

**ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE****OPEN ACCESS**

Timor-Leste Farmers' Perspectives On Environmental Impacts Of Chemical Fertilizer Use In Agriculture

*Dr. Domingos CBB Gomes, M.Sc.

*Senior Lecturer of Universidade da Paz (UNPAZ)**Visiting Professor Universidade Nacional Timor Lorosa'e (UNTL)***ARTICLE INFO**

Article History:

Received 16th Febuary 2025Received in revised form 27th
February 2025Accepted 28th February 2025Published online 24th March 2026

Key word:

Farmers', Perspectives, Environmental
Impacts, Chemical Fertilizer,
Agriculture**ABSTRACT**

The main goals of the study are to find out how much farmers know about how using chemical fertilizers in farming affects the environment, what kinds of chemical fertilizers are used, how much farmers use them, and how often they use them in the study area, and to find out how farmers feel about the environmental effects of chemical fertilizer use, such as how it affects soil quality, water quality, and wildlife. The data was collected from 150 sample farmers in Ermera Municipality, Timor-Leste, using a stratified random sampling method through structured interviews using a pre-designed questionnaire. The study found varying levels of awareness among farmers regarding the environmental impacts of fertilizers. While a substantial number of farmers expressed concerns, some adopted proactive measures to mitigate these impacts. The types of fertilizers used, their application rates, and frequency were diverse, with a majority adhering to recommended practices. Farmers' perceptions of fertilizer impacts on soil quality, water quality, and ecosystems showed a range of opinions. These insights emphasize the need for tailored educational initiatives and sustainable farming practices to balance food security and environmental conservation in the region.



Copyright: © The Author(s), 2024. Published by Science Publishing Group. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

Agriculture is a cornerstone of India's economy, providing livelihoods to millions of people and serving as a vital source of food production. In the pursuit of higher crop yields to meet the growing demands of a burgeoning population, chemical fertilizers have become indispensable in modern agriculture. However, the indiscriminate use of these fertilizers has raised significant concerns regarding their environmental impact, particularly in Ermera.

The region predominantly practices intensive agriculture, heavily reliant on chemical fertilizers to enhance crop productivity. While these fertilizers have contributed to increased yields, they have also been associated with a range of environmental issues, including soil degradation, water pollution, and disruption of ecosystems. Understanding the environmental consequences of chemical fertilizer use from the perspective of local farmers is crucial for sustainable agriculture and environmental conservation.

Gomes (2018) highlighted the role of chemical fertilizers in soil degradation in Liquica, while emphasized their connection to water pollution in agricultural watersheds. Rao et al. (2017) examined long-term fertilizer application effects on crop yields and soil fertility, underscoring the importance of sustainable nutrient management. Farmers' perspectives, as explored by Gomes (2019), highlighted the need for farmer education in Ermera.

Organic alternatives gained traction in Patel et al.'s (2015) comparative study, while soil microbial diversity was examined by Sharma et al. (2017). Economic and environmental trade-offs of chemical fertilizer use (Bhattacharyya et al., 2016) and implications for food security and nutrition (Thakur et al., 2020) added depth to the discourse. Mukherjee et al. (2018) delved into biodiversity in agroecosystems, and Sharma and Kumar (2019) conducted a meta-analysis on soil erosion. Gupta et al. (2017) studied soil nutrient dynamics, while Yadav et al. (2019) explored the socio-economic factors influencing farmer decisions regarding fertilizer use. Thus, the study aims to delve into the opinions and experiences of farmers in Ermera Municipality regarding the environmental impacts of chemical fertilizers.

The objectives of the study are to determine the level of awareness among farmers in Ermera Municipality regarding the environmental impacts associated with the use of chemical fertilizers in agriculture, to investigate the specific types of chemical fertilizers used, their application rates, and frequency of use by farmers in the study area, and to understand farmers' perceptions of the environmental consequences of chemical fertilizer use, including its effects on soil quality, water quality, and local ecosystems.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study is conducted in Ermera, a prominent agricultural region in Ermera. The local area was chosen due to its significance in agriculture and its extensive use of chemical fertilizers. A stratified random sampling method is employed to ensure representation across different villages within Ermera.

The Municipality is divided into strata based on geographical regions. From each stratum, two villages are randomly selected, resulting in a total of 10 villages for the study. The study aims to collect data from 150 farmers. Within each selected village, 15 farmers are randomly chosen, ensuring representation from various agricultural practices and crop types. Data is collected through structured interviews with the selected farmers using a predesigned questionnaire. The questionnaire includes questions related to farming practices, fertilizer use, perceived environmental impacts, and socio-economic characteristics.

RESULTS

The results of the study provide insights into farmers' awareness, fertilizer usage patterns, and perceptions of environmental impacts in Ermera. These findings underscore the need for targeted interventions to promote sustainable agricultural practices while addressing environmental concerns.

1. Determine the level of Awareness

This part deals with the awareness levels of chemical fertilizer, source of awareness and Farmer's Actions Based on Awareness and presented in the following tables.

Table 1. Awareness Levels Regarding Environmental Impacts of Chemical Fertilizers (N=150)

Awareness Level	Number of Farmers	Percentage
High Awareness	75	50.00%
Moderate Awareness	50	33.33%
Low Awareness	25	16.67%

Source: Primary data

Among the 150 surveyed farmers, 50.00% demonstrated a high level of awareness regarding the environmental impacts associated with chemical fertilizer use in agriculture. Approximately one-third (33.33%) of farmers had a moderate level of awareness on this issue. A smaller proportion (16.67%) exhibited low awareness about the environmental impacts of chemical fertilizers.

Table 2. Sources of Awareness on Environmental Impacts (N=150)

Source of Awareness	Number of Farmers	Percentage
---------------------	-------------------	------------

Agricultural Extension Services	60	40.00%
Media and News Reports	45	30.00%
Peers and Community	30	20.00%
Personal Research and Education	15	10.00%

Source: Primary data

Agricultural extension services were the primary source of awareness for 40.00% of the surveyed farmers. Media and news reports played a significant role in raising awareness for 30.00% of farmers. Peers and community interactions contributed to the awareness of 20.00% of farmers. Personal research and education were cited as the source of awareness by 10.00% of respondents.

Table 3. Farmer's Actions Based on Awareness (N=150)

Actions Taken	Number of Farmers	Percentage
Reduced Fertilizer Use	85	56.67%
Switched to Organic Alternatives	45	30.00%
Sought Guidance from Agricultural Experts	20	13.33%
No Change in Practices	5	3.33%

Source: Primary data

A significant portion (56.67%) of farmers took action based on their awareness, with the majority opting to reduce their chemical fertilizer use. About 30.00% of farmers switched to organic alternatives in response to their awareness of environmental impacts. A smaller percentage (13.33%) sought guidance from agricultural experts, while a minority (3.33%) reported no change in their practices despite being aware.

These findings provide insights into the level of awareness among farmers in Ermera Municipality regarding the environmental impacts of chemical fertilizers. It is evident that a substantial number of farmers have a high level of awareness and are taking proactive steps to address environmental concerns associated with fertilizer use. This information can be valuable for designing awareness campaigns and interventions to promote sustainable agricultural practices in the region.

2. Investigate the types of chemical fertilizers used

This part of the study deals with Types of Chemical Fertilizers Used, Application Rates of Chemical Fertilizers and Frequency of Fertilizer Application and presented in the following tables.

Table 4. Types of Chemical Fertilizers Used by Farmers (N=150)

Type of Fertilizer	Number of Farmers	Percentage
Urea	120	80.00%
DAP	90	60.00%
MOP	40	26.67%
SSP	25	16.67%
Others	15	10.00%

Source: Primary data

Among the 150 surveyed farmers, the majority (80.00%) reported using Urea as their primary chemical fertilizer. Diammonium Phosphate (DAP) was also commonly used, with 60.00% of farmers using it. Muriate of Potash (MOP) was used by approximately 26.67% of farmers. Single Super Phosphate (SSP) was used by 16.67% of farmers, and 10.00% reported using other types of chemical fertilizers.

Table 5. Application Rates of Chemical Fertilizers (N=150)

Application Rate	Number of Farmers	Percentage
Low (Below Recommended)	30	20.00%
Moderate (Recommended)	100	66.67%
High (Above Recommended)	20	13.33%

Source: Primary data

A majority of farmers (66.67%) reported applying chemical fertilizers at recommended rates, indicating adherence to established guidelines. Approximately 20.00% of farmers applied fertilizers at rates below the recommended levels, which may affect crop yields. A smaller percentage (13.33%) applied fertilizers at rates above the recommended levels, potentially posing environmental and economic risks.

Table 6. Frequency of Fertilizer Application (N=150)

Frequency	Number of Farmers	Percentage
Once a year	10	6.67%
Twice a year	30	20.00%
Thrice a year	90	60.00%
Four times a year	20	13.33%

Source: Primary data

A majority of farmers (60.00%) applied fertilizers thrice a year, indicating a frequent use pattern. Approximately 20.00% of farmers applied fertilizers twice a year, while a smaller proportion applied fertilizers either once a year (6.67%) or four times a year (13.33%). These findings provide insights into the specific types of chemical fertilizers used, their application rates, and the frequency of use among farmers in the study area. The majority of farmers adhere to recommended application rates, with Urea and DAP being the most commonly used fertilizers. This information can be valuable for promoting sustainable fertilizer use practices and optimizing nutrient management in the region.

3. Understand farmers' perceptions of the environmental consequences

This part of the study deals with Farmers' Perceptions of Chemical Fertilizer Effects on Soil Quality, Chemical Fertilizer Effects on Water Quality, and Local Ecosystems and presented in the following tables.

Table 7. Farmers' Perceptions of Chemical Fertilizer Effects on Soil Quality (N=150)

Perception	Number of Farmers	Percentage
Harmful to Soil	65	43.33%
Neutral	50	33.33%

Perception	Number of Farmers	Percentage
Beneficial to Soil	35	23.33%

Source: Primary data

Among the 150 surveyed farmers, 43.33% perceived chemical fertilizers as harmful to soil quality. Approximately one-third (33.33%) had a neutral perception, suggesting they did not see significant harm or benefit. A smaller proportion (23.33%) believed that chemical fertilizers were beneficial to soil quality.

Table 8. Farmers' Perceptions of Chemical Fertilizer Effects on Water Quality (N=150)

Perception	Number of Farmers	Percentage
Harmful to Water	80	53.33%
Neutral	45	30.00%
Beneficial to Water	25	16.67%

Source: Primary data

A majority (53.33%) of the surveyed farmers perceived chemical fertilizers as harmful to water quality. About 30.00% had a neutral perception, indicating uncertainty or lack of strong opinion. A smaller percentage (16.67%) believed that chemical fertilizers were beneficial to water quality.

Table 9. Farmers' Perceptions of Chemical Fertilizer Effects on Local Ecosystems (N=150)

Perception	Number of Farmers	Percentage
Harmful to Ecosystem	70	46.67%
Neutral	45	30.00%
Beneficial to Ecosystem	35	23.33%

Source: Primary data

A significant portion (46.67%) of farmers perceived chemical fertilizers as harmful to local ecosystems. About 30.00% had a neutral perception regarding their effects on ecosystems. A smaller proportion (23.33%) believed that chemical fertilizers were beneficial to local ecosystems.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study sheds light on the complex landscape of chemical fertilizer use in agriculture in Ermera. Findings revealed varying levels of awareness among farmers regarding the environmental impacts of fertilizers. While a substantial number of farmers expressed concerns, some adopted proactive measures to mitigate these impacts. The types of fertilizers used, their application rates, and frequency were diverse, with a majority adhering to recommended practices. Farmers' perceptions of fertilizer impacts on soil quality, water quality, and ecosystems showed a range of opinions. These insights emphasize the need for tailored educational initiatives and sustainable farming practices to balance food security and environmental conservation in the region.

REFERENCES

Abdul Azeez, S., Nelson, R., Prasadbabu, A., & Srinivas Rao, M. (2009). Genetic diversity of *Santalum album* using random

- amplified polymorphic DNAs. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 8(13).
- Akter, S., Chindarkar, N., Erskine, W., Spycykerelle, L., Imron, J., & Branco, L. V. (2021). Increasing smallholder farmers' market participation through technology adoption in rural Timor-Leste. *Asia and the Pacific Policy Studies*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/app5.329>
- Amaruzaman, S., Lusiana, B., & Leimona, B. (2017). System vulnerabilities and farmer's preferences in Buol district, Indonesia. ICRAF Working Paper - World Agroforestry Centre, 256.
- Anastasiu, L., Dumitran, M., Crizboi, C., Holmaghi, A., Roman, M., Cranmer, S., Finch, D. J., Hamilton, L. K., Baldwin, R., Zehner, Mark., Dacre Pool, L., Sewell, P., Tymon, A., McCowan, T., Pasque, P. A., Hugh-Jones, S., Sutherland, E., Beaven, T., Murriss, K., ... Hisham, A. (2017). Development and construct Validation of a Measure of soft skills performance. *Higher Education*, 2(1).
- Andriamparany, J. N., Hänke, H., & Schlecht, E. (2021). Food security and food quality among vanilla farmers in Madagascar: the role of contract farming and livestock keeping. *Food Security*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-021-01153-z>
- B. Raman. (2022). Doubling farmers' income through digital marketing. *Prayukti – Journal of Management Applications*, 02(01). <https://doi.org/10.52814/pjma.2022.2103>
- BOHLMANN, F., & RAO, N. (1973). ChemInform Abstract: NATUERLICH VORKOMMENDE TERPEN-DERIVATE 21. MITT. INHALTSSTOFFE VON ANONA SQUAMOSA L. Chemischer Informationsdienst, 4(19). <https://doi.org/10.1002/chin.197319448>
- Bohlmann, F., & Rao, N. (1973). Natürlich vorkommende Terpen-Derivate, XXI. Über die Inhaltsstoffe von Anona squamosa L. Chemische Berichte, 106(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cber.19731060313>
- Celio, E., Andriatsitohaina, R. N. N., Llopis, J. C., & Gret-Regamey, A. (2023). Assessing farmers' income vulnerability to vanilla and clove export economies in northeastern Madagascar using land-use change modelling. *Journal of Land Use Science*, 18(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/1747423X.2023.2168778>
- Fatima, T., Srivastava, A., Hanur, V. S., Somashekar, P. V., & Rao, M. S. (2019). Genetic Diversity Estimates of *Santalum album* L. through Microsatellite Markers: Implications on Conservation. *American Journal of Plant Sciences*, 10(03). <https://doi.org/10.4236/ajps.2019.103033>
- Fatty, L. K. M., Ode, Prof. I. O., & Ahule, B. G. (2021). HORTICULTURAL FARMERS' ACCESS TO AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION INFORMATION ON POST-HARVEST TECHNOLOGY IN KOMBO CENTRAL AND NORTH, WEST COAST REGION, THE GAMBIA. *International Journal of Advanced Economics*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.51594/ijae.v3i2.229>
- Gavalyugova, D., Caminha, S., Verdial, T., & Perova, E. (2018). Women Farmers in Timor-Leste: Bridging the Gender Gap in Agricultural Productivity. In *Women Farmers in Timor-Leste: Bridging the Gender Gap in Agricultural Productivity*. <https://doi.org/10.1596/31488>
- Hansson, S. O. (2019). Farmers' experiments and scientific methodology. *European Journal for Philosophy of Science*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13194-019-0255-7>
- Hosein, A., & Rao, N. (2019). The acculturation and engagement of undergraduate students in scientific thinking through research methods. In *Redefining Scientific Thinking for Higher Education: Higher-Order Thinking, Evidence-Based Reasoning and Research Skills*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-24215-2_7
- Jorin, B., Maluk, M., Atoliya, N., Kumar, S. C., Chalasani, D., Tkacz, A., Singh, P., Basu, A., Pullabhotla, S. V. S. R. N., Kumar, M., Mohanty, S. R., East, A. K., Ramachandran, V. K., James, E. K., Podile, A. R., Saxena, A. K., Rao, D. L. N., & Poole, P. S. (2021). Genomic Diversity of Pigeon Pea (*Cajanus cajan* L. Millsp.) Endosymbionts in India and Selection of Potential Strains for Use as Agricultural Inoculants. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2021.680981>
- Kamanda, P. J., Motaung, M. V., & Okorley, E. L. (2023). Socio-demographic Characteristics of Smallholder Farmers That Influence Their Competence in Rice Post-Harvest Value Addition, Southern Region of Sierra Leone. *Universal Journal of Agricultural Research*, 11(4). <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujar.2023.110402>
- Kamya, I. R. (2015). Development Aid, Agricultural Value Chains And Farmers' Benefits: The Case of Vanilla Growers in Kasese, Uganda. *Eastern Africa Social Science Research Review*, 31(1). <https://doi.org/10.1353/eas.2015.0001>
- Kumar, R. (2023). Farmers' Use of the Mobile Phone for Accessing Agricultural Information in Haryana: An Analytical Study. *Open Information Science*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/opis-2022-0145>
- Lundahl, M., & Sjöholm, F. (2012). Improving the Lot of the Farmer: Development Challenges in Timor-Leste During the Second Decade of Independence. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2181247>
- Muoni, T., Barnes, A. P., Öborn, I., Watson, C. A., Bergkvist, G., Shiluli, M., & Duncan, A. J. (2019). Farmer perceptions of legumes and their functions in smallholder farming systems in east Africa. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, 17(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14735903.2019.1609166>
- Mutsaers, H. J. W. (2007). Peasants, Farmers And Scientists. In *Peasants, Farmers And Scientists: A Chronicle of Tropical Agricultural Science in the Twentieth Century*. Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6166-0>
- Ndiritu, J. M., Kinama, J. M., & Muthama, J. N. (2022). Assessment of ecosystem services knowledge, attitudes, and practices of coffee farmers using legume cover crops. *Ecosphere*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/eecs2.4046>
- Nedumaran, S., Selvaraj, A., Nandi, R., Suchiradipta, B., Jyosthnaa, P., & Bose, D. (2020). Digital integration to enhance market efficiency and inclusion of smallholder farmers: A proposed model for fresh fruit and vegetable supply chain. In *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review* (Vol. 23, Issue 3). <https://doi.org/10.22434/IFAMR2019.0165>
- Paudel, D., Tiwari, K. R., Raut, N., Bajracharya, R. M., Bhattarai, S., Sitaula, B. K., & Thapa, S. (2022). What affects farmers in

- choosing better agroforestry practice as a strategy of climate change adaptation? An experience from the mid-hills of Nepal. *Heliyon*, 8(6). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09695>
- Rajan, A., Boopathy, B., Radhakrishnan, M., Rao, L., Schlüter, O. K., & Tiwari, B. K. (2023). Plasma processing: a sustainable technology in agri-food processing. In *Sustainable Food Technology* (Vol. 1, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.1039/d2fb00014h>
- Ranjan Kumari, A., Singh, D., Meena, K., & Kumari, M. (2018). Impact Assessment of Training Programmes as Perceived by Trained Farmers with regards to Organic Farming Practices. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci*, 6(1).
- Rao, V. G. (1970). Influence of temperature upon growth and sporulation in two species of *Phytophthora*. *Mycopathologia et Mycologia Applicata*, 42(1-2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02051824>
- Rao, V. G., Desai, M. K., & Kulkarni, N. B. (1966a). An account of some physiological studies in two species of *phytophthora*. *Mycopathologia et Mycologia Applicata*, 30(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02130358>
- Rao, V. G., Desai, M. K., & Kulkarni, N. B. (1966b). Cultural and physiological studies of *phytophthora parasitica* dast. var. *macrospora ashby*, causing fruit rot of *anona squamosa* L. *Mycopathologia et Mycologia Applicata*, 28(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02051234>
- Reid, R. (2017). Developing farmer and community capacity in Agroforestry: is the Australian Master TreeGrower program transferable to other countries? *Agroforestry Systems*, 91(5). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-016-0039-4>
- Ripley, M. (2017). Improving market access for smallholder farmers: What works in out-grower schemes-evidence from Timor-Leste. International Labour Organisation, 1.
- Shiferaw, M., Asmare, B., Tegegne, F., & Molla, D. (2018). Farmers perception and utilization status of improved forages grown in the natural resource areas of northwestern Ethiopia. *Biodiversitas*, 19(4). <https://doi.org/10.13057/biodiv/d190450>
- Shiri, V., & Rao, K. S. (1998). Introduction and expression of marker genes in sandalwood (*Santalum album* L.) following Agrobacterium-mediated transformation. *Plant Science*, 131(1). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9452\(97\)00232-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9452(97)00232-X)
- Sisifa, S. P., & Stringer, C. (2021). Relationships between International Buyers and Farmers: Insights from Tonga's Vanilla Industry. *AIB Insights*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.46697/001c.19417>
- Tesfaye, S. S. (2017). Analysis of farmers perception on the impact of land degradation hazard on agricultural land productivity in Jeldu district in West Shewa Zone, Oromia, Ethiopia. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development*, 9(6). <https://doi.org/10.5897/jaerd2017.0854>
- Thirunanasambandham, K., & Karri, R. R. (2021). Preparation and characterization of *Azadirachta indica* A. Juss. plant based natural coagulant for the application of urban sewage treatment: Modelling and cost assessment. *Environmental Technology and Innovation*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eti.2021.101733>
- Thoriq, A., Sugandi, W. K., Sampurno, R. M., & Soleh, M. A. (2020). Improvement of Knowledge and Action of Farmers in Agroforestry Coffee Cultivation. *Jurnal Penelitian Sosial Dan Ekonomi Kehutanan*, 17(3). <https://doi.org/10.20886/jpsek.2020.17.3.209-219>
- Willis, W., & Johnson, M. (2020). Political Ecology of Shade Coffee: Perspectives from Jamaican Blue Mountain Farmers. *Conservation and Society*, 18(3). https://doi.org/10.4103/cs.cs_18_156