RESEARCH ARTICLE

ADVANCE RESEARCH JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

Volume 4 | Issue 2 | December, 2013 | 153-159

Gender perspectives in livestock development activities

■ **P.N. Antwal,** C.M. Bellurkar **and** P.B. Bhosale

AICRP-Extension Component, College of Home Science, Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, PARBHANI (M.S.) INDIA

(Email: snehankit23@rediffmail.com)

ARTICLE INFO:

Received : 10.06.2013
Revised : 00.00.2013
Accepted : 00.00.2013

KEY WORDS:

Role, Responsibility, Access, Control, Livestock activities

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE :

Antwal, P.N., Bellurkar, C.M. and Bhosale, P.B. (2013). Gender perspectives in livestock development activities, *Adv. Res. J. Soc. Sci.,* **4** (2) : 153-159.

ABSTRACT

Present investigation was carried out in Yavatmal district of Central Vidarbha Zone of Maharashtra State to study the gender perspective in livestock activities. The data were collected from Yavatmal, Ner, Kalamb and Babhulgaon blocks of Yavatmal District. From these selected blocks 300 respondents (150 male and 150 female) were selected randomly for the study. The data were analyzed by using frequency and percentages and correlation. Independent participation of rural women was found to be negligible, whereas independent participation of rural men was noticed in procuring fodder, procuring and repayment of credit / loan, growing fodder and engagement of labour. Joint participation of rural women with female was also observed in excreta management – fresh, processed, processing of produce, retention of produce for household, consumption, care of livestock / poultry shed management and care of sick animals, whereas joint participation of rural men with female was noticed in excreta management – fresh, processed, processing of produce, retention of produce for household consumption. A huge majority of rural women were jointly participating with male in the areas of care of livestock / poultry / cattle, poultry shed management, care of sick animal, processing of produce and retention of produce for household consumption. Joint participation of rural men with male was recorded in breeding of animal, grazing of animal and marketing of produce. As regards responsibility of livestock management activities, rural women had complete responsibility in fresh and processed excreta management, retention of produce for house hold consumption and processing of produce, where as rural men were completely responsible for procuring and repaying of credit / loan, procuring fodder, marketing of produce and management of cash earned from sale of produce and fodder storage. It was further noticed that rural women were partially responsible for care of livestock / poultry, cattle / poultry shed management and care of sick animal and fodder storage, while rural men were partially responsible for fresh and processed excreta management, retention of produce for house hold consumption and processing of produce and grazing of animal. Occupation, education and socio-economic status of male were found to be positively and significantly related with participation, responsibility, access and control over livestock development activities. Socio-economic status of female was found to be positively and significantly related with female's responsibility and control over livestock development activities.

INTRODUCTION

About 70 per cent population of India resides in rural area with agriculture as main occupation and dairy as a subsidiary occupation. Cattle play a vital role in the rural economy of India. India's ex-President Late Dr. Rajendra Prasad said that "The whole structure of Indian Agriculture rests on cows and bullocks".

Livestock is an important segment of agricultural sector in India as it makes multifaceted contributions to socio-economic uplift of the rural poor. Livestock in India is kept mainly by the small holders and the landless that constitute bulk of rural population. Thus, by being an important means of income and employment, livestock helps to alleviate poverty and smoothers income distribution in the process assuring a balanced development of rural economy.

A research study on "Qualitative data base on rural women- ecologically friendly empowerment" conducted by All India Coordinated Research Project on Home Science (Extension component) (2003) revealed that in Andhra Pradesh in case of livestock related activities, it was observed that care and management of livestock is of great concern to women. They rear poultry, goat and milch animals depending upon their purchasing power. While men invest in buying livestock, it is the women who attend to care of animals. The women of medium and small land holding families do the entire work of management that includes fodder and feed management, feeding and watering, cleaning cattle shed/yard, milking and management for marketing, collection of cow dung, making of dung cakes for fuel and preparation of farm yard manure.

The participation of women in farm decisions as well as participation in animal management practices increased now a day. Women contribute significantly in taking decisions about use of dairy animal management practices, use of new machinery in the dairy, etc. Thus, women play very important role not only in maintaining their cattle but also managing their farms, depending upon the situational, personal and socio-economic characteristics of the family to which they belong. For making drastic change in the field of dairying and agriculture, the women make it a strong force, so as to work as a "vehicle of change". Therefore, considering above points in mind present investigation was undertaken with the following objectives :

- To study the profile of respondents and families.
- To study the gender role and responsibility in livestock development activities.
- To study the access and control of gender over livestock development activities.
- To study the correlation between socio-personal characteristics of gender with gender role, responsibility, access and control.

METHODS

Present investigation was carried out in randomly selected Yavatmal district of Central Vidarbha Zone. The data were collected from Yavatmal, Ner, Kalamb and Babhulgaon blocks of Yavatmal district. From these blocks five villages were selected randomly. Totally 300 respondents from these villages (150 male and 150 female) were selected randomly. The data on gender perspectives in livestock development activities were collected personally by using the structured interview schedule. The data were analyzed by using frequency, percentages and correlation.

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

The results obtained from the present investigation as well as relevant discussion have been summarized under following heads :

Personal and socio-economic profile of the respondents :

As far as personal and economic profile of respondents was concerned it was observed from Table 1 that more than half (56.00 %) of the female and male respondents were middle aged and upper aged, respectively. A great majority of them were married (97.33 and 98.66 %). Near about half of females (48.67 %) were illiterate or unlettered, whereas 17.33 per cent of them have completed their Primary School education and 12.67 per cent had completed High School level education, while one fifth of males (20.67 %) were educated up to High School level and 18.67 per cent of men were illiterate, primary level education and post matric diploma were completed by 16.67 per cent and 16.00 per cent rural men, respectively. As regards their occupation, more than half (52.67 %) of the females were non-wage earners, while near about three fourth (72.00 %) of the males were engaged in farming occupation.

Further, it was found that 58.00 per cent families were nuclear and 42.00 per cent were of joint families. Whereas equal percentages (25.33 %) of the farm families had medium and small land holding, while (24.67 %) per cent of the families were large land holders and landless.

Role and responsibility in livestock management activities :

It is evident from Table 2 that Independent participation of rural women was found to be very negligible (1.00 – 3.00 %) in livestock management activities, whereas independent participation of rural men was noticed in procuring fodder (39.69%), procuring and repayment of credit / loan (37.40 %), growing fodder and engagement of labour (29.77 %). Joint participation of rural women with female was also observed (2.00 – 6.00 %) in excreta management – fresh, processed, processing of produce, retention of produce for household, consumption, care of livestock / poultry shad management and care of sick animals, whereas joint participation of rural men with female was noticed in excreta management – fresh, processed (61.83 %), processing of produce (61.07 %), retention of produce for household consumption (57.25 %). A huge majority (90.00 – 94.00 %) of rural women were jointly participating with male in the areas of care of livestock / poultry / cattle, poultry shad management (93.85 %), care of sick animal, processing of produce (92.31 %) and retention of produce for household consumption (90.77 %). Joint participation of rural men with male was recorded in breeding of animal (70.23 %), grazing of animal (62.60 %) and marketing of produce (59.54%). More than 80.00 per cent of the rural women were not involved in growing fodder (93.85 %), procuring fodder (88.46 %) and breeding of animal (80.77 %).

The results are in line with the findings of Patki *et al.* (2000), Ekale *et al.* (2003) and Bhamare *et al.* (2006).

As regards the responsibility of livestock management activities, it was portrayed that rural women had complete responsibility in fresh and processed excreta management (45.38 %), retention of produce for house hold consumption (37.69 %) and processing of produce (33.85 %), where as rural men were completely responsible for procuring and repaying of credit / loan (72.31 %), procuring fodder, marketing of produce and management of cash earned from sale of produce (69.23 %) and fodder storage (68.46 %). It was further noticed that rural women were partially responsible for care of livestock / poultry (83.08 %), cattle / poultry shad management and care of sick animal (82.31 %) and fodder storage (80.00 %), while rural men were partially responsible for fresh and processed excreta management (38.46 %), retention of produce for house hold consumption and processing of produce (37.69 %) and grazing of animal (34.62 %). Rural women were not responsible for the activities, growing fodder (61.54 %), procuring fodder (53.08 %) and breeding of animal (48.46 %), management of produce at commercial level – fresh, processed (57.25 %) and storage of fodder (94.66 %), feeding of animal (93.13 %) and management of revenue earned from sale of produce (91.60 %) were the activities in which rural women had complete access.

Further, it was observed from Table 3 that rural women had partial access to storage of fodder (80.92 %), management of revenue earned from sale of produce (74.05 %) and care of sick animals (65.65 %). Rural men had partial access to

Table 1 : Personal and socio-economic profile of the respondents

Sr. No.	Profile characteristics\categories	(n=150) Rural women		(n=150) Rural men	
		F	%	F	%
A	Age				
1.	Young (18 - 30) years	25	16.67	12	8.00
2.	Middle (31 – 45) years	84	56.00	54	36.00
3.	Upper (46 years and above)	41	27.33	84	56.00
B	Marital status				
1.	Unmarried	0	0.00	1	0.67
2.	Married	146	97.33	148	98.67
3.	Widow	4	2.67	1	0.67
4.	Divorcee	0	0.00	0	0.00
C	Education				
1.	Illiterate/ unlettered	73	48.67	28	18.67
2.	Can read and write/ lettered	6	4.00	15	10.00
3.	Primary School	26	17.33	25	16.67
4.	Middle School	11	7.33	13	8.66
5.	High School	19	12.67	31	20.67
6.	Post matric diploma	8	5.33	24	16.00
7.	Graduate and above	7	4.67	14	9.33
D	Occupation of respondent				
1.	Non-wage earner	79	52.67	0	0.00
2.	Wage earner -				
(i)	Farming	31	20.67	108	72.00
(ii)	Service	0	0.00	3	2.00
(iii)	Enterprise	19	12.66	23	15.33
(iv)	Labour	21	14.00	16	10.67
E	Family type				
1.	Nuclear	87	58.00	87	58.00
2.	Joint	63	42.00	63	42.00
F	Land holding				
1.	Large	37	24.67	37	24.67
2.	Medium	38	25.33	38	25.33
3.	Small	38	25.33	38	25.33
4.	Landless	37	24.67	37	24.67

Table 2: Distribution of women and men according to role and responsibility in livestock management activities

Sr. No.	Livestock management activities	Total % of respondents		Role (RW=130, RM=131)										Responsibility (RW=130, RM=130)							
		RW	RM	Independent		Joint with female		Joint with male		No participation		Not applicable		Complete		Partial		No responsibility		Not applicable	
				RW	RM	RW	RM	RW	RM	RW	RM	RW	RM	RW	RM	RW	RM	RW	RM	RW	RM
1.	Fodder mgt.																				
	Growing fodder	100	82	0.00	29.77	0.00	2.29	6.15	38.17	93.85	12.21	0.00	17.56	0.77	53.85	36 15	25.38	61.54	3.08	0.00	16.92
	Procuring fodder	100	100	0.00	39.69	0.00	5.34	11.54	50.38	88.46	4.58	0.00	0.00	0.77	69.23	44 62	30.00	53.08	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Fodder storage	100	100	2.31	22.90	1.54	19.85	81.54	53.44	14.62	3.82	0.00	0.00	12.31	68.46	80 00	31.54	6.15	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Feed of animal	100	100	2.31	14.50	0.77	29.77	80.00	49.62	16.92	6.11	0.00	0.00	10.77	67.69	76 92	32.31	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2.	Grazing of animal	100	98	0.77	12.21	0.77	3.82	20.77	62.60	77.69	19.85	0.00	1.53	3.08	64.62	53 08	34.62	42.31	0.00	0.00	0.77
3.	Care of live st./ poultry	100	100	0.77	10.69	2.31	38.17	93.85	48.85	3.08	2.29	0.00	0.00	13.85	66.92	83 08	33.08	1.54	0.00	0.00	0.00
4.	Cattle/ poultry shed mgt.	100	100	0.77	7.63	2.31	38.93	93.85	51.15	3.08	2.29	0.00	0.00	14.62	66.92	82 31	33.08	1.54	0.00	0.00	0.00
5.	Engagement of labour	100	88	0.77	29.77	0.77	8.40	71.54	45.80	26.92	3.82	0.00	12.21	3.85	60.77	70 00	26.15	24.62	3.08	0.00	10.00
6.	Care of sick animal	100	100	0.77	7.63	2.31	35.88	92.31	54.96	4.62	1.53	0.00	0.00	13.08	65.38	82 31	34.62	3.08	0.00	0.00	0.00
7.	Breeding of animal	100	100	0.77	15.27	0.77	6.87	17.69	70.23	80.77	7.63	0.00	0.00	3.08	66.92	46 92	31.54	48.46	0.77	0.00	0.00
8.	Excreta magt.																				
	i. Fresh	100	100	3.08	3.05	5.38	61.83	80.00	24.43	11.54	10.69	0.00	0.00	45.38	57.69	40 77	38.46	5.38	3.85	0.00	0.00
	ii. Processed	100	100	3.08	3.05	5.38	61.83	81.54	22.90	10.00	12.21	0.00	0.00	45.38	57.69	41 54	38.46	4.62	3.85	0.00	0.00
9.	Retention of produce for household consumption	100	100	0.77	13.74	4.62	57.25	90.77	25.95	3.85	3.05	0.00	0.00	37.69	62.31	53 85	37.69	3.08	0.00	0.00	0.00
10.	Processing of produce	100	100	0.77	7.63	5.38	61.07	92.31	29.01	1.54	2.29	0.00	0.00	33.85	62.31	58 46	37.69	1.54	0.00	0.00	0.00
11.	Marketing of produce	100	100	0.00	24.43	0.77	13.74	59.23	59.54	40.00	2.29	0.00	0.00	6.15	69.23	62 31	30.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
12.	Magt. of cash earned from sale of produce	100	100	0.00	29.01	0.77	27.48	84.62	42.75	14.62	0.76	0.00	0.00	7.69	69.23	71 54	30.00	17.69	0.00	0.00	0.00
13.	Credit/loan																				
A	Procuring																				
(i)	Source	100	100	0.00	37.40	0.77	27.48	74.62	34.35	24.62	0.76	0.00	0.00	2.31	72.31	55 38	26.92	40.77	0.00	0.00	0.00
(ii)	Amount	100	100	0.00	37.40	0.77	27.48	74.62	34.35	24.62	0.76	0.00	0.00	2.31	72.31	55 38	26.92	40.77	0.00	0.00	0.00
B	Repaying																				
(i)	Amount	100	100	0.00	37.40	0.77	27.48	74.62	34.35	24.62	0.76	0.00	0.00	2.31	72.31	55 38	26.92	40.77	0.00	0.00	0.00
(ii	Mode	100	100	0.00	37.40	0.77	27.48	74.62	34.35	24.62	0.76	0.00	0.00	2.31	72.31	55 38	26.92	40.77	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table 3: Distribution of women and men according to access and control over resources in livestock management

Sr. No.	Livestock management activities	Total % of response		Access (RW=131, RM = 131)								Control (RW=131, RM = 131)							
		RW	RM	Complete		Partial		No access		Irrelevant		Complete		Partial		No control		Irrelevant	
				RW	RM	RW	RM	RW	RM	RW	RM	RW	RM	RW	RM	RW	RM	RW	RM
1.	No. of animals to be purchased/ sold	100	100	0.76	74.81	9.16	24.43	90.08	0.76	0.00	0.00	0.76	70.99	8.40	28.24	90.84	0.76	0.00	0.00
2.	Fodder management																		
(i)	Procuring of fodder	100	100	0.00	83.21	9.16	16.79	90.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.76	77.86	9.16	20.61	90.08	1.53	0.00	0.00
(ii)	Growing of fodder	100	89	0.00	75.57	15.27	4.58	84.73	9.16	0.00	10.69	0.76	74.81	15.27	4.58	83.97	6.11	0.00	14.50
(iii)	Storage of fodder	99	100	10.69	94.66	80.92	5.34	7.63	0.00	0.76	0.00	11.45	93.13	77.86	6.11	10.69	0.76	0.00	0.00
(iv)	Purchase of cattle fd.	100	100	3.05	77.86	15.27	22.14	81.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.82	72.52	16.03	25.19	80.15	2.29	0.00	0.00
(v)	Feeding of animal	100	100	34.35	93.13	58.02	6.87	7.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.59	90.84	57.25	8.40	9.16	0.76	0.00	0.00
(vi)	Grazing of animal	100	98	13.74	87.02	36.64	11.45	49.62	0.00	0.00	1.53	11.45	86.26	44.27	11.45	44.27	0.76	0.00	1.53
3.	Veterinary facilities																		
(i)	Care of sick animals	100	100	31.30	89.31	65.65	10.69	3.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	26.72	84.73	67.18	14.50	6.11	0.76	0.00	0.00
(ii)	Breeding	99	100	17.56	83.97	57.25	15.27	24.43	0.76	0.76	0.00	9.92	64.12	41.98	31.30	48.09	4.58	0.00	0.00
4.	Excreta management																		
(i)	Fresh	100	100	54.96	87.02	41.98	10.69	3.05	2.29	0.00	0.00	51.91	86.26	43.51	9.92	4.58	3.82	0.00	0.00
(ii)	Processed	100	100	56.49	88.55	40.46	9.16	3.05	2.29	0.00	0.00	51.15	87.02	45.04	9.16	3.82	3.82	0.00	0.00
5.	Mgt produce at hh level																		
(i)	Fresh	100	100	69.47	90.08	27.48	7.63	3.05	2.29	0.00	0.00	66.41	88.55	29.77	7.63	3.82	3.82	0.00	0.00
(ii)	Processed	100	100	68.70	90.84	28.24	6.87	3.05	2.29	0.00	0.00	66.41	89.31	29.77	6.87	3.82	3.82	0.00	0.00
6.	Mgt of produce at com. level																		
(i)	Fresh	100	100	57.25	86.26	35.11	11.45	7.63	2.29	0.00	0.00	23.66	77.10	64.12	17.56	12.21	4.58	0.00	0.76
(ii)	Processed	100	100	57.25	87.02	33.59	10.69	9.16	2.29	0.00	0.00	24.43	78.63	63.36	16.03	12.21	4.58	0.00	0.76
7.	Mgt. of labour																		
(i)	Hiring	100	99	25.95	72.52	52.67	14.50	21.37	12.21	0.00	0.76	21.37	70.99	56.49	16.03	22.14	11.45	0.00	1.53
(ii)	Assigning of duty	100	99	30.53	79.39	50.38	7.63	19.08	12.21	0.00	0.76	26.72	77.86	53.44	8.40	19.85	12.21	0.00	1.53
(iii)	Supervising	100	99	30.53	79.39	51.91	7.63	17.56	12.21	0.00	0.76	26.72	77.86	53.44	8.40	19.85	12.21	0.00	1.53
8.	Mgt. of revenue earned from sale of produce	100	100	21.37	91.60	74.05	8.40	4.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.69	88.55	77.10	9.16	12.21	1.53	0.00	0.00
9.	Credit/loan																		
A	Procuring																		
(i)	Source	100	100	9.92	59.47	60.31	29.77	29.77	0.76	0.00	0.00	4.58	43.51	29.01	43.51	66.41	12.21	0.00	0.76
(ii)	Amount	100	100	9.92	59.47	60.31	29.77	29.77	0.76	0.00	0.00	4.58	43.51	29.01	43.51	66.41	12.21	0.00	0.76
B	Repaying																		
(i)	Amount	100	100	9.92	59.47	60.31	29.77	29.77	0.76	0.00	0.00	4.58	43.51	29.01	43.51	66.41	12.21	0.00	0.76
(ii)	Source	100	100	9.92	59.47	60.31	29.77	29.77	0.76	0.00	0.00	4.58	43.51	29.01	43.51	66.41	12.21	0.00	0.76

procuring and repaying of credit/loan (29.77 %), no. of animals to be purchased / sold (24.43 %) and purchase of cattle feed (22.14 %). It was also observed from the same table, that more than half of the rural women had complete control over management of produce for household level – fresh, processed (66.41 %), excreta management – fresh (51.91 %) and processed (51.15 %), while majority of rural men had complete control over storage of fodder (93.13 %), feeding of animals (90.84 %) and management of processed produce at household level (89.31 %) in live-stock management activities.

It was further noticed that remarkable percentage of rural women had partial control over storage of fodder (77.86 %), management of revenue earned from sale of produce (77.10 %) and care of sick animals (67.18 %). Partial control of rural men was observed over procuring and repaying of credit/loan (43.51%), number of animals to be purchased / sold (28.24 and %) and purchasing of cattle feed (25.19 %).

Correlation co-efficient :

Correlation co-efficient of profile of respondents with participation in livestock development activities :

It is observed from Table 4 that the variable occupation (0.309) was positive and significantly related at 0.01 level of significance with participation of male in livestock development activities. No socio-economic variable have shown any relation with participation of female in livestock development activities. It is illustrated from Table 5 that occupation (0.359) and socio-economic status (0.273) were positive and significantly related at 0.01 level of significance whereas education (0.205) was positive and significantly related at 0.05 level of significance with male's responsibility in livestock development. Socio-economic status (0.211) was found to be positively and significantly related at 0.05 level of significance with the female's responsibility of livestock activities.

Correlation co-efficient of profile of respondents with access to livestock development activities :

It is observed from Table 6 that the independent variables *viz.*, occupation (0.413) and socio-economic status (0.381) were found to be positively and significantly related at 0.01 level of significance while education (0.209) was positively and significantly related at 0.05 level of significance with access of male to livestock development activities. Whereas not a single variable showed any relation with access of female to livestock development activities.

From Table 7 it was observed that occupation (0.438) and socio-economic status (0.418) were found to be positively and significantly related at 0.01 level of significance and education (0.223) was positively and significantly related at 0.05 level of significance with control of male over livestock development activities. Whereas socio-economic status (0.380) was found to be positively and significantly related at 0.01 level of significance with control of female over livestock development activities.

Table 4 : Correlation co-efficient of profile of respondents with participation in livestock development activities

Sr. No.	Categories	Participation	
		Male	Female
1.	Age	-0.1135	-0.0173
2.	Marital status	0.0084	-0.0450
3.	Education	0.0592	0.0886
4.	Occupation	0.3092**	0.1315
5.	Socio-economic status	0.0396	0.1708

* and ** indicate significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively

Table 5 : Correlation co-efficient of profile of respondents with responsibility in livestock development activities

Sr. No.	Categories	Responsibility	
		Male	Female
1.	Age	0.0073	-0.0154
2.	Marital status	0.0000	0.0571
3.	Education	0.2058*	0.1363
4.	Occupation	0.3595**	0.1351
5.	Socio-economic status	0.2737**	0.2110*

* and ** indicate significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively

Table 6 : Correlation co-efficient of profile of respondents with access over livestock development activities

Sr. No.	Categories	Access	
		Male	Female
1.	Age	0.0683	0.0827
2.	Marital status	0.0019	-0.0121
3.	Education	0.2096*	0.1287
4.	Occupation	0.4137**	0.0464
5.	Socio-economic status	0.3815**	0.3723

* and ** indicate significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively

Table 7 : Correlation co-efficient of profile of respondents with control over livestock development activities

Sr. No.	Categories	Control	
		Male	Female
1.	Age	0.0820	0.0860
2.	Marital status	0.0373	0.0062
3.	Education	0.2230*	0.1232
4.	Occupation	0.4382**	0.0341
5.	Socio-economic status	0.4181**	0.3804**

* and ** indicate significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively

Conclusion :

Independent participation of rural women was found very negligible, whereas independent participation of rural men was

noticed in procuring fodder, procuring and repayment of credit/loan, growing fodder and engagement of labour. Joint participation of rural women with female was also observed in excreta management – fresh, processed, processing of produce, retention of produce for household, consumption, care of livestock / poultry shad management and care of sick animals, whereas joint participation of rural men with female was noticed in excreta management – fresh, processed, processing of produce, retention of produce for household consumption. A huge majority of rural women were jointly participating with male in the areas of care of livestock / poultry / cattle, poultry shad management, care of sick animal, processing of produce and retention of produce for household consumption. Joint participation of rural men with male was recorded in breeding of animal, grazing of animal and marketing of produce.

As regards responsibility of livestock management activities, rural women had complete responsibility in fresh and processed excreta management, retention of produce for house hold consumption and processing of produce, where as rural men were completely responsible for procuring and repaying of credit / loan, procuring fodder, marketing of produce and management of cash earned from sale of produce and fodder storage. It was further noticed that rural women were partially responsible for care of livestock / poultry, cattle / poultry shed management and care of sick animal and fodder storage, while rural men were partially responsible for fresh and processed excreta management, retention of produce for house hold consumption and processing of produce and grazing of animal.

It is clear from correlation analysis education, occupation and socio economic status of rural men were found to be significant with participation, responsibility, access and control over livestock development activities whereas socio-economic status of rural women was found to be significant with responsibility and control over livestock development activities.

REFERENCES

Anonymous (2003). Qualitative data base on rural women - ecologically friendly empowerment (2003). All India Coordinated Research Project (Extension component), Indian Council of Agricultural Research, NEW DELHI (INDIA).

Bhamare, Y.A., Deshmukh, M.P., Wakle, P.K. and Jinturkar, A.S. (2006). A study of participation of rural women in livestock management activities. Research paper presented in National Seminar on - Participatory approach in Rural Development, February 27-28, 2006, pp.67-68.

Ekale, J., Nikhade, D.M. and Bellurkar, C.M. (2003). Role perception of farm women in farm activities. *Maharashtra J. Extn. Edu.*, **22**(2) : 90-93.

Patki, A.D., NIkhade, M. and Thote, S.G. (2000). Role performance of rural women in animal husbandry practices. *Maharashtra J. Extn. Edu.*, **19** : 246-248.