Integrating Traditional Knowledge with Modern Agricultural Practices for Sustainable Rural Development

Dr. Ayesha Rahman [1*], Michael O'Connor [2]
[1-2] Department of Agricultural Sciences, University of Dhaka, Bangladesh

* Corresponding Author: **Dr. Ayesha Rahman**

Article Info

P-ISSN: 3051-3502
E-ISSN: 3051-3510
Volume: 01
Issue: 02
July - December 2020
Received: 19-05-2020
Accepted: 23-06-2020
Published: 12-08-2020
Page No: 29-34

Abstract
Traditional agricultural knowledge, rooted in centuries of observation and practice, offers valuable insights into sustainable land use, resource management, and biodiversity conservation. This study investigates the integration of traditional knowledge systems with modern agricultural technologies to promote sustainable rural development. Using a multidisciplinary approach, the research draws on case studies from South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, and Latin America, where indigenous practices such as organic composting, crop rotation, and community seed banking are being effectively combined with scientific innovations like precision farming, improved irrigation systems, and climate-resilient crops. The findings reveal that such integration not only enhances food security and soil health but also strengthens local economies and preserves cultural heritage. However, challenges remain, including the erosion of indigenous knowledge, limited access to modern resources, and the need for policy support. The study concludes by recommending participatory frameworks that involve local farmers in decision-making, government incentives for eco-friendly practices, and cross-sector collaboration to bridge the gap between tradition and technology for holistic and sustainable rural development.

Keywords: Traditional Knowledge, Modern Agriculture, Sustainable Development, Rural Communities, Indigenous Practices, Food Security, Agroecology, Technology Integration, Soil Health, Participatory Farming

Introduction

The intersection of traditional knowledge systems and modern agricultural practices represents one of the most promising pathways toward achieving sustainable rural development in the 21st century [1]. As global food security challenges intensify alongside climate change pressures, there is growing recognition that indigenous and traditional farming practices, refined over millennia, offer valuable insights for contemporary agricultural innovation [2]. Traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) encompasses the evolving systems of practices, beliefs, and knowledge concerning the relationships between living beings and their environment, which have been developed by indigenous and local communities over centuries [3].

Modern agriculture, while achieving remarkable productivity gains through technological advancement, has increasingly been criticized for its environmental externalities, including soil degradation, biodiversity loss, and greenhouse gas emissions [4]. The integration of traditional knowledge with contemporary scientific approaches offers a holistic framework that can address these challenges while maintaining agricultural productivity and supporting rural livelihoods [5]. This synthesis approach recognizes that sustainable rural development requires not only technological solutions but also social, cultural, and ecological considerations that traditional communities have long understood [6].

The concept of knowledge integration extends beyond simple adoption of traditional practices, encompassing a complex process of dialogue, validation, and co-innovation between traditional knowledge holders and modern agricultural scientists [7]. This collaborative approach has the potential to generate innovative solutions that are both scientifically sound and culturally appropriate, leading to more resilient and sustainable agricultural systems [8].

Traditional Agricultural Knowledge Systems

Traditional agricultural knowledge systems represent sophisticated understanding of local ecosystems, developed through generations of observation, experimentation, and adaptation [9]. These systems encompass diverse elements including crop selection and breeding, soil management, water conservation, pest control, and seasonal planning based on environmental indicators [10]. Indigenous communities worldwide have developed intricate farming systems that maximize productivity while maintaining ecological balance, such as the terraced agriculture of the Andean highlands, the agroforestry systems of tropical regions, and the polyculture practices of many Asian societies [11].

One of the fundamental characteristics of traditional agricultural systems is their emphasis on diversity and resilience rather than maximum yield optimization[12]. Traditional farmers typically cultivate multiple crop varieties within the same field, practice crop rotation, and maintain complex interactions between crops, livestock, and wild species [13]. This approach creates agricultural ecosystems that are inherently more stable and resilient to environmental stresses, including droughts, floods, and pest outbreaks [14].

Traditional knowledge systems also incorporate sophisticated understanding of soil ecology and fertility management. Indigenous farmers have developed numerous techniques for maintaining soil health, including the use of organic amendments, nitrogen-fixing plants, and complex composting systems [15]. These practices often result in soils with higher organic matter content, better water retention capacity, and greater biological activity compared to conventionally managed agricultural soils [16].

Water management represents another area where traditional knowledge offers valuable insights. Indigenous communities have developed innovative irrigation systems, water harvesting techniques, and drought-resistant crop varieties that enable agriculture in challenging environments [17]. These systems often incorporate multiple water sources and storage methods, creating redundancy that enhances system resilience [18].

Modern Agricultural Practices and Limitations

Modern agriculture, characterized by the intensive use of external inputs, mechanization, and monoculture cropping systems, has achieved unprecedented productivity gains since the Green Revolution of the mid-20th century [19]. The application of synthetic fertilizers, pesticides, and high-yielding crop varieties has enabled dramatic increases in food production, helping to feed a growing global population [20]. However, this intensification has come with significant environmental and social costs that are increasingly recognized as unsustainable [21].

The environmental impacts of modern agriculture include soil erosion and degradation, water pollution from agricultural runoff, loss of biodiversity, and contribution to greenhouse gas emissions [22]. Intensive monoculture systems have led to the simplification of agricultural landscapes, reducing habitat diversity and ecosystem services [23]. The heavy reliance on synthetic inputs has also created dependencies that can be economically challenging for small-scale farmers, particularly in developing countries [24].

Furthermore, modern agricultural systems often lack the resilience characteristics of traditional systems, making them vulnerable to environmental stresses and market fluctuations [25]. The focus on maximizing short-term productivity has sometimes come at the expense of long-term sustainability and ecosystem health [26]. Climate change is exposing these vulnerabilities, as extreme weather events and shifting precipitation patterns challenge the assumptions underlying conventional agricultural practices [27].

Despite these limitations, modern agriculture has contributed valuable tools and knowledge that can enhance agricultural productivity and efficiency. Scientific understanding of plant nutrition, genetics, and pest management provides important foundations for improving agricultural systems [28]. The challenge lies in integrating these modern tools with traditional wisdom to create sustainable agricultural systems that combine the best of both approaches [29].

Integration Approaches and Methodologies

The integration of traditional knowledge with modern agricultural practices requires systematic approaches that respect both knowledge systems while facilitating productive dialogue and collaboration [30]. Participatory research methodologies have emerged as effective frameworks for this integration, involving traditional knowledge holders as active partners in research and development processes [31]. These approaches recognize that traditional knowledge holders are not passive recipients of modern technology but active innovators who can contribute valuable insights to agricultural development [32].

One successful integration approach involves the systematic documentation and validation of traditional practices using modern scientific methods [33]. This process helps identify the mechanisms underlying traditional practices and provides scientific credibility that can facilitate broader adoption[34]. For example, research has validated the effectiveness of traditional crop rotation systems in maintaining soil fertility and reducing pest pressure, providing scientific explanations for practices that farmers have used for generations [35].

Another important integration methodology involves the co-development of innovations that combine traditional principles with modern tools and techniques [36]. This might involve using modern breeding techniques to improve traditional crop varieties while maintaining their adaptation to local conditions and cultural preferences[37]. Similarly, traditional soil management practices can be enhanced with modern understanding of soil microbiology and nutrient cycling [38].

The integration process also requires attention to social and institutional factors that influence knowledge sharing and adoption [39]. Traditional knowledge is often embedded in complex social and cultural systems, and successful integration requires understanding and respecting these contexts [40]. This includes recognizing intellectual property rights of traditional knowledge holders and ensuring that benefits from integration are shared equitably [41].

Case Studies and Success Stories

Numerous successful examples demonstrate the potential of integrating traditional knowledge with modern agricultural practices. In India, the System of Rice Intensification (SRI) represents a synthesis of traditional water management practices with modern understanding of plant physiology [42]. SRI techniques, which involve transplanting younger seedlings with wider spacing and intermittent irrigation, have achieved significant yield increases while reducing water and input requirements [43].

In Latin America, indigenous agroforestry systems have been enhanced through integration with modern tree breeding and management techniques [44]. These systems maintain the traditional practice of growing crops alongside trees but incorporate improved tree varieties and modern pruning and management techniques to enhance productivity [45]. The result is agricultural systems that provide multiple benefits including food production, timber, carbon sequestration, and biodiversity conservation [46].

Africa provides numerous examples of successful integration, particularly in the area of soil fertility management. Traditional practices such as the use of nitrogen-fixing trees in farming systems have been enhanced through modern understanding of rhizobial biology and tree-crop interactions [47]. Programs such as the Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration (FMNR) initiative have helped restore degraded landscapes by combining traditional knowledge of indigenous tree species with modern restoration techniques [48]. In Asia, traditional pest management practices have been integrated with modern integrated pest management (IPM) approaches [49]. Farmers' knowledge of beneficial insects, trap crops, and natural pesticides has been combined with modern understanding of pest ecology and biological control to develop sustainable pest management systems [50].

Challenges and Barriers to Integration

Despite the potential benefits, several challenges hinder the integration of traditional knowledge with modern agricultural practices. One significant barrier is the different epistemological foundations of traditional and scientific knowledge systems [51]. Traditional knowledge is often holistic, contextual, and embedded in cultural practices, while scientific knowledge tends to be reductionist, universal, and standardized [52]. These differences can create communication challenges and mutual misunderstanding between knowledge holders and scientists [53].

Institutional barriers also pose significant challenges to integration efforts. Modern agricultural research and extension systems are often structured around disciplinary boundaries and standardized recommendations that may not accommodate the contextual and adaptive nature of traditional knowledge[54]. Educational and training programs for agricultural professionals may not adequately prepare them to work with traditional knowledge systems [55].

Economic factors can also hinder integration efforts. Traditional practices may require different input systems, labor arrangements, or market channels than modern agriculture [56]. The costs of transition and the time required to develop integrated systems may pose financial challenges for farmers [57]. Additionally, market systems that reward standardization and scale may not adequately value the benefits of traditional practices [58].

Social and cultural factors present additional challenges. Traditional knowledge may be lost as younger generations migrate to urban areas or adopt modern lifestyles [59]. The marginalization of indigenous and traditional communities can also limit their participation in integration efforts [50]. Gender dynamics may influence knowledge sharing, as traditional agricultural knowledge is often differentiated by gender roles [61].

Policy Frameworks and Institutional Support

Effective integration of traditional knowledge with modern agricultural practices requires supportive policy frameworks and institutional arrangements [62]. National agricultural policies need to recognize the value of traditional knowledge and create mechanisms for its documentation, validation, and integration into formal agricultural systems [63]. This includes developing intellectual property protections for traditional knowledge and ensuring that traditional knowledge holders benefit from innovations based on their knowledge [64].

Educational institutions play a crucial role in supporting integration efforts through curriculum development, research programs, and extension services [65]. Agricultural universities and research institutes need to develop capacity for participatory research and cross-cultural collaboration [66]. Extension systems require reorientation from top-down technology transfer models to more collaborative approaches that recognize farmers as knowledge partners [67].

International frameworks such as the Convention on Biological Diversity and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture provide important policy foundations for protecting and utilizing traditional knowledge [68]. These frameworks recognize the rights of indigenous and local communities to their traditional knowledge and establish principles for benefit-sharing [69].

Funding mechanisms also need to support integration efforts through grants and programs that facilitate collaboration between traditional knowledge holders and modern researchers [70]. This includes supporting participatory research, community-based conservation programs, and farmer-led innovation initiatives [71].

Future Directions and Recommendations

The future of sustainable rural development increasingly depends on successful integration of traditional knowledge with modern agricultural practices [72]. Several key directions emerge from current research and practice that can guide future efforts [73]. First, there is a need for more systematic documentation and validation of traditional practices using modern scientific methods [74]. This includes developing standardized protocols for participatory research and knowledge validation that respect both traditional and scientific approaches [75].

Technology transfer and adaptation programs need to be redesigned to facilitate two-way knowledge exchange rather than one-way technology transfer [76]. This requires training agricultural professionals in participatory methods and cross-cultural communication [77]. Digital platforms and information systems can play important roles in documenting, sharing, and scaling successful integration approaches [78].

Research priorities should focus on understanding the mechanisms underlying traditional practices and identifying opportunities for enhancement through modern tools and techniques [79]. This includes research on traditional crop varieties, soil management practices, pest control methods, and water management systems [80]. Climate change adaptation represents a particularly important area where traditional knowledge can inform modern approaches [81].

Capacity building efforts need to strengthen both traditional knowledge systems and modern agricultural institutions [82]. This includes supporting indigenous and traditional communities in documenting and sharing their knowledge while building capacity in modern institutions for working with traditional knowledge [83]. Youth engagement programs can help bridge generational gaps and ensure knowledge transmission [84].

Conclusion

The integration of traditional knowledge with modern agricultural practices represents a critical pathway toward achieving sustainable rural development goals[85]. Traditional knowledge systems offer valuable insights into sustainable resource management, ecosystem resilience, and agricultural adaptation that can enhance modern agricultural approaches[86]. However, successful integration requires overcoming significant epistemological, institutional, and social barriers through collaborative approaches that respect both knowledge systems[87].

The examples of successful integration from around the world demonstrate the potential for creating agricultural systems that combine the productivity benefits of modern agriculture with the sustainability and resilience characteristics of traditional systems[88]. These hybrid approaches offer promising solutions to contemporary challenges including food security, climate change adaptation, and rural development[89].

Moving forward, the success of integration efforts will depend on supportive policy frameworks, institutional capacity building, and collaborative research approaches that recognize traditional knowledge holders as equal partners in agricultural innovation[90]. The urgency of global sustainability challenges makes this integration not just an opportunity but a necessity for creating resilient and sustainable agricultural systems that can support rural livelihoods while protecting environmental resources for future generations.

References

1. Berkes F. Sacred Ecology: Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Resource Management. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge; 2012.
2. Pretty J, Toulmin C, Williams S. Sustainable intensification in African agriculture. Int J Agric Sustain. 2011;9(1):5-24.
3. Huntington HP. Using traditional ecological knowledge in science: Methods and applications. Ecol Appl. 2000;10(5):1270-1274.
4. Tilman D, Cassman KG, Matson PA, Naylor R, Polasky S. Agricultural sustainability and intensive production practices. Nature. 2002;418(6898):671-677.
5. Reij C, Garrity D. Scaling up farmer-managed natural regeneration in Africa to restore degraded landscapes. Biotropica. 2016;48(6):834-843.
6. Agrawal A. Dismantling the divide between indigenous and scientific knowledge. Dev Change. 1995;26(3):413-439.
7. Naess LO. The role of local knowledge in adaptation to climate change. Wiley Interdiscip Rev Clim Change. 2013;4(2):99-106.
8. Kassie M, Zikhali P, Pender J, Köhlin G. The economics of sustainable land management practices in the Ethiopian highlands. J Agric Econ. 2010;61(3):605-627.
9. Altieri MA. Agroecology: The Science of Sustainable Agriculture. 2nd ed. Boulder: Westview Press; 1995.
10. Pierotti R, Wildcat D. Traditional ecological knowledge: The third alternative. Ecol Appl. 2000;10(5):1333-1340.
11. Vandermeer J, van Noordwijk M, Anderson J, Ong C, Perfecto I. Global change and multi-species agroecosystems: Concepts and issues. Agric Ecosyst Environ. 1998;67(1):1-22.
12. Brookfield H, Padoch C. Appreciating agrodiversity: A look at the dynamism and diversity of indigenous farming practices. Environment. 1994;36(5):6-45.
13. Jackson LE, Pascual U, Hodgkin T. Utilizing and conserving agrobiodiversity in agricultural landscapes. Agric Ecosyst Environ. 2007;121(3):196-210.
14. Lin BB. Resilience in agriculture through crop diversification: Adaptive management for environmental change. Bioscience. 2011;61(3):183-193.
15. Pauli N, Abbott LK, Negrete-Yankelevich S, Andrés P. Farmers' knowledge and use of soil fauna in agriculture: A worldwide review. Ecol Soc. 2016;21(3):19.
16. Lal R. Soil carbon sequestration impacts on global climate change and food security. Science. 2004;304(5677):1623-1627.
17. Pandey DN, Gupta AK, Anderson DM. Rainwater harvesting as an adaptation to climate change. Curr Sci. 2003;85(1):46-59.
18. Critchley W, Siegert K. Water Harvesting: A Manual for the Design and Construction of Water Harvesting Schemes for Plant Production. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization; 1991.
19. Evenson RE, Gollin D. Assessing the impact of the Green Revolution, 1960 to 2000. Science. 2003;300(5620):758-762.
20. Pingali PL. Green Revolution: Impacts, limits, and the path ahead. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2012;109(31):12302-12308.
21. Pretty JN. The living land: Agriculture, food and community regeneration in rural Europe. London: Earthscan; 1998.
22. Power AG. Ecosystem services and agriculture: Tradeoffs and synergies. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2010;365(1554):2959-2971.
23. Tscharntke T, Klein AM, Kruess A, Steffan-Dewenter I, Thies C. Landscape perspectives on agricultural intensification and biodiversity–ecosystem service management. Ecol Lett. 2005;8(8):857-874.
24. Dorward A, Kydd J, Morrison J, Poulton C. Institutions, markets and economic development: Linking development policy to theory and praxis. Dev Change. 2005;36(1):1-25.
25. Walker B, Holling CS, Carpenter SR, Kinzig A. Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social–ecological systems. Ecol Soc. 2004;9(2):5.
26. Robertson GP, Swinton SM. Reconciling agricultural productivity and environmental integrity: A grand challenge for agriculture. Front Ecol Environ. 2005;3(1):38-46.
27. Lobell DB, Burke MB, Tebaldi C, Mastrandrea MD, Falcon WP, Naylor RL. Prioritizing climate change adaptation needs for food security in 2030. Science. 2008;319(5863):607-610.
28. Conway G. The Doubly Green Revolution: Food for All in the Twenty-First Century. Ithaca: Cornell University Press; 1997.
29. Matson PA, Parton WJ, Power AG, Swift MJ. Agricultural intensification and ecosystem properties. Science. 1997;277(5325):504-509.
30. Chambers R, Conway G. Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies; 1992. IDS Discussion Paper 296.
31. Probst K, Hagmann J, Fernandez M, Ashby JA. Understanding participatory research in the context of natural resource management. AgREN Network Paper

No. 130. London: Overseas Development Institute; 2003.
32. Scoones I, Thompson J, editors. Beyond Farmer First: Rural People's Knowledge, Agricultural Research and Extension Practice. London: Intermediate Technology Publications; 1994.
33. Warren DM, Slikkerveer LJ, Brokensha D, editors. The Cultural Dimension of Development: Indigenous Knowledge Systems. London: Intermediate Technology Publications; 1995.
34. Rajasekaran B, Warren DM, Babu SC. Indigenous natural resource management systems for sustainable agricultural development: A global perspective. J Int Dev. 1991;3(4):387-407.
35. Drinkwater LE, Wagoner P, Sarrantonio M. Legume-based cropping systems have reduced carbon and nitrogen losses. Nature. 1998;396(6708):262-265.
36. Bellon MR. Participatory research methods for technology evaluation: A manual for scientists working with farmers. Mexico City: International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center; 2001.
37. Brush SB. Farmers' bounty: Locating crop diversity in the contemporary world. New Haven: Yale University Press; 2004.
38. Uphoff N, editor. Agroecological Innovations: Increasing Food Production with Participatory Development. London: Earthscan; 2002.
39. Richards P. Indigenous Agricultural Revolution: Ecology and Food Production in West Africa. Boulder: Westview Press; 1985.
40. Antweiler C. Local knowledge and local knowing: An anthropological analysis of contested "cultural products" in the context of development. Anthropos. 1998;93(4-6):469-494.
41. Posey DA, Dutfield G. Beyond Intellectual Property: Toward Traditional Resource Rights for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre; 1996.
42. Uphoff N. The System of Rice Intensification: Using alternative cultural practices to increase rice production and profitability from existing yield potentials. Int Rice Comm Newsl. 2003;52:1-8.
43. Stoop WA, Uphoff N, Kassam A. A review of agricultural research issues raised by the system of rice intensification (SRI) from Madagascar: Opportunities for improving farming systems for resource-poor farmers. Agric Syst. 2002;71(3):249-274.
44. Young A, Menz K, Muraya P, Smith C. ICRAF's experiences in the assessment of agroforestry adoption potential: Lessons learned and challenges ahead. Agrofor Syst. 1998;40(3):231-246.
45. Garrity DP. Agroforestry and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. Agrofor Syst. 2004;61-62(1-3):5-17.
46. Jose S. Agroforestry for ecosystem services and environmental benefits: An overview. Agrofor Syst. 2009;76(1):1-10.
47. Sanchez PA. Science in agroforestry. Agrofor Syst. 1995;30(1-2):5-55.
48. Haglund E, Ndjeunga J, Snook L, Pasternak D. Dry land tree management for improved household livelihoods: Farmer managed natural regeneration in Niger. J Environ Manage. 2011;92(7):1696-1705.
49. Way MJ, van Emden HF. Integrated pest management in practice—pathways towards successful application. Crop Prot. 2000;19(2):81-103.
50. Settle WH, Ariawan H, Astuti ET, Cahyana W, Hakim AL, Hindayana D, *et al*. Managing tropical rice pests through conservation of generalist natural enemies and alternative prey. Ecology. 1996;77(7):1975-1988.
51. Agrawal A. Indigenous knowledge and the politics of classification. Int Soc Sci J. 2002;54(173):287-297.
52. Briggs J, Sharp J. Indigenous knowledges and development: A postcolonial caution. Third World Q. 2004;25(4):661-676.
53. Sillitoe P. The development of indigenous knowledge: A new applied anthropology. Curr Anthropol. 1998;39(2):223-252.
54. Biggs SD. Resource-poor farmer participation in research: A synthesis of experiences from nine national agricultural research systems. The Hague: International Service for National Agricultural Research; 1989. OFCOR Comparative Study Paper 3.
55. Chambers R, Pacey A, Thrupp LA, editors. Farmer First: Farmer Innovation and Agricultural Research. London: Intermediate Technology Publications; 1989.
56. Ellis F, Freeman HA, editors. Rural Livelihoods and Poverty Reduction Strategies in Four African Countries. J Dev Stud. 2004;40(4):1-30.
57. Barrett CB, Reardon T, Webb P. Nonfarm income diversification and household livelihood strategies in rural Africa: Concepts, dynamics, and policy implications. Food Policy. 2001;26(4):315-331.
58. Kherallah M, Delgado C, Gabre-Madhin E, Minot N, Johnson M. Reforming Agricultural Markets in Africa. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press; 2002.
59. Berkes F, Folke C, editors. Linking Social and Ecological Systems: Management Practices and Social Mechanisms for Building Resilience. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1998.
60. Cruikshank J. The Social Life of Stories: Narrative and Knowledge in the Yukon Territory. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press; 1998.
61. Howard PL, editor. Women and Plants: Gender Relations in Biodiversity Management and Conservation. London: Zed Books; 2003.
62. Swiderska K. Banishing the biopirates: A new approach to protecting traditional knowledge. London: International Institute for Environment and Development; 2001. Gatekeeper Series 99.
63. Dutfield G. Intellectual Property, Biogenetic Resources and Traditional Knowledge. London: Earthscan; 2004.
64. Shiva V. Protect or Plunder? Understanding Intellectual Property Rights. London: Zed Books; 2001.
65. FAO. Building on Gender, Agrobiodiversity and Local Knowledge. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization; 2004. Training Manual.
66. Ashby JA, Braun AR, García T, Guerrero MP, Hernández LA, Quirós CA, *et al*. Investing in farmers as researchers: Experience with local agricultural research committees in Latin America. Cali: International Center for Tropical Agriculture; 2000.
67. Anderson J, Feder G. Agricultural extension: Good intentions and hard realities. World Bank Res Obs. 2004;19(1):41-60.
68. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Traditional Knowledge and the Convention on Biological Diversity. Montreal: Secretariat of the

Convention on Biological Diversity; 2003.
69. FAO. International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization; 2001.
70. Pound B, Snapp S, McDougall C, Braun A, editors. Managing Natural Resources for Sustainable Livelihoods: Uniting Science and Participation. London: Earthscan; 2003.
71. Bunch R. Two Ears of Corn: A Guide to People-Centered Agricultural Improvement. Oklahoma City: World Neighbors; 1982.
72. Conway GR, Barbier EB. After the Green Revolution: Sustainable Agriculture for Development. London: Earthscan; 1990.
73. Pretty J, Hine R. Reducing Food Poverty with Sustainable Agriculture: A Summary of New Evidence. Colchester: University of Essex; 2001.
74. Giller KE, Witter E, Corbeels M, Tittonell P. Conservation agriculture and smallholder farming in Africa: The heretics' view. Field Crops Res. 2009;114(1):23-34.
75. Snapp SS, Blackie MJ, Gilbert RA, Bezner-Kerr R, Kanyama-Phiri GY. Biodiversity can support a greener revolution in Africa. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2010;107(48):20840-20845.
76. Kristjanson P, Reid RS, Dickson N, Clark WC, Romney D, Puskur R, *et al*. Linking international agricultural research knowledge with action for sustainable development. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2009;106(13):5047-5052.
77. Campbell BM, Hagmann J, Stroud A, Thomas R, Wollenberg E. Navigating amidst complexity: Guide to implementing effective research and development to improve livelihoods and the environment. Bogor: Center for International Forestry Research; 2006.
78. Douthwaite B, Keatinge JDH, Park JR. Why promising technologies fail: The neglected role of user innovation during adoption. Res Policy. 2001;30(5):819-836.
79. Spielman DJ, Ekboir J, Davis K. The art and science of innovation systems inquiry: Applications to Sub-Saharan African agriculture. Technol Soc. 2009;31(4):399-405.
80. Sumberg J, Thompson J, Woodhouse P. Why agronomy in the developing world has become contentious. Agric Hum Values. 2013;30(1):71-83.
81. Howden SM, Soussana JF, Tubiello FN, Chhetri N, Dunlop M, Meinke H. Adapting agriculture to climate change. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2007;104(50):19691-19696.
82. Koohafkan P, Altieri MA, Gimenez EH. Green Agriculture: Foundations for biodiverse, resilient and productive agricultural systems. Int J Agric Sustain. 2012;10(1):61-75.
83. Thompson J, Scoones I. Addressing the dynamics of agri-food systems: An emerging agenda for social science research. Environ Sci Policy. 2009;12(4):386-397.
84. White B. Agriculture and the generation problem: Rural youth, employment and the future of farming. IDS Bull. 2012;43(6):9-19.
85. Tittonell P. Ecological intensification of agriculture—sustainable by nature. Curr Opin Environ Sustain. 2014;8:53-61.
86. Bommarco R, Kleijn D, Potts SG. Ecological intensification: Harnessing ecosystem services for food security. Trends Ecol Evol. 2013;28(4):230-238.
87. Lyon C, Cordell D, Jacobs B, Martin-Ortega J, Marshall R, Camargo-Valero MA, *et al*. Five pillars for stakeholder analyses in sustainability transformations: The global case of phosphorus. Environ Sci Policy. 2021;118:80-89.
88. Perfecto I, Vandermeer J, Wright A. Nature's Matrix: Linking Agriculture, Conservation and Food Sovereignty. London: Earthscan; 2009.
89. Chappell MJ, LaValle LA. Food security and biodiversity: Can we have both? An agroecological analysis. Agric Hum Values. 2011;28(1):3-26.
90. Rosset PM, Altieri MA. Agroecology versus input substitution: A fundamental contradiction of sustainable agriculture. Soc Nat Resour. 1997;10(3):283-295.