



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2021; SP-10(11): 295-298
© 2021 TPI
www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 28-09-2021
Accepted: 30-10-2021

Budharam

M.Sc. Research Scholar,
Department of Livestock
Production Management, RCA,
MPUAT, Udaipur, Rajasthan,
India

Heera Lal Bugalia

Assistant Professor, College of
Agriculture, Bhilwara,
Rajasthan, India

Lekhu Kumar

M.Sc. Research Scholar,
Department of Livestock
Production Management,
SKNAU, Jobner, Rajasthan,
India

A study on socio-economic status of backyard poultry rearers in tribale area of Rajasthan

Budharam, Heera Lal Bugalia and Lekhu Kumar

Abstract

The current research was conducted on Socio-Economic Status of Backyard Poultry Rearers in Dungarpur District of Rajasthan, four blocks of Dungarpur district i.e. Dungarpur, Bicchiwada, Aspur and Sagwara 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 sample of 180 respondents. The examination revealed that all the selected farmers belong to tribe of Hindu religion and 51.11 per cent recipients live in joint families. The recipients were mostly having 4-6 members in their family (69.44 per cent). The literacy rate of whole family was 62.62 per cent and all the farmers depend on agriculture plus animal husbandry profession and living in mixed type houses. Most of the farmers (46.67 per cent) had 1-2 ha land followed by (45.00 per cent) less than 1 ha land, poultry species predilection by the farmers was supreme (70.56 per cent).

Keywords: backyard poultry, dungarpur 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 % 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). 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 elit sire and dam lines. However scanty information with respect to backyard poultry growth and production performance in Dungarpur area are available.

Materials and Methods

The existing study was carried out in Dungarpur district of Rajasthan. Dungarpur district is situated in the south region of Rajasthan and geographically characterized by the Aravali hills. The district lies in the middle of 23.8°N latitude and 73.7°E longitude and altitude of 225 meter

Corresponding Author

Budharam

M.Sc. Research Scholar,
Department of Livestock
Production Management, RCA,
MPUAT, Udaipur, Rajasthan,
India

beyond average sea level. Dungarpur district comprises of total 8 tehsils, out of which 4 tehsils *i.e.* Dungarpur, Bicchiwada, Aspura and Sagwara were selected for the investigation. Three villages were selected from the each identified tehsil and total twelve villages were selected on the basis of backyard poultry birds availability in the villages. Fifteen respondents from every village were randomly selected and a total number of 180 farmers were investigated for current research. 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 answers 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 83.33 per cent backyard poultry recipients were male and 16.67 were female. Further, 51.11 prefer to live in joint family while the remaining 48.89 per cent have a preference of nuclear family. The data also revealed that 19.44 per cent recipients were from small family (< 4 members), 69.45 per cent recipients were from medium family (4-6 members) and remaining 11.11 per cent were from large family (> 6 members) (Table 1). In case of cast of recipients 46.11 per cent belongs to SC, 30.00 percent to ST, 18.33 to OBC and 5.56 per cent belongs to general category whereas 29.44 per cent depended on agriculture, 58.89 per cent on agriculture + animal husbandry, 10.00 per cent on labour and merely 1.67 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 83.54 per cent and 39.39 per cent male and female kids were literate whereas 16.46 and 60.61 per cent were illiterate. In case of adult 92.86 per cent males and 37.50 per cent females were literate, whereas 7.14 per cent male and 62.50 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 37.38 per cent recipients were illiterate and 62.62 per cent. Data of table 3 reveals that rate of literacy was extremely significant ($\chi^2 = 249.53$). Literacy level in male and female were 85.98 and 39.25 per cent, respectively. Out of entire 1070 members, 62.62 per cent were educated while 37.38 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	150	83.33
Female	30	16.67
Total	180	100.00
Family Type		
Nuclear	88	48.89
Joint	92	51.11
Total	180	100.00
Size of family		
<4	35	19.44
4-6	125	69.45
>6	20	11.11
Total	180	100.00
Caste		
SC	83	46.11
ST	54	30.00
OBC	33	18.33
Gen	10	5.56
Total	180.00	100.00
Occupation		
Agriculture	53	29.44
Agriculture + Animal husbandry	106	58.89
Labour	18	10.00
Services	3	1.67
Total	180	100.00

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

Sex of recipients		Number	Percent
Male children	Literate	330	83.54
	Illiterate	65	16.46
Total		395	100.00
Female children	Literate	195	39.39
	Illiterate	300	60.61
Total		495	100.00
Male adult	Literate	130	92.86
	Illiterate	10	7.14
Total		140	100.00
Female adult	Literate	15	37.50
	Illiterate	25	62.50
Total		40	100.00

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

Members	Male	Percent	Female	Percent	Total	Percent	χ^2
Literate	460	85.98	210	39.25	670	62.62	
Illiterate	75	14.02	325	60.75	400	37.38	249.53**
Total	535	100.00	535	100.00	1070	100.00	

* Significant at 5% level, ** Significant at 1% level

Land Resources

Recipients grouped according to land size and presented in Table 4. It is obvious from the figures that 45.00 per cent farmers have below 1.0 ha land, 46.67 per cent have 1-2 ha, 6.11 per cent have 2-4 ha and only 2.22 per cent have above 4 ha land. The data depicted in Table 4.5 exposed that out of 180 recipients, 13.89 per cent have kuccha, 16.67 per cent have pucca and 69.44 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 with 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	81	45.00
1-2 ha	84	46.67
2-4 ha	11	6.11
>4ha	4	2.22
Total	180	100.00
House type		
Kuccha	25	13.89
Pucca	30	16.67
Mixed	125	69.44
Total	180	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, 22.14 per cent were cow, 16.37 per cent buffaloes, 3.46 per cent sheep, 12.79 per cent goats and maximum 45.24 per cent were poultry birds. The result of Table 6 discovered that complete species liked by recipients were cow 8.89 per cent, buffaloes 7.78 per cent, sheep, 3.89 per cent, goats, 8.89 per cent cattle and poultry was maximum 70.56 per cent. Maximum recipients (95 per cent) were like to rear developed poultry fowl and but 5 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	364	5.84
		Female	332	5.32
	Adult	Male	364	5.84
		Female	321	5.15
Total			1381	22.14
Buffalo	Young	Male	156	2.50
		Female	401	6.43
	Adult	Male	273	4.38
		Female	191	3.06
Total			1021	16.37
Sheep	Young	Male	54	0.87
		Female	54	0.87
	Adult	Male	54	0.87
		Female	54	0.87
Total			216	3.46
Goat	Young	Male	191	3.06
		Female	225	3.61
	Adult	Male	191	3.06
		Female	191	3.06
Total			798	12.79
Poultry	Young	Male	191	3.06
		Female	191	3.06
	Adult	Male	689	11.05
		Female	1751	28.07
Total			2822	45.24
Grand Total			6238	100.00

Table 6: Allocation of Species predilection of recipients

Species	Number	Percent
Cattle	16	8.89
Buffalo	14	7.78
Sheep	7	3.89
Goat	16	8.89
Poultry	127	70.56
Total	180	100.00

Table 7: Allocation of Predilection of poultry strain of recipients

Liking of poultry	Number	Percent
Developed	171	95.00
Indigenous	9	5.00
Total	180	100.00

Conclusion

The study concluded that, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry is major occupation of tribles in Dungarpur. In which animal husbandry Backyard Poultry Farming is major enterprise of tribles. All the farmers depend on agriculture plus animal husbandry profession and living in mixed type houses in Dungarpur 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

1. Anonymous. Department of animal husbandry, dairing and fisheries, Ministry of agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Govt. of India 2018-19.
2. 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 R.S. 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. *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, Jagdish 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.