



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**EFFICACY, COST-EFFECTIVENESS, AND RISK-BENEFIT ANALYSIS
OF THREE HERBICIDES IN IMMATURE OIL PALM PLANTATION**

WAHYU WIBAWA

FP 2007 27

**EFFICACY, COST-EFFECTIVENESS, AND RISK-
BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF THREE HERBICIDES
IN IMMATURE OIL PALM PLANTATION**

WAHYU WIBAWA

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

2007



**EFFICACY, COST-EFFECTIVENESS, AND RISK-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF
THREE HERBICIDES IN IMMATURE OIL PALM PLANTATION**

By

WAHYU WIBAWA

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,
in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

December 2007



Dedicated to
Allah S.W.T,
my late father Suroyo Sarwo Darsono,
my late mother Hj. Tumirah,
my wife Sari Susanty,
my son Muhammad Aldrich Akhtar Wibawa



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment
of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**EFFICACY, COST-EFFECTIVENESS, AND RISK-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF
THREE HERBICIDES IN IMMATURE OIL PALM PLANTATION**

By

WAHYU WIBAWA

December, 2007

Chairman: Professor Rosli Mohamad, PhD

Faculty: Agriculture

Field experiment and survey were conducted at Malaysian Airport Berhad (MAB) Agriculture-Horticulture Sdn. Bhd., Sepang, Selangor. Laboratory and glass-house experiments were done at the Faculty of Agriculture, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Serdang. Two-year old oil palm planted in the plantation was used in the experiment. Paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium and glyphosate were used as treatments. The experimental design was a randomized complete block design (RCBD) with four replications. The general objective of this study was to evaluate the performance and impact of three commonly used broad-spectrum herbicides, namely, paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium and glyphosate on cost, production, environment and safety. Efficacy, short term weed dynamic, oil palm growth, fungi and bacteria population in



soil, residual phytotoxicity effect, residue analysis, and risk-benefit analysis of the three broad-spectrum herbicides were determined and evaluated in the experiment.

Paraquat at 200 and 400 g a.i. ha⁻¹ were not effective to control weeds, whereas at 600 and 800 g a.i. ha⁻¹ were effective with the duration of effective weed control of 8.75 and 11.75 weeks, respectively. Glufosinate-ammonium at 200 g a.i. ha⁻¹ and glyphosate at 400 g a.i. ha⁻¹ gave excellent weed control, within the duration of effective weed control of 15 and 14.5 weeks, respectively. Thus, efficacy of glufosinate-ammonium and glyphosate was better than paraquat.

Treatments with glufosinate-ammonium and glyphosate increased densities of broadleaf weed, but not on grass and total weed densities. Paraquat treatments did not cause weed shifting, whereas both glufosinate-ammonium and glyphosate treatments caused shifting in the weed species composition.

A round of paraquat sprayed at 200, 400, 600, and 800 g a.i. ha⁻¹, glufosinate-ammonium at 200, 400, 600, and 800 g a.i. ha⁻¹, and glyphosate at 400, 800, 1200, and 1600 g a.i. ha⁻¹ did not increase herbicide residues in the soil.

Using paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate for controlling weeds were safe for vegetative (plant height, the number of fronds/plant) and generative (number



of fruit bunches/plant) growths of oil palm. Severe weed competition affected number of fruit bunch of oil palm significantly, especially at early maturation stages.

Using paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate for controlling weeds in immature oil palm did not affect bacteria and fungi populations in the soil. The herbicides applied at range of recommended dose were safe not only to oil palm crops but also for bacteria and fungi as expressed by their populations.

Paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate residues in soil did not cause adverse effects (risk) on seed germination and growth components (plant height, leaf area, root length, and total dry weight) of corn and cucumber seedlings in bioassay study conducted. At the range of recommended application doses, paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate were safe for seed germination and plant growth.

Paraquat has unacceptable risk to human health, especially to the applicators. Paraquat at 800 g a.i./ha is quite costly (RM 310.80/ha/year) to get the satisfactory weed control. The risk of paraquat clearly outweighed its benefit. Glufosinate-ammonium has acceptable risk level to human health and environment. Glufosinate-ammonium require medium cost (RM 214.19/ha/year) to get to the satisfactory weed control. Glufosinate-ammonium can be used as alternate herbicide to avoid weed resistance. Glyphosate has acceptable risk to human health and environment, and



lower cost (RM 108.95/ha/year) to get to the satisfactory level of weed control. The benefit of glyphosate clearly outweighed its risk. This herbicide should be recommended widely because of its efficacy, cost-effectiveness, and safety. However, alternate herbicide is needed to avoid broadleaf weeds resistance.

Safe and effective use of herbicides in oil palm plantations were depend significantly on herbicide knowledge, experience, and formal education of the applicators. Handling and using herbicides safely were available, but preventive measures are costly. The use of dangerous herbicides should be restricted, when preventive behavior can not be used as a method of controlling the health risks associated with herbicides.



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**EFIKASI, KEBERKESANAN-KOS, DAN ANALISIS RISIKO-
KEUNTUNGAN DARIPADA TIGA JENIS RACUN RUMPAI PADA
LADANG TANAMAM KELAPA SAWIT PRA-MATANG**

Oleh

WAHYU WIBAWA

Disember, 2007

Pengerusi: Profesor Rosli Mohamad, PhD

Fakulti: Pertanian

Kajian dan tinjauan di ladang dilakukan di MAB Agriculture-Horticulture Sdn. Bhd., Sepang, Selangor. Kajian-kajian di makmal dan di rumah kaca dilakukan di Fakulti Pertanian, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Serdang. Tanaman kelapa sawit yang berumur dalam lingkungan dua tahun digunakan dalam kajian ini. Parakuat, glufosinat-amonium and glifosat digunakan sebagai rawatan. Rekabentuk eksperimen adalah blok penuh rawak (RCBD) dengan empat replikasi. Tujuan umum kajian ini adalah untuk menilai pencapaian dan kesan daripada tiga jenis racun rumpai berspektrum luas iaitu parakuat, glufosinat-amonium dan glifosat pada kos, pengeluaran, alam sekitar, dan keselamatan. Efikasi, dinamik rumpai jangka pendek, pertumbuhan tanaman kelapa sawit, populasi kulat dan bakteria dalam tanah, kesan sisa baki, analisis sisa baki, dan analisis risiko-keuntungan dari tiga jenis racun rumpai berspektrum luas dinilai dalam kajian ini.



Parakuat pada dos 200 dan 400 g a.i. ha⁻¹ tidak berkesan mengawal rumpai, sedangkan pada dos 600 dan 800 g a.i. ha⁻¹ berkesan mengawal rumpai, keberkesanannya masing-masing dalam jangka masa 8.75 dan 11.75 minggu. Glufosinat-amonium pada dos 200 g a.i. ha⁻¹ dan glifosat pada dos 400 g a.i. ha⁻¹ sangat berkesan dalam mengawal rumpai, keberkesanannya masing-masing dalam jangka masa 15 dan 14.5 minggu. Efikasi glufosinat-amonium dan glifosat ketara lebih baik daripada parakuat.

Rawatan dengan glufosinat-amonium dan glifosat meningkatkan kepadatan rumpai berdaun lebar, tetapi tidak pada rumpai rumputan dan jumlah rumpai secara keseluruhan. Rawatan dengan parakuat tidak mengubah komposisi rumpai, sedangkan glufosinat-amonium dan glifosat mengubah komposisi spesies rumpai.

Kadar penyemburan sekali parakuat pada dos 200, 400, 600, dan 800 g a.i. ha⁻¹, glufosinat-amonium 200, 400, 600, dan 800 g a.i. ha⁻¹, dan glifosat 400, 800, 1200, dan 1600 g a.i. ha⁻¹ tidak meningkatkan sisa baki racun rumpai dalam tanah.

Penggunaan parakuat, glufosinate-amonium, dan glifosat untuk mengawal rumpai adalah selamat untuk pertumbuhan vegetatif (tinggi tanaman, jumlah pelepah daun/pokok) dan generatif (jumlah tandan buah/pokok) daripada tanaman kelapa sawit. Gangguan rumpai yang teruk mempengaruhi jumlah tandan buah/pokok secara ketara, khasnya pada peringkat awal pengeluaran.

Penggunaan parakuat, glufosinat-amonium, dan glifosat untuk mengawal rumpai pada tanaman kelapa sawit pra-matang tidak mempengaruhi populasi bakteria dan kulat di dalam tanah. Penggunaan racun rumpai pada dos yang disyorkan adalah selamat tidak hanya pada tanaman kelapa sawit tetapi juga pada populasi bakteria dan kulat.

Kajian kesan sisa baki mendapati parakuat, glufosinat-amonium, dan glifosat tidak menyebabkan kesan negatif (risiko) pada percambahan biji benih dan komponen pertumbuhan (tinggi tanaman, lebar daun, panjang akar, dan jumlah berat kering) dari anak pokok jagung dan mentimun. Pada dos yang disyorkan, parakuat, glufosinat-amonium, dan glifosat adalah selamat untuk percambahan biji benih dan pertumbuhan tanaman.

Parakuat mempunyai risiko yang tinggi terhadap kesihatan manusia, khasnya kepada operator pengendali racun rumpai . Parakuat pada dos 800 g a.i./ha adalah cukup mahal (RM 310.80/ha setahun) untuk memberikan kawalan rumpai yang memuaskan. Glufosinat-amonium sangat kurang mempunyai risiko terhadap kesihatan manusia dan alam sekitar. Glufosinat-amonium memerlukan kos yang agak tinggi (RM 214.19/ha/setahun) untuk memberikan kawalan rumpai yang memuaskan. Glufosinat-amonium boleh digunakan secara bergilir dengan glifosat untuk mengawal rumpai yang resistan. Glifosat sangat kurang mempunyai risiko terhadap kesihatan manusia dan alam sekitar, malah kosnya adalah rendah (RM

108.95/ha/setahun). Manfaat yang diperolehi daripada penggunaan glifosat adalah lebih banyak berbanding keburukannya. Racun rumpai ini sepatutnya disyorkan secara meluas terutama berkaitan dengan efikasi, keberkesanan-kos, dan keselamatannya. Bagaimanapun, penggunaan racun rumpai secara bergilir diperlukan untuk mencegah resistansi rumpai berdaun lebar.

Penggunaan racun rumpai yang selamat dan berkesan di ladang kelapa sawit adalah ketara bergantung pada pengetahuan tentang racun rumpai, pengalaman bekerja, dan pendidikan formal daripada operator pengendali racun. Pilihan untuk menggunakan racun rumpai secara selamat adalah tersedia, tetapi tindakan keselamatan adalah mahal. Tabiat tidak mengamalkan langkah keselamatan sebagai suatu kaedah dari pengawalan risiko berhubung kesihatan yang berkaitan dengan racun rumpai menyebabkan penggunaan racun rumpai yang merbahaya harus dipertimbangkan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere appreciation is extended to Prof. Dr. Rosli Mohamad, the chairman of the Supervisory Committee, for his keen interest, invaluable guidance, tireless advice and support provided during the planning and preparation of this thesis. His countless patience, encouragement and generosity cannot be emphasized.

I am also very grateful to Prof. Dr. Dzolkhifli Omar, Prof. Dr. Ghazali Mohayidin, and Associate Prof. Dr. Abdul Shukor Juraimi, member of the Supervisory Committee, for their invaluable assistance and guidance at all stages of my research and preparation of this thesis.

The support of Government of Indonesia through the Agency for Agricultural Research and Development (AARD), particularly the Participatory Development of Agricultural Technology Project (PAATP, Asian Development Bank Loan) for awarding me a scholarship is gratefully acknowledged.

I wish also to thank the Director of the Agency for Agricultural Research and Development (AARD), Director of the committee of Human Resource, Director of Bengkulu Assessment Institute for Agricultural Technology (AIAT) for their support and encouragement and faith in me. I wish also to thank Managers of MAB



Agricultural-Horticultural Sdn. Bhd that have approved the field experiment in the plantation.

I am greatly indebted to the entire technical staff of Plant Protection and Crop Science Department, UPM, especially to Mr. Jarkasi, Mr. Mohd. Zaki, Mr. Mohd. Khir, Mrs. Junainah, Mr. Zawawi, Mr. Zainal, Mr. Shamsudin, Mr. Arifin for their cooperation that led to the smooth running of experiment.

Last but not least, to all my family members, especially my wife (Sri Susanty), my son (Muhammad Aldrich Akhtar Wibawa) thanks for their patience, love, care, sacrifices, endless emotional and physical support, and motivation.



I certify that an Examination Committee has met on 17th December 2007 to conduct the final examination of Wahyu Wibawa on his Doctor of Philosophy thesis entitled “Efficacy, cost-effectiveness, and risk-benefit analysis of three herbicides in immature oil palm plantation” in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Regulation 1981. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Members of the Examination Committee were as follows:

Mohammad Mohd. Lassim, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Sheikh Awadz Sheikh Abdullah, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Mohd. Mansor Ismail, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Ismail Sahid, PhD

Professor
Faculty Science and Technology
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
(External Examiner)

HASANAH MOHD. GHAZALI, PhD

Professor and Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 28 January 2008



This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Rosli Mohamad, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Dzolkhifli Omar, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Mohd. Ghazali Mohayidin, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Abdul Shukor Juraimi, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Agriculture
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

AINI IDERIS, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 21 February 2008



DECLARATION

I declare that the thesis is my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously, and is not concurrently, submitted for any other degree at Universiti Putra Malaysia or at any other institution.

WAHYU WIBAWA

Date: 11 January 2008



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xi
APPROVAL	xiii
DECLARATION	xv
LIST OF TABLES	xx
LIST OF FIGURES	xxiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxv
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1 Weed-Crop Association	4
2.1.1 Interference	4
2.1.2 Weed-crop competition	4
2.1.3 Threshold of competition	6
2.2 Oil Palm in Malaysia	6
2.2.1 Oil palm area	6
2.2.2 Oil palm production	7
2.3 Weed Management in Oil Palm Plantation	8
2.3.1 Weed definition and classification	8
2.3.2 Weed vegetation analysis	9
2.3.3 Weed problem in oil palm	10
2.4 Chemical Weed Control	11
2.4.1 Advantages and disadvantages using herbicide	11
2.4.2 Method of herbicide application in oil palm	13
2.5 Pesticide Regulation and Registration	16
2.5.1 Pesticide legislation	16
2.5.2 Pesticide registration	17
2.6 Hazard Associated with Herbicide Use	18
2.6.1 Human injury	18
2.6.2 Impact on non-target organism and environment	21
2.7 Protecting People and Environment	22
2.7.1 Pesticide applicator's safety	22
2.7.2 Personal safety equipment	23



	2.7.3 The safe handling pesticide	25
2.8	Herbicides Used in Oil Palm	26
	2.8.1 Paraquat	26
	2.8.1.1 Regulatory status of paraquat	26
	2.8.1.2 Effect of paraquat to human health	29
	2.8.1.3 Mode of action and fate of paraquat	32
	2.8.2 Glufosinate-ammonium	35
	2.8.2.1 Regulatory status and toxicological effect of glufosinate-ammonium	35
	2.8.2.2 Mode of action of glufosinate-ammonium	38
	2.8.3 Glyphosate	39
	2.8.3.1 Regulatory status and toxicological effects of glyphosate	39
	2.8.3.2 Mode of action of glyphosate	42
2.9	Residual Phytotoxicity Effect of Herbicides	44
2.10	Risk-Benefit Analysis	45
3	EFFICACY OF THREE HERBICIDES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON SHORT-TERM WEED DYNAMIC IN IMMATURE OIL PALM	49
3.1	Introduction	49
3.2	Materials and Methods	51
	3.2.1 Experimental site and treatments	51
	3.2.2 Initial weed vegetation analysis	52
	3.2.2.1 Density, frequency and dominance	52
	3.2.2.2 Important value index and summed dominance ratio	54
	3.2.2.3 Community coefficient	54
	3.2.3 Weed sampling and data collected after treatment	55
	3.2.4 Data analysis	58
3.3	Results and Discussion	59
	3.3.1 Initial weed vegetation analysis	59
	3.3.2 Efficacy of three herbicides in immature oil palm	62
	3.3.2.1 Percentage of weed killed	62
	3.3.2.2 Weed dry weight	67
	3.3.2.3 Percentage of weed growth reduction	71
	3.3.2.4 Duration of effective weed control	75
	3.3.3 Effect of three herbicides on short-term weed dynamic in immature oil palm	79
	3.3.3.1 Weed density	79
	3.3.3.2 Summed dominance ratio	83
	3.3.3.3 Community coefficient and weed shifting	87



3.4	Conclusion	94
4	RESIDUE ANALYSIS OF PARAQUAT, GLUFOSINATE-AMMONIUM, AND GLYPHOSATE IN SOIL	95
4.1	Introduction	95
4.2	Materials and Methods	96
	4.2.1 Experimental site and treatment	96
	4.2.2 Soil sampling	97
	4.2.3 Analytical procedures	98
	4.2.3.1 Paraquat analysis	98
	4.2.3.2 Glyphosate and glufosinate-ammonium analysis	101
	4.2.4 Statistical analysis	104
4.3	Results and Discussion	105
4.4	Conclusion	119
5	EFFECTS OF THREE HERBICIDES ON OIL PALM GROWTH, MICROORGANISM POPULATIONS IN SOIL, AND THEIR RESIDUAL PHYTOTOXICITY EFFECT	120
5.1	Introduction	120
5.2	Materials and Methods	122
	5.2.1 Effect of herbicides on growth of oil palm	122
	5.2.2 Effect of herbicides on fungi and bacteria populations in soil	125
	5.2.3 Residual phytotoxicity effect of herbicides on corn and cucumber	127
	5.2.4 Statistical analysis	129
5.3	Results and Discussion	130
	5.3.1 Effects of herbicides on oil palm growth	130
	5.3.2 Effect of herbicides on bacteria and fungi populations in the soil	140
	5.3.3 Residual phytotoxicity effect of herbicides on cucumber and corn	144
5.4	Conclusion	159
6	RISK-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF THREE HERBICIDES IN IMMATURE OIL PALM	160
6.1	Introduction	160
6.2	Materials and Methods	163
	6.2.1 Experimental and survey location	163
	6.2.2 Risk assessment	164
	6.2.3 Benefit assessment	165
6.3	Results and Discussion	167
	6.3.1 Risk assessment	167



	6.3.2 Benefit assessment	176
6.4	Conclusion	189
7	FACTORS INFLUENCING WORKER’S WILLINGNESS TO ACCEPT RISK DURING HERBICIDE APPLICATION	190
7.1	Introduction	190
7.2	Methods	193
	7.2.1 Survey location	193
	7.2.2 Theoretical frame work	193
	7.2.3 Hypotheses	194
	7.2.4 Data analysis	194
7.3	Result and Discussion	196
	7.3.1 Inter-item consistency reliability	196
	7.3.2 Descriptive statistic	197
	7.3.3 Multiple regressions of variables	198
7.4	Conclusion	205
8	GENERAL CONCLUSION	206
	REFERENCES	209
	APPENDICES	230
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	248
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	250



LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	Toxicity class and signal word in relation to acute toxicity and skin/eye irritation	20
2.2	The hazards of paraquat herbicide	27
2.3	The hazards of glufosinate-ammonium herbicide	36
2.4	The hazards of glyphosate herbicide	40
3.1	Weed species, IVI, and SDR of weed recorded at initial weed vegetation analysis	60
3.2	Community coefficient at initial weed vegetation analysis (%)	61
3.3	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on percentage of weed killed	63
3.4	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on weed dry weight	68
3.5	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on percentage of weed growth reduction	72
3.6	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on duration of effective weed control	76
3.7	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on weed density	80
3.8	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on the SDR (%)	84
3.9	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on community coefficient at 8 WAT	88
3.10	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on community coefficient at 12 WAT	89



3.11	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on community coefficient at 16 WAT	90
4.1	Recovery of paraquat, glyphosate, and glufosinate-ammonium (%)	110
4.2	Paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate residues in the soil	116
5.1	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on plant height of oil palm	132
5.2	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on number of oil palm fronds/plant	133
5.3	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on number of fruit bunches and oil palm response	135
5.4	Residual toxicity effect of three herbicides on bacteria population in soil	141
5.5	Residual toxicity effect of three herbicides on fungi population in soil	142
5.6	Percentage of corn germination and plant response affected by herbicide residues in soil	145
5.7	Percentage of cucumber germination and plant response affected by herbicide residues in soil	146
5.8	Plant height of corn and plant response affected by herbicide residues in soil	149
5.9	Plant height of cucumber and plant response affected by herbicide residues in soil	150
5.10	Leaf area of corn and plant response affected by herbicide residues in soil	151
5.11	Leaf area of cucumber and plant response affected by herbicide residues in soil	152
5.12	Root length of corn and plant response affected by herbicide residues in soil	153



5.13	Root length of cucumber and plant response affected by herbicide residues in soil	154
5.14	Dry weight of corn and plant response affected by herbicide residues in soil	155
5.15	Dry weight of cucumber and plant response affected by herbicide residues in soil	156
6.1	Synthesis of human health risk considered in the EU risk assessment	162
6.2	Risk assessment of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate	168
6.3	Personal protective equipments worn by herbicide applicators during handling herbicide	175
6.4	Cost-effectiveness of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate (RM/ha/year)	178
6.5	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on major component cost	179
6.6	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on biological characteristics	180
6.7	Balancing between the risks and benefits of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate	186
7.1	Description of respondents and sprayer equipments in immature oil palm	197
7.2	Model summary of dependent variable (willingness)	198
7.3	ANOVA	199
7.4	Test of significance of individual variable (coefficients)	201



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	Structural formula of paraquat-dichloride	26
2.2	Structural formula of glufosinate	35
2.3	Structural formula of glyphosate	40
2.4	Environmental risk assessment scheme	47
2.5	Element and concepts to consider risk assessment	48
3.1	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on percentage of total weed killed and weed dry weight	69
3.2	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on percentage of total weed killed and weed growth reduction	73
3.3	Effect of paraquat, glufosinate-ammonium, and glyphosate on percentage of total weed killed and duration of effective weed control (weeks)	77
4.1	Calibration curve of paraquat, glyphosate, and glufosinate-ammonium	106
4.2	Overlaid chromatograms of paraquat standard solution at 0.1, 0.5, 1.0, 5.0, and 10 ppm	107
4.3	Overlaid chromatograms of glyphosate standard solution at 0.1, 0.5, 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0 ppm	108
4.4	Overlaid chromatograms of glufosinate-ammonium standard solution at 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, and 3.0 ppm	109
4.5	Paraquat chromatograms of blank soil, standard solution, and soil treated	111
4.6	Glyphosate chromatograms of blank soil, standard solution, and soil treated	113

