The Pharma Innovation Journal 2020; SP-9(4): 152-154

www.ThePharmaJournal.com

The Pharma Innovation

ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.03
TPI 2020; SP-9(4): 152-154

www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 13-02-2020
Accepted: 17-03-2020

Lok Prakash Verma
M.V.Sc. Scholar, Department of Veterinary and Animal Husbandry Extension, GBPUAT, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, India

D Suryam Dora
Subject Matter Specialist, Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Chhattisgarh, India

Neetu Sonkar
MVSc. Scholar, Livestock Production and Management Department, College of Veterinary Science & A. H., Chhattisgarh Kamdhenu Vishwavidyalaya, Anjora, Durg, Chhattisgarh, India

Chandraprakash Verma
M.Sc. Scholar, Department of Agronomy, Indra Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur, Chhattishgarh, India

Corresponding Author:
Lok Prakash Verma
M.V.Sc. Scholar, Department of Veterinary and Animal Husbandry Extension, GBPUAT, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, India

Impact of socio-economic factors on backyard Kadaknath chicken farming in Kanker district of Chhattisgarh

Lok Prakash Verma, D Suryam Dora, Neetu Sonkar and Chandraprakash Verma

Abstract
Kadaknath farming is like cash crop in livestock sector. Disease resistant, hardy nature, low input, fetches high price with more demand in market made Kadaknath rearing a profitable farming. Socio economic profile of farmers has greater effect on farming. Data of 81 farmers of 13 villages of cankers district is collected in interview schedule and categories in small medium and large groups based on bird numbers. Result of study reveals that in social profile majority of farmers has male in middle age with high school level education, Hindu, schedule tribes, other backward class and schedule caste. Study of Economic profile reveals that majority has small land, mixed house and high experience in Kadaknath faming. It's all concluded that socio- economic profile affect numbers of bird at starting sustaining of farming.

Keywords: Kadaknath, socio-economic profile, Kanker, back yard

Introduction
Livestock production in general and chickens in particular play important socio-economic roles in developing countries [1]. Livestock production in general and chickens in particular play important socio-economic roles in developing countries [1].The development are not only in size but also in productivity and quality. The impacts and contributions of extensive and small-scale scavenging poultry production systems in rural, varies from more intensive systems in urbanized settings. Rural backyard poultry plays an important role in poverty alleviation by means of income generation and household food security [2]. Provision of animal protein, generation of extra cash incomes and religious/cultural considerations are amongst the major reasons for possession village chickens by rural communities. The past researches reported that education, age, land, farm experience and reach to credit related with farming production and profit so, present study was carried out to study the socio-economic profile Kadaknath farmers.

Material and Method
The present study was conducted in 13 villages of Kanker district of Chhattisgarh state. Structured interview schedule used for primary data collection. The research design adopted for this study was of ex-post-facto in nature since the phenomenon has already occurred [3] **.**purposive random sampling used for selection of more than 30 bird holding farmers. The schedule was prepared maintaining relevance with the objectives of the study. The selected farms were categorized as small, medium and large as per bird capacity viz., 40 – 66 birds, 67 -93 birds and 94 -120 birds respectively [4]. The data were put on the excel sheet in Microsoft Office Excel 2007 and were arranged and analyzed from tables of Excel.

Table 1: Socio economic status of Kadaknath farmer

Particulars	Low (40-66) (47)	Medium (67-93)(28)	High (94-120)(6)
Age			
Young (up to 30)	0	0	**0**
Middle (31-45	28(59.57)	27(96.42)	6(100)
Old(46-60)	19(40.42)	1(3.57)	Z
Gender			
Male	47(100)	28(100)	6(100)
Female	0	0	0
Religion			
Hindu	47(100)	28(100)	6(100)
Muslim	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
Caste			
Other	0	0	0
OBC	14(29.78)	20(71.43)	3(50)
SC	6(12.77)	3(10.71)	2(33.34)
ST	27(57.45)	5(17.86)	1(16.66)
Education			
Illiterate	0	0	0
Primary school	17(36.17)	3(10.71)	0
Middle school	12(25.53)	13(46.42)	1(16.66)
High school	18(38.29)	12(42.85)	5(83.34)
Higher secondary school	0	0	0
College	0	0	0
Family type			
Nucleolus	14(29.78)	9(32.14)	1(16.66)
Joint	33(70.21)	19(67.86)	5(83.34)
Family size			
Low (up to 6)	7(14.89)	4(14.29)	1(16.66)
Medium (7-12)	13(27.65)	8(28.57)	2(33.34)
Large (13-18)	27(57.44)	16(57.14)	3(50)
Economic Profile			
Total bird	2719	2130	620
Average bird	57.85	76.07	103.34
Landholding			
Marginal (<2.5 acre)	6(12.76)	3(10.71)	2(33.33)
Small (2.5 to 5 acre)	23(48.93)	19(67.86)	4(66.67)
Semi marginal (6 to 10 acre)	18(38.29)	6(21.43)	0
Medium (10 to 25 acre)	0	0	0
Large (>25 acre)	0	0	0
House type			
Kaccha 2			
Pucca 3	23(48.92)	18(64.29)	5(83.34)
Mixed	24(51.06)	10(35.71)	1(16.66)
Occupation			
Primary (Agriculture)	23 (48.93)	18(64.29)	5(83.34)
Business	24(51.06)	10(35.71)	1(16.66)
Subsidiary (Poultry)	47(100)	28(100)	6(100)
Farm experience in kadaknath rearing			
Low(0-2)	14 (29.78)	5(17.86)	0
High (3-4)	31 (65.95)	22(78.57)	3(50)
Medium(5-6)	2(4.2)	1(3.57)	3(50)
Loan	No	no	No

Results

Study of this Kadaknath farming deals with socio-economic status of Kadaknath farmers and also entertains its relation with Kadaknath farming. [Table 1]

Social Profile

Age: Study revealed that majority of farmers were middle age in group1 (59.57), group2 (96.42), and group3 (100) followed by old age (40.42, 3.57, 0) group. Data also showed that majority of famers had high experience in Kadaknath rearing. It's denoted that, in study area farmers started Kadaknath rearing at young age and also no new farmers introduced in this field. Farmers start Kadaknath farming after 30 year age [5]. It resembled with business nature of young India [6].

Gender: All farmers in all groups were male. Head of all Kadaknath farming family was male. Work divided between family members but major contributor was male.

Religion and Caste: All respondents were Hindu. Data of caste revealed that in group 1 majority of farmers were schedule tribes (57.45) followed by other backward class (29.78), and schedule caste (12.77). Group 2 had majority of other backward class (71.86) followed by schedule tribes (17.86) and schedule caste (10.71). Group 3 had majority of other backward class (50) followed by schedule caste (33.34) and schedule tribes (16.66). Study of caste statistics was important because it helps in the formulation and implementation of community and region based schemes.

Education: Study of education profile of farmers show that majority of famers had high level school education in group 1 (38.29), group 2(42.85), and group 3(83.34) followed by middle school level education in group 1(25.53), group2 (46.42) and group3 (16.66). Education reflects the awareness and thinking of people, schemes are more likely to succeed among the more educated community [4].

Family Type and Size: Majority of farmers lived in joint family in all groups (70.21, 67.86, 83.34) followed by nucleus type family therefore majority of respondent in all group had large of family size (57.44, 57.14, 50) followed by medium (27.65, 28.57, 33.34) and low (14.89, 14.29, 16.66) family size. It related to the existing work force for farming [7].

Economic Profile: Study of Economic profile of respondents revealed total and average number of goat, land holding, primary and secondary occupation, type of house, and source of credit that needed to start Kadaknath farming. Total bird in group 1, group2, and group3 were 2719, 2130 and 620 respectively. Average numbers of Kadaknath birds in group 1, group2, and group3 were57.85, 76.07 and 103.34 respectively [Table 1].

Land Holding: Study of land holding data revealed that farmers had 3 type of lands marginal, small and semi-marginal. Majority of group 1 farmers had small (48.93) lands followed by semi marginal (38.29) and marginal (12.76). Majority of Group 2 famers had small (67.86) followed by semi marginal (21.43) and marginal (10.71). Lastly group 3 hand only small (66.67) and marginal (33.33) type lands so, they need to rear more bird for income [8].

House Type: Majority of famers had mixed followed by pacca houses in all groups and all had kaccha poultry houses.

Occupation: Occupation reflects source of income to the farmers and it is 2 type primary and secondary occupation. Data of study revealed that as primary occupation majority of farmers had agriculture (48.93, 64.29, and 83.34) followed by different business (51.06, 35.71, and 16.66) and as subsidiary occupation all had Kadaknath farming [9], [10].

Experience: Majority of farmers had high experience in

group1 (65.95), group 2 (78.57) and group 3(50) followed by low (29.78, 17.86, 0) and middle (4.2, 3.57, 50) level of experience. The more experienced farming community has greater management efficiency which increases both Kadaknath farming and profit.

Loan: All farmers started Kadaknath farming without loan. They use their own money as seed capital. According to respondent loan and insurance procedure of poultry production is difficult and complex, so they were not motivated to barrowing money from bank.

Conclusion

The study was concluding that in all groups majority of respondents was middle age, male, Hindu, education until middle school, joint family and large family size with medium experience. Study of socio-economic concluded that majority of respondent had small and marginal land size. It`s shows that a universal policy and plan may not work for all the kadaknath farmers. So make policies that covered majority of population. Kadaknath farming improved farmers socio–economic status and also influence by it. The backyard poultry contributes nearly 30 per cent of the National egg production, is the most neglected one.

Reference

1. Alders RG, Pym RAE. World's Poultry Science Journal. Village poultry: still important to millions, eight thousand years after domestication. World's Poultry Science Journal. 2009; 65:181-190.
2. Abdelqader A, Wollny CBA, Gauly M. Characterization of local chicken production systems and their potential under different levels of management practice in Jordan, Tropical Animal Health and Production 2007; 39:155-164. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11250-007-9000-x
3. Sevilla CG, Ochave JA, Punsalan TG, Regala BP and Uriarte GG. Research methods. 3rd end, Rex Book store. 2007.
4. Deka P, Borgohain R, Deka B. Status and constraints of backyard Poultry farming amongst tribal community of Jorhat district in Assam. The Asian Journal of animal sciences. 2013; 8(2):86-91.
5. Kanwat M, Meena MS, Suresh Kumar P, Choudhary VK, Bhagawati R. Measurement of attitude towards the adoption of backyard poultry farming in Arunachal Pradesh. Journal of Agricultural Science. 2012; 4(3):86-99.
6. Jatto NA. Economics and social characteristics of registered poultry egg producers in Ilorin, Kwara state. Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Science, 2012, 11(11).
7. Singh CB, Jilani MH. Backyard poultry farming in Garhwal Himalayas. Indian J Poult. Sci. 2012; 40(2):195-198.
8. Mandal MK, Khandekar N, Khandekar P. Backyard poultry farming in Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh, India: An analysis. Livestock Research for Rural Development. 2006; 18(7):20-39.
9. Bikash B, Hazarika P, Saharia KK. Socioeconomic and psychological status of poultry farmers in Dibrugarh district of Assam. Indian J Field Vet. 2010; 5(4):67-69.
10. Saha D. Status of rural poultry production in North 24 Parganas district of West Bengal M.V.Sc. Thesis, Division of Extension Education, IVRI, Izatnagar, 2003.