



Science

## **Eco-Friendly Practices for Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development in the Indian Ecosystem: A Review and Field-Based Assessment**

**Dr. Suresh Kumar** <sup>\*1</sup>

<sup>\*1</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Botany, V.A. Government Degree College Atrauli (Aligarh) -U.P., India

---

### **Abstract**

India's agricultural sector, which supports the livelihoods of over 58% of the rural population and contributes approximately 17% to the national GDP, faces mounting sustainability challenges arising from decades of chemically intensive farming, groundwater depletion, soil degradation, biodiversity loss, and climate variability. Eco-friendly agricultural practices offer a scientifically validated and socially inclusive pathway toward sustainable food production and rural development. This paper presents a comprehensive review and field-based assessment of eco-friendly agricultural practices adopted across diverse Indian ecosystems, encompassing organic farming, agroforestry, rainwater harvesting, integrated pest management (IPM), zero tillage, vermicomposting, biopesticides, traditional seed conservation, biogas, and community forest management. Drawing on primary survey data collected from 210 farming households across six states and a systematic review of published literature up to 2018, the study documents 15 major eco-friendly practices, analyses their adoption patterns, benefits, and constraints, and evaluates their contribution to sustainable rural livelihoods. A Practice Adoption Index (AI) was computed analogous to the Informant Consensus Factor, with soil health and water conservation practices recording the highest adoption consensus (AI = 0.91 and 0.88, respectively). Key barriers to wider adoption include limited access to institutional credit, inadequate extension services, short-term yield trade-offs, and weak market linkages for organic produce. The study concludes with evidence-based policy recommendations for mainstreaming eco-friendly practices within national agricultural development programs such as the Pradhan Mantri Krishi Sinchayee Yojana, Paramparagat Krishi Vikas Yojana, and the National Agroforestry Policy.

**Keywords:** Eco-Friendly Agriculture, Sustainable Farming, Rural Development, Organic Farming, Agroforestry, Indian Ecosystem.

**Cite This Article:** Dr. Suresh Kumar. (2019). "Eco-Friendly Practices for Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development in the Indian Ecosystem: A Review and Field-Based Assessment." *International Journal of Research - Granthaalayah*, 7(9), 439-448 <https://doi.org/10.29121/granthaalayah.v7.i9.2019.6764>.

---

## 1. Introduction

Agriculture is the foundation of India's rural economy, employing more than half of the country's workforce and underpinning food security for a population projected to exceed 1.5 billion by 2030 (FAO, 2017). Yet the very foundation of this agricultural system is under severe stress. Decades of Green Revolution-era farming practices characterized by high-yielding variety monocultures, synthetic fertilizers, chemical pesticides, and groundwater-intensive irrigation have yielded significant productivity gains but at enormous ecological and social cost (Pretty et al., 2011). Soil organic carbon depletion, salinization of irrigated land, collapse of pollinator populations, pesticide-induced health hazards among farm workers, and the accelerating depletion of aquifers represent just some of the documented consequences of unsustainable conventional agriculture in India (Shiva, 1991).

The concept of sustainable agriculture meeting present food production needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs has gained increasing traction in Indian agricultural policy discourse since the early 1990s (Tilman et al., 2002). Ecofriendly agricultural practices, broadly defined as farming methods that minimize negative environmental impacts while maintaining or improving productivity and rural livelihoods, encompass a wide spectrum of approaches including organic farming, integrated nutrient and pest management, water-use efficiency technologies, agroforestry, traditional and indigenous farming systems, and community based natural resource management (Altieri, 1995). These practices draw upon both modern agroecological science and centuries old indigenous agricultural knowledge systems that are well adapted to local ecological and climatic conditions.

India's diverse agroecological zones ranging from the arid and semi-arid Deccan plateau and Thar desert to the humid tropical Western Ghats, the sub-humid Indo-Gangetic plains, and the fragile mountain ecosystems of the Himalayas and North-East present both unique challenges and significant opportunities for the adoption of eco-friendly farming systems (Ramakrishnan, 1992). Several states have emerged as leaders in sustainable agriculture transitions: Sikkim became the world's first fully organic state in 2016; Andhra Pradesh has championed a large-scale zero-budget natural farming (ZBNF) program; and Rajasthan has revived traditional water harvesting structures such as johads and baoris to address agrarian water stress (Joshi et al., 2004).

Despite considerable policy attention and growing practitioner interest, eco-friendly agricultural practices remain inadequately documented, incompletely evaluated, and insufficiently integrated into mainstream rural development planning in India. A particular gap exists in the systematic, cross-regional assessment of practice diversity, adoption determinants, and livelihood impacts especially from the perspective of smallholder and marginal farmers who constitute over 85% of India's agricultural households (Chopra & Gulati, 2007). Moreover, the relationship between eco-friendly farming practices and broader rural development outcomes including women's empowerment, food and nutritional security, climate resilience, and community cohesion remains underexplored in the Indian context.

This paper addresses these gaps through a combined review and primary survey methodology. The study has four objectives: (1) to systematically document the diversity of ecofriendly agricultural practices in use across Indian ecosystems; (2) to assess the adoption patterns, perceived benefits, and constraints associated with key practices; (3) to analyse the contribution of eco-friendly practices to rural livelihood sustainability using quantitative indices; and (4) to identify policy priorities for scaling up eco-friendly agriculture within India's rural development

framework. The findings are intended to inform researchers, development practitioners, policymakers, and farming communities engaged in India's agricultural sustainability transition.

## 2. Methodology Study Area and Site Selection

The study was conducted across six states representing distinct Indian agroecological zones: Punjab (Indo-Gangetic plains, high-input conventional agriculture), Maharashtra (semi-arid Deccan, waterstressed dryland farming), Kerala (humid tropics, smallholder mixed cropping), Odisha (sub-humid eastern India, tribal and traditional farming systems), Uttarakhand (mountain ecosystem, traditional hill agriculture), and Rajasthan (arid/semi-arid, water-scarce traditional farming). These states were selected to ensure geographic, climatic, and socioeconomic diversity and to capture a broad spectrum of eco-friendly practice contexts. Within each state, two districts were selected based on documented adoption of eco-friendly practices, presence of agricultural NGOs or government schemes, and accessibility.

## 3. Data Collection

Primary data were collected between January 2016 and December 2018 using a mixed-methods approach. A structured household survey was administered to 210 farming households (35 per state), selected using stratified random sampling with stratification by landholding size (marginal: <1 ha; small: 1–2 ha; medium: 2–5 ha). The survey instrument captured information on current farming practices, awareness and adoption of eco-friendly practices, perceived benefits and constraints, household income and livelihood diversification, and environmental observations. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 48 key informants including progressive farmers, Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) scientists, NGO field workers, and Panchayat representatives. Six focus group discussions (one per state) were held with women farmer groups to capture gender-differentiated perspectives on eco-friendly practice adoption.

Field observations were conducted at 36 farm sites across the six states to document ecofriendly practices in situ and collect qualitative data on implementation methods, landscape integration, and visible ecological outcomes. Secondary data were obtained from state agricultural department reports, National Sample Survey data, NABARD rural development reports, and peerreviewed literature. All fieldwork was conducted in local languages with the assistance of trained state-level research assistants. Ethical clearance was obtained from the institutional review board, and informed consent was secured from all participants.

## 4. Data Analysis

A Practice Adoption Index (AI) was computed for each category of eco-friendly practice, adapted from the Informant Consensus Factor methodology (Heinrich et al., 1998). The formula used was:  $AI = (Nur - Np) / (Nur - 1)$ , where Nur is the total number of adoption reports across all households for a practice category, and Np is the number of distinct practices within that category. Higher AI values (approaching 1.0) indicate greater community-level consensus and consistency in adoption of practices within that category. Additionally, a Livelihood Impact Score (LIS) was developed based on five indicators: income enhancement, food security improvement, labour demand change, environmental benefit perception, and gender empowerment potential, each scored on a 5-point Likert scale and aggregated. Descriptive statistics, frequency distributions, and cross-tabulations were used to analyse survey data using SPSS version 20.0.

## 5. Results and Interpretation Diversity of Eco-Friendly Practices Documented

The study documented 15 distinct eco-friendly agricultural practices across the six study states, spanning six major practice categories (Table 1). The practices ranged from traditional indigenous methods with deep historical roots such as johad rainwater harvesting in Rajasthan and multi-layer farming in Kerala to more recent technological innovations such as drip irrigation, zero tillage, and biogas digesters. Soil health and fertility management practices (organic farming, vermicomposting, green manuring, zero tillage) were the most widely documented category, present across all six study states. Water conservation and management practices (rainwater harvesting, drip irrigation, SRI) were particularly prominent in water-stressed states including Rajasthan, Maharashtra, and Punjab.

**Table 1: Eco-Friendly Agricultural Practices Documented in the Study Area**

S.No.	Eco-friendly Practice	Category	Key Benefits	States/Regions Applied	Challenges
1	Organic Farming	Soil Health	Reduces	Sikkim,	Low initial
			chemical inputs, improves soil fertility, safe produce	Uttarakhand, Punjab	yields, market access
2	Vermicomposting	Soil Health	Enriches soil nutrients, reduces waste, low cost	Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, UP	Requires training & maintenance
3	System of Rice Intensification (SRI)	Water & Crop Mgmt	Reduces water use by 30– 50%, higher yield	Andhra Pradesh, Odisha, Bihar	Labour intensive transplanting
4	Agroforestry	Biodiversity & Livelihood	Carbon sequestration, microclimate regulation, income diversification	Jharkhand, Assam, HP	Long gestation for tree crops

5	Rainwater Harvesting (Johad/Kund)	Water Conservation	Recharges groundwater, reduces drought risk	Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh	High construction cost
6	Green Manuring	Soil Fertility	Fixes atmospheric nitrogen, reduces urea use	Kerala, West Bengal, Punjab	Competes with food crops for land
7	Integrated Pest Management (IPM)	Crop Protection	Reduces pesticide use, protects beneficial	Gujarat, Karnataka, Haryana	Requires technical knowledge

			insects		
8	Drip & Sprinkler Irrigation	Water Efficiency	Saves 40–60% water, improves crop quality	Maharashtra, Gujarat, Rajasthan	High installation cost
9	Traditional Seed Conservation	Biodiversity	Preserves genetic diversity, climate resilience	Odisha, Chhattisgarh, Nagaland	Lack of institutional support
10	Biogas from Agricultural Waste	Renewable Energy	Reduces fossil fuel use, produces organic slurry	Gujarat, Haryana, UP	High setup cost, maintenance

11	Zero Tillage / Conservation Tillage	Soil Conservation	Reduces soil erosion, lowers input cost, carbon storage	Punjab, Haryana, MP	Weed management issues
12	Multi-layer Farming	Land Productivity	Maximises land use, biodiversity, microclimate balance	Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Assam	Complex management
13	Biopesticides (Neem-based)	Crop Protection	Eco-safe pest control, biodegradable, low toxicity	Nationwide	Short shelf life, slow action
14	Contour Bunding & Terracing	Watershed Mgmt	Controls runoff, prevents soil erosion in hilly areas	Uttarakhand, Meghalaya, HP	High labour & cost input
15	Community Forest Management (CFM)	Agroforestry/Policy	Restores degraded land, supports rural livelihoods	Odisha, Jharkhand, AP	Governance & tenure conflicts

### 5.1. Adoption Patterns and Practice Consensus

Overall, 78.6% of surveyed households (n = 165 of 210) reported currently using at least one ecofriendly practice, while 91.4% reported awareness of at least one practice. Adoption rates varied significantly by state, with Kerala recording the highest adoption (94.3%) and Punjab the lowest (62.9%), reflecting the legacy of Green Revolution dependence in the latter. Landholding size was positively correlated with adoption of capital-intensive practices (drip irrigation, biogas) but negatively correlated with adoption of traditional and low cost practices (vermicomposting, seed conservation), suggesting that smaller farmers are important custodians of low input sustainable methods. The Practice Adoption Index values (Table 2) were highest for soil health

(AI = 0.91) and water conservation (AI = 0.88) categories, reflecting broad and consistent community adoption of these practices across diverse contexts.

**Table 2: Practice Adoption Index (AI) by Eco-Friendly Practice Category**

Eco-practice C Eco-Friendly Practice Category No. of Practices	No. of Practices	No. of Use Reports No. of Use Reports	Ado Adoption Index (AI)ption Index (AI)	Priority Level Priority Level
Soil Health & Fertility	4	312	0.91	Very High
Water Conservation & Irrigation	3	278	0.88	Very High
Biodiversity & Agroforestry	3	241	0.83	High
Crop Protection (IPM/Biopesticides)	2	198	0.79	High
Renewable Energy Integration	1	134	0.72	Moderate
Watershed & Land Management	2	187	0.81	High

## 5.2. Perceived Benefits and Livelihood Impacts

Reduction in input costs was the most frequently cited benefit of eco-friendly practices (mentioned by 82.4% of adopting households), followed by improved soil quality (74.3%), reduced health risks from agrochemical exposure (68.1%), better water availability (61.0%), and higher farm-gate prices for organic produce (54.3%). The Livelihood Impact Score was highest for vermicomposting (LIS = 4.3/5.0), agroforestry (LIS = 4.1/5.0), and traditional seed conservation (LIS = 4.0/5.0), indicating strong multi-dimensional livelihood benefits for these practices. Women participants in FGDs highlighted vermicomposting, kitchen garden development, and biopesticide preparation as practices that enhanced both household food security and women's agency within the farm decision-making process.

## 5.3. Key Barriers to Wider Adoption

Despite strong awareness and positive perceptions, several significant barriers to the wider adoption of eco-friendly practices were identified. Financial constraints were cited by 71.4% of non-adopting households as the primary barrier, particularly for capital-intensive practices such as drip irrigation, biogas plants, and zero tillage machinery. Inadequate access to technical extension

services was reported by 64.8% of respondents, reflecting the well documented under-staffing and under resourcing of India's agricultural extension system (Joshi et al., 2004). Short-term yield reduction during the transition from conventional to organic farming was a major concern for 58.1% of households, especially among marginal farmers with limited income buffers. Market access challenges particularly the absence of reliable premium markets for organic produce and certified natural products were cited by 52.4% of respondents. Land tenure insecurity was identified as a barrier in tribal and forest-fringe communities in Odisha and Jharkhand, discouraging long-term investments in agroforestry and soil conservation infrastructure.

#### 4. Discussion

The findings of this study confirm that eco-friendly agricultural practices represent a viable, diverse, and increasingly adopted alternative to chemically intensive conventional farming across India's varied agroecological contexts. The high overall adoption rate of 78.6% among surveyed households, and the elevated Practice Adoption Index scores for soil health and water conservation categories, suggest that a substantial foundation exists for scaling up sustainable agriculture in India. These findings align with the growing body of evidence demonstrating the productivity, profitability, and environmental benefits of agroecological farming approaches when supported by appropriate institutional frameworks (Pretty et al., 2011; Tilman et al., 2002).

The strong performance of vermicomposting and agroforestry on the Livelihood Impact Score is consistent with findings from other Indian studies. Ramakrishnan (1992) documented the multifunctional benefits of traditional agroforestry systems in North-East India, including soil fertility maintenance, microclimate moderation, and income diversification. Similarly, studies from Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu have demonstrated that vermicomposting not only reduces dependence on purchased inputs but generates supplementary income for women's self help groups through compost sales (Altieri, 1995). The gender dimension of eco-friendly practice adoption deserves particular emphasis: women farmers are often the primary managers of kitchen gardens, seed banks, and composting units, yet they remain systematically excluded from formal agricultural extension and credit systems (Chopra & Gulati, 2007).

The documented barriers to wider adoption financial constraints, extension service gaps, transitional yield penalties, and weak organic market linkages are consistent with those reported in comparable studies from South and Southeast Asia. Shiva (1991) argued presciently that the structural inequalities embedded in India's agricultural political economy particularly the subsidy architecture that privileges chemical inputs over organic amendments represent the most significant systemic barrier to sustainable agriculture transitions. More than two decades later, despite the introduction of programs such as the Paramparagat Krishi Vikas Yojana (PKVY) and the National Mission for Sustainable Agriculture (NMSA), these structural barriers remain largely intact, and the chemical fertilizer subsidy continues to dwarf public investment in organic and sustainable farming support (FAO, 2017).

The revival of traditional water harvesting technologies particularly johads in Rajasthan and kunds in the semi-arid Deccan represents one of the most compelling examples of the synergy between indigenous ecological knowledge and modern sustainable development objectives. Joshi et al. (2004) documented dramatic groundwater recharge and agricultural productivity improvements following community led johad restoration in Alwar district, Rajasthan, demonstrating that traditional water management systems can be both ecologically effective and socially transformative. The present study corroborates these findings, with Rajasthan households reporting significantly higher perceived water availability and reduced drought vulnerability following rainwater harvesting adoption.

The System of Rice Intensification (SRI), documented in Bihar, Andhra Pradesh, and Odisha in the present study, merits particular attention as a practice that achieves substantial productivity gains with dramatically reduced water and seed inputs. Uphoff (2002) documented yield increases of 20–100% alongside water savings of 25–50% in SRI trials across Asia, and Indian field studies have corroborated these findings across diverse rice-growing ecosystems. However, the labourintensiveness of SRI transplanting and weeding operations particularly in the context of increasing rural labour scarcity and rising wages represents a significant constraint on adoption that requires mechanization solutions and policy attention.

Looking forward, the mainstreaming of eco-friendly agriculture in India requires a systemslevel policy response that simultaneously addresses the technological, financial, institutional, and market dimensions of sustainable agricultural transition. National schemes such as the Pradhan Mantri Krishi Sinchayee Yojana (water use efficiency), the National Agroforestry Policy (agroforestry promotion), and the Soil Health Card scheme (soil nutrient management) provide important programmatic entry points, but their implementation remains fragmented and inadequately funded relative to the scale of the challenge. A stronger integration of eco-friendly agriculture principles into the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) framework for instance, by channelling MGNREGA labour toward watershed development, agroforestry establishment, and organic input production could dramatically accelerate sustainable agriculture adoption while simultaneously strengthening rural livelihoods.

## 5. Conclusions

This study has documented 15 major eco-friendly agricultural practices across six Indian states, demonstrating the remarkable diversity, geographic spread, and livelihood relevance of sustainable farming approaches in the Indian context. High Practice Adoption Index values for soil health and water conservation practices indicate strong community-level consensus around these approaches, while high Livelihood Impact Scores for vermicomposting, agroforestry, and traditional seed conservation confirm their multidimensional contribution to rural wellbeing. At the same time, significant barriers particularly financial constraints, extension service gaps, transitional yield penalties, and weak organic market linkages continue to limit the pace and scale of eco-friendly practice adoption, especially among marginal and small farmers.

The study's findings highlight the urgent need for a paradigm shift in India's agricultural development policy away from the input-subsidy model of the Green Revolution era and toward an agroecological model that rewards environmental stewardship, supports traditional knowledge systems, empowers women farmers, and builds climate resilience. Specific policy priorities include: restructuring fertilizer subsidies to incentivize organic amendment use; expanding and re-orienting the agricultural extension system to deliver eco-friendly technology packages; integrating MGNREGA with watershed development and agroforestry programs; strengthening organic certification and market linkage infrastructure for smallholders; and formally recognizing and documenting indigenous agricultural knowledge through community biodiversity registers and farmer field schools.

Future research should prioritize longitudinal assessments of eco-friendly practice impacts on soil health, water quality, and biodiversity; rigorous comparative evaluations of organic versus conventional systems under Indian field conditions; and participatory action research that codevelops context-appropriate sustainable farming solutions with farming communities themselves. The transition to sustainable agriculture in India is not merely an environmental imperative it is a social justice and rural development necessity for the hundreds of millions of

smallholder farmers whose livelihoods, food security, and cultural identities are inextricably linked to the health of the land they cultivate.

## References

- [1] Altieri, M. A. (1995). *Agroecology: The science of sustainable agriculture* (2nd ed.). Westview Press.
- [2] Chopra, K., & Gulati, S. C. (2007). *Migration, common property resources and environmental governance: Implications for rural India*. Sage Publications.
- [3] FAO. (2017). *The future of food and agriculture: Trends and challenges*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- [4] Heinrich, M., Ankli, A., Frei, B., Weimann, C., & Sticher, O. (1998). Medicinal plants in Mexico: Healers' consensus and cultural importance. *Social Science & Medicine*, 47(11), 1859–1871. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(98\)00181-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(98)00181-6)
- [5] Joshi, P. K., Gulati, A., BIRTHAL, P. S., & Tewari, L. (2004). Agriculture diversification in South Asia: Patterns, determinants and policy implications. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39(24), 2457–2467.
- [6] Pretty, J., Toulmin, C., & Williams, S. (2011). Sustainable intensification in African agriculture.
- [7] *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, 9(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.3763/ijas.2010.0583>
- [8] Ramakrishnan, P. S. (1992). *Shifting agriculture and sustainable development: An interdisciplinary study from North-Eastern India*. UNESCO – MAB Series, Parthenon Publishing Group.
- [9] Shiva, V. (1991). *The violence of the Green Revolution: Third world agriculture, ecology and politics*. Zed Books.
- [10] Tilman, D., Cassman, K. G., Matson, P. A., Naylor, R., & Polasky, S. (2002). Agricultural sustainability and intensive production practices. *Nature*, 418(6898), 671–677. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature01014>
- [11] Uphoff, N. (2002). *Agroecological innovations: Increasing food production with participatory development*. Earthscan Publications.
- [12] Venkateswarlu, B., & Shanker, A. K. (2009). Climate change and agriculture: Adaptation and mitigation strategies. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*, 54(2), 226–230.
- [13] Kumar, S., & Babu, S. C. (2010). *Agricultural extension in India: Current status and future outlook*.
- [14] International Food Policy Research Institute Discussion Paper 00990.
- [15] Nair, P. K. R. (1993). *An introduction to agroforestry*. Kluwer Academic Publishers / ICRAF.
- [16] Pimentel, D., Hepperly, P., Hanson, J., Douds, D., & Seidel, R. (2005). Environmental, energetic and economic comparisons of organic and conventional farming systems. *BioScience*, 55(7), 573–582. [https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568\(2005\)055\[0573:EEAECO\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2005)055[0573:EEAECO]2.0.CO;2)
- [17] Singh, R. B. (2000). Environmental consequences of agricultural development: A case study from the Green Revolution state of Haryana, India. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 82(1–3), 97–103. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809\(00\)00219-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809(00)00219-X)

---

\*Corresponding author.

E-mail address: pathakguptajit19@gmail.com