Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare
ISSN 2224-3208 (Paper) ISSN 2225-093X (Online)
Vol.8, No.3, 2018

Livestock Production Constraints and Opportunities and its Determinant in Assosa District, Benishangul-Gumuz Regional State, Western Ethiopia

Biruk-Kemaw
Department of Plant Science, College of Agriculture and Natural Resource Science, Debre Berhan University, P.O.Box 445, Debre Berhan, Ethiopia

Abstract
The study was carried out in 4 selected kebeles of Assosa district with the objectives of identifying the major constraints and opportunities of livestock production and analyzing the determinants of livestock production of smallholder farmers' in the study area. A total of 99 household heads were selected through random sampling techniques. Both primary and secondary sources of data collection was applied. The primary data was collected through interviewing the selected farmers and field observation supported with secondary data sources. The collected data was analyzed by descriptive and cobb-douglas econometric model. Both SPSS and STATA software were used. The result of the study showed that the average age of sampled farmers was 47.34%. 7.1% and 92.9% of farm household head were female and male headed households, respectively with mean educational schooling of 4.25 years. The study revealed that the average grazing land size was 1.62 hectares with mean 1.64 km and 2.44 km of distance traveled by livestock to water source and sampled household head to the livestock market, respectively. the major livestock constraints identified in the study area were: disease, shortage of grazing land, lack of capital and improved breed, water scarcity during the dry season and lack of artificial insemination, respectively with the livestock production opportunities of availability of veterinary supply, input access, mixed crop production system, access to credit service and feed availability. The econometric result showed that from the hypothesized 14 explanatory variables, only 6 variables (labor, Extension contact service, capital, grazing land, veterinary service, breeding type) were found to be statistically significant at 1 and 5% significance level in affecting household livestock production. The study recommends that provision of extension service, supply of improved breed and capital along with a combined effort expansion is needed to increase livestock production.
Keywords: Assosa district, livestock, Cobb-Douglass

Introduction

Agricultural sector in Ethiopia is the mainstay of the country's economy with raising crop is the main activity experienced by farmers (Yisehak, *et al.,* 2013). Rearing livestock product also plays a crucial role in the Ethiopian economy scoring the second largest earner of foreign exchange after coffee in that the sub-sector contributing about 20% to the gross domestic product and 40% to the gross value of annual agricultural output (Malede and Takele, 2014). Ethiopia is among the first ten nations in the world with respect to the livestock population taking the lead in Africa with an estimated 41 million cattle, 26 million sheep, 23 million goats, 41 million chicken, 5.7 million equines and 2.3 million camels (CSA, 2010).

Despite the huge potential, number and diversity of livestock population, Ethiopian livestock sub-sector are facing chronic challenges such as prevalence of major endemic diseases, poor feeding and high stocking rate on grazing lands, lack of support services such as extension services, veterinary services, insufficient data to plan improved services and inadequate information on how to improve animal breeding, marketing, and processing, various livestock management problems and lack of human capital (Kedija *et al.*, 2008). The use of poor technological skills which resulted in the production of smallholder farmers with low quantities of products that are equally of poor quality, which resulted in their products being neglected by output markets both domestically and internationally (Ayele *et al*., 2003). In addition to the above, shortage of adequately trained animal health service providers, fragmented coordination between private and public animal health delivery system, uncoordinated development of the few existing staff and the need to access remote and often large areas characterized by poor infrastructure and communication networks was major constraints in the country facing livestock sector (Catly *et al*., 2012).

In the selected study area, according to the regional agricultural bureau report (2016), Assosa district, livestock production is considered as an important economic activity to the livelihood for the growing population and many small holder farmers are rearing and consuming livestock domestically. The local government through its research organizations supply different improved breeds and others has deliberately developed artificial insemination, provided extension services up to community levels throughout the entire country, removed disease problem on livestock production. Despite those mentioned efforts done by the government, livestock production has remained low to the extent of trailing in the study area. Limited number of veterinary service,

absence of government subsidy, existence of livestock diseases such as: Anthrax, and shortage of forage used as animal feed and lack of research and development on livestock production by the concerned bodies were some hindering factors that limited livestock production in the study area (Assosa District Agricultural Office, 2016). As depicted by Assosa district agricultural offices, livestock productions have a potential to contribute to the national economy in general and improving the livelihood of the farmers, the study tried to identify major factors that determines livestock production in that there is high potential of livestock production so that it's better to address determinants of livestock production in the district. Thus, this study was mainly concerned to analyze determinants of livestock production among smallholder farmers, to identify the challenges and opportunities of livestock production in the study area and suggest possible events for their improvements.

Materials and Methods

The Study Area: This study was conducted in Assosa district, Assosa zone of Benishangul Gumuz Regional State, western Ethiopia, located at 663 km away from Addis Ababa lies between $10^0 20'$ latitude in the North and $34^0 58'$ longitudes in the East. The district is composed of 74 rural and 4 urban kebeles bordered with Bambasi and Menge districts in the East, Sudan and Kurmuk in the West, Homosha and Menge districts in the North and Tongo and Bambasi districts in the South with the estimated land area of 2,330 square kilometers (BoFED, 2007). The climate of the area is uni-modal type being distributed from end of April to end September ranging from 219.7 to 1858.3 mm of rainfall per annual. The mean minimum and maximum annual temperature ranges from 26.5^0C to 30.1^0C, respectively (NMSA, 2014). Agro-ecologically, the district is mostly classified as lowland with an average rainfall of 1,275 mm per annual with altitude range of 1300-1570 meter above sea level (ADBoARD, 2013).

Mixed farming is the predominant sources of livelihood for the majority of the population in the study area. Sorghum, maize, teff among food crops, haricot bean, niger seed, soya bean, sesame among oil crops, and horticultures are tomato, onion, pepper, head cabbage, carrot, potatoes, sweet potato, mango, banana, papaya, avocado and cazamiro are the major crops grown in the area. Additionally, the major livestock reared in the district are cattle, goats, sheep and poultry as well as livestock management is undertaken in a traditional way. Farmers are plowing with a pair of cow /or an ox. This deteriorates the production and productivity of cows (in terms of milk and meat production) and the deterioration is worse when it is coupled with feed shortage. This creates a problem on the reproductive performance and subsequent effect on number of calving and calving interval of the cows that are used as a draft power (ADBoARD, 2012). Demographically, according to 2007 national census report, a total population of this district was 92,687, of whom 46,866 were men and 45,820 were females. From this, about 73.98% live in rural set-ups while the remaining 26.01% were urban dwellers. The three largest ethnic groups in Assosa were the Amhara (53%), the Berta (34%), and the Oromo (9.4%) and all other ethnic groups made up 3.6% of the population. Amharic is spoken as a first language by55%, 34% speak Berta, and 8.7% speak Afan Oromo; the remaining 2.3% spoke other primary languages reported (CSA, 2007).

Research Design

The study adopted a cross sectional survey design and the livestock farmers were the respondents in this study. The design enabled the collection of qualitative and quantitative data using questionnaires and interview. Data aimed at answering the research questions was collected once and for all. The design was also used to compare study variables and establish the relationships.

Data Source and Method of Data collection

Both primary and secondary data were collected from sampled household head and concerned body or offices in the study area through interview and questionnaire. Primary data collected from sample households include information on household socio-economic characteristics (age, sex, and education level), availability of water, labor force, marketing information, extension service, disease, grazing land, breeding type, artificial insemination, veterinary service and infrastructure. The second data were collected from journals, books CSA, published and unpublished material (report) of the Agricultural and Livestock Agency Office.

Secondary data collected from review of documents and office reports at various levels. Assosa district Agricultural office and administrative council office have been used to address detail information need for the interview. Populations of district, farming systems, meteorological data (annual rainfall and min-max temperature) were collected from written documents.

Data was collected from 99 livestock farmers on socio-economic characteristics, availability of grazing land, water, supply of breed and technology development factors impacting on livestock determinants using questionnaires and interview. Questionnaires were used because they were easy to administer and analyses. A few open ended questionnaires which provided room for all new responses to be recorded in addition to those that were provided.

Sampling Techniques and Sample Size Determination

For this study Assosa district is selected purposively supposing that severe problems of livestock production are observed in the district. The district has74 kebeles; out of these 3 kebeles are randomly selected because there is similar livestock production systems in the districts. Sample households will be randomly selected from the 3 kebeles using a proportionate to size random sampling technique. Accordingly for this study we applied a simplified formula provided by Yamane (1967) to determine the required sample size at 95% confidence level, degree of variability = 0.5 and level of precision = 10% are recommended in order to get a sample size which is represent a true population.

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2} = \frac{18{,}811}{1+18{,}811(0.1)^2} = 99$$

Where: n = is the sample size of livestock producer households, N = is the total households in the district (N = 18811) and e = 0.1 is the level of precision defined to determine the required sample size at 95% confidence level. A total of 99 sample households were randomly selected from the three kebele after determined by using sample size determination formula and Proportionate to sampling size was employed to select households for interviews from each kebele.

Table 1 Distribution of sampled household head by their location and size sample area

	Total number of HH			Sampled HH			
Kebele	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	%
Amba-3	12	335	347	2	27	29	29.3
Amba-5	17	503	520	3	41	44	44.4
Amba-6	11	303	314	2	24	26	26.3
Total	40	1141	1181	7	92	99	100

Method of Data Analysis

The study employed both descriptive statistics and econometric methods to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics such as mean, percentage and standard deviation were used and tabulated. To run statistical analysis, data were coded and entered in to a computer program with statistical package for social studies (SPSS) version 16 software packages.

Econometric model

Cobb-Douglas production function was used to analyze the determinants of livestock production of smallholder farmers in the selected study area. Most of the studies using the Cobb Douglas production function approach stated that the functional form of the Cobb-Douglas production model is assume homogeneity, unitary elasticity of substitution between input and output and also it is among the best well known production function utilized in applied production and productivity analysis (Enami *et al.*, 2011). According to Gujarati, (1995), the generalized form of the CD production function can be specified as:

$$Y = \beta oX_1^{\beta 1} X_2^{\beta 2} X_3^{\beta 3} - - - X_n^{\beta n} e^{ui} \quad \text{_____ (1)}$$

Where, Y- is number of livestock household have in TLU, βo - constant factor, X_i'-s are explanatory variables. Since the CD production function is a power function, it is impossible to directly use the ordinary least square (OLS) Method, therefore, logarithmic transformation was made to obtain its linear form and to estimate the parameters. In this case, the dependent variable, logarithmic number of livestock HHH, which is a continuous variable expressed in terms of TLU. The nature of explanatory variables were composed of both dummy as well as continuous.

$$\ln Y = \beta 0 + \beta_1 \ln X_1 + \beta_2 \ln X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 - - - - - - - - \beta_n \ln X_n + ui \quad \text{---------- (2)}$$

Where:

LnY = Logarithm of number of livestock HHH have (TLU)
$\ln X_1$= Age of HHH (year)
$\ln X_2$= Distances travelled by livestock to water sources (km)
$\ln X_3$ = Availability of labor used in production (Number)
$\ln X_4$= Distances to livestock market (km)
$\ln X_5$= Amount of extension services contact (trip)
$\ln X_6$= Availability of grazing land (ha)
$\ln X_7$= number of year HHH stay in schooling (year)
lnX8= Capital used in production (birr)
X_9 = Sex (0= female, 1=male)
X_{10}= Availability of disease (yes/No)

X_{11} = Availability of breed type (yes/No)
X12= Availability of artificial insemination (yes/No)
X13= Availability of veterinary services (yes/No)
X14= Availability of infrastructure (yes/No)
β0 and βi (I = 1, 2, 3…, 13) are parameters to be estimated.

An extra term is added to represent the residual error but it is not included in the above equation assuming it is zero on average. The function is estimated using OLS method. In this section, some aspects of livestock production are discussed. The main interest of analysis in this part is to assess the determinants of livestock production. As it was mentioned earlier, linear production function is selected and used in this purpose. To express quantitative relationships between variables, the production function must be expressed in functional form. The functional forms employed (Linear and Cobb Douglas) with definition of variables and hypothesis set are discussed for the above types of analyses in the following sections. Ordinary linear regression model is appropriate because of the non-interval or non-categorical nature of the dependent variable and the spacing of the outcome choice cannot be assumed to be uniform.

CD production function is one of the most widely used functions in the economic analysis of problems related to empirical productivity estimation in agriculture and industry. Many empirical studies including (Moock, 1976: cited in Addis *et al*., 2000) have employed the CD form of production function to measure agricultural productivity. The sum of elasticities of output with respect to the relative inputs also provides the returns to scale of the parameters. Although this function has other advantages in that it shows diminishing marginal return, it involves some limitations. One of the limitations of the CD production function is that the elasticity of substitution between factor inputs is restricted to unity.

To analyze the econometric model, the basic assumptions were needed to be tested. Existence of multicolinearity among the independent variables was conducted. Hence, Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for continuous explanatory variables and Contingency coefficient (CC) for discrete or dummy explanatory variables. Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) techniques were employed to detect the problem of multicollinearity for the continuous explanatory variables because VIF is common way of detecting problem of multicollinearity for the continuous explanatory variables. The VIF result revealed that there was no multicolinearity problem among the independent variables, which is less than 10 showing that there is no existence of a perfect or exact linear relationship among some or all explanatory variables of a Cobb- Douglas model and the CC value is less than 0.5 indicating that there is weak association between variables.

Results and Discussion

Household Characteristics: The survey result revealed that the average age of house hold head (HHH) was 47.34 years. The sampled HHH age was observed between 25 to 74 years (SD of 13.12). In relation to the gender of the HHH characteristics, from the total interviewed farmers, 7.1% of them were female headed and the remaining 92.9% were male headed households with the overall mean age of the sampled HHH is about 40.3 years. The result of the study was in line with Zewdie (2010) who reported that 93% and 7% of livestock farmers were male and female headed households, respectively. The probable reason for less number of female headed households involved in the study area was due to cultural issues that forced females into early marriage due to economic reasons. Educational status of the HHH showed that the minimum and maximum years in education were 1 and 12 years with mean and standard deviation 4.25, 3.46 respectively. The higher rate of literacy in the study area has the benefit of accepting and adopting new technologies more rapidly than farmers with lower educational status. Willingness to accept and implement trainings offered from different concerned bodies were another major benefit of literacy among farm households in the study area which helps more production and productivity (Zewdie, 2010; Ekwe and Nwachukwu, 2006 and Ofukou *et al.,* 2009).

Number of livestock owned by the sampled households: Livestock is one of the major assets for small holder farmers with the role of source of food, power for cultivation, threshing and transportation. In addition, as Zinash, 2015 indicated, livestock also reared for security purpose in time of crop failure since they are seen as "near cash" in the selected study area and providing manure for farm yard which helps improving soil fertility. The majority of survey respondents (90%) of them keep livestock and these include cattle, ruminants/shoats such as goats and sheep, and equines and donkeys. The survey result indicated that farmers in the study area have 211 TLU, 28.75 TLU, 78.75 TLU, 127 TLU, 4.03 TLU, 25.6 TLU, and 57.4 TLU of cow, calf, heifer, oxen, sheep, goat, and donkey, respectively. The most dominant species of livestock in the study area was cow followed by oxen; the cow might mainly be used as source of milking and greater number of oxen may be due to the need for draft power.

Major Constraints of Livestock Production in the Study Area: Major bottlenecks of livestock production in the study area are: shortage of grazing land, lack of improved breed, scarcity of water during dry season, occurrence of diseases, lack of capital and artificial insemination (Table 2). According to the sampled

respondents, occurrence of diseases is the primary hindering factor for livestock production followed by shortage of grazing land. Livestock diseases mainly caused by internal and external parasites and antrax are reported as the major diseases of livestock in the study area. Expansion of crop land due to increase in number of population number is a prime factor for shortage of grazing land, which is the second livestock constraint indicated during the study. Shortage of capital improved breed, scarcity of water and shortage of artificial insemination, were major livestock bottlenecks identified in the study area, respectively.

Table 2: Description of major constraint to livestock production in the study area

Constraints	Respondents		Rank
	Number	Percent	
Shortage of Grazing Land	21	21.21	2nd
Lack of improved breed	12	12.12	4th
Water scarcity during dry season	11	11.11	5th
Disease	31	31.31	1st
Lack of capital	17	17.17	3rd
Lack of artificial insemination	7	7.07	6th
Total	99	100	

Source, Owen Survey (2017)

Opportunities for Livestock Production in the Study Area: Even though livestock production have the importance of serving as intermediate food, draught power, wealth status and cash source, the production level is not utilized as potential. As a major opportunities identified in livestock production in the study area, out of 99 respondents in the study area, 27%, 25%, 22%, 13% and 12% of the respondents reported that availability of veterinary supply, input access, mixed crop production system, access to credit service and feed availability were the major opportunities for livestock production in study area**.**

Table 3: Description of opportunities of livestock production of the sampled household

Opportunities for livestock production in the study area	Respondents		Rank
	Number	Percent	
Feed availability	12	12.12	5th
Credit service	13	13.13	4th
Veterinary supply	27	27.27	1st
Availability of input	25	25.25	2nd
Mixed crop-livestock system	22	22.22	3rd
Total	99	100	

Source Owen survey (2017)

Econometric Model Results (Determinants of Livestock Production)

Table 4: Econometric parameters estimation results of Cobb-Douglas production function

Variables	Coefficient	Standard Error	T- ratio
Constant	1.6595	0.457	3.63
SexHH	0.0399	0.153	0.26
LS-DIS	0.042	0.069	-0.62
lnEduHH	0.074	0.045	1.64
VETAC	0.255**	0.3	2.55
LS-BRT	-0.289**	0.2012	-2.07
IFR	0.079	0.085	0.94
AI	0.038	0.127	0.3
lnCP	0.669***	0.155	4.29
lnAgeHH	-0.032	0.124	-0.26
lnLB	0.260***	0.064	4.03
lnAGL	0.360***	0.111	3.23
LnAV-EXS	0.395***	0.107	3.69
lnDTWS	-0.048	0.075	-0.64
LnDST-LSM	0.034	0.066	0.51

Number observation= 99

R^2= 0.7297

Adjusted R^2= 0.688

***, ** and * are significant at 1%, 5% and 10% probability level respectively.

Source: Model Output, 2017

The OLS method was applied to the log transformed values. Cobb-Douglass production analysis shows that six out of fourth independent variables included in the models significantly determine livestock production in the study area. Hence, sex household, capital, labor, educational level of household head, age of the household head, availability of grazing land, livestock breed type, distance to livestock market, distance by livestock to water source, artificial insemination, availability of infrastructure, veterinary service, livestock disease and extension contact services are the independent variables assumed to explain the dependent variable using the specified model. However, it doesn't mean that the variables included are exhaustive.

As indicated in Table 4, the coefficient of determination (R2) and the adjusted R2 values are 0.7297 and 0.688, respectively. It means that about 72.97% of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables, indicating relatively high explanatory power (goodness of fit) of the model. The regression analysis result reveals that most of the coefficients of the explanatory variables included in the model have positive sign. The positive sign of the coefficients indicates that the explanatory variables influence the dependent variable positively. However, the level of significance varies from one independent variable to the other.

Out of these 14 explanatory variables, only 6 variables are found to be significantly affecting' household livestock production. Those variables which are considered as important determinants of livestock as per the analysis result are (labor, Extension contact service, capital, grazing land, veterinary service, breeding type) are statistically significant at 1 and 5% significance level. Discussions on the statistically significant independent variables are as under

Extension contact: the estimated coefficient of this variable supports the proposed hypothesis and it is significance at 1 per cent level of significance. Other being constant a one-unit increase in extension contact household livestock production increases by 0.395 units. This is true by expanding and encouraging the household participation rate for the use of extension program is still important for the livestock production enhancement since the extension user households are more productive than non-user. This is consistent with the finding by (Alemayehu Reda *et al*., 2006).

Number of labor used in production: - the estimated coefficient of this variable supports the proposed hypothesis and it is significance at 1 per cent level of significance, other factors being constant. This implies that a 1% increase in family labor, smallholder livestock production increases by 0.260%. One known reason behind this is that, the rural household of Ethiopia uses more family labor than hired labor in their livestock production processes. As a result having more family labor with in a household would be able to a high possibility of livestock management work like timely keeping increasing livestock production.

Livestock Breed Type (LS _BRT):-Breed type here refers to adoption of improved livestock breed types by the households. It is assumed that improved breeds are more necessary for livestock production. The regression model analysis reveals that livestock breed type in the study area found to have a negative relationship with livestock production. The estimated coefficient of this variable contradicts the proposed hypothesis and was significant at 5% level. As supply of improved breed increases 1%, livestock production decreases by 0.289%. Therefore, the implication of the result of the analysis is that as the smallholder farmers adopt improved livestock breed types means that mainly depend on the improving the quality and performance of livestock rather than increasing number of livestock they have.

Availability of Grazing Land (AV_GL): -Availability of grazing land is one of the most figurative constraints of smallholder farmers in the study area. According to the results of interview grazing land in the study area is administered by communal mode. More appreciably, the result of regression model coincided with the above result from descriptive analysis. The econometric model analysis result reveals that availability of grazing land as hypothesized has a positive relationship with the level of livestock production. The relationship between livestock production and availability of grazing land is significant at 1% level of significance. Other factors being constant as availability of grazing land increases by one unit of hectare, livestock production increases by 0.36 units. This is true as farmers have more grazing land and more likely to produce livestock. The implication of the analysis result is that grazing pasture is major inputs for livestock production in the study area. Sufficient grazing resources will be initiate farmers to have more number of livestock.

Veterinary service: The econometric model analysis result reveals that the estimated coefficient of this variable supports the proposed hypothesis and it is significance at 5% level of significance. As availability of veterinary service increases 1%, livestock production of small holder farmer increase by 0.36%. The implication of the analysis result is that veterinary service is an input for the health of livestock production, hence increases number of livestock production.

Capital: -The econometric model analysis result reveals that the estimated coefficient of this variable supports the proposed hypothesis and it is significance at 1% level of significance. Coefficient estimated capital of household have is 0.669 with respect to livestock production, other factors being constant as capital of household head increase in one unit of birr, with estimated 0.669 unit increase in livestock production in the study area. This is true that capital is an important for enhancement of inputs like veterinary service, improved breed, and

extension service that increases livestock production.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The descriptive analysis result showed that, in the study area, the major constraints hindering the livestock production system were: livestock disease, lack of artificial insemination, lack of improved breed, shortage of grazing land and lack of infrastructure. Availability of veterinary supply, input access, mixed crop production system, access to credit service and feed availability were the major opportunities for livestock production in study area**.** Cobb-Douglas production function model analysis was carried out by using Stata version 13 in order to analyze major factors affecting livestock production in the selected study area. The regression analysis result revealed that from the hypothesized 14 explanatory variables, only 6 variables, namely: Labor, capital, availability of extension contact, and availability of grazing land are found to be statistically significant at 1 and 5% level of significance in affecting farmer's livestock production. To this effect, the study suggested that future interventions should be taken in the following areas: improving the local animal breed potential by selection and crossbreeding, identifying and controlling animal diseases in order to avoid frequently bans and increasing supply through increasing the veterinary vaccination and providing veterinary medicines at reasonable prices, expanding infrastructural developments in order to raise flow of livestock, processing and marketing and due consideration should be given in training the farmers in haymaking and feed conservation practices.

REFERENCE

ADBoARD (Assosa District Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development). 2012. District Annual Report of Benishangul Gumuz Regional State, Ethiopia.

ADBoARD (Assosa District Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development). 2013. Assosa District Agriculture and Rural Development Office, Annual Report. Assosa, Ethiopia.

Ayele Solomon, Assegid Workalemahu, M.A. Jabar M.M. Ahmed and Belachew Hurissa. 2003. Livestock marketing in Ethiopia, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Benishangul Gumuz Region Agricultural Bureau, 2016: Annual Report, Unpublished Annual Report, Assosa, Ethiopia.

BoFED. 2007. Regional Atlas of Benishangul Gumuz Region, Assosa, Ethiopia

CSA (Central Statistical Agency). 2007. Livestock and Livestock Characteristics, Agricultural Sample Survey. Volume II, Statistical Bulletin, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

CSA (Central Statistical Agency). 2010. Agricultural Sample Survey 2009/10, volume II Report on Livestock and Livestock Characteristics, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Ekwe, K. C., and I. Nwachukwu. 2006. Influence of Household Factors on the Utilization of Improved Garri Processing Technology in southern Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Extension.

Gujarati, D. 1995. Basic Econometrics.4th edition, New Delhi, Graw-Hill Publishers.

Kedija, H., Azage, T., Mohammed, Y. and Berhanu, G. 2008. Traditional cow and camel milk production and marketing in agro-pastoral and mixed crop-livestock systems: The case of Mieso District, Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia.

NMSA (National Meteorology Service Agency). 2014. Assosa, Station Meteorology Report. Assosa, Ethiopia.

Ofukou, A. U., E. O. and Enujeke, E.C. 2009. Integrated Pest Management (IPM). Adoption among Farmers in Central Agro-ecological Zone of Delta State, Nigeria. Advances in Biological Research.

Yamane T. (1967). Statistics: An Introductory Analysis, 2nd Ed, New York, USA.

Zewdie Wondatir. 2010. Livestock Production Systems in Relation with Feed Availability in the Highlands and Central Rift Valley of Ethiopia. MSc Thesis, Haromaya University, Ethiopia.

Zinash Worku. 2015. Assessment of Livestock Production Practises And Feed Resources in Peri Urban and rural Areas of Sekota District In waghimra Zone, Ethiopia. MSc thesis, Haramaya University, Ethiopia.