Original Research Article

Farm Level Indicators of Sustainable Land Management: Effect on Agricultural production in Oyo State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Farmland sustainability and increased agricultural production has been a major concern of average farmers in Nigeria especially in South Western part of the Country. The study examined the farm level indicators and their effects on agricultural production among rural farmers. Multi-stage methods of sampling technique were used to select fifty respondents for this study using a well-structured questionnaire. Data collected were analyzed by the use of descriptive such as means, percentage, standard deviation and fuzzy logic analysis. The result shows that average age of farmer, farm size, household size and faming experience was 52.28 years, 2.072 hectare, 6.80 and 29.42 years of farming experience respectively. The fuzzy logic method was used to compute the composite indicators of sustainable land use (ISLU) which was 0.2843 indicating that farmers' land management practices in the study area are generally sustainable with the current application of the indicators. Land fallowing, trends of vegetative cover, irrigation, pesticide used among others contributed a higher percentage of **land use sustainability with about 3.8% each.**, while minimum tillage, cover crops, crop rotation and cassava cutting use **have no contribution to land use sustainability**. The study recommended that rural water should be made available and that informal training through extension services should be conducted to educate farmers on sustainable land management (SLM) practices in order to have a better environment and improve production in the study area.

Keywords: Farm Level, Indicators, Sustainable, Land Managements, Fuzzy, Cassava, Oyo State.

1. INTRODUCTION

The agricultural sector has always been an important component of the Nigerian economy. The sector is almost entirely dominated by small scale resource-poor farmers living in the rural areas, with farm holdings of 1-2 hectares, which are usually scattered over a wide area (Ojo *et al*., 2009). The size distribution of these holdings as defined by previous studies and evidenced in the literature by (Olayide *et al*., 1980, Oksana, 2005, Dorward *et al*., 2005) as; small-scale farms, ranges from 0.10 to 5.99-hectares, medium scale, 6.0-9.99 and large scale above 10 hectares.

These classes constituted 84.49 percent, 11.28 percent and 4.23 percent respectively in 2004 (NBS, 2006). According to Olayide *et al*., (1981), about 75% of southwestern Nigeria's land is under arable cultivation with a land-human ratio of 58 persons per square kilometre in southwestern Nigeria. Sustainable agriculture has been defined variously by different authors (Idachaba, 1987; Young, 1989; Spencer and Swift, 1992). However, FAO (1989) defined sustainable agriculture as one, which involves the successful management of resources for agriculture to satisfy human needs, while maintaining or enhancing the quality of the environment and conserving natural resources. Sustainable land management (SLM) is defined as a knowledge-based procedure that helps integrate land, water, biodiversity, and environmental management (including input and output externalities) to meet rising food and fibre demands while sustaining ecosystem services and livelihoods. Sustainable land management (SLM) has been defined as the adoption of appropriate land management practices that enables land users to maximize the economic and social benefits from the land while maintaining or enhancing the ecological support functions of the land resources (FAO, 2009).

Traditionally through time, farmers have developed different soil conservation and land management practices of their own. With these practices, farmers have been able to sustain their production for centuries thus the determined effects of resource exploitation has become widespread, there has been growing awareness that productive lands are getting scarce, land resources are not unlimited, and that the land already in use needs more care. As a result of the increase in world population, other non-agricultural activities are demanding for land space, hence there is a progressive loss of land for food production. At the same time, demand for food and other agricultural products is increasing, requiring for more land which is not available since the earth's land area is finite.

The extent of land degradation in Nigeria is presently alarming. This occurs in different scales and dimensions and no part of the country can be entirely excluded. Also, compared with some other African countries, the country is blessed with abundant land resources, which are capable of indefinite regeneration over a given period of time f the prevailing management practices are conducive. Management issue cannot be taken for granted, given that these resources constitute the productive base for the Nigerian agriculture, upon which the livelihoods of many rural and urban household depend on Oyekale, (2012), moreover, poor incentives for natural resource conservation, among other socioeconomic problems, have subjected the soil's nutrients to serious exploitation and depletion. The diminishing worldwide availability of productive land is such that continued degradation of such land is a clear threat to the survival of the human race. Hence this raises the research objectives which are to (i) describe the socio-economic characteristics of the farmers in the study area (ii) analyse the effect of sustainable land management indicators to land use among the farmers as to whether or not the forces driving improved management practices are fully understood and construct an index of sustainable land use indicators.

Materials and methods

2.1 The Study area

This study was carried out in Oyo State, Nigeria, the State is located in the Southwestern part of the country, Oyo State consists of thirty-three (33) local government areas grouped under four (4) agricultural zones of Oyo State Agricultural Development Programme (OYSADEP). The zones are Ibadan-Ibarapa, Oyo, Saki and Ogbomoso Zones. Oyo State covers a total land area of about 27,249,000 square kilometre with a total population of about 5.6million (Akinniran et al., 2013). It is situated between Latitude 7^o N and 19^oN and Longitude 2.5^oE and 5^oE of the meridian. The state is predominantly agrarian, annual mean rainfall is above 1000 mm and the rainy season in the state average eight months in a year. Rain starts in Oyo state during the first week of March with storms. Mean temperature varies from a daily minimum of 18.9^0C to a daily maximum of 35^0C. Humidity is quite high in Oyo state; relative humidity in the state is 70 percent with a maximum of about 60 percent in the evening and a maximum of around 80 percent in the morning.

2.2 Sampling technique and sample size

Multi-stage sampling technique was used to obtain data for this study through the use of structured questionnaires.

The first stage was the choice of choosing the existing four Agricultural zones, namely, Ibadan-Ibarapa, Oyo, Saki and Ogbomoso zones, Second stage involved purposive selection of the respondents under Oyo agricultural zone where these farmers are concentrated. Third stage: Ten percent (50) of the respondent were selected according to the population of the registered cassava farmers from the list of the Nigeria Cassava Growers Association (NCGA). Lastly, 50 respondents were selected at random for this study. The study used data obtain mainly from the primary source.

2.3 Analytical techniques

Descriptive statistics were used to analyse the socio-economic characteristics of the farmers while the fuzzy set theory was used to analyse the contribution of the indicators to land management used.

The fuzzy set was proposed by Zadeh (1965).This approach had been applied to land suitability analysis by many authors (Tang and Van Ranst 1992; Braimoh *et al*., 2004; Oyekale 2012). It was proposed that in a population A of n households [A = a1, a2, a3, ……an], the subset of households using land unsustainably B includes any household $a_i \in B$. These farmers present some degree of sustainability in some of the m land indicators (X). The degree of sustainability by the ith farmer (i=1,….,n) with respect to a particular attribute (j) given that (j = 1,……,m) is defined as: μ*B* [Xj (ai)] = xij, 0 < xij < 1. Specifically, xij = 1 when the farmer's use of land depicts sustainability and xij = 0 otherwise. Betti *et al*., (2005) noted that putting together categorical indicators of deprivation for individual items to construct composite indices requires decisions about assigning numerical values to the ordered categories and the weighting and scaling of the measures. Farm-level indicators of sustainable land use often take the form of simple 'yes/no' dichotomies. In this case xij is 0 or 1. However, some indicators may involve more than two ordered categories (for example, discrete categorical variables and continuous categorical variables), reflecting the different degree of deprivation. Consider the general case of c = 1 to C ordered categories of some deprivation indicator, with c = 1 representing the most deprived and c = C the least deprived situation. Let ci be the category to which individual *i* belongs. Cerioli and Zani (1990), assuming that the rank of the categories represents an equally-spaced metric variable, assigned to the individual a deprivation score as: xij = (C-ci)/(C-1) (1) where 1 < ci < C by summarizing the key notions about sustainable land management based on the theory of fuzzy sets, and in particular on the work of Dagum and Costa (2004).

i. sustainable land management indicators in the given space (a_1)

A = {a1 ....ai ....}; and.. (1)

ii. A vector to the order of m for socio-economic attributes (X_1) for studying the state of sustainable land management for

A: X = {X1 ....Xj .... Xm}.. (2)

The choice of the set of socio-economic attributes in relation to sustainable land management will consist, for each set in a selection of socio-economic sets the absence or partial possession of which contributes to the state of farmers sustainable land management. They are calculated using a vector X of the order m: X = (X_i............X_j.........X_m), X includes economic, social, and family attributes represented by (discrete and continuous) quantitative variables and/or qualitative variables. Let us call b a sub-set of A such that each $a_i \varepsilon B$ represents a degree of deprivation in at least one of the attributes included in X.

The function of the i-th farmer (i = 1.........n) belonging to the fuzzy subset B in relation to the j-th attribute (j 1......m) is defined as follows

$X_{ij} = U_\beta (X_1(a_1))$, 0 ≤ 1... (3)

In this case:

Xij = 1, if the i-th farmer does not have the j-th attribute;

Xij = 0, if the i-th farmer possesses the j-th attribute;

0 < xij < 1, if the i-th farmer has the j-th attribute with an intensity between (0, 1).

The function of the i-th farmer (i = 1............. n) belonging to the fuzzy subset B can be defined as the average weight of xij;

μ_β (ai) = equation μ_β (ai) measures the ratio of the sustainable land management of the i-th farmer, where w_i is the weight attached to the j-th attribute and where;

$0 \leq \mu_\beta$ (ai) ≥ 1

The behaviour of the function of belonging (to a fuzzy subset) is the following;

μB (ai) = 0, if ai possesses the m attributes;

μB (ai) = 1, if ai is totally deprived of the m attributes;

0 < μB (ai) < 1, if ai is partially or totally deprived of some attributes, but not completely deprived of all attributes.

Weight wj represents the intensity of deprivation linked to attribute Xj. It is an inverse function of the degree of deprivation of this attribute for the farmer population. The smaller the number of households with attribute Xj is, the bigger the weight wj will be Cerioli and Zani (1990) define a weight that verifies this property, namely;

Wj = $\log[\sum_{j=1}^{n} g(a_i) / \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_n\, g(a_i)]$ .... (4)

$\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_n\, g(a_i) > 0$

Where $g(a_i)$ refers to the frequency (weight) with which respondent a_i of the population was observed;

$g(a_i)\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_n\, g(a_i)$ is the relative frequency with which sample ai of the population observed, g(ai) is equal to n times the relative frequency of farmers in the total population.

Therefore, $\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_n\, g(a_i) = n$, Therefore, when everybody possesses an attribute or nobody has it, the attribute should be removed because it is of no serious relevance to the sustainability of land use. In equation (5), the denominator of the logarithm is always positive. If the value Xij = 0, was part of the possible sets, that would mean that there would be no deprivation in Xj. The fuzzy index of sustainability of set A is a weighted mean of μ_B (a_i) given by formula (4)

In addition to determining the multidimensional sustainable land management for the i-th farmer and that for the overall population, the use of the theory of fuzzy sets makes it possible to calculate a uni-dimensional index for each one of the j attributes considered.

μ_β (X_j) = $\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_n g(a_i) / \sum_{j=1}^{n} g(a_i)$ j = 1, 2,........... m............................ (5)

μ_β (X_j) defines the degree of deprivation of the jth attribute for the population of the respondent. The overall fuzzy index of sustainable land management can also be defined as a weighted average of uni-dimensional indices for each attribute;

$\mu_\beta = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mu_\beta(X_j) W_j / \sum_{j=1}^{m} w_j$ = 1, 2,........... m.. (6)

The analysis of the results obtained in (5), for j=1 ....m, offers the decision makers the possibility to identify the causes of unsustainable land management and to intervene structurally in order to reduce it.

2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of the farmer

Socio-economic characteristics	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	52.8	13.310
Gender	0.38	0.490
Marital status	1.12	0.480
Educational level	1.48	0.953
Household Size	6.80	1.829
Source of land	0.80	0.833
Source of labour	0.82	0.388
Farming experience	7.66	3.192
Source of water	0.80	0.404
Mode of cultivation	0.18	0.388
Farm size used (hectare)	2.07	1.485
Land use duration (year)	15.86	7.895
Farm management experience (year)	18.32	8.353
Gross income (Naira)	295400	172581.95

Table 1 revealed that the average age of the farmers was 52.8 years, average farming management experience was 18.32 years, implies that the farming system in the study is becoming ageing. This is in line with findings of Ogunniyi *et al*., (2013) which says that cassava-based farming in Oyo State was in the hands of elderly people who may not have the required labour by themselves 38% of the farmers were female, this shows that male farmers were the majority involved in cassava farming in the study, 1.12% were single, average farm size owned by the farmer was 2.07 hectares which implies that farmers were operating on a small scale farming system, mean household size was 6.80 persons which is fairly large and can be useful for family labour, average educational level was 1.48, indicating that average farmers could not go beyond secondary education, 82% of the farmer used hired labour, 80% rely on rain-fed agriculture, 18% used mechanical mode of cultivation while 82% made use of the crude/manual mode of cultivation, average years of land use duration was 15.86 years. This may cause soil nutrients lost because of its long term use which may lead to a poor yield of crops if not properly managed while average farm income was =N=295,400.00k, 80% of the farmer have an absolute right to their farmland. This may enhance the farmer to embark on extensive sustainable land management practices without any fear.

The contribution of SLM indicators to sustainable land use and index of sustainable land use

Table 2: Effect of SLM indicators to Sustainable Land Use in the Study Area

SLM Indicators	Absolute contribution	Relative contribution (%)

The vigour of crop yield	0.0095	3.32840342
Trend of vegetative covers	0.0108	3.78987618
Residue cover	0.0107	3.77705761
Crop yield	0.0084	2.94250896
Labour productivity	0.0100	3.53044691
Profit per hectares	0.0080	2.82105708
Organic matter contents	0.0090	3.15403524
Drainage/infiltration of water	0.0102	3.58372123
Water holding capacity	0.0095	3.34660207
Aggregation of soil	0.0108	3.78993742
Earthworm/ soil life	0.0084	2.96773692
Compaction and rooting	0.0107	3.77711864
Crusting/emergency	0.0102	3.58372123
Tilth / workability	0.0108	3.79068973
Wind or water erosion	0.0106	3.73488028
Salinity	0.0106	3.73488028
Plot level application fertilizer	0.0080	2.82105708
Addition of organic manure	0.0098	3.45054330
Mulching of crops	0.0063	2.20416883
Minimum tillage	0.0000	0.00000000
Cover crops	0.0000	0.00000000
Rotation of crops	0.0000	0.00000000
Land fallowing	0.0108	3.80332494
Irrigation Water level	0.0108	3.80332494
Irrigation Water quality	0.0090	3.15403524
Use of Pesticide	0.0094	3.80332494
Use of Herbicide	0.0108	3.80332494
Use of chemical poison	0.0084	2.94255651
Industrial discharges	0.0099	3.49803877
Land use intensity	0.0099	3.49803877
Labour use intensity	0.0082	2.89541341
Type of seeds	0.0082	2.89541341
Seed use intensity	0.0066	2.32205584
Total Computed (ULUI)	0.2843	100

From the result of table 2 it was reveal that land following contributes relatively 3.8% to sustainability because same pieces of farm land were used periodically for agricultural activities which may serve as a cause of soil nutrients loss and degradation without allowing the land to rest. Trends of vegetative cover have a relative contribution of 3.78% to sustainability because farmers' clear and fell forest trees but unable to replace them thereby led to land degradation and deforestation. Irrigation water level also contributes 3.8% to sustainability because the water level annually reducing because the farmers solely depend on rainfall for irrigation also pesticide application contributes 3.8% to sustainability because pesticide applied may have contaminated water and was not applied in a right manner. This is in conformity with the findings of Oyekale, (2012). All the indicators mentioned above contribute to land been sustainable, and these can reduce the level of crop production in the study area. However, Stem use intensity, minimum tillage, cover crops and crop rotation contributed (0 %) to land sustainability. This implies that all these indicators contribute relatively to land sustainability which can influence crop output positively in the study area because the closer the fuzzy value is closer to zero the better the sustainability.

3. CONCLUSION

The study examines the farm level indicators and its contributions to sustainable land management practices among rural farmers in Oyo agricultural zone. It considered different production objectives in farmers land use system using fuzzy sets. This allows the integration of different properties of a particular land into a composite index that captures the extent of degradation to the farm land. It was discovered that majority of the farmer were male and they are operating on a small scale farming system also, trends of vegetative cover, land fallowing, irrigation, pesticide used among others contribute higher percentage to **land use sustainability with about 3.8% each.**, while minimum tillage, cover crops, crop rotation and cassava cutting use intensity **have no contribution to land use sustainability** respectively in the study area.

4.1 Recommendation

Based on the result and findings of the study the following are therefore recommended.

- Informal training can be conducted to educate the farmers on sustainable land use practices that can deplete soil through extension officers.
- The government agencies saddled with the responsibility of disseminating information to farmers through extension service departments should step up her efforts in creating awareness through mass orientation in the study area.
- Small scale farmers should form agricultural societal group in other to have access to micro credit which can result in environmental conservation through access to formal credit.
- Farmers should be encouraged to replace back the trees that were cleared/ felled from the farmland in order to discourage deforestation and exposure of the soil to aeration or winds and thereby enhance agricultural sustainability in the study area.

Disclaimer : article was presented as a conference paper

References

Betti, G.,Cheli, B., Lemmi,A., and Verma V., (2005). The Fuzzy approach to multidimensional poverty: the case of Italy in the 90's. Paper presented at 'The measurement of multidimensional poverty, theory and evidence. Brasilia, August 29-31, 2005.

Braimoh AK, Paul L, Vlek G, Alfred S (2004). Land evaluation for maize based on fuzzy set and interpolation. *Environmental Management,* 33(2):26 - 238.

Cerioli A, Zani S (1990). A fuzzy approach to the measurement of poverty. In: C Dagum, M Zenga (Eds.): *Income and Wealth Distribution, Inequality and Poverty*. Berlin: Springer Verlag, pp. 272- 284.

Dagum, M, Costa, C (2004). "Analysis and measurement of poverty univariate and multivariate approaches and their policy implications: A case study of Italy" In Dagum C. and Ferrari G. (eds.); Household Behaviour, Equivalence Scales, Welfare and Poverty, Springer Verlag, Germany.

Dorward,A., Kydd, J.,Poulton,(2005).Coordination risk and cost impacts on Economic Development in Poor Rural Areas. Agricultural Economic Society Conference, April 2005, Nottingham.

FAO, (1989). Sustainable agricultural production: implication for international agricultural Research Technical advisory committee, CGIAR. FAO research and technical paper No. 4. FAO, Rome.

FAO. (2009). Country support tool – for scaling up sustainable land management in Sub-Saharan Arica. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.

Idachaba, F. S (1987). Sustainability issues in agricultural development. Proceeding of the 7th Agricultural Sector symposium. World Bank Washington DC.

Ogunniyi, L.T. Ajetomobi, J.O. and Fabiyi, Y.L. (2013): Technical Efficiency of Cassava based Cropping in Oyo State of Nigeria. *Journal of AGRIS online Papers in Economics and Informatics*, 5(1):51-59.

Ojo, M. A., U. S. Mohammed, A. O. Ojo, and R. S. Olaleye., (2009), "Return to scale and Determinants of farm level technical inefficiency among small scale yam based farmers in Niger state, Nigeria: implications for food security" *International Journal of Agriculture Economics and Rural Development (IJEARD) 43- 51.*

Oksana, N., (2005). Small farms: Current Status and Key Trends. In Proceedings of Research Workshop on the future of small farms Wye, Uk Organised by International Food policy research institute (IFPRI)/2020 initiative and Overseas Development Institute (ODI) Imperial College, London

Olayide, S., Eweka, J., Bello-Osagie, V.,(1980): Nigerian Small Farmers: Problems and Prospects in Integrated Rural Development. Centre for agricultural rural and development (CARD), University of Ibadan, Nigeria publisher.

Olayide, S. O., Olayemi, J. K. and Eweka, J. A.(1981): Perspectives in Benin-Owena River Basin Development by Centre for Agricultural and Rural Development Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria. Pp.25-50.

Oyekale A.S (2012). Fuzzy Indicator of Sustainable Land Management and Its Correlates in Osun State, Nigeria. *J Hum Ecol, 39(3): 175-182.*

Spencer, D. S. C. and Swift, M. J. (1992). Sustainable agriculture: Definition and measurement, SSSA (Soil science society of America) (1995). SSSA statement on soil quality.

Tang H, Van Ranst E (1992). Testing fuzzy set theory in land suitability assessment for rainfed grain maize production. *Pedologie*, 41(2): 129-147.

Young, A. (1989). Agroforestry for soil conservation. Wallingford, UK/Nairobi, Kenya: CAB international/ICRAF.

Zadeh L. A (1965). Fuzzy sets. Information and control, 8, 338-353.

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), 2006, 2009 and 2011. Gross Domestic Products (GDP) for Nigeria 2010 and Quarter (Q) 1-3 of 2011. Publication of NBS, Abuja, Nigeria pp 1-15.

Akinniran, T. N,. Ezekiel, A.A,. Ganiyu, M.O,. Adeyemo. S.A. 2013. EFFECT OF RAINFALL VARIABILITY ON CROPS PRODUCTION IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA (1990-2009). International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, Volume 4, Issue 9