
COW-BASED ORGANIC FARMING PROCESSES FOR POOR FARMERS

Narendra Nath Saxena*; Dr. Prafull Kumar**

*Sanskriti University,
Mathura, Uttar Pradesh, INDIA
Email id: narendra.ag@sanskriti.edu.in,

**Sanskriti University,
Mathura, Uttar Pradesh, INDIA
Email id: prafull@sanskriti.edu.in

DOI: 10.5958/2249-7315.2021.00275.6

ABSTRACT

The significance of consuming healthy and chemical-free meals is constantly rising. Consumers are ready to pay extra for high-quality food. To attain economic emancipation, farmers must embrace this entrepreneurial potential. In this context, one such effort by a farmers' interest organization was studied. In the article, the creation as well as conduct of the group, as well as the group dynamics of the group members, were studied and discussed. Using the case study method, first-hand information was collected via a well-planned interview schedule, in-depth interviews with community members, and the researcher's key findings. The Group Dynamics Index (GDI) was developed to evaluate the dynamics of a group of individuals. This article attempts to disclose a better agricultural technique for poor and marginal land owners in order to improve their earnings. Farmers are being encouraged to spend less and produce more under the zero-budget natural farming program. Jivamrut and Dashparniark, which are produced from cow dung and urine, are utilized by farmers. This has resulted in enhanced soil beneficial micro and macro flora and fauna, as well as a 40 to 45 percent decrease in agricultural expenses. Farmers earn a lot of money when they go to the store to sell their goods. This has revived the traditional mixed-cropping technique and decreased farmers' dependence on the demand for seeds and inputs.

KEYWORDS: *Agricultural Technology Management Agency(ATMA), Cow Farming, Farmer Interest Group (FIG), Group Dynamics, Organic.*

REFERENCES

1. Aryal KP, Chaudhary P, Pandit S, Sharma G. Consumers' Willingness to Pay for Organic Products: A Case From Kathmandu Valley. *J Agric Environ.* 2009;10:15–26.
2. Aryal P, Bhujra DR, Thapa-Parajuli RB, Meiners SJ. Economic and ecological comparison of organic and non-organic farming: A case of green economy in Nepal. *Int J Green Econ.* 2015;
3. Neelam HSC, Kadian KS. Cow based natural farming practice for poor and small land holding farmers: A case study from Andhra Pradesh, India. *Agric Sci Dig - A Res J.* 2016;36(4).
4. Sarat Chandra NH, Kadian KS, Baliram Kale R. Identifying the Factors Affecting Coordination among Different Agencies with ATMA in Andhra Pradesh, India. *Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci.* 2017;6(11):890–9.
5. Guilford JP. *Psychometric methods*, 2nd ed. Psychometric methods, 2nd ed. 1954. ix, 597–ix, 597.

6. Amare A, Simane B. Determinants of smallholder farmers' decision to adopt adaptation options to climate change and variability in the Muger Sub basin of the Upper Blue Nile basin of Ethiopia. *Agric Food Secur.* 2017;6(1).
7. Badgley, C., Moghtader, J., Quintero, E., Zakem, E., Chappell, M.J., Avilés-Vàzquez, K., Samulon, A., and Perfecto I. Organic agriculture and the global food supply. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems* 22. *Renew Agric food Syst.* 2007;22(2):86–108.
8. Singh Bagal Y, Sharma LK, Kaur GP, Singh A, Gupta P. Trends and Patterns in Fertilizer Consumption: A Case Study. *Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci.* 2018;7(04):480–7.
9. Sukhdev P, May P, Müller A. Fix food matrix. *Nature.* 2016;
10. Hardeweg B, Waibel H. Economic and environmental performance of alternative vegetable production systems in Thailand. *Sustain Food Secur Manag Nat Resour Southeast Asia - Challenges 21st Century.* 2002;