



Impact of Integrated Farming System on Doubling Farmers' Income

Ruikar B. A. ^{a++*}, Gaikawad A. B. ^{b#}, Kharge A. P. ^{c†},
Kadam J. R. ^{c‡} and Maske K. V. ^{d†}

^a Department of Social Work, Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth Pune (MS), India.
^b AICRP-WIA College of Community Science, V. N. M. K. V. Parbhani (MS), India.
^c Department of Extension Education, Dr. B.S. S. K. V. Dapoli (MS), India.
^d Department of Extension Education, M.P K. V. Rahuri (MS), India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI:10.9734/ACRI/2024/v24i3641

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/112893>

Original Research Article

Received: 12/12/2023
Accepted: 17/02/2024
Published: 23/02/2024

ABSTRACT

The present study was undertaken with the main objective impact of integrated farming system on doubling farmers' income. The study was conducted in four district of Konkan region of Maharashtra namely Ratnagiri, Sindhudurg, Raigad and Palghar district. In all 200 respondents were selected by using multi stage sampling techniques. The "Ex-Post-Facto" research design was used for conducting the study. The data were collected through the personal interview. The data collected were processed and statistically analyzed by using statistical technique like frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation and chi square test. The analysis of data revealed that majority (104.00 per cent) change percent in income was occurred in agriculture + dairy farming system followed by

⁺⁺ Assistant Professor;

[#] Young Professiona-II;

[†] Ph.D. Scholar;

[‡] Head;

*Corresponding author: Email: bhagyashribodlke2018@gmail.com;

agriculture + horticulture + fishery (85.00 per cent), agriculture + poultry (82.00 per cent), agriculture + horticulture + poultry + dairy (84.00 per cent), agriculture + poultry (82.00 per cent), agriculture + Horticulture +poultry (76.00 per cent) agriculture +poultry + dairy (74.00 per cent) agriculture + horticulture + dairy (73.00 per cent), agriculture + poultry + goat rearing (66.00 per cent), agriculture+ horticulture + goat rearing (62.00 per cent), agriculture +poultry + goat rearing + horticulture (60.00 per cent), agriculture + goat rearing (58.00 per cent) and agriculture + dairy + goat rearing (14.00 per cent).

Keywords: Impact; integrated farming system; income

1. INTRODUCTION

“In India, agriculture plays a vital role in the Indian economy. Farming is the primary source of income for more than 70.00 per cent of rural households. It employs more than 60.00 percent of the workforce and accounts for over 18.80 percent of the GDP of India, making it a key sector of the economy” (Economic Survey 2021-22). The bulk of India's economy seems to be rural and agricultural in character, reliant on the nation's arable land, with the majority of farmers (86.08%) being small-scale and marginal. Our land resources are limited, but the population is expanding faster than the holding's size.

“Agriculture has been linked to the development of staple food crops throughout the past few decades. The income from the farming system must be added to the agricultural income in order to increase it. Therefore, many additional jobs related to farming will be acknowledged as a component of agriculture as the process of economic development accelerates. Currently, in addition to farming farmers raise livestock, dairy products, goats, chickens and bees among other things. This type of system, which includes at least one aspect of farming, is known as integrated farming system” [1]. During the last few decades, various authors have given definition of IFS as a combination of at least one component of farming plus one component of livestock (Edward 1997, Jayanthi et al. 2000 and Radhamani et al. 2003). The Integrated Farming System (IFS) raises farming revenue, which boosts livestock security. As a result, in the unlikely event that one of the farming systems proves to be less successful, the other farming systems will serve as a safeguard. By stabilizing the intensification of crop and related enterprises, IFS therefore offers a chance to raise economic yield per unit area and per unit time. Profitability, sustainability, a healthy diet, environmental safety, year-round revenue generating, job creation, and fuel solution are further benefits. The affiliated farmers will grow

more quickly with these farming systems. Because of this, the integrated agricultural system strategy is thought to be among the most efficient ways to raise the profitability of farming operations. It needs to be planned, designed and put into practice. It is a concept of ecological soundness that leads to sustainable agriculture as well as a reliable means of attaining pretty high productivity with a significant fertilizer economy.

Keeping above fact in view, the present study was designed to analyze the impact of integrated farming system with following specific objective;

1. Impact of integrated farming system on doubling farmers' income.

2. METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted in four district of Konkan region of Maharashtra. “A multistage sampling procedure was adopted for the selection of integrated farming system adopter farmers’. In all 200 respondents were selected for study from the four districts of Konkan region. The “Ex-Post-Facto” research design was used for the proposed study. The data were collected through the personal interview. The data collected were processed and statistically analyzed by using statistical technique like frequency, percentage, mean standard deviation and chi-square”. The impact on income was measured by collecting of data of average yield and average price of different enterprises of the year 2012 and 2022 and then calculated in terms of per cent change as follows,

$$\% \text{ Change in annual IFS income} = \frac{\text{Income of IFS year 2022} - \text{Income of IFS year 2012}}{\text{Income of year IFS 2012}} \times 100$$

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the present study as well as relevant the discussion has been summarized under the following heads:

Table 1. Average change occurred in income due to IFS

Sr. No.	Farming System (Year 2012)	Farming System (Year 2022)	Frequency	Income during year 2012 (Rs.In Lakha)	Income during year 2012 (Rs. In Lakha)	Per cent change in income(%)
1.	Agriculture	Agriculture + Dairy	08	3.12	6.37	104.00
2.	Agriculture + Horticulture	Agriculture + Horticulture + Poultry	69	4.51	7.97	76.00
3.	Agriculture + Horticulture	Agriculture + Horticulture+ Goat Rearing	05	5.17	3.38	62.00
4.	Agriculture + Horticulture	Agriculture + Poultry +Goat Rearing + Horticulture	07	6.17	9.90	60.00
5.	Agriculture+ Dairy	Agriculture + Dairy +Goat	01	3.50	4.01	14.00
6.	Agriculture+Poultry	Agriculture + Horticulture + Poultry +Dairy	29	5.43	10.00	84.00
7.	Agriculture	Agriculture + Poultry+ Dairy	11	3.95	6.89	74.00
8.	Agriculture	Agriculture + Poultry	14	4.43	8.10	82.00
9.	Agriculture + Horticulture	Agriculture + Horticulture + Dairy	40	5.69	9.90	73.00
10.	Agriculture	Agriculture + Goat Rearing	03	3.96	6.29	58.00
11.	Agriculture + Horticulture	Agriculture + Horticulture + Fishery	09	3.74	6.95	85.00
12.	Agriculture +Poultry	Agriculture + Poultry +Goat Rearing	04	3.10	5.17	66.00

Table 2. Distribution of the respondents according to impact of integrated farming system in terms of change in income

Sr.No.	Change in income(%)	Respondent (N=200)	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (upto 46.57)	20	10.00
2.	Medium (46.58 to 93.09)	157	78.50
3.	High (93.10 and above)	23	11.50
	Total	200	100
Mean = 69.83		S.D. = 23.26	

3.1 Impact of Integrated Farming System on Doubling Farmers' Income

An impact of the integrated farming system on doubling farmer's income was measured in terms of per cent change in income and per cent change in employment.

3.2 Average Change Occurred in Income Due to IFS

Income generation is operationally defined as the annual income of the respondents obtaining from the different integrated farming systems which was generally expressed in monetary terms. The total income obtained from all the farming system owned by the respondents for the past one year was computed as net annual income of family. To measure the per cent change in income last ten years data of farming was recorded, analyzed and presented in Table 1.

It was observed from Table1 that, majority (104.00 per cent) change percent in income was occurred in agriculture + dairy farming system followed by agriculture + horticulture + fishery (85.00 per cent), agriculture + poultry (82.00 per cent), agriculture + horticulture + poultry + dairy (84.00 per cent), agriculture + poultry (82.00 per cent), agriculture + Horticulture + poultry (76.00 per cent) agriculture +poultry + dairy (74.00 per cent) agriculture + horticulture + dairy (73.00 per cent), agriculture + poultry + goat rearing (66.00 per cent), agriculture + horticulture + goat rearing (62.00 per cent), agriculture +poultry + goat rearing + horticulture (60.00 per cent), agriculture + goat rearing (58.00 per cent) and agriculture + dairy + goat rearing (14.00 per cent).

Table2. Indicates that, majority (78.50 per cent) of the respondents were belong to 'medium' category of impact while 11.50 per cent of the respondents were belonged to 'high' category and 10.00 per cent of the respondents were

belonged to 'low' category of integrated farming system impact.

Similar findings were supported by Biradar [2], Mangala [3], Kumar and Tripathi [4], Dadabhau [5], Ramesh [6], and Neha Kale [7]. Adsul GB [8]. Ahire RD [9] and Kapse PS, Chaudhary PJ [10], Chavhan PN [11], Kumaran M. [12] and Vasanthakumar J., Rahaman SKM, [13] *etl.*, Rathod MK and Damodar P. [14] and Yadav AB. [15].

4. CONCLUSION

It is concluded from above tables that, majority of the respondents were belonged to 'medium to high' category of impact on income generation as respondents were practicing integrated farming system over last ten years. Hence, the hypotheses that, the integrated farming system has differential impact on doubling farmers' income were accepted

5. IMPLICATION

The result of the present study revealed that, the Agriculture+ Dairy farming system have made positive impact on more income generation. Hence, the implementation of such farming system needs to be continued and extend in other areas.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Bodke BG, Kadam JR, Sawant PA, Warwadekar SC. Association between profile of the respondents and impact of integrated farming system. The Pharma Innovation Journal 2023;12(2):1550-1551.

2. Biradar BN. A study on impact of income generating activity on sustainable rural livelihoods of Kawad project beneficiaries. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad; 2008.
3. Mangala B. Impact of integrated farming system on socio-economic status of Bharatiya Agro Industries Foundation (BAIF) beneficiary farmers. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, University of agricultural sciences, Dharwad; 2008.
4. Kumar R, Tripathi H. Profitability of dairy husbandry through income and employment generation. ISEE National Seminar. 2009:284.
5. Dadabhau AS. A comprehensive study on integrated farming systems for sustainable livelihood security in backward district of Maharashtra. Ph.D. (Agri.) Thesis, National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal; 2014.
6. Ramesh GB. Impact of National Horticulture Mission on growth and development of horticultural crops in Karnataka, an economic analysis. Ph.D. (Agri.) Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Raichur; 2017.
7. Neha, Kale. Impact of national agricultural innovation project on its beneficiaries in Marathwada region. Ph.D. (Agri.) Thesis, Vasantrya Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parabhani, Maharashtra; 2020.
8. Adsul GB. Socio-economic impact of National Horticulture Mission (NHM) on its beneficiaries in Marathwada region. Ph.D. (Agri.) Thesis, Vasantrya Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parabhani; 2016.
9. Ahire RD, Kapse PS. Socio-economic impact of National Initiative on Climate Resilient Agriculture (NICRA) project on its beneficiaries. Agresco 2016-2017; 2017.
10. Chaudhary PJ. Impact of Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Vejalpur of Panchmahals district of Gujarat state. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Anand Agricultural University, Anand; 2018.
11. Chavhan PN. Impact of mobile based agro advisory services by state department of agriculture in Marathwada region. Ph.D. (Agri.) Thesis, Vasantrya Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani; 2019.
12. Kumaran M, Vasanthakumar J. Farming System of Small and Marginal Farmers in rainfed Areas. Indian Journal of Extension Education. 2010;46(3&4): 7-10.
13. Rahaman SKM, Bera BKM, Haldar S, Ghosh A, Pal S, Nandi S. Income and employment generation capability of identified farming systems with their sustainability in the Sunderbans. Green Farming. 2015;7(2):412-421.
14. Rathod MK, Damodar P. Impact of MAVIM activities on empowerment of rural women. Indian Research Journal of Extension Education. 2015;15(1):8-11.
15. Yadav AB. Impact of National Horticulture Mission (NHM) programme on potato growers in Gwalior district of Madhya Pradesh. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Rajmata Vijayaraje Scindia Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Gwalior (M.P.); 2019.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/112893>