

Original Research Article

ASSESSMENT OF EXTENSION ADVISORY SERVICES IN CONTRACT AND NON-CONTRACT BROILER FARMING

ABSTRACT

Poultry is one of the most important and fastest growing sectors of agriculture today in India. The present study was conducted to assess the extent of extension advisory services in contract and non-contract broiler farming. The study was conducted in 3 districts of Karnataka and the data was collected from 60 contract and 60 non-contract broiler farmers through pretested interview schedule. The study revealed that Cent percent of the contract broiler farmers depends on Integrator for the extension advisory services, non-contract broiler farmers depend upon private poultry consultant for extension advisory services. The returns are assured and almost fixed in contract broiler farming, whereas in non-contract broiler farming they vary widely depending upon the market price, Establishment of regulatory bodies and expansion and strengthening of the EAS is essential for further improvement.

Keywords: *Broiler farming, Contract farming and Advisory services*

INTRODUCTION

In India about 65-70 percent of population directly or indirectly depend on agriculture. Animal husbandry and livestock management are the integral parts of agriculture. Livestock sector contributes 4.11% GDP and 25.6% of total Agriculture GDP. Indian Poultry Industry is 5,000 years old whereas the poultry sector in India has undergone a paradigm shift in structure and operation. Poultry is one of the most important and fastest-growing sectors of agriculture today in India. The poultry sector majorly maintains the requirements of protein and nutrition. A significant feature of India's poultry industry has been its transformation from a mere backyard activity into a major commercial activity in just about four decades.

The contract broiler farming system has played a major role in the spectacular growth especially in southern and western states with almost 80% of broiler meat being produced under

contract farming. During the last three decades, there have been major changes in structure, size and number of broiler farms. Now a typical broiler farmer raises 5000 to 50,000 birds for a weekly cycle compared to few hundred in 1990s. Due to modernization of production and management practices, the body weight which was achieved at 8 weeks of age during the 1980s is now realized in 35 to 40 days of age, of course with compromise in poultry welfare.

The major differences between CBF and NCBF are, in the case of CBF, an integrator provides working capital (chicks, feed, medicines, vaccines and veterinary services) and EAS including routine and emergency veterinary services, pays rearing charges along with incentives for efficiency and penalties for high mortality and assures a market for broilers. In the case of NCBF, the farmer is responsible for all costs associated with broiler production and marketing and the returns are almost fixed in case of CBF where as it is mainly dependent on market sale rate in NCBF. With these facts we set the objective to study the extension advisory services in contract and noncontract broiler farming.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

An exploratory research design was adopted for the present study. The study was carried out in two taluks for CBF and three taluks for NCBF in Shivamogga, Davanagere and Vijayanagara Districts of Karnataka. These districts are purposively selected as a poultry hub, having dense contract and non-contract broiler poultry farmers and they are located in the centre of the Karnataka.

Purposive sampling is used for selection of the respondents from randomly selected villages of taluks of the districts. Shivamogga, Davanagere and Vijayanagara, districts consist of a total of 19 taluks, out of these, 2 taluks from each district were selected thus comprising a total 6 taluks for the study. From these selected 6 taluks 10 contract poultry farmers were selected from randomly selected villages, thus forming a total of 20 farmers from each district and total respondent size of 60 contract broiler farmers from all the three districts. Because there is a smaller number of non-contract broiler farmers in these 2 taluks of each district, one more taluk is selected from each district totally 3 taluks from each district were selected, thus arriving a respondent's size of 20 non-contract broiler farmers, from each district, and thus forming a total respondent size of 60 non-contract broiler farmers from the three districts.

The interview schedule covering all the variables was developed and pretested with 10 contract and 10 non-contract farmers in non-sample area i.e., Ballari district in Karnataka state. On the basis of the pre-testing experience, the interview schedule was modified and duplicated for data collection. In all the districts, the respondents were interviewed personally at their

respective poultry farms. Researcher made sure that the respondents correctly understood the questions by repeating the questions whenever necessary. The data obtained was coded, entered into a computer spreadsheet and analyzed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

EXTENSION ADVISORY SERVICES

Applicability of advisory services

Among contract broiler farmers majority (55 %) felt that applicability of advisory services is applicable, followed by 45 per cent is extremely applicable, nobody having neither applicable nor inapplicable, Inapplicable and extremely inapplicable. In non-contract broiler farmers applicability of advisory services is neither applicable nor inapplicable is 45 percent, followed by 30 per cent is applicable, 21.67 per cent is inapplicable and 1.67 per cent is inapplicable as well as extremely inapplicable.(Table.1) In contract broiler farming, regarding applicability of the advisory services, nearly half of the number of respondents expressed that it was applicable as they were depending on the integrator for advisory services. This finding is in line with findings of Gopala [1] and Sasidhar and Suvedi [2]

Frequency of EAS

Among contract broiler farmers majority (65.00) felt that frequency of EAS is regular, 35 per cent felt that it is highly regular and nobody has the opinion that EAS was Very irregular, irregular, neither regular nor irregular. In case of non-contract broiler farmers half (50%) felt it was irregular followed by 36.67 per cent neither regular nor irregular,8.33 per cent it was regular,3.33 per cent it was highly regular and in 1.67 percent it was very regular.(Table.1) Regarding frequency of providing EAS in contract broiler farming is regular or highly regular because, integrator is more concerned about the overall good production management and by good margin of profit. This finding is in line with findings of Gopala [1] and Sasidhar and Suvedi [2]

Timeliness of EAS

Among contract broiler farmers majority (55.00%) felt that EAS was timely, followed by 45 per cent was very timely and nobody felt that it was very untimely, untimely, neither timely nor untimely. Among non-contract broiler farmers half (50.00%) it was neither timely nor untimely

followed by 30 percent it was untimely, in 16.67 per cent it was timely, in 3.33 percent it was very timely and nobody felt that it was very untimely.(Table.1) Regarding timeliness in getting EAS more than half of the contract broiler farmers, it is timely and in nearly half of the non-contract broiler farmers getting the EAS is neither timely nor untimely. Integrator provides EAS timely in case of contract broiler farmers on regular basis where as in case of non-contract broiler farmers he has to depend on private poultry consultant by paying. This finding is in line with findings of Gopala [1] and Sasidhar and Suvedi [2]

Relevance of EAS

Among contract broiler farmers majority (55.00 %) felt that relevance of EAS relevant, followed by 45 percent it was highly relevant and nobody felt that it was Highly irrelevant, Irrelevant and Neither relevant nor irrelevant. Among non-contract broiler farmers half (50.00 %) it was neither relevant nor irrelevant, followed by in 33.33 percent it was relevant, 13.33 it was irrelevant, in 3.33 it was highly relevant and nobody felt it was highly irrelevant (Table.1). Regarding relevance of EAS, more than half of the contract boiler farmers felt that it was relevant and half of the non-contract broiler farmer's relevance of EAS is neither relevant nor irrelevant. This finding is in line with findings of Gopala [1] and Sasidhar and Suvedi [2]

Adequacy of the EAS

Among contract broiler farmers majority (61.67%) felt that adequacy of the EAS was adequate, followed by 36.67 percent felt it was highly adequate,1.67 percent inadequate, nobody felt that it was neither adequate nor inadequate and also highly inadequate. Among non-contract broiler farmers half (51.67%) felt that adequacy of the EAS was neither adequate nor inadequate, followed by 23.33 percent was adequate and inadequate, in 1.67 it was highly adequate and nobody had felt it was highly inadequate (Table.1). Regarding adequacy of the EAS more than half of the contract broiler farmers felt it was adequate and among non-contract broiler farmers half of them felt that it was neither adequate nor inadequate. This finding is in line with findings of Gopala [1] and Sasidhar and Suvedi [2]

Usefulness of EAS

Among contract broiler farmers half (50.00%) felt that Usefulness of EAS is highly useful, followed by another half (50.00%) felt it was useful and nobody felt it was neither useful nor not useful, not useful, highly not useful. Among non-contract broiler farmers majority (56.67%) felt that it was

useful, followed by 28.33 per cent felt it was neither useful nor not useful, in 13.33 percent it was not useful, 1.67 felt that it was highly useful and nobody felt it was highly not useful. (Table.1). Regarding usefulness of EAS for half of the contract broiler farmers is highly useful and for another half it was useful. Among non-contract broiler farmers for more than half it was useful only. This finding is in line with findings of Gopala [1] and Sasidhar and Suvedi [2]

Technical know-how of EAS provider

Among contract broiler farmers majority (55.00%) felt technical know-how of EAS provider was satisfied, followed by the 43.33 percent are extremely satisfied, 1.67 percent are neither useful nor not useful, none of them are dissatisfied and extremely dissatisfied. among non-contract broiler farmers majority (56.67%) are satisfied, 40.00 percent felt neither useful nor not useful, 3.33 percent are extremely satisfied, 1.67 percent felt highly useful none of them felt it was highly not useful (Table.1). Regarding technical know-how of EAS provider more than half of the contract broiler farmers and same percent of the non-contract broiler farmers are satisfied with the EAS provider. Advisory services are provided by the integrator for which he is charging which comes under overheads as per live weight of the birds produced, so he provides advisory services on regular basis. Whereas in case of the non-contract broiler farmers he has to pay extra money as cash, or he will manage with his experiences so in case of the noncontract broiler farmers EAS is less applicable, frequency is irregular, neither timely nor untimely, neither relevant nor irrelevant, neither adequate nor inadequate, useful, satisfied with the technical know-how of EAS provider, message was understandable.

Sources for EAS

In CBF, the integrator was the only source of EAS (100%). About 91.67 and 8.33 percent of contract farmers received EAS from the integrator very frequently and frequently, respectively and only 3.33 per cent received EAS from any other KVK very rarely. Private poultry consultants were the primary source of EAS for NCBF (75%), other poultry farmers (21.67%) government veterinary doctor (6.67%), Govt. Extension personnel (1.67%), any other like KVK (1.67%) EAS is lacking in the NCBF but they are managing with self-experience (Table 2). Company supervisors visited contract farms from time to time to give EAS services, advise on medications, and check the performance/growth of the birds, and record key performance metrics such as body weight, FCR, mortality and so on, according to contract farmers. The company's supervisors are trained poultry technicians, not poultry veterinarians, according to

the FGD and discussions with contract farmers. Only when a disease outbreak or unusual mortality was recorded did veterinarians from the contract company visit the farms. In the case of NCBF, private poultry consultants were a significant source of EAS on a payment basis. Observations from interactions with non-contract farmers revealed that farmers handled the majority of day-to-day problems using their experience, but sought the advice of poultry consultants during disease outbreaks. The findings of the study with respect to extension advisory services are in agreement with that of the findings of Kathirchelvan and Senthilkumar [3], Singh *et al.* [4]. Sultana *et al.* [5],

Difference in adoption of technical advice in CBF and NCBF

Results presented in (Tables 3) indicate that technical advices related to chicks, housing and feeding were adopted more in CBF, but in NCBF advice on medication practices were more often adopted. The findings of the study with respect to adoption of technical advice in contract and non-contract broiler farmers are in agreement with that of the findings of Sasidhar and Suvedi (2015) and Gopala. (2016).

CONCLUSION

In this study it was found that majority of the contract farmers perceived the extension advisory services are timely available and they are useful, whereas in case of noncontract broiler farmers only half of the respondents perceived it as useful and they perceived it is not timely available. Regarding satisfaction both the farmers are satisfied with the services, but still they demand for the improvement of the services. Hence care need to be taken by the concerned authority to provide need-based services to the farmers.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Gopala GT, Evaluation of integrated contract broiler farming system in Karnataka. 2016 Ph.D. thesis, School of Agriculture Indira Gandhi National Open university, New Delhi.
- [2] Sasidhar PVK and Suvedi M. Integrated Contract Broiler Farming: An Evaluation Case Study in India. Modernizing Extension and Advisory Services 2015, www.meas.illinois.edu
- [3] Kathirchelvan M and Senthilkumar T, Inputs Quality Assessment among the Beneficiaries of Contract Broiler Farming System. 2015. Elixir.Poult.Sci., 86: 34925-34926.
- [4] Singh AK, Sagar MP and Chander M. Constraints in Contract and Non-Contract Broiler Farming Systems in Eastern Plain Zone of Uttar Pradesh. The Indian Journal of Veterinary Sciences and Biotechnology., 2017 12(03): 39-41.
- [5] Sultana F, Khatun H and Islam A Small scale broiler farming at Santhia upazilla of Pabna District of Bangladesh. Bangladesh Journal of Animal Science., 2012. 41(2):116-119

Table 1. Extension advisory services in contract and non-contract broiler farming

Advisory Services	Applicability	CBF (n=60)	NCBF (n=60)
		Frequency (Percentage)	
Applicability of advisory services	Extremely Applicable	27(45.00)	01(1.67)
	Applicable	33(55.00)	18(30.00)
	Neither Applicable nor Inapplicable	00	27(45.00)
	Inapplicable	00	13(21.67)
	Extremely Inapplicable	00	01(1.67)
Frequency of EAS	Very irregular	00	01(1.67)
	Irregular	00	30(50.00)
	Neither regular nor irregular	00	22(36.67)
	Regular	39(65.00)	05(8.33)
	Highly regular	21(35.00)	02(3.33)
Timeliness	Very untimely	00	00
	Untimely	00	18(30.00)
	Neither timely nor untimely	00	30(50.00)
	Timely	33(55.00)	10(16.67)
	Very timely	27(45.00)	02(3.33)
Relevance of EAS	Highly irrelevant	00	00
	Irrelevant	00	08(13.33)
	Neither relevant nor irrelevant	00	30(50.00)
	Relevant	33(55.00)	20(33.33)
	Highly relevant	27(45.00)	02(3.33)
Adequacy of the EAS	Highly adequate	22(36.67)	01(1.67)
	Adequate	37(61.67)	14(23.33)
	Neither adequate nor	00	31(51.67)

	inadequate		
	Inadequate	01(01.67)	14(23.33)
	Highly inadequate	00	00
Usefulness of EAS	Highly useful	30(50.00)	01(1.67)
	Useful	30(50.00)	34(56.67)
	Neither useful nor not useful	00	17(28.33)
	Not useful	00	08(13.33)
	Highly not useful	00	00
Technical know-how of EAS provider	Extremely dissatisfied	00	00
	Dissatisfied	00	00
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	01(01.67)	24(40.00)
	Satisfied	33(55.00)	34(56.67)
	Extremely satisfied	26(43.33)	02(3.33)

Table 2. Sources of EAS provision in contract and non-contract broiler farming

EAS source	Frequency of utilization -- Frequency (%)					
	Very Rarely	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Very frequently	Total
CBF						
EAS by Integrator	-	-	-	5 (08.33)	55 (91.67)	60 (100)

Any other	2 (3.33)	-	-	-	-	2 (3.33)
NCBF						
Private Poultry Consultants	30 (50)	1 (1.67)	12 (20)	2 (3.33)	-	45 (75)
Other poultry Farmers	5 (8.33)	5 (8.33)	2 (3.33)	-	1 (1.67)	13 (21.67)
Govt. Veterinary doctor	1 (1.67)	-	2 (3.33)	-	1 (1.67)	4 (6.67)
Govt. Extension personnel	-	1 (1.67)	-	-	-	1 (1.67)
Any other	1 (1.67)	-	-	-	-	1 (1.67)

Table 3. Difference in adoption of technical advice in contract and non-contract broiler farming.

Technical advice#	CBF (n=60)		NCBF (n=60)		't' value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Chicks	3.78	0.51	3.60	0.85	6.249*
Housing	3.96	0.25	3.83	0.42	14.227*
Feeding	3.85	0.43	3.83	0.49	11.442*

Medication	3.52	0.72	3.58	0.77	7.484*
------------	------	------	------	------	--------

Scale values: 1=not adopted, 2=discontinued 3= partially adopted, 4=fully adopted.

Note: - The 't' value of the parameter with * as super script are significant at 5%. The

unmarked 't' values are non-significant.

UNDER PEER REVIEW