



Social Sustainability in Dairy Industry: A Case Study in Vishaka Dairy

Gedela Rakesh Varma

Research Scholar,

**Department of Commerce and Management Studies,
Andhra University,
Visakhapatnam-530003.**

Prof. Jaladi Ravi

Professor,

**Department of Commerce and Management Studies,
Andhra University,
Visakhapatnam-530003.**

Abstract:

Dairy is a worldwide agricultural production. People milk dairy animals exist almost in every country around the world, and up to one billion people live on dairy farms. It is a important part of the global food system and it plays a important role in the sustainability of rural areas in particular. It is a widely-known fact that the dairy sector directly contributes to the economies of a number of communities, regions and countries. social sustainability is process in the community to develop techniques and systems which not only meet the requirements of its current members but also support the ability of future generations to maintain a healthy community. Social sustainability is a quality of our societies. It shows the nature-society relationships, mediated by work, as well as relationships within the society. The main objective of this paper is to study the strategies of vishaka dairy for social sustainability.

Key words:

Social sustainability, society development, dairy industry.

Preface:

Dairy is a worldwide agricultural production. people milk dairy animals exist almost in every country around the world, and up to one billion people live on dairy farms. It is a important part of the global food system and it plays a important role in the sustainability of rural areas in particular.

It is a widely-known fact that the dairy sector directly contributes to the economies of a number of communities, regions and countries. An increasing demand worldwide is noticeably emerging at present, and the industry is globalizing, thus increasing the scope and intensity of the global dairy trade. Social sustainability is the practice of creating a quality and equitable society that successfully meets the basic social needs of people. Basic, however, is a broad word in this framework mainly because there are very many things we all require daily, continuously, or as-needed Social Resources such as welfare, community programs, governance, democracy, politics, justice, solidarity. Equal Opportunity such as equity, employment, income, education, housing, voting rights, labor rights. Diversity in community, pluralism, cultural education, appreciation, interaction, integration.

Review of Literature:

There is general agreement that the different dimensions of sustainable development (e.g. social, economic, environmental and institutional) have not been equally prioritised by policy makers within the sustainability discourse [Drakakis Smith, 1995].is is mainly because sustainable development was born out of the synergy between the emerging environmental movement of the 1960s and the 'basic need' advocates of the 1970s, but also because assessing the intangible nature of social aspects of development presents measurement quandaries, which will be discussed later.



As a result, there is limited literature that focuses on social sustainability to the extent that a comprehensive study of this concept is still missing. Indeed, Littig and Grießler (2005) argue that approaches to the social sustainability concept have not been grounded on theory but rather on a practical understanding of plausibility and current political agendas. In addition, a recent study by the OECD (2001) points out that social sustainability is currently dealt with in connection with the social implications of environmental politics rather than as an equally constitutive component of sustainable development. These fragmented approaches to social sustainability are also criticised by Metzner (2000) who contends that social sciences and social policy research have developed a plethora of social objective strategies and measurement instruments, but with little regard for the sustainability perspective. In fact, while there exists abundant social research studies and policy documents, these have rarely been integrated into the sustainability framework.

Even when cross-discipline approaches have been attempted, covering for example the environmental and the social dimensions of sustainable development within the 'ecological footprint' concept (Reed and Wackernagel, 1996), it can be argued that such endeavours have only been partially framed within an integrated approach to sustainability. As a result, the concept of social sustainability has been under-theorised or often oversimplified in existing theoretical constructs and there have been very few attempts to define social sustainability as an independent dimension of sustainable development. For these reasons, it can be argued that the relationships between the different dimensions of sustainable development or indeed between 'sustainabilities' are still very much unclear. For example, Assefa and Frostell, 2007 contend that social sustainability is the finality of development whilst economic and environmental sustainabilities are both the goals of sustainable development and instruments to its achievement.

Similarly, Hardoy et al (1992) dispute interpretations according to which social sustainability is defined purely as the social conditions necessary to support environmental sustainability. Furthermore, no consensus seems to exist on what criteria and perspectives should be adopted in defining social sustainability. Each author or policy maker derives their own definition according to discipline-specific criteria or study perspective, making a generalised definition difficult to achieve. Littig and Grießler (2005: 72) emphasise the importance of both 'work', which is a traditional anchor concept in the German sustainability discourse, and 'needs' as defined by the Bruntland Commission (1987). Similarly, Biart (2002: 6) highlights the importance of social requirements for the sustainable development of societies. Despite the confusion over the meaning of social capital, his approach emphasises the importance of 'time-frames' and 'social conditions' for the long term functioning of societal systems.

However, in his analysis there is no reference to the physical environment, allowing for the traditional criticism that sociology has often suffered from a neglect of the physical and non-social realm (Omann and Spangenberg, 2002). A more comprehensive definition of social sustainability with a special focus on urban environments is provided by Polese and Stren (2000: 15-16). They emphasise the economic (development) and social (civil society, cultural diversity and social integration) dimensions of sustainability between development and social disintegration intrinsic to the concept of sustainable development. However, they also acknowledge the importance of the physical environment (e.g. housing, urban design and public spaces) within the urban sustainability debate. Within the context of urban areas, other authors also maintain that social sustainability interpretations emphasising social equity and justice may assist cities in evolving to become 'good' places by facilitating a fairer distribution of resources and a long term vision (Ansell and Compton-Fawcett, 2008).



Similarly, from a housing and built environment perspective, Chiu (2003) identifies three main approaches to the interpretation of social sustainability. first interpretation equates social sustainability to environmental sustainability. As a result, the social sustainability of an activity depends upon specific social relations, customs, structure and value, representing the social limits and constraints of development. second interpretation, which she labels 'environment-oriented', refers to the social preconditions required to achieve environmental sustainability. According to this interpretation, social structure, values and norms can be changed in order to carry out human activities within the physical limits of the planet. Lastly, the third 'people-oriented', interpretation refers to improving the well-being of people and the equitable distribution of resources whilst reducing social exclusions and destructive conflict. In her study of the social sustainability of housing, Chiu (2003) adopts the second and third approach to demonstrate how social preconditions, social relations, housing quality and equitable distribution of housing resources and assets are key components of sustainable housing development.

Need for the Study:

The visakha dairy had adopted social sustainable policies to promote Social and ecological transformation which is must for environmental and social well-being So, this study has made an attempt to provide effectiveness and activities of social sustainability in visakha dairy.

Objective:

The main objective of this paper is to study the social sustainability in dairy industry in visakha dairy.

Methodology:

This paper mainly based on secondary data. The articles which are published in the area of in social sustainability in dairy industry have collected for the study and from website of visakha dairy.

Visakha Dairy is not only concentrating on the farmer's cattle welfare but more equally giving priority for the welfare of farmer families in different dynamics like health, education, socio economic measures In this process Visakha Dairy Chairman Sri Adari Tulasi Rao established Welfare Trust in 1989 name as Milk Producers and Employee's Education Health and Medical Welfare Trust (MP & EEH & MW Trust). The main aim of the Trust is to extend Medical Health and Educational facilities particularly to farmers and their families. In this direction the trust has established a modern hospital fully equipped with the latest technology and employed specialist and super specialists. Further, it has established schools and colleges for rural poor and farmer's children. The Trust's activities are being carried out in 8.25 acres of land in the vicinity of city of Visakhapatnam. Various social welfare activities have been undertaken since it's establishment. These activities have been applauded by various Government officials, Chief Ministers, Parliamentarians, Ministers and other Public Figures.

HEALTH:

Krishi Trust Hospital is one of the most well equipped and best Medical Trust Hospitals in the Green City of Visakhapatnam. The Hospital is a 450 bedded modern multi – speciality cum critical care referral hospital. To give the patient best care round the clock, The hospital is fully infrastructured with Hi-Tech equipment of world class quality to provide best medical care. Krishi Trust Hospital is situated in a quiet and serene place in Sheelanagar away from the noise and pollution of the city.

EDUCATION:

Trust provides the residential educational facility with subsidised rates for visakha dairy milk producers and employees childrens & general public also. It provides free education to orphans recommended by the local village heads as well as to children who are below poverty level. Providing Education from Primary Level to Junior College & Nursing Collage.



Computer education is provided from 3rd class onwards. We have Residential facility for 300 Students. We believe in value based education, Our teacher student ratio is 1:25 in true spirit. Our students are disciplined and hard working, so every year the school gets good results in the general public exams . Our aim is to impart qualitative education. There is a well equipped Laboratory, Library, Multi Media Computer Lab. We have a playground with sports facilities. Our Students are selected for national sports, and sports academy in Andhra Pradesh.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC MEASURES:

Various social welfare activities have been taken up by the Trust. Among the other activities, the Trust has provided drinking water to rural poor by digging Bore Wells in villages and arranging water channels for farmers by digging old and new reservoirs, and also constructed bridges on rivers, where crossing rivers were impossible for rural people in rainy season. Major task of the Trust is identifying, training, providing employment to weaker sections who are not having any support from the society. Hither the Trust has provided employment directly and indirectly to more than 1000 people. Providing Employment to Physically Handicapped, every Year by Conducting interviews with cooperation of visakha dairy. Providing employment to women, who are physically abused by their family and who have no other source of living. Providing hearing aids to deserving deaf people after a thorough check-up by the concerned physicians, providing wheel chairs to the physically handicapped people.

Conclusion:

The first six of the UN Global Compact's principles focus on this social dimension of corporate sustainability, of which human rights is the cornerstone. Our work on social sustainability also covers the human rights of specific groups: labour, women's empowerment and gender equality, children, indigenous peoples, people with disabilities, as well as

people-centered approaches to business impacts on poverty. As well as covering groups of rights holders, social sustainability encompasses issues that affecting them, for example, education and health. as vishaka dairy implements some of the sustainable factors health, poverty, socio economic measures in their organisation and maintain social sustainability.

References:

- Ancell S. and Thompson-Fawcett (2008), *Social Sustainability of Medium Density housing: A Conceptual model and Christchurch Case Study*, *Housing Studies*,(23):3, 423-442
- Assefa G. and Frostell B., (2007), *Social Sustainability and Social Acceptance in technology Assessment: A Case Study of Energy Technologies*, *Technologies in Society* (29): 63-78
- Baines J. and Morgan B., (2004), 'Sustainability Appraisal: A Social Perspective' In *Sustainability Appraisal. A Review Of International Experience And Practice*, Dalal-Clayton B And Sadler B, (Eds), First Draft of Work in Progress, International Institute for Environment and Development, London
- Barrow, C. J., (2000), *Social Impact Assessment. An Introduction*, Arnold, London
- Biart, M. (2002) 'Social sustainability as part of the social agenda of the European community', in Ritt, T. (Ed.): *Soziale Nachhaltigkeit: Von der Umwelt politik zur Nachhaltigkeit? Arbeiter kammer Wien*, Informationen zur Umweltpolitik 149, Wien, pp.5-10
- Bramley, G., Dempsey, N., Power, S. and Brown, C., (2006) What is 'Social Sustainability' and How do our Existing Urban Forms Perform in Nurturing it?, Paper presented at the 'Sustainable Communities and Green Futures' Conference, Bartlett School of Planning, University College London, London.



Chiu R. L. H., (2003, Social Sustainability, Sustainable Development and and Housing Development: the Experience of Hong Kong, in Forrest R. and Lee J. (Eds), Housing and Social Change: East-West perspectives, Routledge, London

Colantonio, A., (2007) Social Sustainability: An Exploratory Analysis of its Definition, Assessment Methods, Metrics and Tools, OISD (EIB) WP No 1

Koning, J., (2001), Social Sustainability in a Globalizing World. Context, theory and Methodology Explored, paper prepared for the UNESCO/MOST Meeting, 22-23 November 2001, The Hague, the Netherlands

Pope J., (2007), Sustainability Assessment as a Deliberative Learning Process, presentation at Sustainability Conference, University of Madras, Chennai, India, 4-7 January

Saunders A. M. and Therivel R. (2006), Sustainability Integration and Assessment, Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management Vol 8, (3): 281-298

Sheate W. R., Rosario do Partidario M., Byron H., Bina O. and Dagg S., (2008), Sustainability Assessment of Future Scenarios: Methodology and Application to Mountain Areas of Europe, Environmental management (41): 282-299

therivel, R. (2004) Sustainable Urban Environment- Metrics, Models and Toolkits-Analysis of Sustainability/social tools, Levett-Therivel, Oxford

vishakadairy website