



Information Sources Utilization by Contract and Non-Contract Broiler Farmers in Eastern Plain Zone of Uttar Pradesh

Amit Kumar Singh^{1*}, M.P. Sagar², A.K. Chaturvedani³ and Jitendra Pratap⁴

¹MVSc Scholar, ^{3&4}PhD Scholar, ²Principal Scientist

Division of Extension Education

ICAR- Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, India-243 122

*Corresponding author: amitvet1987@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted with the objective to identify and compare the information sources utilization by contract and non-contract broiler farmers in four randomly selected blocks of Azamgarh and Varanasi districts of Uttar Pradesh. The information was collected with the help of a pre-tested structured interview schedule developed for the purpose. The study revealed that mobile phone, chick suppliers, broiler feed suppliers and other successful broiler farmers were major sources of information for broiler farmers. Contractors (Integrators) employees were major source of information for contract broiler farmers whereas as chick suppliers, broiler feed suppliers and other successful broiler farmers were major sources of information for non-contract broiler farmers.

KEY WORDS: Information sources, Chick suppliers, Demonstration, Personal localite sources, Mass media.

Received 16.06.2018

Revised 20.07.2018

Accepted 18.08. 2018

INTRODUCTION

Poultry industry contributes about Rs. 600 billion, accounting for about 0.77 per cent of the national GDP and about 10 per cent of the livestock GDP and provides employment to over five million people in the country. The Indian poultry sector has witnessed one of the fastest growing sector with 7.3 per cent growth in poultry population, 8 per cent in egg production and 10 per cent in meat production, over the last decade (2003-2013) amongst all animal based sectors. The high growth has placed India at 3rd position in egg production with a production of 75 billion eggs and 5th position in chicken meat with a production of 3.7 million metric tons of chicken meat [3].

Uttar Pradesh, in spite of its large human population, contributed just around 2.56 per cent of the country's poultry population [4]. As egg production of the state was 181.223 crores per year, while the consumption is 473 cores per year. This huge gap in demand and supply of about 292 crores per year was met by the private sector through procuring nearly one crore eggs daily from other states. Similarly, the requirement of chicken meat was met through purchasing an approximately 10 crores day old broiler chicks from other states annually, therefore it is much needed to prioritize poultry development in the animal husbandry sector. As per the recommendations of the Indian Nutritional Academy, Hyderabad, there should have been consumption of 182 eggs per head per annum as standard. At National level 55 eggs per person are consumed annually, while the state average is only 22 eggs per person annually. Similarly, the standard suggested for meat consumption is 11 kg, while the national availability is 2.8 kg and for U.P, it was 0.987 kg per head per annum [1].

The poultry sector is, however, highly prone to production and market risks, which periodically affect the profitability of poultry production, particularly on the small farms. These risks also threaten the profitability of the industry engaged in breeding of chicks and manufacturing of feed, vaccines and medicines. In order to minimize the risks to the producers and sustain the profitability of the industry, some large poultry firms (for example, Venkateshawara Hatcheries Ltd., Suguna Hatcheries, Pioneer Hatcheries, Diamond Hatcheries, etc.) began integrating their activities with that of poultry production through the institution of contract farming as early as in the early 1990s. A large scale integrated operation typically includes the raising of grandparent and parent flocks, rearing of day-old-chicks, feed

milling, provision of veterinary services and contract production. Such Integrators are most common in Southern and Western region of the country [6].

A contract farming arrangement in poultry production, referred to as “chick growing agreement” is generally a wage contract between an Integrator, who supplies the intermediate inputs and procures the output, and a poultry farmer, who provides the primary inputs in the production process. The Integrator provides the growing stock (DOCs; fatteners), feed, veterinary supplies and services, and implements the final marketing of the output. The contract farmer typically provides the space and facilities (land and housing), equipment, utilities, labours (family and/or hired) and day-to-day farm management. Thus, the major component of working capital is borne by the Integrator and He is the absolute owner of movable stocks in the farm.

The farmer receives a guaranteed wage or growing charges for each live bird based on its live weight in a condition that is predetermined and agreed upon through contractual obligation. These are usually specified by the Integrator for the purposes of live sale or slaughter. Generally the payments are linked to the performance criteria in terms of efficiency in managing the birds; for example the weight, quantum of feed used to produce that weight (Feed Conversion Ratio- FCR), percentage of birds died and others. Additional incentives are given to the farmer for surpassing the performance standards. For farmers who fall below the set standards, corresponding penalty amount per bird is subtracted from the wage bill. Hence, the production contracts can be seen as a self regulating system of reward and punishment to ensure cost effective production of poultry for the Integrator in accordance with the quality and quantity, needed by the markets. As in contract farming, the integrators provide the extension and advisory services to the farmers, so the present study was conducted to identify and compare the information sources utilization by contract and non-contract broiler farmers.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

For the present study, two districts Azamgarh and Varanasi were selected, purposely, out of 12 districts of the eastern plain zone of Uttar Pradesh, on the basis of poultry population. Two blocks from each selected district, Mahrajganj and Bilariyaganj from Azamgarh and Kashi Vidyapeeth and Pindra from Varanasi district were selected, randomly. Thus, four blocks were selected from both the districts. Contract and non-contract broiler farmers in each block were listed separately. Fifteen contract and fifteen non-contract broiler farmers, having at least 2000 birds and two years of experience in broiler farming were selected, randomly, from the respective list. This makes total sample size of 120 broiler farmers (60 contract and 60 non-contract). Problems faced by contract broiler farmers were categorized into categories as problems in receiving inputs, problems in marketing of outputs and problems in services and payment. Whereas problems faced by non-contract broiler farmers were grouped as problems in purchasing of input and problems in marketing of output. The data was collected with the help of a pre-tested structured interview schedule and results were presented in terms of frequency and percentage.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Information source utilization

Mass media sources

The table 1 shows that all the contract and non-contract broiler farmers (100%) were found to use mobile phone ‘often’ for getting information regarding commercial poultry farming. While farm publications were utilized by 46.67 per cent contract broiler farmers ‘occasionally’ as compared to 43.33 per cent non-contract broiler farmers, which were mostly supplied by feed companies. Other mass media sources of information, used occasionally by the contract and non-contract broiler farmers were radio (16.67 and 11.67%), newspaper (15 and 11.62%), TV (8.33 and 3.33%), and internet (8.33 and 5%) respectively. The mass media information sources like *Kisan mela*, films and demonstrations were never used by any contract and non-contract broiler farmers for getting information about poultry farming. Contract and non-contract broiler framers in overwhelming majorities were never used internet (91.67 and 95%), TV (91.67 and 96.67%), Radio (83.33 and 83.33%) and news paper (81.67 and 88.33%), respectively. Similar findings were reported by Babu [2].

Table 1: Distribution of broiler farmers, according to information sources utilization: Mass media sources

Information sources utilization	Often		Occasional		Never	
	C.B.F (n=60)	N.C.B.F (n=60)	C.B.F (n=60)	N.C.B.F (n=60)	C.B.F (n=60)	N.C.B.F (n=60)
TV	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (8.33)	2 (3.33)	55 (91.67)	58 (96.67)
Radio	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	10 (16.67)	7 (11.67)	50 (83.33)	53 (88.33)
Films	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	60 (100)	60 (100)
News Paper	2 (3.33)	0 (0.0)	9 (15.00)	7 (11.67)	49 (81.67)	53 (88.33)
Farm publication	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	28 (46.67)	26 (43.33)	32 (53.33)	34 (56.67)
<i>Kisan mela</i>	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	60 (100)	60 (100)
Demonstration	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	60 (100)	60 (100)
Mobile phone	60 (100)	60 (100)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Internet	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (8.33)	3 (5)	55 (91.67)	57 (95)

Figures in the parenthesis indicate percentage, C.B.F. = contract broiler farmers, N.C.B.F. = Non-contract broiler farmers.

Personal cosmopolite sources

In case of personal cosmopolite sources of information contract broiler farmers were completely dependent on contractor's employee as cent per cent poultry farmers were found to use it often while, non-contract broiler farmers were found to dependent on feed suppliers and chick suppliers, as they used these sources for obtaining information regarding broiler farming. The Veterinary Officers and Livestock Extension Officers were "never" used as a source of information for broiler farming by contract broiler farmers, whereas majority of non-contract broiler farmers used Veterinary Officers and Livestock Extension Officers (66.67 and 63.33%) "Occasionally" followed by "never" (26.67 and 23.33%) and "often" (6.67 and 8%) as a source of information regarding broiler farming. Similar findings were reported by Pratap [5].

Table 2: Distribution of broiler farmers, according to information sources utilization: Personal cosmopolite sources.

Information source utilization	Often		Occasional		Never	
	C.B.F (n=60)	N.C.B.F (n=60)	C.B.F (n=60)	N.C.B.F (n=60)	C.B.F (n=60)	N.C.B.F (n=60)
Veterinary officer	0 (0.0)	4 (6.67)	0 (0.0)	40 (66.67)	60 (100)	16 (26.67)
L.E.O	0 (0.0)	8 (13.33)	0 (0.0)	38 (63.33)	60 (100)	14 (23.33)
Chick supplier	60 (100)	60 (100)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Feed supplier	60 (100)	60 (100)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Contractor's employee	60 (100)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	60 (100)

Figures in the parenthesis indicate percentage, C.B.F. = contract broiler farmers, N.C.B.F. = Non-contract broiler farmers.

Personal localite sources

Table 3 further reveals that contract and non-contract broiler farmers (100%) were completely dependent on other poultry farmers as they 'often' used them for getting information regarding broiler farming. Contract and non-contract broiler farmers were also found to use family members as 'often' (28.33 and 31.67%), and 'occasionally' (20 and 18.33%), respectively. The personal localite sources of information such as neighbors, friends and relatives were never used by overwhelming majority of contract (93.33, 80 and 88.34%) and non-contract (91.67, 83.33 and 81.67%) broiler farmers, for seeking information on broiler farming respectively.

Table 3: Distribution of broiler farmers, according to information sources utilization: Personal localite sources.

Information sources utilization	Often		Occasional		Never	
	C.B.F (n=60)	N.C.B.F (n=60)	C.B.F (n=60)	N.C.B.F (n=60)	C.B.F (n=60)	N.C.B.F (n=60)
Neighbors	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (6.67)	5 (8.33)	56 (93.33)	55 (91.67)
Friends	8 (13.33)	8 (13.33)	4 (6.67)	2 (3.33)	48 (80.00)	50 (83.33)
Family members	17 (28.33)	19 (31.67)	12 (20.00)	11 (18.33)	31 (51.67)	30 (50.00)
Relatives	5 (8.33)	7 (11.67)	2 (3.33)	4 (6.66)	53 (88.34)	49 (81.67)
Other poultry farmers	60 (100)	60 (100)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)

Figures in the parenthesis indicate percentage, C.B.F. = contract broiler farmers, N.C.B.F. = Non-contract broiler farmers.

In nutshell, results indicate that mobile phone, chick suppliers, poultry feed suppliers other successful poultry farmers had emerged as major sources of information on poultry farming for poultry farmers

CONCLUSION

The study identified and compares the socio-economic status of contract and non-contract broiler farmers in broiler production. The study revealed that mobile phone, chick suppliers, broiler feed suppliers and other successful broiler farmers were major sources of information for broiler farmers. Contractors (Integrators) employees were major source of information for contract broiler farmers whereas as chick suppliers, broiler feed suppliers and other successful broiler farmers were major sources of information for non-contract broiler farmers.

REFERENCES

1. Annual Report. (2013). State department of animal husbandry, Uttar Pradesh.
2. Babu, P. (2013). 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.
3. CARI. (2013). Perspective Plan Vision 2050, Central Avian Research Institute, Izatnagar, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh, India.
4. GOI. (2012). Livestock census, Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India.
5. Pratap, J. (2014). 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.
6. USDA. (2004). India's Poultry Sector, Development and Prospects, Agriculture and Trade Reports, Economics Research Service, WRS-04-03.

CITATION OF THIS ARTICLE

Amit Kumar Singh, M.P. Sagar, A.K. Chaturvedani and Jitendra Pratap. Information Sources Utilization by Contract and Non-Contract Broiler Farmers in Eastern Plain Zone of Uttar Pradesh. Bull. Env. Pharmacol. Life Sci., Vol 7 [10] September 2018: 139-142