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Abstract

The result have shown that majority of the farmers were of middle age group (36-50 years), educated up to metric, belonged to joint family with 4-6 members, performed only farming and had land holding up to 5 acres. Result pertaining to awareness indicated that awareness about the utilization of biogas plant waste, mushroom waste, wheat waste, mustard and horticultural waste was more than 70 percent. Awareness about utilization of paddy waste, sugarcane waste, cotton waste, floricultural wastes, poultry waste and livestock waste was between 50 to 60 percent. Thus, overall awareness about utilization of agricultural waste was very high. The result revealed that utilization of agricultural waste by the farmers was very less. None of the farmers exploited the wastes fully; waste utilization of wheat, paddy, sugarcane cotton and mustard crop, horticultural crops and floricultural crops was very low. Waste utilization of mushrooms, livestock and poultry was medium and biogas waste utilization was high. The result showed that there was a huge gap between the awareness and utilization of agricultural waste. The farmers must understand that there is nothing waste in agriculture, everything can be converted into something useful.
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INTRODUCTION

Agricultural wastes are unusable substances that may be either liquid or solid produced as result of cultivation processes such as fertilizers, pesticides, crop residues and animal waste. Agricultural waste management is part of the ecological cycle in which everything is cycled and recycled such that an interdependent relationship is maintained in the eco-system. Waste management places all the plant wastes placed at the right place and right time for the best utilization in order to convert into useful products and pollution control. Globally, 140 billion metric tons of biomass is generated every year from agriculture. Ministry of New and Renewable Energy, Govt. of India estimated that about 500 Mt of crop residue is generated every year. These wastes are destroyed by burning or allowed to decay in public places in the open air creating environmental pollution. Thus by managing crop wastes in a well-planned manner, we can maintain a healthy environment for ourselves and all other living creatures. This study will highlight some of the trends that could be adopted in the agricultural waste management so that the farmers become aware and take full advantage of the various possibilities of plant waste cycling, recycling and further utilization for economic purpose.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted in two districts of Haryana state, Hisar and Sonipat, purposively selected. Further six villages were selected randomly, ten farmers were selected randomly from each village, and thereby a total number of 120 farmers having multiple cropping systems were interviewed for the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Personal profile of the farmers:- Personal profile of the farmers indicated that most of the farmers were from middle age group (36-50 years), were educated up to metric, belonged to joint family of medium size with 4-6 members. Majority of the farmers had their main occupation as farming and land holding up to 5 acres. Among mass media exposure, utilization of newspaper among the
farmers was maximum followed by TV, radio, kisan seva Kendra and magazine. The extent of utilization of newspaper, radio and T.V. was daily and magazine and kisan seva Kendra was often. Out of 120 farmers only 55 (44.85 percent) farmers underwent training or workshop related to management of their waste. Among the contacts with extension officials, maximum contact of farmers was with progressive farmers, followed by scientist, ADO (Agricultural Development Officer), SDAO/SMS (Sub Divisional Agricultural Officer)/ Subject Matter Specialist and NGO. The frequency of contact with progressive farmers and scientists was weekly, ADO and SDAO/SMS was whenever needed and monthly with NGO (Table 1).

### Facilities available with the farmers

Facilities available with the farmers either personal or public, the study indicated that only 63.33% of farmers could easily avail to laborers/manpower, 39.16 % of farmers had transport facility for waste, 42.50% of farmers had personal composting units, 34.17% farmers had personal biogas plants, only 8.33% of farmers had the facility of community waste collection centres and farmers did not have any common waste dumping sites or block making machine in their villages.

### Table 1. Profile of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>Middle (36-50)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Family type</td>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Family size</td>
<td>Medium (5-6 members)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Occupation of respondent</td>
<td>Only farming</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>81.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Land holding</td>
<td>Up to 5 acres</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Facilities available with the farmers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Compost plant</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transportation facility for waste</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Biogas plant</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community waste collection centre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>08.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Common waste dumping site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Block making machine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Awareness among the farmers about the products made from agricultural wastes

Awareness: awareness among the farmers about the utilization of agricultural waste was noticed to be very high. The result was apposite as the farmers were well educated and had regular mass media contact. Radio and TV were the most common and easily accessible source of agriculture information for farmers including contact and non-contact groups [1]. Farmers had regular contact with extension officials and often visited to KVKs, and ATIC is performing excellent role of information spread [9].

One hundred twenty farmers from two districts of Haryana state, namely, Hisar and Sonipat were interviewed. It was observed that 100 percent farmers were aware regarding the use of agricultural waste to make animal feed, biogas, animal shelter and its use as energy source. Awareness regarding making compost, vermin compost and organic manure was found 97.50 percent. Awareness about making poultry litter was 96.67, for generating electricity was 90.00 percent, mulching and handicrafts was 85.00 percent, making beauty products was 80.83 percent, paper, cardboard and particle board was 75.83, making briquettes was 52.50, planting bed was 51.67 and awareness about making chemicals was 40.00 percent. Low percentage of awareness was noticed regarding making activated carbon (29.17 percent) followed by Bioplastics (24.17 percent), textile fibre (20.83 percent) and utensils 00.83 percent (Table 2).

### Overall awareness about the utilization of agricultural wastes

The overall awareness among the farmers about utilization of different crop waste is presented in the figure 1. The figure clearly describes the awareness about the utilization of different crop waste. Awareness about utilization of wheat straw was 72.33 percent and paddy waste was observed 63.94 percent. Awareness about utilization of sugarcane waste was 62.73 percent. Awareness about utilization of cotton sticks was 61.33 percent and about utilization of mustard sticks was observed 70.08 percent.
wheat straw to particle board industries nor they utilize it to make other products like briquettes, dry flowers, hats, mats, carpets and other handicrafts. Similar results were found that particle board can be made with crop residues mixed with wood from *pinus radii*, all the crop residues like wheat straw, corn and rice straw are suitable for making particle boards but best results were with wheat straw and corn stubbles[4]

3. **Sugarcane waste** From sugarcane crop, residues are sugarcane trash and bagasse. From the farmers those who cultivated sugarcane (43 farmers), 48.83 percent used the bagasse as fuel in making jaggery, 46.51 percent turned it into compost/vermicompost and only 11.62 percent sold it to paper/cardboard industry or power plant. Farmers used sugarcane trash to feed their animals (100.00), composting/vermicomposting (46.51), sell as animal feed (16.28) and use it for mulching (1.67). Apart from composting and feeding bagasse and trash to animal, bagasse can also be used as planting for growing green fodder. Beside this sugarcane bagasse has one more important use which is production of biogas; this is similar to the findings of [3], who conducted the study due to the existing difficulty of finding energy sources and reducing pollution, the use of renewable sources and highly efficient technologies for electrical energy production, the combination of these two aspects, namely, a molten carbonate fuel cell system fed with biomass derived syngas. In particular, the biogas comes from bagasse and barbojo, the sugarcane residues. So far, in developing countries they have been wasted or partly used with poorly efficient technology.

4. **Cotton waste** Seventy-five farmers cultivated cotton crop. Cotton sticks, which are left after the picking of cotton, are used as fuel and stored by all the farmers. Cotton sticks were not utilized for any other purpose. If the farmers sell the cotton sticks to power plants, plywood industries, particle board industries they can add to their income. Another way of changing the waste cotton sticks into useful material is by chopping and converting them into compost. Cotton waste
can also be used in biogas production by treating it anaerobically. This was similar to the findings of [5], who found out that cotton wastes are a good source of biogas. Approximately 65, 86 and 78 ml CH₄ were produced in 23 days from 1 g of cotton stalks, cotton seed hull and cotton oil cake in the presence of basal medium (BM), respectively. BM supplementation had an important positive effect on the production of biogas.

5. Mustard waste Mustard was cultivated by 102 farmers. Mustard sticks and husk are two major by-products from mustard crop. Mustard sticks and husk are sold to brick industries by all the farmers who cultivate it (100.00), 90.19 percent farmers stored it for future use, percent 73.52 percent used it for burning in chulha and only 16.66 percent farmers use it for composting. A profitable way of managing mustard sticks is chipping and composting or feeding to animals after treating with ammonia. Another important material, which can be made from mustard sticks are briquettes. Mustard stalk, mixed waste of tree leaves and grasses in 3:1 proportion and wood waste along with three organic binding materials (molasses, press mud and distillers dry grain) with varying concentration of 5, 10, 15 and 20% can be used for preparing briquettes. Press mud was is a better binding agent, followed by distiller’s dry grain and molasses. This was similar to the finding of the result by [2] who reported the physical characteristics like moisture content, bulk density, compression ratio and compressive strength desired for better utilization and safe handling and transportation are found to be best for briquettes made from press mud and mustard stalk at die pressure of 123.42 MPa.

6. Horticultural waste Horticultural crops were cultivated by 64 farmers. Damaged or spoiled fruits and vegetables, dead plants, branches, leaves and unsold fruits and vegetables are the horticultural wastes. Among these damaged fruits and vegetables are turned into compost/vermicompost or fed to animals by 70.31 percent of farmers. The dead plants, branches and leaves were fed to animal by 100.00 percent and composted by 70.31 percent of farmers. Unsold fruits and vegetables are fed to animals by 100.00 percent, composted by 70.31 percent, and 26.56 percent farmers sold it after processing. Value added products can be made from surplus fruits and vegetables and then sold in market this will not only help the farmers avoid wastage but to earn more. Another way of preserving the unsold fruits and vegetables is drying them and then selling. Various chemical can also be extracted from waste fruits and vegetables like citric acid, lactic acid, acetic acid, etc. Manoj et al. (2012) that it can be produced through the batch & fed batch fermentation method using hydrolyzed potato starch, results from the findings of [10] concluded that potato residues could also be used for extraction of pectin-studied production of Lactic acid.

7. Floricultural waste Flowers were cultivated by only 14 farmers. After picking of flowers, the whole plant is a waste along with the damaged and unsold flowers. The left flowers are generally sold at least price by 100.00 percent of farmers, used in composting, vermicomposting and green manuring by 71.43 percent of flowers. The dead plants and waste flowers are used either in composting, vermicomposting or in green manuring by 8.33 percent of farmers. The left out flowers can be dried and powdered and cut flowers can be used for making dry flowers, which is an upcoming industry. The dry-flowers can be painted, coloured, dyed and various floral products such as cards, pictures, wall hangings, arrangements, pot-pouris and pomanders can be prepared out of them.

8. Mushroom waste Mushrooms are produced on natural materials taken from agriculture, woodlands, animal husbandry, and manufacturing industries. After mushroom crops are harvested, millions of tonnes of “spent” (used) mushroom substrate become available for other uses. The used growing medium is far from spent. It is clear from table 25 that; it is used as manure, for gardening, for making nurseries and growing vegetables by all the farmers those who grow mushrooms use the waste mushrooms for composting and vermicomposting, 16.67 percent farmers fed it to animals and used for
biogas generation. The spent compost was used for vermicomposting, manuring and planting bed by 100.00 percent of farmers. Surplus mushrooms were sold at least price by all the farmers and sold after processing by 33.33 percent of farmers. Another way of handling spent substrate from Agaricus bisporus production is relevant with the study conducted by [8], which is already in wide use in horticulture as a component of potting soil mixes; in agriculture or landscape trades to enrich soil; as a casing material in the cultivation of subsequent Agaricus crops, in vermin culture as a growing medium, in wetlands for remediation of contaminated water, in stabilizing severely disturbed soils, in the bio-remediation of contaminated soils, as a bedding for animals, as an animal feed, and to control plant diseases. Spent substrate from other mushroom species has found acceptance as food for animals, as ingredients in the cultivation of other mushroom species, as fuel, as a medium for vermin culture, to enrich soils, and as a matrix for bio-remediation.

9. Biogas plant waste Forty-one farmers possessed biogas plant. The farmers (100.00) as manure and for composting and vermicomposting by 78.04 percent of farmers utilize slurry thrown out of the biogas plant. This result was analogous with the findings of [7] that vermicompost can be used as manure on farm, the application of FYM + vermicompost @ 2.5t/ha along with the panchagavya 3% proved to be the best treatment as it was found to record the highest plant height (83.17cm), no. of branches (38.23) and leaf (1115.87) and also recorded the mass herbage (44.81g/plant).

10. Livestock waste. Livestock was owned by all the farmers. All the farmers used the waste to make dung cakes this was relevant to the study conducted by [6], who reported that in Haryana all the farmers make dung cakes daily and the problems faced by the respondent in procurement of fuel were time constraint health and drudgery psychological and lastly economical problems. Only 34.17 percent of farmers used to generate biogas, 42.5 percent farmers used it for composting/vermicomposting and only 1.67 percent farmers used it for making bioinsecticide. Currently the energy consumption is rising and there is need of an alternate energy source, this problem can be solved by utilizing the agriculture biomass for generating energy. Major agro-industrial wastes, animal farm waste and municipal solid waste were sources of biogas feedstock in biogas technology. Thus, a better way of producing clean energy is biogas technology.

Gap between awareness and utilization of agricultural wastes

The huge gap between awareness and utilization is shown in the figure 3. The awareness about the utilization of wheat waste was 72.33 percent and utilization of wheat waste was 12.87 percent. Awareness about utilization of paddy waste was 69.94 percent and utilization was computed as 16.90 percent, awareness about utilization of sugarcane waste was 62.73 percent and utilization was 9.88 percent, awareness about utilization of cotton waste was computed as 61.33 percent and utilization as 20.00 percent, awareness about utilization of mustard waste was 70.08 percent and utilization was 38.04 percent, awareness about utilization of horticultural waste was computed as 70.54 percent and utilization was computed as 28.78 percent, awareness about utilization of floricultural waste was 64.12 percent and utilization was computed as 26.89 percent, awareness about utilization of mushroom waste was 80.76 percent and utilization was 75.00 percent, awareness about utilization of livestock waste was 68.33 percent and
utilization was 55.66 percent, awareness about utilization of poultry waste was 58.75 percent and utilization was 50.00 percent and awareness about utilization of biogas waste was computed as 98.75 percent and utilization was 89.08 percent (Figure 3).
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**Fig. 3.** Gap between awareness and utilization

### CONCLUSIONS

The study revealed that there was a huge difference between the awareness and utilization of agricultural waste. This difference existed due to lack of interest among the framers. Thus there is need to motivate farmers which can be made possible by organizing trainings, lectures, showing films to farmers or demonstrating waste management techniques on field.
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