

Original Research Article

Collective study on Housing management practices of Kenguri sheep farmers under intensive and extensive rearing systems in Yadgir district of Karnataka

ABSTRACT

The main domains of housing management practices followed by Kenguri sheep farmers were analyzed during the research. Twenty sheep farms in intensive and extensive were pointed out based on the accessibility in the respective study location Yadgir (Northern Eastern dry agro-climatic zone) district of Karnataka, India. The examination was carried out during the months of January to February in the year 2022. The objectives of housing practices were assessed by computing frequency percentage values and average descriptive values. The majority of intensive sheep farmers had wooden type of flooring (60.00%) and whereas, mud flooring (100.00%) is the only option for extensive sheep farmers. All intensive sheep farms were having galvanized roofing (100.00%), in contrary all extensive sheep farms were with no roofing. Sheep in intensive rearing had trough water sources (45.00%) majorly and in extensive rearing they had natural water source (70.00%) accessibility. Most of the intensive sheep farmers maintained proper commercial feed (60.00%) access for the sheep, but fodder (65.00%) was the key food type for sheep reared under extensive system. The advantage of fans for better ventilation (40.00%) was seen in intensive rearing system, whereas, only natural ventilation (100.00%) was observed in extensive rearing system. The good space availability and pen dimensions are the only concerns with intensive rearing system. The outcomes of this work will help the sheep farmers to accustom to the better housing management practices in near times.

Keywords: Housing management practices, Kenguri sheep, flooring, roofing, ventilation, space availability

1. INTRODUCTION

Under Indian conditions, the sheep farmers used a kutchra kind of floor in their sheep sheds, which was made of locally available moorum and gravel for a much lower cost than concrete, timber, or rubber mat flooring, which were more expensive. Although less expensive to install, this sort of flooring had the disadvantage of being unsanitary [16 & 17].

According to the Livestock Census 2019 [2], India had 74.26 million sheep overall, ranking third globally. The total number of sheep has grown by 14.13% from the 2012 [1] Livestock Census [4]. According to a recent estimate from 2020, there were 6.7 lakh Kenguri sheep in Karnataka [8].

Utilisation of thatch as their roof material by 64.41% farmers, followed by asbestos sheet (35.24%) and tiles (0.35%), with concrete and galvanised roofing being the most cost-effective. Lamb enclosures made of bamboo sticks were found in 82.12% of the sheep sheds, protecting the lambs from predators after delivery. Similar form of protection was noticed by [6].

The possibility of unrestricted access to outer regions [5], protection from thermal extremes [14], adequate space is necessary to ensure the wellbeing and health of production species [12].

High building expenditures are associated with housing the sheep in an insulated structure with regulated mechanical ventilation that maintains an ambient temperature of 1.5–8.6 °C [7].

In general, access to drinking water was limited [11] and shepherds had to travel large distances in search of potable water or rely on open sources [8]. Sheep prefer 50% grasses, 30% fodder, and 20% shrubs, according to [10].

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1. Sheep farm visit

Over the course of two months, in January and February of 2022, the study was conducted. Yadgir, the research area, is situated 389 meters above average sea level in the Northern Eastern Dry Zone of Karnataka. Its latitude is 16° 15' N and its longitude is 77° 20' E [15]. This region receives between 640 and 810 mm of rain on average each year [9]. Total 40 sheep farms including intense and extensive sheep farms that were chosen randomly for analysis. The typical flock size in extensive farms is between 25 and 1480, whereas in intensive farms it ranges from 35 to 300. Through teleconference, the farmers were informed in advance about the visits to every sheep farm.

2.2. Method of data collection

The planned schedule created for the study was used to evaluate the housing management techniques of sheep farmers by live assessment under field conditions in the chosen study area.

2.3. Statistical analysis

Using IBM SPSS version 16.0 software, the findings were obtained via statistical tools such as frequency percentages, mean (average), standard error/deviation, P-value.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Flooring and Roofing

In intensive rearing system, majority of the sheds were provided with wooden (60.00%) type of flooring followed by concrete (20.00%), mud (10.00%) and rubber mat/plastic slates

(10.00%). In extensive system all the sheds were having mud (100.00%) flooring system. In intensive system all the sheds were provided with galvanized (100.00%) roofing. In extensive system there was no roofing (100.00%) system (Table 1). The data analysis for type of flooring in intensive system found that, majority of the sheds had wooden type of flooring followed by concrete, mud and rubber mat types, whereas mud flooring was the commonly observed in extensive system of sheep rearing systems. Regarding type of roofing in case of intensive rearing all the sheds had galvanized type of roofing whereas all pens in extensive system had no proper roofing. These findings are in line with the findings of [16], [17] and [6].

3.2. Water source

With respect to intensive rearing system, most of the farmers provided trough (45.00%) as water source followed by automatic drinker (35.00%) and bucket (20.00 %) to sheep; when compared to extensive system the type of water source provision had altered with following results as sheep had access to natural water source (70.00%) majorly followed by bucket (15.00%) and trough (15.00%) provision (Table 1). The type of water source in intensive system was majorly seen as trough whereas in extensive system it was of natural source like open flowing streams. These findings were in agreement with the leads of [11 & 17].

3.3. Feed source and Ventilation

Under intensive rearing system, major farmers provided feed (60.00%) followed by fodder (20.00%) and supplements (20.00%) for sheep; when compared to extensive system the feeding pattern was changed as sheep had provided with fodder (65.00%) followed by feed (35.00%) with no provision of supplements. In intensive system most of the sheds were provided natural (60.00%) ventilation and other sheds were having fans provision (40.00 %). Whereas in contrast in case of extensive system all pens had access to natural (100.00%) ventilation with no provision of fans (Table 1). The feed supply was the major contributor as a feeding source for sheep in intensive but in case of extensive fodder was the major feed resource. Most of the sheds were having natural ventilation with minimum per cent of sheds having fans provision in intensive rearing whereas in extensive all the pens were having natural ventilation. These results were in competence with the outcomes of [13 & 10].

3.4. Space availability and pen dimensions

The mean open area and closed area were (2.49 ± 0.16) m² and (0.77 ± 0.09) m², respectively in intensive rearing for sheep. Sheep shed had mean length (21.31 ± 3.01) m, mean width (10.56 ± 0.45) m, and mean height (3.45 ± 0.26) m in intensive rearing system (Table 2). Space availability and pen dimensions are only related to intensive rearing system. These results were partly in concurrence with the leads of [5].

Table 1: Housing management practices of Kenguri sheep farmers

Particulars	Intensive (n=20)		Extensive (n=20)	
	F	%	F	%
Type of flooring				
Mud	2	10.00	20	100.00
Concrete	4	20.00	0	00.00
Wooden	12	60.00	0	00.00
Rubber mat/plastic slates	2	10.00	0	00.00
Type of roofing				
Thatched	0	00.00	0	00.00

Concrete	0	00.00	0	00.00
Galvanized	20	100.00	0	00.00
No roof	0	00.00	20	100.00
Type of water source				
Bucket	4	20.00	2	15.00
Trough	9	45.00	2	15.00
Automatic drinker	7	35.00	0	00.00
Natural source (Open flowing streams)	0	00.00	11	70.00
Feeding types				
Feed	12	60.00	7	35.00
Fodder	4	20.00	13	65.00
Supplements	4	20.00	0	00.00
Type of ventilation				
Fans provision	8	40.00	0	00.00
Natural	12	60.00	20	100.00

n- Sample size, F- Frequencies, %- Percentage

Table 2: Space availability and pen dimensions of sheep shed
Mean values with different superscripts (a, b) within the row differ significantly ($p < 0.05$)

Particulars	Intensive (n=20)	Extensive (n=20)	P- value
Space availability			
Open area (m ²)	2.49 ± 0.16 ^a	0.00 ± 0.02 ^b	0.0001
Closed area (m ²)	0.77 ± 0.09 ^a	0.00 ± 0.05 ^b	0.0001
Pen/shed dimensions			
Shed length (m)	21.31 ± 3.01 ^a	0.00 ± 0.01 ^b	0.0001
Shed width (m)	10.56 ± 0.45 ^a	0.00 ± 0.04 ^b	0.0001
Shed height (m)	3.45 ± 0.26 ^a	0.00 ± 0.06 ^b	0.0001

Figure 1: Sheep feeding in manger

flooring in shed

Figure 2: Galvanized roofing with slatted



Figure 3: Sheep in open fence



Figure 4: Sheep in closed shed



Figure 5: Trough water for sheep in shed



Figure 6: Fan ventilation in sheep shed



4. CONCLUSION

By this evaluation we can conclude that, the farmers rearing sheep in intensive farms have finer ideas of housing practices with relation to flooring, roofing, feeding and watering, ventilation and space provision compared to extensive sheep rearing farmers. But, natural access to feed and water, free space and air for movements and breathing is well witnessed in extensive rearing system. Finally, the overall housing practices of intensive sheep farmers was better compared extensive sheep farmers.

REFERENCES

1. 19th Livestock census, Animal Husbandry Statistics. Government of India, Ministry of Fisheries Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi, 2012. <https://dahd.nic.in/schemes/programmes/animal-husbandry-statistics>
2. 20th Livestock census, Animal Husbandry Statistics. Government of India, Ministry of Fisheries Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi, 2019. <https://dahd.nic.in/schemes/programmes/animal-husbandry-statistics>
3. Averós X, Lorea A, Beltran de Heredia I, Arranz J, Ruiz R, Estevez I. Space availability in confined sheep during pregnancy, effects in movement patterns and use of space. PLoS One. 2014;9(4), p.e94767.
4. Basic Animal Husbandry Statistics, Annual Report. Animal Husbandry Statistics. Government of India, Ministry of Fisheries Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi, 2023. <https://dahd.nic.in/schemes/programmes/animal-husbandry-statistics>
5. Casamassima D, Sevi A, Palazzo M, Ramacciato R, Colella GE, Bellitti A. Effects of two different housing systems on behaviour, physiology and milk yield of Comisana ewes. Small Ruminant Research. 2001;41: 151–161.
6. Chandran PC, Kandasamy N, Panneerselvam S. Distribution, characteristics and management of Vembur sheep. Indian Journal of Animal Science. 2009;79: 73–77.

7. Flaten O, Rønning L. Best påsau-faktorersom påvirker økonomisk resultat i saueholdet. A study of factors influencing financial performance of sheep farms in Norway. NILF-Report. 2011.
8. Gowane GR, Akram N, Misra SS, Chopra A, Sharma RC, Kumar A. The breeding structure for the small ruminant resources in India. *Tropical Animal Health and Production*. 2020;52(4):1717-1724.
9. Hallad SC, Reddy GV, Kumbar D. Studies on Variability of Rainfall over North-Eastern Dry Zone of Karnataka: A Statistical Analysis. *International Journal of Environment and Climate Change*. 2023;13(12), pp.272-289.
10. Kailash NK. Grazing and housing practices of sheep in western Rajasthan. *Cibtech Journal of Zoology*. 2015;4(1), pp.23-25.
11. Misra AK, Ramana DBV, Prasad MS, Ramakrishna YS. Feeding and management of small ruminants, *KVK Bulletin*. Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Central Research Institute for Dryland Agriculture, Hyderabad. 2007;(2).
12. Petherick JC. Spatial requirements of animals: Allometry and beyond. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*. 2007;2: 197–204.
13. Rajanna N, Mahender M, Thamiraju D, Nagalakshmi D, Sreenivasa Rao D. Housing and health care management practices adopted by sheep farmers in Telangana region of Andhra Pradesh. *Veterinary Research*. 2013;6 (3):64-67.
14. Sevi A, Annicchiarico G, Albenzio M, Taibi L, Muscio A, Dell'aquila S. Effects of solar radiation and feeding time on behaviour, immune-response and production of lactating ewe under high ambient temperature. *Journal of Dairy Science*. 2001;84: 629-640.
15. Shanwad UK, Shankergoud I, Janagoudar BS, Srinivas AG, Biradar V. Influence of seasonal and annual rainfall variability on crop planning in north eastern dry zone (Zone-2) of Hyderabad Karnataka Region. *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2015;28(5), pp.768-770.
16. Sharma MC, Pathodiya OP, Jingar SC, Mitesh Gaur. A study on socio – economic status of goat rearers and adoption of management practices. *Indian Journal of Small Ruminants*. 2007;13: 75 – 83.
17. Suresh A, Gupta DC, Mann JS. Farmer's management practices and economics of sheep farming in eastern semi – arid region of Rajasthan. *Indian Journal of Animal Science*. 2008;14 (2):236-242.