

Factors Affecting Farm Mechanization – A Case Study In Assam

Abstract

The study was conducted in Central Brahmaputra Valley and Upper Brahmaputra Valley Zone of Assam in India. The present study is an attempt to study the effect of mechanization on income and limiting factors of farm mechanization of the sample farms. Primary data of 240 sample farms by personal interview schedule method was used for examining the across affecting mechanization adoption. All data collected from sample farms pertains to the year 2014-15. With the help of logit regression different factors affecting the mechanization adoption was examined in the sample households where six explanatory variable to explain mechanization adoption viz., age of the head of household, size of land holdings, access to irrigation, access to extension agents, area under high yielding varieties and the access to institutional credit were included and the negative value of the coefficient of AGE showed that the younger generation of farmers favoured the mechanization of farm much more compared to the old block. The coefficient of EDU (4.325) was positive and highly significant at 10 per cent probability level confirming that the adoption of farm mechanization was more prevalent among the farms having relatively literate in the study area. It was found from the above analysis that there were different factors which affect the farm mechanization linkage of extension functionaries with the grassroots level by creating awareness about the use of farm machineries amongst the farmers

Key words: Mechanized, non mechanized, mechanization adoption, linkage ,profitability

INTRODUCTION

Mechanization encourages to improve efficiency of production, encourages large scale production and ultimately leads to urbanization and commercialization in agricultural sector. Olaoye (2010) reported that the key factors for successful mechanization include socio-economic factors, supporting infrastructure, agro ecological and land situation, and technical skills and service of people [1]. Important agricultural equipment demand like tractors, power tillers, combine harvesters, irrigation pump sets, diesel engines, has shown an increasing trend. Introduction and adoption of agricultural machinery in the recent past has mainly been confined to the northern states of India. However, with the increase in the irrigation facilities and modernization of the cropping practices, the demand for agricultural machinery has shown an increasing trend in the southern and western parts of the country. The eastern and the north-eastern states have been less responsive to adaption of agricultural machinery. The shift from conventional flood irrigation to sprinkler, micro sprinkler or drip irrigation systems is apparently visible indicating the importance of water use efficiency for covering more area under irrigation. The Government support in the form of subsidy is serving as a catalyst to compensate for the high initial cost of the system. Further, new equipment such as precision planter, zero-till drill,

48 seed cum fertilizer drill, raised bed planter, improved weeders, plant protection equipment,
49 harvesting and threshing machines, drip, micro sprinkler and sprinkler irrigation equipment have
50 been made available to the farmers. As a result of the joint efforts made by the government and
51 the private sector, the level of mechanization has been increasing steadily over the years. Since
52 independence, Indian agriculture has been transformed from subsistence agriculture to modern
53 agriculture. The sources of energy and power, farming practices and technologies and crops have
54 undergone area change. This is evident from the data on number of mechanical power units used
55 in Indian agriculture. Number of tractors, diesel engines, electric motors, power tillers and self-
56 propelled combines has increased by manifolds during the second half of the twentieth century.
57 Use of tractors can be essential for expanding the aggregate area cultivated by large farms, for
58 whom hired labor represents a high production cost of production. The economies of scale
59 associated with a large machine such as a tractor have also made mechanization a more attractive
60 technology to reduce the time as well as labour. In developing countries tractor owners in most
61 are typically larger farmers, who also provide hiring services to non-owners when it helps them
62 maximize their tractors' utilization. Such trends have been observed commonly in Asia. A
63 significant share of mechanization in Asia has been adopted by small holders cases from Asia
64 shows that mechanization is often driven by large farm sizes and enables farmers to further
65 expand their landholdings, but it is not a prerequisite for mechanization to be profitable.
66 Profitability of service provision is an important component of medium to large farmers' demand
67 for mechanization equipment. Tractor owners can get benefit from hiring out machineries where
68 there is high demand for mechanization among farmers, even if area expansion is not possible
69 due to limited land or a weak tenure system. Some owners of machineries utilize to migrate with
70 their machines to areas with different seasons for plowing and harvesting beyond hiring out
71 services to local farmers. Tractor and power tillers can also be used beyond land preparation by
72 using the engine to power a tractor-mounted threshing machine or water pump or through hiring
73 out transport services. Even though farm mechanization shows an increasing trend, across the
74 states in India there are wide ranging disparities in the levels of mechanization. Northern States
75 such as Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh have achieved a faster growth in mechanization than
76 other areas in India. Throughout the country sale of other implements and machines like combine
77 harvesters, threshers and other power-operated equipment have been increasing almost. Adoption
78 of mechanization in north-eastern states has not been satisfactory due to constraints such as
79 topography, socio-economic conditions, high cost of transport, lack of institutional financing and
80 lack of manufacturing industries for farm machinery. Mechanization in Western and Southern
81 states of the country viz., Gujarat, Maharashtra, Rajasthan and certain areas of Tamil Nadu,
82 Andhra Pradesh etc., has increased with the increase in area under irrigation. In the study area
83 extent of mechanization adoption was found moderate. In this section different factors which
84 influence the mechanization adoption in the study area are discussed. Rasouli *et al.* (2006)
85 conducted a study to determine the factor affecting the implementation of national agricultural
86 mechanization programs in Iran. The findings of the second phase of this research indicated that
87 the mean agricultural mechanization level practiced on the sunflower producing farms was about
88 0.5 KW per ha of cultivated land and the amount of energy input varied between 0.0149 to
89 3.4973 KW. Using Multivariate linear regression, 46.9 per cent ($R^2 = 0.469$) of the variance in the
90 level of agricultural mechanization practiced could be explained by variables such as income,
91 total farming land, and land holdings under sunflower seed cultivation [2]. Ayandiji and Olofinsao
92 (2015) studied the socio economic factors affecting farm mechanization by cassava farmers in
93 Ondo state, Nigeria and logistic regression analysis model to examine the factors. They found

94 that access to extension workers and access to farm machines had a positive relationship with
95 adoption and problems faced included were access to spare parts, access to skilled man power,
96 maintenance of farm machines, availability of machines in time required.[3]

97 Mwangi and Kariuki (2015) studied the factors affecting adoption of new agricultural technology
98 by smallholder farmers in developing countries and concluded that perception of farmers towards
99 a new technology was a key precondition for adoption to occur. Other factors included were
100 human specific factors, economic factors, technological and institutional factors. They reported
101 that the determinant of agricultural technology adoption did not always have the same effect on
102 adoption rather the effect varies depending on the type of technology being introduced [4]

103 104 105 **Statement of the problem**

106 In the context of farm mechanization impact and factors on agricultural production, , there has
107 hardly been any study so far in the state of Assam and therefore the present study was an
108 attempt to answer the aspects of farm mechanization in Assam with following specific
109 objectives.

110
111 **Objectives :** factors affecting farm mechanization of the sample farms
112
113
114

115 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

116
117 The present study is an attempt to study the effect of mechanization on income of
118 the sample farms. The study was conducted in Upper Brahmaputra and Central Brahmaputra
119 Valley Zone of Assam. The sampling design followed for the study was four stage random
120 sampling design. Districts from the first stage unit, blocks were the second stage unit, villages
121 were the third and the sample farmers were the fourth ultimate stage of units of sampling. For
122 Central Brahmaputra Valley Zone, Nagoan district had been selected as Nagaon district is ahead
123 of mechanization compared to other districts. Dibrugarh and Jorhat district represented the Upper
124 Brahmaputra Valley Zone. In consultation with Agricultural Development Officer (ADO) and
125 Agricultural Engineering Department, Government of Assam in the selected districts, the blocks
126 having higher concentration of farm implements were selected. The present study is an attempt to
127 study the effect of mechanization on income of the sample farms. The study was conducted in
128 Upper Brahmaputra and Central Brahmaputra Valley Zone of Assam. Primary data pertaining to
129 the year 2014-15 were collected with 240 numbers of sample farms by personal interview
130 method and with the help of specially designed pretested schedule were used for examining the
131 factors affecting farm mechanization. Logit regression analysis was done for various sample
132 farm in order to study the factors affecting farm mechanization. Uaiene and Rafael (2005)
133 reported the agricultural technology adoption by rural households in Mozambique and probit and
134 logit models based on normal and logistic cumulative distribution functions were used and
135 difficulty in accessing credit appeared to be one of the major constraints to technology adoption
136 [5]. Aslanet al. (2007) analyzed personal, physical and socio-economic factors affecting farmers
137 land consolidation adoption with the help of dummy variable constructed against dependent and
138 different independent variable by using logit regression model [6]. Though it is very difficult to
139 achieve the mechanization level of the farmers, here index of mechanization was used based on

140 farmers' used and ownership of modern implements such as tractors (owned or hired), power
141 tiller (owned or hired), sprayer, harvester, thresher etc. Farmers' responses of these parameters
142 are codified as scores. Total scoring of these codification ranges from 1 to 7 on the level of farm
143 mechanization achieved by the respective farmer. Finally if the score of the farmer exceed 50 per
144 cent of the total attainable score we considered the farm as mechanized and assign a value 1 to
145 that farm and 0, otherwise. Logit analysis was with the help of following formula:

$$146 \quad P = 1/(1+e^{-FM})$$

147 Where, P is the probability that household achieved farm mechanization

$$148 \quad FM = a_0 + a_1 * AGE + a_2 * EDU + a_3 * LHD + a_4 * EXT + a_5 * IRA + a_6 * HYA + a_7 * BLN$$

149 Where,

150 i) AGE is the age of head of the household(proxy for experience) in years

151 ii) EDU is the education level of the household ;

152 Where,

153 0=illiterate

154 1= up to class IV

155 2=from class V to X

156 3=from class X to graduate level

157 4=more than graduate

158 iii) LHD is the farm size in ha.

159 iv) EXT is the level of contact with the extension functionaries;

160 Where,

161 0= no contact

162 1= contact once in a month

163 2= contact twice in a month

164 3= contact more than twice in a month

165 v) IRA is access to irrigation, 1 if yes 0, otherwise

166 vi) HYA is area grown under high yielding variety crops in ha

167 vii) BLN is access to institutional credit yes=1, 0 otherwise

168

169

170 **Result & Discussion**

171

172

173 Table 1 analyzed different factors affecting the mechanization adoption with help
174 of Logit regression in the sample household. Six explanatory variable to explain mechanization
175 adoption *viz.*, maximum education level of the household, age of the head of household, size of
176 land holdings, access to irrigation, level of contact with extension functionaries, area under high
177 yielding varieties and the access to institutional credit were used for the analysis to examine the
178 factors affecting farm mechanization. Four explanatory variables *viz.*, EDU (education level),
179 LHD (landholding size), HYA (area under high yielding varieties) and EXT (level of contact with
180 extension functionaries) out of six was found to be positively significant. The coefficient of EDU
181 (4.32) was positive and highly significant at 10 per cent probability level confirming that the
182 adoption of farm mechanization was more prevalent among the farms having relatively literate
183 respondents in the study area. This implies that the higher the education level of the farmers, the
184 higher the level of adoption of mechanization for performing various agricultural operations.
185 This result is in conformity with the findings of positive correlation found between education and

186 adoption of new technologies reported by Uddinet *al.*(2015) reported the various factors
187 affecting farmers adaptation strategies to environmental degradation and climate change effects
188 in Bangladesh and found that age, education, family size, farm size, family income, and
189 involvement in cooperatives were significantly related to self-reported mechanization adaptation
190 [7].

191 The coefficient of LHD i.e. size of land holding (1.773) with positive and significant at 10 per
192 cent probability level indicated that farmers having greater farm size relatively high
193 mechanization adoption and small farmers had low adoption of mechanization. This was mainly
194 due to larger farmers were financially sound as compared to farmers with small landholding and
195 tend to have modern machineries easily. Again, coefficient of EXT i.e. level of contact with
196 extension functionaries (1.854) and HYA i.e. area under high yielding varieties (1.966) were
197 found to be significant and positive at 1 per cent probability level indicating that level of contact
198 with extension functionaries and area under high yielding varieties played an important role in
199 mechanization adoption. Therefore, more emphasis should be given to increasing the level of
200 access to extension agents to increase the level of mechanization adoption which ultimately
201 uplift the rural community. Hence, farm size, area under high yielding varieties and level of
202 contact with extension functionaries were considered as important explanatory variable of
203 agricultural mechanization because it showed a positive significant relationship with
204 mechanization adoption. Contrary to expectation, the coefficient of the variable IRA (1.49) i.e.,
205 access to irrigation and coefficient of BLN (0.32) i.e. access to institutional credit had found
206 positive but insignificant relationship with adoption of farm mechanization. Insignificant result
207 IRA indicated that area under irrigated area needs more farm mechanization and similar is in
208 case of institutional credit also means that farmers which were access to credit should be more
209 mechanized. Lastly, the negative value of the coefficient of AGE (-2.63) showed that the
210 younger generation of farmers favours the mechanization of farm much more compared to the
211 old block. This result is in consistence with the findings reported by Ghosh(2007) carried out a
212 study on determinants of farm mechanization in Burdwan district of West Bengal in India. and
213 revealed that younger generation were more opt for farm mechanization than the older block, i.e.,
214 age-old custom acted as a hindrance to mechanize the farm practices [8]. This results is in
215 conformity with the findings of Berg (2013) revealed that the main factors were the high age of
216 farmers, high incidence of tractor use, access to land, high off-farm income and poor extension
217 services and found no significant relationships between adoption of mechanization [9].
218 Similarly, Bacet *al.*(2010) studied the determinants affecting farmers' adoption of Vietnamese
219 Good Agricultural Practices (VietGAP) for tea production in Northern Vietnam. With the help of
220 binary logit model and tobit model and found significant and positive impacts of family laborers,
221 tea farm size, tea price, access to irrigation systems, ratio of tea income and farming experience
222 and age of the tea farm negatively affected the conversion decision and farmland allocation [10]
223 and Owomboet *al.* (2012) reported economic impact of agricultural mechanization adoption in
224 Ondo State, Nigeria and found that adopted farmers in the area were middle-aged and were
225 relatively educated and non-adopters agreed that mechanization destroys soil quality and as a
226 result of the logistic regression revealed that education, extension visit and machine access were
227 significant determinants of adoption of mechanization practices [11]. On the contrary Kehindeet
228 *al.* (2017) reported factors affecting improved technologies dis-adoption in cocoa-based farming
229 systems of Southwestern Nigeria and revealed that education was the factors affecting dis-
230 adoption of improved [12].

231

232 **Table 1. Logit analysis of factors affecting farm mechanization of sample farm**

233
234

Variable	B coefficient	Standard error
AGE	-2.63*	1.24
EDU	4.32***	1.68
LHD	1.77*	1.03
EXT	1.85*	1.11
IRA	1.49	0.17
HYA	1.96*	1.19
BLN	0.32	0.09

235

236 * Significant at 10% probability level

237 ** Significant at 5% probability level

238 *** Significant at 1% probability level

239

240

241

242 **Conclusion**

243

244 Mechanization is need based process which provide sufficient time gap for self adjustment
 245 of various inputs which ultimately gives positive impact on agricultural production. The present
 246 study showed the impacts of mechanization on income in Upper Brahmaputra and Central
 247 Brahmaputra Valley zone of Assam. With the help of logit regression different factors affecting
 248 the mechanization adoption was examined. Logit regression in the sample household was done
 249 where six explanatory variable to explain mechanization adoption viz., age of the head of
 250 household, size of land holdings, access to irrigation, access to extension agents, area under high
 251 yielding varieties and the access to institutional credit were included and the negative value of
 252 the coefficient of AGE showed that the younger generation of farmers favoured the
 253 mechanization of farm much more compared to the old block. The coefficient of EDU (4.325)
 254 was positive and highly significant at 10 per cent probability level confirming that the adoption
 255 of farm mechanization was more prevalent among the farms having relatively literate in the
 256 study area. The study revealed that age was the hindrance of mechanization adoption and found
 257 positive correlation between land holding size and mechanization adoption.

258

259

260 **Recommendation:**

261

262 The following recommendations had been emerged from the above findings for appropriate
 263 policy measure for increasing the benefits of farm mechanization:

264 The following suggestions had been emerged from the above findings for appropriate policy
 265 measure for increasing the benefits of farm mechanization:

- 266 1. Development of adequate irrigation and short duration photo-insensitive varieties which
 267 would help to increase the cropping intensity which in turn will neutralize labour
 268 displacement affect in the study area.

- 269 2. Advancing credit for the purpose of purchasing of machineries should be strengthened
270 with simplified forms of norms.
271 3. Increasing the uptake of improved technologies could be achieved through enlightenment
272 programme by linkage of extension functionaries with the grassroots level by creating
273 awareness about the use of farm machineries amongst the farmers.
274
275

276 References

- 277 1. Olaoye, J.O. and Rotimi, A.O. (2010). Measurement of Agricultural Mechanization Index and
278 Analysis of Agricultural Productivity of some Farm Settlements in South West,
279 Nigeria. *Agricultural Engineering International: the CIGR Ejournal*. Manuscript
280 1372. Vol XII, January 2010.
- 281 2. Rasouliet al. (2006) . Factor Affecting Agricultural Mechanization: A case study on sunflower
282 seed farms in Iran. *Journal of Agricultural Science Technology*. Vol:11, pp: 39-48
- 283 3. Mwangi, M. and Kariuki, S. (2015). Factors Determining Adoption of New Agricultural
284 Technology by Small holder Farmers in Developing Countries. *Journal of*
285 *Economics and Sustainable Development* 6(5).
- 286 4. Ayandiji, A. and Olofinsao, O.T. (2014). Socio Economic Factors affecting Adoption of Farm
287 Mechanization by Cassava Farmers in Ondo State, Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of*
288 *Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology* 9(3): 39-45.
- 289 5. Uaiene and Rafael, N. (2005). Determinants of Agricultural Technology Adoption in
290 Mozambique. International Food Policy Research Institute, Maputo, Mozambique
- 291 6. Aslan, S.T.A.; Gundogdu, K.S.; Yaslioglu, E.; Kirmikil, M. and Arici, I. (2007). *Spanish*
292 *Journal of Agricultural Research* 5(2): 204-213.
293
- 294 7. Uddin, M.N.; Bokelmann, W. and Entsminger, J.S. (2012). Factors Affecting Farmers'
295 Adaptation Strategies to Environmental Degradation and Climate Change Effects:
296 A Farm Level Study in Bangladesh. *Climate*, pp.
297 223-241.
298
- 299 8. Ghosh, B.K. (2007). Determinants of Farm Mechanization in Modern agriculture: A Case Stud
300 of Burdwan districts of West Bengal. *International Journal of Agricultural*
301 *Research* 5(2): 1107-1115.
- 302 9. Berg, J.V. (2013). Socio-economic factors affecting adoption of improved agricultural
303 practices by small scale farmers in South Africa. *African Journal Agricultural*
304 *Research* 8(35): 4490-4500.
- 305 10. Bac, H.V.; Nanseki, T. and Chomei, Y. (2016). Factors Influencing Tea Farmers' Decision
306 to Adopt Vietnamese Good Agricultural Practices in Northern Vietnam. *Journal of*
307 *Agricultural Economics and Development* 6(2): 012-020.
- 308 11. Owomboet al. (2012). Economic Impact of Agricultural Mechanization Adoption: Evidence
309 from Maize farmers in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agriculture and*
310 *Biodiversity Research* .Vol:1, PP :25-32
- 311 12. Kehinde, A.D. and Adeyemo, R. (2016). A Probit Analysis of Factors Affecting Improved
312 Technologies Dis-adoption in Cocoa-Based Farming Systems of Southwestern
313 Nigeria. *International Journal of Agricultural Economics* 2(2): 35-41.
314