

**TRAINING WILLINGNESS AND CONSTRAINTS PERCEIVED
BY POULTRY FARMERS IN UTTAR PRADESH**

Jitendra Pratap, M.P. Sagar, Mahesh Chander and A.K. Chaturvedani

Division of Extension Education

Indian Veterinary Research Institute

Izatnagar, Bareilly: 243122

Received 23-2-2016**Accepted 25-3-2016**

Corresponding Author : drjpmathura@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted with the objective to evaluate the training willingness and various constraints perceived by poultry farmers in Barabanki district of Uttar Pradesh. Out of 15 blocks in Barabanki district, five blocks were selected, purposively, based on poultry population and maximum number of farms. The data were recorded from 75 respondents through the pre-tested structured interview schedule. Off-campus type of training was most preferred by 68 per cent, followed by on-campus. The majority of poultry farmers (74.7%) were chosen own village as "most preferred" venue for training. Among those who perceived constraints in receiving training 72.88 per cent perceived that family obligations do not permit to participate in training.

KEY WORDS: Training Willingness, Constraints, Poultry, Broiler Farmer**INTRODUCTION**

In India, over the last four decades, poultry has transformed from backyard venture to vibrant poultry farming. Unemployed youths and farmers are adopting poultry farming as source of income due to early return of investment. Landless, marginal and small scale farmers, who account for about 90 per cent of the 107 million agricultural households in India, keep about eighty-five per cent of the poultry stock of the country, but seventy per cent of meat and egg production is from organized sector. The organised sector had well established infrastructure, trained manpower and efficient management, while, unorganised sector lacks in these aspects. The training makes the person efficient in this job. In the unorganised poultry sector, majority of poultry farmers are untrained and start poultry farming without prior training (Babu, 2013). There is need to understand the facts behind this condition of poultry farming perceived in receiving training by poultry farmers of explicit importance as it provides a platform to identify the training willingness and constrains of the poultry farmers. So, it may help the policy makers, animal husbandry personnel, extensionist, public and private agencies in providing the need based training for improving the skills and practices in scientific poultry farming.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was purposively conducted in Barabanki district of Uttar Pradesh. The district comprises of total 15 development blocks, out of which 5 blocks were selected, purposively, on the basis of poultry population and maximum number of farms. Fifteen poultry farmers from each block who were practising broiler farming for at least one year with flock size of 250 birds and above, per batch (at least three batches) were selected randomly. Thus, a total sample size of 75 poultry broiler farmers was covered under the study. Training willingness was measured in terms of the choice (preference) of respondents for the type of training, methods of training, duration of training, place of training, time of training. It was measured through the duly pre-tested and validated structured interview schedule. The choice of respondents with respect to above mentioned

components were rated on four point continuum as most preferred, preferred, least preferred and not preferred along with respective scores 4, 3, 2, and 1. The constraints in receiving training was studied by direct questioning and data obtained was ranked on the basis of frequency of constraints.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Training willingness in poultry farming:

Table 1 reveals that off – campus training was most preferred, followed by on–campus and distance learning training was least preferred. Similar findings were reported by Gupta (1998), and Durggarani and Subhadra (2009). Table 1 further, reveals that majority of poultry farmers chosen own village as “most preferred” venue for training, followed by local institution like cooperative society and village panchayat and development block because of easily accessibility of the poultry farmers. The results are in line with findings of Pagaria (2012) and Patil *et al.* (2009) who reported that resident village was the most preferred venue by majority of respondents. Regarding the method of training reveals that lecture followed question-answer plus practical was “most preferred” method of training which was ranked first, followed by lecture along with film show as preferred by 56 per cent with rank II, and lecture followed by question-answer session as preferred by 60 per cent at rank III. Exposure visit along with film show, working at poultry farm (learning by doing), and power point presentation were ranked IV, V and VI, respectively. Table 1 also reveals that majority of poultry farmers (48%) most preferred once in year training interval and ranked first followed by, training at every six months (II rank), and every three months (III Rank). Majority of poultry farmers (54.7%) ratted “ one week duration training as “most preferred and ranked it first, followed by one to three days duration with II rank and two week duration of training III ranked. Table 1 depicts that the lean period was perceived as most preferred time for training on broiler farming with rank first, followed by rainy session with rank II, summer session with rank III and winter session with rank IV.

Table 1 Training willingness of poultry farmers (N=75)

Sl. No	Willingness constituent	MP	P	LP	NP	TWS	TWMS	Rank
A. Type of training								
1	On-campus training	36 (48.00)	7 (9.30)	19 (25.30)	13 (17.34)	216	2.88	II
2	Off-campus training	51 (68.00)	23 (30.70)	1 (1.30)	0 (0.00)	275	3.66	I
3	Distance learning (T.V, Farm publication)	1 (1.30)	24 (32.00)	40 (53.30)	10.00 (13.40)	166	2.21	III
B. Choice of venue								
1	Own village	56 (74.70)	12 (16.00)	4 (5.30)	3 (4.00)	271	3.61	I
2	Local institution (cooperatives, village panchayat)	48 (64.00)	22 (29.30)	5 (6.70)	0 (0.00)	268	3.57	II
3	SDAH at district	32 (42.70)	14 (18.70)	15 (20.00)	14 (18.60)	214	2.85	V
4	Development block	30 (40.00)	41 (54.70)	4 (5.30)	0 (0.00)	251	3.34	III
5	Krishi Vigyan	30 (40.00)	34 (45.30)	9 (12.00)	2 (2.70)	242	3.22	IV

C. Choice for method of training								
1	Lecture followed by question-answer session	16 (21.30)	45 (60.00)	9 (12.00)	5 (6.70)	222	2.96	III
2	Exposure visit along with film show	12 (16.00)	34 (45.30)	24 (32.00)	5 (6.70)	203	2.70	IV
3	Lecture followed by question-answer + practical	67 (89.30)	8 (10.70)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	292	3.89	I
4	Working at poultry farm(learning by doing)	19 (25.30)	21 (28.00)	26 (34.70)	9 (12.00)	200	2.67	V
5	Lecture along with film shows	17 (22.70)	42 (56.00)	15 (20.00)	1 (1.30)	225	3.00	II
6	Power point presentation	7 (9.30)	9 (12)	45 (60)	14 (18.7)	159	2.12	VI
D. Choice of training interval								
1	Every three months	25 (33.30)	23 (30.70)	12 (16.00)	15 (20.00)	208	2.77	III
2	Every six months	31 (41.30)	30 (40.00)	13 (17.40)	1 (1.30)	241	3.21	II
3	Every year	36 (48.00)	22 (29.40)	16 (21.30)	1 (1.30)	243	3.24	I
E. Choice of duration								
1	One- three days	28 (37.30)	31 (41.30)	14 (18.70)	2 (2.70)	235	3.13	II
2	One week (6 days)	41 (54.70)	31 (41.30)	3 (4.00)	0 (0.00)	263	3.50	I
3	Two weeks	0 (0.00)	15 (20.00)	36 (48.00)	24 (32.00)	141	1.88	III
F. Choice of time of training								
1	Summer season	22 (29.40)	19 (25.30)	21 (28.00)	13 (17.30)	200	2.66	III
2	Winter season	9 (12.00)	6 (8.00)	24 (32.00)	36 (48.00)	138	1.84	IV
3	Rainy season	21 (28.00)	25 (33.33)	15 (20.00)	14 (18.70)	203	2.70	II
4	Lean period	32 (42.70)	26 (34.70)	10 (13.30)	7 (9.30)	233	3.11	I

Figures in parenthesis indicates percentage

MP= Most preferred, P= preferred, LP= least Preferred, NP= Not Preferred, TWS= total weighted score, TWMS = total weighted mean score

2. Constraints in receiving training on poultry farming

Table 2 reveals that 21.33 per cent poultry farmers were ready to receive training on poultry farming; hence they felt no constraints in receiving training. Among those who perceived constraints in receiving training, were family obligations which do not permit to participate in training.

Table 2: Constraints in receiving training on poultry farming (N=75)

Sl. No.	Constraints	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
1	No constraints	16	21.33	-
2	Lack of time	34	57.66	III
3	Family obligations do not permit to participate in training	43	72.88	I
4	Lack of awareness about source of training	23	38.98	IV
5	Far away Training venue	11	18.64	V
6	Unable to pay higher cost of training	35	59.32	II

CONCLUSION

From above mentioned findings, that most of poultry farmers were interested in off-campus training at own village obvious every year in lean period with use of training methods lecture followed by question-answer session and practical's. Most of respondents felt that family obligation and high cost of training prevent them to receive the training in poultry farming. Hence, it may be concluded that training should be organised keeping in mind aptness and need of the poultry farmers with respect to above discussed factors.

REFERENCES :

- Babu, P. (2013). Knowledge and adoption level of commercial poultry farmers about scientific broiler farming in mid-western plain zone of Uttar Pradesh. Thesis, M.V.Sc. Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, Uttar Pradesh.
- Durggarani, V. and Subhadra, M.R. (2009). *Vet. World*, **2**(6): 221-223.
- Pagaria, P. (2012). *Agri. Update*, **7**(1&2): 133-135.
- Patil, A.P., Gawande, S.H., Gobade M.R. and Nande, M.P. (2009). *Vet. World*, **2**(5): 187-190.

□