

# Study the Impact of Integrated Farming System on Reducing Cost of Cultivation and Increasing Income of Farmers in Chatra District of Jharkhand

## ABSTRACT

The study was conducted on purposively selected Mardanpur village of Chatra block in Chatra district where Sri. Danbushan Lakra, Progressive farmer has developed a unique model of integrated farming system (IFS) in his 5 acres of the farm. He has designed the farm and segregated the land as per the crops and animal requirement. The IFS model comprised of field crops in 2 acres, vegetables in 1 acre, fruit plants in 0.5 acres, a pig farm in 0.25 acre, a dairy farm in 0.25 acre, Poultry in 0.25 acre, composite fish farming in 0.75 acres. Sri Danbushan Lakra has adopted the best practices of farming under technological support of Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Chatra. The productivity and economic return of different enterprises and commodities were calculated and compared with previous productivity and economics. The result indicated that Sri. Danbushan Lakra has got more than 80 per cent additional yield and profit on different enterprises, which are integrated into the farming system. He has reduced 60% external input like the feed of animal, chemical fertilizer requirement, overall he earns the annual net income Rs. 94430.75 that is 68.6% more as compared to his previous income. It happens due to the interrelation set of enterprises used so that the waste from one component became input for another part of the system, which reduced cost and increased productivity.

\*KVK, Chatra

**Keywords:** Integrated farming system, Productivity, Economic importance, Income, Chatra, India

## INTRODUCTION

Unsustainable farming leads to environmental pollution and threatens the livelihood of millions of small farm holders. Strengthening the agricultural production system for greater sustainability and higher economic return is a vital process for increasing income and food and nutrient security in developing countries (Kesavan & Swaminathan, 2007). Therefore, integrated farming system (IFS) is a multidisciplinary whole-farm approach (Soni et al., 2014) and very effective in solving the problems of small and marginal farmers. The approach aims at increasing income and employment from smallholding by integrating various farm enterprises and recycling crop residues and by-products within the farm itself resulting in reducing the cost of cultivation. Integrated farming systems are often less risky if managed efficiently, they benefit from synergisms among enterprises, diversity in produce, and environmental soundness (Lightfoot, 1990). On this basis, IFS models have been suggested by several workers for the development of small and marginal farms across the country (Rangaswamy et al., 1996; Behera and Mahapatra, 1999; Singh et al., 2006). It is now well recognised that achieving sustainable agricultural production needs a special effort to overcome the sector-based perspective and to provide solutions to real-world problems through scientific

47 and socially robust knowledge (Brandt et al., 2013). Kajikawa et al. (2014) argued that agricultural  
48 sustainability is the more representative disciplines-focus issue that provides also the most numerous  
49 links with other fields within the overall landscape of sustainability research. Several workers have  
50 examined the importance of the approaches in sustainability studies which recognize the urgency to  
51 adopt multi-inter-trans-disciplinary approaches (Brandt et al., 2013; Lang et al., 2012; Mattor et al.,  
52 2014; Mobjörk, 2010; Polk, 2014; Serrao-Neumann et al., 2015; De Luca et al., 2015).

53 According to Soni et al (2014) the prices of inputs and outputs commonly change,  
54 together with reliance on external resources, farm size, farm ownership and the  
55 method of farming, often as a cause and result of increasing population pressures  
56 (Alexandratos, 2010; Pretty, 1995; Giampietro et al., 1992). The farmers need to be assured  
57 of regular income for living at least above the poverty line. In this context, Integrated  
58 Farming System (IFS) is one of the important solutions to face this peculiar situation.

59 Keeping this fact under consideration KVK Chatra developed 5-acre crops and  
60 animal-based Integrated Farming System with available resources which will result in  
61 sustainable development. This study was taken into account to assess the effectiveness of  
62 the IFS in terms of yield and farmer's economic profit than the traditional approach and to  
63 popularize the new approach in grass root farmer's level.

64  
65

## 66 **METHODOLOGY**

67 KVK Chatra has developed 5 acres based module of integrated farming system in the  
68 year 2009, with discussion from farmers and suggestion given by scientists. After that, this  
69 module was implemented on the field of Sri Dan Bhushan Lakra who has five acres of land at  
70 one place near the renovated pond under NICRA project of Mardanpur village of Chatra  
71 block in Chatra district of Jharkhand. Before implementation of the farming system module,  
72 Rice and Maize were the important crops in Kharif and some area they grow wheat and  
73 mustard in Rabi season. They also grow vegetable for their home consumption. For better  
74 utilization of his 5-acre land, the IFS module was discussed with Mr Dan Bhushan and  
75 designed the farm and segregated the land as per the requirement of the crop. The layout of  
76 the farming system has been given in Table 1.

77  
78

**Table: 1 Layout of Integrated Farming System (IFS)**

Sl.No	Crops/Enterprises	Area in Acre
1	Field crops	2.0
2	Fruit plant	0.5
3	Vegetable	1.0
4	Pig farming (5F + 1M)	0.25
5	Dairy farming (5 Cow)	0.25
6	Poultry	0.25
7	Compost fish farming	0.75
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5.0</b>

79  
80  
81  
82  
83

Besides this improved technology of farming, improved varieties recommended a dose of nutrient, the package of practices, drip and sprinkler irrigation, plastic mulching, reducing chemical fertilizer by using vermicompost, Plant residues, vermi wash, cow urine, Biogas slurry, application of Bio-Pesticides etc were included facilities in the farm.

84 The data on production cost and monetary return was collected for two years (2016-17 and  
 85 2017-18) from the Integrated farming system, to work out the economic feasibility of  
 86 integrated farming system over the farmers farming system.

87

## 88 Results & Discussion

### 89 Increasing productivity of commodity/enterprises under the Integrated 90 Farming System

91 Production and productivity increase in integrated farming system is presented in  
 92 Table-2

93

94 **Table:2 Increasing productivity of different commodities/Enterprises under**  
 95 **the Integrated farming system**

96

S.No	Commodity/ Enterprises	Yield Q/ha		Percentage Increase
		Before (IFS)	After (IFS)	
1. Kharif				
	Rice	21	32	52.58
	Maize+Redgram	Maize -13	Maize – 17 Red gram - 13	30.76 100.00
	Cucurbits	-	45	100
	Brinjal	42	135	221.4
	Cauliflower	-	155	100
2. Rabi				
	Wheat	13	21	61
	Gram	9.5	16	68.42
	Mustard	6.8	11	61.76
	Brinjal	6.48	156	144
	Cauliflower	-	168	100
3. Summer				
	Cauliflower	-	142	100
	Dairy (3 Cow)	1kg /cow/day	8kg/cow/days	700
	Piggery (5F + 1M)	-	9 piglet/harrowing	100
	Duckery (6 birds)	-	180 egg/ duck/year	100
	Composite fish farm	23q/ha	38q/ha	65.21

97

98 Table-2 shows that so many commodities which were not taken by farmers before the  
 99 implementation of the integrated farming system i.e. cauliflower, pig farming and duckery,  
 100 which contribute 100% extra *income*. It also is seen in table 2 that in dairy farming farmers  
 101 were having indigenous Cow before IFS, which produces only 1kg/cow/day milk but after  
 102 the introduction of the improved breed, they got 8kg/cow/day which was 700% more  
 103 compared to before IFS. In vegetable cultivation farmer get 200% extra yield compared to  
 104 previous practice and in field crops like Rice, Maize + Red gram, Wheat, Mustard, farmers  
 105 get (52.38%), (30.76%), (61%), and (37.5%) extra yield respectively. It has happened due to  
 106 the use of an interrelated set of enterprises so that the waste from one component

107 becomes an input for another component of IFS, which reduced cost and improved  
108 productivity. This finding was also supported by the finding of Alexandratos N (ed) (1995).

109

110 **Economics of Integrated Farming System (IFS)**

111 Analysis of Economics of Integrated Farming System as given in Table-3

UNDER PEER REVIEW

112

**Table :3 Economics of different enterprises/commodities under in Integrated Farming System before and after integration.**

S.No	Enterprises commodity	Yield Q/ha		Cost of Cultivation (Rs./ha)		Cross return (Rs./ha)		Net Return (Rs./ha)		BC Ratio	
		BIFS	AIFS	BIFS	AIFS	BIFS	AIFS	BIFS	AIFS	BIFS	AIFS
<b>Kharif</b>											
	Rice	21	32	19000	21000	44100	67200	25100	46200	2.32	3.20
	Maize+Redgram	13	17	9000	13400	14300	37600	5300	24200	1.58	2.70
	Cucurbits	-	54	-	32000	-	59400	-	27400	-	1.85
	Brinjal	42	135	28000	48000	37800	121500	9800	73500	1.35	2.53
	Cauliflower	-	155	-	48800	-	139500	-	90700	-	2.85
<b>Rabi</b>											
	Wheat	13	21	16500	17800	27300	44100	10800	26300	1.65	2.47
	Gram	9.5	16	14800	19600	20900	35200	6100	15600	1.41	1.79
	Mustard	8	11	10800	11600	18400	25300	7600	13700	1.70	2.18
	Brinajl	48	156	8000	51200	43200	140400	24800	89200	5.4	2.74
	Cauliflower	-	168	-	51300	-	184800	-	133500	-	3.60
<b>Summer</b>											
	Cauliflower farming	-	142	-	68000	-	156200	-	88200	-	2.29

113

S.No	Enterprises commodity	Yield Q/ha		Cost of Cultivation (Rs./ha)		Cross return (Rs./ha)		Net Return (Rs./ha)		BC Ratio	
		BIFS	BIFS	BIFS	AIFS	BIFS	AIFS	BIFS	AIFS	BIFS	AIFS
	Dairy (3 Cow)	1kg/cow/ days	8kg/cow/ day	800/cow/ month	3200/cow/ month	1050/cow/ month	8400/cow/ month	250 Rs./month	5200 Rs./month	1.31	2.62
	Pig farming (5F + 1M)	-	9 piglet/ harrowing	-	46000/ harrowing	-	122000/ harrowing	-	76000	-	2.65
	Duckery	-	180 egg/ Duck/year	-	920 duck/year	-	1800/egg	-	880	-	1.95
	Composite fish farm farming	23	38	42000	89000	184000	304000	142000	215000	4.38	3.41

114 Table-3 shows that farmers get the maximum net income of Rs. 215000/ha in fish farming  
 115 followed by Cauliflower cultivation of Rs. 88200/ha, pig farming Rs. 76000, field crops,  
 116 Duckery and dairy respectively. The benefit-cost ratio was also found more in Rice 3.55  
 117 followed by cauliflower cultivation 3.60 and fish farming 3.41 respectively. The minimum  
 118 cost-benefit ratio recorded in gram 1.79 followed by cucurbits 1.85 and duck farming 1.95  
 119 respectively. But overall under integrated farming system benefit-cost ratio would be more  
 120 compared to farmer's farming system. It is due to location specific systems which have been  
 121 developed based on available resources which yield result in sustainable development.  
 122 Integrated Farming System (IFS) ensured that wastes from one form of agriculture become a  
 123 resource for another form since it utilizes wastes as resources, we not only crimate wastes  
 124 but we also ensure an overall increase in productivity, profitability for the whole agricultural  
 125 systems. This finding agreed with the finding of Rajju Priya Sone *et al.* (2014)

126

127 **Annual net income within 5 Acre**

128 After implementation on IFS in 5 Acre land annual income was calculated and it is presented  
 129 in table 4

130 **Table: 4, Annual Income in the 5-acre Integrated Farming system model.**

S.No	Commodity/Enterprises'	The area under different commodity /enterprises' before (IFS) Acre)	Annual Income (Rs.) Farmer farm system	The area under different commodity /enterprises' after (IFS) Acre	Annual net income. (Rs.)and IFS
1	Field crops	4	37108	2	36272.00
2	Fruit plant	-	-	0.5 (Three years old)	10000.00
3	Vegetable	0.75	35000	1	121000.00
4	Piggery (5F+1M)	-	-	0.25	76000.00
5	Dairy, Improved Breed (5 Cow) (22Dasi breed)in farmer house	0.6	5500	0.25	260,000.00
6	Poultry	-	-	0.25	26400.00
7	Composite fish farming	-	-	0.75	64758.75
<b>Total Net Annual Income in One year</b>			<b>77608</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>594430.75</b>

131

132 Table 4 showed that before the implementation of the IFS model farmer utilized his  
 133 4-acre land in field crops and get Rs. 37108 net income and grew vegetables only for home  
 134 consumption with traditional technology in 0.75 acres and got Rs. 35000 net income  
 135 annually, in dairy farming, farmers reared 2 cows of the local breed which gave only 1-litre  
 136 milk per day and earned Rs. 5500 annual income. When calculating total annual income in 5-  
 137 acre land farmer got Rs. 77608

138 The table further showed total income after the adoption of the Integrated Farming System  
 139 (IFS) model with the integration of different commodities and enterprises. Farmers get Rs,  
 140 594430.75 in 5 acres of land which is 686% more in comparison to farmer's farming system.

141

142

143

144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193

## Conclusion

The integrated farming system gives unique opportunities for maintaining and extending biodiversity. The emphasis in such a system is on optimizing resource utilization rather than maximization of individual elements in the system. The wellbeing of poor farmers can be improved by bringing together the experiences and efforts of farmers, scientist, researchers.

## Reference :

E.Porcire, and R. Rabbinge, Role of research and education in the development of agriculture in Europe, *European Journal of Agronomy* 7, 1997, 1-13.

RajjuPriyaSoni, MittuKatoch, and Rajesh Ladohia, Integrated Farming System – A review, (2014) *IOSR Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary science (IOSR-JAVS)* Volumen 7, Issue 10 Ver, 1 (Oct. 2014), Pp .36-42

Kesavan, P. C., & Swaminathan, M. S. (2007). Strategies and models for agricultural sustainability in developing Asian countries. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 363(1492), 877-891.

Soni, R. P., Katoch, M., & Ladohia, R. (2014). Integrated farming systems-a review. *Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science*, 7(10), 36-42.

Alexandratos, N. (ed.), *World Agriculture: Towards 2010*. (An FAO Study, FAO, Rome1995).

J. N. Pretty, *RegeneratingAgriculture: Policies and Practice for Sustainability and Self Reliance*, (Earthscan, London 1995).

M. Giampietro, G. Cerretelli,, and D. Pimentel, Assessment of different agricultural production practices. *Ambio*21, 1992, 451-459.

Lightfoot, C. 1990. Integration of aquaculture and agriculture: a route to sustainable farming systems. *Naga, The ICLARM Quarterly* 13(1):9-12.

Rangaswamy, A. Venkitaswamy R. Purushothaman and Palaniappan, Sp.1996. Rice-Poultry – Fish – Mushroom integrated farming systems for lowlands of Tamil Nadu – *Indian Journal of Agronomy*, 41(3): 344-348.

Behera, U.K. and Mahapatra, I.C. 1999. Income and employment generation of small and marginal farmers through integrated farming systems. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*. 44(3): 431-439.

Singh, Kalyan, Bohra, J.S., Singh, Y. and Singh, J.P. 2006. Development of farming system models for the north-eastern plain zone of Uttar Pradesh. *Indian Farming*56 (2): 5-11.

Brandt P., Ernst A., Gralla F., Luederitz C., Lang D.J., Newig J., Reinert F., Abson D.J., von Wehrdenet H., (2013), A review of transdisciplinary research in sustainability science, *Ecological Economics*, 92, 1-15.

Kajikawa Y., Tocoa F., Yamaguchi K., (2014), Sustainability science: the changing landscape of sustainability research, *Sustainability Science*, 9, 431-438.

194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216

Lang D. J., Wiek A., Bergmann M., Stauffacher M., Martens P., Moll P., Swilling M., Thomas C. J., (2012), Transdisciplinary research in sustainability science: practice, principles, and challenges, *Sustainability Science*, 7, 25-43.

Mattor K., Betsill M., Huayhuaca C., Huber-Stearns H., Jedd T., Sternlieb F., Bixler P., Luizza M., Cheng A. S., (2014), Transdisciplinary research on environmental governance: A view from the inside, *Environmental Science & Policy*, 42, 90-100.

Mobjörk M., (2010), Consulting versus participatory transdisciplinarity: A refined classification of transdisciplinary research, *Futures*, 42, 866-873.

Polk M., (2014), Achieving the promise of transdisciplinarity: a critical exploration of the relationship between transdisciplinary research and societal problem solving, *Sustainability Science*, 9, 439-451.

Serrao-Neumann S., Schuch G., Harman B., Crick F., Sano M., Sahin O., van Staden R., Baum S., Low Choy D., (2015), One human settlement: A transdisciplinary approach to climate change adaptation research, *Futures*, 65, 97-109.

De Luca, A. I., Molari, G., Seddaiu, G., Toscano, A., Bombino, G., Ledda, L., ... & Vittuari, M. (2015). Multidisciplinary and innovative methodologies for sustainable management in agricultural systems. *Environmental Engineering & Management Journal (EEMJ)*, 14(7).

