



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2021; SP-10(10): 747-750
© 2021 TPI
www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 04-08-2021
Accepted: 06-09-2021

Lekhu Kumar
Krishi Vigyan Kendra,
Banswara, MPUAT, Udaipur,
Rajasthan, India

Bheroo Singh Bhati
Krishi Vigyan Kendra,
Banswara, MPUAT, Udaipur,
Rajasthan, India

The study on socio-economic status of backyard poultry Rearers in Banswara district of Rajasthan

Lekhu Kumar and Bheroo Singh Bhati

Abstract

The current research was conducted on Socio-Economic Status of Backyard Poultry Rearers in Banswara District of Rajasthan, three blocks of Banswara district i.e. Abapura, Banswara and Kushalgarh were selected for the study purpose. Three villages were selected from the each identified block. 15 farmers from every village were randomly selected for a study of 135 respondents. The examination revealed that all the selected farmers belong to tribe of Hindu religion and 55.56 per cent recipients live in joint families. The recipients were mostly having 4-6 members in their family (65.93 per cent). The literacy rate of whole family was 73.15 per cent and maximum farmers depend on agriculture plus animal husbandry profession (77.04) and living in mixed type houses (53.33). Most of the farmers (54.07 per cent) had 1-2 ha land followed by (35.56 per cent) less than 1 ha land, poultry species predilection by the farmers was supreme (61.48 per cent).

Keywords: Backyard poultry, banswara and socio-economic

Introduction

The livestock sector is one of the fastest growing parts of the agricultural economy. The growth and transformation of the sector offer opportunities for agricultural development, poverty reduction and food security gains. Livestock contribute 40 per cent of the global value of agricultural output and support the livelihoods and food safety of nearly a 1.3 billion people (Anonymous, 2019) [1]. Livestock plays a major role in Indian economy. About 20.5 million population depend upon livestock for their livelihood. Livestock contributed 16 per cent to the economy of small farm households as against an average of 14 per cent for entirely rural households. Livestock provides livelihood to about 65 per cent of rural community as well as employment to about 8.8 per cent of the Indian population. This sector contributes 4.11 per cent GDP and contributes 25.6 per cent of total agriculture GDP (Anonymous, 2018-19) [1]. Poultry is also a major part of livestock production in India. Poultry sector contributes about 36 per cent of total meat production in India (Anonymous, 2018-19) [1]. The paying causes for this quicker progress rate are constant increase in demand of poultry products, developed genetic potential of the birds owing to continuous and accurate selection and breeding strategies, improvement in management practices as well as health cover and availability of the quality balanced feed. Indian poultry business is better planned and is succeeding towards renovation. The comparative share of poultry in the national economy has persisted below 1 per cent, but its share in the livestock sector is continuously rising. India ranks 3rd in egg production and 5th in meat production in the world. The Backyard poultry are birds having desirable plumage colour with high performance compare to local indigenous birds with very small change in husbandry practice i.e. followed for the indigenous fowl, crossbreds, produced using exotic breeds are being used for backyard poultry farming (Das *et al.*, 2008, Padhi *et al.*, 2012) [4, 7]. Cross breeding is widely used commercial production as a means of exploiting heterosis when the desired phenotype is a combination of existing breeds to impose the efficiency of the operation through the use of elite sire and dam lines.

Materials and Methods

The present study was carried out by the Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Banswara district of Rajasthan. Banswara district is situated in the south region of Rajasthan. Three block i.e. Abapura, Banswara and Kushalgarh were selected for the investigation. Three villages were selected from the each identified block and total nine villages were selected on the basis of backyard poultry bird availability in the villages. Fifteen respondents from every village were randomly selected and a total number of 135 farmers were investigated for current research.

Corresponding Author
Lekhu Kumar
Krishi Vigyan Kendra,
Banswara, MPUAT, Udaipur,
Rajasthan, India

Data were collected with the help of a semi structured interview schedule and through observation. Before the conduction of interview and collections of data from respondents, particular objectives and the determination of the study was explicitly explained to the farmers. The question in the tool were offered to them in their individual understanding and Hindi confirming that they got the queries properly so as to escape any interpretational disparity of the query by the farmers. The answerers obtained from respondents were documented and only single respondent was questioned at a time. Data so collected, tabulated and analyzed as per standard statistical procedures of Snedecor and Cochran (1994)

Results and Discussion

Family Status

The family status with regards to caste, religion, type and family size, education, main profession, house type, land and animal capitals of the selected farmers was taken for the investigation purpose and is concise as follows Most of the nominated defendants belong to schedule cast and schedule tribe of Hindu religion. The results indicated (Table 1) that 85.19 per cent backyard poultry recipients were male and 16.67 were female. Further, 51.11 prefer to live in joint family while the remaining 55.56 per cent have a preference of nuclear family. The data also revealed that 18.52 per cent recipients were from small family (< 4 members), 65.93 per cent recipients were from medium family (4-6 members) and remaining 15.55 per cent were from large family (> 6 members) (Table 1). In case of cast of recipients 6.67 per cent belongs to SC, 80.00 percent to ST, 7.41 to OBC and 5.92 per cent belongs to general category whereas 11.11 per cent depended on agriculture, 77.04 per cent on agriculture + animal husbandry, 8.89 per cent on labour and merely 2.96 per cent are service men (Table 1). For the study of family member’s educational level, they were categorized into four sections *i.e.* male and female children, male and female adult. The percentage of educated and uneducated family members of different group have been depicted in Table 2. The data presented that 86.96 per cent and 58.49 per cent male and female kids were literate whereas 13.04 and 41.51 per cent were illiterate. In case of adult 82.35 per cent males and 30.77 per cent females were literate, whereas 17.65 per cent male and 69.23 per cent female adult were illiterate Table 2. For developing a considerate regarding the education level of recipients, they were divided under two categories *i.e.* literate and illiterate. The data clearly exhibited (Table 3) that 73.15 per cent recipients were illiterate and 26.85 per cent. Literacy level in male and female were 85.71 and 54.93 per cent, respectively. Out of entire 745 members, 73.15 per cent were educated while 26.85 per cent were uneducated. Most of the backyard poultry recipients were of scheduled tribe of Hindu religion. It was owing to maximum population of Hindu living in area of investigation. Likewise, Mandal *et al.* (2006) [6] found in Bareilly district of UP that all the recipients were of the general category and from Muslim religion. Results showed that 48.89 per cent backyard poultry recipients chosen to live in single family while the remaining 51.11% lived in joint family. The information collected in these areas showed that backyard poultry keeping family possess medium family (6-8 members). Reddy *et al.* (2017) [8] stated that Allocation of the farmers based on their social

status indicated that a most of 36.6% belonged to scheduled tribal’s, followed by 30.0%, 20.0% and 13.3% who were from scheduled caste, backward caste and general caste respectively. It can be concluded that the most of participants of poultry rearing were from scheduled caste communities who were involved in livestock farming which is their traditional caste occupation in the study area. These results are similar with the results of Singh and Jilani (2005) that with regard to moderate sized and nuclear was also in line with Mandal *et al.* (2006) [6]. Maximum of the family members have no knowledge about family planning programmed might be due to illiteracy. The literacy rate between the backyard poultry recipients was 62.62 per cent, while 37.38 per cent were uneducated. The difference in education rate was also observed by Mandal *et al.* (2006) [6]. As a result of education rate, there was low adoption of poultry nurturing technology in the area of study. The education rate of overall male children was 83.54% and feminine children 39.39 per cent.

Table 1: Allocation of recipients on the basis of Family status

Particulars	Number	Percent
Sex of recipients		
	F	MPS
Male	115	85.19
Female	20	14.81
Total	135	100.00
Family Type		
Nuclear	60	44.44
Joint	75	55.56
Total	135	100.00
Size of family		
<4	25	18.52
4-6	89	65.93
>6	21	15.55
Total	135	100.00
Caste		
SC	9	6.67
ST	108	80.00
OBC	10	7.41
Gen	8	5.92
Total	135	100.00
Occupation		
Agriculture	15	11.11
Agriculture + Animal husbandry	104	77.04
Labour	12	8.89
Services	4	2.96
Total	135	100.00

Table 2: Allocation of recipients on level of educational of family Members

Sex of recipients		Number	Percent
Male children	Literate	280	86.96
	Illiterate	42	13.04
Total		322	100.00
Female children	Literate	155	58.49
	Illiterate	110	41.51
Total		265	100.00
Male adult	Literate	98	82.35
	Illiterate	21	17.65
Total		119	100.00
Female adult	Literate	12	30.77
	Illiterate	27	69.23
Total		39	100.00

Table 3: Allocation of recipients on the Literacy rate among selected family

Members	Male	Percent	Female	Percent	Total	Percent
Literate	378	85.71	167	54.93	545	73.15
Illiterate	63	14.29	137	45.07	200	26.85
Total	441	100.00	304	100.00	745	100.00

Land Resources

Recipients grouped according to land size and presented in Table 4. It is obvious from the figures that 35.56 per cent farmers have below 1.0 ha land, 54.07 per cent have 1-2 ha, 6.67 per cent have 2-4 ha and only 3.70 per cent have above 4 ha land. The data depicted in Table 4.5 exposed that out of 135 recipients, 20.00 per cent have kuccha, 26.67 per cent have pucca and 53.33 per cent have mixed type houses.

The major profession of all the recipients were agriculture plus animal husbandry. The consequences obtained in the current exploration are contradictory with the consequences of Mandal and Gautam (2003)^[5] found that major profession of recipients was agricultural labor. Maximum recipients survived in mixed type house. Mostly recipients (61.25%) have less than 2-hectare land that is also close conform to the finding of Mandal *et al.* (2006)^[6] and Sharma *et al.* (2018)^[9].

Table 4: Allocation of recipients agreeing to the land holding and House type of recipients

Size group	Number	Percent
< 1ha	48	35.56
1-2 ha	73	54.07
2-4 ha	9	6.67
>4ha	5	3.70
Total	135	100.00
House type		
Kuccha	27	20.00
Pucca	36	26.67
Mixed	72	53.33
Total	135	100.00

Animal Capitals

The data of animal resource information of the selected recipients are presented in Table 5. Out of the entire livestock kept by the recipients, 15.95 per cent were cow, 13.08 per cent buffaloes, 0.78 per cent sheep, 15.88 per cent goats and maximum 54.31 per cent were poultry birds. The result of Table 6 discovered that complete species liked by recipients were cow 10.37 per cent, buffaloes 8.15 per cent, sheep 3.70 per cent, goats 16.30 per cent cattle and poultry was maximum 61.48 per cent. Maximum recipients (91.11 per cent) were like to rear developed poultry fowl and but 8.89 per cent still wishing to rear local bird (Table 7).

The investigation exposes that poultry was mostly reared by poor farmer and they have large number of poultry *i.e.* 45.24% compare to other livestock which concludes that selected area for the investigation was poultry keeping zone. Among the livestock managed by the recipients, 22.14 per cent were cow, 16.37% were buffalo, 3.46 per cent sheep, 12.79 per cent goat and highest 45.24% were poultry, further Arunachalam and Thiagarajan (1999)^[2] noticed that land holding size had a significantly positive relationship with livestock population.

The figure exposes that overall species liking were cattle 8.89%, buffalo 7.78 per cent, sheep 3.89 per cent, goat 8.89 per cent and highest poultry 45.24 per cent. Similarly, Arunachalam *et al.* (2004)^[3] surveyed five randomly selected

region of Tamil Nadu and stated that poultry was chosen by most of recipients among livestock species.

Table 5: Allocation of Livestock holding of recipients

Livestock			Number	Percent
Cow	Young	Male	255	4.44
		Female	210	3.65
	Adult	Male	222	3.86
		Female	230	4.00
Total			917	15.95
Buffalo	Young	Male	105	1.83
		Female	212	3.69
	Adult	Male	209	3.64
		Female	225	3.92
Total			751	13.08
Sheep	Young	Male	10	0.17
		Female	12	0.21
	Adult	Male	9	0.16
		Female	14	0.24
Total			45	0.78
Goat	Young	Male	245	4.26
		Female	237	4.13
	Adult	Male	198	3.45
		Female	232	4.04
Total			912	15.88
Poultry	Young	Male	312	5.43
		Female	385	6.70
	Adult	Male	745	12.97
		Female	1678	29.21
Total			3120	54.31
Grand Total			5745	100.00

Table 6: Allocation of Species predilection of recipients

Species	Number	Percent
Cattle	14	10.37
Buffalo	11	8.15
Sheep	5	3.70
Goat	22	16.30
Poultry	83	61.48
Total	135	100.00

Table 7: Allocation of Predilection of poultry strain of recipients

Liking of poultry	Number	Percent
Developed	123	91.11
Indigenous	12	8.89
Total	135	100.00

Conclusion

The study concluded that, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry is major occupation of tribles in Banswara. In which animal husbandry Backyard Poultry Farming is major enterprise of tribles. Most of the farmers depend on agriculture with animal husbandry and living in mixed type houses in Banswara district of Rajasthan. The tribal families under rearing developed breed of fowls as backyard poultry experienced an economic upliftment along with mitigation of nutritious grade due to maximum production and maximum mass attained by males of developed strain as related to those keeping native birds.

References

- Anonymous. Department of animal husbandry, dairing and fisheries, Ministry of agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Govt. of India 2018-19.
- Arunachalam S, Thiagarajan M. Livestock Farming

- structure in Tamil Nadu State. *Cheiron* 1999;28:96-101.
3. Arunachalam S, Thiagarajan M, Ramesh V. The poultry farming structure and its income in certain parts of Tamil Nadu. *Indian Veterinary Journal* 2004;81:176-178.
 4. Das SC, Chowdhury SD, Khatun MA, Nishibori M, Isobe N, Yoshimura Y. Poultry production profile and expected future projection in Bangladesh. *World's Poultry Science Journal* 2008;64:99-118.
 5. Mandal MK, Gautam. Status of backyard poultry farming in RS Pura Tehsil of Jammu District. *Journal of Interacademia* 2003;7:491-493.
 6. Mandal MK, Khandekar N, Khandekar P. Backyard poultry farming in Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh, India: an analysis's. *Livestock Research for Rural Development* 2006;18:101.
 7. Padhi MK, Rajkumar U, Haunshi S, Niranjana M, Panda AK, Bhattacharya TK *et al.* Comparative evaluation of male line of Vanaraja, control broiler, Vanaraja commercial in respect to juvenile and carcass quality traits. *Indian Journal Poultry Science* 2012;47:136-139.
 8. Reddy RV, Bhargavi M, Reddy KKM. A Study on empowerment of rural women through backyard poultry in Anantapur district of Andhra Pradesh. *International Journal of Livestock Research* 2017;7(9):212-219.
 9. Sharma H, Preeti, Rohit Kumar, Manjula Thakur, Jagish Kour Reen, Madhu Suman *et al.* Study of managemental practices of backyard poultry in Jammu district of Jammu and Kashmir. *The Pharma Innovation Journal* 2018;7(7):927-932.