income, employment, food, social security, draft etc.

In 1999, Government of India, introduced Swarna Jayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY) to encourage self-employment in rural areas through establishment of SHGs. The movement progressed as a national movement in 2011 and became National Rural Livelihoods Mission (NRLM) i.e., world's largest poverty alleviation programme. SHGs were mainly formed to improve the economic conditions of rural women who are deprived of the vital resources and self-reliance. The women SHGs have helped in refining the status of rural women and empowered them socially and economically. Women are the backbone of workforce in agriculture as well as in animal husbandry sector. Under the agricultural domain, animal husbandry has occupied a prominent place by generating income and

employment to the resource poor rural women. Dairy enterprise has been regarded as an important socio-economic instrument to supplement the income and employment to the women (Ponnusamy et al., 2017). Women's make a notable contribution to food production field especially in horticulture and small ruminants' production (1997; Arshad et al., 2010).

In India, livestock is mainly in the hands of women. They contribute about 69 percent of work force engaged in livestock sector. Better access and control over the assets have been shown to improve household food security, child nutrition and education as well as wellbeing of women. (Quinsumbing 2003, Smith *et al.*, 2003, World Bank 2001). Livestock are an important asset for women because it is often easier for many women in developing countries to acquire livestock asset either through inheritance or markets, than to purchase land or other physical asset or to control other physical assets (Rubin *et al.*, 2010). Increased access and control over the assets by women have been shown to improve household food security, child nutrition and education as well as wellbeing of women (Quinsumbing 2003, Smith *et al.*, 2003, World Bank 2001). Women plays multiple roles in Animal Husbandry sector like care of new born and sick animals, cleaning of animals and sheds, milking, providing feed, fodder and water and taking animals for grazing. They perform supporting as well as dominating roles in decision making pertaining to various livestock farming operations. Therefore, improvement in livestock production is an important pathway for increasing the income of farm women. The concept of livelihood has become increasingly popular in development thinking as a way of conceptualizing the economic activities poor people undertake in their totalities. Livestock Farmer Producer Group is the primary organization of women members from existing SHGs involved in livestock rearing of sheep/goat, dairy animals or poultry. These groups shall be formed either in the same habitation or village and Livestock Farmer Producer Organisations at mandal/district/state level. Its main aim is to increase the income level of the rural poor people by developing bargaining power as a group in execution of common activities and to provide livestock-based livelihoods by at least 50 percent. These LFGs facilitate productivity enhancement, equipment procurement, livestock advisory services, access to insurance and economic empowerment through improved supply of inputs and marketing.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

The present study was conducted in Telangana state. The study was conducted in Nagarkurnool and Siddipet districts and from each district 10 livestock farmer producer groups were selected and from each farmer producer group 6 members were selected randomly. A total of 120 respondents were selected for the present study by using simple random sampling. Data was collected using a structured interview schedule which was processed, analysed and interpreted. Statistical tools such as frequency, percentage were used to interpret findings and draw conclusions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

3.1 Food Security

Food security is access of all people all times to enough food to live an active, healthy life. In this study, availability and accessibility of food was studied. Sources of food, number of meals by the household per day and frequency of vegetarian, non-vegetarian and egg intake were included. Multiple responses were recorded about food sources by LFG members about 93.33% respondents depend upon Public Distribution System followed by own farm and market 55.83 percent, market only (46.67%) and neighbours (35.83%), respectively. The findings of the AMEU (2016) did not match with findings of present study as most of the respondents relied upon super markets for their purchase of foods.

Data further explains that, 95.83 percent respondents had Breakfast-lunch-dinner followed by Breakfast-dinner (4.16%). The data in pooled sample further indicated that, about 90.00 percent respondents had daily vegetable intake followed by 2-3 times a week (10.00%), respectively. Similar findings were reported by Adekoya (2009) that vegetable being most affordable food item and easily accessible consumed by 90.00% of respondents. The data presented in Table 1 revealed that, about 90.00 percent respondents had non-vegetarian intake once a week followed by 2 times a week (5.00%) and once a month (5.00%).

Comment [hj3]: Please add the latest references which is in 5 year

Comment [hj4]: 1. The description of the method is wrong. Please do the improvement with reference to the previous researcher. The authors seen didn't understand the differences of qualitative and quantities method. Please read and clarify correctly on this method.
2. How the data analysis, what is the software used and the reliability and validity of the method need to describe
3. What is the objectives and research question that has been given to the respondents?

Comment [hj5]: How the authors get the data. Referring to what objectives or research question? Please reorganise the writing. Description follows by table.

The data presented in Table 1 revealed that, three-fourths of respondents (75.00%) had egg consumption once a week followed by 2-3 times a week (21.67%) and once a month (3.33%).

3.2 Health Security

Health security

was assessed based upon illness occurrence in last 12 months, household ability to afford professional treatment, health awareness and utilization of government schemes. The results of the study reveals that most of the LFPG members 92.5% fell ill once or twice in a year followed by 7.5% of respondents fell ill few times in a month. The results are in agreement with findings of Raman (2018) revealed that majority face ill once or twice in a year. The data further revealed that 46.67% respondents can afford quality treatment with some difficulty followed by with much difficulty (27.50%), can afford (20.00%) and can afford if money is borrowed (5.83%). The data in pooled sample further indicated that, all respondents (100%) had health awareness about polio, malaria and dengue followed by typhoid (89.17%), tuberculosis (11.67%), AIDS (9.17%) and others (2.50%). regarding utilization of government services data revealed that, all respondents (100.00%) had accessed to emergency health services such as 104, 108 services and Arogyasri scheme and only 23.30 percent had utilized old age pension scheme of the government.

Comment [hj6]: Table ?

3.3 Economic Security

Economic security includes household annual income and income source of the family members. The data presented in Table 3 revealed that more than half respondent's 61.67 percent had 1-2 lakh household annual income followed by below 1 lakh (27.50%) and 2-3 lakh income (10.83%). Similar findings were also examined by Yadav (2016) who found that 38.50% farm families had 1-2 lakh household annual income and Raman revealed that 50.33% had 1-2 lakh annual income and contrary with Mukherjee (2019) and Sreenivasulu et al. (2005). The data further revealed that majority of the respondents (97.50%) had income from animal husbandry, followed by others sources (82.50%), while 79.17 percent respondents had income from agriculture and 11.67 percent were employees.

Comment [hj7]: Same comments as previous

3.4 Habitat Security

Habitat security includes basic amenities such as own house, pucca house, electricity, toilet facility and drinking water source are the important pointers that considerably impact the health of the family and its socio-economic position were reconsidered. The data presented in Table 4 revealed that all respondents (100.00%) had electricity facility, about 98.33 percent respondents had own house, 91.67 percent had toilet facility, while 65.83 percent of respondents had pucca house, 34.17 percent had semi pucca house and only 1.67 percent were in rented house. The present findings are in accordance with Swachh Status Report (2016) which concluded that in rural areas 45.30% households were having sanitary toilets. The data further revealed that majority of the respondents (46.67%) were having availability of water from mineral water plant followed by 30 percent had access to Mission Bhagiradha (drinking water supply scheme of Government of Telangana), hand pump/tank (17.50%) and others (5.83%).

3.5 Educational Security

To determine the educational security of the respondents, four indicators i.e., household literacy level, accessibility of school, accessibility of higher education and cost of education were reconsidered. The data presented in Table 5 clearly showed that majority of the household members (52.50%) were educated up to metric followed by up to graduation (23.33%), up to primary (16.67%), up to post graduation (5.83%) and can read and write (1.67%). The results are in contrary with Saurabh Arya et al. (2019) who revealed that majority are educated up to primary respectively

It is noted from the Table 2 that more than half of the respondents (64.17%) had accessibility to school in the area of >6 km followed by 3.1-6 km (22.50%), 1.1-3 km (7.50%) and 0-1 km (5.83%) respectively. The study also concluded that majority of the respondents (40.83%) had accessibility to higher education within the range of 10.1-30 km followed by 30.1-60 km (32.50%), >60 km (24.17%) and 0-10 km (2.50%) respectively.

These findings are in contrary with Raman (2018) which concluded that accessibility to school were in the

area of 0-1 km whereas for higher education it was 4-6 km. The results from the Table 5 shows that less than half of the respondents (42.50%) considered cost of education as expensive followed by (40.00%) who considered it as most expensive and (17.50%) respondents considered education cost as cheap respectively. Similar findings were reported by Raman (2018) reported that 45% respondents perceived education as expensive.

3.6 Social Network Security

To determine the social network security community participation and relations and support from social groups indicators are used for the present study. The data presented in Table 6 clearly shows that more than three fourths of the respondent's 93.33 percent were member of one organization followed by 7.50 percent respondents were public leaders, 5.00 percent respondents not a member of any organization and 3.33 percent respondents were member of more than one organization. The data presented in Table 2 revealed that, 96.67 percent, 30.00 percent, 25.83 percent and 5.83 percent had very strong relations with family members, friends, LFPG group members and institutions respectively. About 70.00 percent, 62.50 percent, 61.67 percent, and 3.33 percent of LFPG members had strong relations with friends, institutions, LFPG group members and family members, respectively. Whereas 31.67 percent and 12.50 percent LFPG members had not so strong relations with institutions and LFPG group members, respectively. The data further revealed that 97.50 percent, 28.33 percent, 26.66 percent and 0.83 percent of LFPG members getting very strong help in time of distress from family members, friends, LFPG group members and institutions, respectively. About 70.00 percent, 59.17 percent, 35.00 percent, and 2.50 percent of respondents getting strong help from friends, LFPG group members, institutions and family members, respectively. Whereas 64.17 percent, 14.17 percent and 1.67 percent of LFPG members getting not so strong help from institutions, LFPG group members and friends, respectively.

Table 1. Food security of Livestock Farmer Producer Groups

S.No.	Variables	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Sources of food		
	Own farm production	0	0.00
	Own farm production and market	67	55.83
	Market only	56	46.67
	From neighbours	43	35.83
	From Public Distribution System (Govt. supply)	112	93.33
2.	Number of meals the household normally has per day		
	Breakfast-lunch-dinner	115	95.83
	Breakfast-dinner	5	4.16
	Lunch-dinner	0	0.00
3.	Vegetable intake		
	Daily	108	90.00
	2-3 times a week	12	10.00
	Once in a week	0	0.00
4.	Non-vegetarian intake		
	2 times a week	6	5.00
	Once a week	108	90.00
	Once a month	6	5.00
	Only on festivals	0	0.00

	Rarely	0	0.00
5.	Consumption of Eggs		
	2-3timesaweek	26	21.67
	Onceaweek	90	75.00
	Onceamonth	4	3.33
	Rarely	0	0.00

Table 2. Health Security of Livestock Farmer Producer Groups

S.No	Variables	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Illnessoccurrence		
	Onceortwiceinayear	111	92.50
	Fewtimesinamonth	9	7.50
	Once/twiceinaweek	0	0.00
	Almosteveryday	0	0.00
2.	Abilitytoaffordprofessional treatment		
	No	0	0.00
	Yes,ifmoneyis barrowed	7	5.83
	Yes, withmuchdifficulty	33	27.50
	Yes,withsomedifficulty	56	46.67
	Yes,householdcanafford it	24	20.00
3.	Healthawareness		
	Pulsepolio	120	100.00
	Malaria/dengue	120	100.00
	Typhoid	107	89.17
	Tuberculosis	14	11.67
	AIDS	11	9.17
	Others	3	2.50
	4.	Utilization ofgovernment Services	
108services		120	100.00
104services		120	100.00
Receivingpension		28	23.30
Aarogyasricard		120	100.00

Table 3. Economic Security of Livestock Farmer Producer Groups

S.No	Variables	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Householdannualincome		
	Below1lakh	33	27.50
	1-2lakh	74	61.67
	2-3lakh	13	10.83
	3-4lakh	0	0
	Above4lakh	0	0
2.	Incomesource		
	Agriculture	95	79.17

Animalhusbandry	11	97.50
Employee	7	
Others	14	11.67
	99	82.50

Table 4. Habitat Security of Livestock Farmer Producer Groups

S.No.	Variables	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Housing		
	Ownhouse	118	98.33
	Renthouse	2	1.67
	Puccahouse	79	65.83
	Semipucca	41	34.17
	Electricity	120	100.00
	Toilet	110	91.67
2.	Drinkingwatersource		
	Frommineralwaterplant(reverse osmosis)	56	46.67
	Bhaghiradhawater(govt.supply)	36	30.00
	Handpump/tank	21	17.50
	Others	7	5.83

Table 5. Educational Security of Livestock Farmer Producer Groups

S.No.	Variables	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Householdliteracy level		
	Canreadand write	2	1.67
	Uptoprimary	20	16.67
	Uptometric	63	52.50
	Uptograduation	28	23.33
	Uptopostgraduation	7	5.83
2.	Accessibilityofschool		
	0-1km	7	5.83
	1.1-3km	9	7.50
	3.1-6km	27	22.50
	>6km	77	64.17
3.	Accessibility ofhighereducation		
	0-10km	3	2.50
	10.1-30km	49	40.83
	30.1-60km	39	32.50
	>60km	29	24.17
4.	Costofeducation		
	Mostexpensive	48	40.00
	Expensive	51	42.50
	Undecided	0	0.00
	Cheap	21	17.50

Verycheap	0	0.00
-----------	---	------

Table 6. Social network security of Livestock Farmer Producer Groups

S.No.	Community participation	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Member of one organization	112	93.33
2.	Member of more than one organization	4	3.33
3.	Not a member	6	5.00
4.	Public leader	9	7.50
5.	Office bearer	0	0.00

Table 7: Relations and support from social groups of Livestock Farmer Producer Groups

S.No.	Variables	Very strong		Strong		Not so strong	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
Relations							
1.	With family members	116	96.67	4	3.33	0	0
2.	With friends	36	30	84	70	0	0
3.	With LFG group members	31	25.83	74	61.67	15	12.5
4.	With institutions	7	5.83	75	62.5	38	31.67
Getting help in time of distress							
1.	With family members	117	97.5	3	2.5	0	0
2.	With friends	34	28.33	84	70	2	1.67
3.	With LFG group members	32	26.66	71	59.17	17	14.17
4.	With institutions	1	0.83	42	35	77	64.17

CONCLUSION:

The study sought to explore the livelihood security of livestock farmers in Telangana state. It is concluded that the majority of respondents depends upon public distribution system. The government has taken significant steps to combat under and malnutrition through introduction of mid day meals at schools and Anganwadi systems to provide rations to pregnant and lactating mothers. Majority of respondents fell ill once or twice in a year as all respondents have awareness about the diseases and government also initiated Arogyasri health scheme as it provides financial assistance to below poverty line people. Livestock farmers generating majority income from animal husbandry followed by agriculture and other sources. The study also found that farmers generally engaged in activities that are interdependent. Majority respondents have pucca house with electricity toilet facilities as they utilised government schemes like swatch Bharat Mission and double bed room housing scheme. In the study area majority people felt that higher education accessibility is major concern which should be addressed by the government. Regarding social network security majority of members of women Self Help Groups were members of more than one groups which leads to enhancement of knowledge and improved decision making which truly reflects the philosophy of self-help groups.

REFERENCES:

- AMEU. Food security situation and livelihood communities in North Jordan assessment report. (2016).
 Adegbeniga E. Adekoya. Food insecurity and coping strategies among rural households in Oyo State, Nigeria. Journal of Food, Agriculture & Environment. 2009; 7 (3&4):187-191.

Comment [hj8]: Please add the latest references in five years

Arshad S, Muhammad S, Randhawa M.A, Ashraf I, Chaudhary K.M. Rural women's involvement in decision-making regarding livestock management. *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2010b;47(2):1-4.

Raman jodha. Livelihood security of small and marginal farm families in Gurgaon division of Haryana state. Ph.D Thesis, CCS Haryana Agricultural University. 2018.

Swachhta status report. National sample survey office, ministry of statistics and programme implementation, Government of India. 2016.

Sreenivasulu M, Rao P.P. Managerial role of farm women. *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2005;18(4):1026-1030.

Mukherjee A. An analytical study on status, prospects and challenges of Farmers Producer Companies Ph.D. Thesis, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute New Delhi, India. 2019.

Rubin D, Tezara S, Caldwell T. A calf, a house, a business of one's own: Microcredit, asset accumulation and economic empowerment in GLCRSP projects in Ethiopia and Ghana, Global Livestock Research Support Program. 2010.

Quisumbing A.R. Household decisions, gender, and development. A synthesis of recent research, food policy. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute. 2003.

Smith L. C, Ramakrishnan U, Ndiaye A, Haddad L, Martorell R. The importance of women's status for child nutrition in developing countries. *World Health (Research Report 131)*. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute. 2003.

World Bank. Engendering development through gender equality in rights, resources, and voice (Policy Research Report No. 21776). Washington, DC: World Bank. 2001.

Ponnusamy K, Chauhan A.K, Meena S. Testing the effectiveness of Pasu Sakhi: An innovation for resource poor farm women in Rajasthan. *Indian Journal of Animal Sciences*. 2017;87(2): 229-33.

UNDER PUBLICATION

UNDER PEER REVIEW

UNDER PEER REVIEW