

International Journal of Statistics and Applied Mathematics

ISSN: 2456-1452
Maths 2023; SP-8(1): 30-33
© 2023 Stats & Maths
<https://www.mathsjournal.com>
Received: 06-11-2022
Accepted: 10-01-2023

Anand Kumar Mishra
Research Scholar, Faculty of
Agriculture Sciences, Bhagwant
University, Ajmer, Rajasthan,
India

Dr. Amit Kumar Mishra
Assistant Professor, Faculty of
Agriculture Sciences, Bhagwant
University, Ajmer, Rajasthan,
India

SP Singh
S.M.S (Horticulture) KVK
Belipar Gorakhpur, Uttar
Pradesh, India

Corresponding Author:
Anand Kumar Mishra
Research Scholar, Faculty of
Agriculture Sciences, Bhagwant
University, Ajmer, Rajasthan,
India

Awareness perception of the farmers about organic farming in Uttar Pradesh

Anand Kumar Mishra, Dr. Amit Kumar Mishra and SP Singh

Abstract

Organic Agriculture Movement, the major objectives of organic farming include: production of high quality food in sufficient quantity in harmony with natural systems and cycles, enhancing biological cycles within the farming system involving microorganisms, soil flora and fauna, plants and animals, maintaining long-term soil fertility and genetic diversity of the production system and its surroundings including plant and wildlife, promoting healthy use with proper care of water resources and creating harmonious balance between crop production and animal husbandry, and minimizing all forms of pollution. The study was conducted in purposively selected Sitapur district of Uttar Pradesh. There are 19 community development blocks in this district out of that is two block Khairabad, Biswan was selected purposively. The majority of respondents (78.00%) had medium level of overall adoption regarding organic farming practices the highest number of respondents (26.00%) exhibited in „agree“ category of attitude response. The maximum number of respondents was found positive attitude and interested towards organic farming. The innovations/technology regarding organic farming were considered important to utilize because of highest falling of response at awareness stage.

Keywords: Awareness

Introduction

According to the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movement, the major objectives of organic farming include: production of high quality food in sufficient quantity in harmony with natural systems and cycles, enhancing biological cycles within the farming system involving microorganisms, soil flora and fauna, plants and animals, maintaining long-term soil fertility and genetic diversity of the production system and its surroundings including plant and wildlife, promoting healthy use with proper care of water resources and creating harmonious balance between crop production and animal husbandry, and minimizing all forms of pollution. It includes ecological management strategies that maintain and enhance soil fertility, prevent soil erosion, promote and enhance biological diversity, and minimize risk to human and animal health and natural resources.

Since the early 1990s the term Organic Agriculture ‘has become legally defined in a number of countries. Organic agriculture is gaining gradual momentum across the world. Growing awareness of health and environment issues in agriculture has demanded Production of organic food, which is emerging as an attractive source of rural income generation. While trends of rising consumer demand for organics are becoming discernible, sustainability in production of crops has become the prime concern in agriculture development. However, this chapter focuses on historical background of organic movement, method and management of organic farming, development of organic farming in India and development of organic farming in foreign countries etc.

Methodology

The study was conducted in purposively selected Sitapur district of Uttar Pradesh. There are 19 community development blocks in this district out of that is two block Khairabad, Biswan was selected purposively. This block has 10 Nyay Panchayat, 66 gram panchayat and 114 villages, covering an area of 25361 hectares. The number of villages was 114 and 116 from which 5 villages were selected each block purposively, and then the list of total farmers was prepared for each selected villages.

Thereafter 200 farmers were selected as respondents through random sampling techniques with respect to the categories of the farmers for each selected village. Data were collected with the help of semi-structured interview schedule specially developed on standard scales with some modifications in the light of objectives and analyzed with suitable statistical methods respectively.

Result and Discussion

Table 1(a): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about seed

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 4)	40	20.00
2.	Medium (5-6)	124	62.00
3.	High (7 and above)	36	18.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 1 (a) that majority of farmers (62.00%) had medium level of extent of awareness about seed, followed by low level (20.00%) and high level (18.00%), respectively,

Table 2(b): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about manures

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 10)	32	16.00
2.	Medium (11-14)	124	61.00
3.	High (15 and above)	44	22.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 2(b) that majority of farmers (62.00%) had medium level of extent of awareness about manures, followed by high level (27.00%) and low level (15.00%), respectively.

Table 3(c): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about farm yard manure (FYM)

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 3)	40	20.00
2.	Medium (4)	50	25.00
3.	High (5 and above)	110	55.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 3(c) that majority of farmers (55.00%) had high level of extent of awareness about FYM, followed by medium level (25.00%) and low level (20.83%), respectively.

Table 4(d): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about compost

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 2)	22	11.00
2.	Medium (3)	126	63.00
3.	High (4 and above)	52	26.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 4(d) that majority of farmers (63.00%) had medium level of extent of awareness about compost, followed by high level (26.00%) and low level (10.00%), respectively.

The similar finding was also reported by Suman (2012) [12].

Table 5 (e): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about vermi-compost

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 7)	60	30.00
2.	Medium (8-9)	80	40.00
3.	High (10 and above)	60	30.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 5(d) that majority of farmers (40.00%) had medium level of extent of awareness about vermi-compost, followed by high level (31.00%) and low level (30.00%), respectively.

Table 6(f): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about green manure

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 2)	60	21.00
2.	Medium (3-4)	98	49.00
3.	High (31 and above)	62	31.00

It is clear from the above Table 4.2(f) that majority of farmers (49.00%) had medium level of extent of awareness about green manure, followed by high level (31.00%) and low level (20.00%), respectively.

Table 7(g): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about oil-cake

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 2)	38	18.00
2.	Medium (3-4)	102	51.00
3.	High (5 and above)	62	31.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 7(g) that majority of farmers (51.00%) had medium level of extent of awareness about oil-cake, followed by high level (31.00%) and low level (18.00%), respectively.

Table 8(h): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about bio-fertilizer

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 4)	38	19.00
2.	Medium (5-7)	106	63.00
3.	High (8 and above)	36	18.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 8(h) that majority of farmers (63.00%) had medium level of extent of awareness about bio-fertilizers, followed by low level (19.00%) and high level (18.00%), respectively.

Table 9(i): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about weed management

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 4)	56	23.00
2.	Medium (5-6)	88	43.00
3.	High (7 and above)	66	34.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 9(i) that majority of farmers (44.00%) had medium level of extent of awareness about weed management, followed by high level (33.00%) and low level (23.00%), respectively.

Table 10(j): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about liquid organic manure

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 4)	28	14.00
2.	Medium (5-6)	116	58.00
3.	High (7 and above)	54	28.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 10(j) that majority of farmers (58.00%) had medium level of extent of awareness about liquid organic manure, followed by high level (28.00%) and low level (14.00%), respectively.

Table 11(k): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about crop rotation

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 1)	50	24.00
2.	Medium (2)	88	44.00
3.	High (3 and above)	66	32.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 11(k) that maximum number of respondents (44.00%) had medium level of extent of awareness about crop rotation, followed by high level (32.00%) and low level (24.00%), respectively.

Table 12(l): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about mulching

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 3)	26	13.00
2.	Medium (4-6)	110	55.00
3.	High (7 and above)	62	32.00
	Total	240	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 12(l) that majority of farmers (55.00%) had medium level of extent of awareness about crop rotation, followed by high level (32.00%) and low level (14.00%), respectively.

Table 13(m): Awareness about mix farming

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 5)	56	28.00
2.	Medium (6-7)	100	50.00
3.	High (8 and above)	44	22.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 13(m) that majority of farmers (50.00%) had medium level of extent of awareness about mix farming, followed by low level (28.00%) and high level (22.00%), respectively. The similar finding was also reported by Borua and Brahma (2012) [14].

Table 14(n): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about plant protection measures

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 11)	36	18.00
2.	Medium (12-15)	124	62.00
3.	High (16 and above)	40	20.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 14(n) that majority of farmers (62.00%) had medium level of extent of awareness about plant protection measures, followed by high level (20.00%) and low level (18.00%), respectively.

Table 15(o): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about market management

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 2)	70	35.00
2.	Medium (3)	114	47.00
3.	High (4 and above)	36	18.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 15(o) that majority of farmers (47.00%) had medium level of extent of awareness about market management, followed by low level (35.00%) and high level (18.00%), respectively.

Table 16(p): Distribution of respondents according to the extent of awareness about organic certification

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 2)	66	33.00
2.	Medium (3)	54	26.00
3.	High (4 and above)	82	41.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the above Table 16(p) that majority of farmers (41.00%) had high level of extent of awareness about mix farming, followed by low level (33.00%) and medium level (26.00%), respectively.

The similar finding was also reported by Borua and Brahma (2012) [14].

Table 17(q): Distribution of respondents according to the overall awareness about organic farming practices

S. No.	Category	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low (up to 98)	52	26.00
2.	Medium(99-109)	120	60.00
3.	High (110 and above)	28	14.00
	Total	200	100.00

It is clear from the Table 17(q) that majority of farmers (60.00%) had medium level of overall extent of awareness about organic farming practices, followed by low level (26.00%) and high level (14.00%), respectively.

The level of awareness regarding the organic farming cultivation is vital for providing sound educational and policy strategies that aim at limiting the health and environmental hazards caused by organic practices etc. The majority of farmers in this study was well aware of the harmful effects of chemical fertilizers with regard to the environment and human health. This suggests that even though farmers may know the hazards of chemical fertilizers very well and they may often

adopt risky behaviors because of lack of education consequently weak knowledge and understanding of organic farming practices in organic use. Hence, the farmers seem more concerned with high economic returns from their crops than with their own health.

This study showed some organic practices about cultivation of crops. This demonstrates the farmers' lack of awareness of organic farming and the appropriate approach for cultivation practices. The farmers generally demonstrated a poor awareness/knowledge about organic farming. These poor cultivation practices can lead to harmful residues in harvested produce, soil and water contamination, posing a threat to both human and environmental health.

The farmers have inability to direct link the health symptoms experienced by respondents to organic produce. The similar findings were also reported by Suman (2013) ^[13].

Conclusion

The majority of the horticultural farmers in the Sitapur region, according to the study's findings, were in their prime economic and productive years and had a wealth of farming experience. Thus, there is potential for the area to produce more organic Farming in a sustainable manner. They knew about the extensive organic cultivation practices, even though they aren't being used as frequently as they should be likely because of limitations like time, transportation, insufficient credit and storage options, climate change, capital-intensive, absence of extension agents, and technical know-how.

Reference

1. Gopichand B, Banerjee PK. Vendible propriety of vegetable growers in Telangana. *Inter J Agril. Sci. Res.* 2017;6(7):303-310.
2. Govindagowda V, Narayanagowda K. Profile of Thompson Seedless and Bangalore Blue grape growers. *Mysore J Agric. Sci.* 2006;40(3):424-429.
3. Grover I, Sethi N. Mapping out gender dynamics of farming system of Haryana. *J Soc. Sci.* 2007;14(3):281-288.
4. Hanis Diyana Kamarudin, Nor Erlissa Abd Aziz, Muhammad Khairulnizam Zani, Nor Zaina Zaharah Mohd Ariff. Exploring knowledge sharing practices among paddy farmers towards building a foundation of knowledge creation. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity.* 2015;5(1):112.
5. Henry D, Feola G. Pesticide-handling practices of smallholder coffee farmers in Eastern Jamaica. *J Agril. Rur. Dev. Trop. Subtro.* 2013;114(1):59-67.
6. Iyagba AG, Eze GI, Isirima BC. Acceptability and practice of organic agriculture in Etche and Omuma local government area of rivers state, Nigeria. *Inter. J Sci. Envir. Tech.* 2017;1(6):20-32.
7. Jadhav Kailash. A study on Information Management behaviour of tribal farmers of Adilabad district in Andhra Pradesh. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis. Acharya N G Ranga Agricultural University, Hyderabad, India; c2010.
8. Kafle B. Factors affecting adoption of organic vegetable farming in Chitwan district, Nepal. *Worl. J Agril. Sci.,* 2011;7(5):604-606.
9. Kadri FA, Eze CC, Orebiyi JS, Henri-Ukoha A. Economic analysis of paddy rice production in Niger Delta region of Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development.* 2014;4(12):541-550.
10. Meena SL, Lakhera JP, Sharma KC, Johri Raj SK. Knowledge level and adoption pattern of rice production

technology among farmers. *Journal of Extension Education.* 2012;20:133-137.

11. Mustapha SB, Undiandeya UC, Sanusi AM, Bakari S. Analysis on adoption of improved rice production technologies in Jeer local Government area of Borno state, Nigeria. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability.* 2012;1(3):1112-1120.
12. Ellis MJ, Ding L, Shen D, Luo J, Suman VJ, Wallis JW, *et al.* Whole-genome analysis informs breast cancer response to aromatase inhibition. *Nature.* 2012 Jun 21;486(7403):353-60.
13. Roy RV, Suman S, Das TP, Luevano JE, Damodaran C. Withaferin A. A steroidal lactone from *Withania somnifera*, induces mitotic catastrophe and growth arrest in prostate cancer cells. *Journal of natural products.* 2013 Oct 25;76(10):1909-15.
14. Borua S, Brahma AK. A study on the knowledge level and extent of adoption of selected technology by rural youth trained in KVK of AAU in Assam. *J Acad and Indust Res.* 2012;1(7):374-8.