



Universal Impact  
Factor 0.9285:2012;

1.2210:2013

Index Copernicus

ICV 2011: 5.09,  
2012: 6.42, 2013:  
15.8, 2014:89.16,  
2015:78.30

NAAS Rating

2012 : 1.3;

2013-16:2.69

2017: 3.98

SJIF 2012: 3.947,

2013: 4.802

Infobase Index

2015:4.56

Cosmos Impact Factor

2015: 4.366

Received on:

4<sup>th</sup> May 2017

Revised on:

10<sup>th</sup> June 2017

Accepted on:

12<sup>th</sup> June 2017

Published on:

1<sup>st</sup> July 2017

Volume No.

Online & Print

89 (2017)

Page No.

01 to 06

*Life Sciences Leaflets is a international open access print & e journal, peer reviewed, worldwide abstract listed, published every month with ISSN, RNI Free- membership, downloads and access.*

## **STUDIES ON HOUSING MANAGEMENTAL PRACTICES AND CONSTRAINTS PERCIEVED BY GOAT KEEPERS IN THE TRIBAL AREAS OF BANASKANTHA DISTRICT OF NORTH GUJARAT**

**PARWAIZ AHMAD DAR, PRAJAPATI K. B. AND A. A. SHAH**  
**DEPARTMENT OF LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION AND MANAGEMENT, COLLEGE OF VETERINARY SCIENCE AND ANIMAL HUSBANDRY, SARDARKRUSHINAGAR DANTIWADA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY SARDARKRUSHINAGAR - 385 506 (INDIA).**

*Corresponding author's e-mail:* [drparwaiz5@gmail.com](mailto:drparwaiz5@gmail.com)

### **ABSTRACT:**

A field study was undertaken to find out the housing management and constraints perceived by goat rearing farmers in the tribal talukas of Banaskantha district of North Gujarat. Majority of the tribal people had open type of house with wooden or earthen wall or fencing and roof cover made from earthen semicircular slats. Majority of respondents made goat shelter along with their own dwelling. Most of respondents had roof covered by clay tiles without manger in their goat shelters. Lack of scientific knowledge about goat rearing, high price of concentrates, veterinary service, and shortage of feed and fodder were the major constraints in tribal belt.

**KEY WORD:** *Goat, Housing, Constraints, Dwelling, Floor, Roof, Clay tiles.*

### **INTRODUCTION:**

Livestock production is steadily gaining importance in India and it is considered to be an integral part of rural economy. Livestock are important source of income and employment of the rural sector. Goats are more likely to be owned by the poor since they cost less, are more convenient for home consumption or sale and reproduce and grow faster. Sheep and goat have an inseparable identity with the farmers in India from time immemorial. Goat,

the friendly animal, is often spoken as the 'Poor man's cow' in India, and 'wet nurse of infants' in Europe. Goat provides a dependable source of income to 40% of rural population below poverty line in India and many others landless laborers worldwide. The 19<sup>th</sup> Livestock census revealed that India accounts 135.17 million goats (Anonymus, 2012). This sector is capable of changing the profile of rural area if proper attention is paid. The adoption of the improved management practices increases the income levels and socio-economic of goat owners. Goats are considered as the fixed deposits for the poorest of the poor supplying fund as and when necessary by virtue of their ready market demand. Goats require relatively much lower investments and facilities in terms of housing, feed, labour and health care. There is quick pay of dues because of fast multiplication and early maturity.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The survey was conducted in two Talukas of Banaskantha district viz., Danta and Amirgadh Talukas. Three villages were selected as per NAIP project in each Taluka, viz. Sanali, Hathipagala, Chhota Bomodara from Danta and Vaghdadi, Mandaliya, khemragiya from Amirgadh. In each village 20 farmers were randomly selected with the help of Sarpanch of village / Veterinary officer by consideration of all the strata of farmers adopted goat rearing practices. The selected farmers were interviewed and the desired information had been collected in the pro-forma developed for the purpose. Thus, the total respondents included in the study were 120. Data were collected with the help of pre-tested, reliable and valid questionnaire using personal interview.

### **RESULT AND DISCUSSION:**

#### **Housing Managemental Practices**

In tribal belt of Banaskantha district majority of the respondents (76.67%) having open type of animal house, however respondents have fear of wild animals provided closed type of house in both the talukas (Table- 1.1). Trend for type of house was not significantly differed among talukas. This finding was in accordance with the finding of Sharma *et al.* (2007), where they also observed open type enclosure for goat keepers at Nathdwara, Vallabhnagar, Railmagra and Devgarh areas of Rajasthan. Tribal people usually habituated in forest from where they can get the wooden twigs and branches and foliage from tree for making roof and enclosure (fencing). Earthen flat slats were common for shelter of goats. It was revealed from table 1.2 that majority of respondents (55.00 %) were utilized wooden (wall and roof) thorny or earthen semicircular slats and fencing type house and 45.00 percent utilizing wooden fencing and and earthen type house. Trend for housing material used was significantly ( $p < 0.01$ ) differed among talukas. Among talukas wooden (wall and roof) and fencing type house was higher (75.00 %) in Amirgadh and wooden fencing and earthen type was more (65.00 %) in Danta taluka. This finding was in contrast with the finding of Roy *et al.* (2011)

where most of respondents used earthen type house for goats in West Bengal. It was depicted from table 1.3 that majority (65.00 %) respondents had house with human dwelling for goat in tribal belt. Trend of location of goat house was differed significant ( $p < 0.01$ ) among talukas. Majority of respondents (80.00%) in Danta taluka kept their goats in house adjacent to human dwelling while half of the respondents of Amirgadh taluka follow same trend. The finding was similar to that reported by earlier workers (Sharma *et al.* 2007, Tanwar *et al.* 2008, 2007), in which majority of respondents kept their goat with human dwelling. From table 1.4 it was indicated that 81.67 percent respondent tying their animals under shed where as 18.35 percent respondent tying their animal under tree in thorny enclosure. Trend was not differed significantly among talukas. Present findings were well supported by (Tanwar *et al.* 2008) in Mavli and Jhadol of Udaipur District of Rajasthan.

Most of respondents (96.67%) had no manger for goats as they were dependent on natural pasture and foliage of forest land. Trend of facility of manger differed significantly among talukas. Only 6.67 percent respondents of Amirgadh taluka had facility of manger (Table- 1.5). This finding was similar with the finding of Tanwar *et al.* (2008), as they also reported no provision of manger in Mavli and Jhadol of Udaipur District of Rajasthan. From the table 1.6 it was depicted that 94.17 percent respondents had roof covered by clay tiles (semicircular elongated earthen material supported by wooden perlins and earthen walls) were as only 5.83 percent respondents had thatched type of roof. Trend for type of roof was not differed significantly among talukas.

### **CONSTRAINTS:**

It was observed in the table 1.7 that 30.83 percent respondents found lack of scientific knowledge about goat rearing, 21.66 percent respondents found high price of concentrates, 19.16 percent respondents found costly veterinary service and only 15.83 percent respondents found that lack of feed and fodder. The results were in agreement with that of Mande *et al.* (2010), where they also found high price of concentrate and lack of green fodder and lack of scientific knowledge, as constraints of goat keepers. Findings were also supported by Suredkar *et al.* (2010) for constraint of costly veterinary service.

### **CONCLUSION:**

Tribal people had open type of goat house with wooden or earthen wall or fencing and roof cover made from earthen semicircular slats and made goat shelter along with their own dwelling confined their goats during night time for protection from other animals. Lack of scientific knowledge about rearing goat was main constraint.

**REFERENCES:**

- Anonymous (2012). 19th Livestock census, Department of Animal Husbandry and Fisheries, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Mande, J.V., Suradkar, D.D. and Thombre, B.M., 2010. Adoption of improved goat rearing practices in Osmanabad district. *Indian J. Anim. Res.*, **44** (4):260-264.
- Roy, S., Nandi, D., Kesh, S., Bera, S. and Samaanta, A. 2011. The rearing system of Black Bengal goat. *Veterinary World*, **4** (6): 254-257.
- Sharma M.C., Pathodiya O.P., Jingar S.C., Mitesh, G. 2007. A study on socio-economic status of goat rearers and adoption of management practices. *Indian J. of Small Ruminants*, **13**(1):75-83.
- Suredkar, D. D. Thombre, B.M. and Mande J.V 2010. Adoption of improved goat rearing practices. *Indian J Anim. Res.*, **44** (4):260-264.
- Tanwar, P.S., Vaishanava, C.S. and Sharma., 2008 A study on socio-economic aspects of goat keepers and management practices prevailed in the tribal area of Udaipur district of Rajasthan. *Indian J. Anim. Res.*, **42**(1): 71-74
- Tanwar, P.S. Vaishanava, C.S and Jain, L.S. 2007. Studies on housing and breeding management practices adopted by goat owners in tribal area of Udaipur district. *Indian J. Anim. Res.*, **41** (1): 59 – 61.

**Table 1.1 Distribution of the goat owners according to type of goat house**

Sr. No.	Category	Frequency		
		Amirgadh n=60	Danta n=60	Total
1	Open	43 (71.67)	49 (81.67)	92 (76.67)
2	Closed	17 (28.33)	11 (18.33)	28 (23.33)

$X^2 = 1.677$  (Not significant)  
(Figure in the parentheses indicate percentage of the respondents)

**Table 1.2 Distribution of the goat owners according to type of housing material used for goat house**

Sr. No.	Category	Frequency		
		Amirgadh n=60	Danta n=60	Total
1	Wooden type with thorny Fencing	45 (75.00)	21 (35.00)	66 (55.00)
2	Wooden and earthen type	15 (25.00)	39 (65.00)	54 (45.00)

$X^2 = 19.394^{**}$

(Figure in the parentheses indicate percentage of the respondents)

\*\* Indicate chi square statistical significant at 1% level)

**Table 1.3 Distribution of the goat owners according to location of goat house**

Sr. No.	Category	Frequency		
		Amirgadh n=60	Danta n=60	Total
1	Separate house	30 (50.00)	12 (20.00)	42 (35.00)
2	With Human Dwelling	30 (50.00)	48 (80.00)	78 (65.00)

$X^2 = 11.868^{**}$   
 (Figure in the parentheses indicate percentage of the respondents)  
 \*\* Indicate chi square statistical significant at 1% level)

**Table 1.4 Distribution of the goat owners according to animal tying**

Sr. No.	Category	Frequency		
		Amirgadh n=60	Danta n=60	Total
1	Under shed	51 (85.00)	47 (78.33)	98 (81.67)
2	Under tree	9 (15.00)	13 (21.67)	22 (18.33)

$X^2 = 0.891$  (Not significant)  
 (Figure in the parentheses indicate percentage of the respondents)

**Table 1.5 Distribution of the goat owners according to facility of manger in goat house**

Sr. No.	Category	Frequency		
		Amirgadh n=60	Danta n=60	Total
1	Yes	4 (6.67)	0 (0.00)	4 (3.33)
2	No	56 (93.33)	60 (100.00)	116 (96.67)

$X^2 = 4.002^*$   
 (Figure in the parentheses indicate percentage of the respondents)  
 \* Indicate chi square statistical significant at 5% level)

**Table 1.6 Distribution of the goat owners according to type roof in goat house**

Sr. No.	Category	Frequency		
		Amirgadh n=60	Danta n=60	Total
1	Clay tiles	57 (95.00)	56 (93.33)	113 (94.17)
2	Thatched	3 (5.00)	4 (6.67)	7 (5.83)

**X<sup>2</sup>=0.152 (Not significant)**  
**(Figure in the parentheses indicate percentage of the respondents)**

**Table 1.7 Distribution of the goat owners according to the various types of constraints faced**

Sr. No.	Category	Frequency			Rank
		Amirgadh n=60	Danta n=60	Total	
1.	Lack of feed and fodder	10 (16.67)	9 (15.00)	19 (15.83)	VI
2.	costly veterinary service	8 (13.33)	15 (25.00)	23 (19.16)	III
3.	High prices of concentrates	12 (20.00)	14 (23.33)	26 (21.66)	II
4.	Lack of scientific knowledge about rearing goat.	17 (28.33)	20 (33.33)	37 (30.83)	I

**X<sup>2</sup>=1.444 (Not significant)**  
**(Figure in the parentheses indicate percentage of the respondents)**