The Pharma Innovation Journal 2022; SP-11(2): 1286-1288

www.ThePharmaJournal.com

The Pharma Innovation

ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2022; SP-11(2): 1286-1288

www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 08-12-2021
Accepted: 11-01-2022

Piyush Chandra Mishra
Department of Agricultural Economics, Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

Supriya
Department of Agricultural Economics, Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

KK Singh
Department of Agricultural Economics, Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

Aditya Bhooshan Srivastava
Department of Agricultural Economics, Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

RR Kushwaha
Department of Agricultural Economics, Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

Corresponding Author
Supriya
Department of Agricultural Economics, Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh, India

Status of farm enterprise combination and constraints in adoption of IFS system approach in Ayodhya district of Uttar Pradesh

Piyush Chandra Mishra, Supriya, KK Singh, Aditya Bhooshan Srivastava and RR Kushwaha

Abstract
The present study was conducted in the Ayodhya district with the specific objective to identify the primary restrictions faced by farmers who practice different integrated farming system models. The study confined to two locations on IFS, Amaniganj, and Milkipur, which were chosen at random. the farming system in the study area in terms of FS-I Crop+ Dairy, FS-II Crop+Dairy+Poultry, and FS-III Crop+Dairy+Poultry+Fisheries, where the constraints were determined after a personal interaction with the farmers (Number of Farmers=60) and we prioritised and classified the constraints based on their input. There were fifteen constraints were reported by the respondent Out of these farmers in both districts faced major challenges such as high initial investment, insufficient credit facilities, labour scarcity, and many more. Establishing model farms, high lighting the benefits of integrated farming system in the location in each panchayat union will enable the farmer of that locality to gain first-hand knowledge about various aspects of integrating farming system.

Keywords: Integrated farming system, constraints

Introduction
Indian agriculture is characterised by shrinking farm holding sizes, rising population and labour costs, shifting consumption patterns, and limited land and water resources, among other factors. Climate change and global warming are also significant factors challenges. As a result of these challenges, agriculture is responsible for providing household food and nutrition. Nutritional security for a billion or more people. An integrated farming system is a whole-farm management method that tries to make agriculture more sustainable. It's a flexible method that can be used in any farming system around the world (Pushpa, 2010) [3].

According to the site and situation, integrated farming blends the best of contemporary instruments and technologies with ancient practices. It is a set of interdependent, interrelated production systems based on a small number of crops, animals, and related subsidiary businesses that maximize the use of nutrients in each system while minimizing the negative impact of these businesses on the environment. By integrating diverse farm enterprises and recycling agricultural residue and by-product within the farm itself, the method strives to increase income and employment from smallholdings (Behera *et al.*, 2004) [1].

In the economic point of view the importance of farming system can be determine that agriculture, as in any other business, the efficiency is achieved by an optimum utilization of resources. Resources include land, labour, capital, irrigation facilities etc. Optimum allocation of land and other resources is defined as what crops to undertake, how much land to allocate to each crop activity and what method and combination of inputs to use for each crop so that the farm returns are maximum. In a traditional agriculture, little allocative inefficiency is reported (Ramaya *et al.*, 2021) [4].

Agriculture has become a losing venture due to rising farm input costs and declining profitability of agricultural commodity output. As a result, it is critical that the available inputs be utilised cheaply and efficiently. Farming efficiency is determined by the most cost-effective combination of resources for achieving a particular output. In view of this, the relationship between the monetary value of outputs and inputs is used to determine efficiency. The higher the output per unit of input, the better the resource's efficiency, and vice versa, the greater the resource's efficiency, the greater the output. The maximization of efficiency is therefore a condition for the maximization of income (Pandey *et al.*, 2019) [2].

A number of such examples can be given, emphasizing the integrated farming system's greater advantage in generating technologies to combat land degradation. It is the approach that can lead to a significant increase in productivity on a long-term basis, as well as better livelihood security for people living in fragile ecosystems. In recent years, the farming system method to assessing agricultural constraints has gained a lot of traction. The current study, titled "Constraints faced by farmers in existing farming systems in Milkipur and Amaniganj districts of Ayodhya," was undertaken with these considerations in mind.

Materials and Methods

The investigator is familiar with the area's socioeconomic and cultural conditions, which aids in the development of rapport and the collection of reliable data. A list of all the villages in each of the selected blocks was compiled, and ten villages from each block were chosen at random from the list based on the study's purpose to ensure a representative sample. Data was gathered through a personal interview with a systematic, pre-tested interview schedule. There were 60 people who participated in the survey. The 49 farmer practicing FS-I (Crop + Dairy); 9 farmer Practicing FS-II crop + Dairy + Poultry; 2 farmer Practicing crop + dairy + Poultry + Fisheries. (Singh, 2012) [5].

Constraints faced by the respondents related to integrated farming system as a whole and as related to individual enterprises were assessed and ranking was given according to the percentage of no. of farmers who have given highest rank to the various constraints respectively. (Tiwari *et al.*, 2021) [6].

Results and Discussion

Integrated farming system followed by sample farmers of Ayodhya under selected blocks

The integrated farming systems observed in the research region are presented in Table 1. Crop and dairy-based farming systems were the most common in the research area. Crop + Dairy (FS I) was the most popular integrated farming system among the sample farmers in chosen blocks, mainly crops grown were paddy and wheat accounting for 81.66% of the total. Crop + Dairy (35%) was the most popular system among 21 small farmers, followed (30%) among 18 medium farmers, and 10 large farmers (16.66 percent). Crop+ livestock+ poultry (FS II) was the second most frequent integrated farming system, accounting for 15% of the total, according to the sample farmers in chosen blocks. Crop+ Dairy+ Poultry (35%) was the most common system among 3 small farmers, followed by Crop+ Dairy+ Poultry (6.66%) among 4 medium farmers, and crop+ Dairy+ Poultry (6.66%) among 2 large farmers (3.33 percent). 1 small and 1 medium farmer practised Crop+ Dairy+ Poultry+ Fisheries (FS III) in Crop+ Dairy+ Poultry+ Fisheries (FS III).

Table 1: Integrated farming system followed by sample farmers of Ayodhya

Farming system	Farming system	No. of small Farmers	No. of medium farmers	No. of large farmer	Total
FS-I	Crop + Dairy	21 (35%)	18 (30%)	10 (16.66%)	49 (81.66%)
FS-II	Crop +Dairy +Poultry	3 (5%)	4 (6.66%)	2 (3.33%)	9 (15%)
FS-III	Crop +Dairy +Poultry+ Fisheries	1 (1.66%)	1 (1.66%)	0	2 (3.33%)
TOTAL (FS)		25 (41.66%)	23 (38.33%)	12 (20%)	60 (100%)

Constraints faced by farmers in IFS System:

Constraints were determined after a personal interaction with the farmers (Number of Farmers=60) and we prioritized and classified the constraints based on their input. The High initial investment stood at the first rank (83.33%), inadequate credit facilities received the second rank (80%), labour scarcity got the third rank (78.33%), Lack of knowledge of the integrated farming system (76.66), Non-availability of improved varieties of seed/breed (75), Lack of information on government schemes (71.66), High cost of concentrate feed (70), Poor market facilities (68.33), Lack of training facilities (66.66), High market prices fluctuations (65),Lack of storage facilities (63.33), Reduced grazing land for animals (60), Lack of transportation facilities (58.33), Unavailability of green fodder (53.33) and Lack of irrigation facilities (50) among the constraints identified and listed in Table 2.

Table 2: Constraints faced by farmers in IFS System

S.No.	Name of the Constraints faced by farmers	Farmers	Farmers (%)	Ranking
1	Lack of knowledge of integrated farming system	46	76.66	IV
2	Lack of training facilities	40	66.66	IX
3	Inadequate credit facilities	48	80	II
4	Non-availability of improved varieties of seed / breed	45	75	V
5	High market prices fluctuations	39	65	X
6	Lack of storage facilities	38	63.33	XI
7	Scarcity of labour	47	78.33	III
8	High initial investment	50	83.33	I
9	Poor market facilities	41	68.33	VIII
10	Lack of irrigation facilities	30	50	XV
11	Lack of transportation facilities	35	58.33	XIII
12	Lack of information on government schemes	43	71.66	VI
13	Unavailability of green fodder	32	53.33	XIV
14	High cost of concentrate feed	42	70	VII
15	Reduced grazing land for animals	36	60	XII
16	Total	60 (100%)		

Conclusion

The majority of the respondents belonged to the marginal and small farmer categories. In which the top most farmer are used FSI (Crop+ Dairy). These people normally prefer to borrow from village co-operative credit societies. These societies have restrictions on the loan amount allowed for

individuals. These societies usually lend money for crop production purposes and the amount lend is always inadequate. Farmers practicing integrated farming systems need an increased amount of credit to meet the needs of various enterprises. Institutions like co-operative credit society and even the nationalized banks refuse to lend credit for more than one enterprise at a time for the farmers.

Due to that high initial investment stood at the first rank (83.33%), inadequate credit facilities received the second rank (80%), labour scarcity got the third rank (78.33%), Lack of knowledge of integrated farming system got the IV rank (76.66). It is suggested that these constraints could be easily removed by organizing suitable training programmes on the integrated farming system and educating the farmers by organizing peripatetic training programme in the farms practicing integrated farming systems involving both the farmers and their labourers.

References

1. Behra UK, Jha KP, Mahapatra IC. Integrated of Managemnt resource of the small and marginal farmers for generation of income and employment in eastern India. Crop Research. 2004;27(1):83-89.
2. Pandey PR, Gupta JK, Narvariya RK, Meena SC, Narwariya D. Constraints faced by farmers in adoption of integrated farming system in Vindhyan Plateau of Madhya Pradesh, Plant Archives. 2019;19(2):512-514.
3. Pushpa J. Constraints in various integrated farming systems, Agriculture Update. 2010;5(3 & 4):370-374.
4. Ramya HR, Devi MCA, Naveena N, Subhash S. Constraints Analysis in Integrated Farming System in Select Agro-Climatic Zones of Karnataka State, International Journal Current Microbiology Applied Science. 2021;10(3):1220-1234.
5. Singh G. Integrated farming systems: Option for diversification to manage climate change related risk and livelihood security, International Agronomy Congress, 26-30, New Delhi. 2012;1:93-94.
6. Tiwari Y, Sharma HO, Awasthi PK. Constraints faced by the respondents in existing farming in Madhya Pradesh. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2021;10(3):103-106.