BioOne COMPLETE

Surveying stakeholder's perception of glufosinate and use in North Carolina

Authors: Jones, Eric A. L., Cahoon, Charles W., Leon, Ramon G., and Everman, Wesley J.

Source: Weed Technology, 36(3) : 443-450

Published By: Weed Science Society of America

URL: https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2022.31

BioOne Complete (complete.BioOne.org) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at www.bioone.org/terms-of-use.

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/Weed-Technology on 28 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use

Weed Technology

www.cambridge.org/wet

Education/Extension

Cite this article: Jones EAL, Cahoon CW, Leon RG, Everman WJ (2022) Surveying stakeholder's perception of glufosinate and use in North Carolina. Weed Technol. **36**: 443–450. doi: 10.1017/wet.2022.31

Received: 6 January 2022
Revised: 14 March 2022
Accepted: 6 April 2022
First published online: 16 May 2022

Associate Editor:
Prashant Jha, Iowa State University

Nomenclature:
Glufosinate; cotton; *Gosspium hirsutum* L.; corn; *Zea mays* L.; soybean; *Glycine max* L. Merr.

Keywords:
Glufosinate-tolerant crops; herbicide resistance management; weed management; survey

Author for correspondence:
Wesley Everman, Associate Professor, North Carolina State University, 7620 Williams Hall, Raleigh, NC 27695.
Email: Wesley_Everman@ncsu.edu

© The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Weed Science Society of America. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

Surveying stakeholder's perception of glufosinate and use in North Carolina

Eric A. L. Jones[1], Charles W. Cahoon[2], Ramon G. Leon[3] and Wesley J. Everman[2]

[1]Graduate Research Assistant, Department of Crop and Soil Sciences, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA; [2]Associate Professor, Department of Crop and Soil Sciences, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA and [3]University Scholar and Professor, Department of Crop and Soil Sciences, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA

Abstract

Glufosinate is among the few remaining effective herbicides for postemergence weed control in North Carolina crops. The evolution of glufosinate resistance in key weeds is currently not widespread in North Carolina, but to better assess the current status of glufosinate effectiveness, surveys were distributed at Extension meetings in 2019 and 2020. The surveys were designed to provide information about North Carolina farmers' perception of glufosinate and its use. Survey results indicate that many North Carolina farmers (≥26%) apply glufosinate at the correct timing (5- to 10-cm weeds). In addition, North Carolina farmers (≥22%) are applying glufosinate as a complementary herbicide to other efficacious herbicides and to control herbicide-resistant weeds, suggesting that glufosinate is part of a diverse chemical weed management plan. Conversely, survey findings indicated that some farmers (13% to 17%) rely exclusively on glufosinate for weed control. Additionally, 28% to 30% of farmers reported glufosinate control failures, and control failures were observed on several weed species among corn, cotton, and soybean crops. The results of the survey suggest that most North Carolina farmers are currently stewarding glufosinate, but they also support the need for Extension personnel to keep educating farmers on how to correctly use glufosinate to delay the evolution of glufosinate-resistant weeds. Semiannual surveys should be distributed to monitor where glufosinate control failures occur and the weed species not being controlled.

Introduction

Herbicides have been the primary tool for weed control for approximately 60 yr (Clay 2021; Crafts 1975). Harper (1956) hypothesized the evolution of herbicide-resistant weeds before triazine-resistant common groundsel (*Senecio vulgaris* L.) was confirmed in 1968 (Ryan 1970). Since that first confirmed case, there have been 509 cases of unique herbicide-resistant weeds documented globally, and 21 of those 509 inhabit North Carolina (Heap 2022). Consequently, there are few postemergence herbicides that can effectively control weeds in North Carolina row crops. The evolution of herbicides that inhibit acetolactate synthase (EC 2.2.1.6; classified as a Group 2 herbicide by the Weed Science Society of America [WSSA]) and weeds that are resistant to glyphosate (WSSA Group 9) have caused North Carolina farmers to rely extensively on other effective herbicides (Braswell et al. 2016; Cahoon et al. 2015; Mahoney et al. 2020). Glufosinate (WSSA Group 10) remains one of the few effective postemergence herbicides for use in North Carolina crops (Mahoney et al. 2020). Glufosinate is a nonselective herbicide, thus it must be applied to fallow ground, as a directed application, or to crops that have been genetically modified (Anonymous 2017).

The first glufosinate-tolerant crop was canola, which became commercially available in 1995, and was followed by corn (1997), cotton (2004), and soybean (2011; Duke 2014). While glufosinate is effective on many North Carolina summer annual weeds (Culpepper and York 1999; Everman et al. 2007; Mahoney et al. 2020), adoption of glufosinate use has not been high for many reasons, including cost, poor agronomic traits of glufosinate-tolerant crops (i.e., low yielding), and weed height-dependent efficacy (Bradley et al. 2000; Culpepper et al. 2000; Steckel et al. 1997). Glufosinate-tolerant cotton has been more widely planted in North Carolina since it was commercialized to allow for less intensive herbicide applications and to control glyphosate-resistant weeds (Price et al. 2008; Wilcut et al. 1997). Adoption of glufosinate-tolerant corn is widespread in North Carolina because the *bar* gene that confers glufosinate tolerance (phosphinothricin acetyltransferase; EC 2.3.1.183) is a marker for the Bt (*Bacillus thuringiensis*) trait, which provides control of several important insect pests in corn (Fearing et al. 1997). Despite the widespread adoption of glufosinate-tolerant corn in the state, glufosinate has been rarely used due to the availability of other effective herbicides (Armel et al. 2008; Crow et al. 2016; Ferrell

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/Weed-Technology on 28 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use

1. How would you classify your role in agriculture?
   a. Farm owner
   b. Farm owner and operator
   c. Tenant farmer
   d. Farm manager
   e. Crop consultant
   f. Farm supply retailers
   g. Chemical/seed company representatives
   h. Extension personnel
   i. Other _____

2. How many acres are you farming or managing? _____

3. What glufosinate-tolerant (i.e. Liberty Link and Widestrike) crop(s) do you plant? **Please circle ALL that apply.**
   a. Cotton
   b. Corn
   c. Soybeans

4. How do you use glufosinate (Liberty)? **Please circle ALL that apply.**
   a. Your main herbicide to control weeds
   b. A complementary herbicide to other more effective herbicides
   c. A safeguard to control escape of weeds resistant to other herbicides (e.g., glyphosate-resistant weeds)
   d. Other_____

5. If you do plant a glufosinate-tolerant (i.e. Liberty Link and Widestrike) crop(s) when do you apply glufosinate to control weeds? **Please circle ALL that apply.**
   a. Preplant burndown
   b. Early post emergence
   c. Late post emergence
   d. Layby

6. What are the troublesome weed(s) in your field(s)? **Please circle ALL that apply.**
   a. Palmer amaranth
   b. Common ragweed
   c. Sicklepod
   d. Italian ryegrass
   e. Other _____

7. How satisfied are you with the control of your weeds with glufosinate (Liberty)?
   a. Very satisfied
   b. Somewhat satisfied
   c. Neither satisfied nor unsatisfied
   d. Somewhat unsatisfied
   e. Very unsatisfied

8. How concerned are you with glufosinate (Liberty)-resistant weeds becoming a problem on your farm(s)?
   a. Very concerned
   b. Somewhat concerned
   c. Neither concerned nor unconcerned
   d. Somewhat unconcerned
   e. Completely unconcerned

9. Have you noticed glufosinate (Liberty) control failures on weeds that have been controlled in the past with this herbicide?
   a. Yes
   b. No

10. If you circled "Yes" for Question 9, what weed is not being controlled? **Please circle ALL that apply.**
    a. Palmer amaranth
    b. Common ragweed
    c. Sicklepod
    d. Italian ryegrass
    e. Other _____

Figure 1. The stakeholder survey of glufosinate use and perception distributed to North Carolina farmers at 2019 Extension meetings.

and Witt 2002). Glufosinate-tolerant soybeans have not been planted in North Carolina until recently due to the limited availability of varieties with acceptable yields (WJE, personal communication). Glufosinate may be applied frequently to control and delay the evolution of protoporphyrinogen oxidase (EC 1.3.3.4)-inhibiting herbicide (Group 14)-resistant Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) populations that are present in North Carolina soybeans (Cahoon et al. 2015; Heap 2022; Schwartz-Lazaro et al. 2017).

Glufosinate-resistant Italian ryegrass [*Lolium perenne* L. ssp. *multiflorum* (Lam.)] has been confirmed in North Carolina, but no summer annual weed has yet evolved glufosinate resistance (Molin et al. 2017; Heap 2022). While globally only one broadleaf species (Palmer amaranth) has evolved resistance to glufosinate (Heap 2022), it is important to note that it is the driver species for increased glufosinate use in North Carolina. As North Carolina farmers increase the number of times they apply glufosinate to control problem weeds, it is important to understand how farmers perceive its ability to control specific weeds and how and when glufosinate is applied. Knowledge of control failures with glufosinate will provide insight on which weeds to monitor for the potential evolution of glufosinate resistance. Understanding how farmers are currently using glufosinate can also foreshadow the loss of susceptibility over time (Neve et al. 2011; Young 2006).

Farmer surveys are important because through them, weed scientists are able to gain insight on the perceptions and usage of specific weed management tactics (Givens et al. 2009; Gott and Coyle 2019; Johnson et al. 2009; Sarangi and Jhala 2018; Schwartz-Lazaro et al. 2017; Sosnoskie and Culpepper 2014). Thus, we determined that surveying farmers who attend North Carolina Cooperative Extension meetings would be an appropriate strategy for gauging their current perceptions and usage of glufosinate. The survey hypothesis was that North Carolina farmers are using glufosinate in accordance with the label, but control failures are occurring with problem weeds. The specific objectives of this survey were to determine 1) how North Carolina farmers are applying glufosinate, 2) whether stakeholders have observed any weed control failures after glufosinate applications, and 3) whether glufosinate perceptions (i.e., control satisfaction and concern with the evolution of glufosinate-resistant weeds) and use differ across regions and crops in North Carolina.

Materials and Methods

A survey was distributed to stakeholders during North Carolina Cooperative Extension meetings conducted between January and March in 2019 and 2020. The survey consisted of 10 questions (Figures 1 and 2). Five-hundred and 343 surveys were distributed in 2019 and 2020, respectively. Common names of weeds and the tradenames "Liberty, Liberty Link, Widestrike" for glufosinate and the term "layby" was used in place of post-emergence-directed were used in the survey to avoid unintentional confusion. Changes to survey questions were made

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/Weed-Technology on 28 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use

1. How would you classify your role in agriculture?
   a. Farm owner
   b. Tenant farmer
   c. Farm manager
   d. Crop consultant
   e. Farm supply retailers
   f. Chemical/seed company representatives
   g. Extension personnel
   h. Other _____

2. How many acres are you farming or managing? _____

3. Do you apply glufosinate (Liberty) for weed control?
   a. Yes
   b. No

4. Why do you use glufosinate (Liberty)? **Please circle ALL that apply.**
   a. Your sole herbicide to control weeds
   b. A complementary herbicide to other more effective herbicides
   c. A safeguard to control escape of weeds resistant to other herbicides (e.g., glyphosate-resistant weeds)
   d. Other _____

5. When do you apply glufosinate (Liberty) to control weeds? **Please circle ALL that apply.**
   a. Preplant burndown
   b. Early post emergence (2 inch weeds)
   c. Post emergence (4 inch weeds)
   d. Late post emergence (Greater than 4 inch weeds)
   e. Layby

6. What are the troublesome weed(s) in your field(s)? **Please circle ALL that apply.**
   a. Palmer amaranth
   b. Common ragweed
   c. Sicklepod
   d. Italian ryegrass
   e. Other _____

7. How satisfied are you with the control of your weeds with glufosinate (Liberty)?
   a. Very satisfied
   b. Somewhat satisfied
   c. Neither satisfied nor unsatisfied
   d. Somewhat unsatisfied
   e. Completely unsatisfied

8. How concerned are you with glufosinate (Liberty)-resistant weeds becoming a problem on your farm(s)?
   a. Very concerned
   b. Somewhat concerned
   c. Neither concerned nor unconcerned
   d. Somewhat unconcerned
   e. Completely unconcerned

9. Have you noticed glufosinate (Liberty) control failures **not attributable to application issues** on weeds that have been controlled in the past with this herbicide?
   a. Yes
   b. No

10. If you circled "Yes" for Question 9, what weed is not being controlled? **Please circle ALL that apply.**
    a. Palmer amaranth
    b. Common ragweed
    c. Sicklepod
    d. Italian ryegrass
    e. Other _____

Figure 2. The stakeholder survey of glufosinate use and perception distributed to North Carolina farmers at 2020 Extension meetings.

between years to improve question clarity, conciseness, and to address responses from the prior survey (Figures 1 and 2). For the question "How would you classify your role in agriculture?", the response "Farm Owner and Operator" from the 2019 survey was not included on the 2020 survey to minimize redundancy from the answer "Farm Owner" (Figures 1 and 2). The 2020 survey included the question "Do you apply glufosinate for weed control?", which replaced the question "What glufosinate-tolerant crop(s) do you plant?" on the 2019 survey (Figures 1 and 2). The question "What glufosinate-tolerant crop(s) do you plant?" was redacted from the 2020 survey because it deterred farmers that do not use glufosinate from completing the survey. The question "Do you apply glufosinate for weed control?" was also included on the 2020 survey because many stakeholders wrote "Do not plant" or "Do not spray" to answer the question "What glufosinate-tolerant crop(s) do you plant?" on the 2019 survey. The possible responses for the question "When do you apply glufosinate to control weeds?" was changed from 2019 to 2020; specifically, the change was made from "Main herbicide" to "Sole herbicide". The change in the answer options was made because "main herbicide" could be mistaken for a herbicide that is just part of a chemical management plan rather than the only (i.e., sole) herbicide used for weed control (Figures 1 and 2). The response "Post emergence" was included for the question "When do you apply glufosinate to control weeds?" on the 2020 survey because the 2019 survey included only "Early post emergence" and "Late post emergence" (Figures 1 and 2). The question about observed control failures after glufosinate application was reworded to exclude control failures that were incurred by application error (Figures 1 and 2). Additionally in 2020, the county where the survey was distributed and the type of crop being grown were recorded. Counties were then grouped into regional categories that included Coastal Plain, Piedmont, and Tidewater (Figure 3). County-level data were recorded to account for the unique production factors present in each region of the state (Gibson et al. 2005; Wiles et al. 1992).




Figure 3. The counties where the Extension meetings were held and the glufosinate use survey administered was recorded for the 2020 survey. The counties were grouped into geographical regions within North Carolina. The Piedmont region consists of seven counties; the Coastal Plain region has five counties; and the Tidewater has five counties. Black dots represent surveyed counties.

Surveys were considered completed if ≥ 70% of the questions were answered. Additionally, the survey was considered completed if "no" was answered for "Do you apply glufosinate for weed control?" on the 2020 survey. Responses were represented

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/Weed-Technology on 28 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use

with a numeric dummy variable to the corresponding response for each survey question. Responses to each survey question were modeled with a linear regression using the GLM procedure in SAS software v.9.4 (Statistical Analysis System, SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC) to determine whether the independent variables were significant predictors of the dependent variables (question responses; $\alpha \leq 0.05$, where the independent variable for the 2019 survey questions was stakeholders and the independent variables for the 2020 survey were crop, region, and stakeholders. This method of analyzing categorical survey data has been used for previous surveys (Jussaume et al. 2021; Hope and Shannon 2005; McKelvey and Zavoina 1975). The survey questions "Why do you use glufosinate?" and "When do you apply glufosinate to control weeds?" were used as covariates for the responses to the survey questions "How concerned are you with glufosinate-resistant weeds becoming a problem on your farm(s)", "Have you noticed glufosinate control failures on weeds that have been controlled in the past with this herbicide?" (2019), and "Have you noticed glufosinate control failures not attributable to application issues that have been controlled in the past with this herbicide?" (2020; Figures 1 and 2). Pearson's correlation coefficients were determined between the questions "What are the troublesome weeds(s) in your field(s)?", "Have you noticed glufosinate control failures with glufosinate on weeds that have been controlled in the past with this herbicide?", and "If you circled 'yes' for Question 9, what weed(s) are not being controlled" using the Corr procedure in SAS 9.4 ($\alpha \leq 0.05$).

Results and Discussion

Response Rate

Of the surveys that were distributed, 229 were completed in 2019 (500 distributed, 46% response rate) and 296 were completed in 2020 (343 distributed, 86% response rate). Because the survey composition differed between 2019 and 2020, comparisons cannot be directly made across surveys, so they are discussed separately.

Stakeholder Composition

Most of the survey respondents classified themselves as farm owners and/or owner-operators (2019, 77%; 2020, 71%). Stakeholder description did not have a significant effect on the responses of subsequent survey questions in either year ($P > 0.05$), thus, all survey question responses were pooled across stakeholder type for both years. The stakeholder composition of survey years is provided in Table 1. Because the type of stakeholder had no effect on responses, herein the collective stakeholders will be referred to as farmers.

Hectares Farmed or Managed

Total farmland represented by completed surveys were 212,000 and 222,000 ha in 2019 and 2020, respectively. The farmland represented by completed surveys is approximately 10% to 15% of the total row crop farmland (1.8 million ha) in North Carolina (USDA-NASS 2019).

Glufosinate-Tolerant Crops Grown

The question "What glufosinate-tolerant crop(s) do you plant?" was asked on the 2019 survey only. The most common singular planted glufosinate-tolerant crop was cotton (16%) and soybean (15%), followed by corn (5%; Table 2). Farmers responses to multiple glufosinate-tolerant crops planted in their operation included corn+soybean (25%), cotton+soybean (13%), and then cotton+corn (3%), with 17% of farmers planting glufosinate-tolerant corn+cotton+soybean (Table 2). Although "Do not plant" was not a response option on the survey, 6% of the surveyed farmers wrote in those words (Table 2). Previous survey results show similar percentages of glufosinate-tolerant crops being planted in other parts of the United States (Riar et al. 2013a, 2013b; Sarangi and Jhala 2018; Schwartz-Lazaro et al. 2017).

Table 1. Responses to the survey question "How would you classify your role in agriculture?"

	Response	
Role in agriculture	2019	2020
	%	
Farm owner	15.5	71
Farmer owner and operator[a]	66	–
Tenant farmer	3	3
Farm manager	9	14
Crop consultant	0.5	6
Farm supply retailer	1	3
Chemical/seed company representative	3	2
Extension personnel	0	0
Other	2	1

[a]The response "Farm owner and operator" was deleted from the question on the 2020 glufosinate use survey.

Table 2. Responses to the question "What glufosinate-tolerant crop(s) do you plant?" in the 2019 survey.

Answer	Response
	%
Corn	5
Cotton	16
Soybean	15
Corn + cotton	3
Corn + soybean	25
Cotton + soybean	13
Corn + cotton + soybean	17
Do not plant[a]	6

[a]"Do not plant" was not a response option in the 2019 glufosinate use survey, but 6% of respondents wrote that in on the survey.

Glufosinate for Weed Control

The question "Do you apply glufosinate for weed control?" was asked on the 2020 survey only. Region ($P = 0.47$), crop ($P = 0.054$), or region by crop ($P = 0.56$) did not influence the response to the question. Fifty-six percent of the respondents to the 2020 survey reported they used glufosinate for weed control. Similar survey results provide evidence that glufosinate use is lower than 50% in other parts of the United States (Riar et al. 2013a, 2013b; Sarangi and Jhala 2018; Schwartz-Lazaro et al. 2017). In comparison, the survey was conducted more recently and in a different geographic region than those other studies, which likely influenced the responses.

Problem Weeds

Palmer amaranth along with combinations of Palmer amaranth and common ragweed (*Ambrosia artemisiifolia* L.), sicklepod

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/Weed-Technology on 28 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use

Table 3. Responses to the question "Why do you use glufosinate?"

Answer	Response 2019	2020
	%	
Main/sole herbicide[a]	17	13
Complementary herbicide	22	28
Resistance safeguard	28	33
Other	2	2
Main/sole herbicide + other	0	0
Complementary herbicide + other	0	0
Resistance safeguard + other	0	1
Main/sole herbicide + complementary herbicide	10	2
Main/sole herbicide + resistance safeguard	6	3
Complementary herbicide + resistance safeguard	3	14
Main/sole herbicide + complementary herbicide + resistance safeguard	2	4
Do not spray	10[b]	–[c]

[a]Main herbicide was the response on the 2019 glufosinate use survey, while sole herbicide was the response on the 2020 glufosinate use survey.
[b]"Do not spray" was not a response option on the 2019 glufosinate use survey, but a noticeable number of respondents wrote that in on the survey.
[c]"Do not spray" was not included in the 2020 glufosinate use survey.

Table 4. Responses to the question "When do you apply glufosinate to control weeds?"

Application timing	Response 2019	2020
	%	
Burndown	7	11
+ early postemergence	9	5
+ early postemergence + postemergence	–[b]	5
+ early postemergence + late postemergence	5	0.5
+ early postemergence + postemergence + late postemergence	–[b]	2.5
+ early postemergence + postemergence-directed[a]	1	0.5
+ early postemergence + postemergence + postemergence-directed	–[b]	2
+ early postemergence + late postemergence + postemergence-directed	3	0.5
+ early postemergence + postemergence + late postemergence + postemergence-directed	–[b]	2
+ postemergence	–[b]	4.5
+ postemergence + late postemergence	–[b]	0.5
+ postemergence + late postemergence + postemergence-directed	–[b]	0.5
+ late postemergence	3	1
+ postemergence-directed	1	1
Early postemergence	26	9
+ postemergence	–[b]	14
+ late postemergence	13	2
+ postemergence + late postemergence	–[b]	5
+ postemergence + late postemergence + postemergence-directed	–[b]	0.5
+ postemergence + postemergence-directed	–[b]	2
+ postemergence-directed	4	2
Postemergence	–[b]	18
+ late postemergence	–[b]	3.5
+ late postemergence + postemergence-directed	5	0.5
+ postemergence-directed	–[b]	1.5
Late postemergence	10	4.5
+ postemergence-directed	1	0
Postemergence-directed	2	1
Do Not Spray	10[c]	–[d]

[a]Layby was used in place of postemergence-directed on the glufosinate use survey to avoid unintentional confusion.
[b]The response was not included as an option on the 2019 glufosinate use survey.
[c]"Do Not Spray" was not a response option on the 2019 glufosinate use survey, but a noticeable number of respondents wrote that in on the survey.
[d]"Do Not Spray" was not a response option on the 2020 glufosinate use survey.

[*Senna obtusifolia* (L.) H.S. Irwin & Barneby], or Italian ryegrass were the most reported problem weeds in the 2019 and 2020 surveys. This result was expected because Palmer amaranth ranks as the most pervasive and ubiquitous weed in the southeastern United States, and the aforementioned weeds are ubiquitous in North Carolina row crops as well (Van Wychen and Hand 2020).

Glufosinate Use

Region ($P = 0.11$), crop ($P = 0.84$), or region by crop ($P = 0.70$) did not influence the response to the question "Why do you use glufosinate?" in 2020, and the responses were consistent across both years. The most common answer was "resistance safeguard" (2019, 28%; 2020, 33%), and "complementary herbicide" was the second most reported answer in 2019 (22%) and 2020 (28%; Table 3). Additionally, "resistance safeguard + complementary herbicide" was the most common response of the selected combination responses in 2020 (14%; Table 3). Only 6% of surveyed farmers answered "resistance safeguard + complementary herbicide" in 2019 (Table 3). The sizable percentage of farmers subscribing to these three answers may be regarded as a likely intent for "delaying of the evolution of herbicide resistance" as the answers represent frequently recommended practices to farmers (Beckie and Harker 2017; Owen 2016).

Conversely, the use as "main herbicide" (2019) and "sole herbicide" (2020) represented 17% and 13% of the total responses to this question, respectively (Table 3). These two responses were concerning because this means that approximately 20,000 ha represented in the surveys are being treated with glufosinate as the main or sole herbicide, and relying on a single herbicide for weed control will impart selection pressure and expedite the evolution of glufosinate-resistant weeds on these farms (Matzrafi et al. 2020; Young 2006). Most responses (50% to 60%) to the question "Why do you apply glufosinate" provides evidence that North Carolina farmers are using glufosinate as part of a diverse herbicide program. However, because responses indicate that glufosinate was being intensively relied on for weed control (i.e., as the main or sole herbicide), herbicide stewardship still needs to be communicated at Extension meetings in an attempt to prolong the time until a glufosinate-resistant summer annual weed evolves in North Carolina.

Glufosinate Applications

Region ($P = 0.48$), crop ($P = 0.18$), or region by crop ($P = 0.06$) did not influence the response to the question "When do you apply glufosinate to control weeds?" in 2020. The question covariate "Why do you use glufosinate for weed control?" had a significant effect on the responses to this question in 2020 ($P = 0.002$); in these instances the more reasons why a farmer used glufosinate resulted in more application timings being used. No other question covariate was significant from either survey year. The most common response to the question "When do you apply glufosinate to control weeds?" was early postemergence (26%) in 2019 and postemergence (18%) in 2020 (Table 4). These responses (applying glufosinate early postemergence and postemergence) are well received because these applications are the most efficacious with glufosinate. The survey provided evidence that some farmers

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/Weed-Technology on 28 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use

(4.5% to 10%) are applying glufosinate at late postemergence, which is concerning because weeds are generally not effectively controlled with this application timing (Cahoon et al. 2015; Everman et al. 2007; Steckel et al. 1997; Table 4). North Carolina farmers also responded that they used glufosinate for burndown and postemergence-directed applications, which is inconsistent with recommendations of North Carolina State University Extension specialists (Table 4). Applying glufosinate as a burndown is not recommended in North Carolina because air temperature and relative humidity are lower when these applications are typically made, which can result in control failures (Coetzer et al. 2001; Sellers et al. 2003). Additionally, other efficacious herbicides can be applied for burndown and postemergence-directed purposes, and thus reduce the selection pressure and evolution of glufosinate-resistant weeds (Boerboom 1999; Everman et al. 2007; Price et al. 2008). Many of the farmers who responded to the survey use ≥ 2 application timings of glufosinate per season: early postemergence + late postemergence (13%) and early postemergence + postemergence (14%) were the most common responses in 2019 and 2020, respectively (Table 4). The plethora of glufosinate application combinations represented in both survey years is presented in Table 4. While the responses suggesting glufosinate applied in multitudinous ways could be concerning because it suggests overreliance, these responses could represent how a North Carolina farmer uses glufosinate as deemed fit for particular environments and prevalent weeds across years.

Satisfaction of Weed Control with Glufosinate

Region (P = 0.07), crop (P = 0.91), or region by crop (P = 0.33) did not influence the response to the question "How satisfied are you with the control of your weeds with glufosinate?" in 2020. The question covariate "When do you apply glufosinate for weed control?" had a significant effect on the responses to the 2019 survey (P = 0.01) in that the more application timings a farmer used resulted in somewhat satisfaction with weed control. No other question covariate was significant from either survey year. Responses of very satisfied and somewhat satisfied represented 80% and 93% of the total responses in 2019 and 2020, respectively (Table 5). This result was expected because glufosinate will control weeds (including weeds that are resistant to other herbicides) when applied in a timely manner. Evidence that North Carolina farmers are applying glufosinate in a timely manner was derived from the question "When do you apply glufosinate to control weeds?" as glufosinate is applied to weeds < 10 cm in height (Table 4). Satisfaction with glufosinate control is parallel to results of other farmer surveys conducted in areas where the herbicide is still efficacious (Sarangi and Jhala 2018; Schwartz-Lazaro et al. 2017).

Concern with the Evolution of Glufosinate-Resistant Weeds

Region (P = 0.37), crop (P = 0.84), or region by crop (P = 0.33) did not influence the response to the question "How concerned are you with glufosinate-resistant weeds becoming a problem on your farm(s)?" in 2020. The question covariate "Why do you spray glufosinate?" had a significant effect on the responses to the 2019 survey (P = 0.03): the more reasons a farmer gave for applying glufosinate resulted in a decreased concern for the evolution of glufosinate-resistant weeds. No other question covariate was significant from either survey year. Very concerned and somewhat concerned represented 85% of the total responses in both years (Table 6). The responses to this question provide evidence that most North Carolina farmers are cognizant that glufosinate resistance can evolve among the summer annual weeds that inhabit their fields. The remaining responses of neither concerned, somewhat concerned, and very unconcerned about weeds evolving resistance to glufosinate are highly worrisome because herbicide-resistant weed management should be a community approach (Ervin and Frisvold 2017). Pollen and seeds from herbicide-resistant weeds (e.g., glufosinate-resistant weeds) from fields that are poorly managed can emigrate to fields in proximity where management practices are being implemented to mitigate the evolution of glufosinate resistance (Ervin and Jussaume 2014; Liu et al. 2012; Norsworthy et al. 2014).

Table 5. Responses to the question "How satisfied are you with the control of your weeds with glufosinate?"

	Response	
Answer	2019	2020
	%	
Very satisfied	32	38
Somewhat satisfied	52	45
Neither satisfied nor unsatisfied	12	4
Somewhat Unsatisfied	4	2
Very Unsatisfied	0	1

Table 6. Responses to the question "How concerned are you of glufosinate-resistant weeds becoming a problem on your farm(s)?"

	Response	
Answer	2019	2020
	%	
Very concerned	45	48
Somewhat concerned	40	37
Neither concerned nor unconcerned	12	10
Somewhat unconcerned	2	3
Very unconcerned	1	2

Control Failures

Control failures with glufosinate were reported for the surveys distributed in 2019 and 2020. Region (P = 0.84) and crop (P = 0.40) did not influence the response to the question on the 2020 survey; however, there was a significant interaction between the two main effects (P = 0.007). The question "When do you apply glufosinate to control weeds" was a significant covariate for the responses to the 2019 survey (P = 0.02): the more application timings a farmer used resulted in realizing a control failure. This result could be due to the application of glufosinate to weeds too large to control (i.e., late postemergence and postemergence-directed). No other question covariate was significant from either survey year. Responses to the questions "What are the troublesome weed(s) in your field(s)?" and "Have you noticed control failures with glufosinate on weeds that have been controlled in the past with this herbicide?" were not correlated in 2019 (r = 0.025; P = 0.7) or 2020 (r = -0.04; P = 0.58). Of the farmers who responded to the survey, 70% and 60% in 2019 and 2020, respectively, did not experience a glufosinate control failure. The reported glufosinate control failures do not delineate the evolution of glufosinate resistance but are worth noting (Mahoney et al. 2020; Sosnoskie and Culpepper 2014). On average, control failures with glufosinate did not occur with Piedmont corn and soybean, Coastal Plain corn and cotton, or Tidewater soybean

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/Weed-Technology on 28 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use

Table 7. Responses to the question "Have you noticed glufosinate control failures not attributable to applications issues on weeds that have been controlled in the past with this herbicide?"

Region	Crop	Response	
		Yes	No
		%	
Piedmont	Corn	29	71
	Cotton	43	57
	Soybean	27	73
Coastal Plain	Corn	28	72
	Cotton	11	89
	Soybean	62	38
Tidewater	Corn	–[a]	–
	Cotton	38	62
	Soybean	22	78

[a]No corn Extension meeting was held in the Tidewater region in 2020.

(Figure 3; Table 7). Responses to questions regarding control failures and successes were similar in the Piedmont (yes, 43%; no, 57%) and Tidewater (yes, 38%; no, 62%) cotton (Figure 3; Table 7). The responses to questions regarding glufosinate control failures being common in Piedmont cotton may be skewed. Piedmont cotton was represented only by seven surveys in one county (Figure 3; Table 7). Those few surveys representing that region was expected because cotton is not widely grown in the Piedmont. Control failures with glufosinate was the common response in Coastal Plain soybean (Figure 3; Table 7).

While the responses to the survey questions provide evidence that the majority of glufosinate applications are efficacious in North Carolina, control failures are evident and farmer complaints should be taken seriously. Recommendations should focus on controlling the weeds that survive the herbicide application immediately rather than allowing surviving weeds to produce seed (Beckie and Harker 2017; Owen 2016). The limited number of reported control failures could be due to the application of more efficacious, complementary herbicides and appropriate application timing of the herbicide (Cahoon et al. 2015; Everman et al. 2009; Vann et al. 2017).

Weeds Not Being Controlled with Glufosinate

Region ($P = 0.43$), crop ($P = 0.051$), or region by crop ($P = 0.77$) did not influence the response to the question "If you circled 'Yes' for Question 9, what weed is not being controlled?" in 2020. Responses to the questions "What are the troublesome weed(s) in your field(s)?" and "If you circled 'Yes' for Question 9, what weed is not being controlled?" were correlated in 2019 ($r = 0.3$; $P = 0.02$) and 2020 ($r = 0.39$; $P = 0.005$). Palmer amaranth was the most commonly reported weed that was not controlled with glufosinate in both years (2019, 52%; 2020, 53%). This response was expected because Palmer amaranth ranks as one of the most pervasive and ubiquitous weeds in the southeastern United States (Van Wychen and Hand 2020). Aside from Palmer amaranth being pervasive and ubiquitous, control failures are often incurred due to the rapid growth of the species, resulting in applying the herbicide when the weed is too large (Bond and Oliver 2006; Steckel et al. 1997). Palmer amaranth has evolved resistance to 10 unique herbicide groups (including glufosinate-resistant and multiple herbicide–resistant populations), so the assumption that some populations may be in a transition from glufosinate-susceptible to glufosinate-resistant should be a core component in any weed management and glufosinate stewardship strategy (Heap 2022; Norsworthy et al. 2021; Salas-Perez et al. 2018).

Overall, the responses to the glufosinate use survey indicate that most farmers in North Carolina are currently stewarding glufosinate to some degree and that this herbicide remains efficacious on most row crop weeds. The survey sample from 2020 also indicated that approximately half of the farmers who responded are applying glufosinate. Since some of the responses raised concerns (i.e., inappropriate application timing, incurred control failures, no concern about the risk of the evolution of glufosinate resistance), herbicide stewardship should be continuously addressed and corrected by Extension personnel. Increasing awareness of glufosinate use can influence farmer decisions to extend the effectiveness longevity of this herbicide. The survey responses will also aid Extension personnel to understand how and why glufosinate is being used in their region. The glufosinate use survey should be redistributed in North Carolina semiannually to monitor the use of glufosinate, farmers' perception of it, and weed susceptibility to it. Since control failures were identified in all crops and regions surveyed, North Carolina weed populations should be collected and screened to determine the susceptibility to glufosinate. In parallel, if glufosinate control failures do occur, determining why and how glufosinate was used could provide an explanation for the failure. Additional questions should be added to subsequent glufosinate (or any given herbicide) use surveys to determine why farmers choose to not apply glufosinate for weed control purposes. Understanding the barriers to glufosinate adoption could provide insight on how Extension personnel could accommodate and recommend how and why to use glufosinate (or any given herbicide) for weed control.

Acknowledgments. No conflicts of interest have been declared. Funding was provided by the North Carolina Soybean Producers Association. Special thanks to Charles W. Cahoon and Wesley J. Everman for distributing the glufosinate use surveys at North Carolina Extension Cooperative meetings for two years. We extend a special thank you to Dr. Micheal D.K. Owen for reviewing the manuscript.

References

Anonymous (2017) Liberty® herbicide product label. Research Triangle Park, NC: Bayer CropScience. 27 p

Armel GR, Richardson RJ, Wilson HP, Hines TE (2008) Mesotrione and glufosinate in glufosinate-resistant corn. Weed Technol 22:591–596

Beckie HJ, Harker NK (2017) Our top 10 herbicide-resistant weed management practices. Pest Manage Sci 73:1045–1052

Boerboom CM (1999) Nonchemical options for delaying weed resistance to herbicides in Midwest cropping systems. Weed Technol 13:636–642

Bond JA, Oliver LR (2006) Comparative growth of Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) accessions. Weed Sci 54:121–126

Bradley PR, Johnson WG, Hart SE, Buesinger ML, Massey RE (2000) Economics of weed management in glufosinate-resistant corn (*Zea mays* L.). Weed Technol 14:495–501

Braswell LR, Cahoon CW, York AC, Jordan DL, Seagroves RW (2016) Fluridone and encapsulated acetochlor reduce protoporphyrinogen oxidase inhibitor use in a glufosinate-based Palmer amaranth management program for cotton. Weed Technol 30:838–847

Cahoon CW, York AC, Jordan DL, Everman WJ, Seagroves RW, Culpepper AS, Eure PM (2015) Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) management in dicamba-resistant cotton. Weed Technol 29:758–770

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/Weed-Technology on 28 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use

Clay SA (2021) Near-term challenges for global agriculture: Herbicide-resistant weeds. J Agron 113:4463–4472
Coetzer E, Al-Khatib K, Loughin TM (2001) Glufosinate efficacy, absorption, and translocation in amaranth as affected by relative humidity and temperature. Weed Sci 49:8–13
Crafts AS (1975) Pages 161–176 *in* Modern weed control. Oakland: University of California Press
Crow WD, Steckel LE, Mueller TC, Hayes RM (2016) Management of large, glyphosate-resistant Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) in corn. Weed Technol 30:611–616
Culpepper AS, York AC (1999) Weed management in glufosinate-resistant corn (*Zea mays*). Weed Technol 13:324–333
Culpepper AS, York AC, Batts RB, Jennings KM (2000) Weed management in glufosinate- and glyphosate-resistant soybean (*Glycine max*). Weed Technol 14:77–88
Duke SO (2014) Perspectives on transgenic, herbicide-resistant crops in the United States almost 20 years after introduction. Pest Manag Sci 71:652–657
Ervin DE, Frisvold GB (2017) Community-based approaches to herbicide-resistant weed management: Lessons from science and practice. Weed Sci 64:609–626
Ervin D, Jussaume R (2014) Integrating social science into managing herbicide-resistant weeds and associated environmental impacts. Weed Sci 62:403–414
Everman WJ, Burke IC, Allen JR, Collins J, Wilcut JW (2007) Weed control and yield with glufosinate-resistant cotton weed management systems. Weed Technol 21:695–701
Everman WJ, Clewis SB, York AC, Wilcut JE (2009) Weed control and yield with flumioxazin, fomesafen, and S-metolachlor systems for glufosinate-resistant cotton residual weed management. Weed Technol 23:391–397
Fearing PL, Brown D, Vlachos D, Meghji M, Privalle L (1997) Quantitative analysis of CryIA(b) expression in Bt maize plants, tissues, and silage and stability of expression over successive generations. Mol Breed 3:169–176
Ferrell JA, Witt WW (2002) Comparison of glyphosate with other herbicides for weed control in corn (*Zea mays*): efficacy and economics. Weed Technol 16:701–706
Gibson KD, Johnson WG, Hillger DE (2005) Farmer perceptions of problematic corn and soybean weeds in Indiana. Weed Technol 19:1065–1070
Givens WA, Shaw DR, Kruger GR, Johnson WG, Weller SC, Young BG, Wilson RG, Owen MD, Jordan D (2009) A grower survey of herbicide use patterns in glyphosate-resistant cropping systems. Weed Technol 23:156–161
Gott RC, Coyle DR (2019) Educated and engaged communicators are critical to successful integrated pest management adoption. J Integr Pest Manag 35:1–5
Harper JL (1956) The evolution of weeds in relation to resistance to herbicides. Pages 179–188 *in* Proceedings of the 3rd British Weed Control Conference, Farnham, UK, November 5–8 1956
Heap I (2022) International survey of herbicide resistant weeds. www.weedscience.org/in.asp. Accessed: March 4, 2022
Hope MA, Shannon ED (2005) A comparison of two procedures to fit multilevel data: PROC GLM versus PROC MIXED. http://www2.sas.com/proceedings/sugi30/200-30.pdf. Accessed: March 5, 2022
Johnson B, Owen MD, Kruger GR, Young BG, Shaw DR, Wilson RG, Wilcut JW, Jordan DL, Weller SC (2009) Farmer awareness of glyphosate-resistant weeds and resistance management strategies. Weed Technol 23:308–312
Jussaume RA, Dentzman K, Frisvold G, Ervin D, Owen MDK (2021) Factors that influence on-farm decision-making: Evidence from weed management. Soc Nat Resour doi: 10.1080/08941920.2021.2001123
Liu J, Davis AS, Tranel PJ (2012) Pollen biology and dispersal dynamics in waterhemp (*Amaranthus tuberculatus*). Weed Sci 60:416–422
Mahoney DJ, Jordan DL, Burgos NR, Jennings KM, Leon RG, Vann MC, Everman WJ, Cahoon CW (2020) Susceptibility of Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) to herbicides in accessions collected from the North Carolina Coastal Plain. Weed Sci 68:582–593
Matzrafi M, Morran M, Jasueniuk M (2020) Recurrent selection with glufosinate at low rates reduces the susceptibility of a *Lolium perenne* ssp. *Multiflorum* population to glufosinate. Agronomy 10:1288
McKelvey RD, Zavoina W (1975) A statistical model for the analysis of ordinal level dependent variables. J Math Sociol 4:103–120
Molin WT, Nandula VK, Wright AA (2017) Italian ryegrass from Iredell County, North Carolina is resistant to glufosinate, ACCase- and ALS-inhibiting herbicides. Page 112 *in* Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Weed Science Society of America. Tucson, Arizona, February 6–9, 2017
Neve P, Norsworthy JK, Smith KL, Zelaya IA (2011) Modeling glyphosate resistance management strategies for Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) in cotton. Weed Technol 25:335–343
Norsworthy JK, Barber T, Priess GT, Houston MM, Piveta LB, Bradley KW, Gage KL, Hager A, Kruger G, Steckel L, Reynolds DB, Young BG (2021) Are dicamba and glufosinate still viable options for Palmer amaranth in U.S. soybean production systems? Pages 258–259 *in* Proceedings of the 61st Weed Science Society of America, Virtual
Norsworthy JK, Griffith G, Griffin T, Bagavathiannan M, Gbur EE (2014) In-field movement of glyphosate-resistant Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) and its impact on cotton lint yield: evidence supporting a zero-threshold strategy. Weed Sci 62:237–249
Owen MDK (2016) Diverse approaches to herbicide-resistant weed management. Weed Sci 64:570–584
Price AJ, Koger CH, Wilcut JW, Miller D, van Santen E (2008) Efficacy of residual and non-residual herbicides used in cotton production systems when applied with glyphosate, glufosinate, or MSMA. Weed Technol 22:459–466
Riar DS, Norsworthy JK, Steckel LE, Stephenson DO, Bond JA (2013a) Consultant perspectives on weed management needs in Midsouthern United States cotton: a follow-up survey. Weed Technol 27:778–787
Riar DS, Norsworthy JK, Steckel LE, Stephenson DO, Eubank TW, Scott RC (2013b) Assessment of weed management practices and problem weeds in the Midsouth United States—soybean: a consultant's perspective. Weed Technol 27:612–622
Ryan GF (1970) Resistance of common groundsel to simazine and atrazine. Weed Sci 18:614–616
Salas-Perez RA, Saski CA, Noorai RE, Srivastava SK, Lawton-Rauh AL, Nichols RL, Roma-Burgos N (2018) RNA-Seq transcriptome analysis of Amaranthus palmeri with differential tolerance to glufosinate herbicide. PLOS ONE 13: e0195488.
Sarangi D, Jhala AJ (2018) A statewide survey of stakeholders to assess the problem weeds and weed management practices in Nebraska. Weed Technol 32: 642–655
Schwartz-Lazaro LM, Norsworthy JK, Steckel LE, Stephenson DO, Bish MD, Bradley KW, Bond JA (2017) A Midsouthern consultant's survey on weed management practices in soybean. Weed Technol 32:116–125
Sellers BA, Smeda RJ, Johnson WG (2003) Diurnal fluctuations and leaf angle reduce glufosinate efficacy. Weed Technol 17:302–306
Sosnoskie LM, Culpepper AS (2014) Glyphosate-resistant Palmer amaranth (*Amaranthus palmeri*) increases herbicide use, tillage, and hand-weeding in Georgia cotton. Weed Sci 62:393–402
Steckel GJ, Wax LM, Simmons FW, Phillips WH (1997) Glufosinate efficacy on annual weeds is influenced by rate and growth stage. Weed Technol 11:484–488
[USDA-NASS] U.S. Department of Agriculture–National Agriculture Statistics Service (2019) State agricultural overview: North Carolina. https://www.nass.usda.gov/Quick_Stats/Ag_Overview/stateOverview.php?state=NORTH%20CAROLINA. Accessed: February 10, 2021
Vann RA, York AC, Cahoon CW, Buck TB, Askew MC, Seagrove RW (2017) Effect of delayed dicamba plus glufosinate application on Palmer amaranth (Amaranthus palmeri) control and XtendFlex™ cotton yield. Weed Technol 31:633–640
Van Wychen L, Hand LC (2020) Survey Results for the most common and troublesome weeds in grass crops, pasture and turf. Page 34 *in* 60th Proceedings of the Weed Science Society of America. West Minster, Co: Weed Science Society of America
Wilcut JW, Jordan DL, Vencill WK, Richburg JS (1997) Weed management in cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*) with soil-applied and post-directed herbicides. Weed Technol 11:221–226
Wiles LJ, Oliver GW, York AC, Gold HJ, Wilkerson GG (1992) Spatial distribution of broadleaf weeds in North Carolina soybean (*Glycine max*) fields. Weed Sci 40:554–557
Young BG (2006) Changes in herbicide use patterns and production practices resulting from glyphosate-resistant crops. Weed Technol 20:301–307

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/Weed-Technology on 28 Mar 2024
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use