



## SOCIO – ECONOMIC STATUS OF FARMERS REARING NATIVE BREEDER CHICKEN INTENSIVELY IN WESTERN TAMIL NADU

P. Balamurugan<sup>1</sup>, S. Ezhil Valavan<sup>2</sup>, R. Asha Rajini<sup>3</sup>, N. K. Sudeep kumar<sup>4</sup>,  
A. Sundaresan<sup>5</sup> and A. Serma Saravana Pandian<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>PG Scholar, Department of Poultry Science, Madras Veterinary College, Chennai – 600 007

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Poultry Research Station, Chennai-600 051

<sup>3</sup>Professor, Department of Poultry Science, Madras Veterinary College, Chennai – 600 007

<sup>4</sup>Professor and Head, Department of LBM, Madras Veterinary College, Chennai – 600 007

<sup>5</sup>Assistant Professor, DCAPS, Chennai- 600 051

<sup>6</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of AHE, Madras Veterinary College, Chennai – 600 007

### ABSTRACT

*The present study was conducted to analyze the socio-economic status of farmers rearing native breeder chicken under intensive management system in Western district of Tamil Nadu viz, Erode, Tirupur and Coimbatore. A total of 45 farms, 15 farms in each district were selected by simple random sampling and the data were collected through a semi-structured interview schedule. The selected farms were classified as small (up to 1500), medium (1501 - 3000) and large (more than 3000) with the average farm capacity of 600, 2271 and 5017 birds respectively. The result of the study showed majority of farmers rearing native breeder chicken were graduates, middle (36 to 45 years) aged males who owned the farms and the involvement of women appeared to be consistently low. Native breeder chicken farmers had more than two hectare of lands, low level of experience (less than five years) and used their own lands for native breeder chicken farming in Western district of Tamil Nadu. Native breeder farmers started their practice to earn main income from the native breeder farm and majority of the farmers were not participated any training program.*

**Key words:** Native breeder chicken, intensive rearing, socio-economics

### I. INTRODUCTION

Livestock industry is an important component of the Indian economy that provides animal protein as well as employment for a considerable percentage of the population especially weaker section of country. India has huge population of poultry, out of that around 25 per cent of the total poultry population was contributed by native chicken (Vetrivel and Chandrakumarmangalam, 2013). India has 72.22 per cent of its population living in rural areas and 89 per cent rural livestock householder's rear native poultry as an important supplementary source of cash income (Khandait *et al.*, 2011). In India, meat from native chicken is preferred by people because of its taste, leanness and pigmentation. Native chicken are well known for their adaptability to local agro-climatic condition, hardiness, ability to utilize locally available feed, minimum requirement of care and management and less input technology (Sharma, 2007) that made farmers to rear native chicken in backyard and intensive on their own traditional methods. Previously, native chicken rearing has been investigated in India, focusing mainly on the production performances and survival rate of native chicken reared for meat purpose. In this view, this study was mainly focusing on native breeder chicken, where the new technologies adopted and followed in native breeder chicken farming in Western districts of Tamil Nadu was low or inadequate because of the socioeconomic background of the farmers. Hence the present study was undertaken to summaries the socio – economic status of the farmers rearing native breeder chicken in intensively.

## II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Breeder native chicken farms which have been in continuous production for at least one year were identified in Western district of Tamil Nadu. A total of 45 farms, 15 farms in each district (Erode, Tirupur and Coimbatore) were selected by simple random sampling and the data were collected through a semi-structured interview schedule. The selected farms were classified as small (up to 1500), medium (1501 - 3000) and large (more than 3000) with the average farm capacity of 600, 2271 and 5017 birds respectively. Basic preliminary information on level of education, age in completed years, sex and occupation of the entrepreneurs were collected. The status of the farmers as individual ownership or partnership, land holding particulars and category of farmers were noted. The investment particulars like own investment or bank loan and experience of farmers were gathered. The purpose of maintaining native chicken farm for financial dependence of their livelihood as self-employment or additional source of income was also surveyed. The data collected were subjected to statistical analysis as per Snedecor and Cochran (1989).

## III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Socio – economic status of farmers rearing native breeder chicken in Western Tamil Nadu are presented in table 1 and 2 respectively.

### a. Educational status

Education is one of the important factor which accelerates growth and development of any enterprise. Majority of the intensive native breeder chicken farmers in Western districts of Tamil Nadu were graduates. The above findings are not in agreement with the earlier reports of Satheeskumar (2011) and Kumaresan *et al.* (2008). According to Mandal *et al.* (2006) and Patrick *et al.*, (2013) most of the backyard poultry farmers in Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh and indigenous Tswana chicken owners respectively were illiterates.

The present study indicates that majority of the poultry farmers were educated above high school level of education and over one-third of them were graduates. Their education level might have given them confidence to listen and abide by instruction given by institutions such as veterinary colleges / university and State Animal Husbandry Department, private hatcheries etc. These farmers need hands on training for the higher production of quality native chicks and government organization should study the limitations of these groups and provide them skill development programmes, so as to improve their enterprise.

### b. Age

Among the sample farmers in the study area most of them were middle aged followed by young and old age group. A similar trend was noted by Bikash *et al.* (2010) and Patrick *et al.* (2013). However, Mandal *et al.* (2006) and Satheeskumar (2011) indicated that majority of the poultry owners were young followed by middle and old age group, which is not in agreement with the results of this study. Middle aged farmers being attracted towards native chicken farming augers well for the development of native breeder chicken farming in the state.

### c. Gender

Involvement of men in intensive native breeder chicken farming was high and appeared to be same for all categories of farm size. The finding in this study was very similar to Prabakaran *et al.* (2001) and Lestari *et al.* (2011). Satheeskumar (2011) reported that only 9.09 per cent of the native chicken farms surveyed were owned by females and 90.91 per cent were males. Even though most of the labour intensive activities in the native breeder chicken farming are performed by females, as

entrepreneurs, their role in native breeder chicken farming is minimal. Training programmes by the university and other government institution should concentrate on female participants to ensure their wider participation and for gender equity in poultry farming.

#### **d. Occupation**

The findings of the study showed that intensive native breeder chicken farming was found to be a main occupation for 68.89 per cent of farmers and subsidiary occupation for 31.11 per cent farmers. The present study agreed with the earlier report of Mozumdar *et al.* (2009) and Bikash *et al.* (2010). However, Prabakaran *et al.* (2001) observed that the farmers with commercial layer as main occupation turned to native chicken farming to meet out the loss incurred by layer farming due to seasonal variation, lack of integration and hike in the raw materials cost.

#### **e. Farm ownership status**

In Western districts of Tamil Nadu, most of the native breeder chicken reared under intensive system was owned by individual farmers. Only 4.44 per cent of the native breeder chicken farms were maintained under partnership. Similar results were obtained by Ramamurthy (1994) and Satheeskumar (2011). The results indicate that, native breeder chicken farming is at a nascent stage of development, native chicken farms are mostly owned by individual farmers due to its smaller size and due to this contract farming has also not been attempted so far in native breeder chicken farming.

#### **f. Land holding**

Most of the farmers rearing native breeder chicken have more than two hectares of land, followed by marginal (35.55 per cent) and small (17.78 per cent) who had one to two hectares and less than one hectare respectively. Similar results were observed by Sankhyan *et al.* (2013) and Mandal *et al.* (2006). Most of the farmers had more than two hectares of land indicating that native breeder chicken farming was integrated with agriculture and manure could be used for agriculture.

#### **g. Experience of the farmers**

Majority of the farmers rearing native breeder chicken were new to this enterprise (less than five year), this indicated that native breeder farming in Western Tamil Nadu is in a growing phase and the adoption of scientific management practices needs to be standardized for the well-being of the farmers.

### **IV. CONCLUSION**

The farmers attempting intensive rearing of native breeder chicken were mostly middle aged (40.00 per cent) and very few women (13.33 per cent) were involved in the business when compared to men (86.67 per cent). Most farmers were graduates and had intensive native breeder chicken farming as their main occupation and owned their farms. Most of the native breeder chicken farmers had more than two hectares of land, low level of experience (53.33 per cent) and most farmers used their own land for rearing native breeder chicken in the study area.

### **V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The authors are highly thankful to Tamil Nadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, Chennai -600 051 for conduct of this research programme.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Bikash, B., P. Hazarika and K.K. Saharia, 2010. Socioeconomic and psychological status of poultry farmers in Dibrugarh district of Assam. *Indian J. Field Vet.*, **5**(4): 67-69.
- [2] Khandait, V.N., S.H. Gawande, A.C.Lohakare and S.A. Dhenge, 2011. Adoption level and constraints in backyard poultry rearing practices at Bhandara district of Maharashtra (India). *Res. J. Agri. Sci.*, **2**(1): 110 -113.
- [3] Kumaresan, A., K.M. Bujarbaruah, K.A. Pathak, B. Chhetri, S.K. Ahmed and S. Haunshi, 2008. Analysis of a village chicken production system and performance of improved dual purpose chickens under a subtropical hill agro-ecosystem in India. *Trop. Anim. Health. Prod.*, **40**(6): 395-402.
- [4] Lestari, V.S., S.N. Sirajuddin and K. Kasim, 2011. Adoption of bio-security measures by layer smallholders. *J. Indonesian Trop. Anim. Agric.*, **36**(4): 297-302.
- [5] Mandal, M.K., N. Khandekar and P.Khandekar, 2006. Backyard poultry farming in Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh, India: An analysis. *Livestock Research for Rural Development.*, **18**(7): 20-39 downloaded from <http://www.Irrd.org/Irrd18/17/mand18101.htm>.
- [6] Mozumdar, L., K.S. Farid, J.U. Ahmed and M.V. Rahman. 2009. Broiler farming: An approach to improve rural livelihood. *J. Bangladesh Agril. Univ.*, **7**(2): 395-402.
- [7] Prabakaran, R., T. Sivakumar, K.N. Selvakumar, M. Thirunavukkarasu and A. Serma Saravana Pandian, 2001. FAO projects final report on private sector partnerships in poultry production and marketing in India. Case-Study: Tamil Nadu, Tamil Nadu Veterinary Animal Sciences University, Chennai-51.
- [8] Ramamurthy. N., 1994. The performance of broilers under field conditions in Tamil Nadu. Ph.D. thesis submitted to Tamil Nadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, Chennai.
- [9] Sankhyan. V., S. Katoch, Y.P. Thakur, K. Dinesh, S. Patial and N. Bhardwaj, 2013. Analysis of characteristics and improvement strategies of rural poultry farming in North Western Himalayan state of Himachal Pradesh, India. *Livestock research for rural development*, **25**(12), Article # 211, downloaded from <http://www.Irrd.org/Irrd25/12/sank25211.htm>.
- [10] Satheeskumar, S., 2011. Intensive rearing of native chicken for meat in western Tamil Nadu. M.V.Sc., thesis submitted to Tamil Nadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, Chennai.
- [11] Sharma, R.K., 2007. Role and relevance of rural family poultry in developing countries with special reference to India. *Family poultry*, **17**(1&2): 35-40.
- [12] Snedecor, G.W and W.G. Cochran, 1989. Statistical methods. VIII Edn. Iowa state University Press, Ames, Iowa.
- [13] Vetrivel, S.C and S. Chandrakumarmangalam, 2013. The role of poultry industry in Indian economy. *Brazilian J. Poult. Sci.*, **15**(4): 287-294.

**Table 1. Social status of farmers rearing native breeder chicken intensively in Western Tamil Nadu**

S. No	Particulars		Small (n=15)	Medium (n=15)	Large (n=15)	Over all (n=45)	X <sup>2</sup> -statistics
1	Education	Illiterate	2 (13.33)	-	-	2 (4.44)	-
		Upto high School level	3 (20.00)	1 (6.67)	3 (20.00)	7 (15.56)	
		Higher secondary	5 (33.33)	6 (40.00)	3 (20.00)	14 (31.11)	
		Diploma	1 (6.67)	3 (20.00)	2 (13.33)	6 (13.33)	
		Graduate	4 (26.67)	5 (33.33)	7 (46.67)	16 (35.56)	
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>45 (100)</b>	
2	Age group	Young (≤ 35 yrs)	5 (33.33)	7 (46.67)	3 (20.00)	15 (33.33)	5.43 <sup>NS</sup>
		Middle (36-45 yrs)	7 (46.67)	6 (40.00)	5 (33.33)	18 (40.00)	
		Old (> 45 yrs)	3 (20.00)	2 (13.33)	7 (46.67)	12 (26.67)	
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>45 (100)</b>	
3	Gender	Male	12 (80.00)	13 (86.67)	14 (93.33)	39 (86.67)	1.15 <sup>NS</sup>
		Female	3 (20.00)	2 (13.33)	1 (6.67)	6 (13.33)	
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>45 (100)</b>	
4	Occupation	Main	9 (60.00)	9 (60.00)	13 (86.67)	31 (68.89)	3.32 <sup>NS</sup>
		Subsidiary	6 (40.00)	6 (40.00)	2 (13.33)	14 (31.11)	
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>45 (100)</b>	
5	Farm Ownership status	Individual	15 (100)	14 (93.33)	14 (93.33)	43 (95.56)	-
		Partnership	-	1 (6.67)	1 (6.67)	2 (4.44)	
		<b>Total</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>45 (100)</b>	

Figures in parentheses indicate respective proportions in per cent.  
 NS - Non significant

**Table 2. Socio – economic status of farmers rearing native breeder chicken in Western Tamil Nadu**

S. No	Particulars	Small (n=15)	Medium (n=15)	Large (n=15)	Overall (n=45)	$\chi^2$ - statistics
<b>I</b>	<b>Land holding</b>					<b>4.53<sup>NS</sup></b>
1	Marginal (< 1 hectare)	8 (53.33)	5 (33.34)	3 (20.00)	16 (35.55)	
2	Small (1-2 hectare)	2 (13.33)	2 (13.33)	4 (26.67)	8 (17.78)	
3	Large (> 2 hectare)	5 (33.34)	8 (53.33)	8 (53.33)	21 (46.67)	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>45 (100)</b>	
<b>II</b>	<b>Experience of the farmers</b>					-
1	Low ( ≤ 5 years)	10 (66.66)	11 (73.33)	3 (20.00)	24 (53.33)	
2	Medium (6 – 10 years)	4 (26.67)	4 (26.67)	8 (53.33)	16 (35.56)	
3	High (>10 years)	1 (6.67)	-	4 (26.67)	5 (11.11)	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>15 (100)</b>	<b>45 (100)</b>	
<b>III</b>	<b>Land ownership</b>					-
1	Own land	11 (73.33)	9 (60.00)	15 (100)	35 (77.78)	
2	Lease	4 (26.67)	6 (40.00)	-	10 (22.22)	

Figures in parentheses indicate respective proportions in per cent  
 NS - Non significant

