Impact of Integrated Farming Systems on Socio-Economic Status of Farmers

M. K. Rathod[1] and Sonali Raut[2]

Abstract

The present study was conducted in Wardha district of Vidarbha region in Maharashtra to study the impact of integrated farming system on socio-economic status of farm families. The farmers who had adopted different farming systems in addition to agriculture were purposively selected from 12 villages and personally interviewed. Data was collected regarding the impact of farming systems on socio-economic status of farmers, before and after adoption of the farming system. Almost all indicators of SES were found increased in their levels after adoption of the farming system. The results revealed that overall socio-economic status improved after adoption of integrated farming system.

Introduction

Farming enterprises include crop, livestock, poultry, fish, tree crops, plantation crops, forestry, sericulture etc. A combination of one or more enterprises with cropping, when carefully chosen, planned and executed, gives greater dividends than a single enterprise, especially for small and marginal farmers. Farm as a unit is to be considered and planned for effective integration of the enterprises to be combined with crop production activity. The integration of farm enterprises depends on many factors such as soil and climatic features of the selected area, availability of the resources, land, labour and capital, present level of utilization of resources, returns from the existing farming system, economics of the proposed integrated farming system, managerial skills of the farmer, etc.

Integration of different agriculture related enterprises with crop activity as a base will provide ways to recycle produce and waste material of one component as input through another linked component, to bring in improvement in soil health and reduce the cost of production which will finally raise the total income of the farm.

[1] Associate Professor, College of Agriculture, Dr. PDKV, Akola, Nagpur, Maharashtra

[2] Ex-PG Student, College of Agriculture, Dr. PDKV, Akola, Nagpur, Maharashtra

Hence, by looking at the present scenario, it is proposed to have an Integrated Farming System (IFS) approach instead of growing only field crops. This will supplement the crop loss and enable the farmers to obtain income from other farm enterprises as well. The present study was undertaken with the specific objective to study the impact of integrated farming system on socio-economic status of farm families.

Methodology

The study was carried out in Wardha district of Vidarbha region. The farmers who had adopted farming system or subsystems of agriculture were identified with the help of the District Superintendent Agriculture Officer who had prepared a list of such farmers. The number of respondents were uneven in the villages, hence 120 respondents were selected from 12 villages which were purposively selected. An exploratory research design was used for investigation. For the present study an interview schedule was found to be the most convenient method for data collection from the selected farmers. The dependent variable i.e. socio-economic status was measured with the help of a scale developed by Thakare (2004). Findings regarding impact of the farming system on socio-economic development of farmers were included in the study.

Results and Discussion

It is apparent from Table 1 that before adoption of an integrated farming system, majority of the respondents (54.17%) had agriculture as the only occupation followed by 45.83 per cent respondents having agriculture + labour as their occupation. After adoption of integrated farming system, majority of family heads (81.67%) had agriculture + allied occupation (Goat farming/Poultry/Apiculture/Sericulture) followed by 10.83 per cent of respondents (family head) who had agriculture + business as their occupation, while 07.50 per cent respondents had agriculture (farming) as their only occupation. Before adoption of an integrated farming system, majority of the respondents (other dependents i.e. son/brother) had agriculture + labour (49.17%) as their occupation, followed by 34.17 per cent of the respondents (other dependent i.e. son/brother) who were landless labour (daily wage earner), while 16.67 per cent of the respondents had agriculture (farming) as their occupation.

Table 1. Impact of Farming Systems on Occupation of the Family of Respondents

Sr. No.	Item / Indicator	Before adoption of IFS		After adoption of IFS	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
a)	**Occupation of Family Head**				
	Agriculture + labour	55	45.83	00	00.00
	Agriculture (Farming)	65	54.17	09	07.50
	Agriculture + allied occupation (Goat farming/Poultry/Apiculture/ Sericulture)	00	00.00	98	81.67
	Agriculture + business (Professional/non professional)	00	00.00	13	10.83
	Agriculture + Service (Job with monthly salary)	00	00.00	00	00.00
b)	**Occupation of other dependents (Son/Brother etc.)**				
	Landless labour (Daily wage earner)	41	34.17	00	00.00
	Agriculture + labour	59	49.17	01	00.83
	Agriculture (Farming)	20	16.67	06	05.00
	Agriculture + allied occupation (Goat Farming/Poultry/Apiculture/ Sericulture)	00	0.00	98	81.67
	Agriculture + business (Professional/non professional)	00	0.00	13	10.83
	Agriculture + Service (Job with monthly salary)	00	00.00	02	01.67

After adoption of an integrated farming system, majority of other dependents i.e. son/brother (81.67%) had agriculture + allied occupation (Goat farming/ Poultry/ Apiculture/ Sericulture) followed by 10.83 per cent respondents (other dependents i.e. son/brother) who had agriculture + business as their occupation. While, 5 per cent of the respondents (other dependents i.e. son/brother) had agriculture (farming) as their occupation, a very negligible percentage (1.67%) of respondents (other dependents i.e. son/brother) had agriculture + service (Job with monthly salary) as their occupation and only 0.83 per cent respondents (other dependents i.e. son/brother) had agriculture + labour as their occupation. The findings clearly indicate that the family who had adopted integrated farming system did not need to go for other enterprises for work as IFS generated income throughout the year in their own occupations. It is very encouraging that IFS provides employment to members of the family who were unable to leave their home.

Table 2. Impact of Farming Systems on Land Holding and its Indicators

Sr. No.	Item / Indicator	Before adoption of IFS		After adoption of IFS	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
a)	**Type of cultivation**				
	Rain fed	73	60.83	61	50.83
	Irrigated	47	39.17	59	49.17
b)	**Cropping pattern ***				
	Seasonal cropping / single cropping	120	100.00	23	19.17
	Double / Multiple cropping	00	00.00	97	80.83
	Biannual cropping	00	00.00	24	20.00
	Orchards	00	00.00	40	33.33
c)	**Source of irrigation**				
	No source	73	60.83	61	50.83
	River	25	20.83	07	05.83
	Well	20	16.67	50	41.67
	Canal	02	01.67	02	01.67
d)	**Ownership of land**				
	Land leased out	00	00.00	09	07.50
	Land leased in	00	00.00	00	00.00
e)	**Contingency paid yearly worker**				
	No	120	100.00	27	22.50
	Yes	00	00.00	93	77.50

* Multiple responses

There was no change in land holding after adoption of IFS. The findings from Table 2 show that, before adoption of the farming systems, majority of the respondents (60.83%) had rain fed agriculture followed by 39.17 per cent respondents who had irrigated agriculture. After adoption of farming systems, rain fed area decreased to 50.83 per cent and irrigated increased by ten per cent i.e. 49.17 per cent respondents had irrigated agriculture. Before adoption of integrated farming system, all the respondents had a seasonal/single cropping pattern. After adoption of farming systems, 80.83 per cent respondents had double/multiple cropping pattern followed by 31.33 per cent of the respondents who had orchards, 20 per cent of the respondents had biannual cropping pattern and remaining 19.17 per cent of the respondents followed a seasonal/single cropping pattern.

Before adoption of farming systems, 60.83 per cent respondents had no source of irrigation, followed by 20.83 per cent respondents who had river as the source of irrigation, 16.67 per cent had well as a source of irrigation and only 1.67 per cent of the respondents had canal as a source of irrigation. After adoption of IFS, 50.83 per

cent respondents had no source of irrigation followed by 41.67 per cent respondents who had well, 05.83 per cent had river as a source of irrigation and only 1.67 per cent of the respondents had canal as a source of irrigation. This indicates that respondents had developed sources of irrigation for subsidiary farming enterprises as a complimentary farming system.

As may be seen in Table 2, 7.50 percent of the respondents leased out their lands after adoption of IFS. Majority (77.5%) of the respondents remained as contingency paid yearly workers even after adoption of IFS where as 22.5 percent of the respondents turned to be non contingency paid yearly workers.

The irrigation sources which were dead due to maintenance, were started by some of the farmers with the guidance of experts and about one third of the respondents dug out wells which consequently helped to cultivate double and triple cropping as well as orchard plantations like mango, orange etc.

Table 3. Impact of Farming Systems on Annual Income of Respondents

Sr. No.	Item / Indicator	Before adoption of IFS		After adoption of IFS	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
a)	**Annual income**				
	Below poverty line	02	01.67	00	00.00
	Up to Rs. 50,000/-	74	61.67	07	05.83
	Rs. 50,000/- to Rs. 1,00,000/-	43	35.83	60	50.00
	Rs. 1,00,000 to 1,50,000/-	01	00.83	47	39.17
	Rs. 1,50,000/- to creamy layer (Rs. 4,50,000)	00	00.00	06	05.00
	Above creamy layer	00	00.00	00	00.00

The findings from Table 3 indicate that, before adoption of farming systems, annual income of majority of respondents (61.67%) was up to Rs. 50,000/- followed by annual income of 35.83 per cent respondents, which was Rs. 50,000/- to Rs.1,00,000/-. Annual income of 01.67 per cent of the respondents was below the poverty line and only 00.83 per cent of the respondents had annual income of Rs. 1,00,000 to Rs. 1,50,000/-..

After adoption of farming systems, annual income of half of the respondents (50%) was Rs. 50,000/- to Rs.1,00,000/- followed by annual income of 39.17 per cent of the respondents which was Rs. 1,00,000/- to Rs.1,50,000/-. Annual income of 05.83 per cent of the respondents was up to Rs. 50,000/- and 5 per cent of the respondents had an annual income of Rs. 1,50,000 to creamy layer (Rs. 4,50,000). It is inferred that adoption of integrated farming system helped the farmers to earn more money and increase their annual income.

The data from Table 4 indicates that before adoption of farming systems, cent per cent of the respondents were without any position in any social or political organization. However, after adoption of farming systems, majority of the respondents (49.17%) were involved in community work though not having membership or official position in any social or political organization, followed by 17.50 per cent who had membership of one social or political organization, 6.67 per cent were village leaders/opinion leaders. Among all, 4.17 per cent of the respondents had an official position in a social or political organization and 03.33 per cent had membership of one social and political organization.

Table 4. Impact of Farming Systems on Socio-Political Participation of Respondents

Sr. No.	Item / Indicator	Before adoption of IFS		After adoption of IFS	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
a)	**Socio-political participation**				
	Membership of one social or political organization	00	00.00	21	17.50
	Membership of one social and political organization	00	00.00	04	03.33
	Involved in community work though not having membership or official position in any social or political organization	00	00.00	59	49.17
	Financial contribution / Raising common funds	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Official position in social or political organization	00	00.00	05	04.17
	Village leader/opinion leader	00	00.00	08	06.67
	Wide public leader	00	00.00	00	00.00

Before adoption of farming systems, majority of the respondents did not have any position in a social or political organization. However, after adoption of farming systems, respondents became aware about the position in social and political organizations and were motivated to be actively involved in community work of such organizations. This indicates that increase in family income due to adoption of integrated farming system made the farmers more social by participating in social organizations as well as community work.

It is apparent from Table 5 that before adoption of farming systems, 59.17 per cent respondents had brick wall and tiled type of house which is followed by 40.83 per cent respondents having mud wall and thatched type of house. After adoption of integrated farming systems, 53.33 per cent respondents had concrete type of house followed by 27.50 per cent who had brick wall and tiled type of house, 13.33 per cent had mud wall and thatched type of house and 05.83 per cent had double storied house. Ownership of the house remained the same before and after the adoption of farming systems; all respondents had their own house, toilet/ soak pit.

Table 5. Impact of Farming Systems on Household of the Respondents

Sr. No.	Item / Indicator	Before adoption of IFS		After adoption of IFS	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
a)	**Household**				
	Shed Thatched (Stalk frames)	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Mud wall and thatched	49	40.83	16	13.33
	Brick wall and tiled	71	59.17	33	27.50
	Concrete house	00	00.00	64	53.33
	Double storied	00	00.00	07	05.83
b)	**Ownership of house**				
	Rented	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Own	120	100.00	120	100.00
c)	**Other facilities ***				
	Toilet / Soak pit available	120	100.00	120	100.00
	Well inside the yard	42	35.00	45	37.50
	Bio Gas connection / LPG connection	70	58.33	120	100.00
	No other facilities	00	00.00	01	00.83
d)	**Condition of the house**				
	Needs much repair	40	33.33	22	18.33
	Needs some repair	75	62.50	37	30.83
	Neat and well kept without court yard	05	04.17	47	39.17
	Neat and well kept with court yard	00	00.00	14	11.67
e)	**Lighting facility ***				
	Kerosene lamp / Petromax	09	07.50	00	00.00
	Electricity	120	100.00	120	100.00
f)	**Family Type**				
	Single	120	100.00	120	100.00
	Joint	00	00.00	00	00.00
g)	**Family size**				
	Small (1 to 3 members)	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Medium (4 to 6 members)	120	100.00	120	100.00
	Large (7 to 9 members)	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Very large (10 and above)	00	00.00	00	00.00
h)	**Storage house available**	00	00.00	00	00.00
	No	120	100.00	94	78.33
	Yes	00	00.00	26	21.67

** Multiple responses*

Only 58.33 per cent of the respondents had LPG connection before adoption of farming systems. After adoption of different farming systems 100.00 per cent of the respondents have LPG connection. Before the integrated farming system, 35.00 per cent of the respondents had a well inside the yard and after adoption of integrated farming system, 37.50 per cent have a well inside the yard.

Before adoption of the farming systems, 62.50 per cent respondents needed some repair of their house, 33.33 per cent respondents needed much repair of their house and only 4.17 per cent respondents had a neat and well kept house without a court yard. After adoption of farming systems, 39.17 per cent respondents had a neat and well kept house without a court yard, 30.83 per cent respondents needed some repair of their house, 18.33 per cent respondents needed much repair of their house and 11.67 per cent respondents had a neat and well kept house with a court yard. All the respondents had electricity and had a medium family size and single family type before and after IFS. Before adoption of farming systems, cent per cent of the respondents had no storage facility. After adoption of farming systems, 78.33 per cent of the respondents had storage facility. In all, the living standards of IFS farmers improved.

Results from Table 6 indicate that before adoption of farming systems, 84.17 per cent respondents had hoe, 57.50 per cent had wooden plough, 34.17 per cent had mould board plough, 25.83 per cent had harrow, 12.50 per cent had sprayer and only 00.83 per cent of the respondents had wooden seed-drill. After adoption of farming systems, 92.50 per cent respondents had hoe and harrow, 57.50 per cent had wooden plough, 81.67 per cent had mould board plough, 25.83 per cent had harrow, 56.67 per cent had sprayer and only 00.83 per cent respondents had wooden seed-drill.

Before adoption of farming systems, 52.50 per cent respondents had no grain storage facility and 47.50 per cent had metallic bins as grain storage facility. After adoption of farming systems, 60 per cent had metallic bins as grain storage facility, while 40 per cent respondents had no grain storage facility. Before adoption of farming systems, 49.17 per cent respondents had divan, 43.33 per cent had chairs, 22.50 per cent had almirah and only 00.83 per cent had tables. But, after adoption of farming systems, 97.50 per cent had chairs, 93.33 per cent had almirah, 90 per cent of the respondents had divan, 69.17 per cent had tables and 04.17 per cent had sofa.

The data indicates that there was an increase in the number of respondents using modern home appliances after adoption of farming systems.

Before adoption of farming systems, cent per cent of the respondents had non discrete (domestic) farm animals (bullock) and milch animals. After adoption of farming systems, 94.17 per cent and 98.33 per cent had non discrete (domestic) farm animals (bullock) and milch animals, respectively, 5 per cent respondents had no farm animals (bullock) and only 00.83 per cent and 01.67 per cent respondents had discrete (breeds) farm animals (bullock) and milch animals, respectively.

Table 6. Impact of Farming Systems on Material Possession by the Respondents

Sr. No.	Item / Indicator	Before adoption of IFS		After adoption of IFS	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
a)	**Material possession ***				
	No farm implements / equipments				
	Harrow	31	25.83	111	92.50
	Hoe	101	84.17	111	92.50
	Wooden plough	69	57.50	69	57.50
	Wooden seed-drill	01	00.83	01	00.83
	Mould board plough	41	34.17	98	81.67
	Ferti-hoe	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Iron seed – cum – fertilizer drill	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Duster	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Sprayer	15	12.50	68	56.67
	Diesel engine	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Electric pump	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Thresher / Harvester	00	00.00	00	00.00
b)	**Household equipment**				
	Grain storage				
	No grain storage facility	63	52.50	48	40.00
	Silo pits	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Pev	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Kangi	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Metallic bins	57	47.50	72	60.00
	Furniture *				
	No furniture availability				
	Chairs	52	43.33	117	97.50
	Tables	01	00.83	83	69.17
	Almirah	27	22.50	112	93.33
	Divan	59	49.17	108	90.00
	Sofa	00	00.00	05	04.17
	Other house hold equipment *				
	No other house hold equipment				
	Watch/torch	74	61.67	110	91.67
	Fan	66	55.00	110	91.67
	Camera	00	00.00	00	00.00
	CD player	00	00.00	01	00.83
	Mixer / grinder	56	46.67	113	94.17
	Tape-recorder	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Telephone/mobile	05	04.17	76	63.33
	Cooler	110	91.67	116	96.67
	Refrigerator	49	40.83	82	68.33
c)	**Animal possession**				
	Farm animals (Bullock)				
	No farm animals	00	00.00	06	05.00
	Non discrete (Domestic)	120	100.00	113	94.17
	Discrete (Breeds)	00	00.00	01	00.83
	Milch animals				
	No milch animals	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Non discrete (Domestic)	120	100.00	118	98.33
	Discrete (Breeds)	00	00.00	02	01.67
	Goat / sheep				
	No goat / sheep	18	15.00	26	21.67
	Non discrete (Domestic)	102	85.00	94	78.33
	Discrete (Breeds)	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Poultry				
	No poultry possession	66	55.00	88	73.33
	Possesses poultry (Backyard poultry)	54	45.00	32	26.67

Sr. No.	Item / Indicator	Before adoption of IFS		After adoption of IFS	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
d)	**Information sources ***				
	No information sources				
	Books	05	04.17	14	11.67
	Farm publications	21	17.50	49	40.83
	Agricultural bulletins / magazines	02	01.67	06	05.00
	News paper –Daily / Weekly / Fortnight	19	15.83	48	40.00
	Radio	72	60.00	43	35.83
	TV – Black and white/coloured	67	55.83	119	99.17
	Internet access (common)	00	00.00	21	17.50
e)	**Farm structure**				
	Cattle shed				
	No cattle shed	03	02.50	01	00.83
	Katcha	117	97.50	115	95.83
	Pucca	00	00.00	04	03.33
	Implements shed				
	No implement shed	31	25.83	20	16.67
	Katcha	89	74.17	96	80.00
	Pucca	00	00.00	04	03.33
f)	**Transport ***				
	No transport facility				
	Cycle	116	96.67	79	65.83
	Bullock cart	42	35.00	51	42.50
	Motor cycle/ moped	36	30.00	109	90.83
	Jeep/lorry/van	00	00.00	03	02.50
	Tractor	00	00.00	06	05.00
g)	**Farm visits / Exhibitions / Extension activities**				
	Always	00	00.00	03	02.50
	Sometimes	22	18.33	85	70.83
	Never	98	81.67	32	26.67

* *Multiple responses*

Before adoption of farming systems, 85.00 per cent respondents had non discrete (domestic) and 15 per cent had no goat/sheep. After adoption of farming systems, 78.33 per cent had non discrete (domestic) goat/ sheep and 21.67 per cent had no goat/sheep. Before adoption of farming systems, 55 per cent of the respondents had no poultry and 45 per cent possessed poultry (backyard poultry). After adoption of farming systems, 73.33 per cent respondents had no poultry and 26.67 per cent possessed poultry (backyard poultry).

Before adoption of farming systems, majority of the respondents (60%) had radio as a source of information, 55.83 per cent had television, 17.50 per cent had access to farm publications, 15.83 per cent had news paper as a source of information, 04.17 per cent were using books as a source of information and only 01.67 per cent had agricultural bulletin/magazines as a source of information. These results are in line with that of Dhamodaran and Vasanthkumar (2001).

After adoption of farming systems, majority of the respondents (99.17%) had television as a source of information, 40.83 per cent had access to farm publications,

40 per cent had newspaper as a source of information, 35.83 per cent had radio, 17.50 per cent had access to internet access, 11.67 per cent used books as a source of information and only 5 per cent had agricultural bulletin/magazines as a source of information.

Before adoption of farming systems, majority of the respondents (97.50%) had *katcha* cattle shed, 2.5 per cent had no cattle shed. 74.17 per cent had *katcha* implement shed and 25.83 per cent had no implement shed. After adoption of farming systems, majority of the respondents (95.83%) had *katcha* cattle shed, while 3.33 per cent had *pucca* cattle shed and only 00.83 per cent had no cattle shed. Eighty per cent had *katcha* implement shed, 16.67 per cent had no implement shed and 03.33 per cent had *pucca* implement shed.

Before adoption of farming systems, majority (96.67%) of the respondents had a cycle as a transport facility, 35 per cent had bullock cart and 30 per cent were having motor cycle / moped. After adoption of farming systems, 90.83 per cent respondents had motor cycle/ moped, 65.83 per cent had cycle, 42.50 per cent had bullock cart, 5 per cent had tractor and only 2.5 per cent had jeep/lorry/van as transport facility.

Before adoption of farming systems, 81.67 per cent of the respondents never participated in any farm visits/exhibitions/extension activities, 18.33 per cent sometimes went for farm visits/exhibitions/ extension activities. After adoption of farming systems, 70.83 per cent sometimes participated in farm visits/ exhibitions/ extension activities, 26.67 per cent of the respondents never had any farm visits/exhibitions/extension activities and only 2.5 per cent always went for farm visits/exhibitions/extension activities.

The above results clearly indicate that, there was increase in the number of respondents using modern home appliances. After adoption of farming systems, there was maximum use of various sources of information by the respondents to get scientific and current knowledge about various integrated farming systems and their proper management.

Data in Table 7 reveals that before adoption of farming systems, 3.33 per cent respondents were progressive farmers and only 0.83 per cent were prize winners (village/tahsil/district level). More than three fourth of the respondents (79.17%) borrowed loans and 20.83 per cent had not borrowed loans. Majority of the respondents (71.67%) were defaulters while 7.5 per cent were non defaulters.

Table 7. Impact of Farming Systems on other Attributes of the Respondents

Sr. No.	Item / Indicator	Before adoption of IFS		After adoption of IFS	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
a)	**Other attributes**				
	No other Attributes	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Seed producer	00	00.00	00	00.00
	Progressive farmer	04	03.33	05	04.17
	Prize winner-village/Tahsil/District level	01	00.83	02	01.67
	Krishi Pandit	00	00.00	00	00.00
b)	**Loan (Rs.)**				
	Borrowed	95	79.17	82	68.33
	Not Borrowed	25	20.83	38	31.67
c)	**Repayment behavior**				
	Defaulter	86	71.67	23	19.17
	Non defaulter	09	07.50	59	49.17

After adoption of integrated farming system, 4.17 per cent of the respondents were progressive farmers and 1.67 per cent were prize winners (village/tahsil/district level). More than two third of the respondents (68.33%) had borrowed loans which was lower as compared to before IFS and 31.67 per cent had not borrowed loans. Majority of the respondents (49.17%) were non defaulters.

Table 8. Distribution of Respondents according to Overall Socio-Economic Status before and after Adoption of Integrated Farming System

Sr. No.	Categorization	Before		After	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Very low	81	67.50	01	00.83
2	Low	39	32.50	51	42.50
3	Medium	00	00.00	65	54.17
4	Medium high	00	00.00	03	02.50
5	High	00	00.00	00	00.00

It is observed from the data pre tested in Table 8 that before adoption of farming systems, over two thirds of the respondents (67.50%) were having very low level of socio-economic status followed by low level of socio-economic status (32.50%). No one had medium, medium high or high level of socio-economic status. After adoption of integrated farming system, over half of the respondents (54.17%) were having medium level of socio-economic status, followed by low level of socio-economic status (42.50%), medium high level of socio-economic status (2.50%) and only 0.83 per cent had very low level of socio-economic status. No one had high level of socio-economic status. It clearly means that adoption of integrated farming system could

exert an increase in the level of socio-economic status. Hence, it can be concluded that adoption of integrated farming system has a positive impact on socio-economic status of the farmers. The results obtained are in conformity with the findings of Rangaswamy (1999), Sharma et al. (2008) and Channabasavanna et al. (2009).

Conclusion

It is concluded that adoption of integrated farming system helped the farmers to increase their annual income and support their economic development. Economic development consequently motivates the farmers to increase their socio-political participation. Positive impact on social, economic and political parameters resulted in improvement in standard of living of the farmers.

References

Channabasavanna, A. S., D. P. Biradar, K. N. Prabhudev and Mahabhaleswar Hegde. (2009). Development of profitable integrated farming system model for small and medium farmers of Tungabhadra project area of Karnataka. *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.,* 22(1): (25-27).

Rangasamy, A. (1999). In : Lecture Notes of Summer Short Course on Farming Systems for Sustainable Production, *Univ. Agric. Sci. Dharwad,* 24th May to 2nd June 1999.

Sharma Y. K., G.S. Bangarva and S.K. Sharma. (2008). Farming System Based Constraints faced by Farmers. *Indian Res. J. Ext. Edu.* 8 (1): 57-59.

Thakare, U. G. (2004). Impact of Centrally Sponsored Crop Development Programmes on the Beneficiaries. *Ph. D. Thesis (Unpub.)* Dr. PDKV, Akola.