Biotechnology Applications in Agriculture: A Study of Farmers' Perception in Karnataka

Sajeev, M.V.

Scientist (Agril. Ext.), ZPD, Zone – III, ICAR Research Complex for NEH Region, Umiam, Meghalaya

Corresponding author e-mail:sajeevmv@yahoo.co.in

ABSTRACT

The study reveals farmer support for biotechnology applications in agriculture. New indices developed for the study could reveal farmer willingness to pay for GM seeds, to trial in time, to invest additionally and to substitute available area. Farmers were willing to pay 59 percent more over present options for GM seeds and invest an additional 99 percent towards cultivation of GM crops. Majority farmers were willing to substitute their available area with a GM alternative to the tune of 59 percent while most farmers were willing to take up the GM option after observing the performance in fellow farmers' fields for one season. Ongoing research with respect to fourteen biotechnology applications in agriculture was tested for their farmer acceptability. Farmer support was found highest for research on crops requiring lesser chemical fertilizers. This was followed by support for crops requiring less water for growth, crops having longer shelf life periods, drought tolerant crops and salinity tolerant crops respectively. The study reveals that contrary to popular belief and media projections, farmers are supportive of biotechnology applications in Indian agriculture provided the projected advantages are realized in field. The findings will serve researchers, industry and Government in developing biotech communication strategies, pricing, production and timing of market entry as well as development of GM crops based on farmer needs in future. It is recommended that current policies with respect to GM crops be fine tuned with a positive and futuristic outlook in the larger interest of Indian agriculture and farmers.

Keywords: *Biotechnology application; Farmer support; GM Crops; Indian farmers;*

India has become the focal point of one of the biggest GM debate. All major stakeholders have joined in the debate, on whether to fully introduce GM crops into the nation's agriculture (*GreenBio, 2009*). But much of this debate lacks science or the voice of scientists. The media in India has also exhibited an irresponsible approach by continuously publishing poorly researched articles.

India approved commercial cultivation of Bt Cotton from 2002. Of the 6.3 million hectares of hybrid cotton in India in 2006, which represents 70% of all the cotton, 60% or 3.8 million hectares was Bt cotton - a remarkably high proportion in a fairly short period of five years (*APCoAB, 2006*). Also, India has doubled its production in the last five years and has crossed the US last year to become the second largest cotton producer in the world. It is expected to overtake China to become the biggest producer (*Gurcharan, 2007*).

Almost a decade after introduction of Bt cotton, India is looking forward to the introduction of Bt Brinjal. Scientists are currently experimenting with GM mustard, cabbage, cauliflower, brinjal (aubergine/egg plant), potato, tomato, ground nut and rice (*Sajeev, 2006*). According to *Swaminathan (2005*), among the frontier technologies relevant to the next stage in our agricultural revolution, the foremost is agricultural biotechnology. The work already performed in India has revealed the potential for breeding new GM crop varieties possessing tolerance to salinity, drought and some major pests and diseases, together with improved nutritive quality. However GM foods are predicted to have many disastrous effects on the economy and society of such a struggling nation (P*aarlberg, 2002*).

There is an inverse association between consumers' perceived risks and perceived benefits (*Alhakami & Slovic, 1994 and Siegrist, 1999*). It

has been suggested that the negative correlation shows that people fail to consider the dimensions of risks and benefits separately *(Alhakami & Slovic, 1994)*. In other words, those that perceive high risks would tend also to perceive low benefits from GM crops.

According to *Hoban (1999)* majority of American and Japanese population remain positive about the use of biotechnology. About three quarters of the Japanese consumers support the use of biotechnology in agriculture. In an extensive international study of public perceptions of biotechnology conducted by *Environics International (2000),* almost three-fifths of the people surveyed in the Americas, Asia and Oceania agreed that the benefits of the use of biotechnology outweigh the risks. Following the psychometric paradigm, risk researchers analyzed the cognitive structure underlying the risk perception of the lay public with respect to potential hazards containing different risk characteristics (*Fischhoff et al, 1978*). According to findings based on empirical research, qualitative risk characteristics like personal control, voluntariness, familiarity, expected consequences of potential hazards; etc determines the public perception of risk (*Slovic et al, 1985*). Level of education also results in a better capacity to identify risks as well as benefits (*Berrier, 1987*). It has been argued that ability to process information also influences risk and benefit perception; this ability is presumed to be related to level of education (*Steenkamp, 1997*) although the direction of the effect is somewhat ambiguous. Perceived knowledge about GM crops is also expected to have an influence on risk-benefit perceptions. It is hypothesized that people perceive risks that are familiar to them as lower than those that are unfamiliar (*Miller, 1998*), suggesting a negative association between perceived knowledge and perceived risk. Semantic images associated with the meaning of technological risks (e.g. pending danger, slow killers, cost/benefit ratio, avocational thrill, etc.) (*Rohrmann and Renn, 2000*) and immediate affect (*Finucane et. al., 2000*) also determines the perception.

Ravenswaay (1995) concluded that trust in government and industry may be a more important influence on risk perception than the inherent safety or the danger of a particular agrichemical. This view holds true and is reflected by the American consumer's continued positive attitudes toward biotechnology. Several surveys have shown that trust in regulatory authorities is higher in the United States than in Europe. In contrast, Europeans trust the government regulatory system less than Canadians or Americans, preferring international regulatory agencies (*Einsiedel, 1997*).

Risk-benefit perceptions are hypothesized to be related to people's trust in the source of information also. It can be anticipated that because government and the food industry promote a generally positive message about GM technology (*FAO, 2000*), people who trust these information sources will perceive lower risks and higher benefits. By contrast, environmental groups tend to paint a bleak picture of GM technology, so trust in these organizations should lead to higher risk and lower benefit perceptions (*Verdurme et. al, 2001*).

In India, not much scientific studies have been conducted on farmer support towards GM Crops. In a study conducted by *Sajeev and Gangadharappa (2006)* in villages of Karnataka, a meager 2.5 per cent of farmers showed awareness regarding biotechnology and its applications in agriculture. Being that Indian government has to make many key decisions regarding GM crops, it is ideal time for farmers' support towards various biotechnology applications in agriculture be studied.

METHODOLOGY

Locale, survey instrument and data collection: The Bangalore rural district of Karnataka state of India was sensitized towards the concept of GM food crops and other biotechnology applications in agriculture. The work was done under the project; 'Improving nutritional quality of food through biotechnology approaches' initiated in 2004 as a partnership between Purdue University, USA and University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore, India and funded by USAID-ALO. Three villages from this district namely Heggadehalli, Venketanahalli and Shettihalli were selected after initial survey and PRA exercises by the international project team during late 2005. Extensive biotechnology awareness programmes (focusing mostly on Bt Brinjal and Bt Tomato) were conducted in these villages till completion of first phase of project in early 2008. For the present study data was collected randomly from 120 farm families out of the

256 families living in these villages. An original simple survey instrument was developed in consultation with social science and life science experts of University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore, India and Purdue University, USA. Respondents were asked to recall the biotechnology awareness programmes conducted in their village before introducing them to the questions on biotechnology awareness and GM readiness.

Contingent Valuation Method (CVM) was used to study the farmers' willingness to pay (WTP) for GM seeds. We have used or rather modified the CVM to develop three more willingness indices namely Willingness to Substitute available area (WTS), Willingness to Invest additionally (WTI) and Willingness to Trial in Time (WTT).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-personal profile of the farmers : The socio personal profile of farmers is compiled in Table 1 and the major findings are explained below:

The mean age of the respondents in the study area was found to be 42 to 43 years (42.7) with middle age group dominating with 71.7 per cent. The mean family size in the study area was found to be of 5 to 6 members. Medium sized families dominated with three fourth of the population (75%).

Respondents seemed evenly distributed with respect to education level with almost two fifth (19.2%) illiterate, one eighth can only read and write (11.7%), two fifth having primary education, 18.3 per cent having secondary education, 17.5 per cent with SSLC, one eighth passing PUC and only a meager 4.2 per cent having a degree or higher qualifications.

Mean farming experience (in years) was found to be 21 to 22 years with majority (67.5%) having medium farming experience. Mean area under cultivation was found to be 2 to 3 acres with a great majority (90%) having medium sized farm land, followed by the remaining 10 per cent having large holdings.

Slightly less than two third of the population recorded medium trust in agencies followed by high (22.5%) and low (15.0%) trust leading to a vast majority (81.7%) having only low level of extension participation. This is due to the fact that public research and extension system in India has put up a poor performance in recent times.

Table 1. Socio-personal profile of the farmers (N=120)

Independent variables	Mean	SD	Category	Respondents	
				No.	%
Age	42.70	11.03	Young	15	12.5
			Middle age	86	71.7
			Old	19	15.8
Family size	5.83	1.93	Small	13	10.8
			Medium	90	75.0
			Large	17	14.2
Level of Education	3.62	1.77	Illiterate	23	19.2
			Can read and write	10	8.3
			Primary	24	20.0
			Secondary	22	18
			High School	21	17.5
			Sec./Inter	15	12.5
			Graduation & above	5	4.2
Experience in farming	21.27	10.64	Low	24	20.0
			Medium	81	67.5
			High	15	12.5
Area under agriculture	2.64	2.48	Small	0	0.0
			Medium	108	90.0
			Large	12	10.0
Extension participation	4.63	3.78	Low	98	81.7
			Medium	0	0.0
			High	22	18.3
Level of aspiration	2.19	1.12	Low	32	26.7
			Medium	74	61.7
			High	14	11.6
Cosmopo-liteness	5.62	5.67	Low	0	0.0
			Medium	97	80.8
			High	23	19.2
Risk taking ability	4.23	2.68	Low	4	3.33
			Medium	81	67.5
			High	35	29.2
Trust in agencies	21.61	7.36	Low	18	15.0
			Medium	75	62.5
			High	27	22.5
Mass media usage	1.49	3.66	Low	10	8.3
			Medium	86	71.7
			High	24	20.0
GM awareness	1.15	0.90	Not Aware	14	11.7
			Low	8	6.66
			Moderate	79	65.8
			High	19	15.8

A majority (61.7%) of the population had medium aspiration level followed by others. In case of Cosmopoliteness, a four fifth majority of the population

had only medium cosmopoliteness. Subsistence farming calls for medium cosmopoliteness only thereby explaining the result.

A two third majority of the farmers had medium risk taking ability followed by around 30 percent of the farmers having high risk taking ability and a meager portion registering low risk taking ability. Mass media usage was found to be medium in a vast majority (71.7%) and high among one fifth of the population followed by low in a meager 8.3 per cent of the population.

Moderate GM awareness was found among two third of the population (65.8%) while 15.8 per cent had high and a meager 6.66 per cent reported low GM awareness. It was noted that around one tenth (11.7%) of the population didn't report any GM awareness. The only channel through which these villagers could gather information and awareness about GM technology or biotechnology was through their participation in the focus group meetings and lecture classes conducted by USAID ALO project scientists. Since this has not happened much in reality as seen in the case of low extension participation it in turn has lead to the moderate GM awareness.

Economic profile and willingness indices of farmers: Mean annual investment in agriculture was found to be Rs. 8495.83/- with almost all farmers belonging to medium investment category (Table 2). Mean long term investment in agriculture was found to be Rs. 44495.83/-. Economic motivation was found to be medium among great majority (85.8%) of the population followed by others. Through generations the farmers in the study area have resorted to subsistence farming which yields only modest results. Hence; the farmers are tuned towards medium economic motivation.

Willingness to Pay (WTP) was found to be low among more than half of the respondents while 16.7 per cent had medium and one eighth of the farmers had high WTP. More than one eighth of the population had no willingness to pay. The mean WTP above the price of the ordinary seed varieties was found to be 59 per cent. The results show the poor financial condition prevailing in the farm families as well as their aversion to take risk in investing more.

The above findings augur badly for any agency aiming at high profit business through sale of GM seeds in future. It calls upon the public sector to rise to the occasion to provide cheaper and affordable varieties of GM food crops to the Indian farmers. Public or private, the agencies involved in development and marketing of GM crops in future can price their seeds based on the price ranges that the farmers are willing to pay as revealed b y this study. Willingness to Substitute available area (WTS) was found to be medium among nearly three fifth of the respondents while the remaining 27.5 and 6.66 per cent of the population had high and low WTS respectively. Mean WTS for the prospective GM

Table 2. Economic profile and willingness indices of farmers (N=120)

Independent variables	Mean	SD	Category	Respondents	
				No.	%
Annual investment in agriculture	8495.83	15124.21	Low	0	0.0
			Medium	112	93.3
			High	8	6.7
Long term investment in agriculture	44495.83	83736.85	Low	0	0.0
			Medium	25	20.8
			High	95	79.2
Economic motivation	13.49	1.73	Low	12	10.0
			Medium	103	85.8
			High	5	4.2
Willingness To Pay (WTP)	Mean WTP for GM seeds above the ordinary seed price (%) 59		No WTP	17	14.2
			Low (‹50%)	68	56.7
			Medium (51-100%)	20	16.7
			High (›100%)	15	12.5
Willingness To Substitute available area (WTS)	Mean area available for substitution (%) 59		No WTS	8	6.66
			Low	8	6.66
			Medium	71	59.1
			High	33	27.5
Willingness To Invest additionally (WTI)	Mean WTI for GM crop cultivation above the ordinary variety (%) 99		No WTI	6	5
			Low (‹50%)	24	20
			Medium (51-100%)	72	60
			High (›100%)	18	15
Willingness To Trial in Time (WTT)			Not willing	14	11.6
			Undecided	2	1.66
			Third season	8	6.66
			Second season	69	57.5
			First season	27	22.5

crop was found to be 59 per cent. The results show the aversion of farmers to take risk by substituting their available farm area for a GM alternative.

The significance of the above results lies in the fact that on a broad scale, agencies will be able to quantify the demand for GM seeds based on the willingness to substitute available area reported by farmers. Accordingly, agencies can go for rough estimates of seed replacement rates expected and can augment their production pertaining to the trends made available here. The results give a preliminary idea of what level of initial response agencies can expect for their GM seeds. Mean Willingness to Invest additionally (WTI) for GM crop cultivation above the ordinary variety was found to be 99 per cent with three fifth of the population reporting medium WTI. While one fifth of the respondents reported low WTI, 15 per cent had high WTI and a meager 5 per cent reported a complete 'NO WTI'. Although WTP for GM seeds was found moderate (59%), farmers have recorded very high WTI on management costs (99%). This reflects the farmer readiness to cultivate GM crops confirming to the prescribed package of practices for these crops. It should also be noted that they are willing for the same upon the hope that their choice of a GM alternative should reap success at any cost. Hence, the findings call for increased technology performance assurance on part of public and private sector agencies.

Regarding Willingness to Trial in Time (WTT), nearly three fifth of the farmers were ready to trial a GM crop only in the second season/opportunity while around one fourth plans to try it in the first season/ opportunity itself. While 6.66 per cent were willing to take up GM in the third season, 11.6 per cent were not at all willing to cultivate it and the remaining 1.66 per cent was undecided. It should be noted that a striking proportion (25%) of the farming population have identified themselves as '*innovators*' with respect to readiness in adopting GM technologies. These innovators are followed by a majority (60%) who belong to the 'early adopter' category. This is contrast with the classical 'adopter category' classification by Rogers in which generally we find only 3.5 percent and 13.5 percent of farmers in falling under 'innovator' and 'early adopter' categories respectively. The findings hold good for public as well as private research institutions who aim for mass popularization of GM crops in future.

Extent of farmer support for biotechnology applications in agriculture : The extent of farmer support for ongoing biotechnology research in agriculture is depicted in Table 3. The support was highest for crops requiring lesser chemical fertilizers with 92.5 per cent of the farmers supporting it. This is due to the fact that fertilizer costs are not affordable by small and marginal farmers and hence research on GM crops requiring less chemical fertilizers was widely supported.

Applications like crops requiring less water for growth, crops having long shelf life periods, drought

Table 3. Extent of farmer support for ongoing biotechnology research in agriculture (N=120)

S. No.	Ongoing biotechnology research in agriculture	Support		Neutral		Oppose	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Nutritionally enhanced cereals like Golden rice	93	77.5	14	11.7	13	10.8
2.	Nutritionally enhanced vegetables and fruits	87	72.5	23	19.2	10	8.3
3.	Crops requiring less water for growth	110	91.7	2	1.6	8	6.7
4.	Crops requiring lesser pesticides	107	89.2	13	10.8	0	0
5.	Crops requiring lesser chemical fertilizers	111	92.5	9	7.5	0	0
6.	Crops containing hormones for better human health	56	46.7	19	15.8	45	37.5
7.	Crops containing vaccines against human diseases	46	38.3	3	2.5	71	59.2
8.	Crops having long shelf life periods	110	91.7	2	1.6	8	6.7
9.	Protein enriched tubers	88	73.3	27	22.5	5	4.2
10.	Protein enriched cereals	88	73.3	27	22.5	5	4.2
11.	Drought tolerant crops	110	91.7	2	1.6	8	6.7
12.	Saline tolerant crops	110	91.7	2	1.6	8	6.7
13.	Herbicide tolerant crops	107	89.2	13	10.8	0	0
14.	Crops with terminator seeds	0	0	10	7.5	110	92.5

tolerant crops and saline tolerant crops garnered support from 91.7 per cent of the farmers and stood second. This is due to the fact that water has become a scarce resource and also farmers in India don't have an institutionalized cold chain support there by incurring huge losses every time perishable crops suffer a price crash. Salinity has rendered much area in India uncultivable and hence the wide support for that application. Research on crops requiring lesser pesticides and herbicide tolerant crops were closely supported by 89.2 per cent of the farmers while nutritionally enhanced cereals (77.5%) and nutritionally enhanced vegetables and fruits (72.5%) also got wide support. Pesticide applications take a major chunk of the farming expenses incurred by the poor farmers in this village and the idea of crops requiring fewer pesticide applications was readily accepted and supported. Herbicide tolerance was supported as a 'utility idea' while the promises of nutritional enhancement through biotechnology has fascinated the imagination of the villagers contributing to the excellent support. The same principle worked in case of support for protein enriched tubers and cereals. Crops containing hormones were supported by only 46.7 per cent and crops containing vaccines by only a mere 38.3 per cent. In the above two cases, the idea of inserting genes producing hormones and vaccines in to edible crops was viewed with suspicion and fear which has resulted in low support.

Crops with terminator seeds were not supported by any farmer with almost all farmers (92.5%) fully opposing research and development of that application. This is due to the fact that terminator application was viewed as a threat to the basis of agriculture itself where a farmer who cultivates a crop is not allowed to take the seeds of his crop for raising the next crop. This is part of a global agenda of multinational seed giants to cheat the poor farmers of the developing countries there by making them dependent on the companies for seeds in every subsequent cropping season. Hence this research on this application was vehemently opposed by the farmers by using their commonsense.

CONCLUSION

The study reveals that contrary to popular belief and media projections, farmers are highly supportive of biotechnology applications in Indian agriculture. Orchestrated bashing of scientific institutions and their findings by NGOs and media has pushed the scientific facts to background. Policy makers have to take note of scientific studies by reputed agencies and their results so as to reorient the current research and policies with respect to GM crops in the larger interest of Indian agriculture and farmers.

Paper received on : April 19, 2011
Accepted on : June 11, 2010

REFERENCES

1. Alhakami, A.S. and Slovic, P. (1994). A psychological study of the inverse relationships between perceived risk and perceived benefit. Risk Analysis, pp. 14: 1085-1096.
2. APCoAB. (2006). Bt Cotton in India – A status report, asia pacific consortium on agricultural biotechnology, New Delhi, India. p. 34
3. Berrier, R.J. (1987). Public perceptions of biotechnology. In L. Batra and W. Klassen (Eds.), public perception of biotechnology, Bethesda, MD: Agricultural Research Institute. pp. 37-51.
4. Einsiedel, E.F. (1997). Biotechnology and the canadian public: report on a 1997 National Survey and Some International Comparisons. University of Calgary, Alberta.
5. Environics International. (2000). International environmental monitor 2000, Toronto, Canada.
6. Finucane, M. L., Alhakami, A., Slovic. P. and Johnson, S. M. (2000). The affect heuristic in judgments of risks and benefits. *J. Behavioral Decision Making*, **13**: 1-17.
7. Fischhoff, B., Slovic, P. and Lichtenstein, S. (1978). How safe is safe enough? A psychometric study of attitudes towards technological risks and benefits. Policy Sciences, 9 pp. 127-52.
8. Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN and World Health Organization, (2000). Safety aspects of genetically modified foods of plant origin (Report of a joint FAO/WHO expert consultation on foods derived from biotechnology). Geneva: FAO/WHO.

9. GreenBio. (2009). India – The GM debate, available online at: http://greenbio.checkbiotech.org/news/india_gm_debate
10. Gurcharan Das. (2007). Let biotech crops bloom, Men and Ideas, The Times of India, 04-11-2007
11. Hoban, T.J. (1999). Consumer attitudes. Presented at Ag . West Conference.
12. Miller, H. (1998). The emotional response to risks: Inevitable but not unmanageable. *Ag. Bio Forum.* **1** (1): 14-16. http://www.agbioforum.org.
13. Paarlberg, R. (2002) The real threat to GM crops in poor countries: Consumer and policy resistance to GM foods in rich countries, Food Policy, pp. 247-250.
14. Ravenswaay, E.O. (1995). Public perceptions of agrichemicals. Council for Agricultural Science and Technology task force report. Ames, Iowa. p. 34.
15. Rohrmann, B. and Renn, O. (2000). Risk perception research – an introduction. In: Cross-Cultural Risk Research. A Survey of Empirical Studies, eds. O. Renn and B. Rohrmann. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
16. Sajeev, M.V. and Gangadharappa, N.R. (2006). Trends in biotechnology awareness, support towards biotechnology applications, willingness to cultivate GM crops and conviction among Indian farmers, In: Abstracts of International Conference on Biotechnology Approaches for Alleviating Malnutrition and Human Health, Bangalore, India, p. 136.
17. Sajeev, M.V. (2006). Scientists perception and farmers readiness towards GM crops. PhD Thesis (Unpub), University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore, India, pp. 5-6.
18. Siegrist, M. (1999). A causal model explaining the perception and acceptance of gene technology. *J. Applied Social Psychology*, **29** : 2093-2106.
19. Slovic, P., Fischhoff, B. and Lichtestein, S. (1985). Characterizing perceived risk. In: Perilous Progress: managing the hazards of technology, eds. R. W. Kates, C. Hohenemser, and J. X. Kasperson. Boulder: Westview.
20. Steenkamp, J.B.E.M. (1997). Dynamics in consumer behaviour with respect to agricultural and food products. In B. Wierenga, et al. (Eds.), Agricultural Marketing and Consumer Behavior in a Changing World (pp. 143-188). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
21. Swaminathan, M.S. (2005). Ever green revolution and sustainable food security, Agricultural biotechnology: Finding common international goals, NABC Report 16, Ithaca, New York. pp. 63.
22. Verdurme, A., Gellynck, X., and Viaene, J. (2001). Consumers' acceptability of GM food. 71st EAAE Seminar — The Food Consumer in the 21st Century, Zaragoza, Spain.