Available online at https://www.gyanvihar.org/researchjournals/ctm_journals.php
**Suresh Gyan Vihar University International Journal of Economics and Management**
E-ISSN: 2455-7528
Vol.14 Issue 1 Page No 10-13

# Agricultural Performance and Behavioral Barriers in Agro-Technological Transitions: A Comparative Analysis of Modern Versus Traditional Farming Systems in Haryana

Akashdeep Kumar[1]
[1]*Department of Management, Suresh Gyan Vihar University, Jaipur, India*
akashdeep.2453526@mygyanvihar.com
Kuldeep Singh Gour[2], Neelu Lamba[3]
[2]*Associate Professor, Suresh Gyan Vihar University, Jaipur, India*
kuldeepsingh.gaur@mygyanvihar.com

***Abstract***
**Traditional crop models across northwestern India are hitting serious ecological limits, making a shift toward modern precision farming necessary. However, adoption rates are still quite low due to practical hurdles and behavioral resistance. Using a multi-stage random sampling approach across different parts of Haryana, this study looks closely at socioeconomic baselines, operational inputs, and adoption roadblocks through a transaction-cost lens. Our findings show that while farmers genuinely care about saving water and reducing manual labor, the actual shift gets blocked by heavy upfront capital costs and long administrative delays in getting state subsidies. Statistical tests further prove a clear gap between operational landholding sizes and technology uptake, highlighting a tech divide that mostly hurts small and marginal farmers. We wrap up with practical policy ideas, focusing on direct-to-vendor automated subsidies and flexible micro-finance.**

***Keywords: Agro-Technological Transitions, Behavioral Barriers, Precision Agriculture, Cropping Adaptation Strategies, Transaction Costs, Subsidy Lags, Haryana.***

## I. INTRODUCTION

Farming forms Agriculture remains the foundational pillar of rural livelihoods, economic stability, and food security across developing economies. Within India's post-Green Revolution trajectory, the state of Haryana has historically operated as a premier agricultural powerhouse, contributing a disproportionately large share of essential food grains to the national buffer stock despite its modest geographical footprint. However, the intensive, resource-extractive farming paradigms established in the late 1960s—characterized by unchecked groundwater over-extraction, heavy chemical fertilizer dependency, and aggressive tillage cycles—have severely degraded the natural resource base. Today, agrarian communities face mounting ecological vulnerabilities, including alarming groundwater table declines, plummeting soil organic carbon levels, escalating variable input costs, and heightened exposure to climate anomalies and erratic monsoon patterns.In response to these tightening ecological limits, transitioning toward modern precision agronomy—encompassing high-efficiency drip irrigation, solar-powered fertigation, laser land leveling, and protected cultivation structures such as polyhouses—has become an urgent imperative to decouple agricultural growth from environmental degradation. Yet, the adoption of these innovations remains highly uneven across different strata of the farming community. While large-scale commercial growers frequently navigate institutional frameworks to leverage state-backed incentives, small and marginal holders face deep-seated operational, financial, and behavioral bottlenecks. To address these complexities, this study adopts a localized, multi-district survey approach across diverse agro-climatic zones in Haryana.

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Shifting away from conventional setups is frequently examined through human capital and transaction cost frameworks. Feder, Just, and Zilberman (1985) established early on that capital-intensive agricultural innovations experience restricted adoption among smallholders unless credit access or matching grants are

 Correspondence to- Akashdeep Kumar

Available online at https://www.gyanvihar.org/researchjournals/ctm_journals.php
**Suresh Gyan Vihar University International Journal of Economics and Management**
E-ISSN: 2455-7528
Vol.14 Issue 1 Page No 10-13

secure [3]. Simtowe et al. (2016) further emphasized that secure land tenure and reliable extension support are vital for clearing initial hurdles [8]. Expanding on these structural barriers, Kumar et al. (2020) demonstrated that the integration of tractor-operated implements and farm mechanization depends heavily on addressing local operational bottlenecks and localized resource constraints [5].

In the regional context of northwestern India, structural hurdles heavily dictate transition trajectories. Birthal et al. (2017) demonstrated that farm households with formal credit access, such as Kisan Credit Cards, adopt precision tools more rapidly and secure enhanced profit margins [2]. Complementing this financial dimension, Narayanamoorthy (2021) highlighted that deploying modern interventions like micro-irrigation yields substantial macroeconomic and farm-level gains, directly boosting water-use efficiency and economic returns across Indian agriculture [6]. Furthermore, recent regional frameworks by Chaudhary et al. (2025) emphasize that evaluating these agricultural shifts requires analyzing a comprehensive push-pull mechanism, where economic incentives and sustainability pressures must actively outweigh localized disincentives such as high capital outlays and complex technical demands.

Despite these documented economic advantages, the relationship between financial returns and qualitative behavioral perceptions remains divided in the broader literature. Sharma et al. (2020) observed that administrative red tape—including protracted subsidy disbursement delays and deficient vendor support—often undermines the intended benefits of modern technology [7]. Barrett et al. (2012) corroborated that smallholder exclusion is primarily driven by prohibitive upfront compliance costs [1]. Corroborating these constraints globally, recent empirical work by Pandeya et al. (2025) underscores that high initial investment costs, steep learning curves, and technical complexities remain the most significant deterrents for small-scale growers. To evaluate these multifaceted behavioral patterns and empirical datasets rigorously, foundational statistical methodologies (such as those outlined by Garrett and Woodworth, 1969) remain essential for processing psychological and educational metric data [4]. This study builds directly upon these interconnected insights through a structured multi-district field survey in Haryana.

## III. METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a descriptive and empirical research design, combining primary field data collection with rigorous quantitative and qualitative analytical tools to evaluate the determinants of agro-technological transitions. The methodological framework is structured across four key dimensions: sampling design, study area profiling, data collection instruments, and analytical techniques.

### *A. Sampling Design and Study Area*

To capture the heterogeneity of agricultural practices, resource constraints, and adoption behaviors, the study employed a multi-stage stratified random sampling framework across the state of Haryana. In the first stage, representative districts were deliberately chosen to reflect distinct agro-climatic zones, soil profiles, and irrigation regimes. In the second stage, blocks and clusters of villages were randomly sampled, followed by the random selection of farm households.

1) *Sirsa & Hisar (Semiarid Belt):* Characterized by sandy soils, high ambient temperatures, and brackish groundwater tables. Farm households here predominantly focus on drip-irrigated cotton production and the integration of solar-powered water pumps.
2) *Fatehabad (Transitional Zone):* Representing a shifting transition terrain where farmers balance traditional paddy-wheat rotations with commercial sugarcane and diversified cropping strategies to manage localized climate variability.
3) *Karnal (Alluvial Zone):* Benefiting from high groundwater tables and rich alluvial soils, serving as a primary hub for protected horticulture (polyhouses) and resource-conserving techniques such as direct-seeded rice (DSR).

### *B. Data Collection and Variable Framework*

Primary data was gathered through a structured, pre-tested interview schedule administered to farm households, divided evenly between modern technology adopters (treatment group) and traditional farming setups (control group).

1) *Socio-Economic & Demographic Profiles:*

 Correspondence to- Akashdeep Kumar

Available online at https://www.gyanvihar.org/researchjournals/ctm_journals.php
**Suresh Gyan Vihar University International Journal of Economics and Management**
E-ISSN: 2455-7528
Vol.14 Issue 1 Page No 10-13

Capturing age, education, operational landholding size, family size, and off-farm income sources.

2) *Operational Inputs & Costs:* Quantifying variable expenses related to seeds, chemical fertilizers, irrigation energy (electricity/diesel), labor hours, and machinery rentals.
3) *Yield & Financial Metrics:* Measuring crop productivity per acre, gross returns, net margins, and variable transaction costs incurred during input procurement.
4) *Perception & Behavioral Metrics:* Utilizing structured Likert-scale items to gauge farmer attitudes toward water conservation, labor scarcity, technical complexity, risk aversion, and institutional bottlenecks (such as subsidy delays and vendor reliability).

## IV. RESULTS & DISCUSSION

### A. *Regional Socio-Technical Strengths and Crop Adaptation Strategies*

1) *Arid Conservation in Sirsa and Hisar:* Operating within a semiarid belt marked by sandy soils and brackish groundwater, farmers heavily rely on micro-irrigation systems—specifically drip lines and micro-sprinklers—coupled with solar-powered pumps. These tools have proven critical in stabilizing cotton yields by mitigating heat stress and preventing soil salinization caused by traditional flood irrigation.
2) *Rotational Flexibility in Fatehabad:* Located within the transitional zone, farming communities navigate climate variability by balancing traditional paddy-wheat regimes with commercial sugarcane and diversified multi-cropping rotations. This flexibility acts as a risk-hedging mechanism against shifting monsoon patterns and fluctuating market prices.
3) *Agronomic Intensification in Karnal:* Benefiting from favorable alluvial soils and high groundwater tables, this zone serves as a focal point for protected horticulture (such as polyhouses) and resource-conserving innovations like direct-seeded rice (DSR). These practices substantially reduce methane emissions, lower labor overheads for transplanting, and optimize water-use efficiency.

### B. *Evaluation of Farmer Perceptions and Behavioral Responses*

Psychometric evaluations using structured Likert-scale metrics indicate a high level of cognitive awareness among farmers regarding the long-term benefits of precision agriculture. Respondents strongly agree that modern interventions successfully conserve water, curtail diesel and electricity usage for pumping, minimize manual labor dependency, and enhance overall crop quality while curbing excessive chemical inputs. However, a pronounced psychological and operational resistance persists. Farmers frequently cite the steep technical learning curve required for day-to-day calibration, troubleshooting, and maintenance of automated tools as a psychological deterrent. Furthermore, the survey highlights that upfront capital intensity remains the single greatest behavioral barrier, creating risk aversion among smallholders who operate on thin liquidity margins.

### C. *Institutional Frictions, Subsidy Lags, and Vendor Deficiencies*

The transition toward precision farming is heavily impeded by systemic institutional bottlenecks:

1) *Capital Outlay and Subsidy Disbursement Lags:* High initial setup costs are severely exacerbated by bureaucratic delays. Administrative bottlenecks often result in a 12- to 18-month lag in state subsidy payouts. This prolonged delay freezes farmer liquidity, deters risk-averse growers, and forces reliance on informal, high-interest credit markets.
2) *Vendor Deficiencies and Maintenance Gaps:* Field responses underscore a distinct lack of reliable local repair services and technical support. Frequent shortages of certified replacement parts and inadequate vendor accountability heighten fears of unexpected equipment breakdowns during critical crop growth stages.
3) *The Structural Scale Divide:* Empirical cross-tabulations and statistical checks confirm a profound positive correlation between operational landholding size and the rate of precision technology adoption. Large-scale commercial farmers easily absorb transaction

 Correspondence to- Akashdeep Kumar

Available online at https://www.gyanvihar.org/researchjournals/ctm_journals.php
**Suresh Gyan Vihar University International Journal of Economics and Management**
E-ISSN: 2455-7528
Vol.14 Issue 1 Page No 10-13

costs, navigate compliance red tape, and leverage institutional networks. Conversely, small and marginal farmers face structural exclusion due to prohibitive upfront compliance costs and unequal access to formal credit instruments like Kisan Credit Cards.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

The empirical findings from our multi-district survey reveal a clear dichotomy: while farmers across diverse agro-climatic zones—from the arid, brackish groundwater zones of Sirsa and Hisar to the alluvial regimes of Karnal—demonstrate high cognitive awareness regarding the water-saving, labor-reducing, and productivity-enhancing benefits of precision tools, actual adoption rates remain heavily skewed. The research confirms that technological uptake is severely constrained not by an inherent resistance to innovation, but by structural bottlenecks. Prohibitive upfront capital outlays, steep technical learning curves, and an acute "scale divide" systematically disadvantage small and marginal holders, who struggle to absorb transaction costs compared to large-scale commercial growers. Furthermore, systemic institutional frictions—most notably protracted 12- to 18-month administrative delays in subsidy disbursements and inadequate local vendor support—erode farmer liquidity and exacerbate risk aversion.

1) *Automated Direct-to-Vendor Subsidies:* Replacing cumbersome reimbursement architectures with direct, automated bank transfers to certified vendors upon digital verification of equipment installation. This mechanism would eliminate liquidity-freezing administrative lags and restore financial confidence among growers.
2) *Scale-Adjusted Capital Support:* Designing progressive financial assistance structures, such as enhanced matching grants and preferential credit terms targeted specifically at small and marginal farmers, to bridge the upfront cost barrier and mitigate the structural scale divide.
3) *Decentralized Custom Hiring Centres (CHCs):* Establishing village-level or cluster-based rental hubs equipped with high-value precision assets (such as laser levelers, solar-powered fertigation units, and specialized implements) made accessible to smallholders at affordable hourly rates.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my profound gratitude to Suresh Gyan Vihar University, Jaipur, and the Faculty of Commerce and Management for providing the academic environment and institutional resources necessary to carry out this research. I am deeply thankful to my academic supervisor and the Research Advisory Committee for their invaluable guidance, insightful feedback, and continuous encouragement throughout the course of this study. Special thanks are extended to the farming communities and agricultural extension officers across the districts of Haryana—Sirsa, Hisar, Fatehabad, and Karnal—whose active participation, patience, and transparent responses during the multi-district field survey formed the empirical backbone of this work. Finally, I acknowledge the constant moral support of my family and peers, whose encouragement sustained me through every stage of this research journey.

## REFERENCES

[1] C. B. Barrett et al., "Smallholder participation in agricultural market institutions," *Brainstorming Paper for the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 112–145, 2012.
[2] P. S. Birthal et al., "Financial inclusion and technology adoption in agriculture," *Agricultural Economics*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 721–731, 2017.
[3] G. Feder et al., "Adoption of agricultural innovations in developing countries," *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 255–298, 1985.
[4] H. E. Garrett and R. S. Woodworth, *Statistics in Psychology and Education*. Bombay: Vakils, Feffer and Simons, 1969.
[5] A. Kumar et al., "Adoption of tractor-operated implements and farm mechanization in Nepal," *Land Use Policy*, vol. 96, p. 104689, 2020.
[6] A. Narayanamoorthy, "Economics of micro-irrigation in India," *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, vol. 76, no. 1, pp. 45–68, 2021.
[7] R. Sharma et al., "Transaction costs and institutional bottlenecks in protected horticulture," *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 78, pp. 210–222, 2020.
[8] F. Simtowe et al., "Determinants of agricultural technology adoption under credit constraints," *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 312–338, 2016.
[9] S. Pandeya, B. R. Gyawali, and S. Upadhaya, "Factors influencing precision agriculture technology adoption among small-scale farmers in Kentucky and their implications for policy and practice," Agriculture, vol. 15, no. 2, p. 177, 2025.
[10] S. Chaudhary, H. R. Meena, and J. Behera, "Adoption of precision agriculture technologies in northern India: A push-pull framework approach," Journal of Experimental Agriculture International, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 974–981, 2025.

 Correspondence to- Akashdeep Kumar