IICA
PM-A2/JM-96-04

IICA-

IICA

IICA
BIBLIOTECA VENEZUELA
14 AGO 1998
RECIBIDO

WILL SMALL YAM FARMERS IN JAMAICA ADOPT THE MINI-SETT TECHNOLOGY?

April 1996

IICA OFFICE IN JAMAICA

WHAT IS IICA?

The Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) is the specialized agency for agriculture of the inter-American system. The Institute was founded on October 7, 1942 when the Council of Directors of the Pan American Union Approved the creation of the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, to be headquartered in Costa Rica.

IICA was founded as an institution for agricultural research and graduate training in tropical agriculture. In response to changing needs in the Americas, the Institute gradually evolved into an agency for technical cooperation in the field of agriculture. These changes were officially recognized through the ratification of a new Convention on December 8, 1980. The Institute's purposes under the new Convention are to encourage, facilitate and support cooperation among its Member States so as to promote agricultural development and rural well-being.

The Member States participate directly in the Inter-American Board of Agriculture (IABA) and the Executive Committee, the Institute's governing bodies, which issue the policy guidelines executed by the General Directorate. Today, IICA has a geographic reach that allows it to respond to needs for technical cooperation in the countries, through its Technical Cooperation Agencies and five Regional Centers, which coordinate the implementation of strategies tailored to the needs of each region.

The participation and support by the Member States and the relations IICA maintains with its Permanent Observers and numerous international organizations provide IICA with channels to direct its human and financial resources in support of agricultural development throughout the Americas.

The 1994-1998 Medium Term Plan (MTP) provides the strategic framework for orienting IICA's actions during this four-year period. **Its general objective is to support the efforts of the Member States in achieving sustainable agricultural development, within the framework of hemispheric integration and as a contribution to human development in rural areas.** The Institute's work is aimed at making changes in three aspects of agriculture: production, trade and institutions, using an integrated approach to development which is based on sustainability, equity and competitiveness. IICA carries out its technical activities in four Areas of Concentration: Socioeconomic Policies, Trade and Investments; Science and Technology, Natural Resources and Agricultural Production; Agricultural Health; and Sustainable Rural Development. IICA's actions receive support from two Specialized Services; Training, Education and Communications; and Information, Documentation and Informatics.

The Member States of IICA are: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela. Its Permanent Observers are: Arab Republic of Egypt, Austria, Belgium, European Communities, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kingdom of the Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, and Spain.

IICA

14 AGO 1

ISSN/0534-5391

WILL SMALL YAM FARMERS IN JAMAICA ADOPT THE MINI-SETT TECHNOLOGY?

by

Veronica Williamson &
Armando Reyes-Pacheco

April 1996

MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATION SERIES
ISSN-0534-5391
A2/JM-96/004

April 1996
Kingston, Jamaica

"The views expressed in signed article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture"

00000969

WILL SMALL YAM FARMERS IN JAMAICA ADOPT THE MINI-SETT TECHNOLOGY?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	i
List of Tables	ii
Summary	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
Objective	2
Justification	2
METHODOLOGY	4
Study Design and Sample	4
Method of Data Analysis	4
Explanation of Model	5
RESULTS OF STUDY	7
Social Aspects of Farmers	7
General Information	8
Attitudinal Variables	9
Factor Analysis of Attitudinal Variables	10
Discussion of Key Factors	11
GENERAL DISCUSSION	13
REFERENCES	16
ANNEX	
Tables	
Questionnaire	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the contribution made by Mr. William J. Fielding, Biometrician, and Mrs. Joy Todd, Data Processing Manager of the Data Bank of The Ministry of Agriculture and Mining. Special thanks to Ms. Donna Halstead for typesetting this paper.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Social aspects	18
Table 2.	Acreage of land utilization	18
Table 3.	Land tenure	19
Table 4.	Farming as major source of income	19
Table 5.	Farm family labour	19
Table 6.	Income from yam production	20
Table 7.	Problems encountered in yam production	20
Table 8.	Awareness of The Mini-Sett Technology	20
Table 9.	Current practices of The Mini-Sett Technology	21
Table 10.	Most reliable means of agricultural information	21
Table 11.	Percentage ranking of attitudinal variables	22
Table 12.	Correlation matrix of attitudinal variables	23
Table 13.	Unrotated factor pattern: Principal component	24
Table 14.	Rotated factor pattern: Equamax rotation	25
Table 15.	Final estimate of communalities for the first seven variables and eigenvalues: Unrotated matrix	26

SUMMARY

To alter the production and productivity structure at the farm level entails technological innovations for achieving a more efficient use of natural, human and economic resources. Beyond the complexity of devising technology in itself, it impels recasting the farming systems to emphasize a more commercially-oriented system than subsistence traditional production. This transformation demands that agricultural technology adoption and sustainability among small farmers be examined within the context of their perception. It must surpass the generation and exposure processes of technological alterations to farmers if it is to be cost-effective and provide elements of sustainability. If agricultural research and technology transfer is to promote suitable agricultural technology, generate sustainable farming techniques and methods, foster technology flows, and generally strengthen income levels, it merits the incorporation of the social and economic milieu and the often overlooked: farmers' attitudes.

This research paper is a renewed attempt to clarify the importance of farmers' social context and opinions related to embracing a technological production package. It overviews and incorporates attitudinal questions centered on farmers' discernment of the Mini-Sett Technology for yam production. The objective is to conceptualize and ascertain the social and attitudinal traits of those farmers who are more likely to espouse the new technology.

There is no single set of socio-economic variables that will ensure the adoption of a given technological package. However, to sketch a profile of Jamaican farmers who are disposed to adopt the Mini-Sett Technology in the production of yams, goes a far way towards facilitating the implementation of technology transfer, which is likely to become more cost-effective as it is target-oriented and focussed on those farmers who seem most likely to become adopters.

An interview of 100 yam farmers selected randomly from the seven (7) major yam producing parishes of Jamaica revealed that the knowledge of the Mini-Sett Technology related to yam production is fairly widespread. Most farmers have currently undertaken some of the new technology components and practices in their yam production systems. However, many are unaware of, and unable to highlight, formally, the specific practice(s) or component(s) they have incorporated to address their individual constraints in achieving a more productive yam enterprise. It seems

that the small farmers intuitively derive their technical rationale that validates the adoption of a partial element or complete technological package.

Based on the study's results, there is a positive attitudinal pre-disposition among small yam farmers towards adopting technological change even if it involves risks. The transformation of traditional yam production is up-and-coming. Any attempt to identify those farmers who are more likely to accept and adopt the Mini-Sett Technology requires a clear understanding of the technology, its objectives and the problem-solving capability of applying the techniques - partially or totally. Indeed, there is evidence to support the thesis that yam production and productivity can be enhanced due to the application of this technology. A sense of optimism prevails that it might well constitute a major break-through in the transformation of the traditional system of yam production among the small farmers of Jamaica.

WILL SMALL YAM FARMERS IN JAMAICA ADOPT THE MINI-SETT TECHNOLOGY?[1]

Veronica Williamson[2] & Armando Reyes-Pacheco[3]

INTRODUCTION

Small farmers' participation in the generation and transfer of technology was not always considered essential for incorporating technological innovations in their production processes. Technology was considered overall neutral. The situation is different today. Technology is rapidly changing the way we live and produce. Production units are compelled to increase production and productivity at a relatively faster rate than before to be able to remain competitive. This requires more knowledge and skills to be procured, devised and delivered to the farming community expeditiously to accelerate adoption. To hasten this process, the technology generation and transfer processes must take into consideration small farmers' participation and perception as well as knowledge of their environment.

Increases in agricultural productivity entail either a design of a technological innovation to alter a prior production system, or a modification of the production process. While this is feasible, as it encourages efficiency in maximizing production, it does not ensure increases in production by itself, for it requires that it be adopted by producers. Thus, the transfer and adoption of agricultural technology is crucial for enhancing production especially among small farmers. Indeed, this process recognizes the need to assess farmers' opinions, preferences, criticisms and suggestions as they refer to a specific technology. Once this perception is known and evaluated it can be communicated more readily to technology designers who need to understand the farmers' point of view about the usefulness of a new technology to enhance its adoption (*Crowder, et al. 1993*).

---

[1] This paper was presented at the 32nd Annual Meeting of the Caribbean Food Crop Society - CFCS, Zamorano, Honduras, Central America, July 7-13, 1996.

[2] Agricultural Economist - Consultant.

[3] Representative of the IICA Office in Jamaica.

The Mini-Sett Technology was developed to improve the efficiency of yam production especially for export and was tested on farmers' fields through the IICA/MINAG Cropping Systems Project in 1987 (*Chin, 1993*). This technological package was introduced to increase yam production by changing the traditional system thereby reducing labour costs, achieving more efficient use of stakes, and the amount of planting material required per production unit. Additionally the mini-sett method simplifies packaging and grading for export, diminishes harmful effects due to post-harvest chemical treatments and contributes to the control of soil erosion (*Chin Sue, 1991*). Its dissemination was through the National Yam Export Development Project.[4]

Objective

The core of this paper is to discern the profile of those farmers likely to adopt the Mini-Sett Technology. The objective of this study is to feature the underlying rationale for the adoption or non-adoption of this technology by giving an insight with respect to small farmers priorities and decision-making processes. Thus, a Jamaican farmers' profile that seems more prone to adopt this technology can be identified, from which in turn a clientele can be portrayed and targeted. Indeed one could muse that the viability of this technology to be transferred and adopted can be more cost-effective once it is tailored to farmers' needs.

Justification

Traditionally the process of agricultural technology generation and transfer in Jamaica has been "Top-to-Bottom" as limited consideration has been given to the views of farmers who are the "end-users". Efforts developed and disseminated following this approach are often frustrated, mirrored on the adoption levels. The cost-effectiveness of this methodological procedure to increase production and productivity remains a subject of debate. A weakness lies within the research procedures used to develop new technological packages, as they lack evaluations or assessments of farmers'

---

[4] The National Yam Export Development Project was a sub-project of the Agricultural Export Service Project funded by The United States Agency for International Development --USAID. It was implemented by The Rural Agricultural Development Authority --RADA and The Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture --IICA.

perspectives and perceptions of the problems to be addressed, and more importantly, how the innovations will affect them. An alternative is the On-Farm Research and Extension Systems Approach.

Like many other technological packages, The Mini-Sett Technology for yam production was introduced among the farming community in Jamaica without enough consideration as to its acceptability in satisfying the farmers' needs. Ashby, (1990) refers to some of the objectives that circumscribe farmers' evaluation of the technological innovations, which include; inter alia,

(i) Supporting farmers' needs for year-round timely food supply; and

(ii) Compatibility with their farm plans, which incorporate an insurance strategy reflected in their high crop mix to buffer price variability, crop failures, etc. Indeed, their production function seems to reflect an income flow stabilization rather than a profit maximizing objective.

The complexity of small farming systems in Jamaica is a function of multiple objectives. These systems are compelled to be self-sufficient, and this is reflected in their need to produce a continuous and reliable supply of food based on a constant and balanced cash flow to cover farm or household expenditures. These considerations set apart the importance for designers of new technologies to measure and evaluate farmers' perceptions and motives for their specific problems and solutions, if one is to expect increased and sustained levels of adoption; especially when dealing with small farmers having very low resource endowments, a fragile natural resource base from which they operate and limited and unreliable supply of institutional services and infrastructure.

METHODOLOGY

Study Design and Sample

A survey was conducted in the seven (7) major yam growing parishes in Jamaica, namely St. Andrew, St. Catherine, Clarendon, Manchester, St. Ann, Trelawny, and Hanover. Data was collected from one hundred (100) farmers randomly selected throughout the parishes. The questionnaire was designed to gather information on farmers' background, their criteria for choosing a new technology and their reaction to novel technological practices.

Method of Data Analysis

Apart from the descriptive statistics used to summarize the responses of the questions --frequencies and cumulative frequencies, factor analysis was used to identify the factors behind the interrelationship among the various attitudinal and opinionated questions. The purpose of using factor analysis is to represent a variable Zj in terms of several underlying factors.

The specification of the factor analysis model used is as follows:

$$Z_j = a_{ji}F_1 + a_jF_2 + ...a_{im}F_m + d_j\, u_j \; (j = 1,2,...,n)$$

where each n observed variables are described linearly in terms of m common factors and a unique factor. The common factors account for the correlations among the variables, while each unique factor accounts for the remaining variance of that variable. The coefficients of the factors are frequently called "loadings".

The model may be further written explicitly for the value of variable j for individual i as follows:

$$Z_{ji} = \sum_{p=1}^{m} a_{jp}.F_{pi}...+d_j\, u_{ji} \; (i = 1,2,....,n_{ji})$$

In this expression F_{pi} is the value of a common factor P for an individual i, and each m terms $a_{jp}.F_{pi}$ represents composite, while $d_j u_{ji}$ is the "residual error" in the theoretical representation of the observed measurement Z_{ji}.

The commonality of a variable Z_j is given by the sum of squares of the common-factor coefficients, i.e.,

$$h^2_j = a^2_{ji} + a^2_{j2} + \ldots\ldots a^2_{jm} \quad (j=1,2,\ldots,n)$$

The factor analysis model may be expanded and expressed as follows:

$$Z = a_{11}F_1 + a^2_{j1} + a^2_{j2} + \ldots\ldots a^2_{jm} \quad (j = 1,2,\ldots.n)$$

$$Z = a_{21}F_1 + a_{22}F_2 + \ldots\ldots + a_{2m}F_m \ldots\ldots + d_2u_2$$

$$Z = a_{n1}F_1 + a_{n2}F_2 + \ldots\ldots a_{nm}F_m\ldots\ldots\ldots + d_nu_n$$

This set of equations is called the factor pattern.

Explanation of Model

The basic factor analysis model used is described as the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), which seeks to explain the following:

(i) Overall significance of the regression.

(ii) Significance of the improvement of fit obtained by the introduction of additional explanatory variables in the model.

(iii) Quality of coefficients obtained from the different samples.

(iv) Extra sample performance of the regression, and the stability of the coefficients and

(v) Restriction imposed on the coefficient of the function. In other words, to examine the correlation between and among the

explanatory variables (F1...F2...F_m) to determine how they influence the model (if all other variables are held constant, i.e., if specific explanatory variables are removed from the model).

ANOVA was used to identify the extent, and the impact of the error term variations (between and among the explanatory variables) on the model, thus the relative impact on the coefficients of the variable used. Hence, the explanation of loadings can be done by testing the quality of coefficients , and the restriction imposed on the coefficients of the function.

For the model $Z_j=a_{ji}F_1+a_jF_2+.....a_{jm}F_m+d_ju_j(j=1,2..n)$ is explaining Z_j=Total of sum of squares of the model $a_{ji}F_1+a_jF_2+.....a_{jm}F_m$ = total sum of squares variations among and between the explanatory variables; $d_j u_j$ = the residual error (or the unexplained error) which is equivalent to the correction factor a_j = the coefficient of correlation of the explanatory variables of the model.

The individual observation, Z_{ji} is a subset of the composite model Z_j, with its components a_{jp}, F_{pi} - a subset of a_j F_j and a_{ji}, being the coefficient of and among the m explanatory variables $F_1...F_m$.

The model built from the individual observations upwards using jm common factors namely:

(i) the correlation among the explanatory variables,

(ii) the summation of the regression lines of system of equations expressed in a matrix form, and

(iii) along with the residual error d_j u_j,

seeks to explain the impact of each individual variable on the model. It also seeks to determine the level of correlation between the other explanatory variables ($F_1...F_m$) and how it relates to the variation (the spread of the data among the points on the regression line) which is due to the unexplained residual error - Hence, the model $Z_j=a_{ji}F_1+a_jF_2+.....a_{jm}F_m+d_j$ u_j (j=1, 2..n) is applied.

RESULTS OF STUDY

Social Aspects of Farmers

This section focuses on the farmers' socio-economic aspects and related information solicited in the survey. The parameters relate to: sex, age, income, educational level, farm size, land tenure, experience in and exposure to farming, and also the farm family's contribution to farm labour requirements. The rationale is that if generation and transfer of technology is to be effective and sustained, an understanding of the socio-economic setting on which small farmers operate is essential.

Comparative analysis of results from the social aspects of the respondents in the "Minisett Adoption Technology Survey, 1995" carried out by IICA, and the "Modified Baseline, 1992" carried out by the Ministry of Agriculture, shows similar characteristics. Table # 1 of the Annex shows that the gender of farmers is predominantly male with about 50% of them being over 50 years of age. Sixty-seven percent (67%) of the respondents had less than or equivalent of primary education, 73% being full-time farmers with 56% having more than twenty five (25) years of farming experience. In short, farmers have been engaged in agriculture for very long periods and are dedicated to farming activities, but have achieved only limited formal educational levels. This provides an information base for on-farm technology generation and transfer systems.

Tables # 2 and # 3 display the area of land use and tenure of the respondents. Most farmers (56%) used land within the range of 1-5 acres, and 18% with less than 1 acre, with 55% or slightly more than half of them being titled owners. The structural implications regarding size of these farming units bias the technological feasibility of these innovations. Similarly, the land tenure situation conveys a high correlation about the type of crops --annual vis-a-vis perennial to be introduced on those farming systems as a function of the land tenure status.

While approximately 73% of the farmers derived their income from farming it is important to note that 62% of them were utilizing labour from the farm family. Tables # 4 and 5 correspondingly underline the high level of economic dependence on the management, production and productivity of their farms, within their low level of endowment.

General Information

If the primary objective of a given technological practice or package, (i.e., the Mini-Sett Technology), for small farmers is to increase productivity, in order to be effective and meaningful, it must be envisioned in a way that incorporates and reflects the farmer's needs and their absorptive and adoption capacities more effectively. The absence of a researcher-farmer relationship is a major limitation to the existing traditional research procedures, that must be changed to one in which farmers' participation is basal.

In order to facilitate the analyses of yam-farmers' production practices and appraise their systems and perspectives it will be necessary to provide additional information to avoid blindly prescribing blanket recommendations, unrelated to causal factors that will limit their application, adoption and ultimate success. For instance (66%) of farmers appeared dissatisfied with the income generated from present yam production, low prices being the frequently uttered opinion Table # 6. Table # 7 advances the various problems that are likely to be encountered in the production of yam. As expected, the high cost of labour accounted for 50% of the problems, followed by erosion, 26%. While only 1% had difficulty acquiring stakes, responses to the other problems were almost equally distributed. This serves as a preamble to try new production packages or technological innovations that specifically save on labour costs.

When questioned on the awareness of the Mini-Sett Technology, 93% responded positively. Similarly a high percentage reported that they had either practiced the technique or seen it done (Table # 8). Thus the coverage of this technology among the farming community is not only well-known but practiced, at least with some of the technological components as presented in Table # 9. Indeed, 24% are currently planting on mounds, with almost equal amounts (23%) using mulch. Close planting is practiced by 18% and while 23% are planting smaller setts, 4% are using smaller stakes. Eight percent (8%) of the respondents are not currently using any of the practices. This confirms previous findings that some components of The Mini-Sett Technology are being adopted by small yam farmers *(Chin-Sue, et. al. 1995).*

Given that Extension by far was the most reliable source of agricultural information (Table # 10), it supports the high levels of awareness and adoption. Also it is a reflection of the effectiveness of the means used to transfer technological information. Farmers seem to prefer the on-spot extension system to uphold one-to-one discussions

and demonstrations. Small farmers consider highly and reliable the inter-personal relationship with the extension officer, on this case, through the implementation of the National Yam Development Project by The Rural Agricultural Development Authority (RADA) in disseminating this technology.

Attitudinal Variables

For a technology generation and transfer system to be demand-driven, it is critical to understand and analyze measurements pertaining to farmers' views on technological changes, specifically to the Mini-Sett Technology. Several attitudinal questions, Table # 11 of the Annex displays the results of the responses measured on "yes", "no", "don't know" questions.

While common belief prevails that farmers are reluctant to change, it does not reflect how "easy and/or comfortable" they feel about accepting changes. Sixty five percent (65%) of the farmers indicated that they did not feel uncomfortable accepting technological changes. Similarly the general perception about small farmers not being risk-prone, does not account for their attitude towards their readiness to make changes even if they involve risks as 81% agreed to this. It seems that for small farmers risk is a matter of degree --a calculated risk. Approximately 88% strongly agreed that farmers should participate in research experiments. It calls for small farmers' participatory approach to a sense of belonging or involvement in innovations.

Responses to the statements "new technologies are expensive", "new technologies are labour intensive" show contrasting agreements. Most of those interviewed (55%) reported that new technologies were expensive while 53% felt that new technologies were not labour intensive. Interestingly, equal responses (47%) were given for agreeing and disagreeing with the availability of inputs for new technologies.

As displayed, approximately 53% of the farmers admit experiencing erosion problems, compared with the 54% that indicated a preference for using mounds instead of hills. An overwhelming 91% agreed that it was good to treat planting material. This was confirmed as the question "I grow yams without chemicals" reported a 65% disagreement with the statement.

An overwhelming 90% of those interviewed indicated their interest in growing yams using production systems other than the traditional, which validates the small farmers' attitudes towards change and risk. Approximately, 86% of the farmers denoted that they had some preference for using mulch. Forty-two percent (42%) indicated preference for plastic mulch while (44%) would prefer to use grass. Getting adequate water for growing yams did not seem much of a problem as the majority (55%) of the farmers indicated good water supply.

Unexpectedly, responses show that more than half, approximately 58%, did not like to produce big yams. Most of the farmers, 71% reported that market outlets, for yams were available, but approximately 60% felt that the present price was unreasonable.

Factor Analysis of Attitudinal Variables

Factor analysis was used to estimate the attitudes of one hundred (100) yam farmers in the seven (7) major yam growing parishes of Jamaica. Thus, one has to identify the factors'--underlying dimensions, behind the inter-relationships among the various attitudinal questions (Q12-Q27 as in Table #11).

A correlation matrix was used to show inter-correlation among the attitudinal variables. Table # 12 shows there is substantial correlation between questions #'s 16 & 22 (r=.83) and between questions #'s 17 & 22 (r=.69). Yet, there are also very low and negative correlations between some of these variables. Questions #'s 13 & 20 have a very low positive correlation (r=.19) whereas, questions #'s 12 and 13 have a very low negative correlation (r=-0.082). Several factors can be extracted from the matrix by inspection, but as the matrix' size increases it becomes difficult to ascertain factor patterns using this technique. Instead a mathematical technique was used for making factor analysis easier than visual inspection.

The factor analysis procedure encompasses two steps. The first is to extract the "unrotated' factors, otherwise called factor "loadings". A factor loading is essentially the same as a correlation. It expresses the relationship between a variable and a factor. (permitting interpretation of the factor with respect to the particular variable's meaning.) Table # 13 presents the factor loadings for the unrotated matrix. Only those loadings with absolute values of 0.4 and above are included in the matrix, since factors with those values sensibly delimit their attributes.

The second step in the analysis is the rotation of the factor loadings to obtain a better interpretation of the correlation, Table # 14. The loadings from the unrotated matrix are different from those of the rotated matrix. For instance in the unrotated matrix, the variables load heavily on factors 1 & 3. This presents a clustered picture that makes interpretation difficult. In the rotated matrix, however, the variables are more dispersed, allowing better interpretation. The equamax method of rotation was used. The number of factors chosen to be rotated was determined by the Eigenvalue. The Eigenvalue measures the portion of total variation accredited to the common factor, which is the sum of the squares of the factor loadings. Eigenvalues less than 1.0 are usually not interpreted since they account for no more than the variance of a single variable. As a result, only seven (7) factors were chosen in the rotation matrix.

Table # 15 in the Annex presents the final commonality estimates of the variables and eigenvalues. A commonality symbolizes the sum of squares of the loadings for each variable. The range in value is from 0 to 1.0. The higher the value, the higher the contribution to the total variation. For instance, question # 14 (Farmers should participate in research experiments) has a communality of 0.64, implying a high correlation between other variables comprising the factor, thus this variable contributes 64% of the total variation.

Discussion of key factors

Factor 1 Three variables were significant in forming the factor --Q's # 12, 17 & 26. The farmers expressed that they were comfortable accepting changes. They implied that there was not much difficulty getting inputs for new technologies nor finding market for yams.

Factor 2 The two variables significant in this factor suggest that farmers felt new technologies were expensive with plastic mulch (which is more expensive) being preferred to grass mulch which is also labour intensive --Q's # 16 & 19.

Factor 3 Only one variable was found significant in this factor --Q # 13. It suggests that farmers are willing to undertake new technologies even if they involve certain degrees of risks.

Factor 4 The single variable found significant in this factor implies that most farmers were experiencing erosion --Q # 18.

Factor 5 The variables making important contribution to this factor denote that most farmers believe that they should be involved in research experiments, with interest of growing yams of medium to small sizes in other ways than traditional --Q's # 14, 25 & 21.

Factor 6 The two variables forming this factor centered around the use of chemical in yam production. Farmers imply that it was good to treat planting materials i.e., growing yams with the use of chemicals --Q's # 20 & 24.

Factor 7 The two variables forming this factor suggest that farmers had interest growing yams on mounds than hills and other than the traditional way --Q's # 22 & 21.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

There are curbed arguments to the proposition that the technology generation and extension process for small farmers ought to have an integrated and phased approach. Phased concerning the need to focus on technology generation, before heavily investing in extension services as a vehicle for delivering information. Indeed, extension services are unlikely to be cost-effective without a strong inflow of technology that is valuable to farmers. It should be integrated in that the research and extension processes must be demand-driven by an active and participatory role of the farmers themselves. This is an approach to make a research/extension agenda more effective and accountable to clients' needs.

Through a phased system --established on linkages of research, extension and farmers, the delayed and unco-ordinated technology generation and extension process can be accelerated. From the survey results it is evident that there is a potential for tremendous increases in yam production by means of the Mini-Sett Technology. But for this to be achieved there is a need to identify and disburden farmers' priority problems. Indeed, this facilitates building and expanding on achievements derived from pilot efforts, --the National Yam Export Development Project, to decide the best models for strengthening the research and extension work at the farm levels on a phased approach.

A look at the social variables shows that the majority (73%) of the respondent farmers, were full-time farmers, 67% with primary or no education and more than half (56%) having more than twenty-five (25) years experience in farming, whose main source of income is from farming. This identifies a social group of farmers highly dependent on their farming systems for their livelihood, but whose capacity to comprehend adequately the application stages and benefits to stem from new ideas of farming is hampered. Parallel to their land structure and tenure characteristics -- 74% with less than five (5) acres, it limits the technology generation and challenges its relevance to their limited resource base. If one is to accept farmers' years of experience --over twenty-five (25) years, they require sufficient time and constant feedback to be convinced that the practices they have used can be improved to their benefit. This suggests that the technology generation and extension system has to be constant and monitored over long periods before successful long-term use and benefits to be derived from a new technology can be realized.

This calls for technology generation and transfer to be tuned to farmers' socio-economic characteristics to enhance its effectiveness and adoption. Farmers' participation in technology generation itself is important, but also the transfer of information, where a personal relationship seems vital. Farmers rendered their appreciation for this type of relationship as 87.5% endorsed that farmers should participate in research experimentation, and 67% choose the extension officer as the most reliable means of obtaining agricultural information.

The two most severe problems reportedly encountered in the present yam production system are the high cost of labour, and the low income generated due to low market prices. If given enough technical supervision, farmers can realize that both constraints (high labour costs and low yields, since higher yields generate higher incomes) can be addressed by the Mini-Sett Technology. This realization is promising when results show that 93% of the farmers interviewed were aware of the Mini-Sett Technology with the majority, 88%, practicing some techniques involved. This implies that farmers are willing and somewhat capable of applying practices of this technology beyond the initial stages of introduction, but many are unable to identify which practices are most suitable for addressing their specific constraints, maximizing profits and minimizing the cost of producing yams.

From the attitudinal questions, the attitudes extracted from factor analysis query general perceptions, beliefs and arguments surrounding small farmers behavior towards technological innovations. The findings highlight the fact that farmers were willing to modify old practices or adjust to new methods even if they involve risks. This presents a positive environment for the adoption of the Mini-Sett Technology in yam production. It denotes their willingness to use chemical treatments and a preference for plastic mulch, although farmers expressed the view that the high cost of plastic helps to contribute to their assessment that new technologies are more expensive.

This analysis helps to feature some reactions that yam farmers display towards the viability of the Mini-Sett Technology. It accents some attitudes that seem favourable or critical constraints towards the sustainable adoption of any of the components of this technological package, recently introduced to the farming community in Jamaica. From the factor analysis it seems that the prospects for the sustainability of at least some of the components are promising. Granted it comprises a long term support for yam development programmes. This will allow small farmers, exporters and other economic sectors to realize the economic prospects of increasing yam production and

productivity on a sustainable basis through the application of the Mini-Sett Technology.

REFERENCES

Ashby, J.A., 1990. Evaluating technology with farmers: a handbook. CIAT. Colombia.

Cernea, M.M., et. al. 1985. Research, extension, farmer: a two way continuum for agricultural development. World Bank, Washington D.C.

Chin, A. V., 1993. On-farm research in Jamaica: the cropping system project. Kingston, Jamaica., IICA. (Miscellaneous Publication Series ISSN-0534-5391). A2/JM-93/006.

Chin Sue, H., 1991. Improved technology for yam production. Kingston, Jamaica., USAID/RADA/IICA. (Miscellaneous Publication Series ISSN-0534-5391).

--------, et al. 1995. Adoption of mini-sett technology in Jamaica. Kingston, Jamaica., IICA. (Miscellaneous Publication Series ISSN-0534-5391). A2/JM-95/001.

Crowder, L.V, and Fielding, W., 1993. The social dynamics of on-farm adaptive research. Kingston, Jamaica., IICA. (Miscellaneous Publication Series ISSN-0534-5391). A2/JM- 94/001.

Groenfeldt, D., et. al. 1989. Social science perspectives on managing agricultural technology. International Irrigation Management Institute, Sri Lanka.

Harman, H. H., 1972. Modern Factor Analyses 2nd. Ed. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, USA.

Hilddebrand, P.E, and Poey, F. 1985. On-farm agronomic trials in farming systems research and extension. Lynne Runner Publishers. Inc. Boulder, USA.

ANNEX

Table 1: Social Aspects

Social Aspects	Percent of Farmers		
	Current Survey	Adop. of Mini-Sett Tech. in Jamaica [1]	Ministry of Agri. [2]
Female	15	7	10
With primary or no education	67	65	67
With tertiary education	5	10	8
Over 50 years old	52	51	52
Over 25 years farming experience	56	60	46
Full time farmers	73	43	74

1. Adoption of Minisett Technology in Jamaica, Chin-See, et. al., IICA,1995
2. Modified Baseline Survey NYEDP Data Bank,Ministry of Agriculture,1992

Table 2: Acreage of Land Utilization

Acreage	Percentage of farmers
0-1	18
1-5	56
5-10	11
10-20	9
>20	6
TOTAL	100

Table 3: Land Tenure

Tenure	Percentage of farmers
Owned	55
Rented	17
Leased	18
Other	10
TOTAL	100

Table 4: Farming as Major Source of Income

Farming	Percentage of farmers
Yes	73
No	27
TOTAL	100

Table 5: Farm Family Labour

Labor	Percentage of farmers
Yes	62
No	38
TOTAL	100

Table 6: Income from Yam Production

Satisfaction	Percentage of farmers
Yes	34
No	66
TOTAL	100

Table 7: Problems Encountered in Yam Production

Problems	Percentage of farmers
High cost of labor	50
Lack of water	9
Shortage of sticks	1
Low yield	8
Erosion	26
Other	6
TOTAL	100

Table 8: Awareness of the Mini-Sett Technology

Awareness	Percentage of farmers
Yes	93
No	7
TOTAL	100

Table 9: Current Practices of the Mini-Sett Technology

Practices	Percentage of farmers
Mounds	24
Mulch	23
Closer planting	18
Smaller setts	23
Shorter stakes	4
No practice	8
TOTAL	100

Table 10: Most Reliable Means of Agricultural Information

Means of Information	Percentage of farmers
Extension	67.0
Radio	9.3
Television	3.0
Newspaper	5.2
Other	15.5
TOTAL	100

Table 11: Percentage Rankings for Attitudinal variables

	Attitudinal Questions	Yes	No	Don't Know
Q 12	I feel uncomfortable accepting changes	33	65	2
Q 13	I am prepared to make changes which may involve risk	80.8	18.2	1
Q 14	Farmers should participate in research experiments	87.5	12.5	-
Q 15	New technologies are expensive	55.1	40.8	4.1
Q 16	New technologies are labor intensive	43.7	53.1	3.1
Q 17	Inputs are always readily available for new technologies	43.7	43.7	12.5
Q 18	I experience erosion problems from time to time	52.6	43.3	4.1.
Q 19	Plastic mulch is preferred to grass mulch	41.8	43.9	14.3
Q 20	It is good to treat planting material	90.7	9.3	-
Q 21	I am interested in growing yams in other ways than traditional	89.8	8.2	2
Q 22	I prefer hills to continuous mounds	38.8	54.1	7.1
Q 23	There is problem of getting enough water for growing yams	43.9	55.1	1
Q 24	I grow yams without the use of chemicals	29.9	64.9	5.2
Q 25	I like to grow big yams	42.3	57.57	-
Q 26	There is a problem finding market for yams	25.5	71.4	3.1
Q 27	The present price for yam is reasonable	39.6	59.5	1

Table 12. Correlation Matrix For Attitudinal Variables

	Q 12	Q 13	Q 14	Q 15	Q 16	Q 17	Q 18	Q 19	Q 20	Q 21	Q 22	Q 23	Q 24	Q 25	Q 26	Q 27
Q 12	1.000	-0.0815	-0.2742	0.1300	0.1587	-0.1149	-0.2161	0.1378	-0.2264	0.2805	0.2202	0.1237	0.0698	0.0695	0.1109	0.0085
Q 13		1.000	0.0365	-0.1988	-0.1260	0.0338	0.0316	0.1121	0.1887	-0.0708	0.2820	-0.0264	-0.0916	0.1238	0.1235	0.2519
Q 14			1.0000	0.116[illegible]	-0.1266	0.0240	0.1569	-0.3112	0.0934	0.2837	0.1384	-0.1146	0.0957	0.0676	-0.2445	-0.0513
Q 15				1.0000	0.2650	-0.0171	0.0671	0.0706	0.0839	-0.1324	0.0942	0.5407	0.8711	-0.1135	0.0447	0.1463
Q 16					1.0000	0.7304	0.1863	0.2821	-0.1986	-0.2978	0.8294	0.2116	0.1589	-0.1706	0.1834	0.2442
Q 17						1.0000	0.1106	-0.0462	0.0967	0.6720	0.6888	-0.1219	0.2104	-0.8195	-0.1443	0.0274
Q 18							1.0000	0.0103	0.0813	.4538	-0.1954	0.0047	-0.0523	-0.0427	0.1227	-0.0328
Q 19								1.0000	-0.0810	0.0263	0.1823	0.1828	-0.6697	-0.2694	0.1189	0.9921
Q 20									1.0000	0.1042	0.1845	-0.0135	-0.496	0.1332	0.1515	0.1064
Q 21										1.0000	-0.0975	-0.1470	-0.2009	-0.0500	0.1471	-0.0726
Q 22											1.0000	-0.1227	0.0742	0.1005	0.1769	0.0833
Q 23												1.0000	0.2084	-0.0945	0.6418	0.1672
Q 24													1.0000	0.0682	0.1399	0.0249
Q 25														1.0000	0.0851	-0.2076
Q 26															1.0000	0.6381
Q 27																1.000

Table 13. Unrotated Factor Pattern: Principal Component

VARIABLE NOTATION		FACTOR									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Q 12	Feel uncomfortable accepting changes			.6943							
Q 13	Prepared to make changes involving risk			.6105							
Q 14	Farmers should participate in research experiments	.4354									
Q 15	New technologies are expensive										.6991
Q 16	New technologies are labor intensive	.4099									
Q 17	Inputs are readily available			.6879							
Q 18	I experience erosion problem						.4611				
Q 19	Plastic is preferred to grass mulch	.4588									
Q 20	It is good to treat planting materials	.4298									
Q 21	I have interest in growing yams other than traditional	.4343									
Q 22	Prefer hills to continous mounds			.4431							
Q 23	Inadequate water supply for yams										
Q 24	Grow yams without chemicals					.6877					
Q 25	Like to grow big yams				.4740						
Q 26	Problem finding yam market	.4747		.6923							
Q 27	The present yam price is reasonable	.4562									

Table 14 Rotated Factor Pattern: Equamax Rotation

VARIABLE NOTATION		FACTOR						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q 12	Feel uncomfortable accepting changes	.6373						
Q 13	Prepared to make changes involving risk			.7215				
Q 14	Farmers should participate in research experiments					.5957		
Q 15	New technologies are expensive							
Q 16	New technologies are labor intensive		.6794					
Q 17	Inputs are readily available	.6466						
Q 18	I experience erosion problems				.7677			
Q 19	Plastic is preferred to grass mulch		.7133					
Q 20	It is good to treat planting materials						.6725	
Q 21	I have interest in growing yams other than traditional					.5115		.6399
Q 22	Prefer hills to continuous mounds							.7316
Q 23	Inadequate water supply for yams							
Q 24	Grow yams without chemicals						.4522	
Q 25	Like to grow big yams					.6906		
Q 26	Problem finding yam market	.5979						
Q 27	The present yam price is reasonable							

Table 15: Final Estimate of Communalities For The First Seven Variables and Eigenvalues: Unrotated Matrix

Variable	Factor	Estimated Communality	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variation	Cumulated Percentage
Q 12	1	.4791	3.2292	0.20	0.20
Q 13	2	.4908	2.0091	0.14	0.34
Q 14	3	.6356	1.8819	0.13	0.47
Q 15	4	.4216	1.4807	0.12	0.59
Q 16	5	.4727	1.2683	0.10	0.69
Q 17	6	.3800	1.2070	0.09	0.78
Q 18	7	.5120	1.1051	0.07	0.85

Table 14 Rotated Factor Pattern: Equamax Rotation

VARIABLE NOTATION		FACTOR						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q 12	Feel uncomfortable accepting changes	.6373						
Q 13	Prepared to make changes involving risk			.7215				
Q 14	Farmers should participate in research experiments					.5957		
Q 15	New technologies are expensive							
Q 16	New technologies are labor intensive		.6794					
Q 17	Inputs are readily available	.6466						
Q 18	I experience erosion problems				.7677			
Q 19	Plastic is preferred to grass mulch		.7133					
Q 20	It is good to treat planting materials						.6725	
Q 21	I have interest in growing yams other than traditional					.5115		.6399
Q 22	Prefer hills to continuous mounds							.7316
Q 23	Inadequate water supply for yams							
Q 24	Grow yams without chemicals						.4522	
Q 25	Like to grow big yams					.6906		
Q 26	Problem finding yam market	.5979						
Q 27	The present yam price is reasonable							

Table 15: Final Estimate of Communalities For The First Seven Variables and Eigenvalues: Unrotated Matrix

Variable	Factor	Estimated Communality	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variation	Cumulated Percentage
Q 12	1	.4791	3.2292	0.20	0.20
Q 13	2	.4908	2.0091	0.14	0.34
Q 14	3	.6356	1.8819	0.13	0.47
Q 15	4	.4216	1.4807	0.12	0.59
Q 16	5	.4727	1.2683	0.10	0.69
Q 17	6	.3800	1.2070	0.09	0.78
Q 18	7	.5120	1.1051	0.07	0.85

QUESTIONNAIRE

FARMERS PROFILE FOR MINI-SETT YAM TECHNOLOGY

1. NAME:_____ 2. PARISH_____

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. Sex 4. Age 5. Level of Formal Education

Male =1 female =2 **16-25=1** **26-35=2** **36-45=3** **46-55=4** **>55=5**

PRIMARY SECONDARY VOCATIONAL TERTIARY

Primary =1; Secondary =2; Vocational=3;Tertiary=4

6. Size of farm _____ acres
0-1=1; 1-5=2; 5-10=3; 10-20=4; >20=5

7. Owned _____ Rented _____ Lease _____
Other _____

Owned =1; Rented =2: Lease =3; Other =4

8. Number of years in farming _____
1-5=1; 6-15=2; 16-25=3; 26-35=4; >36=5

9. Do you earn most of your income from farming?

(a) Yes

(b) No

If no (specify)_____

Yes =1 No =2

10. Does the farm family contribute to the farm labour requirement?

(a) Yes

(b) No

Yes =1 No =2

11. Were you at any time exposed to farming while growing up?

(a) Yes

(b) No

Yes = 1 No =2

Indicate with a **TICK** your **Opinion** and **Attitude** towards the following:

		Yes	**No**	**Don't know**
12.	I feel uncomfortable accepting changes.	_____	_____	_____
13.	I am prepared to make changes which may involve a certain degree of risk.	_____	_____	_____
14.	Farmers should participate in research experiments	_____	_____	_____
15.	New technologies are expensive	_____	_____	_____
16.	New technologies are labour intensive intensive.	_____	_____	_____
17.	Inputs are always readily available for new technologies.	_____	_____	_____
18.	I experience erosion problems from time to time.	_____	_____	_____
19.	Plastic mulch preferred to grass mulch.	_____	_____	_____

20.	It is good to treat plantin materials.	_____	_____	_____
21.	I have interest growing yams in other ways than traditional.	_____	_____	_____
22.	I prefer hills to continuous mounds.	_____	_____	_____
23.	There is a problem keeping moisture or getting water to my yams.	_____	_____	_____
24.	I prefer to grow yams without the use of chemicals.	_____	_____	_____
25.	I like to grow big yams.	_____	_____	_____
26.	There is a problem finding suitable yam market.	_____	_____	_____
27.	The present price for yam is reasonable.	_____	_____	_____
		Yes =1	No =2	Don't Know =3

28. Are you satisfied with the earnings from your yam production?

(a) Yes ☐

(b) No

If no,
Explain why _____

Yes =1 No =2

29. Which of the following do you regard as the most reliable means of agricultural information

(a) EXTENSION OFFICER _____

(b) RADIO _____

(c) TELEVISION _____

(d) NEWSPAPER _____

(e) OTHER (Explain) _____

Extension Officer =1; Radio =2; Television =4; Newspaper =8; Other =16

30. What problems do you encounter in the production of yams?

		YES	NO
(a)	HIGH COST OF LABOUR	_____	_____
(b)	LACK OF WATER	_____	_____
(c)	SHORTAGE OF STICKS	_____	_____
(d	LOW YIELD	_____	_____
(e)	EROSION	_____	_____
(f)	OTHER (SPECIFY)	_____	_____

High cost of labour =1; Lack of water =2; Shortage of sticks =4; Low yield =8; Erosion =16; Other =32

31. Are you aware of the mini-sett yam technology?

YES _____ NO _____

Yes = 1; No = 2

32. Which of the following practice of the minisett technology are you now using?

(a) CONTINUOUS MOUNDS _____

(b) MULCHING _____

(c) USE OF TRELLIS _____

(d) PLANTING SMALLER SETTS _____

(e) CLOSE PLANTING _____

(f) TREATING SETTS _____

(g) OTHER (SPECIFY) _____

Continuous mounds =1; Mulching =2; Use of trellis =4; Smaller setts =8; Close planting =16; Treating setts =32; Other =64


FECHA DE DEVOLUCION
IICA
PM-A2/JM-96-04
Autor
Título Will small yam farmers in
Jamaica adopt the mini-se
Fecha
Devolución
Nombre del solici

INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR COOPERATION ON AGRICULTURE
11 Fairway Avenue, Kingston 5, P.O. Box 349 Kingston 6. Tel.: (809) 927-6462, 927-4837
FAX: 809 927-6933, Cable: IICAJA

Superb Printing & Stationery Supplies, 1G Arnold Rd., Kingston 4, Telephone: 922-7328