

Socio-Economic Status of Tribal Backyard Poultry Rearers in Bastar District of Chhattisgarh

A.K. Chaturvedani¹, Niranjan Lal², Jitendra Pratap³ and N.K. Khyalia^{4*}

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted in the Bastar district of Chhattisgarh with the specific objective of finding out the socio-economic profile of the backyard poultry rearers. A multi-stage random sampling procedure was used to select 120 respondents (12 respondents per village) for the study. A structured interview schedule duly pre-tested and validated was used to elicit information from the respondents. The findings of the study revealed that most of the poultry rearers (58.00%) were middle aged belonged to *Gond* tribe (55.83%) with primary to secondary level education and small size family, agriculture as primary (51.67%) and poultry as secondary occupation (35.38%), with medium flock size (11-16 birds) poultry farms. Majority (84.17%) of the respondents were marginal to small land holding and getting low level of income (67.50%). Majority (51.67%) of the respondents had low level of material possession. The study concludes that the backyard poultry production needs more extension training to enrich their skill and to improve their standard of living.

Keywords: Socio-economic, Tribal, Chhattisgarh, Backyard Poultry.

INTRODUCTION

Bastar, the land of tribes and about 70 per cent of the total population comprises tribals, contribute 26.76 per cent of the total tribal population of Chhattisgarh. The major tribes of the Bastar region are *Gond*, *Abhuj Maria* and *Bhatra Bhatra*. These households have traditionally relied on small scale low cost poultry production systems to supplement and enhance their livelihoods (Ahuja and Sen, 2007). Backyard poultry play important role in accelerating the pace of poverty reduction, enhancing the food, nutrition security of the rural households and promotion of gender equality (Ahuja, 2004). Backyard poultry has found special favour with the poor (landless, marginal and small farmers) and tribals, scheduled castes and other backward caste communities (Shinde and Srivastava, 2006; Mandal *et al.*, 2006). Information on the existing backyard poultry production system and tribals involved in this particular system helps in formulating the strategies for better adoption of poultry practices. In this context, the socio-economic status of the tribal backyard poultry rearers is very much essential for the policy makers to develop an effective programme. Hence, an effort has been made in the present study to collect information regarding socio-

economic status of backyard poultry rearers and their farming systems in Bastar district of Chhattisgarh.

METHODOLOGY

The present study was purposively conducted in Bastar district of Chhattisgarh. The Bastar district comprises of 7 blocks out of which two blocks (Bakawand and Jagdalpur) were chosen randomly. From each block five villages were selected randomly and from each village 12 poultry rearers were selected randomly making a total 120 poultry rearing women were selected for the study. The data was collected using well-structured and pre-tested interview schedule. Relevant data pertaining to the study was collected, analysed using frequency and percentage analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Age: The data related to the social background of the respondents is given in table 1. Respondents were categorized into three groups based mean \pm standard deviation viz; young (<30 yrs), middle aged (30-50 yrs) and old (>50 yrs). It was found that out of the total

^{1, 3, 4}PhD Scholar, Division of Extension Education, ICAR-Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh - 243122

²Senior Scientist and Head, KVK Churachandpur, Manipur

respondents 58.33 per cent respondents were in middle age group, 36.67 per cent in the young age group and 5.00 per cent in the old age group. The average age of Bakawand, Jagdalpur blocks were 32.62, 32.58 years, respectively and overall average age was 32.6 years. These observations were in concurrence with the findings of Khan (2006) in Uttar Pradesh.

Sex: It could be observed from the table-1 that in Bakawand, Jagdalpur block (55.00%) and (50.00%) of the respondents were male and (45.00%) and (50.00%) of remaining were female, respectively. The overall male respondents were (52.50%) and female were (47.50%).

It implies that male members of the family were comparatively more engaged in backyard poultry rearing in the study area.

Religion: A cursory look at table-1 reveals that a majority (81.67%) of the respondents were Hindu and rest (18.34%) were Christian. It implies that study area was Hindu dominated.

Family type: It was indicated that a majority (75.83%) of the respondents had nuclear family and only (24.17%) respondents had joint family. Table-1 revealed that 75.00 per cent and 76.67 per cent respondents of Bakawand

Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to their social background

Social characters	Bakawand (n=60)		Jagdalpur (n=60)		Total (N=120)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Age						
Young (<30yrs)	21	35.00	23	38.33	44	36.67
Middle (30-50yrs)	37	61.67	33	55.00	70	58.33
Old (>50yrs)	2	3.33	4	6.67	6	5.00
Mean ± SD	32.62 ±6.99	32.58 ±8.28	32.6 ±7.63			
Sex						
Male	33	55.00	30	50.00	63	52.50
Female	27	45.00	30	50.00	57	47.50
Religion						
Hindu	50	83.33	48	80.00	98	81.66
Christian	10	16.67	12	20.00	22	18.33
Tribes						
Gond	32	53.33	35	58.33	67	55.83
Bhatra	10	16.67	8	13.33	18	15.00
Halba	6	10.00	8	13.33	14	11.67
Muriya	4	6.67	5	8.33	9	7.50
Mariya	3	5.00	2	3.33	5	4.17
Kawar	3	5.00	1	1.67	4	3.33
Oraon	2	3.33	1	1.67	3	2.50
Family type						
Nuclear	45	75.00	46	76.67	91	75.83
Joint	15	25.00	14	23.33	29	24.17
Family size						
Low (3-6)	32	53.33	34	56.67	66	55.00
Medium (6-9)	24	40.00	21	35.00	45	37.50
High (9-12)	4	6.67	5	8.33	9	7.50
Mean ± SD	5.6 ±1.91	5.6 ±1.95	5.6 ±1.92			
Family education status						
Low (2-4)	33	55.00	35	58.33	68	56.67
Medium (4-6)	26	43.33	23	38.33	49	40.83
High (6-8)	1	1.67	2	3.33	3	2.50
Mean ± SD	3.52±1.09	3.56±1.18	3.54±1.13			
Type of housing						
Hut	15	25.00	12	20.00	27	22.50
Kaccha	28	46.67	26	43.33	54	45.00
Pacca	5	8.33	6	10.00	11	9.17
Mixed	12	20.00	16	26.67	28	23.33
Land holding						
Landless	3	5.00	5	8.33	8	6.67
Marginal (<1 hac)	24	40.00	26	43.33	50	41.67
Small (1-2hac)	27	45.00	24	40.00	51	42.50
Medium (2-4hac)	6	10.00	5	8.33	11	9.17
Mean ± SD	2.55±1.578	2.37±1.605	2.46±1.587			

and Jagdalpur blocks belonged to nuclear family. About (25.00%) and (23.33%) respondents had joint family in Bakawand and Jagdalpur block, respectively.

Family size: The data in table 1 revealed that a majority (55.00%) of poultry rearers belonged to small (3- 6 members) followed by medium (37.50%) with family size (between 6-9 members) and only 7.50 per cent were having larger family size (9-12 members). The average family size was found to be 5.6 in both the selected blocks *i.e.* Bakawand and Jagdalpur, respectively. However, overall mean family size was 5.6 members. This indicates the changing social dimension from large to small family size.

Family education status: A perusal of data in table 1 revealed that a majority (56.67%) of families belonged to low family educational status followed by medium (40.83 %) and high (2.50%). Similar finding was also reported by Thakur (2013) in hills of Himachal Pradesh, that majority of respondents and their family members received education up to primary school level.

Type of house: The data in table- 1 shows that (45.00%) of the respondents had *kaccha* house, (23.33%) had mixed housing, (22.50%) had huts and (9.17%) had *pucca* houses. Similar finding was also reported by Patel *et al.*, (2014) in Dahod District of Gujarat, implies that the socio-economic status of rearers were very poor in the studied area.

Land holding: Land holding is one of important socio-economic parameter, which has influence on the economic and social status of the farmers. The data in table 1 revealed that the average land holdings amongst the poultry rearers in Bakawand and Jagdalpur blocks were 2.55 and 2.37 acres, respectively. The majority (42.50%) of respondents were belonging to small land holding category, followed by marginal (41.67 %), medium (9.17 %) and landless (6.67 %) categories. This may be because those having marginal and smaller land are venturing into other occupations like labour, to improve their income and livelihood.

Occupation: The data presented in table 2 revealed that 51.67 per cent respondents had agriculture farming as primary occupation followed by labour (30.00 %), business (10.00 %) and service (8.33 %), whereas (35.83 %) respondents had poultry as secondary occupation followed by labour (25.83 %), agriculture farming (20.83 %) and animal husbandry (17.50 %).

The primary occupation of both the blocks was agriculture whereas backyard poultry farming was found to be a secondary and subsidiary occupation for majority of the

Table 2: Distribution of respondents according to occupation

Family occupation	Total (N=120)			
	Primary		Secondary	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Labour	36	30.00	31	25.83
Agricultural farming	62	51.67	25	20.83
Animal husbandry	0	0.00	21	17.50
Business/ trade and commerce	12	10.00	0	0.00
Service	10	8.33	0	0.00
Poultry production	0	0.00	43	35.83

respondents. It could provide gainful employment to the family members and utilize the baron and fallow land available with the rearers. Similar finding also reported by Saha (2003) in West Bengal.

Flock size: The data in table 3 revealed that average flock size of Bakawand and Jagdalpur block was 13 and 14 birds, respectively. The table further revealed that majority (53.33%) of poultry rearers were found to rear medium size flock (11-16), followed by (24.17 %) had small flock (5-11) and 22.50 per cent had large flock size (16-22). Results concurred with finding of Nath *et al.* (2012) in rural tribal areas of Sikkim, indicated that farmers rear poultry at small scale, as a secondary source of income for their livelihood.

Experience in poultry rearing: All the backyard poultry respondents reported that they rear *desi* type and coloured birds. *Desi* birds seem to be the promising native chicken for low input free range system of rearing for meat and egg production in rural and tribal areas. The data in table 3 indicates that a majority (59.17%) of poultry rearers were having low level of experience (3-15 years), while 35.00 per cent had medium level of experience (15-28 years) and the rest 5.83 per cent had high level of experience (28-40 years). Mean values of experience in poultry farming of Bakawand and Jagdalpur block were 16 and 14.72 years, respectively. Overall mean experience was 15.36 years.

Gross family income: A perusal of data given in table 3 revealed that majority (67.50%) poultry rearers belonged to low income category, followed by medium (26.67%) and high (5.83%) income from all sources including poultry farming. This may be because of majority of respondents being either landless or marginal farmers and possessing small flock size. The average annual income from all the sources of Bakawand and Jagdalpur block was 42,456.7 and 43,451.7 respectively with a minimum ₹13,500 in low income group and a maximum ₹1,25,000 in high income group.

Table 3: Distribution of respondents according to economic backgrounds

Economic characters	Bakawand (n=60)		Jagdapur (n=60)		Total (N=120)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Flock size						
Low (5-11)	17	28.33	12	20.00	29	24.17
Medium (11-16)	32	53.33	32	53.33	64	53.33
High (16-22)	11	18.33	16	26.67	27	22.50
Mean ± SD	12.78±4.211		13.83±4.126		13.31±4.184	
Gross annual family income						
Low (13500-50667)	44	73.33	37	61.67	81	67.50
Medium (50667-87833)	12	20.00	20	33.33	32	26.67
High (87833-125000)	4	6.67	3	5.00	7	5.83
Mean ± SD	42456.7±24965		43451.7±23354.5		42954.2±24076.6	
Annual income from poultry						
Low (1500-3200)	18	30.00	13	21.67	31	25.83
Medium (3200-4900)	31	51.67	31	51.67	62	51.67
High (4900-6600)	11	18.33	16	26.67	27	22.50
Mean ± SD	3796.67±1293.79		4118.33±1264.71		3957.5±1284.14	
Experience in poultry rearing						
Low (3-15)	33	55.00	38	63.33	71	59.17
Medium (15-28)	24	40.00	18	30.00	42	35.00
High (28-40)	3	5.00	4	6.67	7	5.83
Mean ± SD	16±7.44		14.72±7.63		15.36±7.54	
Level of material possession						
Low(0-6)	33	55.00	29	48.33	62	51.67
Medium (6-12)	22	36.67	24	40.00	46	38.33
High (12-18)	5	8.33	7	11.67	12	10.00

Gross annual income from poultry: With respect to annual income from poultry, the data presented in table 3 revealed that majority (51.67%) poultry rearers were in medium income group, followed by low (25.83 %) and high (22.50 %). The average annual income from poultry in Bakawand and Jagdalpur blocks were 3796.67 and 4118.33. The least annual income was 1500 per annum in low income group and maximum 6600 in high income group, so majority of the poultry rearers belonged to below poverty line (BPL) category.

Level of material possession: The data in table 3 revealed that a majority of poultry rearers (51.66%) had low level of material possession, (38.33%) had medium level and (10.00%) had high level of material possession. It's due to fact that majority of the poultry rearers belonged to below poverty line (BPL) category.

CONCLUSION

The present study shows that backyard poultry play an important role in supplying the additional income to small, marginal farmers of tribal area. The study also revealed that average flock size was 13.3 and average income from backyard poultry rearing was 3957.5. Socio-economic development can be achieved with the help of backyard poultry rearing. There is a wide scope for development of free-range poultry rearing in the tribal

backyard poultry production because rural poor women have enough time for rearing desi birds. It would be really very helpful for income generation, women empowerment, and nutritional improvement for the rural family. In the present study in terms of overall socio-economic improvement cent percent backyard poultry rearers opined that backyard poultry farming helped to improve their socio-economic condition. As a result, tendency to initiate backyard poultry rearing is widely observed in tribal areas.

REFERENCES

- Ahuja, V. and Sen, A. 2007. Scope and Space for small scale poultry production in developing countries, International Conference "Poultry in the 21st Century: Avian Influenza and Beyond", Bangkok, November, 5-7.
- Ahuja, V. 2004. Livestock and Livelihoods: Challenges and Opportunities for Asia in the Emerging Market Environment, National Dairy Development Board, India and Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (South Asia Hub) of FAO.
- Khan, M. A. 2006. Study of organized and unorganized sector of poultry production in Uttar Pradesh. M.V.Sc Thesis, ICAR-Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, Uttar Pradesh.
- Mandal, M. K; Khandekar, N. and Khandekar, P. 2006. Backyard poultry farming in Bareilly district of Uttar Pradesh, India: An analysis. *Livestock Research for Rural Development*, 18 (7).

Nath, B.G; Toppo, S; Chandra, R; Chatlod, L.R. and Mohanty, A.K. 2012. Level of adoption and constraints of scientific backyard poultry rearing practices in rural tribal areas of Sikkim, India. *Online Journal of Animal and Feed Research*, 2(2),133-138.

Patel, S. K; Machhar, R. G; Kacha, H. L; Rani, R. R; Patel, G. D. and Patel, U.M. 2014. Effect of Backyard Poultry Farming on Living Standard of Tribal Farmers in Dahod District of Gujarat, India. *Journal of Poultry Science and Technology*, 2(4), 79-83.

Saha, D. 2003. Status of rural poultry production in North 24 Parganas district of West Bengal. M.V.Sc. Thesis, ICAR- Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, Uttar Pradesh.

Shinde, P.K. and Srivastava, Neeraj. 2006. Adaptive Research Interventions on Household Poultry: Lessons Learned and Feedback for Further Research. In: Sasidhar, P.V.K. (Ed.). Poultry Research Priorities to 2020, Proceedings of National Seminar, November 2-3, 2006. Central Avian Research Institute, Izatnagar, pp, 239-243.

Thakur, D; Sharma, A.K; Chander M. and Katoch, S. 2013. Adoption of scientific backyard poultry rearing practices in hills of Himachal Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Poultry Science*, 48(3), 357-361.