GAU Research Journal **37** (1) : 70-73 January 2012

Feeding practices followed by the poultry farmers of Banaskantha district of Gujarat state

K.J.ANKUYA[1], A.K.JAIN[2] and K.B.PRAJAPATI[3]

Department of Livestock Production
College of Veterinary Science & Animal Husbandry
S.D.Agricultural University, Sardarkrushinagar-385 506 (Gujarat).

Received : 17 November, 2009

ABSTRACT

The results of the study conducted in Banaskantha district of Gujarat state with a sample size of 70 poultry farmers showed that maximum (68.58 %) number of respondents had medium level of adoption of scientific feeding management practice followed by 17.14 and 14.29 per cent respondents with high and low level of adoption respectively.

Key words : Poultry farmer, feeding practices

Feed represents about 70 per cent of the total cost of poultry production. Even minute saving of feed per bird can save good amount of money particularly in larger farm. Therefore, efficiency in feeding is one of the key factors for successful poultry production. Very few poultry farmers devote a comparable proportion of their managerial time to ensure that the feed supplies and feed intake by the birds are satisfactory. With proper management of finance and resources, poultry can give the needed momentum and direction to the aspirations of the large majority of people for better quality of life. The economic ability of the poultry unit mainly depends on the production and productivity of the birds for which the farmers should adopt scientific techniques. Hence this study was undertaken to analyse the level of adoption and the possible factors contributing for the same.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A study was conducted in Banaskantha district of North Gujarat region. A sample size of 70 poultry farmers was selected based on the Purposive random Sampling Technique. A questionnaire containing 13 questions related to the feeding practice was prepared. The adoption level of poultry farming practices by the respondents were calculated based on the adoption score obtained by the individual on feeding practices for the study having 13 sub-practices.

On the basis of score obtained by the respondents the Adoption quotient was calculated for each respondent using mean and standard deviation (Sengupta, 1967). Based on the Adoption quotient, respondents were classified into three levels of categories *viz.*, High, Medium and Lower of Adoption.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It is evident from the Table 1 that the 100 % respondents were found to provide mash feed, calculation of FCR, had provide the optimum feeding space to the birds and purchase of feed at short interval of time (fresh feed). These poultry farmers actually do not purchase the feed but the traders supply them. The results are in agreement with the suggestion of Kalita (1994). Purchase of fresh feed at a short interval is preferred in poultry farming to avoid fungal infection.

It was found that 61.43 and 38.57 per cent respondents feed birds once or twice a day respectively. Generally twice a day feeding is preferred to avoid wastage. This is affected by quantity of feed filled in feeder. It was found that 17.14 and 21.43 per cent respondents fill feeder one third and one half respectively. While 61.43 per cent respondents fill the feeder fully.

To avoid selective feeding in birds and also keeping in

[1]Subject Matter Specialist, Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Khedbrahma, [2]Professor & Head, [3] Research Scientist, Livestock Research Station

Table 1 Adoption of Scientific Poultry Farming related to Feeding (N = 70)

Sr. No.	Particulars	Total no. of Poultry Farmers (Frequency)	Per Cent
1.	Type of feed.		
	i. Mash	70	100.00
	ii. Grain / Pelleted	00	00.00
2.	Frequency of feeding		
	i. Once	43	61.43
	ii. Twice	27	38.57
3.	Quantity of feed filled in feeder		
	i. One third	12	17.14
	ii. One half	15	21.43
	iii. Full	43	61.43
4.	Frequency of feed stirring per day		
	i. No stirring	29	41.43
	ii. Once	28	40.00
	iii. Twice	13	18.57
5.	Method of feed shifting practice		
	i. Sudden	58	82.86
	ii. Gradually	12	17.14
6.	Knowledge of feed nutritive value		
	i. By name	65	92.86
	ii. By protein / energy value	05	07.14
7.	Observation of feed wastage		
	i. Yes	12	17.14
	ii. No	58	82.86
8.	Frequency of feed purchase		
	i. 7 to 10 days	70	100.00
	ii. 14 days	00	00.00
9.	Provision of store room		
	i. Yes	51	72.86
	ii. No	19	27.14
10.	Calculation of feed consumption per batch		
	i. Yes	70	100.00
	ii. No	00	00.00,
11.	Calculation of FCR		
	i. Yes	60	85.71
	ii. No	10	14.29
12.	Care for leftover		
	i. Mix with new feed	60	85.71
	ii. Mix with cattle feed	10	14.29
	iii. Through away	00	00.00
13.	Feed space per bird		
	i. Optimum	70	100.00
	ii. Less space	00	00.00

view the facts that minerals and vitamins are powdery and heavier, tend to settle down to the bottom of feeder. Stirring of feed at least once a day promotes proper utilization of minerals and vitamins in feed and reduces the selective feeding preferably by the stronger birds. The results revealed that 58.57 per cent of respondents were aware of the knowledge and were stirring the feed once or twice a day.

It was found that majority of poultry farmers (82.86 %) practice sudden shifting of feed from broiler starter to broiler finisher. While only 17.14 per cent respondents gradually shift over from one type of feed to another one. The results are not in agreement with the suggestions of Kalita (1994). Gradual Change over is preferred to minimize the stress level in birds due to sudden change in plain of Nutrition.

It was found that majority of respondents (92.86 %) were knowing the feed by name only. (Broiler mash, Starter, Finisher). While only 7.14 per cent respondent knew well aware of the protein and energy value of different types of feed they used. This indicates that for nutrition and feeding of birds, technical knowledge input is comparatively very poor.

It was found that 17.14 per cent respondent observe for feed wastage. While majority of respondents (82.86 %) do not paid much attention towards this vital components of poultry farming. This was might be due to lack of knowledge. It is essential to observe the feed wastage, even a minute feed saving can save to a bigger total in large flock size. The results are not in agreement with the suggestions of Kalita (1994). This might be due to lack of knowledge.

It was found that majority of poultry farms (72.86 %) were provided with storeroom facility for feed storage. The results are in accordance with the suggestion of Kalita (1994) that feed bags should be stored in good dry place of a godown prevented from rain water, dampness, insects, rats or free flying birds. Otherwise improper storage can cause degradation of feed quality, encourage mould growth and insect damage. 27.14 per cent of poultry farms do not have facility for feed storage. They store the feed either in corner of poultry house or in their resident.

It was found that all the farmers were found to calculate feed consumption per batch. About 85.71 per cent of farmers were found to calculate FCR. The results are in accordance with the suggestion of Kalita (1994). It was found that majority of poultry farmers (85.71 %) mix the left over feed to the feed of finisher feed of the next flock. 14.29 per cent respondents mix the left over feed with the cattle feed of animal.

It was found that all the poultry farmers were providing optimum feed space per bird. The results are in agreement with the suggestions of Hasnat Ahmed *et al.*, (1991) and Kalita (1994).

Relationship between the Characteristics of poultry farmers and extent of adoption

To study the relationship between the characteristics of poultry farmers and extent of adoption, the data were tested by calculating correlation co-efficient (r) and the results are presented in Table 2.

Out of five characteristics studied, the variables age, education, flock size and land holding had non-significant relationship with extent of adoption of poultry practices. These findings are not in agreement with those of Mathiyalagan and Subramanian (1995). Tie-up arrangement of poultry farmers and middlemen might be the cause for this result.

Income was found to have positive significant relationship with the relationship with extent of adoption of poultry practices. A sound economical condition probably minimizes the risk factor and also in adopting the new technologies.

Table 2 Relationship between Characteristic of poultry farmers and their adoption of Recommended poultry practices

Sr.No.	Independent Variable	Correlation co-efficient
1.	Age	0.1887^{NS}
2.	Education	$+ 0.09029^{NS}$
3.	Flock size	0.05568^{NS}
4.	Land Holding	0.6120^{NS}
5.	Income	0.2456^{*}

* Significant at 5 per cent level. NS = Non-significant

CONCLUSION

The majority of poultry farmers were found to provide mash feed, calculation of FCR, had provide the optimum feeding space to the birds, purchase of feed at short interval of time (fresh feed), practice sudden shifting of feed from broiler starter to broiler finisher, knowing the feed by name only. (Broiler mash, Starter, Finisher), having the facility of storeroom for feed

storage, calculate feed consumption per batch and FCR and providing optimum feed space per bird. Out of five characteristics studied, the variables age, education, flock size and land holding had non-significant relationship with extent of adoption of poultry practices and Income was found to have positive significant relationship with the relationship with extent of adoption of poultry practices. A sound economical condition probably minimizes the risk factor and also in adopting the new technologies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are thankful to the Dean and Principal, College of Veterinary Science and Animal husbandry, S.D.Agricultural university, Sardarkrushinagar for providing necessary facilities to carry out this study.

REFERENCES

Hasnat Ahmed., Kiani Ghulqm S. and Hashmi, A.S. 1991. Influence of variable feeder and water space on growth efficiency of Male Broilers. *Indian Journal of Poultry Science*, **26** (20): 80-83.

Mathiyalagan, P. and Subramanian, R. 1995. Extent of adoption of Improved poultry practices. *Journal of Extension Education*, **6** (2): 1030-33.

Kalita 1994. Package of practice of on successful Broiler production. (Part II). *Poultry Advisor*, **XXVII** (4): 51-73.

Sengupta, T. 1967. A simple adoption scale for farmers high yielding varieties programme on Rice. *Indian Journal of Extension Education* **3**(3): 107-115.