*Indian Journal of Extension Education*
*Vol. 51, No. 1 & 2, 2015 (102-104)*

# Awareness and Attitude of Farmers towards Agro-forestry

**Satyendra Kumar Singh[1], R. K. Doharey[2], A. K. Singh[3], Prakash Singh[4] and Sandip Kumar Singh[5]**

**ABSTRACT**

The study was conducted in Milkipur block of Faizabad District by concluding personal interview with 100 respondents selected through proportionate random sampling technique on the criteria of land holding size possessed, *viz.* Marginal, small, medium and large to find out the knowledge, attitude and adoption of agro-forestry systems. The majority of respondents (73 %) were found having medium level of attitude towards agro-forestry and attitude was measured on the scale developed by Shukla and Tyagi (2002). The respondents were categorized into three categories such as low, medium and high on the basis on the respondents e.g. low (up to 38), medium (39 to 44), high (45 and above) based on (i) mean-SD (ii) between mean ± SD (iii) mean +SD respectively. The correlation of attitude with like economic motivation and knowledge extent were found to be highly significant.

**Key words:** Awareness, attitude, farmers, agro forestry, agro forestry practices.

## INTRODUCTION

The major policy initiatives, including the National Forest Policy 1988, the National Agriculture Policy 2000, Planning Commission Task Force on Greening India 2001, National Bamboo Mission 2002, National Policy on Farmers, 2007 and Green India Mission 2010, emphasized the role of agro-forestry for efficient nutrient cycling, organic matter addition for sustainable agriculture and for improving vegetation cover. However, agro-forestry has not gained the desired importance as a resource development tool due to various factors. Some of these factors include: restrictive legal provisions for harvesting & transportation of trees planted on farmlands and use of non-timber produce, near non-existent extension mechanisms, lack of institutional support mechanisms, lack of quality planting materials, inadequate research on agro-forestry models suitable across various ecological regions of the country, inadequate marketing infrastructure and price discovery mechanisms, lack of post- harvest processing technologies, *etc*. This is also due to the fact that the mandate of agro forestry falls through the cracks in various ministries, departments, agencies, state governments, *etc*. The value and position of agro-forestry is ambiguous and undervalued, and despite its numerous benefits, it is only sporadically mentioned at the national level, because of the lack of appropriate public policy support. Agro-forestry systems include both traditional and modern land-use systems where trees are managed together with crops and or/ animal production systems in agricultural settings. Agro-forestry is practiced in both irrigated and rainfed conditions where it produces food, fuel, fodder, timber, fertilizer and fiber, contributes to food, nutritional and ecological security, sustains livelihoods, alleviates poverty and promotes productive and resilient cropping and farming environments. Agro forestry also has the potential to enhance ecosystem services through carbon storage, prevention of deforestation, biodiversity conservation, and soil and water conservation. In addition, when strategically applied on a large scale, with appropriate mix of species, agro forestry enables agricultural land to withstand extreme weather events, such as floods and droughts, and climate change.

## METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted during 2011-2012 to study the attitude towards agro-forestry farmers regarding improved agro forestry farming practices. The Milkipur block of Faizabad district was selected purposively for this study because presence of Agro-forestry area, from the selected block ten villages were selected namely, Sarurpur, Kaidhana khurd, Sahulara, Keenhupur, Sidhauna, Shivnathpur, Balarmaw, Kuchera, Tendha khurd and Sariyanwa through random sampling techniques.

A total number of 100 agro-forestry famers from 10 sample villages were selected through proportionate random sampling technique on the basis of size of land

[1]Research Scholar and [3]Professor & Head, Department of Extension Education, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, BHU Varanasi-221005
[2&4].Professor Department of Extension Education NDUA&T Kumarganj Faizabad-224229. 5. SRF Department of Agronomy MPUA&T Udaipur, Rajasthan.

holding. An interview schedule was prepared in the light of decided objectives and variables undertaken. Attitude was measured using the scale developed by Shukla and Tyagi (2002) consisting of modified eleven statements on a five point continuum *viz.* Strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree by assigning weights of 5,4,3,2, and 1 respectively for each positive statements and reverse for negative statements.

The respondents were categorized in to three categories such as low, medium and high on the basis of total scores obtained by the respondents e.g. low (up to 38), medium (39 to 44), high (45 and above) based on (i) less than a mean-SD (ii) between mean ± SD (iii) greater than mean +SD respectively.

The questionnaire consisted of close questions, all of which were translated into the local language. Appropriate statistics are used to draw inferences, accordingly.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to attitude about agro forestry system**

**n=100**

| Categories | Respondents | |
|---|---|---|
| | No. | Percentage |
| low (up to38) | 13 | 13.00 |
| Medium (39 to 44) | 73 | 73.00 |
| High (45 to above) | 14 | 14.00 |
| **Total** | 100 | 100.00 |

Mean =41.50 S.D. =3.1511 Min.=33 Max. =48

From Table 1 it is observed that 73 per cent of the respondents were found having medium level of attitude towards agro-forestry followed by 14 and 13 per cent who had high and low levels of attitude towards agro-forestry system, respectively.

The mean score for attitude towards agro forestry system was observed to be 41.50 with a range of minimum 33 and maximum 48.

Hence, it can be inferred that most of the respondents 75 per cent were found having medium level of attitude towards agro-forestry system regarding different statements. In other words, it may be said that special attention was given to agro forestry by the farmers.

**Table 2: Correlation coefficient (r) between different variable and attitude about agro forestry system**

| Variables | Correlation coefficient(r) |
|---|---|
| Age | 0.0458 |
| Education | 0.1134 |
| Family size | 0.1416 |
| Housing pattern | -0.0390 |
| Land holding | 0.0902 |
| Annual income | 0.0520 |
| Social participation | 0.0616 |
| Occupation | 0.0637 |
| Farm power | 0.1689 |
| Farm implements | 0.0159 |
| Household material | 0.1390 |
| Transportation material | 0.1559 |
| Communication media | 0.0529 |
| Economic motivation | 0.3269** |
| Scientific orientation | 0.1033 |
| Extension contact | -0.1220 |
| Knowledge extent | 0.2623** |
| Adoption extent | 0.0340 |

* Significant at 0.05 probability level = 0.195
** Significant at 0.01 probability level = 0.254

It is revealed from Table 2 that the variables like economic motivation and knowledge extent were found to be highly significant. Age, education, family size, land holding, annual income, social participation, occupation, farm power farm implements, households material, transportation material, communication media, scientific orientation and adoption extent were significant by and positively correlated. Housing pattern and extension contact were found negatively insignificant with respect to attitude of respondents. It can be noted that the variables, namely age, education, caste, family type, family size, land holding, annual income, social participation, occupation, farm power, farm implements, house hold material, transportation material, communication media, scientific orientation and adoption extent had no influence on attitude of the respondents while those, which should be positive and significant relationship had direct influence over attitude. It meant that the value of these variables if increased, the extent of attitude will go towards favorableness.

## CONCLUSION

Majority of respondents (73 %) were observed in the medium level of attitude followed by low 14 per cent and 13 per cent high and low levels of attitude, respectively. The mean scores of attitude was found to be 41.50. Among 18 variables studied, the two variables namely,

economic motivation and knowledge extent had highly significant and positive correlation with attitude of agro-forestry system.

*Paper received on : February 05,2015*
*Accepted on : February 16,2015*

## REFERENCE

Ajayi, O. C. 2007. User acceptability of sustainable soil fertility technologies: lessons from farmers' knowledge, attitude and practice in Southern Africa. *Journal Sustainable Agriculture*. 30 (3): 21-40.

Alam, M.; Furukawa, Y. and Mika, M. 2010. Perceptions, preferences, and attitude of Bangladesh farmers towards homegarden farming systems. *Small-scale Forestry*. 9 (2): 213-226.

Banyal, R.; Masoodi, N. A.; Masoodi, T. H.; Sharma, L. K. and Gangoo, S. A. 2011. Knowledge and attitude of farmers towards agroforestry practices in North Kashmir a case study. *Indian Forester Dehra Dun*. 137 (12): 1377-1381.

Khan, W. N.; Siddiqui, G. S.; M. T. Atif M. T. 2008. Farmers' attitude towards agroforestry in district Faisalabad. *Pakistan Journal Agricultural Sciences*. 45 (1): 60-64.

Manhas, J. S. and Singh, S. B. 2012. Attitude of trainees towards Basic Agriculture and Horticulture Training (BA & HT). *Progressive Agriculture*. 12 (1) 175-179.

Marseille, M. M.; Elands, B. H.; M. Brink, M. L. and Van, D. 2012. Experiencing polar bears in the zoo: feelings and cognitions in relation to a visitor's conservation attitude. (Special Issue: Human emotions toward wildlife.) *Human Dimensions Wildlife.* 17 (1): 29-43.

McGinty, M. M.; Swisher, M. E. and Alavalapati, J. 2008. Agroforestry adoption and maintenance: self-efficacy, attitude and socio-economic factors. *Agroforestry Systems*. 73 (2): 99-108.

Sanlier, N. and Konaklioglu, E. 2012. Food safety knowledge, attitude and food handling practices of students . *British Food Journal*. 114 (4): 469-480.