



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2021; SP-10(8): 152-155
© 2021 TPI
www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 10-04-2021
Accepted: 18-05-2021

RKR Sangamitra

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Veterinary Physiology, Madras Veterinary College, Tamil Nadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

P Eyazhini

M.V.Sc., Scholar, Department of Veterinary and Animal Husbandry Extension Education, Madras Veterinary College, Tamil Nadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

A Elamaran

Assistant Professor, Department of Veterinary Pharmacology and Toxicology, Veterinary College and Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, Orathanadu, Tamil Nadu, India

Corresponding Author

RKR Sangamitra

Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Veterinary Physiology, Madras Veterinary College, Tamil Nadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

Socio-economic profile analysis among the backyard poultry farmers in Thanjavur district of Tamil Nadu

RKR Sangamitra, P Eyazhini and A Elamaran

Abstract

The study was undertaken to find out the socio-economic profile of the backyard poultry farmers in Thanjavur district of Tamilnadu. Thanjavur district of Tamil Nadu state, India was purposively selected on the basis of better production profile of livestock and familiarity of the researcher with the local dialect and socio-cultural aspects of the area. Out of the nine taluks in Thanjavur district, Peravoorani taluk was randomly selected from which five villages were selected. From each of the selected villages, 10 respondents were selected randomly leading to a total of 50 respondents. The data was collected through personal interview method with the help of well-structured interview schedule from randomly selected 50 backyard poultry farmers in selected villages of Peravoorani taluk, Thanjavur district of Tamilnadu. Majority of the respondents were female (66.00%) and 55.00 per cent belongs to old age group (> 45 years) with 34.00 per cent had more than 6 years poultry farming experience. About 48.00 per cent of the respondents had annual income from 1-2 lakh. More than half (52.00%) had land holding up to 1 acre and 54.00 per cent had small flock size (<20 birds). Majority (88.00%) of them had small family size (< 5 members) and living as nuclear family (84.00%). Nearly half respondents had education level ranges from secondary (30.00%) to middle (22.00%) level and more than half of them had livestock farming and agriculture as their occupation.

Keywords: socio-economic, profile, poultry farmers, Thanjavur district, Tamil Nadu, India

Introduction

India country is an agrarian country its mainly depends on agriculture, animal husbandry and allied sector for their livelihood. India represents a major success in the present era of agricultural production, livestock and poultry arena. According to 20th livestock census, the total poultry in the country is 851.81 million in 2019 and total birds in the backyard poultry in the country is 317.07 million. The total Commercial Poultry in the country is 534.74 million in 2019 [1]. India ranks sixth position in worldwide poultry population [2]. Poultry production has been a household day to day practice in our country since ancient times.

Backyard chicken production is an integral part of rural economy. Backyard poultry is a great need to increase the availability of protein food source in rural areas to alleviate protein malnutrition. This can be achieved by adopting poultry farming in small scale in the back yard of rural households or rearing them under intensive farm conditions in small numbers by utilizing locally available, less expensive feed and housing inputs. Backyard poultry is identified as a significant livelihood activity for many poor and landless families and particularly for women who looks for additional income [3].

Backyard poultry can provide a good source of income to resource-poor rural villagers. It also plays a vital role in providing nutritional security in India as, the eggs and meat produced from backyard poultry are rich sources of protein, vitamins and minerals. Products from rural poultry farming fetches high price as compared to those from intensive poultry farming. Birds reared under free range conditions give eggs and meat with low cholesterol concentration and high value biological protein compared to those produced under intensive poultry farming. Women have been considered to be the predominant owners of rural poultry, hence backyard poultry is considered as women-domain. Rural women rear indigenous poultry under extensive system, which serves as a source of self-employment and generating income [4].

The productivity of poultry under the traditional production system is low owing to their maintenance under extensive system on natural vegetation. With the identification of their socio- economic condition, constraints perceived and there by introduction of improved poultry rearing practices in backyard it possible to increase income of poultry farmers. The backyard poultry farmers should adopt feeding, diseases and other management practices in

scientific manner to get maximum benefits. Under these circumstances, proposed research work was designed to find out the socio- economic profile of the poultry farming respondents of Thanjavur district of Tamil Nadu.

Methodology

Study area

The study was carried out in Thanjavur district of Tamil Nadu state which was purposively selected on the basis of better production profile of livestock and familiarity of the researcher with the local dialect and socio-cultural aspects of the area. The Thanjavur district consisted of nine taluks and out of nine taluks in Thanjavur district, Peravoorani taluk was randomly selected for the study. From the taluk selected, five villages were selected randomly. The selected five villages namely were Peravoorani, Kuruvikarambai, Nadiyam, Kalathur and Kallangaadu.

Sampling procedure

From each of the five villages selected, 10 poultry owning households were selected randomly leading to a total sample size of 50 poultry owning households. Any one adult member in the family of poultry owning households who was actively involved in the poultry farming activities was considered as the respondent for the study.

The independent variables in accordance with the objectives set forth were selected based on review of literature, expert opinion and judges relevancy rating scores. The selected variables were operationalized with the aid of existing literature and measured through appropriate schedules, scales and indices. A well-structured interview schedule with all the items pertaining to the socio-economic profile of the poultry farmers was developed and pretested in a non-sampling area and necessary alterations were made as appropriate. Primary data were collected from 50 respondents personally with the pre-tested interview schedule.

Data collection and analysis

The data were collected through face to face interview and by direct observation method, in the farmer's homes or fields from July 2020 to September 2020. Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts and percentages were used to present the data which were further analyzed while using MS excel software.

Results and discussion

Distribution of the respondents according to their profile

The distribution of respondents according to their profile characteristics is presented in Table.

Gender

Majority (66.00 per cent) of respondents belonged to female category while 34.00 per cent belonged to male category (Table). This is in agreement with the findings of ^[5], who reported that women were the sole persons engaged in backyard poultry production operations. Keeping in view the dynamic role of women in this enterprise it becomes important to ensure their active involvement in the process of improved poultry production operations. This necessitates planning poultry development projects in such a way that women participation is ensured in poultry extension work.

Age

Fifty four per cent of the respondents belonged to old age

category (above 45 years), followed by 26.00 per cent in middle (35 to 45 years) and 18.00 per cent in young age (below 35 years) (Table). This was in agreement with scientific works of ^[5, 6]. These researchers concluded that high level of education will facilitate the respondent for accessing relevant information that will boost the productivity of their enterprises. This suggests that relatively more efforts would be needed in our surveyed area to prepare the farmers to accept interventions for improvement in farming as compared to farmers who were well qualified and had the ability to understand the technical aspects of interventions in poultry rearing.

Family type

Majority (84.00 per cent) of the respondents belonged to nuclear family type followed by compound family type (16.00 per cent) (Table). Similar finding was observed by ^[6] where majority of the family involved in poultry rearing belonged to nuclear family than joint family.

Family size

It could be observed from Table that majority (88.00 per cent) of the respondents belonged to small family size (less than 5 members) while 12.00 per cent fell in the medium family size (5 to 10 members) and the none of them in large family size (more than 10 members) category. The family size found to be highly significant in respect to farm size, where small sized farmers rearing lesser number of poultry than medium and large size family. The result of this study is not in agreement with ^[7] who reported that majority belonged to medium family size.

Flock size

Majority (54.00 per cent) of the respondents had small (less than 20 birds) flock size while the remaining 36.00 per cent had medium flock size (20 to 50 birds) and another 10.00 percent of the respondents had large flock size (more than 50 birds) (Table). These findings are in consonance with the results of ^[8] who reported that most of the respondents had less than twenty birds.

Total land holding

More than half (52.00 per cent) of the respondents had up to one acre of land, followed by 34.00 per cent of the respondents had 1 to 2 acres of land and 14.00 per cent had more than 2 acres of land (Table). Similar finding were observed by ^[8] who revealed that nearly half of the respondent having less than one hectare land which will be highly useful to get subsidiary income by adopting Animal husbandry activities.

Education

Thirty per cent of the respondents were educated up to secondary level followed by 22.00 and 16.00 per cent with middle, higher secondary level of education respectively. Twelve per cent of the respondents were educated up to primary level, followed by 10.00 per cent were graduate and above level. Only 8.00 per cent of respondents were illiterate, while 02.00 per cent were in "can read only" and none of them were in "can read and write" categories. These findings are in consonance with results of ^[8, 9].

Occupation

Twenty nine per cent of the respondents had a component of

agriculture + livestock in their farming as their main occupation, followed by “livestock farming + agriculture” (34.00 per cent), “agriculture + livestock farming” (26.00 per cent) and “wages + livestock farming + agriculture” (22.00 per cent) as shown in Table. A twelve per cent of the respondents (18.00 per cent) were having “livestock farming + others” as their main occupation. None of the respondents were belonged to the categories of “livestock farming alone”, “wages + livestock farming”. It is explicit to note that poultry farming formed an integral part of the occupation for majority of the respondents in spite of whatever main occupation they were pursuing. This finding is in agreement with the earlier result of [6] who observed that major respondents had agriculture and livestock as their main occupation. The discrepancy found in our study with one reported earlier may be due to the fact that a greater proportion of the respondents in Peravoorani taluk were involved in doing agriculture + livestock since the territory of the study belongs to Cauvery delta region.

Annual income

It could be observed from the Table that maximum proportion (48.00 per cent) of total respondents had annual income from Rs. 1 to 2 lakhs, while 28.00 per cent belonged to more than Rs. 2 lakhs and 24.00 percent belonged to less than Rs. 1 lakh income category. This is in agreement with the findings of [6] who reported that most of the respondents belonged to medium income category.

Experience in poultry farming

As shown in the Table, Thirty four per cent of the respondents belonged to more than six years of experience in poultry farming. About 28.00 per cent of the respondents were belonged to 4-6 years of experience and 22.00 per cent of them had 2-4 years of experience in poultry farming. Another 16.00 per cent of the respondents had less than 2 years of experience in poultry farming. This is in agreement with [8] who reported that most of the respondents had more than 6 years of experience in poultry farming.

Table 1: Socio- Economic Profile of Backyard Poultry Farmers

S. No	Variables	Frequency (n=50)	Percentage (%)	
1.	Gender	Male	17	34.00
		Female	33	66.00
2.	Age (in completed years)	Young(<35 years)	9	18.00
		Middle (35-45 years)	13	26.00
		Old (>45 years)	27	54.00
3.	Family type	Nuclear	42	84.00
		Joint	8	16.00
4.	Family size	Small (<5 members)	44	88.00
		Medium (5-10 members)	06	12.00
		Large (>10 members)	0	0
5.	Flock size	Small (< 20 birds)	27	54.00
		Medium (20-50 birds)	18	36.00
		Large (>50 birds)	05	10.00
6.	Total land holding	Up to 1acres	36	52.00
		1 – 2 acres	17	34.00
		Above 2 acres	07	14.00
7.	Education	Illiterate	04	08.00
		Can read only	01	02.00
		Can read and write	0	0
		Primary	06	12.00
		Middle	11	22.00
		Secondary	15	30.00
		Higher Secondary	08	16.00
		Graduate and above	05	10.00
8.	Occupation	Livestock farming alone	0	0
		Livestock farming + Others	09	18.00
		Livestock farming + Agriculture	17	34.00
		Agriculture + Livestock farming	13	26.00
		Wages + Livestock farming + Agriculture	11	22.00
		Wages + Livestock farming	0	0
9.	Annual income	Less than 1 lakh	12	24.00
		From 1-2 lakh	24	48.00
		More than 2 lakh	14	28.00
10.	Experience in poultry farming	Less than 2 years	08	16.00
		From 2-4 years	11	22.00
		From 4-6 years	14	28.00
		More than 6 years	17	34.00

Conclusion

The results of the study also showed that majority of the respondents were female (66.00%) and 55.00 per cent belongs to old age group (> 45 years) with 34.00 per cent had more than 6 years poultry farming experience. More than (52.00%) had land holding upto 1 acre of total land holding and 54.00

per cent had small flock size (<20 birds). About 48.00 per cent of the respondents had annual income from 1-2 lakh. Majority (88.00%) of them had small family size (< 5 members) and living as nuclear family (84.00%). Nearly half respondents had education level ranges from secondary (30.00%) to middle (22.00%) level and more than half of

them had livestock farming and agriculture as their occupation. In the study area this activity is entirely carried out by women, which implies that while designing poultry improvement programs the participation of women should be the primary focus of the interventions. Thus to improve the adoption of poultry rearing practices in study area, extension agencies have to arrange training and demonstration programs regarding low cost poultry rearing practices and there by encouraging them to increase the flock size to achieve maximum income out of it. The study also recommends that innovations in technological interventions on scientific poultry farming shall be supported with vocational training locally, demonstration of efficient technologies and motivating the poultry farmers with help of extension support and services from the line departments. Thus it might help them to improve the poultry farmers economically it will render them to adopt improved technologies and sustainable poultry production thereby enhancing the farmer's livelihood.

References

1. Basic Animal Husbandry Statistics Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Ministry of Fisheries, Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Government of India 2019.
2. FAOSTAT, 2019;
<http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QA/visualize>
3. Singh M, Poonia MK, Kumhar BL, Singh G. Livelihood Security of Poor Families through Pratapdhan Backyard Poultry Rearing in Kota District of Rajasthan. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences* 2017;6(4):466-469.
4. Bharti R, Sagar M. Production performance of backyard poultry reared by rural women in Budelkhand region of Uttar Pradesh. *International journal of livestock research* 2020;8(11):158-163.
5. Achakzai KB, Shah MA, Achakzai R. Analysis of backyard chicken farmers socioeconomic and management practices in district quetta, balochistan. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*. 2019;30(3):1-9.
6. Bikash B, Hazarika P, Saharia KK. Socioeconomic and psychological status of poultry farmers in Dibrugarh district of Assam. *Indian Journal of Field Veterinarian*, 2010;5(4):67-69.
7. Singh CB, Jilani MH. Backyard poultry farming in Garhwal Himalayas. *Indian Journal of Poultry Science*. 2005;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. Balamurugan P, Senthilkumar A, Murugesan S. An analysis on socio – economic profile of backyard poultry farmers in theni district of tamil nadu. *International Journal of Science, Environment and Technology* 2017;6(6):3513-3519.