



Edgar Sebastián Villagra (Autor)

Does product diversification lead to sustainable development of smallholder production systems in Northern Patagonia, Argentina?

Tropical Animal Breeding and Husbandry
Georg-August-Universität Göttingen



Does product diversification lead to sustainable development of smallholder production systems in Northern Patagonia, Argentina?



Edgar Sebastián Villagra



Cuvillier Verlag Göttingen

<https://cuvillier.de/de/shop/publications/2672>

Copyright:

Cuvillier Verlag, Inhaberin Annette Jentzsch-Cuvillier, Nonnenstieg 8, 37075 Göttingen, Germany

Telefon: +49 (0)551 54724-0, E-Mail: info@cuvillier.de, Website: <https://cuvillier.de>

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| List of Tables | iv |
| List of Figures | vi |
| List of Abbreviations | vii |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Literature review | 4 |
| 2.1 Introduction of sheep in Patagonia | 4 |
| 2.2 Importance of sheep in the Patagonia settlement | 4 |
| 2.3 The smallholder livestock production system | 7 |
| 2.3.1 Sheep production | 7 |
| 2.3.2 Goat and cattle production | 10 |
| 2.4 Constraints on sustainable development of livestock production systems | 11 |
| 2.4.1 Economic constraints | 11 |
| 2.4.2 Social constraints | 12 |
| 2.4.3 Environmental constraints | 12 |
| 2.5 Farm diversification to increase sustainability | 17 |
| 2.5.1 Definitions of farm diversification | 17 |
| 2.5.2 Diversification as a strategy | 18 |
| 2.5.3 Farm diversification | 19 |
| 2.5.4 What can we learn from previous farm diversification studies? | 21 |
| 2.5.5 Ecological consequences of farm diversification | 22 |
| 2.6 Economic and institutional environment | 24 |
| 2.7 Justification and hypothesis | 26 |
| 3. Material and methods | 28 |
| 3.1 On-farm research | 28 |
| 3.1.1 Research area | 28 |
| 3.1.2 Climate and vegetation | 29 |
| 3.1.3 Selection of households | 32 |
| 3.1.4 Data collection | 33 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 3.2 Data processing and analysis | 34 |
| 3.2.1 Cost–benefit analysis | 34 |
| 3.2.2 Net returns per unit of most limiting constraint | 35 |
| 3.2.3 Animal records | 37 |
| 3.2.4 Animal Production | 38 |
| 3.2.5 Grassland evaluation | 40 |
| 3.2.5.1 Vegetation census | 40 |
| 3.2.5.2 Grassland status indicators | 42 |
| 3.2.6 Statistical analysis | 46 |
| 4. Results | 48 |
| 4.1 Characterisation of the production systems | 48 |
| 4.2 Socio-economic analysis | 54 |
| 4.2.1 Major characteristics of the households | 54 |
| 4.2.2 Cost-benefit analysis | 55 |
| 4.2.3 Returns to production factors | 57 |
| 4.2.4 Productivity according to livestock specie | 61 |
| 4.2.5 Interrelationship between productivity and income | 68 |
| 4.3 Ecological analysis | 72 |
| 4.4 Relationship between animal and grassland production | 76 |
| 5. Discussion | 81 |
| 5.1 Characterisation of the production systems | 81 |
| 5.2 Socioeconomic analysis | 82 |
| 5.2.1 Cost benefit analysis | 82 |
| 5.2.2 Returns to labor | 83 |
| 5.2.3 The role of wool | 84 |
| 5.2.4 The role of goats | 86 |
| 5.2.5 The role of cattle | 91 |
| 5.2.6 The role of horses | 93 |
| 5.3 Ecological analysis | 94 |
| 5.4 Relationship between animal and grassland production | 96 |
| 5.5 The role of the “Programa Ganadero” | 99 |

| | |
|------------------|-----|
| 6. Conclusions | 100 |
| 7. Summary | 101 |
| 8. References | 105 |
| Acknowledgements | 120 |