

AN EVALUATION OF THE ADOPTION OF  
INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT IN PADDY FARMING  
IN  
BATTICALOA DISTRICT OF SRI LANKA.

BY

THIAGARAJAH RAMILAN

A RESEARCH REPORT

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE ADVANCED COURSE



IN  
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF THE BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN AGRICULTURE.

FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE,  
EASTERN UNIVERSITY, SRI LANKA,  
CHENKALADY.



FAG90



Project Report  
Library - EUSL

1996

APPROVED BY

30395

*Rugivam*

SUPERVISOR

DR (MS). J. NADARAJAH,

SENIOR LECTURER,

DEPARTMENT OF AGRIC. ECONOMICS,

FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE,

EASTERN UNIVERSITY, SRI LANKA.

HEAD/AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRIC. ECONOMICS

FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE,

EASTERN UNIVERSITY, SRI LANKA.



## ABSTRACT.

Paddy farmers, in general, perceive pesticides as important inputs in rice production. Indiscriminate use of pesticides resulted in the environmental, economic and health problems. This is the rational for IPM technology. IPM is based on the premise that better agronomic practices, maintenance of agro ecosystem and integration of various pest control methods into cohesive strategies. IPM emphasizes the use of natural control mechanisms and reduction in the use of chemical pesticides. CARE International conducted training on the aspects of IPM via FARMER FIELD SCHOOLS (FFS), a non formal educational method of FAO, in order to impart IPM knowledge to paddy farmers in Porathievu Pattu Divisional Secretariat Division.

The study attempted to asses the impact of IPM training in terms of trained farmers awareness and adoption of IPM practices and the Diffusion of IPM techniques from trained farmers to untrained farmers and consequent adoption of IPM practices.

The data was collected by interviewing a stratified random sample of 60 paddy farmers from the programme implemented localities of Batticaloa district and from various secondary sources.

The farmer training method (FFS) used in the programme has contributed substantially to knowledge acquisition of IPM. The concept of IPM has not reached sufficiently to untrained farmers. Role of other extension sources in the dissemination of IPM was

poor. Most of the trained farmers have adopted IPM techniques. The adoption of IPM has reduced the cost of pest control substantially and increased the yield level.

Limitations are identified in the adoption of IPM such as restrictions in the availability of inputs mainly water and fertilizer and non adoption of IPM by neighboring farmers.

Trained farmers recognized the economic and environmental benefits of IPM. This will contribute to the sustainability of IPM.

The study recommends follow up programmes have to be conducted to reinforce the concepts of IPM and to achieve better understanding. Farmer organizations have to be established or reactivated as IPM can effectively be progressed via the collective action of farmers. Limitations in the accessibility of infrastructures such as input supply and marketing have to be eliminated. Further research should be carried out to assess the impact of training on the awareness, adoption and diffusion of IPM and on the development of technologies for IPM.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Pages
Abstract.	i
Acknowledgment.	iii
Table of Contents.	iv
List of Tables.	viii
List of Figures.	ix
List of Appendices.	x
Abbreviations and Acronyms.	xi
 CHAPTER I	
1. INTRODUCTION.	1
1.1. Central Theme of the Thesis.	1
1.2. Agriculture in the Economy of Sri Lanka.	2
1.3. The Role of IPM in Agricultural Development.	3
1.4. IPM Programmes in Batticaloa District.	4
1.5. Objectives of the Study.	6
1.6. Plan of Succeeding Chapters.	6
1.7. Limitations of the Study.	7
 CHAPTER II	
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	8
2.1. Use of pesticides in Agriculture.	8
2.1.1. Pesticide use in Sri Lanka.	9
2.2. Consequences of indiscriminate pesticide use in Agriculture.	9
2.2.1. Adverse effects on ecology.	9
2.2.2. Adverse effects on human beings.	10
2.2.3. Ban on toxic pesticides in Sri Lanka.	10



2.3. Emergence of Integrated Pest Management.	10
2.3.1. Traditional Pest Management Practices and IPM.	12
2.3.2. Contribution of IPM towards Sustainable Agriculture.	12
2.4. Dissemination of IPM knowledge to farmers.	13
2.4.1. Importance of farmer participation.	13
2.4.2. Role of Agricultural extension in the Dissemination of Knowledge.	13
2.4.3. Method of dissemination of IPM.	14
2.4.4. Role of NGOs in the dissemination of IPM.	15
2.5. Adoption of IPM.	15
2.5.2. Adoption of IPM in Sri Lanka.	16
2.5.2. Adoption of IPM in other countries.	17
2.5.3. Problems in Adoption of IPM.	18
2. 6. Evaluation.	20

### CHAPTER III

3.1. METHOD OF ANALYSIS.	21
3.1. Description of the study area.	21
3.2. Population.	23
3.3. Sampling procedure.	23
3.4. Sample.	24
3.5. Method of Data collection.	25
3.6. Analytical procedure.	26

## CHAPTER IV

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.	29
4.1. Socio economic conditions.	29
4.1.1. Level of education.	30
4.1.2. Farming experience.	31
4.1.3. Nature of ownership.	32
4.1.4. Extent of Cultivation.	33
4.2. Dissemination of knowledge on IPM.	34
4.2.1. IPM Farmer Field Schools (FFS) by CARE International.	34
4.2.2. Other sources of information on IPM.	34
4.2.3. Access to technical advice on field problems.	35
4.3. Awareness and Adoption of IPM practices.	36
4.3.1. Crop sanitation.	36
4.3.2. Land preparation.	36
4.3.3. Crop establishment.	39
4.3.4. Fertilizer application.	43
4.3.5. Water management.	47
4.3.6. Weed control.	49
4.3.7. Incidence of pest attack	51
4.3.8. Pest control.	51
4.3.8.1. Biological control.	52
4.3.8.2. Use of Medicinal plants.	54
4.3.8.3. Chemical control.	54
4.3.9. Pesticide safety.	58
4.3.10. Harvesting and Threshing.	61
4.3.11. Storage.	62
4.3.12. Production and Marketing.	63
4.3.13. Problems in Adoption.	63