Case Study
ISSN (Online): 2350-0530
ISSN (Print): 2394-3629

International Journal of Research - GRANTHAALAYAH
July 2025 13(7), 15–27

AGROCHEMICAL RETAILERS AS CHANGE AGENTS: A BEHAVIOURAL STUDY ON THEIR WILLINGNESS TO PROMOTE BIO-PESTICIDES AND ORGANIC INPUTS

Abul Faiz [1]

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of Zoology, Barama College, Barama, Assam, India

Received 10 May 2025
Accepted 12 June 2025
Published 31 July 2025

Corresponding Author
Abul Faiz, itzfaizhere@gmail.com

DOI
10.29121/granthaalayah.v13.i7.2025.6280

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ABSTRACT

Agrochemical retailers serve as a vital link between manufacturers and farmers, often influencing decisions related to pesticide use. With the growing need for sustainable agriculture, the promotion of bio-pesticides and organic inputs is critical. However, limited attention has been paid to the behavioural determinants behind retailers' product recommendations. This study investigates the willingness of pesticide retailers to promote eco-friendly alternatives such as bio-pesticides and organic inputs in Kamrup district, Assam, India. Using a mixed-method approach involving surveys and interviews with 50 retailers, the study reveals that while most retailers are aware of bio-pesticides, their willingness to promote them is often constrained by perceived low demand, lack of incentives, insufficient technical knowledge and concerns over product efficacy. The study concludes with policy recommendations aimed at strengthening retailers' capacity as change agents for sustainable agriculture.

Keywords: Agrochemical, Behaviour, Biopesticide, Retailers, Sustainable

1. INTRODUCTION

The sustainability of modern agriculture has emerged as a pressing concern amidst growing environmental degradation, loss of biodiversity and the escalating public health impacts linked to indiscriminate pesticide use. In developing countries like India, where agriculture continues to form the backbone of rural livelihoods, chemical-intensive farming has become the norm. Despite short-term productivity gains, this approach has contributed to soil degradation, pesticide resistance, and water contamination. In response, there has been a global push toward the adoption of more sustainable practices, among which the use of bio-pesticides and organic

inputs features prominently. These alternatives are known for their environmentally benign nature, safety for non-target organisms, and lower residue levels in food products. However, despite their ecological and health-related advantages, the adoption of such inputs by farmers has remained significantly low, particularly in regions with limited access to scientific advisory services. In this context, agro-input retailers, commonly referred to as pesticide dealers, assume a critical intermediary role in the agricultural ecosystem. Positioned at the interface between formal agri-business companies and farmers, they not only distribute inputs but also act as de facto advisors, especially in areas where formal agricultural extension mechanisms are weak, understaffed, or inaccessible. Studies have shown that a large number of farmers rely more on local retailers for guidance on pest management than on government agricultural officers. This centrality places retailers in a unique position of influence over the choices farmers make regarding pest control, crop protection, and fertilizer application.

However, despite their pivotal position, pesticide retailers have seldom been recognized or trained as potential agents of sustainable agriculture. Most research and policy discourse around sustainable farming has focused on farmers, extension personnel, and researchers, overlooking the behavioural drivers and decision-making patterns of retailers who significantly influence pesticide adoption on the ground. The few studies that do exist often limit themselves to evaluating retailer knowledge or compliance with regulatory guidelines, rather than exploring the deeper cognitive, economic and motivational factors that guide their product promotion choices. The role of pesticide retailers in shaping input use behaviour among farmers has received growing attention in agricultural development research, particularly in the context of developing economies like India. Indian studies affirm global observations that agro-input retailers often serve as the most accessible and influential information source for farmers, especially where formal extension services are inadequate or non-existent. The role of agro-input retailers in influencing pesticide use patterns has garnered increasing academic attention over the past two decades. Traditionally perceived as mere distributors of agricultural inputs, retailers are now recognized as influential knowledge intermediaries who often fill the void left by inadequate public extension systems in many developing countries. However, their adoption remains suboptimal, especially in the Global South. While studies on farmer behaviour toward bio-pesticides are increasing, literature on retailer attitudes and behaviours remains limited. A few studies have sought to understand the retailer perspective. A study by Ashoka et al. (2018) in Karnataka found that although 75% of retailers were aware of bio-pesticides, only 25% regularly stocked them due to low farmer demand and poor market promotion by manufacturing firms. Retailers expressed concerns regarding the shelf life, perceived lower efficacy, and lack of trust in government-subsidized organic inputs. The same study reported that over 60% of retailers believed that farmers would be more open to using bio-inputs if they were demonstrated on fields through extension trials or farmer field schools. Another strand of literature emphasizes the potential of training and certification in enhancing retailer behaviour. For instance, Pretty and Bharucha (2015) documented successful interventions in Southeast Asia where trained pesticide retailers became advocates of integrated pest management and bio-control products. Meijer et al. (2015) examined agro dealers in Kenya and reported that while many were aware of alternative pest control methods, only a minority actively promoted them due to concerns over profitability and farmer scepticism. One of the most comprehensive Indian studies on pesticide retailer behaviour was conducted by Kumar and Singh (2019), who surveyed over 200 pesticide dealers across the

states of Haryana and Punjab. The study revealed that nearly 78% of retailers advised farmers on pesticide selection, yet only 23% had received any form of formal training in pesticide application or environmental safety. The absence of mandatory training standards and the profit-driven nature of pesticide sales were identified as critical factors influencing the promotion of high-dose, broad-spectrum chemicals, rather than selective or sustainable alternatives. The government of India has also acknowledged the pivotal role of retailers. The National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management (MANAGE) conducted a training needs assessment across five states and concluded that capacity building of pesticide retailers in sustainable agriculture could significantly reduce the misuse of chemicals MANAGE (2020). Their pilot program revealed that trained retailers were 3.5 times more likely to recommend bio-pesticides and significantly reduced suggestions for cocktail pesticide mixtures. In India, Singh et al. (2015) found training needs of the pesticide retailers in different areas of pest management. Identification of different pest and pesticides emerged as the most needed training area. Other training areas are diagnostics, symptoms and damages caused by insect pest; Insect pest management and its components; bio-fertilizer-its use and importance; crop management etc. According to Peshin et al. (2020), factors such as inconsistent performance, lack of availability, and poor awareness among both farmers and retailers impede the widespread use of bio-pesticides in India. The knowledge deficit, coupled with the absence of standardized training protocols, points to a structural gap in the supply chain of sustainable inputs. A report by the Centre for Science and Environment Centre for Science and Environment. (2021) analysing pesticide retailing practices in Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh found widespread sale of Schedule-H pesticides (highly hazardous) without proper prescriptions. The report called for regulation reforms that include not just punitive measures but also incentivization schemes to promote sustainable alternatives through the same retail networks. This highlights the economic rationale driving retailer behaviour, suggesting that willingness to promote sustainable products is not necessarily absent, but rather contingent on commercial feasibility and institutional support.

This study addresses the critical gaps by exploring the behavioural willingness of pesticide retailers to promote sustainable alternatives, particularly bio-pesticides and organic inputs. It investigates the levels of awareness, perceived efficacy, perceived risks and motivating factors that shape retailers' promotional behaviours in the Kamrup district of Assam, a region with a mixed agricultural economy and emerging interest in organic practices. By employing both quantitative and qualitative methods, the study seeks to offer a comprehensive understanding of how pesticide retailers think, decide and act with respect to sustainable input promotion. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for formulating effective policies and intervention strategies that can harness the power of retailers as change agents. If appropriately trained, incentivized and supported, pesticide retailers can transition from being mere sales agents of synthetic agrochemicals to becoming active promoters of ecological agriculture. In doing so, they can play a vital role in reshaping the pesticide supply chain toward greater environmental sustainability and public health protection. This study is significant from various aspects. If we think of novelty, then this study is one of the most important among the existing studies on pesticide retailers which focus on knowledge gaps or misuse. Very few, if any, study the psychology and behavioural economics of retailers such as why they recommend what they do and what might influence them to promote sustainable alternatives. This shifts the research from knowledge or policy to individual decision-making behaviour which is a rich area combining agriculture,

sustainability and psychology. Understanding retailers' willingness and barriers to promoting bio-pesticides and organic inputs can help shape the incentive schemes, training programs and policy frameworks for sustainable input marketing. Especially in regions like Assam, particularly in my study area where retailers often act as primary advisors to farmers, this topic has broad relevance.

2. METHOD

This study adopted a mixed-methods research design to investigate the behavioural dimensions of pesticide retailers' willingness to promote bio-pesticides and organic agricultural inputs. The combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches allowed for both statistical generalization and in-depth contextual interpretation, enabling a holistic understanding of the attitudes, motivations and constraints influencing retailer decisions.

2.1. STUDY AREA

The research was conducted in Kamrup district of Assam, India, selected purposively due to its diverse agricultural landscape, comprising both conventional and emerging organic farming clusters. The district includes peri-urban, rural and semi-tribal agricultural zones, offering a representative cross-section of agro-input retail dynamics. It has been witnessed recent interventions by Non-Governmental Organizations and other agencies to promote bio-inputs, making it a suitable setting for the study.

2.2. RESEARCH DESIGN

A concurrent triangulation design was used wherein quantitative and qualitative data were collected simultaneously during fieldwork, allowing for cross-validation of findings. Quantitative data were primarily derived from structured questionnaires, while qualitative insights were gathered through semi-structured interviews and field observations.

2.3. SAMPLING METHOD AND SAMPLE SIZE

The sample population consisted of licensed pesticide and agro-input retailers operating within the Kamrup district. A purposive sampling method was employed to select 50 pesticide retailers who had been in operation for a minimum of three years and dealt regularly in crop protection products. Retailers were selected from a list obtained through the Assam Department of Agriculture and verified through field visits. Care was taken to ensure geographic diversity in the sample, covering major market towns and rural agricultural hubs.

2.4. DATA COLLECTION TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

The study employed multiple instruments to gather both quantitative and qualitative data from pesticide retailers. The two principal tools were a structured questionnaire and a semi-structured interview guide. These were developed with reference to previous validated instruments used in agro-dealer studies Kumar and Singh (2019), Food and Agriculture Organization. (2021) and were adapted to the local context through expert consultation and pre-testing.

2.4.1. STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE

The structured questionnaire was designed to elicit quantifiable information regarding retailers' knowledge, attitudes and behavioural tendencies concerning bio-pesticides and organic inputs. The tool was divided into the following sections:

1) RETAILER PROFILE

This section collected demographic and operational information, such as age, education level, number of years in agro-retail, number of employees, daily customer flow and geographical location (urban, peri-urban, or rural).

2) KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS

Questions in this section assessed the respondent's awareness of bio-pesticides, recognition of brand names, knowledge of application methods, and familiarity with government regulations concerning sustainable inputs. Questions included both closed-ended items (yes/no) and scaled responses.

3) ATTITUDES AND WILLINGNESS

This core section used a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) to gauge the retailers' attitudes towards product efficacy, profitability, customer demand and their willingness to promote or stock sustainable alternatives. Statements included items such as:

- "I believe bio-pesticides are as effective as synthetic pesticides."
- "I would promote organic inputs if given proper training."
- "Farmer demand strongly influences what I stock."

4) BARRIERS AND INCENTIVES

Retailers were also asked to indicate the factors that discouraged or motivated them to promote bio-inputs. This section included multiple-choice questions and ranking items, as well as an open-ended prompt to record additional feedback.

The questionnaire was administered in face-to-face interviews by trained field investigators, ensuring clarity of responses and reducing the risk of misinterpretation. Most sessions lasted between 20 to 30 minutes.

2.4.2. SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

To complement the quantitative data, in-depth qualitative interviews were conducted with a purposive sub-sample of 20 respondents from varying educational and operational backgrounds. The interview guide contained open-ended questions structured around key thematic areas including:

- Retailers' perceptions of bio-pesticide quality and efficacy
- Their understanding of farmer attitudes toward organic products
- Experiences with suppliers or government departments promoting bio-inputs
- Views on profitability, stocking risks, and shelf-life concerns
- Responses to hypothetical scenarios (e.g., "What if government offered a 20% subsidy for each unit of bio-pesticide sold?")

These interviews allowed for greater nuance and depth in understanding the reasoning and emotions behind retailer choices, particularly in relation to economic uncertainty, peer influence, and trust in institutional actors. Interviews were

conducted in Assamese, Hindi, or English, based on the respondent's preference, and were digitally recorded with consent. They were later transcribed and translated for thematic analysis. The interviews typically lasted between 35 to 45 minutes and were conducted in a private section of the retail outlet or nearby space to ensure candid responses. To enhance credibility and reflexivity, the field team maintained reflective notes to document non-verbal cues, shop environment, and observable retailer-farmer interactions.

2.4.3. FIELD OBSERVATIONS

Non-participant observations were conducted at the retail outlets to record physical evidence of bio-pesticide availability, promotional materials, and interaction styles with farmers and the overall business environment. Observational data were recorded using a checklist.

2.5. DATA ANALYSIS

2.5.1. QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

Quantitative data were analysed using Microsoft Excel. Descriptive statistics (Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations) were used to summarize the responses. Cross-tabulations were performed to examine relationships between retailer characteristics (e.g., education level, years in business) and willingness to promote bio-pesticides.

2.5.2. QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

Interview transcripts were analysed using thematic coding. Codes were generated inductively and organized into broader categories such as "perceived profitability," "farmer scepticism," "knowledge barriers" and "external incentives."

2.6. VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

To ensure content validity, the questionnaire and interview guide were reviewed by two agricultural extension experts and one social science researcher. A pilot test involving five retailers was conducted in a neighbouring district to refine wording, scale clarity and sequencing of questions.

2.7. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

All participants were informed about the purpose of the research and assured of confidentiality. Verbal informed consent was obtained prior to data collection. Participants were informed that their involvement was voluntary, and they could withdraw at any point. No personal identifiers were used in analysis or reporting.

3. RESULT

The study yielded a comprehensive picture of the attitudes, knowledge and behavioural intentions of pesticide retailers concerning the promotion of bio-pesticides and organic agricultural inputs. Data from 50 structured questionnaires and 20 semi-structured interviews were analysed.

3.1. AWARENESS AND STOCKING PATTERNS

A significant proportion of respondents (90%) reported awareness of bio-pesticides, primarily acquired through supplier representatives or promotional campaigns. However, only 38% of retailers reported actively stocking bio-pesticides and just 22% displayed promotional materials related to organic inputs in their outlets. This discrepancy highlights a gap between awareness and market behavior.

3.2. WILLINGNESS TO PROMOTE BIO-INPUTS

Retailers stated willingness to promote bio-pesticides varied. While 30% were highly willing and viewed the products as future market opportunities, 40% remained neutral—expressing conditional openness dependent on demand and incentives. Notably, 30% were not willing to actively promote such products due to concerns about efficacy and profitability.

3.3. MOTIVATORS FOR PROMOTION

Government support in the form of incentives or guaranteed margins was cited by 64% of respondents as the strongest motivating factor. Training and demonstration support from government agencies or NGOs motivated 52% of retailers. About 49% reported that increased farmer demand would make them consider switching to sustainable products, while 28% mentioned active marketing efforts by input companies.

3.4. BARRIERS TO PROMOTION

Perceived low efficacy of bio-pesticides compared to conventional products was the leading barrier, reported by 70% of retailers. This was closely followed by low farmer demand (68%) and high cost or low profit margins (40%). Lack of technical knowledge (38%) also emerged as a consistent barrier, particularly among smaller, rural retailers.

3.5. INFLUENCE OF RETAILER BACKGROUND

Cross-tabulation revealed that retailers with graduate-level education were more likely to express positive attitudes toward bio-pesticides and organic inputs. Years of experience, however, did not significantly influence willingness to promote. Urban and peri-urban retailers showed greater exposure to promotional materials and trainings compared to rural counterparts.

3.6. OBSERVATIONAL INSIGHTS

Field observations confirmed that bio-pesticides were usually kept on lower or hidden shelves, unlike synthetic pesticides which occupied visible display areas. Few retailers actively offered sustainable alternatives unless prompted by farmer queries. Retailer-farmer conversations were predominantly focused on product effectiveness and quick results—reinforcing the preference for conventional inputs (Table 1).

Table 1

Table 1 Observational Insights

Theme	Insights from Interviews
Perception of Bio-pesticide Efficacy	Most retailers believe bio-pesticides work slower and are less effective than chemicals.
Economic Concerns	High cost and low margins deter retailers from stocking sustainable products.
Influence of Farmers' Demand	Retailers say they rarely promote products farmers don't ask for, demand drives stocking.
Training and Knowledge Gaps	Retailers lack formal training and rely on supplier representatives for information.
Recommendations to Improve Promotion	Retailers suggest government incentives, demonstrations, and margin guarantees.

3.7. LEVEL OF EDUCATION AND STOCKING OF BIO-PESTICIDE

The sample comprised 50 pesticide retailers across the districts. The majority of the retailers (90%) were male and 10% were female. The average age of respondents was 41.6 years (SD = 9.8), with most having completed at least secondary education (82%). Nearly half of the retailers (50%) had over 10 years of experience in agro-input retailing. Cross-tabulations revealed significant relationships between education level and the likelihood of stocking bio-pesticides. Retailers with graduate-level education were nearly twice as likely to stock bio-pesticides compared to those with only secondary or below-secondary education (Table 2).

Table 2

Table 2 Relation Between Education and Bio-Pesticide Stocking

Education Level	Stocks Bio-Pesticides	Percentage	Does Not Stock	Percentage	Total
Below Secondary	3	33.33	6	66.67	9
Secondary	9	39.14	14	60.86	23
Graduate and above	11	61.11	7	38.89	18
Total	23	46	27	54	50

3.8. EXPERIENCE AND STOCKING OF BIO-PESTICIDE

Retailers with more than 10 years of experience were more likely to engage in sustainable advisory services for stocking of bio-pesticide and integrated pest management (IPM) with farmers (Table 3).

Table 3

Table 3 Relation Between Experience and Bio-Pesticide Stocking

Experience Level	Stocks Bio-Pesticides	Percentage	Does Not Stock	Percentage	Total
<5	1	12.5	7	87.5	8
05-Oct	6	35.3	11	64.7	17
>10	16	64	9	36	25
Total	23	46	27	54	50

4. DISCUSSION

The results of this study shed critical light on the multifaceted role of pesticide retailers in influencing the adoption and promotion of sustainable agricultural inputs, particularly bio-pesticides. This discussion interprets the findings in relation to the research objectives and situates them within the broader scholarly and policy discourse on agro-retail systems and sustainable input dissemination.

4.1. AWARENESS-BEHAVIOUR GAP

The survey revealed that while 90% of pesticide retailers were aware of bio-pesticides, only 46% actively stocked them. This gap between awareness and behaviour is consistent with the findings of Van den Berg et al. (2012), who noted that awareness of sustainable practices does not necessarily translate into behavioural change among agro-input dealers due to underlying economic and institutional disincentives.

4.2. INFLUENCE OF ECONOMIC RATIONALITY

Retailers, as rational economic agents, are primarily driven by profit margins, customer preferences and supplier support. Our results affirm that perceived low efficacy (reported by 70%) and insufficient farmer demand (68%) were key barriers. The findings indicated the slow growth in bio-pesticide consumption in India, emphasizing the need for government intervention to promote this sector. The interviews also echoed this sentiment, with retailers expressing apprehension about product shelf-life, customer satisfaction and return on investment.

4.3. WILLINGNESS TO PROMOTE AND CONDITIONAL SUPPORT

While only 30% of retailers reported a strong willingness to promote bio-pesticides, a significant 40% displayed conditional openness. This suggests that with targeted interventions—such as marketing support, training and economic incentives—retailer behaviour could be enhanced toward sustainability. Our finding that retailers with higher education levels showed more willingness to promote sustainable inputs aligns with the work of Asfaw et al. (2012), who observed that better-educated dealers were more responsive to new technologies and public extension messages.

4.4. STRUCTURAL AND INFORMATIONAL BARRIERS

The limited availability of promotional material (only 22% of retailers displayed any) and lack of training support further illustrate structural weaknesses in the current input distribution system. Moreover, our qualitative data revealed that retailers often rely on private pesticide company representatives for information, which biases their knowledge toward chemical solutions. These findings reflect the conclusions of Feder et al. (2010), who underscored the risk of privatized knowledge ecosystems in distorting the sustainability agenda.

4.5. POLICY AND MARKET RECOMMENDATION

Retailers in our study expressed a strong interest in receiving institutional support, including training, demonstrations and guaranteed margins. These

findings align with the recommendations made by the Food and Agriculture Organization. (2021), which emphasized the importance of including retailers as critical actors in sustainable input policy design and implementation. Government interventions that succeeded in increasing organic input sales in states like Sikkim Sarma and Prity (2025) were supported by multi-pronged efforts including retail training, subsidy support and consumer awareness campaigns. These success stories provide a blueprint for scaling similar interventions across other Indian states.

4.6. LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

While the current study provides valuable insights, it is based on a modest sample size and limited geographical scope. Further research with larger, diverse samples across multiple agro-ecological zones in India would be instrumental in validating and refining these findings. Future studies should also investigate the role of digital platforms, e-commerce trends in agro-input retail and the influence of farmer cooperatives on retailer decisions.

5. CONCLUSION

This study has illuminated the critical yet often underexplored role of pesticide retailers in facilitating or impeding the transition toward sustainable agriculture, particularly through the promotion and distribution of bio-pesticides and organic inputs. The findings reveal a nuanced landscape in which high levels of awareness among retailers are not adequately translated into practice, largely due to economic, structural, and informational barriers. The fact that 90% of retailers were aware of bio-pesticides but only 46% stocked them highlights a persistent awareness-behaviour gap, emphasizing that knowledge alone is insufficient to change market practices. Retailers operate within a complex ecosystem shaped by customer demand, supplier influence, economic margins, and regulatory frameworks. Their decisions are primarily governed by rational economic considerations—factors such as product shelf life, perceived efficacy, consumer preferences and profitability. Without incentives and institutional support, most retailers remain reluctant to risk stocking or promoting bio-inputs, even when they recognize their ecological benefits. The study also underscores that retailer willingness is not static but contingent. The 40% of respondents who showed conditional openness to promoting sustainable inputs represent a significant leverage point. These actors could be mobilized through targeted interventions such as training programs, government-backed demonstration trials, assured price margins, and awareness campaigns directed at both farmers and input sellers. Furthermore, qualitative insights from interviews revealed that many retailers desire greater technical support and express willingness to cooperate with government and NGO initiatives—provided their economic risks are mitigated. This suggests that the current policy landscape underutilizes agro-retailers as potential allies in the sustainable agriculture movement. Comparative findings from Indian states such as Kerala, Sikkim and Tamilnadu show that state-driven models that integrate retailers into capacity-building and incentive structures yield tangible shifts in market behaviour. These examples validate the study's central proposition that pesticide retailers, when meaningfully engaged, can be pivotal actors in advancing agro-ecological goals. Thus, this research reaffirms that pesticide retailers should not be seen merely as commercial vendors but as intermediaries of agricultural knowledge, influence and innovation. Policies aimed at promoting sustainable agriculture must acknowledge and harness their strategic position in the input

supply chain. Future reforms should involve them directly through participatory extension, formal training certification programs and reward-based stocking initiatives. Such approaches can bridge the current disconnect between awareness and practice and accelerate the mainstreaming of bio-pesticides in Indian agriculture.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all the pesticide retailers who participated in this study and generously shared their time and insights. My special thanks to the agricultural extension officers and local authorities for their support and cooperation during data collection. I am deeply thankful to the subject experts and reviewers who provided valuable feedback on the questionnaire and interview protocols. Finally, I am grateful to my colleagues and mentors for their continuous support and motivation.

REFERENCES

Asfaw, S., Kassie, M., Simtowe, F., & Lipper, L. (2012). Poverty Reduction Effects of Agricultural Technology adoption: A Micro-evidence from Rural Tanzania. The Journal of Development Studies, 48, 1288–1305. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2012.671475

Ashoka, N., Ravi, K. B., Gajanana, K., Ravi, Y., Rajeshwari, N., & Venkatesh, H. (2018). Analysis of Farmer's Behaviour for Bio-Pesticides in Hyderabad-Karnataka: A Case in Ballari and Koppal Districts. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry, 7(5), 1503–1506.

Centre for Science and Environment. (2021). Pesticide Use and Regulation in India: A CSE report. New Delhi: Centre for Science and Environment.

Feder, G., Murgai, R., & Quizon, J. (2010). Sending Farmers Back to School: The Impact of Farmer Field Schools in Indonesia. Review of Agricultural Economics, 26(1), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9353.2003.00161.x

Food and Agriculture Organization. (2021). Pesticide Retailer Training Manual. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Kumar, S., & Singh, P. (2019). Adoption of Organic Farming Practices in India: Role of Extension and Advisory Services. Indian Journal of Extension Education, 55(4), 10–16.

MANAGE (National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management). (2020). Training Module for Input Dealers Under DAESI Programme. Hyderabad: MANAGE.

Meijer, S. S., Catacutan, D., Ajayi, O. C., Sileshi, G. W., & Nieuwenhuis, M. (2015). The Role of Knowledge, Attitudes and Perceptions in the Uptake of Agricultural and Agroforestry Innovations Among Smallholder Farmers in sub-Saharan Africa. International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 13(1), 40–54. https://doi.org/10.1080/14735903.2014.912493

Peshin, R., Hansra, B. S., Nanda, R., Singh, K., Sharma, R., Bajiya, M. R., & Kumar, R. (2022). Impact of Integrated Pest Management Farmer Field School Programs in the Subtropics of Jammu and Kashmir, India. International

Journal of Pest Management, 70(4), 1315–1330. https://doi.org/10.1080/09670874.2022.2111617

Pretty, J., & Bharucha, Z. P. (2015). Integrated Pest Management for Sustainable Intensification of Agriculture in Asia and Africa. Insects, 6(1), 152–182. https://doi.org/10.3390/insects6010152

Sarma, S., & Prity, K. (2025). A Case Study on Sikkim Sustainability Initiatives and Economic Implications. Indian Journal of Sustainable Development, 11(1).

Singh, A. K., De, H. K., & Pal, P. P. (2015). Training Needs of agro-input Dealers in South 24 Parganas District of West Bengal. Indian Research Journal of Extension Education, 15(2), 7–10.

Van den Berg, H., Zaim, M., Yadav, R. S., Soares, A., Ameneshewa, B., Mnzava, A., Hii, J., Dash, A. P., & Ejov, M. (2012). Global Trends in the use of Insecticides to Control Vector-Borne Diseases. Environmental Health Perspectives, 120(4), 577–582. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1104340

APPENDICES

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RETAILERS

SECTION 1: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1) Name (Optional):
2) Age:
3) Education Level:
4) Years in Business:
5) Location of Shop: Urban / Semi-urban / Rural

SECTION 2: KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS

6) Are you aware of bio-pesticides? (Yes / No)
7) Have you ever sold any bio-pesticide products? (Yes / No)
8) Do you receive product knowledge/training from suppliers? (Often / Sometimes / Never)
9) Rate your understanding of bio-pesticides: (1 = Very Poor, 5 = Excellent)

SECTION 3: ATTITUDES AND WILLINGNESS (LIKERT SCALE 1–5)

(1=Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)

10) I believe bio-pesticides are effective in controlling pests.
11) Farmers are interested in buying bio-pesticides.
12) I would like to promote more sustainable agricultural inputs.
13) Selling bio-pesticides is less profitable than selling chemical pesticides.
14) I would stock more bio-pesticides if there were incentives.
15) Lack of knowledge is a barrier to promoting organic inputs.

INTERVIEW GUIDE (QUALITATIVE QUESTIONS)

1) What are the most popular products sold from your store?
2) How do you usually decide which products to recommend to farmers?
3) What do you know about bio-pesticides and organic inputs?
4) Have you ever recommended them to a farmer? Why or why not?
5) What do farmers usually say about such products?

6) Would you promote bio-pesticides if: a) a company trained you? b) Government provided a subsidy?
7) What are the risks or concerns you have about stocking more bio-products?
8) How would you feel about your role as an agent of sustainable agriculture?