

UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

FACTORS INFLUENCING ATTITUDE TOWARDS TECHNOLOGY ADOPTION AMONG PERMANENT FOOD PRODUCTION PARK PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS OF SELECTED STATES IN PENINSULAR MALAYSIA

ZULQARNAIN

FP 2022 52



FACTORS INFLUENCING ATTITUDE TOWARDS TECHNOLOGY ADOPTION AMONG PERMANENT FOOD PRODUCTION PARK PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS OF SELECTED STATES IN PENINSULAR MALAYSIA

By

ZULQARNAIN

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

June 2021

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science

FACTORS INFLUENCING ATTITUDE TOWARDS TECHNOLOGY ADOPTION AMONG PERMANENT FOOD PRODUCTION PARK PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS OF SELECTED STATES IN PENINSULAR MALAYSIA

By

ZULQARNAIN

June 2021

Chairperson : Norsida binti Man, PhD Faculty : Agriculture

The Malaysian government has been focusing on innovation, research and development through the integration of technology and agriculture. The Permanent Food Production Park (PFPP) programme was introduced by the government, aiming to increase food production, decrease foods import and to support the application of large scale of agriculture entrepreneurs. This study aimed to explore the factor influencing attitude towards technology adoption among PFPP programme participants in West Malaysia. The specific objectives of this study were: 1) To describe the socio-demographic and farm profile of PFPP participants; 2) to determine the attitude level towards technology adoption among PFPP farmers; 3) to determine the factors associated with farmers' attitude towards technology adoption. The study adopted a crosssectional study design and was conducted in four states in Malaysia namely: Negeri Sembilan, Selangor, Perak and Johor. The studied population included the PFPP programme participants with a sample size of 275 farmers selected using a simple random sampling technique. The data were collected using a wellstructured questionnaire that was initially pilot tested and validated. To achieve the stated objectives, five (5) main constructs were considered as independent variables based on relevant theories and previous studies. These constructs included respondents' socio-demographic characteristics, farm profile, perceived benefits of technology, perceived measures to improve technology adoption, and perceived role of agricultural officers. The obtained data were analyzed by applying descriptive analysis, independent T-tests, and multiple regression analysis using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, version 22). Most of the respondents in this study were males (93.5%), 45.5% were above 50 years old and 68.0% were Muslims. The majority of respondents were Malays (67.6%) followed by Chinese (29.1%), and less than 5% were Indians or belonging to other ethnicities. The majority (76.8%) of respondents had either primary or secondary education. In terms of farm profile, most respondents (96.7%) had farm size ranging from 1-30 hectares and 70.9% of them used TKPM land for their farming activities. A higher proportion of respondents (36.7%) earned less or equal to RM10,000 as gross income while 25.8% earned between RM10,001 - RM50,000.

Based on the analysis of all items measuring farmers' attitude level, 89.1% of the respondents had good attitude towards technology adoption. Further analysis showed that only 31.6% of the participants had high adoption level of technology in agricultural practices. Farmers with primary to standard six education had a significantly lower attitude score (B = -2.06; 95% CI -3.09, -1.04; P = 0.0001) compared to those with higher education. The farmers who owned and rented a land for farming purposes tended to have higher attitude score (B = 2.41; 95% CI -0.03, 4.86; P = 0.05) compared to those belonging to the TKM and surrogate land owners. Furthermore, farmers with the minimum net income (less or equal RM 10,000) had a significantly lower attitude score (B = -1.89; 95% CI -0.34, -3.44; P = 0.017) compared to those earning more than RM 100,000. Each unit increase in farmers' scores for items measuring the impact of technology was associated with an increased attitude score towards technology adoption (B = 0.11; 95% CI 0.14, 0.08; P = 0.0001). Similarly, a unit increase in farmers' scores for measures perceived to motivate farmers was associated with an increased attitude score towards technology adoption (B = 0.19; 95% CI 0.19, 0.07; P = 0.0001). These findings indicated that these factors could be used by appropriate authorities when developing strategies to improve technology adoption amongst participants of PFPP.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains

FAKTOR YANG MEMPENGARUHI SIKAP TERHADAP PENGGUNAAN TEKNOLOGI DALAM KALANGAN PESERTA PROGRAM TAMAN KEKAL PENGELUARAN MAKANAN TETAP NEGERI TERPILIH DI SEMENANJUNG MALAYSIA

Oleh



Di Malaysia kerajaan telah memberi tumpuan kepada inovasi, penyelidikan dan pembangunan melalui penyatuan teknologi dan pertanian. Taman Pengeluaran Makanan Tetap Program Program (TKPM) diperkenalkan oleh pemerintah, vang bertujuan untuk meningkatkan produksi makanan, mengurangi import makanan dan untuk mendukung aplikasi pengusaha pertanian skala besar. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk meneroka faktor yang mempengaruhi sikap terhadap penggunaan teknologi di kalangan peserta program PFPP di Malaysia Barat. Objektif khusus kajian ini adalah: 1) Untuk menerangkan sosio-demografi dan profil ladang peserta PFPP; 2) untuk menentukan tahap sikap terhadap penggunaan teknologi di kalangan petani PFPP; 3) untuk menentukan faktorfaktor yang berkaitan dengan sikap petani terhadap penggunaan teknologi. Kajian ini menggunakan reka bentuk kajian keratan rentas dan dilakukan di empat negeri di Malaysia iaitu; Negeri Sembilan, Selangor, Perak dan Johor. Populasi yang dikaji termasuk peserta program PFPP dengan ukuran sampel 275 petani yang dipilih menggunakan teknik persampelan rawak mudah. Data dikumpulkan menggunakan soal selidik berstruktur yang baik yang pada awalnya diuji coba dan disahkan. Untuk mencapai objektif yang dinyatakan, lima (5) konstruk utama dianggap sebagai pemboleh ubah bebas berdasarkan teori yang relevan dan kajian sebelumnya. Konstruk ini merangkumi ciri sosiodemografi responden, profil ladang, manfaat teknologi yang dirasakan, langkahlangkah yang dirasakan untuk meningkatkan penggunaan teknologi, dan peranan pegawai pertanian yang dirasakan. Data yang diperoleh dianalisis dengan menerapkan analisis deskriptif, uji T bebas, dan analisis regresi berganda menggunakan Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, versi 22). Sebilangan besar responden dalam kajian ini adalah lelaki (93.5%), 45.5% berumur 50 tahun ke atas dan 68.0% beragama Islam. Majoriti responden adalah orang Melayu (67.6%) diikuti oleh orang Cina (29.1%), dan kurang dari 5% adalah orang India atau berasal dari etnik lain. Majoriti (76.8%) responden

mempunyai pendidikan rendah atau menengah. Dari segi profil ladang, kebanyakan responden (96.7%) mempunyai ukuran ladang antara 1-30 hektar dan 70.9% daripadanya menggunakan tanah TKPM untuk aktiviti pertanian mereka. Sebilangan besar responden (36.7%) memperoleh kurang atau sama dengan RM10,000 sebagai pendapatan kasar sementara 25.8% memperoleh antara RM10,001 - RM50,000.

Berdasarkan analisis semua item yang mengukur tahap sikap petani, 89.1% responden mempunyai sikap yang baik terhadap penggunaan teknologi. Analisis lebih lanjut menunjukkan bahawa hanya 31.6% peserta mempunyai tahap penggunaan teknologi yang tinggi dalam amalan pertanian. Petani dengan pendidikan rendah hingga enam mempunyai skor sikap yang jauh lebih rendah (B = -2,06; 95% CI -3,09, -1,04; P = 0,0001) berbanding dengan mereka yang berpendidikan tinggi. Petani yang memiliki dan menyewa tanah untuk tujuan pertanian cenderung mempunyai skor sikap yang lebih tinggi (B = 2.41; 95% CI -0.03, 4.86; P = 0.05) berbanding dengan yang dimiliki oleh TKM dan pemilik tanah pengganti. Tambahan pula, petani dengan pendapatan bersih minimum (kurang atau sama dengan RM 10,000) mempunyai skor sikap yang jauh lebih rendah (B = -1.89; 95% CI -0.34, -3.44; P = 0.017) berbanding dengan mereka yang berpendapatan lebih dari RM 100,000. Setiap kenaikan skor petani untuk item yang mengukur kesan teknologi dikaitkan dengan peningkatan skor sikap terhadap penggunaan teknologi (B = 0.11; 95% CI 0.14, 0.08; P = 0.0001). Begitu juga, peningkatan satuan skor petani untuk langkah-langkah yang dianggap memotivasi petani dikaitkan dengan peningkatan skor sikap terhadap penggunaan teknologi (B = 0.19; 95% CI 0.19, 0.07; P = 0.0001). Penemuan ini menunjukkan bahawa faktor-faktor ini dapat digunakan oleh pihak berkuasa yang tepat ketika mengembangkan strategi untuk meningkatkan penggunaan teknologi di kalangan peserta PFPP.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful, I began this work with the believe that if God wants goodness for one of his followers, his wish shall be deemed to be, no matter anyone else's wish for it not to be. I direct my heartfelt gratitude to God for covering me with His love and care. Also praises be for Holy Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W), whose teaching are complete code of life and has been send to Rahmat-UI Almeen for mankind. I would like to thank, with gratefulness, my supervisor, Associate Prof. Dr. Norsida Man for her valuable advice and guidance. I truly appreciate her patience and understanding throughout my studies. I would like to mention to thank all the faculty members and those who willingly to participate in this study for granting me an access to information and opinions. May God bless us all. Last but not least, I would like to extend my appreciation to my family. I express highest regard to my caring parents, sister and elder brothers without their support. I also thank my elder brother Muhammad Ismail and sister in law Normazlina Tan for their encouragement, support and endless love. Without them, this thesis would have not become a reality.

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

Norsida binti Man, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Agriculture Universiti Putra Malaysia (Chairman)

Juwaidah binti Sharifuddin, PhD

Associate Professor Faculty of Agriculture Universiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

Salim bin Hassan, PhD

Senior Lecturer Faculty of Agriculture Uniersiti Putra Malaysia (Member)

ZALILAH MOHD SHARIFF, PhD

Professor and Dean School of Graduate Studies Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 9 March 2022

Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision;
- supervision responsibilities as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) are adhered to.

| Signature: Name of | |
|---|--|
| Chairman of Supervisory Committee: | Associate Professor Norsida binti Man |
| Signature: Name of Member of Supervisory Committee: | Associate Professor Juwaidah binti Sharifuddir |
| Signature: Name of Member of Supervisory Committee: | Dr. Salim bin Hassan |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|-----------------------|------|
| ABSTRACT | i |
| ABSTRAK | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | V |
| APPROVAL | vi |
| DECLARATION | viii |
| LIST OF TABLES | xiii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | xv |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | xvi |

CHAPTER

| 1 | INTR | ODUCTION | 1 |
|---|------|---|-----|
| | 1.1 | Introduction | 1 |
| | 1.2 | Background of the Study | 1 |
| | | 1.2.1 Agriculture in Malaysia | 2 |
| | 1.3 | Problem Statement | 4 |
| | 1.4 | Research Questions | 5 |
| | 1.5 | Objectives of the Study | 5 |
| | | 1.5.1 General Objective | 5 |
| | | 1.5.2 Specific Objectives | 5 |
| | 1.6 | Significance of the Study | 5 |
| | 17 | Thesis Organisation | 6 |
| | | | Ũ |
| 2 | LITE | RATURE OF REVIEW | 7 |
| - | 21 | Introduction | 7 |
| | 22 | Technologies in Agriculture | . 7 |
| | 2.3 | Permanent Food Production Park (PEPP) | , |
| | 2.0 | programme | 8 |
| | 24 | Attitudes | 11 |
| | 2.4 | Adoption | 11 |
| | 2.6 | Theoretical Framework | 12 |
| | 2.0 | 2.6.1 Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) | 12 |
| | | 2.6.2 Technology adoption process | 12 |
| | 27 | Social Learning Theory and Social Acceptance | 17 |
| | 2.1 | Easters Influencing Attitude towards Technology | 17 |
| | 2.0 | Adoption | 10 |
| | | 2.8.1 Socia demographic Eactors | 10 |
| | | 2.8.1 Socio-demographic Factors | 19 |
| | | 2.0.2 Failli Fiolile and Characteristics | 20 |
| | | 2.8.4 Factors Influencing Tachnology Adaption | 21 |
| | | 2.8.4 Factors initiancing rechnology Adoption | ~~~ |
| | ~ ~ | among Malaysian Farmers | 22 |
| | 2.9 | Chapter Summary | 23 |
| 3 | MET | HODOLOGY | 24 |
| | 3.1 | Introduction | 24 |
| | 3.2 | Study Area | 24 |

| | 3.3 | Study Design | 25 | |
|---|------|---|----------|--|
| | 3.4 | Sample Size | 25 | |
| | 35 | Data Collection | 20 | |
| | 3.5 | Concentual Framework | 20 | |
| | 37 | Description of Variables and Hypotheses | 28 | |
| | 0.7 | 3.7.1 Dependent Variable | 28 | |
| | | 3.7.2 Independent Variables | 28 | |
| | | 3.7.3 Farm profile and characteristics | 31 | |
| | | 3.7.4 Variables relating to the implementation of | | |
| | | PFPP | 31 | |
| | 3.8 | Questionnaire Design | 32 | |
| | 3.9 | Pilot Study | 33 | |
| | 3.10 | Data Screening and Analysis | 35 | |
| | | 3.10.1 Descriptive Analysis | 35 | |
| | | 3.10.2 Factor Analysis | 35 | |
| | | 3.10.3 T-Test and One-way ANOVA | 36 | |
| | | 3.10.4 Multiple Regression Analysis | 36 | |
| | 3.11 | Chapter Summary | 37 | |
| ٨ | DESI | | 38 | |
| - | 4 1 | Introduction | 38 | |
| | 42 | Socio-demographic Profile of the Respondents | 38 | |
| | 4.3 | Respondents' Farm Profiles | 40 | |
| | 4.4 | Attitude toward Technology Adoption | | |
| | 4.5 | Level of Technology Adoption in Various Farming | | |
| | | Systems and Practices | 44 | |
| | 4.6 | Technologies Used in Permanent Food Production | | |
| | | Park Programme (PFPP) | 45 | |
| | 4.7 | Benefits of Technology Adoption | 47 | |
| | | 4.7.1 Perception on the Impact of Technology | | |
| | | Porformance | 18 | |
| | 4.8 | Percieved Role of Agriculture Agents on | 40 | |
| | 4.0 | Technology Adoption | 51 | |
| | | 4.8.1 Extent of Change Agents Promotion Efforts | 51 | |
| | | 4.8.2 Communication Channels | 52 | |
| | | 4.8.3 Social System | 53 | |
| | | 4.8.4 Attributes of Innovation and Innovation | | |
| | | Decision | 54 | |
| | 4.9 | Networking and Relationship with Agriculture | | |
| | | Extension | 55 | |
| | | 4.9.1 Agencies interacting with PEPP farmers | 55 | |
| | | 4.9.2 Frequency of Contact and Visit of | FC | |
| | | Agricultural Officer 4.9.3 The Help And Advisory | 00 57 | |
| | 4 10 | Association between farmers' demographic factors | 57 | |
| | 4.10 | and attitude score towards technology adoption | | |
| | | among PEPP farmers | 58 | |
| | | | 00 | |

xi

G

| | 4.11 | attitude score towards technology adoption among PFPP farmers | 60 |
|---|--------------------------|--|----------------------|
| | 4.12 | Association between farmers' attitude score regarding technology adoption and perceived impact of technology, motivating measures and perceived role of extension agents and agricultural | |
| | 4.13 | agencies Simple linear regression analysis for factors associated with farmers' attitude score towards | 61 |
| | 4.14 | Multiple linear regression analysis for factors associated with farmers' attitude score towards | 01 |
| | 4.15 | Chapter Summary | 63 65 |
| 5 | SUM | MARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION | 67 |
| | 5.1 | Introduction | 67 |
| | 5.2 | Summary | 67 |
| | 5.3 | Limitations of the Study | 68 |
| | 5.4 | Recommendations for Future Research | 69 |
| | 5.5 | Conclusion | 69 |
| REFERENC APPENDICI BIODATA C PUBLICATI | ES ES OF STU ON | UDENT | 70 80 93 94 |
| | | | |

C11 r

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | | Page |
|-------|--|------|
| 2.1 | Current Status of PFPP | 9 |
| 2.2 | PFPP Status by State in 2015 | 10 |
| 3.1 | Reliability analysis of the Likert scale items in each section of the questionnaire based on responses from farmers in Johor | 34 |
| 4.1 | Demographic Profile of Respodents | 38 |
| 4.2 | Respondents' Farm Profile | 40 |
| 4.3 | Attitude towards Technology Adoption | 43 |
| 4.4 | Level of Technology Adoption in PFPP | 44 |
| 4.5 | Technologies in Permanent Foof Production Park Programme (PFPP) | 46 |
| 4.6 | Benefits of Technology Adoption | 48 |
| 4.7 | Increase in Income | 49 |
| 4.8 | Better Communication Network | 49 |
| 4.9 | Increased Performance of Farm Management | 50 |
| 4.10 | Changes in Attitude | 51 |
| 4.11 | Extent of Change Agents Promotion Efforts | 52 |
| 4.12 | Communication Channels | 53 |
| 4.13 | Social System | 53 |
| 4.14 | Attributes of Innovation | 54 |
| 4.15 | Respondents' Networking and Association with Agriculture Extension | 55 |
| 4.16 | Agencies Performance | 56 |
| 4.17 | The Help and Advisory | 58 |

- 4.18 Farmers' demographic factors and attitude score towards technology adoption among PFPP farmers
- 4.19 Farm profile factors and attitude score towards technology adoption among PFPP farmers
- 4.20 Comparisons between farmers' attitude score and mean score for impact of technology, measures to improve technology adoption and perceived role of extension agents and agricultural agencies
- 4.21 Simple linear regression analysis for factors associated with farmers' attitude score towards technology adoption
- 4.22 Multiple regression analysis of the factors influencing the attitude towards technology adoption in Agriculture among participants in PFPP

61

59

60

61

63

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | | Page |
|--------|--|------|
| 2.1 | The Flow Chart of Acquisition of PFPP | 9 |
| 2.2 | Technology Acceptance Model | |
| 2.3 | The Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology | |
| 3.1 | Map of Peninsular Malaysia | 25 |
| 3.2 | Conceptual Framework | 28 |
| | | |

 \bigcirc

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| ANOVA | Analysis of Variance |
|--------|--|
| CATPCA | Categorical Principal Component Analysis |
| DOI | Theory of Diffusion |
| EIA | Environmental Impact Assessment |
| FTAM | Farmers Technology Acceptance Model |
| JTAUT | Joined Theory of Acceptance and Use Of Technology |
| ICT | Information and Communications Technology |
| MOA | Ministry of Agriculture |
| NAP | National Agricultural Plan |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and |
| | Development |
| PFPP | Permanent Food Park Production |
| PEOU | Perceived Ease-Of-Use |
| PU | Perceived Usefulness |
| SD | Standard Deviation |
| ТАМ | Technology Adoption Model |
| ТРВ | Theory of Planned Behaviour |
| UTAUT | Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This chapter highlights the agricultural sector in Malaysia by focusing on the recent development in the area of agro-food policy and agricultural extension services. Also, this chapter emphasises the role of the Department of Agriculture in relation to the Permanent Food Production Park Programme (PFPP). Thereafter, the problem statement and significance of the study are discussed. The aims and objectives of PFPP are presented with the research questions to be answered based on the expected study findings.

1.2 Background of the Study

Agriculture contributes to the growth and development of the economy of many countries worldwide. The benefits of agricultural practices include income generation, provision of employment opportunities, improvements in rural development and poverty reduction in most developing countries (Diao et al., 2007). Aside from the positive benefits on national economies, agriculture is associated with environmental, cultural, and social benefits (Murad et al., 2008).

In modern agricultural practice, the transfer and dissemination of technology are one of the most important aspects. Technological innovations contribute immensely to the rapid development of the agriculture sector. However, the developed countries are the main sources and origin of most agricultural innovation and it is challenging to implement some of the technologies in developing nations. Agricultural technologies are at the forefront in attaining poverty alleviation in developing and under-developing countries but the adoption rates of these innovations remain a big challenge (Bandira and Rasul, 2002). Nonetheless, the role of adoption of novel technology is pertinent for the transformation of the agricultural sector. This reinstates the importance of farmers' learning behaviour as reported in several studies (Conley and Udry, 2010).

Despite the aforementioned benefits of technology in agriculture, its adoption by farms remains the major bottleneck in the sector. Several studies have reported the adoption rates of agricultural technology and associated factors in developing countries (Akudugu et al., 2012; Abdullah and Abu Samah, 2013; Silva and Brroekel, 2016). Overall, two main drivers have been identified to influence the successful adoption of agricultural technology and they include, (1) availability and affordability of new agricultural technologies and, (2) farmers'

expectations of profitability in the long term as projected by the new technology and its developers (Foster & Rosenzweig, 2010). Akudugo (2012) categorised the factors influencing farmers' adoption of new agricultural technologies into three aspects: economic factors, institutional factors and social factors. Specifically, the economic factors include the cost of adoption, farm size, expected benefits, access to credit facilities, and off-income generation actions. The factors explaining the social perspective are farmers' age, education and gender, whereas the institutional factors are related to access to and efficiency of extension services.

This leads to the stages of agriculture technology transfer. The first stage involves the transfer and dissemination of agricultural technology to farmers, while the second entails the motivation of farmers to adopt and implement such technologies on their farms (Tai, 2012). For the two stages of agricultural technology transfer to be effective, the process needs to be conducted by experienced specialists in agricultural extension.

The dissemination of technology to potential users is key in technology adoption. Reliable and technical guidance is necessary for the efficient dissemination of novel technology. This has been highlighted in several studies focusing on the significance of the dissemination process for revolutionising the agricultural sector (OECD, 2001, Rogers, 2003). Farmers that are interested in novel agricultural technology are exposed to various media and information platforms. Moreover, farmers may acquire more knowledge through self-experimentation, from agricultural extension services and their colleagues. However, the social learning approach is commonly used in developing countries for farmers' learning. In addition, traditional farmers are recognised to learn through passive means provided by change agents. Thus, technology dissemination is often conducted in rural communities by extension officers, representing the developers of novel technologies (Rogers, 1995). In urban areas, technology is disseminated through training courses in various locations of agricultural extension and communication (Ann, 2013). Today, many countries have established national research programs and institutions to develop and introduce agricultural technologies and good management practices to the farmers.

1.2.1 Agriculture in Malaysia

As stated in the ninth five-year plan of Malaysia, agriculture is one of the main drivers in the nation's economy, which makes. In fact, the agricultural sector ranks third in income generation and contribution to the nations' gross domestic product (Hassan, 2010). The five-year plan also emphasises large scale farming and more application of technology to produce high quality and value-added products and services. This aim is to be achieved by integrating agricultural technology with information and communications technology (ICT), exploring the profits of biotechnology (Economic Planning Unit, 2006).

Malaysian development aligns with the commitment to science and technology. It was between 1986 and 1989, that the domestic science and technology policy

mentioned developing the implementation of technology for economic development and social improvement. A central focus was to increase the innovation in research and development through the combination of technology. Furthermore, the auxiliary focus was to increase creativeness among individuals by creating a better working environment (Rahman, 2012).

The government has recognised that it is simply through agriculture they can feed the population of Malaysia. Therefore, they have invested in both financial and training terms in agriculture. Examples of the training courses are related to biotechnology, horticulture, and agribusiness, to improve the vision of individuals and promoting research and development. The focus has shifted from basic farming to generating value-added products such as fruits, livestock and vegetables. Based on the success recorded in the agricultural industry during the eighth five-year plan (RMK8), the Malaysian government has distributed a further six billion Malaysia ringgit in the agricultural sector to assist the paddy industry (Hayrol et al., 2010; Alam et al., 2010).

Malaysia is known for its heavy rain and all-year-round tropical climate which makes the farmlands one of the fertile grounds for agriculture around the world. Despite the endowed fertile land, Malaysia has always imported food principally from European Union and has to produce more to attain a food trade balance. Malaysia targets to be among the top high-income nation by 2020; hence, there is an emphasis on the agricultural sector to make use of every available opportunity and to take full advantage (Malaysia Ministry of Agriculture, 2018).

One of the recent programs implemented to improve Malaysia agricultural sector is the Permanent Food Production Park (PFPP). The PFPP was planned as a strategy under the Third National Agriculture Plan (NAP3) to support large-scale commercial agriculture and the application of technology in food production. The private sector is also expected to play a huge role in the success of the programme. PFPP places high concern on food production especially fruits and vegetables. In addition, the programme was enforced to tackle the problem of land shortage – a common challenge faced by farmers and entrepreneurs in the private sector. PFPP also plays an important role in graduate training and business incubator of the Department of Agriculture (DOA). The project encourages the provision of basic infrastructure necessary for the adoption of new technologies such as system drainage, irrigation system, farm road perfect, electricity and water supply.

The development concept of the PFPP programme involves the federal government, state government and employers. In Malaysia, the food permanent park is well-known and the facility encourages the continuous food supply in the country. The main objective is for the park to be a permanent food park zone, a source of opportunity and motivation to produce maintainable and eligible foods, and to increase the number of entrepreneurs in viable food production.

1.3 Problem Statement

The creation of PFPP dates back to 2009 and the project was designed to achieve specific objectives in Malaysia's agriculture sector. In general terms, the project was created to facilitate means to meet up with increasing food demand and produce entrepreneurs in the agricultural sector for national development. New technologies in agriculture need to be implemented for the objectives of PFPP to be achieved and sustained. Also, participants in PFPP need to internalise the concept of new technologies and implement them on their farms and other related areas.

The adoption of the new agricultural technology is expected after the concept of such technologies is disseminated to the users. Since the agricultural technologies are based on farmers' needs, it is essential to persuade them to adopt such techniques on their farms or production systems. However, the adoption of agricultural technologies among farmers differs between production systems and influenced by several factors (Abdullah and Abu Samah, 2013). For instance, farmers' perceptions, levels of education, knowledge of extension workers and the physical conditions of the area were reported to affect technology adoption among farmers in Malaysia (Abdullah and Abu Samah, 2013). Upadhyaya (2020) opined that extension service and households' education level were the main aspects to be considered in technology adoption among farmers. Other authors reported that lack of resources, farmers' sociodemographic profiles, incompatibility and complexity of new technology, socioeconomic and cultural constraints were the major constraints affecting technology adoption (Johnson and Kristina, 2009; Mignouna et al., 2011; Silva and Brroekel, 2016; Dhareif et al., 2018). In some instances, factors peculiar to the government or the agency might be more influential in the adoption of technology among certain groups (Fernandez-Cornejo et al., 2007; Keelan et al., 2010). These studies highlight the multidimensional perspectives relating to farmers' technology adoption levels.

Ever since the creation of the PFPP programme in Malaysia, no study has been conducted to assess the progress in achieving its primary objectives. To date, there is no available data on the factors influencing the attitude towards technology adoption among the participants in the PFPP programme, despite the creation of the project almost a decade ago. It is crucial to understand the reasons for the slow pace in achieving technology adoption among participants in PFPP. Likewise, it is pertinent to educate farmers on the current and advanced agriculture information and the dissemination of technology to boost innovation in the industry. This information is key for policymakers to make necessary adjustments and strategies to ensure the aim of the programme is realised. The following research questions were designed to enable the researcher to gain the necessary information and achieve the stated objectives of this thesis.

1.4 Research Questions

- 1) What is the farmers' adoption level of technology through PFPP?
- 2) What is the farmers' attitudes level toward technology adoption through PFPP?
- 3) What are the factors influencing technology adoption among the participants of the PFPP?

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are categorised into general and specific objectives.

1.5.1 General Objective

To determine the factors influencing attitude towards technology adoption among permanent food production park (PFPP) programme participants of selected states in Peninsular Malaysia.

1.5.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study are:

- 1) To determine the participants' adoption level of technology through the PFPP
- 2) To assess the attitudes of participants of the PFPP towards technology adoption
- 3) To determine the factors influencing participants' attitude toward technology adoption.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The study explored the attitude towards agricultural technology adoption among PFPP programme participants. The findings of this study may serve as a reference for policy and decision-makers in the agricultural sector to understand the current status of technology adoption level among farmers enrolled in the PFPP. This study is the first attempt to assess the farmers' attitudes towards technology adoption in the agricultural sector. Such information will reveal the

challenges and prospects of the programme. Also, organisers, policymakers and related personnel can strategise interventions to accomplish specific targets and goal of the programme. Hence, this study can be described as an appraisal of the project. Information from this study will educate policymakers and appropriate bodies on the areas that need to be strengthened to improve technology adoption among the participants. Policies and strategies can be streamlined with the research findings to gain positively from agriculture technology and boosting the nations' production.

Another significance of this study is the provision of socio-demographic characteristics of PFPP participants and opening the potential for future research in agricultural technologies. The data from this study can be employed in creating an effective communication and farming community between PFPP, extension agencies or extension officers and private organisations. Aside from the knowledge and information transfer on new technologies in agriculture, this study will provide the means of demonstrating novel technologies under farm settings.

1.7 Thesis Organisation

This thesis consists of five (5) chapters which are the introduction, literature methodology, result and discussion, and conclusion and review. recommendation. Each chapter describes the conduct of the study systematically. In chapter 1, a brief introduction to the agriculture sector in general and in Malaysia was presented. This was followed by the study background, problem statement, research questions and objectives, and significance of the study. Chapter 2 presents a comprehensive review of related studies. It consists of a literature review of previous and latest work on agricultural technology adoption. Next, Chapter 3 explains the methodology of the study in detail. It also explains the procedure for sampling, data collection and analysis of data. Chapter 4 presents the result and discussion of the research findings. Finally, Chapter 5 concludes the thesis which includes the discussion of the results, inferences from the findings, limitations, and recommendations for future research.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, F.A. & Abu Samah, B. (2013). Factors Impinging Farmers' Use of Agriculture Technology. *Asian Social Science*; 9, 3.
- Abebe, W. (2007). Determinants of Adoption of Improved Box Hive in Atsbi Wemberta District of Eastern zone, Tigray Region. Dissertation for Award of MSc Degree at Haramay University, Ethiopia. 115.
- Abu Samah, B., Shaffril, H. A. M., Hassan, M. S., Abu Hassan, M., & Ismail, N. (2009). ICT Contribution in Increasing Agro-based Entrepreneurs Productivity in Malaysia. *Journal of Agriculture Extension and Social Science*, 5, 93-98.
- Adebiyi, S., & Okunlola, J. (2013). Factors affecting adoption of cocoa farm rehabilitation techniques in Oyo State of Nigeria. World Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 9, 3, 258-265.
- Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In *Action control*. First Edition, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 11-39.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organisational behavior and human decision processes, 50, 2, 179-211.
- Akudugu, K. (2012). Adoption of Modern Agricultural Production Technologies by Farm Households in Ghana: What Factors Influence their Decisions? Agriculture and Healthcare, 2, 3.
- Alam, M.M., Talib B., Siwar C., & Toriman M.E. (2010) The Impacts of Climate Change on Paddy Production in Malaysia: Case of Paddy Farming in North-West Selangor. Processing of The International Conference of The 4th International Conference Malaysia-Thailand Conference on South Asian, Studies. National University Malaysia, Mar 25-26.
- Ann, E. (2013). "Extension agents' access and utilization of information and communication technology in extension service delivery in South East Nigeria", *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development*, 5, 11, 266 276.
- Babbie, E. (1989). Survey Research Methods, second edition, Belmont, CA, Wadsworth.
- Bahaman, A.S., Jeffrey, L.S., Hayrol Azril, M.S. & Jegak, U. (2010) Acceptance, Attitude and Knowledge Towards Agriculture Economic Activity between Rural and urban Youth: The Case of Contract Farming, *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 10, 19, 2310-2315.
- Bandiera, O., & Rasul, I. (2002). Social Networks and Technology Adoption in Northern Mozambique.

- Barton, H., (2003). New Zealand Farmers and the Internet. *Journal of British Food Science*, 105, 96-110.
- Batz, F. J., Peters, K. J., & Janssen, W. (1999). The influence of technology characteristics on the rate and speed of adoption. *Agricultural Economics*, 21, 2, 121-130.
- Baumüller, H. (2012). Facilitating agricultural technology adoption among the poor: The role of service delivery through mobile phones.
- Bonabana-Wabbi, J. (2002). Assessing factors affecting adoption of agricultural technologies: The case ofIntegrated Pest Management (IPM) in Kumi District, Eastern Uganda. Citeseer. Thesis submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Caesarius, L.M., & Hohenthal, J. (2018). Searching for big data: How incumbents explore a possible adoption of big data technologies Scandinavian Journal of Management, 34, 2, 129-140.
- Timothy, C.G. & Udry, C.R. (2010). Learning about a New Technology: Pineapple in Ghana. *American Economic Review*, 100 (1): 35-69.
- D'Silva, J.L., H.A.M. Shaffril, J. Uli & Samah, B.A. (2010). Socio-demographic Factors that Influence Youth Attitude towards contract farming: A case from Peninsular Malaysia. *American Journal of Applied Science*, 7, 603-608.
- Damanpour, F., & Wischnevsky, J. D. (2006). Research on innovation in organizations: Distinguishing innovation-generating from innovation-adopting organizations. *Journal of engineering and technology management*, 23, 4, 269-291.
- David, S., Mukandala, L., & Mafuru, J. (2002). Seed availability, an ignored factor in crop varietal adoption studies: a case study of beans in Tanzania. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture*, 21, 2, 5-20.
- Davis, F. D. (1986). A technology acceptance model for empirically testing new end - user information systems: Theory and results, PhD. Dissertation, MIT Sloan School of Management, Cambridge, MA.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS quarterly*, 319-340.
- Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1989). User acceptance of computer technology: a comparison of two theoretical models. *Management science*, 35, 8, 982-1003.
- Diao, X., Hazell, P., Resnick, D., and Thurlow, J. (2007). The Role of Agriculture in Development: International Food Policy Research Institute 2033 K Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20006-1002, U.S.A.

Economic Planning Unit Malaysia, 2004. Recent Economic History

- Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department, Putra Jaya. (2006). Ninth Malaysian Plan (2006-2010).
- Farid, K.S., Tanny, N.Z., and Sarma, P.K. (2015). Factors affecting adoption of improved farm practices by the farmers of Northern Bangladesh. *Journal* of Bangladesh Agricultural University, 13, 2, 291–298.
- Feder, G., & Umali, D. L. (1993). The adoption of agricultural innovations: A review. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 43, 3-4, 215–239.
- Fernandez-Cornejo, J., Mishra, A. K., Nehring, R. F., Hendricks, C., Southern, M., & Gregory, A. (2007). Offfarm income, technology adoption, and farm economic performance: United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.
- Flett, R., Alpass, F., Humphries, S., Massey, C., Morriss, S., & Long, N. (2004). The technology acceptance model and use of technology in New Zealand dairy farming. *Agricultural Systems*, 80, 199–211.
- Folorunso, O. & Ogunseye, S.O. (2008). Applying an enhanced technology acceptance model to knowledge management in agricultural extension services. *Data Science Journal*, 7, 22.
- Foster, A.D., & Rosenzweig, M.R. (1995). Learning by doing and learning from others: Human capital and technical change in agriculture. Journal of Political Economy, volume 103, 1176 – 209.
- Gakuru, M., Winters, K., & Stepman, F. (2009). Innovative farmer advisory services using ICT. documento presentado en el taller de W3C "Africa perspective on the role of movile technologies in fostering social development", Maputo, 1.
- Haggblade, H., G. Tembo, & C. Donovan (2004). Household level financial incentives to adoption of conservation agricultural technologies in Africa. Working Paper No. 9, Food Security Research project, Michigan State University, Lusaka, Zambia, 23 pp. Howard, J.A. and C. M.
- Han J. and Conti, D. (2020). The Use of UTAUT and Post Acceptance Models to Investigate the Attitude towards a Telepresence Robot in an Educational Setting. *Robotics*, 9, 34;
- Hassan, M. S., Shaffril, H. A. M., Abu Samah, A., Abu Hassan, M., & Ismail, N. (2009). Internet Usage and Its Contribution towards Agri-Based Productivity in Peninsular Malaysia. *Jurnal Ilmu-ilmu Sosial*, 10, 1-9.
- Hassan, M. S., Shaffril, H. A. M., Samah, B. A., Ali, M. S. S., & Ramli, N. S. (2010). Agriculture communication in Malaysia: The current situation. *American Journal of Agricultural and Biological Sciences*, 5, 3, 389-396.

- Hayrol & Azizan & Azahari (2010). The ninth Malaysian plan and agricultural extension officer competency: Acomation for intensification of paddy industry in Malaysia, Uluslararası Sosyal Arastırmalar Dergisi the Journal of International Social Research Volume 3 / 10 winter 2010.
- Hyytia, N., & Kola, J. (2006). Finnish citizens' attitudes towards multifunctional agriculture. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Association*, 09, 03.
- IFAD (2010). Common property resource and the rural poor. *Natural Resources Journal*, 15, 713-727.
- Jain, R., Arora, A., & Raju, S. (2009). A novel adoption index of selected agricultural technologies: Linkageswith infrastructure and productivity. *Agricultural Economics Research Review*, 22, 1, 109-120.
- Johnson, K.N., & Kristina M.L (2009). Challenges to Technology Transfer: A Literature of Review of the Constraints on Environmental Technology Dissemination.
- Kaliba, A. R. M., Featherstone, A. M., & Norman, D. W. (1997). A Stall-feeding management for improved cattle in semi-arid central Tanzania: factors influencing adoption. *Agricultural Economics Journal*, 17, 133-146.
- Kallba, A. R. M., Verkuijl, H., Mwangi, W., Byamungu, D.A., Anadajayasekeram, P., & Moshi, A.J. (2000): Adoption of Maize Production Technologies in Intermediate and Lowlands of Tanzania. In: *Journal of Agriculture and Applied Economics*, 32, 1, 35-47.
- Karami, E. (1995). Agriculture extension: The question of sustainable development in Iran. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture*, 5, 2, 47-54.
- Kariyasa, K., & Dewi, Y. A. (2013). Analysis of factors affecting adoption of integrated crop management farmer field school (icm-ffs) in swampy areas. *International Journal of Food and Agricultural Economics*, 1, 2, 29-38.
- Karubanga, G., Agea, J.G., Okry, F., Kiwewesi, S. & Mugerwa J.L.K., (2019). Factors effecting change in rice production practices and technologies among smallholder farmers in kamwenge district. Uganda. *Indian Journal* of Ecology, 46, 2, 316-324.
- Karubanga, G., Kibwika, P., Okry, F., & Sseguya, H. (2016). How the timing and location of video shows influence learning among rice farmers in Uganda, International Journal of Agricultural Research Innovation and Technology, 6, 2, 77-81.
- Katungi, E., & Akankwasa, K. (2010). Community-Based Organizations and Their Effect on the Adoption of Agricultural Technologies in Uganda: a Study of Banana (Musa spp.) Pest Management Technology, AGRIS, Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nation.

- Keelan, C., Thorne, F. S., Flanagan, P., Newman, C., & Mullins, E. (2010). Predicted willingness of Irish farmers to adopt GM technology.
- Keen, M., Brown, V.A. & Dyball, R. (2005). Social learning in environmental management: Towards a sustainable future. London: Earthscan.
- Kementerian Pertanian & Industri Asas Tani Malaysia. (2015). Projek berimpak besar.
- Khan, P. M. & Chouhan, J. (2006). Adoption gap in improved technology of animal husbandry. Indian Research Journal of Extension Education 5, 1, 63-65.
- King, W. R., & He, J. (2006). A meta-analysis of the technology acceptance model. *Information & management*, 43, 6, 740-755.
- Kotile, D. G., & Martin, R. A. (1998). Farmers perspectives on sustainable farming systems: A case study. Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Conference of the Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education, Tucson, Arizona.
- Kripanont, N. (2007). Using technology acceptance model of Internet usage by academics within Thai Business Schools. PhD thesis submitted to the Victoria University.
- Krueger, N. F., & Carsrud, A. L. (1993). Entrepreneurial intentions: applying the theory of planned behaviour. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 5, 4, 3
- Kumar, U., Yadav, C. M., & Khan, P. M. (2012). Impact of Adoption of Certain Selected Improved Animal Husbandry Practices in Sikar district of Rajasthan. Agricultural Research and Reviews, 1, 3, 86-88.
- Kuratko, D. F. & Hodgetts, T. M. (2004), Entrepreneurship: A Contemporary Approach, 3rd edition, Fort Worth, TX, The Dryden Press.
- Lan, P., & Young, S. (1996). International technology transfer examined at technology component level: a case study in China. *Technovation*, 16, 6, 277-286.
- Linting, M., & van der Kooij, A. (2012). Nonlinear principal components analysis with CATPCA: a tutorial. *Journal of personality assessment*, 94, 1, 12-25.
- Loeber, A., Mierlo, B. van, Grin, J. & Leeuwis, C. (2007). The practical value of theory: Conceptualising learning in the pursuit of a sustainable development. In Wals, A.E.J. (Ed.), Social learning towards a sustainable world. Wageningen: Wageningen Academic Publishers. 83–89.

- Loevinsohn M, Sumberg J, Diagne A (2013) under what circumstances and conditions does adoption of technology result in increased agricultural productivity? A Systematic Review. Protocol. London: EPPI Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Lowenberg-DeBoer, J. (2015). The precision agriculture revolution making the modern farmer. *Foreign Affairs*. May/June 2015 Issue.
- Makokha, M., Odera, H., Maritim, H. K., Okalebo, J. R., & Iruria, D. M. (1999). Farmers' perceptions and adoption of soil management technologies in western Kenya. *African Crop Science Journal*, 7, 4, 549-558.
- Malaysian Business, Travel and Government Portal (2010). Retrieved on 11th August, 2015.
- Malaysian Department of Statistics. (2011). Malaysian yearbook of statistics (2010). Malaysian Department of Statistic, Putrajaya.
- Malaysian Ministry of Agriculture and Agro-Based Industry, Department of Agriculture, Annual Report, (2010). www.doa.gov.my.FAO, (2007). Country report on the state of plant genetic resource for food and Agriculture, Malaysia (1997–2007). Rome.
- Mauceri, M., Alwang, J., Norton, G., & Barrera, V. (2005). Adoption of integrated pest management technologies: A case study of potato farmers in Carchi, Ecuador. Paper presented at the selected paper prepared for presentation at the American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting.
- McGregor, S.L.T. (2007). Sustainability through vicarious learning: Reframing consumer education. In A. Wals (Ed.), *Social Learning Towards a More Sustainable World: Principles, Perspectives and Praxis*, 351-368.
- Melesse, B. (2018) A Review on Factors Affecting Adoption of Agricultural New Technologies in Ethiopia. *Journal of Agricultural Science and Food Research*, 9, 226.
- Mignouna DB, Mutabazi KDS, Senkondo EM, & Manyong VM (2011). Imazapyrresistant maize technology adoption for which weed control in western Kenya. *African Crop Science Journal*, 19, 187-196.
- Miller, N., Griffin, T., Bergtold, J., Sharda, A. & Ciampitti, I. (2017). Adoption of precision agriculture technology bundles on Kansas farms. Southern Agricultural Economics Association (SAEA) Annual Meeting, Mobile, Alabama, 4-7 February 2017, Page 14.
- Ministry of Agriculture & Agro-based industry Malaysia. Dasar Agromakanan Negara 2010-2020(DAN). Last accessed on 22 Jan 2013.

- Ministry of Agriculture and Agro-based Industry. (2011). National agro-foods policy (2011-2020). Kementerian pertanian dan industri Asas Tani, Putrajaya. Muhammad Anim Bin Hosnan. Depty Director. Paddy Industrial.
- Mishra, A. K., & Park, T. A. (2005). An empirical analysis of internet use by US farmers. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*, 34, 2, 253.
- Murad, M. W., Mustapha, N. H. N., & Siwar, C. (2008). Review of Malaysian Agricultural Policies with Regards to Sustainability. *American Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 4, 6, 608-614.
- Mulugo, L., Kyazze, F.B., Kibwika, P., Kikulwe, E., Omondi, A.B., & Ajambo, S. (2020) Unravelling technology-acceptance factors influencing farmer use of banana tissue culture planting materials in Central Uganda, *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development,* 12, 4, 453-465.
- Muro, M., & Jeffrey, P. (2008). A critical review of the theory and application of social learning in participatory natural resource management processes. *Journal of environmental planning and management*, 51, 3, 325-344.
- Muzari, W. Gatsi, W & Muyhunzi, S. (2012). The Impacts of Technology Adoption on Smallholder Agricultural Productivity in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Review, *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 5, 8.
- Neil, A. W. (2004). Elementary Statistics Department of Mathematics and Satistics. Arizona State University. Book.
- Okoroji, V., Lees, N.J. & Lucock, X. (2021). Factors affecting the adoption of mobile applications by farmers: An empirical investigation. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 17, 1, 19-29.
- Othman, N. & Ishak, S. (2009) Attitude towards choosing a career in entrepreneurship amongst graduates, *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 10, 3, 419 434.
- Pickernell, D. G., Christie, M. J., Rowe, P. A., Thomas, B. C., Putterill, L. G., & Lynn Griffiths, J. (2004). Farmers' markets in Wales: making the'Net work? *British Food Journal*, 106, 3, 194-210.
- Pfeifer, J., Gabriel1, A. & Gandorfer, M. (2021). Understanding the public attitudinal acceptance of digital farming technologies: a nationwide survey in Germany. *Agriculture and Human Values*. 38, 107–128
- Rahim M. Sail, (2010). Empowering of Agricultural Extensionists Through Knowledge and Skill of the Extension Profession.

- Rahm, M. R., & Huffman, W. E. (1984). The adoption of reduced tillage: the role of human capital and other variables. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 66, 4, 405-413.
- Ramirez, A. (2013). The influence of Social Networks on Agricultural Technology Adoption. *Proceedia- Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 79, 101-116.
- Reimer, A. P., Weinkauf, D. K., & Prokopy, L. S. (2012). The influence of perceptions of practice characteristics: An examination of agricultural best management practice adoption in two Indiana watersheds. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 28(1), 118-128.
- Roberts, R. K., English, B. C., Larson, J. A., Cochran, R. L., Goodman, W. R., Larkin, S. L., & Reeves, J. M. (2004). Adoption of site-specific information and variable-rate technologies in cotton precision farming. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*, 36, 1, 143-158.
- Robinson, T. & Henry, M. (2001), Government-Supported Management and Workforce Development Initiatives for SMEs: There is Another Way, Leicester: Small Firm Enterprise Development Initiative/Centre for Enterprise
- Rogers, E. M. (1995a). Diffusion of innovations. (4th ed.). New York: Free Press
- Rogers, E. M. (1995b). Lessons for guidelines from the diffusion of innovations. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety*, 21, 7, 324-328.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of Innovation. New York: Free Press. 500.
- Rogers, E. M., & Shoemaker, F. F. (1971). Communication of Innovations; A Cross-Cultural Approach.
- Roling, N. (1988). Extension science: Information systems in agricultural development. CUP Archive.
- Salleh. S., Normand. D. & Featherstone, A. M. (2000). Quantitative Assessment of Improved Rice Variety Adoption: The Farmer's Perspective. *Agricultural Systems*, 66, 129-144.
- Sauter, R. & Watson, J. (2007). Strategies for the Deployment of Microgeneration: Implications for Social Acceptance. *Energy Policy*, 35, 2770-2779.
- Schweizer-Ries, P. (2008). Energy sustainable communities: Environmental psychological investigations. *EconPapers*, 36, 11, 4126-4135
- Seevers, B., & Graham, D. (2012). Education through Cooperative Extension, third edition. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas.

- Sekaran, U. (2010). Research methods for business: A skill building approach, Fifth edition, USA: John Willey & Sons' publisher.
- Shahbazi, E. (1993). Development and rural extension. Tehran, Iran: Center for Tehran University publication.
- Sharp, J. S., & Smith, M. B. (2003). Social capital and farming at the rural–urban interface: the importance of nonfarmer and farmer relations. *Agricultural* systems, 76, 3, 913-927.
- Silva, N., & Broekel, T. (2016). Factors Constraining Farmers' Adoption of New Agricultural Technology Programme in Hambantota District in Sri Lanka: Perceptions of Agriculture Extension Officers (December 8, 2016). University of Sri Jayewardenepura, Sri Lanka, 13th International Conference on Business Management (ICBM).
- Stephenson, G., & Lev, L. (2004). Common Support for Local Agriculture in Two Contrasting Oregon Communities. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*,19,210-217.
- Smith, D. K. & Alexander, R.C. (1988). Fumbling the Future: How Xerox Invented, the Ignored, the First Personal Computer, New York: William Morrow, 1988.
- Tai, H. (2012). Improve the management of dissemination of agricultural technology programs in Iraq. *The Euphrates Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 12, 1, 241-256.
- Tilbury, D. (2007). Learning based change for sustainability: Perspectives and pathways. In Wals, A. (Ed.), *Social learning towards a sustainable world*. Wageningen: Wageningen Academic Publishers. (pp. 117–132)
- Tornatzky, L. G., Fleischer, M., & Chakrabarti, A. K. (1990). The processes of technological innovation. Issues in organization and management series. Lexington Books. Available at http://www. amazon. com/Processes-Technological-Innovation-Organization/Management/dp/0669203483. Accessed June, 10, 2020.
- Traore, N., Landry, R., & Amara, N. (1998). On-farm adoption of conservation practices: the role of farm and farmer characteristics, perceptions, and health hazards. *Land Economics*, 114-127.
- Truong, T. N. C. (2008). Factors Affecting Technology Adoption among Rice Farmers in the Mekong Delta through the Lens of the Local Authorial Managers: An Analysis of Qualitative Data. Omonrice, 16, 107-112.
- Uaiene, R. N., Arndt, C., & Masters, W. (2009). Determinants of agricultural technology adoption in Mozambique. Discussion Paper No. 67E, Ministry of Planning and Development, Republic of Mozambique, Tete.

- Udimal T.B., Jincai Z., Ayamba E.C., & Owusu S.M., (2017). China's water situation; the supply of water and the pattern of its usage, International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment, 6, 491-500.
- Udimal T.B., Jincai Z., Ayamba E.C., Owusu S.M., & Caesar, A.E. (2017b). Factors Influencing the Agricultural Technology Adoption: The Case of Improved Rice Varieties (Nerica) in the Northern Region, Ghana. *Journal* of Economics and Sustainable Development, 8, 8.
- Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS quarterly*, 425-478.
- Waller, B. E., Hoy, C. W., Henderson, J. L., Stinner, B., & Welty, C. (1998). Matching innovations with potential users, a case study of potato IPM practices. Agriculture, ecosystems & environment, 70, 2, 203-215.
- Wollni, M., & Andersson, C. (2014). Spatial Patterns of Organic agriculture adoption: Evidence from Honduras. *Ecological Economics*, 97, 120-128.
- World Bank (2008). World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development. The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Yang, H., Yang, H., Lee, H., Lee, H., Zo, H. & Zo, H. (2017). User acceptance of smart home services: an extension of the theory of planned behaviour. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 117, 1, 68-89.
- Zhou, Y., Yang, H., Mosler, H., & Abbaspour, K. (2010). Factors affecting farmers' decisions on fertilizer use: A case study for the Chaobai watershed in Northern China. Consilience: *The Journal of Sustainable Development*, 4, 1, 80-102.