

RESEARCH ARTICLE

DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURAL PRACTICE WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO NADIA DISTRICT, WEST BENGAL

Pramit Saha*

Department of Geography, Vivekananda College, East Udayrajpur, Madhyamgram, Kolkata - 700129, West Bengal, India.

* Corresponding Author.

ABSTRACT:

Sustainable agriculture refers to the use of farming methods and practices that protect or enhance the base of natural resources, other ecosystems that are influenced by agricultural activities, and the financial sustainability of agricultural production. Agriculture is sustainable when it is based on a thorough scientific understanding and is accepted in the marketplace, society, and culture. Sustainable development is defined as the direction of institutional and technological advancement along with the management and maintenance of the natural resource base. By taking these steps, the requirements of present and future generations will be met. In this article; design and development of sustainable agricultural practice with special reference to Nadia District, West Bengal has been discussed.

KEYWORDS: Agriculture, Productivity, Nadia.

INTRODUCTION:

Agriculture depends on its natural environment. The only method to conserve water is to look into the possibilities of using groundwater and surface water resources, which requires rainfall. [1] Drainage is the supply of high-quality water for irrigation in the farming industry. The intensity of irrigation system utilization depends on the available water for various crops grown in different regions. [2-4] The physical atmosphere and agriculture are closely intertwined, and changes in the atmosphere will unavoidably impact how agricultural land is used. [5–6] Although it has long been known that temperature differences indirectly affect how agricultural land is used, slope gradients also limit agriculture and partially explain variations in soil and climate on different slope faces. [7]

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

Study Area: Nadia district, West Bengal.

Sampling Plan: Simple random sampling.

Sample Size: 300.

Data Source: Primary data.

Methodology:

I was visited the selected areas in Nadia district, West Bengal for collecting the sample size. The sample belongs to farmers and related to their family members (specifically familiar to the work). The questionnaire sheets were distributed in favour of the respondents after clearing the research objectives. Sufficient time was given in favour of the respondents. After completion of their sheet, the sheet was collected for data analysis and interpretation.

Research Tools: Structured Questionnaire Schedule (5 Point Likert Scale).

Data Analysis and Interpretation: Pie chart.

DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

| Туре | Respondents | % of the |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | respondents |
| Upto 30 years old | 76 | 25.34 |
| 31-50 years | 169 | 56.33 |
| 51 years and more old | 55 | 18.33 |
| Total | 300 | 100 |

Table 1. Age group of the respondents:



Figure 1. Age group of the respondents

From the above table and figure, it was found that up to 30 years old respondents were 25.34%, 31-50 years respondents were 56.33% & 51 years and more old respondents were 18.33%.

Table 2. Educational Qualifications of the respondents:

| Туре | Respondents | % of the respondents |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Primary level | 88 | 29.33 |
| Secondary level | 113 | 37.67 |
| Higher secondary/Diploma level | 52 | 17.33 |
| Graduation level | 39 | 13 |

JRLA, 2025, 2(1): 72-89

Online ISSN: 3048-667X

| More than graduation level | 8 | 2.67 |
|----------------------------|-----|------|
| Total | 300 | 100 |



Figure 2. Educational Qualifications of the respondents

From the above table and figure, it was found that educational qualifications of the respondents belong to primary level 29.33%, secondary level 37.67%, higher secondary/diploma level 17.33%, graduation level 13% and more than graduation level 2.67%.

| Table 3. Farr | ners with | holdings | within | the size | classes: |
|---------------|-----------|----------|--------|----------|----------|
|---------------|-----------|----------|--------|----------|----------|

| Туре | Respondents | % of the respondents |
|---------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Less than 1 hectare | 77 | 25.67 |
| 1-2 hectare | 106 | 35.33 |
| 2-4 hectare | 79 | 26.33 |
| Above 4 hectares | 38 | 12.67 |
| Total | 300 | 100 |



Figure 3. Farmers with holdings within the size classes

From the above table and figure, it was found that respondents belong to less than 1 hectare: 25.67%, 1-2 hectare: 35.33%, 2-4 hectare: 26.33% and above 4 hectares: 12.67%.

Table 4.: An advantage of sustainable agricultural practices is reduction in the use of chemical fertilizers

| Statement | Options | Respondents | % of respondents | |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------|------------------|--|
| | Strongly Agree (SA) | 33 | 11 | |
| An advantage of | Agree (A) | 65 | 21.67 | |
| sustainable | Undecided (U) | 8 | 2.67 | |
| agricultural practices | Disagree (D) | 102 | 34 | |
| is reduction in the use | Strongly Disagree | 92 | 30.66 | |
| of chemical fertilizers. | (SD) | | | |
| | Total | 300 | 100 | |



Figure 4. An advantage of sustainable agricultural practices is reduction in the use of chemical fertilizers

From the above table and figure, it was found that the respondents belongs to strongly agree: 11%, agree: 21.67%, undecided: 2.67%, disagree: 34% and strongly disagree: 30.66%.

Table 5.: Farmers in sustainable agriculture lives more in harmony with nature

| Statement | Options | Respondents | % of respondents |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| | Strongly Agree (SA) | 44 | 14.67 |
| Farmers in sustainable | Agree (A) | 93 | 31 |
| agriculture lives more in | Undecided (U) | 78 | 26 |
| harmony with nature | Disagree (D) | 64 | 21.33 |
| | Strongly Disagree (SD) | 21 | 7 |
| | Total | 300 | 100 |



Figure 5. Farmers in sustainable agriculture lives more in harmony with nature

From the above table and figure, it was found that the respondents belongs to strongly agree: 14.67%, agree: 31%, undecided: 26%, disagree: 21.33% and strongly disagree: 7%.

| Table 6 | . Economi | c gains | when | employing | sustainable | agricultural | practices | are | not |
|---------|-----------|---------|------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------|-----|-----|
| convinc | ing | | | | | | | | |

| Statement | Options | Respondents | % of respondents |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Economic gains | Strongly Agree (SA) | 78 | 26 |
| when employing | Agree (A) | 93 | 31 |
| sustainable | Undecided (U) | 6 | 2 |
| agricultural | Disagree (D) | 54 | 18 |
| practices are not | Strongly Disagree (SD) | 69 | 23 |
| convincing | Total | 300 | 100 |



Figure 6. Economic gains when employing sustainable agricultural practices are not convincing

From the above table and figure, it was found that the respondents belongs to strongly agree: 26%, agree: 31%, undecided: 2%, disagree: 18% and strongly disagree: 23%.

| Table | 7. | Net | farm | income | may | decrease | when | a | producer | implements | sustainable |
|---------|-----|-------|---------|--------|-----|----------|------|---|----------|------------|-------------|
| agricul | ltu | ral p | ractice | es | | | | | | | |

| Statement | Options | Respondents | % of respondents |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| | Strongly Agree (SA) | 38 | 12.67 |
| Net farm income may | Agree (A) | 51 | 17 |
| decrease when a | Undecided (U) | 6 | 2 |
| producer implements | Disagree (D) | 118 | 39.33 |
| sustainable agricultural | Strongly Disagree (SD) | 87 | 29 |
| practices | Total | 300 | 100 |



Figure 7. Net farm income may decrease when a producer implements sustainable agricultural practices

From the above table and figure, it was found that the respondents belongs to strongly agree: 12.67%, agree: 17%, undecided: 2%, disagree: 39.33% and strongly disagree: 29%.

 Table 8. Sustainable agricultural systems can improve income on a farm

| Statement | Options | Respondents | % of respondents | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|--|
| | Strongly Agree (SA) | 96 | 32 | |
| Sustainable agricultural | Agree (A) | 121 | 40.34 | |
| systems can improve | Undecided (U) | 3 | 1 | |
| income on a farm | Disagree (D) | 58 | 19.33 | |
| | Strongly Disagree (SD) | 22 | 7.33 | |
| | Total | 300 | 100 | |



Figure 8. Sustainable agricultural systems can improve income on a farm

From the above table and figure, it was found that the respondents belongs to strongly agree: 32%, agree: 40.34%, undecided: 1%, disagree: 19.33% and strongly disagree: 7.33%.

| Statement | Options | Respondents | % of respondents |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| | Strongly Agree (SA) | 85 | 28.33 |
| Sustainable agricultural | Agree (A) | 176 | 58.67 |
| practices would work | Undecided (U) | 4 | 1.33 |
| well on any farm | Disagree (D) | 21 | 7 |
| | Strongly Disagree (SD) | 14 | 4.67 |
| | Total | 300 | 100 |

Table 9. Sustainable agricultural practices would work well on any farm



Figure 9. Sustainable agricultural practices would work well on any farm

From the above table and figure, it was found that the respondents belongs to strongly agree: 28.33%, agree: 58.67%, undecided: 1.33%, disagree: 7% and strongly disagree: 4.67%.

| Table 10. Susta | ainable agricultural praction | ces may require additiona | l management beyond |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| conventional p | ractices | | |

| Statement | Options | Respondents | % of respondents |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------|------------------|
| | Strongly Agree (SA) | 96 | 32 |
| Sustainable agricultural | Agree (A) | 101 | 33.67 |
| practices may require | Undecided (U) | 3 | 1 |
| additional management | Disagree (D) | 64 | 21.33 |
| beyond conventional | Strongly Disagree | 36 | 12 |
| practices | (SD) | | |
| | Total | 300 | 100 |



Figure 10. Sustainable agricultural practices may require additional management beyond conventional practices

From the above table and figure, it was found that the respondents belongs to strongly agree: 32%, agree: 33.67%, undecided: 1%, disagree: 21.33% and strongly disagree: 12%.

| Table 11. The adoption of sustainable agricultural practices is slow b | oecause farmers l | ack |
|--|-------------------|-----|
| the knowledge to implement them | | |

| Statement | Options | Respondents | % of respondents |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| The adoption of | Strongly Agree (SA) | 89 | 29.67 |
| sustainable agricultural | Agree (A) | 113 | 37.67 |
| practices is slow because | Undecided (U) | 23 | 7.67 |
| farmers lack the | Disagree (D) | 40 | 13.33 |
| knowledge to implement | Strongly Disagree (SD) | 35 | 11.66 |
| them | Total | 300 | 100 |



Figure 11. The adoption of sustainable agricultural practices is slow because farmers lack the knowledge to implement them

From the above table and figure, it was found that the respondents belongs to strongly agree: 29.67%, agree: 37.67%, undecided: 7.67%, disagree: 13.33% and strongly disagree: 11.66%.

 Table 12. Recommended pest control methods for sustainable agricultural systems have

 potential for more pests in the long term

| Statement | Options | Respondents | % of respondents |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Recommended pest | Strongly Agree (SA) | 184 | 61.34 |
| control methods for | Agree (A) | 67 | 22.33 |
| sustainable agricultural | Undecided (U) | 4 | 1.33 |
| systems have potential | Disagree (D) | 38 | 12.67 |
| for more pests in the | Strongly Disagree (SD) | 7 | 2.33 |
| long term | Total | 300 | 100 |



Figure 12. Recommended pest control methods for sustainable agricultural systems have potential for more pests in the long term

From the above table and figure, it was found that the respondents belongs to strongly agree: 61.34%, agree: 22.33%, undecided: 1.33%, disagree: 12.67% and strongly disagree: 2.33%.

| Table 13. Sustainable agricultural practices help protect the environment and our natu | ral |
|--|-----|
| resources | |

| Statement | Options | Respondents | % of respondents |
|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| | Strongly Agree (SA) | 126 | 42 |
| Sustainable agricultural | Agree (A) | 123 | 41 |
| practices help protect the | Undecided (U) | 21 | 7 |
| environment and our | Disagree (D) | 24 | 8 |
| natural resources | Strongly Disagree (SD) | 6 | 2 |
| | Total | 300 | 100 |



Figure 13. Sustainable agricultural practices help protect the environment and our natural resources

From the above table and figure, it was found that the respondents belongs to strongly agree: 42%, agree: 41%, undecided: 7%, disagree: 8% and strongly disagree: 2%.

| Table 14. There may be insuf | ficient labour for the workloa | d required in sustainable |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| agricultural system | | |

| Statement | Options | Respondents | % of respondents |
|------------------------|---------------------|-------------|------------------|
| | Strongly Agree (SA) | 69 | 23 |
| There may be | Agree (A) | 71 | 23.67 |
| insufficient labor for | Undecided (U) | 20 | 6.67 |
| the workload required | Disagree (D) | 84 | 28 |
| | Strongly Disagree | 56 | 18.66 |
| agricultural system | (SD) | | |
| | Total | 300 | 100 |



Figure 14. There may be insufficient labour for the workload required in sustainable agricultural system

From the above table and figure, it was found that the respondents belongs to strongly agree: 23%, agree: 23.67%, undecided: 6.67%, disagree: 28% and strongly disagree: 18.66%.

| Table 15. Sustainable agricultural | systems should | produce an | adequate for | od supply to |
|------------------------------------|----------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| feel the world population | | | | |

| Statement | Options | Respondents | % of respondents |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Sustainable agricultural | Strongly Agree (SA) | 116 | 38.67 |
| systems should produce | Agree (A) | 104 | 34.67 |
| an adequate food supply | Undecided (U) | 18 | 6 |
| to feel the world | Disagree (D) | 37 | 12.33 |
| population | Strongly Disagree (SD) | 25 | 8.33 |
| | Total | 300 | 100 |



Figure 15. Sustainable agricultural systems should produce an adequate food supply to feel the world population

From the above table and figure, it was found that the respondents belongs to strongly agree: 38.67%, agree: 34.67%, undecided: 6%, disagree: 12.33% and strongly disagree: 8.33%.

CONCLUSION:

The size of the base farm, the resources available, the growing environment (rain or irrigation), the urban or rural setting, the types of crops and businesses operating under the government's specific macroeconomic policies, the dynamics of supply and demand, and societal customs all affect how effective a given package of sustainable agriculture is. Per socioeconomic requirements, a wide range of sustainability-related topics were thoroughly researched. According to the studies overall conclusions, increasing sustainability can be achieved by implementing methodical changes in crop and livestock production as well as resource management.

REFERENCES:

1. Sarah Velten, Julia Leventon, Nicolas Jager, Jens Newig (2015). What Is Sustainable Agriculture? A Systematic Review, Sustainability, 7, 7833-7865.

2. Babar Someshwar Narayan (2012). Sustainable Agricultural Development and Organic Farming in India, 1(11): 1-4.

3. Sharma R, Peshin R, Khar S, Ishar A.K (2014). Agriculture Innovation System Approach for Sustainable Agriculture Development: A Review, Agro Economist, 1 (1): 1-7.

4. Chandan Roy (2011). Economic backwardness of Uttar Dinajpur: a block level analysis, Munich Personal RePEc Archive, MPRA Paper No. 40376, 1-22.

5. Narayan BS (2012). Sustainable Agricultural Development and Organic Farming in India, Golden Research Thoughts, 1 (11): 1-7.

6. Prosenjit Kayal, Indrajit Roy Chowdhury (2018). Level of Human Development of RaiganjC.D Block, Uttar Dinajpur District, West Bengal: A Geographical Analysis, 5(4): 619-628.

7. Kapoor O. Virat et al. (2019). A study of factors affecting livelihood situations in the disadvantaged areas of West Bengal, India, African Journal of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development, 7(8): 1-10.