Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry

Available online at www.phytojournal.com

**E-ISSN:** 2278-4136
**P-ISSN:** 2349-8234
www.phytojournal.com
JPP 2021; Sp 10(1): 31-34
Received: 04-11-2020
Accepted: 13-12-2020

**RD Bhoir**
M.Sc. Student, RCSM College of Agriculture, Kolhapur, Maharashtra, India

**BT Kolgane**
Associate Professor, Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication, RCSM College of Agriculture, Kolhapur, Maharashtra, India

**KV Gurav**
Associate Professor, Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication, RCSM College of Agriculture, Kolhapur, Maharashtra, India

**Corresponding Author:**
**RD Bhoir**
M.Sc. Student, RCSM College of Agriculture, Kolhapur, Maharashtra, India

# Attitude of farmers towards different integrated farming system components

**RD Bhoir, BT Kolgane and KV Gurav**

**Abstract**
An investigation was carried out in twelve tahsils of Kolhapur district to assess the attitude of farmers towards Integrated Farming System. The study comprised of 150 respondents who were selected on the basis of having at least four IFS components and interviewed through well- structured questionnaires. The findings revealed that more than three fourth (76.67 percent) of the respondents had medium level of attitude towards IFS, followed by high level (18.00 percent) and low level (5.3 percent) of attitude towards IFS.

**Keywords:** Attitude, integrated farming system

## Introduction
India has around 1.3 billion population. Now-a-days population of our country is increasing very fast rate whereas, simultaneously area under agriculture is getting constricted. Indian farmers have very small land holding. It is very much important to increase the agriculture production for food security of huge population. In this situation Integrated Farming System can play a major role. It can also give better income to the farmers.
This indicates that there is urgent need to study the attitude of farmers towards different IFS components, for deciding the future strategy in respect of promoting IFS. In view of this the study was conducted with objectives to study the attitude of farmers towards different IFS components.

## Methodology
The study was conducted during the year 2019-20 in the Kolhapur district of Maharashtra state. The present investigation **"**Documentation of Integrated Farming System in Kolhapur district" was conducted in whole Kolhapur district i.e. twelve tahsils. Six to eight villages from each tahsil and 4-5 respondents having at least four components of IFS from each village were selected. Frequency, Percentage, mean and standard deviation these statistical tools were used to analyze the data. Responses regarding the attitude towards different IFS components were recorded with the help of structured interview schedule. The data was collected personally with the help of structured interview schedule as per the method given. The same was analyzed and presented in the following tables.

## Result and Discussion
### Attitude of respondents about goat/sheep farming
Table 1, revealed that majority (85.19 percent) of the respondents expressed that Goat/Sheep farming is the profitable business.
Near about 29.62 percent of the respondents expressed that there is limited scope for Goat/Sheep farming as compared to livestock farming.
Majority (55.56 percent) of the respondent where disagree with the statement that Goat/Sheep farming does not give more production per unit of investment.
Further 37.03 percent of the respondent felt that initial investment needed for Goat/Sheep farming is low.
Near about 40.74 percent of the respondents expressed that obtaining loan for Goat/Sheep farming is difficult.
According to 48.14 percent of the respondent, Goat/Sheep farming is economically low risky business.

### Attitude of respondents about poultry
Majority (85.17 percent) of the respondents expressed that poultry farming creates employment opportunities for rural people.

Near about 76.19 percent of the respondents were agree with the statement that Poultry farming is best option to earn money for small farmer.
According to 61.90 percent of the respondents, Poultry is economically highly risky business.
Near about 23.80 percent of the respondents expressed that starting the poultry is difficult task.
Almost 42.85 percent of the respondents expressed that it is difficult to obtain credit for the Poultry.
Majority (85.71 percent) of the respondents expressed that poultry is an attractive business.

**Table 1:** Classification of the respondents according to their attitude about different IFS components.

| Sr. No. | Statement | Agree | Undecided | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Respondent (N = 150) Number (Percentage)** | | | | |
| **1** | **Attitude for farmers towards goat/sheep farming** | **Total number of respondents having goat/sheep farming = 27** | | |
| 1 | Goat/sheep farming is profitable business. | 23 (85.19) | 4 (14.81) | 0 |
| 2 | Limited scope of goat/sheep farming as compared to other livestock farming. | 8 (29.62) | 8 (29.62) | 11 (40.74) |
| 3 | Goat/sheep farming does not give more production per unit of investment. | 6 (22.22) | 6 (22.22) | 15 (55.56) |
| 4 | Initial investment needed for goat/sheep farming is low. | 10 (37.03) | 10 (37.03) | 7 (25.92) |
| 5 | Obtaining credit/loan for goat/Sheep farming is difficult. | 11 (40.74) | 8 (29.62) | 8 (29.62) |
| 6 | Goat/sheep farming is economically low risky business. | 13 (48.14) | 6 (22.22) | 8 (29.62) |
| **2** | **Attitude of farmers towards poultry** | **Total number of respondents having poultry = 21** | | |
| 1 | Poultry farming is employment generating occupation for rural people. | 18 (85.71) | 3 (14.29) | 0 |
| 2 | Poultry farming is best option to earn money for small farmer. | 16 (76.19) | 3 (14.28) | 2 (9.52) |
| 3 | Poultry farming is economically highly risky business. | 13 (61.90) | 4 (19.04) | 4 (19.04) |
| 4 | Starting poultry farm is not an easy task. | 5 (23.80) | 10 (47.61) | 6 (28.57) |
| 5 | Obtaining credit/loan for poultry farm is difficult. | 9 (42.85) | 6 (28.57) | 6 (28.57) |
| 6 | Poultry farming is attractive enterprise. | 18 (85.71) | 0 | 3 (14.29) |
| **3** | **Attitude of farmers towards Dairy** | **Total number of respondents having Dairy =150** | | |
| 1 | No problem in adopting dairy farming even if don't get Govt. aid. | 121 (80.67) | 25 (16.67) | 4 (2.67) |
| 2 | Emergency financial need can be met from selling milch animal. | 88 (58.67) | 36 (24.00) | 26 (17.33) |
| 3 | One should not start dairy farming as emerging infectious disease can cause high economic loss. | 14 (9.33) | 21 (14.00) | 115 (76.67) |
| 4 | Dairy farming provide steady income as it is an all season business. | 97 (64.67) | 45 (30.00) | 8 (5.33) |
| 5 | Adoption of dairy farming is good as it gives by-products for organic farming. | 112 (74.67) | 24 (16.00) | 14 (9.33) |
| 6 | Dairy farming is profitable business. | 104 (69.33) | 37 (24.67) | 9 (6.00) |
| **4** | **Attitude of farmers towards agro-processing** | **Total number of respondents having agro-processing = 29** | | |
| 1 | Handling of Agro-processing is difficult. | 12 (41.37) | 6 (20.69) | 11 (37.93) |
| 2 | Adoption of Agro-processing helps to improve living standards of farmers. | 19 (65.51) | 8 (27.59) | 2 (6.90) |
| 3 | Agro-processing is not advisable in rural area | 9 (31.03) | 3 (10.34) | 17 (58.62) |
| 4 | Adoption of Agro-processing is very risky for the farming community. | 5 (17.24) | 8 (27.59) | 16 (55.17) |
| 5 | Only progressive farmers can go for Agro-processing. | 8 (27.59) | 10 (34.48) | 11 (37.93) |
| 6 | Agro-processing is an expensive technology. | 17 (58.62) | 6 (20.69) | 6 (20.69) |
| **5** | **Attitude of farmers towards vermicompost** | **Total number of respondents having vermicompost = 87** | | |
| 1 | Vermicompost is an important component of farming. | 75 (86.21) | 10 (11.49) | 2 (2.29) |
| 2 | Vermicompost is time consuming process. | 25 (28.74) | 23 (26.44) | 39 (44.83) |
| 3 | Vermicompost is possible only for skillful person. | 12 (13.79) | 21 (24.14) | 54 (62.07) |
| 4 | Vermicompost helps in soil improvement. | 67 (77.01) | 15 (17.24) | 5 (5.75) |
| 5 | Vermicompost generates additional farm income. | 58 (66.67) | 18 (20.69) | 11 (12.64) |
| 6 | Vermicompost is very rich source of nutrients. | 69 (79.31) | 14 (16.09) | 4 (4.6) |
| **6** | **Attitude of farmers towards sericulture** | **Total number of respondents having sericulture = 04** | | |
| 1 | Sericulture does not give more production per unit of investment. | 3 (75.00) | 0 | 1 (25.00) |
| 2 | Initial investment required for Sericulture is low. | 2 (50.00) | 1 (25.00) | 1 (25.00) |
| 3 | Obtaining credit for Sericulture is easy. | 3 (75.00) | 1 (25.00) | 0 |
| 4 | Lack of training programme for Sericulture. | 3 (75.00) | 0 | 1 (25.00) |
| 5 | Sericulture is possible only for skillful person. | 1 (25.00) | 0 | 3 (75.00) |
| 6 | Handling of Silkworm is difficult. | 1 (25.00) | 1 (25.00) | 2 (50.00) |
| **7** | **Attitude of farmers towards fishpond/aquaculture/farmpond** | **Total number of respondents having aquaculture/farmpond = 07** | | |
| 1 | Only progressive farmers go for Fishpond/Aquaculture. | 3 (42.86) | 3 (42.86) | 1 (14.29) |
| 2 | Obtaining credit for Fishpond/Aquaculture is difficult. | 3 (42.86) | 0 | 4 (57.14) |
| 3 | Fishpond/Aquaculture is an attractive business. | 3 (42.86) | 2 (28.57) | 2(28.57) |
| 4 | Establishing a Fishpond/Aquaculture is not an easy task. | 5 (71.43) | 1 (14.29) | 1 (14.29) |
| 5 | Initial investment for Fishpond/Aquaculture is high. | 7 (100.00) | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | Fishpond/Aquaculture is a profitable business. | 6 (85.71) | 1 (14.29) | 0 |
| **8** | **Attitude of farmers towards floriculture/nursery** | **Total number of respondents having floriculture/nursery = 24** | | |
| 1 | Initial investment for Floriculture/Nursery is high. | 18 (75.00) | 2 (8.33) | 4 (16.67) |
| 2 | Floriculture/Nursery is not advisable in rural area. | 2 (8.33) | 6 (25.00) | 16 (66.67) |
| 3 | Only progressive farmers go for Floriculture/Nursery. | 3 (12.5) | 4 (16.67) | 17 (70.83) |
| 4 | Floriculture/Nursery is an economically high risk business. | 15 (62.5) | 7 (29.17) | 2 (8.33) |
| 5 | Floriculture/Nursery is an attractive business. | 14 (58.33) | 8 (33.33) | 2 (8.33) |
| 6 | Floriculture/Nursery generates an additional farm income. | 16 (66.67) | 4 (16.67) | 4 (16.67) |

(The figures in the parentheses indicates percentage)

**Attitude of respondents about dairy**

Majority (80.67 percent) of the respondents expressed that no problem in adopting Dairy farming even if don't get Govt. aid.

Almost 58.67 percent of the respondents were agree with the statement that emergency financial need can be met from selling milch animal.

Majority (76.67 percent) of the respondents were disagree with the statement one should not start Dairy farming as emerging infectious disease can cause high economic loss.

Near about 64.67 percent of the respondents were agree with the statement that Dairy farming provide steady income as it is an all season business.

Majority (74.67 percent) of the respondents expressed that adoption of Dairy farming is good as it gives by-products for organic farming, followed by 16.00 percent of the respondents did not expressed their view about this statement.

According to 69.33 percent of the respondents, Dairy farming is profitable business.

**Attitude of respondents about agro-processing**

Near about 41.37 percent of the respondents expressed that handling of Agro-processing is difficult.

Majority (65.61 percent) of the respondents said that adoption of Agro-processing helps to improve the living standards of farmers.

According to 31.03 percent of the respondents, Agro-processing is not advisable in rural area.

Almost 55.17 percent of the respondents were disagree with the statement that adoption of Agro–processing is very risky for the farmer community.

According to 27.59 percent of the respondents, only progressive farmers can go for Agro- processing.

Near about 58.62 percent of the respondent said that Agro-processing is an expensive technology.

**Attitude of respondents about vermicompost**

Majority (86.21 percent) of the respondents said that Vermicompost is an important component of farming.

According to 28.74 percent of the respondent, Vermicompost is time consuming process.

Near about 62.07 percent of the respondents were disagree with the statement that vermicompost is possible only for skillful person.

Majority (77.01 percent) of the respondents said that Vermicompost helps in soil improvement.

According to 66.67 percent of the respondents, vermicompost generates additional farm income.

Majority (79.37 percent) of the respondents said that Vermicompost is very rich source of nutrients.

**Attitude of respondents about sericulture**

According to 75.00 percent of the respondents, Seiculture does not give more production.

Almost 50.00 percent of the respondents said that initial investment required for sericulture is low.

Majority (75.00 percent) of the respondents said that obtaining credit for Sericulture is easy.

Near about 75.00 percent of the respondents expressed that there is lack of training programme for Sericulture.

Majority (75.00 percent) of the respondents were disagree with the statement that Sericulture is possible only for skillful person.

According to 25.00 percent of the respondents, handling of Silkworm is difficult.

**Attitude of respondents about fishpond/aquaculture/farmpond**

According to 42.86 percent of the respondents, only progessive farmers can go for Fishpond/Aquaculture/Farmpond.

Near about 42.86 percent of the respondents said that obtaining credit for Fishpond/Aquaculture/Farmpond is difficult.

According to 42.86 percent of the respondents, Fishpond/Aquaculture/Farmpond is an attractive business.

Majority (71.43 per cent) of the respondents expressed that establishing Fishpond/Aquaculture/Farmpond is not an easy task.

Cent per cent of the respondent said that initial investment for Fishpond/Aquaculture/Farmpond is high.

Majority (85.71 percent) of the respondents said that Fishpond/Aquaculture/Farmpond is a profitable business.

**Attitude of respondents about floriculture/nursery**

Almost 75.00 percent of the respondents said that initial investment required for Floriculture/Nursery is high.

According to 8.33 percent of the respondents, Floriculture/Nursery is not advisable in rural area.

According to 12.5 percent of the respondents, only progressive farmers can go for Floriculture/Nursery.

Near about 62.25 percent of the respondents said that Floriculture/Nursery is economically high risky business.

According to 58.33 percent of the respondents, Floriculture/Nursery is an attractive business.

According to 66.67 percent of the respondents, Floriculture/Nursery generates additional farm income.

**Table 2:** Classification of respondents according to their overall attitude about IFS

| Sr. No. | Category | | Respondent (N = 150) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | | Percentage |
| 1 | Low (Up to 16) | 08 | 5.33 |
| 2 | Medium (17 to 31) | 115 | 76.67 |
| 3 | High (31 and above) | 27 | 18.00 |
| | Total | 150 | 100.00 |

It is observed from the Table 2, that more than three fourth (76.67 percent) of the respondents had medium level of attitude towards IFS, followed by high level (18.00 percent) and low level (5.3 percent) of attitude towards IFS.

**Conclusion**

The results revealed that majority of the respondents were in medium level attitude towards IFS.

It can be concluded that there is a need of conducting trainings/workshop for IFS from line dept. and more help should be provided from Govt.

**References**

1. Alam SD. Perception preferences & attitude of Bangladesh farmers towards home garden farming system Small scale forestry 2010;9(2):213-226.
2. Anonymous 2019. https://economictimes.com
3. Ashby JA. Integrating research on food and environment: An exit strategy from the rational fool syndrome in agricultural science. Ecol. Soc 2001, P5.
4. Chaawla NK, Kurup MPG, Sharma VP. Animal Husbandry. State of Indian farmer. A millennium study, Department of Agriculture and cooperation, Ministry of

Agriculture, Government of India, New Delhi and Academic Foundation. New Delhi 2004.
5. Jyothi V. Information sources consultancy as on approach to crisis management by tomato growers. M.Sc. (Agri.) Thesis (Unpub.) University of Agricultural Science, Bangalore 2000.
6. Kiral BS, Mahajan SK, Nashine R. Impact of Technology Practices on the Productivity of Soybean in FLD, Indian Research Journal of Extension Education 2004;6(1):15-17.
7. Lal SP. Assessment of livelihood security and resilience among farmers affected by national calamity in Bihar. M. Sc. Thesis, NDRI, Deemed University, Karnal 2014.
8. Naik RG. Attitude of mango growers towards sustainable farming practices, crop research (Hisar) 2008;35(1&2): 155-156.