

# EXISTING ANIMAL HUSBANDRY PRACTICES ADOPTED BY THE DAIRY FARMERS OF CHHATTISGARH

Yogesh Kumar Dubey, M.L. Sharma and Kedar Nath Yadav\*

*Department of Agricultural Extension  
Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur (C.G.) – 492 012 (India)  
\*Email: kedar.ri03@gmail.com*

**Abstract:** The present study was conducted in Raipur district of Chhattisgarh with the objectives to find out the existing animal husbandry practices adopted by dairy farmers. Majority of respondents had more than 20 years of experience of dairy farming and they were possessing up to 20 animals for production of milk and milk products. Majority of the respondents possessed 21 cows of improved breeds. Similarly, more than 71 per cent of the respondents were possessing on an average 22 animals of improved breeds of buffaloes. The average milk production per day per dairy farmer was found 127.29 litres per day. Majority of the respondents were allowing their cattle for grazing on pasture, dry fodder and concentrate. Only 20.77 per cent respondents were also making silage for feeding of their animal. Majority of the respondents were keeping breeding bull of cow and buffaloes in their dairy for natural breeding; however artificial insemination was also adopted by them. Vaccination is commonly adopted practices for calves and heifers among the respondent, while, majority of the respondents were not adopting castration and dehorning practices.

**Keywords:** Animal husbandry, Adoption, Improved breeds, Dairy Farmers

## REFERENCES

**Birthal, P.S. and Ali, J.** (2005). Potential of livestock sector in rural transformation. Rural Transformation in India: The role of non-farm sector by Rohini Nayyar and A.N. Sharma. Manohar Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi.

**Chouhan, J. P. S. and Chouhan, K. N. K.** (1982).

Correlates of level of aspirations of high and low milk producers. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, **18**(3&4): 40-44.

**Shah, D. and Shah, A.** (1995). Factors influencing profit in milk production enterprises. *Agricultural Marketing*, **38**(3): 38-42.