

**COMPARATIVE ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF SOIL FERTILITY
MANAGEMENT OPTIONS ON CASSAVA BASED
INTERCROPPING SYSTEMS IN OREDO LOCAL
GOVERNMENT AREA OF EDO STATE,
NIGERIA**

ABSTRACT

The study was carried out in Oredo Local Government Area of Edo State, Nigeria. The broad objective was to determine the comparative economic analysis if soil fertility management options on cassava based cropping/intercropping systems. Data were obtained with the use of primary and secondary sources, primarily through questionnaire distributed to eighty (80) randomly sample size farmers from the study area. Economic analysis was carried out using statistical tools such as descriptive statistics which included frequency tables, percentages, means, pie charts, bar column chart etc. which was used to determine the cost and returns of both soil fertility management options. It was also necessary to test the hypothesis of the study which was tested using the Z-Test analysis due to the sample size. The result showed that higher profit was obtained from inorganic fertilizer by those farmers that made use of them in which they had a gross margin (profit) of N118, 400 when compared to those farmers that made use of organic fertilizer, having a gross margin of N60,900. However, the result from the gross margin analysis as well as the hypothesis of the study shows that the farmers stand to gain more if they use either of the soil fertility management options on their farms. Also, considering the problem of scarcity and effect often associated with inorganic fertilizer, the choice of organic fertilizer is more likely to be accepted by the farmers. Possible recommendations were also made in the course of the study which includes, transformation of farming practices through technology that would stabilize yield and reduce unpredictable variations, farmers should be encouraged to use either of the soil fertility management options to increase their yield, organic fertilizer should be made affordable to farmer and inorganic fertilizer should be made accessible.

Keyword: intercropping, organic and inorganic, comparative.

40 INTRODUCTION

41 Soil fertility in Nigeria is under depletion, and it is the main bio physical
42 factor limiting crop production in Nigeria. Interests has been raised in
43 using data from past fertilizer studies to identify options for increasing
44 agricultural production through increased soil fertility management. This
45 research further shows the comparative analysis between organic and
46 inorganic fertilizers based on their cost, environmental impact,
47 accessibility and availability, application, nutrient availability and
48 composition, for likely recommendation to farmers.

49 On the contrary, soil fertility is not a static feature, it changes constantly
50 and its direction is determined by the interplay between physical,
51 chemical, biological and anthropogenic processes. This dimension is also
52 reflected in such terminological and anthropogenic processes. This
53 dimension is also reflected in such terminologies like nutrient cycle,
54 budget or balances, referring to inputs and outputs in natural ecosystem
55 and managed agro-ecosystem to which nutrients are removed.

56 The average Nigerian meets about 95⁰ percent of the minimum energy
57 requirement mainly from cereals, roots and tubers, followed by grain
58 legumes.

59 Cassava food crops are the most important staples of rural and urban
60 households in southern Nigeria. () current estimates shows that
61 dietary calorie equivalent of per capital consumption of cassava in the
62 consumption of cassava in the country amounts to about 238Vcal (cock
63 1988).

64 This is derived from the consumption of garri(toasted granules), chips,
65 flour, fermented pastes and or fresh roots, the principal cassava food
66 forms

67 Cassava being one of the Base Crop in Nigeria is a very important crop
68 to both the rural and urban dwellers in Oredo Local government Area of
69 Edo State its comparative production over other staple food crops serves
70 to encourage its cultivation even by the resource poor farmers. It is
71 usually grown by small holders in the rural areas of the study are with
72 less or low fertile soils and unpredictable rainfall. It serves as a leading
73 staple food for over eighty million people living in the rural and urban
74 area. It is also the third most important food crop grown in the South
75 Southregion of Nigeria which is used for human consumption, animal
76 feed or for industrial purposes. In 2004, the estimated cassava output

from Nigeria was approximately 34 million tons which have rated Nigeria as the largest producer of cassava. It is mainly intercropped with maize or melon in the Study area. Cassava tuber can supply much of the calories needed for human nutrition. When intercropped with cereals the fast growing cereals can help to solve the problem of nutrient loss through leaching, run off, or erosion. Therefore cassava producing farmers need to apply adequate amount of fertilizer (organic and inorganic) such as, chemical fertilizer or manure to replace nutrient loss or depletion by harvested parts.

The use of much organic or inorganic fertilizer can be expressed properly in terms known as external and internal inputs farmers. The external input farmers include those farmers that make use of inorganic fertilizer and minerals that can promote soil fertility depletion and increase soil nutrient. While the internal input farmers usually make use of organic fertilizer such as animal manure, crop residue etc. which in most cases does not supply sufficient and adequate nutrient to the soil for effective plant growth thereby decreasing agricultural production where fertility depletion is already high. The fact that farmers do not supply or apply sufficient fertilizer and do not use soil conservation practices when the cassava crop is grown is more of socio economic problem than a technical problem.

It is necessary to develop simple practice that are suitable to the local situation or environment that can provide short term benefit to the cassava farmers as well as long term benefit in resource conservation practice.

The above trend of low fertilizer use and poor soil conservation continue unabated because successive individuals and Nigerian Government have not done enough to enable increase in cassava production. With sustainable cropping practices

METHODS

The study was conducted in Oredo Local Government Area of Edo State. It is one of the eighteen Local Government Areas that made up Edo State. The climate of the study area is humid tropical and it is characterized by two distinct seasons known as the wet and dry season. Its soil type is ferrosol or loose sandy sediment. Oredo L.G.A is predominantly a cassava growing area. The agricultural fertile land, relatively flat terrain, the climatic and edaphic factors favour the production of cassava and a wide range of other crops. Random

techniques were employed to select the respondents of the study Area. The first stage was the random selection of eight wards out of fifteen in the study area. The second stage was the random selection of ten cassava based intercropping farmers from eight wards out of fifteen in the study area. The second stage was the random selection of ten cassava based intercropping farmers from eight wards earlier stated which gave a total of eighty farmers (respondents). This farm made use of different fertilizer treatment (organic and inorganic fertilizer) on their farm. The essence was to give the farmers equal chances of being selected. Primary and secondary data were used. The primary data were collected through structured interview and questionnaire. The data were in socio economic characteristic, production inputs, cost, returns and constraints while secondary data were from literature of previous work. Analysis of the data was done using descriptive statistics, gross margin analysis and production function analysis. Objective I, II, III were analyzed using descriptive statistics, such as percentages and frequency distribution column and pie charts. The gross margin analysis was employed to determine the profitability of use of different fertilizer treatment on cassava based intercropping system. This was used to analyze objective IV. It was calculated as the deference between the farm total returns or revenue and the total variable cost Olukosi and Erhabor, 1988). Mathematically it is expressed as

$$GM = TR - TVC$$

$$GM = \text{Gross Margin } \text{N/La}$$

$$TR = \text{Total revenue } \text{N/La}$$

$$\text{Percentage (\%)} = \frac{n}{N} \times 100\%$$

The Z – test at 5% level of significance was used to test the hypothesis
 H_0 : There is a significant difference between organic and inorganic fertilizer management techniques in cassava based intercropping system in Oredo Local Government Area.

Since it's a two tail test, it can be mathematically expressed as

$$H_0: \bar{X}_1 = \bar{X}_2 \text{ or } \bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2 = 0$$

$$H_A: \bar{X}_1 \neq \bar{X}_2 \text{ or } \bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2 \neq 0 \quad \checkmark$$

Where X_1 = Cost input for inorganic fertilizer

X_2 = cost input for organic fertilizer

150 Since Z-test due to its sample size which is greater than 30 (N
151 >30),

152 $Z_{Cal} = \frac{X_1 - X_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{\sigma_2^2}{n_2}}}$

$$\frac{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{\sigma_2^2}{n_2}}}{n_1 \quad n_2}$$

153 Where

154 X_1 = Mean of inorganic/internal input

155 X_2 = mean of organic/internal input

156 σ_1^2 = variance of external input

157 σ_2^2 = variance of internal input (40)

158 n_i = sample size of external input (40)

159 $X_1 = \frac{\sum X_1}{N_1}$ $X_2 = \frac{\sum X_2}{n_2}$
160
161

162 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

163 Gross margin of cassava or from cassava production: from the objective
164 earlier stated which determined the cost and return of external input
165 (inorganic fertilizer) soil fertility management and natural techniques
166 (organic fertilizer) of soil fertility management in and external inorganic)
167 with reference or in terms of profitability from both input techniques of
168 soil fertility management.

169 To get the profitability (gross margin) of both inputs of soil fertility
170 management to attain maximum or optimum output to cassava, there is
171 need to get total variable cost of production of cassava and the total
172 revenue generated from cassava output and this can be illustrated as
173 the total variable cost of cassava production. This can be mathematically
174 expressed as

175 $Gm = TR - TVC$

176 Where

177 Gm = Gross margin

178 Tr = Total revenue

179 Tvc = Total Variable Cost

180 Net profit = Total Revenue – Total cost

181 We determine these variables with the use of the table below.

182

183 **Distribution table assessing the cost of fixed assets used by the**
184 **farmers or respondent in the study area**

Implement	Useful life (yrs)	Unit	Cost (₦)	Total value (₦)
Hoe	3	15	400	6,000
Matchet	3	20	500	10,000
Spade	2	5	1300	6,500
Wheel barrow	5	2	6,000	12,000
Total				34,500

185 **Source:** *Field Survey, 2014.*

186

187 **High internal input option (organic/natural technique)**

input(s)	Unit/quantity	Price/Unit (₦)	Total value (₦)
Land (rent)	1ha	30,000	30,000
Labor (hired)	4	1,000	4,000
Labor (family)	3	300	900
Land preparation	-	55,000	5000
Planting	-	4,000	4,000
Organic fertilizer application	3 bags	5,000	15,000
Weeding (by hired labor)	4	300	1,200
Harvesting (by	4	2,000	8,000

hired labor)

Total variable cost - - -

188

189 **FOR REVENUE**

Output(s)	Unit/quantity	Price/Unit (₦)	Total value (₦)
Cassava tubers	50 bags of10kg	1,500	75,000
Cassava sticks	6 5sacks of3kg	400	26,000
Other	-	28,000	28,000
Total Revenue		55,000	129,000

190 *Source: Field Survey 2014*

191

192 **High external input option (inorganic/artificial tech.)**

193 **FOR VARIABLE COST**

194

input(s)	Unit/quantity	Price/Unit (₦)	Total value (₦)
Land (rent)	1ha	30,000	30,000
Labor (hired)	7	3000	4,000
Land preparation	-	5,000	5000
Tractorization	-	25,000	4,000
planting	-	4,000	15,000
Chemical fertiizer application	3 bags	3000	9,000
Weeding (by hired labor)	7	300	8,000
harvesting (by hired labor)	7	2,000	-
Others	-	-	-

Total variable cost 91,200

FOR REVENUE

Output(s)	Unit/quantity	Price/Unit (₦)	Total value (₦)
Cassava tubers	85 bagsof10kg	1,500	127,500
Cassava sticks	107 sacksof 3kg	300	32,100
Others	-	50,000	50,000
Total Revenue			209,600

Source: Field Survey 2014

From the table given above, gross margin for both input (external/inorganic and internal/organic) in soil fertility management options on cassava based intercropping system in the study area, can be calculated as:

FOR INTERNAL/ORGANIC INPUT

$GM = TR - TVC$

$GM = ?$

$TR = ₦129,000$, $TVC = ₦ 68,100$

$TFC = ₦ 34,500$ (constant for both input)

Therefore,

$GM = ₦ (129,900 - 68,100)$

$= ₦ 60,900$

Net profit for internal input or inorganic input

$NP = TR - TC \Rightarrow 129,000 - 34,500 + 68,100$

$NP = ₦ 26,400$

FOR EXTERNAL (INORGANIC INPUT)

$GM = TR - TVC$

216 GM=?

217 $TR = ₦ 114,500$, $TVC = ₦ 91,200$

218 Therefore,

219 $GM = ₦(209,600 - 91,200)$

220 $₦118,400$

221 Net profit for external input or inorganic input

222 $NP = TR - TC \Rightarrow 209,600 - 34,500 + 91,200$

223 $NP = ₦ 83,900$.

224

225 **CONCLUSION**

226 By way of conclusion, cassava based intercropping system in the study
227 area is very bright from the results obtained if properly managed. It is
228 therefore recommended that the mechanization should be undertaken
229 by farmers in the study area. Government should also provide a tractor
230 hiring/scheme to reduce drudgery. Farming practices should be
231 transformed through technologies that stabilize yield and reduce
232 unpredictable variations. This requires improved crop varieties that are
233 highly resistant to pest. Farmers should be encouraged on the optional
234 use of input to increase yield while sustaining the natural resource base
235 of the soil. The farmers in the study area should be provided with the
236 fertilizer especially organic at a lower cost because from every point of
237 view, organic fertilizer effect on crops is more productive both in quality
238 and quantity when compared to inorganic inputs. Government and other
239 policy makers on agriculture should be sensitized on the need to assist
240 the farmers in achieving sustainable land management in the study
241 area. Inorganic input which is also preferred by some farmers
242 irrespective of its effects on the soil should also be made accessible.

243

244 **REFERENCES**

245 Adeboye. K.B. and Agbini N.N. (1991): The Role of Crop Residues in Soil
246 Fertility Management and Conservation.

- 247 Clayton. H. (2005): Market Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation in a
248 Saline Affected landscape, 8th February, 2005
- 249 Dillion J.L. and Hardaker J.B. (1993): Farm Management Research for
250 small Farmers Development.
- 251 IITA (International Institute of Tropical Agriculture) (2004): Nigeria
252 Cassava Industry; Statistical Handbook Ibadan, Nigeria.
- 253 Lattam. M. (1997): Crop Residues as strategic Research in Mixed
254 Farming Systems. Renard, c (ed).
- 255 Muhammad Tahir, Muhammad .A.M. and Rashid A. (2003): Agno-
256 economic Advantages of Different cassava Based Intercropping System,
257 Pakistan, A. Agronomy 2(1): 40 – 43
- 258 Preston Sullivan (2003): Intercropping principles and production
259 practices, Agricultural System Guide. Appropriate Technology Transfer
260 for Rural Areas (ATTRA)
- 261 Tsuobo M. and Walker.S. (2002): Productivity of Maize-Beans
262 Intercropping System in Semi-And Region of South Africa.