

## CONSUMPTION PATTERN OF MILK AND OTHER LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS IN RURAL AND URBAN AREAS OF TAMIL NADU

A. Swaminathan and M. Prabu

Dept. of Livestock Business Management  
Madras Veterinary College, TANUVAS, Chennai-7.

Received 7-3-2014 Accepted 16-7-2014

Corresponding Author : Mprabhu23@gmail.com

### ABSTRACT

A study was carried out to analyze the consumption pattern of milk and other livestock products in both rural and urban areas of Tamil Nadu. The monthly consumption of milk was 1.89 litres in low income group, followed by middle (3.48 litres) and high (3.79 litres) income groups. Among high income groups, the monthly average meat consumption was 1.17 kg in rural households, 1.75 kg in urban households and 1.45 kg in overall households. The results also showed that, monthly egg consumption per consumption unit was very low among the rural households (2.18 numbers), as compared to urban households (8.36 numbers). As a whole, chicken (49.59 per cent) enjoyed the first rank among different meat items and second rank was equally shared by mutton / chevon and fish (21.49 per cent). Similar to meat, egg consumption also increased with increase in level of income.

**KEYWORDS** : Consumption pattern – Milk and livestock products- Rural and Urban areas- Income

### INTRODUCTION

The per capita availability of livestock products viz milk, meat and egg increased during the year 2007-2010 (Basic Animal Husbandry Statistics, 2012). The consumption levels in India is not at par with the world average as it is considered as a luxury by the vast majority of population. The demand for livestock products is more elastic than the demand for cereals, which implies that the rise in per capita income would lead to greater increase in the demand for livestock products. However, research on food consumption in India is continuing only on the plant based products in spite of increase in demand for foods of animal origin. Hence, the present study was carried out with the objective of exploring the consumption pattern of milk and livestock products in both rural and urban areas across different income groups.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

The objective of the study was to analyze the consumption pattern of livestock products in both rural and urban areas of Tamil Nadu. For the present study, data were collected from 60 sample respondents, each from Ramanathapuram for rural area and Chennai districts for urban consumers. Multistage random sampling was used for the selection of sample households for the present study. From Ramanathapuram district, two taluks, namely Paramakudi and Kamudhi were selected through simple random sampling technique. From each of the selected taluk, three villages were selected through simple random sampling technique. From each village, ten respondents were selected and interviewed. Chennai district has ten zones from which three zones namely Tondiarpet, Kilpauk and Adayar were selected by simple random sampling. From each of these zones, 20 respondents were selected and interviewed. Thus, the total sample size for the study was 120 consumers, of which 60 located in urban (Chennai) and 60 in rural (Ramanathapuram) areas of Tamil Nadu.

### Classification of households

The selected households were classified based on monthly income of the household, religion and

educational level of the head of the household. To measure the household size, consumption units described by Khare (1968) was used, for better comparison between households, because this method of classification takes into account the sex and age differences together.

#### Analytical tools and techniques

The collected data were tabulated and analysed. Tabular analysis in the form of percentages and averages were used to analyse the food consumption pattern and expenditure.

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Consumption of livestock products by different income groups is presented in table 1

**Table 1 Consumption pattern of milk and livestock products by different income groups**

Category	Income groups	Milk (in litres)	Meat items (in kgs)					Egg (in numbers)	
			Mutton and Chevon	Chicken	Pork	Beef	Fish		Total
Rural	Low	1.81	0.13 (14.44)	0.52 (57.78)	-	0.06 (6.67)	0.19 (21.11)	0.90 (100.00)	1.23
	Middle	3.18	0.14 (19.18)	0.46 (63.01)	-	-	0.13 (17.81)	0.73 (100.00)	2.20
	High	3.15	0.25 (21.37)	0.59 (50.43)	-	0.13 (11.11)	0.20 (17.09)	1.17 (100.00)	5.59
	Overall	2.19	0.15 (15.96)	0.53 (56.38)	-	0.07 (7.45)	0.19 (20.21)	0.94 (100.00)	2.18
Urban	Low	2.15	0.27 (20.61)	0.55 (41.98)	-	0.11 (8.40)	0.38 (29.01)	1.31 (100.00)	4.47
	Middle	3.52	0.41 (27.33)	0.72 (48.00)	-	0.05 (3.33)	0.32 (21.34)	1.50 (100.00)	7.45
	High	4.49	0.34 (19.43)	0.69 (39.42)	-	0.33 (18.86)	0.39 (22.29)	1.75 (100.00)	15.93
	Overall	3.40	0.36 (24.16)	0.68 (45.64)	-	0.11 (7.38)	0.34 (22.82)	1.49 (100.00)	8.36
Overall	Low	1.89	0.16 (16.16)	0.53 (53.54)	-	0.07 (7.07)	0.23 (23.23)	0.99 (100.00)	1.98
	Middle	3.48	0.37 (26.43)	0.69 (49.29)	-	0.05 (3.57)	0.29 (20.71)	1.40 (100.00)	6.81
	High	3.79	0.30 (20.69)	0.64 (44.14)	-	0.22 (15.17)	0.29 (20.00)	1.45 (100.00)	10.53
	Overall	2.80	0.26 (21.49)	0.60 (49.59)	-	0.09 (7.43)	0.26 (21.49)	1.21 (100.00)	5.27

*Figures in parentheses indicate percentages of total*

The sample households were classified into three income groups in rural areas as low income (up to Rs. 5,000), middle income (Rs. 5,001 to 15,000) and high income (above Rs. 15,000) and in urban areas as low income (up to Rs. 15,000), middle income (Rs. 15,001 to 25,000) and high income (above Rs. 25,000) based on their monthly family income. Overall, the sample households also were classified into three income groups, as low income (up to Rs. 10,000), middle income (Rs. 10,001 to 20,000) and high income (above Rs. 20,000) based on their monthly income. The household family size was converted into consumption units as given for better comparison. It could be understood from the Table 1 that, by and large, the consumption level of livestock products was higher among higher income groups. The total quantity of milk consumed in rural areas varied from 1.81 to 3.15 litres per month per consumption unit from low to high-income groups with an overall average of 2.19 litres, while in urban areas it varied from 2.15 to 4.49 litres per month per consumption unit with an overall average of 3.40 litres. In the overall sample, the monthly consumption of milk was 1.89 litres in low income group, followed by middle (3.48 litres) and high (3.79 litres) income groups. The study also exhibited that the per capita milk consumption among the households in rural and urban was lesser (116.73 and 75.19 grams per day, respectively) than the ICMR recommended level of 280 grams per day. Although milk is a necessary commodity, the consumption level of milk increased with increase in family income, which might be due to increase in their purchasing power and higher awareness about the nutritive value of milk as compared to other income groups. Similarly, Prabakaran and Patel (1983), Daisyrani (1995) and Priyadharsini (2007) also reported the existence of positive relationship between household income and consumption of milk.

Among high income groups, the monthly average meat consumption was 1.17 kg in rural households, 1.75 kg in urban households and 1.45 kg in overall households. On perusal of the table, it was observed that there was a significant decrease in consumption of meat with decrease in level of income of the households. The results also showed that monthly egg consumption per consumption unit was very low among the rural households (2.18 numbers), as compared to urban households (8.36 numbers).

Of the various meat items consumed by sample households, the quantity of chicken consumed was greater in both rural and urban areas (56.38 and 45.64 per cent, respectively). The second choice of meat product for the rural people was fish (20.21 per cent) while for the urban people it was mutton and chevon (24.16 per cent). As a whole, chicken (49.59 per cent) enjoyed the first rank among different meat items and second rank was equally shared by mutton / chevon and fish (21.49 per cent). The results highlighted that the average consumption of meat among the consumers in urban areas were well above the national per capita meat consumption (30 grams per day). Similar to meat, egg consumption also increased with increase in level of income, irrespective of the locality of the households.

#### REFERENCES :

Basic Animal Husbandry Statistics, AHS series 13 (2012). Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries, Krishi Bhawan, Government of India, New Delhi.

Daisyrani, M.S. (1995). Consumption pattern, Consumer's awareness and preferences for selected livestock products. *Unpublished M.V.Sc thesis submitted to TANUVAS, Chennai-600 051.*

Khare. (1968). Studies in Economics of farm management in Ahmed Nagar district. Report for the years 1967-68, *Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics.*, Pune.

Prabakaran, R and R. K. Patel. (1983). *Cheiron*, 12: 136-140.

Priyadharsini, S. (2007). Consumers' preferences for livestock products: An inquiry in the second-tier cities of Tamil Nadu. *Unpublished M.V.Sc thesis submitted to TANUVAS, Chennai – 600 051.*

