www.ThePharmaJournal.com

The Pharma Innovation

Rita Bharti
Ph.D. Scholar, ICAR-IVRI,
Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, India

MP Sagar
PS, ICAR-CARI, Bareilly,
Uttar Pradesh, India

Socio-economic profile of trainees and non-trainees broiler farmers

Rita Bharti and MP Sagar

Abstract
Present study was conducted purposively, in Uttar Pradesh state as majority of farmers belonged to this state, who has received training from CARI, Izatnagar. Total sample size was 270 where 90 trainees, 90 non-trainee broiler farmers and 90 trainees non- adopter broiler farming were selected as a respondents. Data was collected through semi-structured interview and telephonic survey methods. The average age of respondents was 36.26, 40.02 and 32.71 years in trainee, non-trainee and non-adopters categories, respectively. Majority of the respondents belonged to other backward category (50.74%) followed by general (28.52%) and scheduled caste (20.74%) categories. Babu (2013), Pratap (2017) and Amit (2018) reported the similar finding. Dominating community (76.29%) were Hindu followed by Muslim community (23.7%) and other communities are negligible. Overwhelming majority (98.14%) of the respondent was literate and remaining 1.86 percent were illiterate. 54.07 per cent of respondents belong to nuclear family and 45.93 percent joint family. Babu (2013), Abdul *et al.* (2014) and Amit *et al.* (2018) also reported the similar findings. The average family size of respondents was 6.22, 6.02 and 5.91 in trainee, non-trainee broiler farmers and non-adopters categories, respectively. Over all family education status and land holding were 4.49 and 5.78 acres, respectively. 43.33per cent of the respondents have poultry farming as a primary occupation.

Keywords: trainees, non-trainee broiler farmers, non-adopter, socio-economic

Introduction

About 20.5 million people depend upon livestock for their livelihood. Livestock contributed 16 per cent to the income of small farm households as against an average of 14 per cent for all rural households, provides livelihood to two-third of rural community and employment to about 8.8 per cent of the population in India. Livestock sector contributes 4.11 per cent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and 25.6 per cent of total agriculture GDP (Annual Report, BAH & FS, 2017-18). Poultry is one of the fastest growing sub-sector of livestock and contributes immense potential in income generation. Out of total meat production, poultry alone contributes nearly 50% and rest 50% is contributed by cattle, buffalo, goat, sheep and pig in the year 2018-19. The poultry meat production has increased to nearly 4.06 million tonnes during the year 2018-19 from 3.86 million tonnes during the year 2017-18 at around 5.99 per cent growth rate (Annual Report, BAH & FS, 2018-19). There is consistently increase in per capita availability of eggs and meat, with increase in productivity. However, it is far below the recommended level of consumption of 180 eggs and 10.8 kg meat per person per annum by Indian Council Medical Research (Annual Report, BAH&FS, 2018-19). There is need to develop entrepreneurial behavior quality of individual.

Research methodology

The study was conducted purposively in Uttar Pradesh state as majority of broiler farmers, who has received training from CARI, Izatnagar belong to this state. Total 667 farmers belonged to Uttar Pradesh who has taken training during 2013-14 to 2017-18, out of which, 135 farmers adopted poultry faming. Out of the adopted poultry farmers, 105 adopted broiler farming. From broiler farmers, 90 trainee broiler farmers were selected randomly from the list of adopter broiler farmers. A comprehensive list of untrained commercial broiler farmers scattered in the state was prepared in consultation with scientists of CARI, C.V.O (Chief Veterinary Officers) of different districts of broiler farming dominated area, poultry farmers (as a key informants), and private input dealers. From this list, non-trainee broiler farmers in equal number of broiler farming adopters (trainees) selected as respondents. The non-trainee broiler farmers were selected from the same district from which the trainee broiler farmer belongs.

Corresponding Author:
Rita Bharti
Ph.D. Scholar, ICAR-IVRI,
Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, India

Thus, 90 trainees, 90 non-trainee broiler farmers and 90 non-adopter trainees were selected for present study. Total sample size was 270 for this study.

Result and Discussion
Age
The data given in table 1 reveals that among the trainee broiler farmers, most of the respondents (43.33%) belonged to middle age group followed by young (34.44%) and old (22.22%) age group. While 45.55 percent of non-trainee broiler farmers belong to middle age group followed by old (32.22%) and young (22.22%) age group but in case of non-adopter trainees, most of the respondent belong to young age group (52.22%) followed by middle (45.55%) and old (2.22%) age group. From pooled data, similar trends were observed as in trainee broiler farmers. The average age of respondents was 36.26, 40.02 and 32.71 years in trainee, non-trainee and non-adopters categories, respectively. Overall average age was 36.27 years. Gopal (2015) [10], Ahmad *et al.* (2018) [1] and Nayak *et al.* (2020) [6] also reported similar finding where majority (55.21%) of the broiler poultry farmers were belonged to middle age group followed by young and old age group. Non-adopters were younger than trainee and non-trainee broiler farmers.

Caste/category
The data given in table 1 reveals that among the trainee broiler farmers, most of the respondents belonged to other backward category (51.11%) followed by general (35.56%) and scheduled categories (13.33%). Similar trends were observed in non-trainee broiler farmers that were majority of farmers belonged to Other Backward Category (64.44%) followed by general (26.67%) and scheduled categories (8.89%). While in case of non-adopter trainees, most of the respondents were belonged to scheduled categories (40%) followed by other backward category (36.67%) and general (23.33%) category. Similar result was observed from pool data that was majority of the respondents belonged to other backward category (50.74%) followed by general (28.52%) and scheduled caste (20.74%) categories. Babu (2013) [4], Pratap (2017) and Amit (2018) reported the similar finding i.e. majority of broiler farmers belonged to OBC category.

Religion
The data given in table 1 reveals that majority of trainee broiler farmers belonged to Hindu (75.55%) followed by Muslim (24.45%). Similar trends observed in non-trainee broiler farmers (71.11 percent Hindu and 28.89 percent Muslim) and non-adopter trainees (82.22 percent Hindu and 17.78 percent Muslim). In Uttar Pradesh, dominating community (79.7%) is Hindu followed by Muslim community (19%) and other communities are negligible. That's why respondents belonged to Hindu or Muslim religion and not belong to other religion. Babu (2013) [4] Pratap *et al* (2017) and Amit *et al* (2018) have different finding from this. They reported that both Hindu and Muslim community equally participated (50% each) in commercial broiler farming.

Education
Table 1 reveals that overwhelming majority (98.14%) of the respondents were literate and remaining 1.86 percent were illiterate. Among the literates, most of the respondents (33.33%) were graduates followed by intermediate (30.74%), middle school (12.6%), high school (8.51%), primary (6.67%), professional/diploma courses (3.89%), functional literate (2.22%) and post graduates (2.22%). Similar trend was observed among the trainee broiler farmers, most of the respondents were graduate (33.33%) followed by intermediate (31.11%), middle school (12.22%), high school (8.89%), primary (7.78%), professional/diploma course (3.33), functional literate (3.33%) and postgraduate (1.11%). In non-trainee broiler farmers, 23.33 percent of the respondents educated up-to intermediate followed by middle school & graduate (21.11%), high school (13.33%), primary school (12.22%), illiterate (5.55%) and functional literate (3.33%). No one have PG and professional diploma holders among non-trainee broiler farmers. 45.56 percent of the respondents of non-adopter trainees were graduate followed by higher secondary (37.78%), professional course (5.56%), middle school (4.44%), postgraduate (3.33%) and high school (3.33%). Babu (2013) [4] and Pratap (2017) also revealed similar finding where overwhelming majority of the poultry farmers were literate.

Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to their age, caste, religion and education

		Trainees	Non-trainees	Non-adopter	Pooled
Age	Young (<32.33yrs)	31 (34.44)	20 (22.22)	47 (52.22)	098 (36.29)
	Middle(32.34-44.66yrs)	39 (43.33)	41 (45.55)	41 (45.55)	121 (44.81)
	Old (>44.67yrs)	20 (22.22)	29 (32.22)	02 (02.22)	051 (18.88)
	Mean ± Sd	36.26 ±5.02	40.02 ±6.97	32.71 ±5.95	36.27 ±8.12
Caste category	Schedule caste	12 (13.33)	08 (08.89)	36 (40.00)	056 (20.74)
	Other backward caste	46 (51.11)	58 (64.44)	33 (36.67)	137 (50.74)
	General	32 (35.56)	24 (26.67)	21 (23.33)	077 (28.52)
Religion	Hindu	68 (75.55)	64(71.11)	74 (82.22)	206 (76.29)
	Muslim	22 (24.45)	26 (28.89)	16 (17.78)	064 (23.71)
Education	Illiterate	00 (00.00)	05 (05.55)	00 (00.00)	05 (01.86)
	Functional literate	03 (03.33)	03 (03.33)	00 (00.00)	06 (02.22)
	Primary school	07 (07.78)	11 (12.22)	00 (00.00)	18 (06.67)
	Middle school	11 (12.22)	19 (21.11)	04 (04.44)	34 (12.60)
	High school	08 (08.89)	12 (13.33)	03 (03.33)	23 (08.51)
	Higher secondary	28 (31.11)	21 (23.33)	34 (37.78)	83 (30.74)
	Graduate	30 (33.33)	19 (21.11)	41 (45.56)	90 (33.33)
	Postgraduate	01 (01.11)	00 (00.00)	03 (03.33)	004 (02.22)
	Professional/diploma course	02 (02.22)	00 (00.00)	05 (05.56)	007 (03.89)

(Figures in parentheses indicate percentage)

Family structure (Family type and family size)
Family type
Table2 reveals that majority of trainee broiler farmers have nuclear family (52.22%) followed by joint family (47.78%). Similar trends observed in non-trainee broiler farmers i.e. 58.88 percent have nuclear and 41.22 percent joint family. While among non-adopter trainees 51.11 percent have nuclear and 48.89 percent joint family. Pooled data reveals that 54.07 per cent of respondents belong to nuclear family and 45.93 percent joint family. Babu (2013) [4], Abdul *et al*. (2014) and Amit *et al.* (2018) also reported the similar findings which revealed that majority of the respondents in poultry sector had nuclear type family. Data indicate that family structure in Indian communities were changed from joint to nuclear family it because of vast part of Indian population cover by middle class they have limited sources of income and they are not capable to fulfill rapid increased of household expenditures i.e. food safety, education, medical care and other day-to-day expenses and also they are unable to offer same level of financial support to all family members somehow, it is possible in nuclear family that why, this immense change occur in Indian communities.

Family size
Table2 reveals that among the trainee broiler farmers, majority of the respondents (63.33%) belonged to small family size followed by medium (31.11%) and large (5.56%) family size. Similar trend observed in non-trainee broiler farmers i.e. 72.22 percent of the respondents belong to small family size followed by medium (27.78%) and large family (2.22%). While, 55.56 percent of the non-adopter trainees belonged to small family and 44.44 percent medium family size. There is no one non-adopter has large family. Pooled data indicated that majority of respondents (62.96%) belonged to small family followed by medium (34.44%) and large family size (2.59%). Amit *et al.* (2018) finding was contrast with this finding. The average family size of respondents was 6.22, 6.02 and 5.91 in trainee, non-trainee broiler farmers and non-adopters categories, respectively. Overall average family size was 6.15.

Family education status
A perusal of data in table2 reveals that among the trainee broiler farmers, majority of the respondents (55.56%) belonged to medium family education status followed by high (26.67%) and low (5.56%) family education status. Similar trend were observed in non-adopter trainees that were 61.11 percent have medium family education status followed by high (34.44%) and low (4.45%). While in non- trainees broiler farmers, 61.11 percent have medium family education

status followed by low (32.22%) and high (17.78%) family education status. Pooled data indicated that majority of respondents existed in medium family education status (55.56%) followed by high (26.3%) and low family education status (20.14%). Average family education status of trainees, non-trainee broiler farmers and non-adopter trainees were 4.51, 4.18 and 4.76, respectively. Over all family education status was 4.49. This is quite high it reflected the broad change in mind setup of people about education and they make all possible effort to educate their children. Non-adopter have higher family education status it may because of non-adopter more emphasize to continue higher education for job and provide higher education to his family members for improve economic condition as well family living status in society.

Land holding
Land holding is one of important socio-economic parameter, which has influence on the economic and social status of the farmers. Table 2 reveals that highest percentage (*37.78*%) of the farmers were belonging to small land holding category followed by, semi-medium (26.67%), marginal (21.11%), medium (10%) and small (4.07%) land holding categories. Similar trend were noticed in non-trainees and non-adopter. Among trainees, thirty three percent of the farmer belonged to marginal category followed by, small (30%), semi-medium (22.22%), landless (7.78%), medium (5.56%) and large (1.11%). The average land holding of respondents was 4.64, 6.17 and 6.52 acres in trainee broiler farmers, non-trainee broiler farmers and non-adopters categories, respectively. Overall average land holding was 5.78 acres.

Occupation
The data presented in table2 reveals that majority of the respondents (43.33%) have poultry farming as a primary occupation followed by, agriculture farming (34.07%), job (8.15%), business (15.00%), labors (4.44%) and animal husbandry (3.25%). This finding was in disagreement with Pratap (2015) and Amit *et al.* (2018) finding i.e. majority of broiler farmers have agriculture as primary occupation followed by poultry farming. Among trainees, poultry farming was the primary occupation of majority of the farmers (70%), followed by agriculture (15.56%), job (7.78%) and business (6.67%). While among non-trainees, sixty percent of the farmers have poultry farming as a primary occupation followed by, agriculture (36.67%), and business (3.33%). Whereas among non-adopters, half of the respondents have agriculture as a primary occupation followed by, job (16.67%), laborers (13.33%), animal husbandry (11.11%) and business (8.89%).

Table 2: Distribution of respondents according to their family type, family size, family education status, land holding and occupation

		Trainees	Non-trainees	Non-adopter	Pooled
Family type	Nuclear family	47 (52.22)	53 (58.88)	46 (51.11)	146 (54.07)
	Joint Family	43 (47.78)	37 (41.22)	44 (48.89)	124 (45.93)
Family size	Small (2-6.66)	57 (63.33)	63 (72.22)	50 (55.56)	170 (62.97)
	Medium (6.67-11.33)	28 (31.11)	25 (27.78)	40 (44.44)	093 (34.44)
	Large (11.34-16)	05 (05.56)	02 (02.22)	00 (00.00)	007 (02.59)
	Mean ± Sd	6.22 ±1.99	6.02 ±1.42	5.91 ±1.12	6.15±1.80
Family education status	Low (<1.66)	16 (17.77)	29 (32.22)	04 (04.45)	049 (20.14)
	Medium (1.66-3.33)	50 (55.56)	45 (50.00)	55 (61.11)	150 (55.56)
	High (>3.33)	24 (26.67)	16 (17.78)	31 (34.44)	071 (26.30)
	Mean ± Sd	4.51±1.05	4.18±0.76	4.76± 0.93	4.49 ± 0.93
	Landless	07 (07.78)	01 (01.11)	03 (03.33)	011 (04.07)

Land holding	Marginal (upto2.5 acres)	30 (33.33)	17 (18.89)	10 (11.11)	057 (21.11)
	Small (2.5-5 acres)	27 (30.00)	38 (42.22)	37 (41.11)	102 (37.78)
	Semi-medium (5-10 acres)	20 (22.22)	22 (24.44)	30 (33.33)	072 (26.67)
	Medium (10-25 acres)	05 (05.56)	12 (13.33)	10 (11.11)	027 (10.00)
	Large (25 or above)	01 (01.11)	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	001 (00.37)
	Mean ± Sd	4.64±0.516	6.17±0.438	6.52±0.476	5.78±0.476
Occupation	Agriculture	14 (15.56)	33 (36.67)	45 (50.00)	092 (34.07)
	Animal husbandry	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	10 (11.11)	010 (03.70)
	Poultry	63 (70.00)	54 (60.00)	00 (00.00)	117 (43.33)
	Business/trade	06 (06.67)	03 (03.33)	08 (08.89)	017 (06.29)
	Job	07 (07.78)	00 (00.00)	15 (16.67)	022 (08.15)
	Laborers	00 (00.00)	00 (00.00)	12 (13.33)	012 (04.44)

(Figures in parentheses indicate percentage)

Experience in poultry farming

Table 3 reveals that among the trainee broiler farmers, overwhelming majority of the respondents (93.33%) belonged to low experience in poultry farming followed by medium (6.67%). There is no trainee broiler famers have high experience in poultry farming. While 83.33 percent of the non-trainee broiler farmers belonged to low poultry experience followed by medium (11.11%) and high (5.56%) experience in poultry farming. Pooled data indicated that majority of respondents (88.33%) have low experience in poultry followed by medium (8.89%) and high (2.78%) experience in poultry farming. The average experience in poultry farming of respondents was 4.51 and 6.87 years in trainee and non-trainee broiler farmers, respectively. Overall average of experience in poultry farming was 5.59 year. Pratap *et al.* (2017) Babu (2013) [4] and Oladeji (2010) [7] reported similar finding i.e. majority of poultry farmers belonged to low level of experience followed by medium level and high level of experience.

Table 3: Distribution of respondents according to their experience in poultry farming

Experience	Trainees	Non-trainees	Pooled data
Low (<10)	84 (93.33)	75 (83.33)	159 (88.33)
Medium (10.1-16)	06 (06.67)	10 (11.11)	016 (08.89)
High (>16)	00 (00.00)	05 (05.56)	005 (02.78)
Mean ± Sd	4.51±1.21	6.87±1.40	5.69±1.32

(Figures in parentheses indicate percentage)

Conclusion

The present study provided detail information of socio-economic profile of trainees and non-trainees farmers of the Uttar Pradesh. There is no significant difference between trainee and non-trainees socio-economic profile except age and experience in poultry farming but there is huge difference between these two and non-adopter. Training programmes of poultry farming has an immense potential to provide employment to rural and even in urban areas.

References

1. Ahmad M, Verma HC, Singh RK, Singh PK, Verma V. Socio-Economic Profile and Communication Behaviours of Poultry Farmers Regarding Broiler Farming Practices in Eastern Plain Zone of Uttar Pradesh. An International Refereed, Peer Reviewed & Indexed Quarterly Journal in Science, Agriculture & Engineering, Special Issue, Rkvy Nov-2018 Seminar Nduat Ayodhya. 2018, 8
2. Alam, Mahabub, Sultana S, Hassan, Mohammad, Hasanuzzaman Md, Faruk MSA. Socio-economic status of the farmers and economic analysis of poultry farming at Gazipur district in Bangladesh. International Journal of Natural Sciences 2016;4(8). 10.3329/ijns.v4i2.28598.
3. Annual report 2018-2019, DAHD &F, GOI.
4. Babu P. Knowledge and adoption level of commercial broiler farmers about scientific broiler farming in mid-western plain zone of Uttar Pradesh. Thesis, M.V.Sc. Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, Uttar Pradesh 2013.
5. Basic Animal Husbandry Statistics. 2018-19. Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying & Fisheries, New Delhi, India.
6. Nayak GD, Sardar KK, Das BC. Socio-economic Condition of Khadia Poultry Farmers and Phenotypic Characteristics of Khadia Chicken of Northern Odisha, India. Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. 2020;9(01):1395-1404. doi: https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2020.901.154
7. Oladeji JO. Sources and utilization of poultry production information among poultry farmers in Oyo State. Int. J. Livest. Prod 2010;2:011-016.
8. Pratap J. Assessment of training needs of broiler broiler farmers in Barabanki district of Uttar Pradesh. Thesis, M.V.Sc, Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, Uttar Pradesh 2014.
9. Singh, Amit, Sagar M, Thakur, Devesh. Adoption Of Scientific Broiler Farming Practices Among Contract And Non-Contract Broiler Farmers In Eastern Plain Zone Of Uttar Pradesh 2018.
10. Gopal YM. Impact of Poultry Farming on Socio-Economic Status of Farmers in Mandya District of Karnataka. Trends in Bioscience 2015, 8.