


**Indian Research Journal of
Extension Education**
ISSN: 0972-2181 (Print), 0976-1071 (e-Print)
NAAS Rating : 5.22
Journal homepage: seaa.org.in



RESEARCH NOTE https://doi.org/10.54986/irjee/2022/apr_jun/173-175

Barriers in Adopting Integrated Farming System in Rajasthan

Lokesh Kumar¹, Nitesh Kumar Tanwar², Jitendra Kumar Meena³ and Kailash⁴

1,2&3. Ph.D Scholar, (Ext. Edu.) Rajasthan College of Agriculture (MPUAT), Udaipur Raj., 4. SMS, KVK, New Delhi

Corresponding author e-mail : lavi0016@gmail.com

Received on February 02, 2022, Accepted on March 28, 2022 and Published Online on April 01, 2022

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted on a random sample of 240 farmers in the agro climatic zone (IV a) of Rajasthan state to examine the suggestions for integrated farming systems to overcome the barriers faced by farmers in adopting integrated farming systems. The data were collected by personal contacts. Major suggestions offered by farmers to overcome from the constraints faced by them in adoption of integrated farming system to provide financial support to farmers, Government scheme should be increased for IFS, Provide timely input subsidy, arrange regular training to the famers, Improved low cost technology should be developed which can be easily utilized by small farmers, model units should be established in every block.

Key words: *Integrated farming system.*

Agriculture remains the mainstay of Indian economy and major source of livelihood of rural household, predominantly by small and marginal farmers, and securing the food and nutritional security. Kumar *et al.* (2020). At present, the farmers concentrate mainly on crop production which is subjected to a high degree of uncertainty in income and employment to the farmers. In this contest, it is imperative to evolve suitable strategy for augmenting the income of a farm throughout the year. Integration of various agricultural enterprises viz., cropping, animal husbandry, fishery, forestry etc. in the farming system has great potentialities in agricultural economy. These enterprises not only supplement the income of the farmers but also help in increasing the family labor employment throughout the year (Jayanthi *et al.*, 2000; Singh *et al.*, 1993 and Singh *et al.*, 1997). The definition of IFS is varied and dependent on the context. Agbonlabor *et al.* (2003) in their studies undertaken in Nigeria defined the concept as a type of mixed farming system that combines crop and livestock enterprises in a supplementary and/or complementary manner. Okigbo (1995) defined these systems as a mixed farming system that consists of at

least two separate but logically interdependent parts of a crop and livestock enterprises. Contrasting these definitions Radhammani *et al.* (2003) describes IFS's as a component of farming systems which takes into account the concepts of minimizing risk, increasing production and profits whilst improving the utilization of organic wastes and crop residues.

METHODOLOGY

An ex – post facto research design was used in present study. The present study was conducted in Rajasthan which literally means land of kings. The Rajasthan state has been purposefully selected for the present study. The Integrated Farming System (IFS) approach was implemented in all agro climatic zones of Rajasthan under National Mission on Sustainable Agriculture. Out of ten agro climatic zones in which sub humid southern plain and aravalli (IVa) zone was selected purposively for the study. It includes four districts Bhilwara, Chittorgarh, Rajsamand and Udaipur. Thus, all four districts were selected for the study. Two clusters from each district was selected for present study on the basis of maximum number of farmers

benefitted about different farming systems. Therefore, a total of eight clusters were taken for the study. An equal number 30 farmers were selected randomly from each identified cluster. Thus, a total of 240 farmers were selected for the present investigation. The data was collected through well-structured and pre-tested interview schedule. The collected data was coded, classified and tabulated with the help of appropriate statistical tools to draw meaningful conclusion.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Suggestions offered by the respondent's adoption of integrated farming system. The mean percent score of each suggestion was concluded and ranked accordingly. The findings about suggestions were presented in the Table 1.

Data presented in Table 1 reveal that "Provide financial support to farmers" as suggested by majority

of the respondents were ranked first with 85.83 MPS. The next important suggestion reported by the respondents were "Government scheme should be increased for IFS" and "Provide timely input subsidy" which ranked second and third with 85.69 MPS and 82.91 MPS, respectively.

Analysis of Table 1 further shows that "Arrange regular training to the famers", "Improved low cost technology should be developed which can be easily utilized by small farmers", "Model units should be established in every block", "Use ICT tools (TV, radio, smart phones etc.) in TOT of IFS", "Establish direct marketing facility", "Provide critical inputs based on location specific requirement" and "Loan with low interest rate should be made easily available for both horticultural and agricultural crops" were with important suggestions provided by the respondents 80.69, 80.13, 79.58, 79.02, 77.91, 75.13 and 74.14

Table 1. Suggestions of respondents for integrated farming system

Statements extension	Bhilwara N=60		Chittorgarh N=60		Rajsamand N=60		Udaipur N=60		Over all N=240	
	MPS	R	MPS	R	MPS	R	MPS	R	MPS	R
Government scheme should be increased for IFS	87.77	II	82.22	V	84.44	III	83.88	III	85.69	II
Provide timely input subsidy	85.55	III	83.88	II	73.33	XII	88.88	I	82.91	III
Provide financial support to farmers	88.33	I	86.66	I	86.66	I	86.11	II	85.83	I
Arrange regular training to the famers	77.77	VII	83.33	III	80.00	IX	81.66	IV	80.69	IV
Need exposure visit to new technology	76.66	IX	73.33	X	81.66	VII	58.88	XIII	72.63	XI
Provide critical inputs based on location specific requirement	73.88	XIII	72.22	XI	78.88	X	75.55	X	75.13	IX
Provide technical know-how and follow up service	71.88	XV	69.44	XII	65.00	XIII	63.88	XII	67.36	XIV
Model units should be established in every block	76.11	X	78.88	IX	86.11	II	77.22	IX	79.58	VI
Establish direct marketing facility	81.66	V	71.11	XIV	80.55	VIII	78.33	VIII	77.91	VIII
Encourage farmers club and producer's commodity group	72.22	XIV	81.11	XII	58.33	XI	45.55	XV	64.30	XV
Remove middle man in the marketing of agriculture produce	82.22	IV	81.66	VI	82.77	V	43.33	XIV	72.50	XII
Use ICT tools (TV, Radio, Smart phones etc.) in TOT of IFS	80.55	VI	74.44	XIII	82.22	VI	78.88	VII	79.02	VII
Improve the transportation facilities	77.22	VIII	82.77	IV	57.22	XV	68.11	XI	71.52	XIII
Loan with low interest both horticultural and agricultural crops	75.00	XII	68.88	XV	73.88	XI	80.00	VI	74.44	X
Improved low-cost technology easily utilized by small farmers	75.55	XI	80.55	VIII	83.88	IV	80.55	V	80.13	V

MPS, respectively.

Further the extent of Table 1 shows that “Need exposure visit to new technology”, “Remove middle man in the marketing of agriculture produce”, “Improve the transportation facilities”, “Provide technical know-how and follow up Service” and Encourage farmers club and producers commodity group were viewed by the respondents as suggestions for adoptions of integrated farming system with 72.63, 72.50, 71.52, 67.36 and 64.30 MPS, respectively.

Similar findings were also reported by *Kumar et al. (2018)*, *Sheikh et al. (2021)*, *Sharma et al. (2018)* and *Kumar et al. (2016)*.

CONCLUSION

The valuable suggestions made by the farmers for Integrated Farming System were provide financial support to farmers, Government scheme should be increased for IFS, Provide timely input subsidy, arrange regular training to the famers, improved low cost technology should be developed which can be easily utilized by small farmers, model units should be established in every block.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

- Agbonlabor, M.U.; Aromolaran, A.B. and Aiboni, V.I. (2003). Sustainable soil management practices in small farms of Southern Nigeria: A poultry-food crop integrated farming approach. *J. Sustain. Agri.*, **22**: 51-62.
- Jayanthi, C.; Rangasamy, A. and Chinnusamy, C. (2000). Water budgeting for components in lowland integrated farming systems. *Agril. J.*, **87** (7/9) :411- 414.
- Kumar, S.S.; Narayanagowda, K. and Prasad, V.L.M. (2018). Constraints and suggestions of schedule caste (SC) farmers practicing integrated farming system (IFS) in Southern Karnataka. *Trends in Biosci.*, **11**(26): 3427-3429.
- Kumar, S.; Kumar, A. and Singh, M. (2016). Trend of diversification in farming system of western Uttar Pradesh. *Annals of Horti.*, **9** (1): 105-110.
- Kumar, S.; Rao, D.U.M.; Thombare, P. and Kale, P. (2020). Small and marginal farmers of Indian agriculture: prospects and extension strategies. *Indian Res. J. of Ext.Edu.*, **20**(1), 35-41.
- Okigbo, B.N. (1995). Major farming systems of the lowland savanna of SSA and the potential for improvement. In: Proceedings of the IITA/FAO workshop, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Radhammani, S.; Balasubramanian, A.; Ramamoorthy, K. and Geethalakshmi, V. (2003). Sustainable integrated farming systems for dry lands: A review, *Agril. Reviews*, **24**:204-210.
- Sharma, A.; Kumar, S. and Kandpal, N.K. (2018). Constraints faced by dairy farm women: A study in Nainital district of Uttarakhand. *Indian Res. J. of Ext.Edu.*, **18** (2): 86-90.
- Sheikh, M.M., Riar, T.S., and Pervez, A.K. (2021). Integrated farming systems: A review of farmers friendly approaches. *Asian J. of Agril. Ext., Eco. & Socio.*, 88-99. DOI: 10.9734/ajaees/2021/v39i430564.
- Singh, K.P.; Singh, S.N.; Kumar, H.; Kadian, V.S. and Saxena, K.K. 1993. Economic analysis of different farming systems followed on small and marginal land holdings in Haryana. *Haryana J. Agron.*, **9**: 122-125.
- Singh, S.N.; Saxena, K.K.; Singh, K.P.; Kumar, H. and Kadian, V.S. (1997). Consistency in income and employment generation in various farming systems, *Annals of Agril. Res.*, **18** (3): 340-43.

