

PERCEPTION OF COTTON FARMERS ON THE EFFECTS OF PESTICIDE USE^{\$\$}

Almaszabeen Badekhan¹ and K Uma Devi¹

¹Department of Agricultural Economics, Agricultural College, Bapatla 522101, Andhra Pradesh

ABSTRACT

Pesticide use is said to have contributed significantly to the food security though, with the decline in crop production and post-harvest losses, there is a growing concern over the ill effect of pesticides on human and animal health, environment, natural resources and sustainability of agriculture production. The farmers in Dharwad district of Karnataka are under the misconception that higher returns could be gained through the use of high doses of pesticides. However, this has resulted in pest resistance, pest resurgence and secondary pest out breaks in the region over the past few years and farmers are only unaware of short term ill effects of pesticides. Likert scaling, which is the most widely used psychometric scale in survey research, was used to study the perception of cotton farmers on pesticide use and Chi-square test was done to study the relationship between levels of perception and independent variables. Almost 90.83 per cent respondents felt that the pesticide use effects human health. Approximately, 52.50 per cent accepted the fact that pesticide kills other organisms and only 10 per cent of the respondents neglected it. When asked further about loss of bio diversity, soil, air and water contamination, pesticide drift and pest resurgence, majority of the respondents didn't know anything about it i.e. 48.33 per cent, 52.50 per cent, 60 per cent and 55 per cent respectively.

Keywords- **cotton production, environment, health, perception, pesticide use, relationship**

*Author for correspondence - Ms. Almaszabeen Badekhan

Email-id- almaszabeen@gmail.com

Institution- Acharya N G Ranga Agricultural University, Agricultural college, Bapatla
Address- House no.24, near Makkah masjid, Madani colony,J.P nagar, Gokul road, Hubli, Karnataka-580030

\$\$ This research paper is drawn from the M.Sc. thesis titled “Economic and Environmental Impact Assessment of Pesticide Usage in Cotton – A Study in Dharwad District of Karnataka” submitted to ANGRAU, Agricultural College, Bapatla in 2017.

INTRODUCTION

Cotton accounts for about 16 per cent of global insecticide usage. Almost one kilogram of hazardous pesticides is applied for every hectare under cotton. A total of one to three per cent of agricultural workers worldwide suffer from acute pesticide poisoning with at least one million requiring hospitalization each year (Environmental Justice Foundation report, 2007). Over the past decade, the perplexities in cotton pest management intensified with more and more insect species developing resistance to insecticides which was a consequence of excessive use of insecticides rendering insecticides ineffective, wastage of resources and consequent environmental pollution.

Farmers are directly involved in the handling of pesticides, are at a high risk through contact with pesticide residues on treated crops, unsafe handling, storage and disposal practices, poor maintenance of spraying equipment, and the lack of protective equipment or failure to use it properly (Litchfield 2005, Matthews 2008). Observational studies of those who work with pesticides has revealed traces of pesticide residues in blood samples of cotton farmers (Mathur et al. 2005, Hayat et al. 2010). Cotton undoubtedly represents one of India’s most important

economic, nutritive and cultural commodities, but its conventional cultivation has become deeply problematic, because of the external costs of its impact on health and environment (Environmental Justice Foundation report, 2007).

Pesticides represent one of the major environmental and public health problems all over the world (Jeyaratnam 1990, Pimentel 2005). In particular, inappropriate use of pesticides has been linked with: (1) adverse effects on non-target organisms (e.g., reduction of beneficial species populations), (2) water contamination from mobile pesticides or from pesticide drift, (3) air pollution from volatile pesticides, (4) injury on non-target plants from herbicide drift, (5) injury to rotational crops from herbicide residues remained in the field, (6) crop injury due to high application rates, wrong application timing or unfavorable environmental conditions at and after pesticide application (Damalas and Eleftherohorinos 2011, Eleftherohorinos, 2008). About 19.4 per cent of the respondents had experienced negative side effects on health after handling pesticides. The symptoms include headache, weakness, dizziness, fever, blurred vision, and nausea/vomiting. Most of the respondents are aware of pesticide-related symptoms and possible routes of absorption during application of pesticides. Farmers make only short-term assessments of pesticides and spray these chemicals without taking proper protective clothing (Shetty *et al.*, 2011).

Visualizing the importance of these issues, the present study therefore, is an attempt in this direction and likely to highlight various issues relating to pesticide usage in cotton

65 production. The specific objective was to study farmers perception on pesticide use. It was
66 carried out with an interview schedule, clear statements about health effects, environment, pest
67 resistance, pest resurgence were asked to the farmers directly of Dharwad district of Karnataka.

68 METHOD

69 In Karnataka, cotton is grown in 8,75,000 hectare with 23,12,000 bales of production and 1793
70 metric tonne of pesticide consumption during 2014-15. Dharwad district of Karnataka occupying
71 an area of 90,497 ha under cotton was purposively selected for the present study. Three taluks i.e
72 Navalgund, Kundagol and Hubli were selected based on maximum area under cotton cultivation.
73 Two villages from each taluk were selected based on the highest number of cotton farmers and
74 maximum area under cotton. Twenty cotton farmers from each village were post stratified into
75 small, medium and large farmers proportionately making a total sample of 120. Primary data on
76 various aspects of sample farmers for 2016-17 agricultural year was collected through field
77 survey by the interview and recall memory method with the help of a pre-tested and well-
78 structured schedule in the month of November and December 2016. Simple averages and
79 percentages were calculated for tabulation of the collected data. Likert scaling, which is a
80 psychometric scale is the most widely used approach to scaling responses in surveys. This
81 technique was used to assess the perception of farmers on the effects of pesticide use in cotton.
82 The response to each perception aspect was recorded as strongly agree (5), agree (4), neutral (3),
83 disagree (2) and strongly disagree (1). To get an overall perception, total scores of all five
84 responses was summed up into three major levels high (45-60), medium (29-44) and low (12-28)
85 perceptions. The relationship between the levels of perception and independent variables was
86 tested using Chi-square test in SPSS version 16.0.

87

RESULTS

88 Farmers perception towards pesticide externalities and health effects was measured in relation to
89 cultural, mechanical and chemical plant protection aspects by Likert scaling. Answer categories
90 for these statements was based on a five-category Likert scale, going from 1 (strongly disagree)
91 to 5 (strongly agree). The survey results are presented in Table 1.

92 Almost all respondents interviewed believed that it is important to use pesticides wisely
93 because of its harmful effects on human and environment. This is a welcome finding from the
94 perspective of reducing the hazards of pesticides. About 9.16 per cent strongly agreed and 81.16
95 per cent agreed that the pesticide use cause effects on human health. The respondents were well
96 aware that pesticides are harmful to the environment and human health. Approximately, 4.16 per
97 cent strongly agreed and 48.33 per cent agreed the fact that pesticide kills other organisms (e.g.
98 beneficial insects, birds, earthworms and fish), only 8.33 per cent and 5.83 per cent of
99 respondents neglected the fact. When asked further about loss of bio diversity, soil, air and water
100 contamination, pesticide drift and pest resurgence, majority of respondents didn't know anything
101 about it i.e. 48.33 per cent, 52.50 per cent, 60.00 per cent and 55.00 per cent respectively. Most
102 of the respondents agreed that pesticide contamination is due to misuse of pesticides i.e. 25.00
103 per cent strongly agreed and 37.50 per cent agreed. Regarding the fact that also pesticide is the
104 solution for pest problem i.e. 27.50 per cent and 41.66 per cent strongly agreed and agreed
105 respectively. 8.33 and 37.50 per cent strongly agreed and agreed to the fact that use of pesticides
106 increase levels of crop yield. Most of the farmers were of the opinion that pesticides were less
107 effective and this persuades them to overuse pesticides. Many respondents were in the habit of
108 eating, drinking and smoking during spraying, 45.00 percent of farmers didn't know about
109 pesticide toxicity. Most of the respondents were unaware of the long term effects of pesticide use

and disagreed and strongly disagreed to it were 40.00 and 24.16 per cent, 37.50 and 25.00 per cent experienced short term illness. Farmers were unaware of long term effects of pesticides on health, beneficial insects, predators, crop and livestock, but they were aware of short term illnesses due to pesticide exposure.

To get an overall perception, total scores of all five responses was summed up into three major levels i.e. high (45-60), medium (29-44) and low (12-28) perceptions. The relationship between the levels of perception and the types of farmer, was found that there is a positive relationship between the levels of perception and all independent variables with Pearson Chi-Square value of 10.91. Factors that had positive relationship were type of farmer, age, education, family size, family type and income. Factors significant at one per cent were age and income.

Table 1 Farmers' perception on pesticide use

S.No	Farmers Percep.	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Str. Disagree (1)
1	Pesticides can cause damage to human health	11 (9.16)	98 (81.16)	7 (2.5)	3 (2.5)	1 (0.83)
2	Pesticides will not only reach the target organisms but will also kill other organisms (e.g. beneficial insects, birds, earthworms, fish) in and around the crop fields	5 (4.16)	58 (48.33)	45 (37.50)	10 (8.33)	2 (1.66)
3	Pesticides cause loss of biodiversity, deaths of wild life, and death of farm animals.	3 (2.50)	30 (25.00)	58 (48.33)	22 (18.33)	7 (5.83)
4	Soil, air and water bodies can easily be contaminated with these poisonous chemicals	8 (6.66)	42 (35.00)	63 (52.50)	5 (4.16)	2 (1.16)
5	Spraying of pesticides during the hottest part of the day when volatilization or drift can damage other	1 (0.83)	16 (13.33)	72 (60.00)	29 (24.166)	2 (1.66)

	garden plants, including our neighbor's.					
6	Pesticides usage causes resurgence of pest population after removing natural enemies.	3 (2.50)	24 (20.00)	66 (55.00)	24 (20.00)	3 (2.50)
7	A major factor of pesticide contamination is the misuse of pesticides	30 (25.00)	45 (37.50)	36 (30.00)	5 (4.17)	4 (3.33)
8	Pesticide use only solves pest problem	33 (27.50)	50 (41.66)	30 (25.00)	7 (0.58)	1 (0.83)
9	Use of pesticides increase levels of crop yield	10 (8.33)	45 (37.50)	40 (33.33)	23 (19.16)	2 (1.16)
10	Eating, drinking and smoking in the field causes increased pesticide toxicity	1 (0.833)	20 (16.66)	54 (45.00)	30 (25.00)	15 (12.50)
11	Long term negative effects of pesticides	5 (4.16)	10 (8.33)	28 (23.33)	48 (40.00)	29 (24.16)
12	Symptoms of acute poisoning with pesticides	30 (25.00)	45 (37.50)	34 (28.33)	7 (5.83)	4 (3.33)

Note: Figures in parentheses indicate percentage to the total

In this study, old farmers had high level of perception as they cared more about their health from Table 2. Higher the income level, higher was the level of perception and hence these farmers had taken proper precautions and used protective clothing. Factors significant at five per cent were different size group farmers and education, where small farmers had low perception than large farmers. Education is the most important factor to determine the level of perception and so higher the education of farmers, higher was their level of perception.

Similar results were also found in Adeola (2012) where the Chi-square results showed that age, education, farming experience and extension contact variable were the significant factors associated with farmers' perception. However, household size had no significant relationship with farmers' perception.

Similar results were found with Selvarajah and Thiruchelvam (2007) in their study where most of the farmers were unaware of the ill effects of pesticides on human health and their opinion was that pesticides are less effective and this makes them to overuse pesticides. Farmers awareness about long term effects was very low, with about 11 per cent of the sample population having an understanding of short term as well as long term effects of pesticides while 36 per cent

Table 2 Relationship between levels of perception and independent variables

S.No.	Independent variables	Pearson Chi-Square	Degrees of freedom	p values
1	Different size group farmers	10.91*	4	0.02
2	Age	12.88**	4	0.01
3	Education	15.93*	8	0.04
4	Family size	5.54	4	0.23
5	Family type	0.63	2	0.73
6	Income	19.46**	4	0.01

*- Significant at the 5per cent level. **- Significant at the 1per cent level

and 53 per cent are in low and medium level of perception. Positive relationship was seen in case of age of crop, income and farming type and negative relationship in case of education, experience, labour, land extent and price of pesticide with farmers level of perception.

DISCUSSION

From the above Likert scaling technique, almost all respondents interviewed believed that it is important to use pesticides wisely because of the harmful effects on human and environment, and most of them also accepted the fact that pesticide kills other organisms. Majority of the respondents didn't know anything about loss of bio diversity, soil, air and water contamination, pesticide drift and pest resurgence but were of the opinion that pesticides are inevitable. Most of the farmers were unaware of long term effects because of less education and awareness. Farmer were under the misconception that higher returns could be gained through the use of high doses of pesticides. Factors influencing levels of perception were different size group or type of farmer, age, education and income. Old age and large farmers were much aware of the pesticides effects than young and small farmers because of their experience.

CONCLUSIONS

The objective of this study was to assess farmers' perception on pesticide use. Almost 90.83 per cent respondents felt that the pesticide use effects human health. Approximately, 52.50 per cent accepted the fact that pesticide kills other organisms and only 10 per cent of the respondents neglected it. When asked further about loss of bio diversity, soil, air and water contamination, pesticide drift and pest resurgence, majority of the respondents didn't know anything.. Farmers were found to have medium perception level. Most of the farmers in the study area were not aware of the health hazards caused by the pesticides and also the consequences of their improper handling. Moreover, the use of appropriate and well-maintained spraying equipment along with taking all the precautions required in all stages of pesticide handling could also reduce exposure to pesticides. To increase the farmer's knowledge and promote good farming practices, field-based agricultural training programs should be encouraged. Governments need to adapt or introduce

regulations and policies that ensure that pesticide risks are minimized, that pesticide use is reduced and that alternative systems and methods are promoted. Regulations and policies need to be based on the latest available knowledge and decision making processes need to be transparent. Introducing restrictions on pesticide use and taxes that internalize external costs into the price of pesticides can foster innovation and the development of alternatives. Research and investments are needed in order to assess and monitor impacts of pesticide use and to develop alternatives.

LITERATURE CITED

Adeola RG. Perceptions of environmental effects of pesticides use in vegetable production by farmers in Ogbomoso, Nigeria. Global Journal of Science Frontier Research Agriculture & Biology. 2012;12(4).

Damalas CA and Eleftherohorinos IG. Pesticide exposure, safety issues and risk assessment indicators. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2011;8:1402-1419.

Eleftherohorinos IG. Weed Science: Weeds, herbicides, environment, and methods for weed management. AgroTypos. 2008. Athens. Greece.

Environmental Justice Foundation (EJF). The deadly chemicals in cotton. A report by Environmental Justice Foundation (2007). Available:ejfoundation.org/report/deadly-chemicals-cotton.

Hayat K, Ashfaq M, Ashfaq U and Saleem MA. Pesticide Knowledge and Safety Practices among Farm Workers in Kuwait: Results of a Survey. African Journal of Environmental Science and Technology. 2010; 4(10): 666-684

188 Jeyaratnam J. Acute pesticide poisoning: A major global health problem. World Health Stat.
189 Q. 1990;43(3):139–144.

190 Litchfield MH. Estimates of acute pesticide poisoning in agricultural workers in less developed
191 countries. Toxicol. Rev. 2005;24 (4):271–278.

192 Matthews GA. Attitudes and behaviors regarding use of crop protection products—A survey of
193 more than 8500 smallholders in 26 countries. Crop Prot. 2008;27(3-5):834–846.

194 Mathur HB, Agarwal HC, Johnson S, Saikia N. Analysis of Pesticide residue in blood samples
195 from village of Punjab. CSE Report, India. 2005.1-15.

196 Pimentel D. Environmental and economic cost of the application of pesticides primarily in the
197 United States. Environ. Dev. Sustain. 2005;7(2):229–252.

198 Selvarajah A and Thiruchelvam S. Factors affecting pesticide use by farmers in Vavuniya
199 district, Tropical Agricultural Research. 2007;19:380-388.

200 Shetty PK, Hiremath MB, Murugan M and Nerli RB. Farmer's health externalities in pesticide
201 use predominant regions in India. World Journal of Science and Technology. 2011;1(4):
202 01-11.