

Medwell  
Online

ISSN: 1816-9155

Medwell  
Online

# Agricultural Journal

Medwell Online, ANSHER Building, 2004, Kafan, Town, Sargodha Road, Faisalabad-38000, Pakistan  
Tel. # 999241153 0-40 00 e-mail: medwellonline@gmail.com URL: <http://www.medwellonline.net>

AJ



- 174-179 **Intensive Land Use and Efficiency of Food Production in Southwestern Nigeria**  
*A.S. Oyekale*
- 180-184 **Determining Nitrogen Nutrition and Yield of Canola Through Existing Remote Sensing Technology**  
*Shannon L. Osborne*
- 185-191 **Effect of Essential Oils from Five *Ocimum* sp. on the Pathogenicity of *Pratylenchus brachyurus* (Godfrey) in Tomato**  
*A.K. Onifade*
- 192-196 **Insecticidal Activity of Spicy Plant Oils Against *Sitophilus zeamais* in Stored Maize in Cameroon**  
*Adjoudji Ousman, M.B. Ngassoum, J.J. Essia-Ngang, L.S.T. Ngamo and R. Ndjouenkeu*
- 197-203 **Reproductive and Haematological Responses of Breeder Rabbits Offered Two Dietary Regimes**  
*Ekanem Emma, I.P. Solomon, L.J. Isaac and A. Monsi*
- 204-209 **Use of Essential Oils of Aromatic Plants as Protectant of Grains During Storage**  
*T.S.L. Ngamo, M.B. Ngassoum, P.M. Mapongmestsem, W.F. Noudjou, F. Malaisse, E. Haubruge, G. Lognay, H. Kouninki and T. Hance*
- 210-215 **The Relative Discriminatory Abilities of Techniques Measuring Genotype x Environmental Interaction in Soybean (*Glycine Max* (L) Merr.) in Semi-Arid and Rain Forest Environments of Nigeria**  
*C.O. Aremu, T.A Adebayo, M. Oyekunle and O.J. Ariyo*
- 216-221 **Influence of Phosphorus and Potassium Fertilization on Quality of Sugar of Two Sugarcane Varieties Grown on Three Soil Series of Sudan**  
*E.A. Elamin, M.A. El-Tilib, M.H. Elnasikh, S.H. Ibrahim, M.A. Elsheikh and E.E. Babiker*
- 222-225 **Geographic Distribution and Frequency of *Fusarium* and Fumonisin B<sub>1</sub> in Mexican Corn**  
*P. Cudberto Contreras, M. Rene Rosiles, R. Claudia Rios, R. Carlos Muñoz and O. Victor Fuentes*
- 226-230 **Mineral and Feeding Values of Two Cultivars of Guinea Grass (*Panicum maximum*) as Influenced by Soil Type in the Derived Savanna Zone of Nigeria**  
*F.G. Sodeinde, M.A. Oladipo, A.A. Odunsi, V.O. Asaolu and S.R. Amao*
- 231-235 **Involvement of Women in Livestock Production: A Means of Reducing Hunger and Malnutrition in Ikwuano Local Government Area of Abia State, Nigeria**  
*J.C. Olojede and M.E. Njoku*
- 236-241 **The Use of a Multicriteria Method in Irrigation Water Allocations**  
*N.H. Zardari and I. Cordery*

- 242-247 **Current Post Harvest Practices to Avoid Insect Attacks on Stored Grains in Northern Cameroon**  
*T.S.L. Ngamo, M.B. Ngassoum, P.M. Mapongmestsem, F. Malaisse, E. Haubruge, G. Lognay and T. Hance*
- 248-253 **Dairy Performances of the Goat Genetic Groups in the Southern Tunisian**  
*Amor Gaddour, Sghaier Najari and Mabrouk Ouni*
- 254-257 **Modeling the Behaviour of Igbokoda Loamy Sand Soil, under Uni-Axial Compression**  
*S.I. Manuwa and B.O. Malumi*
- 258-264 **Relative Price Variability and Agricultural Policies in Nigeria**  
*Obasi O. Ukoha*
- 265-270 **Loan Repayment and Credit Worthiness of Farmers under the Nigerian Agricultural Cooperative and Rural Development Bank (NACRDB)**  
*F. Onyenucheya and O.O. Ukoha*
- 271-274 **Perception of Agriculture by Students of Tertiary Institution in Nigeria**  
*B.A. Ayanwale and D.H. Laagye*
- 275-280 **Poverty Determinants among Farmers in Ogun State, Nigeria**  
*O.O. Olubanjo, S.O. Akinleye and W.A. Soremekun*
- 281-284 **Heavy Metals Content of Crude Oil Sludge/Poultry Manure and Crude Oil Sludge/Municipal Solid Waste Composts**  
*N.M. John*
- 285-289 **Optimal Farm Plan in Sweet Potato Cropping Systems: The Case of Offa and Oyun Local Government Areas of Kwara State, North-Central Nigeria**  
*R.O. Babatunde, E.O. Olorunsanya, J.S. Orebiyi and A. Falola*
- 290-293 **Comparative Analysis of Problems Associated with Indigenous and Modern Storage Techniques of Grains and Pulses among Farmers**  
*E.C. Matthews Njoku and O.M. Adesope*
- 294-298 **Adoption of Soil Management and Conservation Technologies by Small Scale Crop Farmers in South Eastern Nigeria: Implications for Sustainable Crop Production**  
*K.I. Ogbonna, I.C. Idiong and H.M. Ndifon*
- 299-305 **A Stochastic Frontier Analysis of Technical Efficiency in Swamp and Upland Rice Production Systems in Cross River State, Nigeria**  
*I.C. Idiong, E. Christian Onyenweaku, B. Susan Ohen and I. Damian Agom*
- 306-311 **Socioeconomic Characteristics of Pig Producers and Their Husbandry Practices in the Sub-Humid Zone of Northern Guinea Savannah, Nigeria**  
*Ajala Margaret Kofoworola*
- 312-318 **Designing an Incentive Scheme for the Adoption of Crop Rotation in the Harran Plain, Turkey**  
*Turan Binici, Carl R. Zulauf and M.Ali Cullu*

- 319-323 **The Impact of Micro-Credit on Food Crop Production in Osun State, Nigeria**  
*S.B. Williams, A.O. Ajao and L.T. Ogunniyi*
- 324-328 **Rural Households Perception of Cooking Banana (*Musa sp. ABB genome*) in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria**  
*A.C. Agumagu and O.M. Adesope*
- 329-336 **Demographics and Perceptions of Introductory Soil Science Students at a Mid-Size Comprehensive Public University in Texas**  
*David C. Weindorf*
- 337-342 **Relationships Between Stem Borer Resistance Traits and Grain Yield Reduction in Maize: Correlations, Path Analysis and Correlated Response to Selection**  
*A.C. Odiyi*
- 343-347 **Analyses of Factors Affecting the Management of Pigs in Kaduna State, Nigeria**  
*Ajala Margaret Kofoworola*



## Adoption of Soil Management and Conservation Technologies by Small Scale Crop Farmers in South Eastern Nigeria: Implications for Sustainable Crop Production

K.I. Ogbonna, I.C. Idiong and H.M. Ndifon

Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria

**Abstract:** The study assessed the adoption of soil management and conservation technologies by farmers in Southern Eastern Nigeria using Enugu State as a case study. A sample of 126 farmers, were selected from the area for the study. The study revealed that majority of the farmers (40.4%) were 50 years old and above. A large majority of the respondents (75.4%) had formal education, an important factor necessary for the adoption of these practices. The study further revealed that majority (68.3%) of the respondents did not have access to adequate land, while 56.3% depended on their personal savings as their major source of finance. Most of the respondents were small scale farmers. The study also showed that about 70% of the farmers adopted organic manuring, mulching and improved cropping. High cost of some recommended technologies, inadequate finance and inputs for demonstration as well as inadequate motivation of extension personnels were identified as constraints to adoption of recommended soil management and conservation technologies. A significant relationship ( $p < 0.05$ ) was observed between farmers' educational level and adoption of fertilizer application and improved cropping system as well as between their annual income and mulching, fertilizer application and terracing. Implication are that food crop production will not be sustainable, since the soil management and conservation technologies are not designed to suit the needs, conditions and farming systems of the study area to encourage farmers' participation and adoption.

**Key words:** Farmers, adoption, sustainable, soil management, conservation, technologies

### INTRODUCTION

Food insecurity as a consequence of low agricultural output and the increasing demand for agricultural products by households and industries due to increasing population have remained a serious problem to governments in developing countries (Boserup, 1975) generally and Nigeria in particular. On the other hand, the need to increase agricultural production to keep pace with the rising demand for agricultural products and the necessity to concurrently retain the quality of land and the ecological balance of the production systems have remained a challenge to researchers and policy makers in Nigeria (Oldema *et al.*, 1991; Opera, 1977).

Nigeria is experiencing serious environmental problems in this decade catalyzed by human activities ranging from agriculture to mineral exploitation. Agricultural production over time has been reported to be a major factor in ecological imbalance. The outcome of uncontrollable land use and intensification of agricultural production often result in declining productivity and land degradation (Nweke and Okorie, 1983; Olayide and Falusi, 1977).

Farmers' agricultural practices, especially cropping patterns for arable crops have been associated with

erosion hazards over time. For instance, the frequent burning of bushes and felling trees for fuel are known to expose the soil to erosion (Ofomata, 1981). The Nigerian Environmental Study Group (NEST, 1991) reported that the impact of erosion as a result of the cultural practices of farmers in Nigeria has been very devastating. The situation is more precarious in the some South Eastern States of Nigeria and especially Enugu State. The cost of addressing ecological damage is often enormous hence the adoption of measures aimed at checkmating its occurrence often becomes the best solution. It was in realization of the ecological problems caused by gully erosion that various soil management and conservation practices have been recommended to farmers through various government agencies such as the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (FEPA), States' Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) and the States' Agricultural Development Programme (ADEP). These practices are concerned with the ways of managing the soil to promote dense vegetation and improve its structure to make it resistant to erosion and other forms of land degradation to engender sustainable agricultural production. These practices are grouped into agronomic, soil management and mechanical measures (Morqan, 1991).



Despite the impressive results obtained from the recommended soil management and conservation practices by researchers in Nigeria, evidence of poor soil management and conservation still abound (Okigbo, 1977). This has been attributed, to a large extent, to the lack of awareness of these practices, farmers' skepticism about their workability under the existing farming systems as well as their low level of income. Low income level makes it difficult for the farmers to acquire the necessary inputs, hence non adoption. Soil management and conservation measures should be technically feasible, economically profitable and socially acceptable (Gipps, 1993). For local conservation technologies to be adopted by farmers there must be awareness campaigns conducted with deliberate respect for cultural and social norms especially where conservation activities are initiated by outsiders (CWN, 1992).

The Enugu State's Agricultural Development Programme (ENADEP), in its mandate, has been saddled with the task of educating farmers on the ways of managing and conserving the soil to reduce degradation, increase fertility and ultimately increase agricultural output in the State. However, it appears not much has been achieved in this direction.

The study therefore sought to identify the various soil management and conservation technologies recommended by the agency and adopted by farmers in the State, determine the relationship between some socio-economic characteristics of the farmers and their adoption of the recommended practices determine the factors that militate against the adoption of these recommended practices by farmers and the attendant implications for sustainable agricultural production in the State.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was carried out in Nsukka zone of the Enugu State (ADP), in South Eastern Nigeria. Nsukka is one of the most populated zones in the State with a population estimate of 695,497 persons (1991 National Census). A good number of the people are either full-time or part-time farmers who grow such major tuber crops as yams, coco yams, cassava; or grains such as maize, beans and rice. They also engage in many off-farm economic activities such as trading and tailoring. Twenty one villages in the zone were selected for the study. Six farmers were randomly selected from each of the selected villages giving a representation sample of 126.

A study instrument (a structured questionnaire) was designed and pre-tested on 13 respondents (about 10% of the total sample size) who were not included in the study in order to determine its reliability. The split-half technique was used to administer the instrument and the

Spearman-Brown formula was then applied to estimate the Reliability Coefficient. A split-half reliability coefficient of 0.81 was obtained which indicates that the instrument had a high internal consistency.

Following the pre-test, a refined questionnaire was then administered to the 126 respondents to elicit information on some socio-economic characteristics of the respondents such as age, level of education, years of farming experience, sources of finance, land related variables including land accessibility, plots owned by respondents and land ownership structure. Information were also collected on farmers' adoption of chosen soil management and conservation practices, factors militating against adoption of these practices as well as factors affecting effective environmental extension service. Frequency distribution tables (descriptive statistics) were used to present this information. A chi-square analysis (inferential statistics) was then used to determine if a significant relationship existed between some socio-economic characteristics of the respondents and their adoption behaviour.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Socio-economic characteristics of respondents

**Age of respondents:** Results of the survey (Table 1) indicate that majority of the respondents (40.4%) were 50 years of age and above. This may be attributed to the migration of the youths from the rural to the urban areas in search of white collar jobs and to enjoy most of the social amenities that are not available in the rural areas.

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of farmers

| Characteristics         | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Age                     |           |            |
| 20-29                   | 18        | 14.3       |
| 30-39                   | 21        | 16.7       |
| 40-49                   | 36        | 28.6       |
| 50 and above            | 51        | 40.4       |
| Total                   | 126       | 100.0      |
| Educational level       |           |            |
| No school               | 23        | 18.3       |
| Primary school          | 30        | 23.8       |
| Secondary school        | 42        | 33.3       |
| Tertiary institution    | 31        | 24.6       |
| Total                   | 126       | 100.0      |
| Years of farming        |           |            |
| 1-3                     | 14        | 11.1       |
| 4-6                     | 28        | 22.2       |
| 7-9                     | 46        | 36.5       |
| 10 and above            | 38        | 30.2       |
| Total                   | 126       | 100.0      |
| Sources of finance      |           |            |
| Personal savings        | 71        | 56.3       |
| Relative/friends        | 15        | 11.9       |
| Financial institution   | 14        | 11.1       |
| Cooperatives and others | 26        | 20.7       |
| Total                   | 126       | 100.0      |

Source: Field survey (2001).



**Educational level of respondents:** The study also revealed that majority of the respondents (75.4%) attained up to the secondary level of education (Table 1), while only 18.3% had no formal education. This means that majority of the respondents were literate enough to understand the modern technologies and this accounted for their positive response to some of the recommended soil management and conservation technologies (Table 1).

**Years of farming of respondents:** Table 1 also shows that majority of the farmers (66.7%) had been in the farming business for seven or more years and therefore were probably well acquainted with the traditional soil conservation and management practices. However, farmers' years of farming experience could have a negative effect on the acceptance of new practices since most farmers, particularly small-scale farmers' exhibit conservative attitude towards change. The longer a farmer adopts a traditional soil conservation technology, the more difficult it becomes to change to a new one.

**Sources of finance for farming activities:** The survey (Table 1) further indicates that majority of the respondents (56.39%) depended on personal savings as the primary source of finance for their farming activities, while only 11.1% claimed to have borrowed money from the bank and other credit institutions. Farmers' dependence on personal savings which often is inadequate and unreliable is likely to affect their rate of adoption of recommended soil management and conservation technologies that usually require the purchase of somewhat expensive materials.

**Accessibility to land by respondents:** Table 2 indicates that 68.3% of the respondents had no access to adequate land for their farming activities, while 31.7% claimed to have access to land. This result suggests that although a good number of the inhabitants in the zone were farmers, lack of access to land by majority of the farmers would undermine early adoption of recommended soil management and conservation practices.

**Number of farm plots owned and ownership structure:** The study further revealed that 70.7% of the respondents owned between 1.0 and 8 plots (Table 2), with a plot size estimated to be 0.15 hectare. This implies that majority of the respondents were small-scale farmers. Also majority of the farmers (49.4%) acquired their plots by inheritance while 2.26% had theirs on lease. Ownership by inheritance often results in the fragmentation of land and continued land-ownership tussles. On the other hand, lease ownership makes it difficult for the lessee to embark on long term investment on the land such as tree crop planting.

Table 2: Land accessibility, number of plots owned and land ownership structure of respondents

| Variables             | Frequency | (%)   |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------|
| Accessibility to land |           |       |
| Accessible            | 40        | 31.7  |
| Not accessible        | 86        | 68.3  |
| Total                 | 126       | 100.0 |
| No. of plots owned    |           |       |
| 1-4                   | 37        | 29.4  |
| 5-8                   | 52        | 41.3  |
| 9-12                  | 24        | 19.0  |
| 13 and above          | 13        | 10.3  |
| Total                 | 126       | 100.0 |
| Ownership structure   |           |       |
| Inheritance           | 86        | 49.4  |
| Purchased             | 13        | 7.5   |
| Leased                | 41        | 22.6  |
| Community owned       | 34        | 19.5  |
| Total                 | 174       | 100.0 |

Note: Total frequency exceeded 126 as a result multiple responses. Source: Field survey (2001)

Table 3: Adoption rates of selected soil management and conservation technologies of farmers (N = 126)

| Technologies               | Frequency* | (%)  |
|----------------------------|------------|------|
| Mulching                   | 110        | 87.3 |
| Manuring                   | 106        | 84.1 |
| Liming                     | 84         | 66.6 |
| Fertilizer application     | 92         | 73.0 |
| Cover crop planting        | 73         | 57.9 |
| Tree crop planting         | 79         | 62.7 |
| Terracing                  | 31         | 24.6 |
| Incomplete land clearing   | 92         | 73.0 |
| Improve tillage practices  | 74         | 58.7 |
| Earth dam construction     | 27         | 17.8 |
| Water channel construction | 98         | 77.8 |
| Improved cropping system   | 101        | 80.2 |

Note: Frequency indicates total number of adopters of each technology, Source: Field survey (2001)

### FARMERS' RATE OF ADOPTION OF THE RECOMMENDED SOIL MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION TECHNOLOGIES

The study revealed that more than 80% of the respondents adopted mulching, manuring and improved cropping system out of all the recommended practices (Table 3). The high adoption rate for organic manuring, mulching and improved cropping system was attributed to their simplicity, moderate cost and importance in increasing fertility and output. The construction of earth dams and terracing were not popular because of the cost implications and labour constraints. Hence, more than 75% of the respondents did not adopt these practices.

### RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOME SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AND THEIR ADOPTION BEHAVIOUR

Table 4, 5 and 6 show the results of the chi-square analysis. The analysis reveals a significant relationship ( $p < 0.05$ ) between farmers' level of education and their



Table 4: Chi-square results showing the relationship between educational level of the respondents and their rate of adoption of some recommended soil management and conservation technologies

| Technologies             | Adoption    | Low | Medium | High | $\chi^2$ | Level of sig. |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----|--------|------|----------|---------------|
| Mulching                 | Adopted     | 18  | 43     | 32   | 1.02     | NS            |
|                          | Not adopted | 05  | 10     | 8    |          |               |
| Fertilizer application   | Adopted     | 18  | 30     | 44   | 19.9     | S             |
|                          | Not adopted | 25  | 9      | 5    |          |               |
| Manuring                 | Adopted     | 23  | 47     | 34   | 0.92     | NS            |
|                          | Not adopted | 3   | 10     | 7    |          |               |
| Improved cropping system | Adopted     | 14  | 52     | 35   | 16.7     | S             |
|                          | Not adopted | 12  | 4      | 9    |          |               |

\*p<0.05; Critical  $\chi^2$ - value = 5.50, Note: NS = not significant; S = significant

Table 5: Chi-square results showing the relationship between age of the respondents and their rate of adoption of some recommended soil management and conservation technologies

| Technologies             | Adoption    | Young | Middle | Old | $\chi^2$ | Level of sig. |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|--------|-----|----------|---------------|
| Mulching                 | Adopted     | 24    | 50     | 16  | 5.07     | NS            |
|                          | Not adopted | 14    | 12     | 10  |          |               |
| Manuring                 | Adopted     | 28    | 42     | 30  | 3.29     | NS            |
|                          | Not adopted | 3     | 12     | 11  |          |               |
| Fertilizer application   | Adopted     | 27    | 42     | 33  | 3.00     | NS            |
|                          | Not adopted | 10    | 6      | 70  |          |               |
| Improved cropping system | Adopted     | 19    | 49     | 23  | 3.69     | NS            |
|                          | Not adopted | 1     | 16     | 8   |          |               |

\*p<0.05; Critical  $\chi^2$  - value = 5.50, Note: NS = not significant; S = significant

Table 6: Chi-square results showing the relationship between income of the respondents and their rate of adoption of some recommended soil management and conservation technologies

| Technologies           | Adoption    | Low | Medium | High | $\chi^2$ | Level of sig. |
|------------------------|-------------|-----|--------|------|----------|---------------|
| Mulching               | Adopted     | 16  | 34     | 60   | 20.7*    | S             |
|                        | Not adopted | 10  | 4      | 2    |          |               |
| Fertilizer application | Adopted     | 18  | 32     | 42   | 17.8*    | S             |
|                        | Not adopted | 19  | 10     | 5    |          |               |
| Terracing              | Adopted     | 4   | 9      | 18   | 14.0*    | S             |
|                        | Not adopted | 14  | 32     | 23   |          |               |

\*p<0.05; Critical  $\chi^2$  -value = 5.50, Note: NS = not significant; S = significant

adoption of fertilizer and improved cropping. This implies that, farmers who attained some level of education adopted fertilizer application and improved cropping more than those who did not. However, there was no significant relationship ( $p>0.05$ ) between level of education and adoption of manuring and mulching. This was expected since these constituted part of the traditional soil management and conservation practices. The table also reveals that, there was no significant relationship ( $p>0.5$ ) between the age of the respondents and their adoption of mulching, manuring, fertilizer application and improved cropping system (Table 5). This was due to the fact that majority of the respondents were in the older generation age bracket. These farmers had practiced the traditional methods for decades and it would be unexpected for them to suddenly change to the modern methods introduced to them.

The study further revealed that there was a significant relationship ( $p<0.05$ ) between the respondents'

Table 7: Factors militating against adoption of recommended soil management and conservation technologies as perceived by the respondents (N = 126)

| Identified factor        | Level of seriousness |      |         |      |             |      |
|--------------------------|----------------------|------|---------|------|-------------|------|
|                          | Very serious         |      | Serious |      | Not serious |      |
|                          | Freq.                | %    | Freq.   | %    | Freq.       | %    |
| Land tenure system       | 83                   | 65.9 | 31      | 24.6 | 12          | 9.5  |
| Small size of plot       | 56                   | 44.4 | 49      | 38.9 | 21          | 16.7 |
| Lack of technical advice | 78                   | 61.9 | 36      | 28.6 | 12          | 9.5  |
| Lack of necessary inputs | 94                   | 74.6 | 18      | 14.3 | 14          | 11.1 |
| Lack of credit           | 89                   | 70.6 | 22      | 17.5 | 15          | 11.9 |
| Low level of education   | 27                   | 21.4 | 35      | 27.8 | 64          | 50.8 |
| Low level of income      | 55                   | 43.7 | 32      | 25.4 | 39          | 30.9 |
| Shortage of labour       | 63                   | 50.0 | 25      | 19.8 | 38          | 30.2 |

Source: Field survey (2001)

annual income and adoption of mulching, fertilizer application and terracing (Table 6). This implies that, farmers within the high income level were likely to adopt these recommended soil management and conservation practices than those within the low income group, who may not be able to afford the cost of adoption of these improved practices. High cost of innovation is one of the known factors that hinder adoption of innovation (Ekong, 1988).

### CONSTRAINTS TO ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDED SOIL MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION METHODS

Table 7 indicates that land tenure system, inadequate technical advice, inadequacy of necessary inputs like credit and labour were identified by the respondents as the most serious constraints that hindered their adoption of the soil management and conservation practices recommended to them by the ENADEP. Other constraints identified include, low level of income and small size of farm plots owned by the respondents. These results agree with the findings of (Okigbo, 1977; Onu, 1986; Udoh, 1998).

The study also revealed that lack of inputs for demonstration, such as seeds, fertilizers and required farm implements inadequate transportation and lack of motivation of extension personnels were the major hindrance to effective extension in the area.

### IMPLICATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE FOOD CROP PRODUCTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Two major components of environmental extension, namely soil management and conservation were investigated in this study. These components involve ways of managing the soil to promote dense vegetation and prevent erosion and other forms of land degradation, with the ultimate aim of sustaining food crop production.



- The study revealed that, there were higher adoption rates for some technologies recommended to the farmers. The reason adduced for such high rates include simplicity, lower cost and enhancement of soil fertility vis a vis output. Implication is that soil management and conservation technologies should be designed to suit the farmers' needs and conditions if sustainable food crop production is to be enhanced in the area.
- To engender the adoption of soil management and conservation technologies that the farmers believed were quite expensive (terracing and construction of earth dams) government through its agencies should adopt policy measures that will enhance unfettered access to credit by these small-scale farmers in the area.
- Since extension has a crucial role to play in promoting sustainable agricultural practices the extension workers as important actors, lack of motivational factors and logistic support is likely to hinder the discharge of their duties. Thus, the absence of effective extension contact with farmers is likely to affect the adoption of modern and effective soil management and conservation practices by farmer. This will, in turn, result in the degradation of land resources and hence, hampering sustainable food crop production in the area.

### CONCLUSION

Soil degradation, most often than not, results from poor soil management and conservation practices commonly adopted by farmers with increasing awareness of the linkage between resource degradation and the deteriorating quality of life, it is becoming clearer that soil degradation contributes to low agricultural yields. For effective conservation of the available arable soil to be achieved, both the extension workers and farmers have crucial roles to play. Although the study has identified some improved soil management and conservation technologies recommended to farmers in the area, a number of constraints that hindered farmers' adoption of these technologies have been identified. These constraints ranged from high cost of technology, inadequacy of necessary inputs and lack of adequate credit to farmers to near absence of motivation and logistic support to extension workers.

### REFERENCES

Boserup, F., 1975. The conditions of agricultural growth. The economics of agricultural changes under population pressure. Allen and Unwin Press.

- Common Wealth of Nations, 1992. Women, conservation and agriculture. A manual for trainers; Women and Development Programme, Common Wealth Secretariat, London.
- Ekong, E.E., 1988. Rural Sociology: An Introduction and Analysis of Rural Nigeria. (1st Edn.), Ibadan: Jumak Printers Ltd.
- Gipps, T., 1993. Breaking the pesticide habit: International Alliance for Sustainable Agriculture Organization for Consumers Union, Denang Malaysia.
- Morgan, R.P.C., 1991. Soil erosion and conservation. London Longman Press.
- Nigerian Environmental Study/Action Team (NEST), 1991. Nigeria's threatened environment: National Profiles: Inter Publications, Ibadan.
- Nweke, F.I. and J.A. Okorie, 1983. Determinants of adoption of new technologies among small holder farmers and implications for administration of transfer programmes: A case study of rice production in Plateau State of Nigeria. *Agric. Admin.*, 12: 78-86.
- Ofomata, G.E.K., 1981. The Land Resource of South Eastern Nigeria. In: N.M. Igbozurike, (Eds). A Need For Conservation In Land Use and Conservation in Nigeria. University of Nigeria Press, pp: 94-106.
- Okigbo, B.N., 1977. Farming System and Soil Erosion in West Africa in D.J. Greenland *et al.* (Eds). Soil Conservation and Management in the Tropics. A Wiley Interscience Publication, Churchester.
- Olayide, S.O. and A.O. Falusi, 1977. Economics of Soil Conservation and Management in the Tropics. In: D.J. Greenland *et al.* (Eds). Soil Conservation and Management in the Tropics. A Willey Interscience Publication, Churchester.
- Oldema, L.R., R.T.A. Hakkeling and W.G. Sombrock, 1991; Global Assessment of Soil Degradation, (2nd Edn.), International Soil Reference and Information Centre, Wageningen, United Nations Environmental Programme Nairobi.
- Onu, D.O., 1986. Land Use Management in Nigeria. In A. O. Eniola and I. R. Bello-Iman (Eds). The Politic of Soil Conservation in Development and Environment. Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research, Resprint Industrial Press Ltd. Ibadan, pp: 442-456.
- Opore, K.D., 1977. The role of agricultural Nigerian extension in adoption of innovation by cotton growers in Ghana. *Rural Sociol.*, 42: 22-24.
- Udoh, E.J., 1998. Economic and Environmental Analysis of Farm Level Land use and Management in Odukpani District of Cross River State. Ph.D. Seminar paper. University of Ibadan.
- Voh, J.P., 1982. A study of factors associated with the adoption of recommended farm practice in a Nigerian village. *Agric. Admin.*, 9: 21-25.