


Pesticides, rice productivity, and farmers' health

an economic assessment

Agnes C. Rola and Prabhu L. Pingali



IRRI
INTERNATIONAL RICE RESEARCH INSTITUTE



WORLD
RESOURCES
INSTITUTE

First printing, 1993
Second printing, 1994

2,000 copies
2,000 copies

Pesticides, rice productivity, and farmers' health

an economic assessment

Agnes C. Rola and Prabhu L. Pingali

1993

IRRI

INTERNATIONAL RICE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

P.O. Box 933, Manila 1099,
Philippines



WORLD
RESOURCES
INSTITUTE

1709 New York Avenue N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20006, USA

The International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) was established in 1960 by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations with the help and approval of the Government of the Philippines. Today IRRI is one of the 18 nonprofit international research centers supported by the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). The CGIAR is sponsored by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Its membership is comprised of 50 donor countries, international and regional organizations, and private foundations.

IRRI receives support, through the CGIAR, from a number of donors, including the Asian Development Bank, the European Economic Community, the Ford Foundation, the International Development Research Centre, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the OPEC Special Fund, the Rockefeller Foundation, UNDP, the World Bank, and the international development assistance agencies of the following governments: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, India, Iran, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Mexico, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and United States.

The responsibility for this publication rests with the International Rice Research Institute.

Copyright © International Rice Research Institute 1993.

All rights reserved. Except for quotations of short passages for the purpose of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in retrieval systems, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior permission of IRRI. This permission will not be unreasonably withheld for use for noncommercial purposes. IRRI does not require payment for the noncommercial use of its published works, and hopes that this copyright declaration will not diminish the bona fide use of its research findings in agricultural research and development.

The designations employed in the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IRRI concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city, or area, or of its authorities, or the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Contents

Foreword **vii**

Acknowledgments **ix**

Chapter 1 Introduction and overview of conclusions **1**

1.1 Study objectives **3**

1.2 Data sources **3**

1.3 Overview of conclusions **4**

Chapter 2 Pest-related yield losses in rice: reality and perceptions **7**

2.1 Farmers' perceptions and pest management practices **7**

2.2 Researchers' perceptions of pest-related yield losses **9**

2.2.1 Evidence from multiperiod, multilocation studies **12**

2.2.1.1. Pesticide evaluation trials **12**

2.2.1.2. Constraint experiments at IRRI **13**

2.2.1.3. Insecticide check method **13**

2.3 Policymakers' perceptions **15**

Chapter 3 Crop protection technologies **19**

3.1 Prophylactic chemical control **19**

3.2 Natural control **20**

3.3 Varietal resistance **20**

3.4 Cultural control **21**

3.4.1 Cultivation and rotation **22**

3.4.2 Timing of planting and harvesting **22**

3.4.3 Variation of plant density **22**

3.4.4 Nutrient use **22**

3.5 Integrated pest management **23**

3.6 Economic analysis of crop protection technologies **25**

Chapter 4	A profile of pesticide use for rice	31
4.1	The study site	31
4.2	Pesticide use profile by rice farmers	32
4.2.1	Frequency of insecticide applications	32
4.2.2	Quantity of insecticide use	32
4.2.3	Timing of insecticide applications	34
4.2.4	Types of insecticides used by rice farmers	35
4.3	Safety and storage practices	37
4.3.1	Handling and reentry intervals	37
4.3.2	Pesticide storage and disposal practices by farmers	38
4.3.3	Sprayer use and maintenance	39
4.4	Incidence of insecticide poisoning among rice farm households	39
Chapter 5	Choice of crop protection technologies under risk: an expected utility maximization framework	41
5.1	Background literature	41
5.2	Methodology	43
5.2.1	Theoretical framework	44
5.2.2	Estimation procedure	44
5.2.2.1	Yield distribution function	44
5.2.2.2	Net benefit or profit function	45
5.2.2.3	Expected utility function	45
5.2.3	Data set and methods of collection	47
5.3	Analysis of findings	48
5.3.1	Regression results	48
5.3.2	Analysis of yield estimates	50
5.3.3	Analysis of net benefits and certainty equivalents	51
5.3.4	Sensitivity analysis	53
5.3.4.1	Input price change	53
5.3.4.2	Output price change	54
Chapter 6	Pesticide exposure, farmers' health, and choice of pest control technologies	55
6.1	Health problems and long-term exposure to pesticides	55
6.1.1	Eye effects	55
6.1.2	Skin effects	56
6.1.3	Respiratory tract effects	56
6.1.4	Cardiovascular effects	57
6.1.5	Gastrointestinal tract effects	57
6.1.6	Neurological effects	57
6.1.7	Hematologic effects	57

- 6.2 Evidences of health impairments among rice farmers due to pesticide exposure **58**
 - 6.2.1 Eye effects **58**
 - 6.2.2 Skin effects **59**
 - 6.2.3 Respiratory tract effects **59**
 - 6.2.4 Cardiovascular effects **59**
 - 6.2.5 Neurological effects **59**
- 6.3 Reestimating expected utility function incorporating health costs due to pesticide exposure **60**
 - 6.3.1 Theoretical framework **60**
 - 6.3.2 The health cost model and estimation procedure **61**
 - 6.3.3 Data set and method of collection **61**
 - 6.3.4 Analysis of results **62**
 - 6.3.4.1. Health cost function **62**
 - 6.3.4.2. New estimates of net benefits and certainty equivalents of treatments **63**

Chapter 7 IPM implementation in the Philippines: a policy overview **65**

- 7.1 IPM in rice in the Philippines **65**
 - 7.1.1 Institutional structure relating to IPM **66**
- 7.2 Redesigning IPM programs **68**
 - 7.2.1 Varietal resistance/durable technology **69**
 - 7.2.1.2 Biocontrol **69**
 - 7.2.1.3 Botanicals as alternative to chemicals **69**
 - 7.2.1.4 Pesticide handler/user safety research **70**
 - 7.2.1.5 On-farm analyses of residues **70**
 - 7.2.2 Extension delivery system in support of IPM **70**
- 7.3 Community action **71**
 - 7.3.1 Synchronizing cultural management practices **72**
 - 7.3.2 Scouting program to enhance IPM **73**
- 7.4 Pesticide-pricing policies and IPM **74**
- 7.5 Constraints to IPM implementation **76**
 - 7.5.1 Institutional constraints **77**
 - 7.5.2 Informational constraints **77**
 - 7.5.3 Technological constraint **77**
 - 7.5.4 Sociological constraints **78**
 - 7.5.5 Economic constraints **78**
 - 7.5.6 Political constraints **78**

Chapter 8 Regulating pesticide use in Philippine agricultural production: some policy considerations **81**

- 8.1 Agricultural productivity and pesticide regulations: an analytical framework **81**

8.2	The Philippine pesticide regulatory policy: current status	82
8.2.1	Registration of new pesticides	83
8.2.2	Restrictions on availability and use	83
8.2.3	Pesticides for institutional use only	84
8.2.4	Licensing	84
8.2.5	Maximum residue limits on foods and feeds	84
8.2.6	Post-registration activities	85
8.2.7	Import restrictions	85
8.2.8	Training programs	86
8.3	Policy options in promoting safe pesticide use	86
8.3.1	Regulatory policies	86
8.3.2	Pricing policies	87
8.3.3	Public-sector investments	88
8.3.4	Research and development	89
8.3.5	Structural reform of the regulatory agency	89

References	91
------------	-----------