



USAGE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF FERTILITY ENHANCEMENT TECHNIQUES AMONG SMALL-HOLDER FARMERS IN THE KANO CLOSE SETTLED ZONE, KANO STATE

¹Abba Sani Abdullahi, ¹Abubakar Haruna Kwaru, ¹Karimatu Umar Adamu and ²Ibrahim DanladiSule

¹Geography Department, School of Secondary Education (Arts & Social Sciences), Sa'adatu Rimi College of Education Kumbotso, PMB 3218 Kano, Nigeria

²Department of Geography & Regional planning, Federal University Dutsin-Ma, Katsina State, Nigeria

Corresponding authors' email: idanladi@fudutsinma.edu.ng Phone Number +2348035285126

ABSTRACT

This study examines the usage and effectiveness of diverse soil fertility enhancement technique (SFET) among smallholder farmers in the Kano close-settled zone. Four study villages were selected from different parts of the Kano Close-Settled Zone, Kano state. A multi- stage sampling technique was used in selecting a total of 112 farmers for the study. Data were collected by means of structured questionnaires and analyzed using descriptive statistics. The result shows that 88.4% of the respondents are in the range of 21 to 50 years, which is active age group. The mean age of the respondents was 40 years. The result reveals that small ruminants manure with a total of 94% was ranked first in term of popularity in usage and effectiveness in fertility enhancement, ashes manure ranked second. Cattle dung manure and Grasses and compound sweeping manure became the third popular and effective techniques among the respondents. However, inorganic fertilizer is largely utilized by most of the farmers more especially NPK (93%) and Urea (93%) which shows that majority of the respondents practice mixed cropping and intercropping (88%) and crop rotation (86%). It is therefore recommended that farmers should always be encouraged in the appropriate adoption of both the modern and indigenous soil fertility enhancement techniques.

Keywords: Soil, fertility, enhancement technique, small scale farmers

INTRODUCTION

The management of soil fertility is the first condition for sustainable crop production which creates certain challenges to farmers in Nigeria. Food security production for man and feeds for animals depend solely on a fertile soil and it is the reason why its management is necessary for a sustainable agricultural development to hold. The combination of factors has resulted in serious and growing problems of food insecurity in the country. Adverse climatic changes (drought), human population pressure and environmental degradation such as decline in the soil fertility were few among the factors responsible for food insecurity. As such sustainable soil fertility enhancement technique that would improve the livelihoods of rural households through the identification, evaluation, and promotion of technological options to enhance productivity and create an enabling environment for the farmers to improve their level of production is highly required. According to FAO (2008), sustainable agriculture was identified as a holistic approach to the problems of resources conservation, But in recent decades, the environmental degradation. unsustainable soil management practices such as inadequate replacement of soil nutrients taken up by crops, indiscriminate vegetation removal and overgrazing have resulted to decreased in soil fertility and increase in the occurrence of acidified soil (Essiet, 2003; Key, Whitfield, Dicks, Sutherland, and Bardgett, 2013). Decreasing fertility of soils because of soil nutrient mining is regarded as a major cause of decrease in crop yields and per capita food production in Africa (Sanchez, 2002). Soil fertility depletion can be reduced and the fertility can be enhanced through proper adoption of Soil Fertility Enhancement Techniques (SFETs) as some of these techniques reduce the impact of rainwater runoff, soil erosion, and increased water infiltration (movement of water into the soil). In addition, SFET were found to increase soil organic matter content and increase the activities and diversity of soil microbes through biomass production which consequently increase high crop yields (Key et al., 2013). SFET are all the techniques employed by farmers to conserve and improve the fertility of their farmland (Yusuf, 2001). Some of the SFET practiced in Nigeria include application of organic manure, inorganic fertilizers, integration of both organic and inorganic fertilizers, crop rotation, mixed/intercropping, kraaling, mixed farming

agro-forestry and bush fallowing among others. Several soil fertility enhancement techniques are being provided by Agricultural Research Institutions such as International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), Alliance for Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA), Institute of Agricultural Research, Zaria (IAR), and Kano State Agricultural and Rural Development Authority (KNARDA) and are been adopted by farmers to improve agricultural sustainability in the country.

The adoption of these techniques, however, varies with the environments (soil and land forms) and other resources (Yusuf, 2001). For instance, modern agro-forestry such as Alley cropping and improved fallow are highly practiced in the forest regions of Nigeria. Whereas mixed farming, kraaling animals manure method (cattle's dung, sheep and goats) are more practiced in the savannah regions of Nigeria. This study will therefore identify the variety of soil fertility enhancement

techniques (SFETs) practices by the smallholder farmers in Kano Close -Settled Zone of Kano state.

The Study Area

The study area is located within what Mortimore, (1993) called Kano close-settled zone, where the rural population density is considered to be very high by Tropical African standard. The Kano Close-Settled Zone (CSZ) lies within the Sudan savannah of northern Nigeria and is the zone experiencing ever increase in population that has the highest rural population density by African standard, reaching over 500 persons per square kilometres since 1995 (Mortimore and Adams, 1999). Hill (1977) cited in Yusuf (2014) described Kano CSZ as the zone with irregular shape and ellipse, extending some 100km from Kano city to the south east and only 50 km in other directions. However, it is important to note that the current population density of Kano Close-Settled Zone reach about 1000 persons per square kilometres due to the rapid changes over the years (Olofin *et al.*, 2008).

In this research, the study area falls within 50 km radius of Kano Close-Settled Zone as shown in figure 1.



Fig. 1: Kano close-settled zone showing the four study villages

The study area comprises of Wasai, GidanTuku, Yanaba, and Yanoko farming communities. Wasai is in the Southern part of Minjibir Local Government Area, which is situated in the northern part of Kano state and is located between latitude 12.15⁰ north of the equator and longitude 8.69⁰ east of the Greenwich meridian. The presence of Wasai dam from Jakara River in this area led to the rise of water table in the area which also favours the smallholder farmers to dig wells for irrigation activities. Yanaba is located in the south western part of Garun Malam Local Government Area and is positioned between latitude 11.65°N of the equator and longitude 8.36° east of the Greenwich meridian. This village is blessed with the presence of river Fayan which favour development of extensive agricultural lands for both rain fed and irrigation system. Yanoko is situated in the eastern part of Tofa Local Government Area found in the western part of Kano state and is located between latitude of about 12.08°N of the equator and longitude 8.31º east of the Greenwich meridian. The presence of Watari River favours the growth of irrigation activities in the area. Gidan Tuku is found in southern part of Warawa Local Government Area, east of Kano city and is located between latitude of about 11.08°N of the equator and longitude 8.85° east of the Greenwich meridian. Gidan Tuku was a settlement before (15-20 years ago) which was demolished by frequent flooding of river Wudil and turned it to be an extensive agricultural land for both rainfed and irrigation activities

Research Method

A multi-stage sampling technique was used for the selection of the study villages in the Kano close-settled zone and the smallholder farmers. Stage one involves a purposive selection of four Local Government Area in each direction (North, East, South and West) of the Kano close- settle zone, that resulted in the picking of Minjibir, Warawa, Tofa and Garun Malam. These Local Governments were selected due to the facts that are closed to the city and potential sites of rain fed and irrigation farming (figure 1). Stage two includes the random selection of four farming villages one from each selected Local Government Area (figure 1). In stage three purposive sampling was adopted in the selection of small-holder farmers from each of the selected village resulting to the selection of twenty eight (28) small-holders farmers that who engaged in both rain fed and irrigation farming. This gives a total of 112 smallholder farmers that were selected for the survey. Data was collected through questionnaire administration to the farmers met at the field. The population for the study consists of smallholder's farmers who have been practicing farming for more than (15) fifteen years. Face-to-face contact in the farm field was used to administered the questionnaire as adopted by Ogbonna, Idiong and Ndifon (2007),Martins, Gideon and Beatrice (2010), Akinola(2010), Yusuf (2010), Muhammad-Lawal, *et al.* (2014)andOyewole and Ojeleye (2015).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table1 indicates the socio-economic characteristics of the farmers. All the sampled farmers were male and married and divided into six age groups for convenience. This indicates that males are more involved in farming activities in the study area. This might be due to female reliance on their husbands in taking farming decisions (FAO, 2005) and most likely women are too occupied in home activities a condition that possibly made them less available for the interview. This result is consistence with the work done in Zaria, Kaduna state by Damisa, and Yohanna (2007) who found out that the level of participation of rural women in the decision-making in different areas of agriculture was quite minimal. But is inconsistence with the study done in Malawi by Kabuli, Phiri and Abdi Khalil (2005), which reveals that majority of the farmers were female. The result also agreed with the findings of Onasanya (2007) that most crop farmers are married and Soyeboet al. (2005) that agriculture is very much practiced by married people to enable meet and cater for their family needs. This may probably be due to the fact that the younger generations have migrated to the city. The results presented in Table 1 show that 88.4% of the respondents are in the range of <20 to 60 years which is the active age group. The mean age of the respondents was 40 years. This group is more physically active and highly energetic to participate in farming. They are also able to perform farming activities effectively throughout the year. About 11.6% of the respondents are within the age of below 20 years and above 50 years.

Age Group		LOCATIONS									
	Yanaba		Wasai		G/Tuku		Yanoko		Total		
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
<u><</u> 20	0	0	2	7	1	4	0	0	3	2.7	
21-30	3	11	5	18	3	11	3	11	14	12.5	
31-40	13	46	10	36	15	54	13	46	51	45.5	
41-50	9	32	7	25	8	29	10	36	34	30.4	
51-60	3	11	3	11	1	4	2	7	9	8.0	
Above 60	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	0.9	
Total	28	100	28	100	28	100	28	100	112	100	
Educational Status of the respo	ondents										
Adult Education	2	33	2	33	1	17	1	17	6	5	
Primary Education	13	33	7	18	10	25	10	25	40	36	
Secondary Education	6	21	6	21	8	28	9	31	29	26	
Tertiary Education	4	22	7	39	3	17	4	22	18	16	
Qur'anic Education only	3	16	6	32	6	32	4	21	19	17	
Total	28	100	28	100	28	100	28	100	112	100	
Occupational status											
Farming only	11	39	5	18	12	43	6	21	34	30	
Civil Servants	8	29	12	43	2	7	6	21	28	25	
Trading	3	11	5	18	5	18	8	29	21	19	
Hand Crafts	3	11	4	14	7	25	6	21	20	18	
Others	3	11	2	7	2	7	2	7	9	8	
Total	28	100	28	100	28	100	28	100	112	100	

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics

Source: Author's field work, 2017

It was found that 5% had adult education while 17% had Qur'anic education. About 36%, 26% and 16% had primary, secondary and post secondary education, respectively. Education propels farmers to adopt innovations and technical skills that are vital for enhancing productivity. The result shows that there are five major categories of respondents that involved in farming practice in the four villages. These include full time farmers, civil servants, trading, hand-crafts and others (Table 1). The study reveals that significant numbers of the respondents are fulltime farmers in both rainfed and irrigation farming more especially in Gidan Tuku (43%) and Yanaba (39%) compared to Yanoko (21%) and Wasai (18%) (Table1). This signifies that their livelihood solely depend on farming activities. However, 25% of the respondents are civil servants as observed in Wasai (43%) and Yanaba (29%) villages but very few were observed in Gidan Tuku (7%) considering farming being the secondary occupation. These respondents use the privilege of their salary income to invest in farming operation. Also, 19% of the respondents engaged in hand craft works such as carpentry, building, mechanic, tailoring among others. But the least number of the respondents (8%) are engaged in other occupation such as sugar cane selling, vegetable selling among others.

Soil Fertility Enhancement Techniques Diversity in the Study Area

The use and adoption of soil fertility enhancement techniques available in the four study villages are not evenly practiced by the smallholder farmers. The results shown in Table 2 reveals that most of the farmers (94%)asserted that small ruminants manure happens to be the first enhancement techniques in term of accessibility, availability and affordability. This is because most of the household heads raise livestock and poultry mainly for trading. Therefore, this gives them privilege to cheaply source livestock and poultry manure. Furthermore, ashes manure became the second most adopted enhancement techniques (73%) because of the frequent use of fire woods and crop residues such as stocks as fuel. Cattle dung manure and Grasses and compound sweeping manure accounting for 62% were equally considered important after the adoption of ashes manure. Moreover, significant numbers of the respondents (43%) adopted the use of poultry pit latrines had (28%) while donkey (15%) and horse (13%) manure are use at micro scale. This study is in agreement with previous works done by Yusuf (2001; 2010) and Maconachie (2012) who lamented that manure generation in the Kano closed settled zone was found to be the backbone of intensive as well as sustainable farming system. It was also revealed that inorganic fertilizer is largely utilized by most of the farmers more especially NPK and Urea, while very few farmers adopted the use of liquid fertilizers (4%) and Super phosphate (SSP) (1%).Integration of organic manure and inorganic fertilizers are use by majority of the respondents (90). The study has shown that farmers in the area adopted the use of inorganic fertilizers despite the cost and short supply. intercropping (88%) and crop rotation (86%) because of their simplicity and benefits while significant number of the respondents adopted the use of bush burning (14%) and kraaling (21%). The use of mixed farming (5%), crop residues (5%), fallowing (4%) and agro forestry (3%) had minimal adoption among the farmers. This signifies that not all the SFETs were adopted by the farmers in the area.

In terms of agronomic practices, the results in Table 2 reveals that majority of the respondents practice mixed cropping and

Table 2: Diversity of soil fertility enhancement techniques

YANABA WASAI GTUKU YANNOKO TOTAL ORGANIC MANURE F % Gas F </th <th colspan="2">SFETs</th> <th colspan="10">LOCATIONS</th>	SFETs		LOCATIONS									
ORGANIC MANURE F % F		YANABA WASAI		SAI	G/TUKU		YANOKO		TOTAL			
Small Ruminants 27 96 26 93 25 89 27 96 105 94 Cattle Dung 14 50 24 86 11 39 20 71 69 62 Poultry 10 36 13 46 5 18 20 71 48 43 Grasses and Compound Sweeping 15 54 15 54 18 64 22 79 70 63 Pit Latrines 10 36 8 29 2 7 11 39 31 28 Ashe 21 75 20 71 21 75 82 73 Horse waste 2 7 4 14 2 7 6 21 14 13 Donkey waste 7 25 2 7 1 4 7 25 17 15 INORGANIC FERTILIZER 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 Super pho	ORGANIC MANURE	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Cattle Dung 14 50 24 86 11 39 20 71 69 62 Poultry 10 36 13 46 5 18 20 71 48 43 Grasses and Compound Sweeping 15 54 15 54 18 64 22 79 70 63 Pit Latrines 10 36 8 29 2 7 11 39 31 28 Ashe 21 75 20 71 20 71 21 75 82 73 Horse waste 2 7 4 14 2 7 6 21 14 13 Donkey waste 7 25 2 7 1 4 7 25 17 15 INP.K. 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 Super phosphate (SSP) 0 0 1 4 0 0 0 1 1 Liquid Fe	Small Ruminants	27	96	26	93	25	89	27	96	105	94	
Poultry 10 36 13 46 5 18 20 71 48 43 Grasses and Compound Sweeping 15 54 15 54 18 64 22 79 70 63 Pit Latrines 10 36 8 29 2 7 11 39 31 28 Ashe 21 75 20 71 20 71 21 75 82 73 Horse waste 2 7 4 14 2 7 6 21 14 13 Donkey waste 7 25 2 7 1 4 7 25 17 15 INORGANIC FERTILIZER 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 UREA 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 Super phosphate (SSP) 0 0 1 4 0 0 0 1 1 L	Cattle Dung	14	50	24	86	11	39	20	71	69	62	
Grasses and Compound Sweeping 15 54 15 54 18 64 22 79 70 63 Pit Latrines 10 36 8 29 2 7 11 39 31 28 Ashe 21 75 20 71 20 71 21 75 82 73 Horse waste 2 7 4 14 2 7 6 21 14 13 Donkey waste 7 25 2 7 1 4 7 25 17 15 N.P.K. 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 Super phosphate (SSP) 0 0 1 4 0 0 0 1 1 Liquid Fertilizer (TakinaRuwa) 0 0 2 7 0 0 2 7 4 4 Organic manure +Inorganic Fertilizer 25 89 25 89 26 93 25 89 101 90 <td>Poultry</td> <td>10</td> <td>36</td> <td>13</td> <td>46</td> <td>5</td> <td>18</td> <td>20</td> <td>71</td> <td>48</td> <td>43</td>	Poultry	10	36	13	46	5	18	20	71	48	43	
Pit Latrines 10 36 8 29 2 7 11 39 31 28 Ashe 21 75 20 71 20 71 21 75 82 73 Horse waste 2 7 4 14 2 7 6 21 14 13 Donkey waste 7 25 2 7 1 4 7 25 17 15 INORGANIC FERTILIZER 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 UREA 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 Super phosphate (SSP) 0 0 1 4 0 0 0 1 1 Liquid Fertilizer (TakinaRuwa) 0 0 2 7 4 4 Organic manure +Inorganic Fertilizer 25 89 25 89 26 93 25 89 101 90 A 25	Grasses and Compound Sweeping	15	54	15	54	18	64	22	79	70	63	
Ashe 21 75 20 71 21 75 82 73 Horse waste 2 7 4 14 2 7 6 21 14 13 Donkey waste 7 25 2 7 1 4 7 25 17 15 INORGANIC FERTILIZER 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 UREA 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 Super phosphate (SSP) 0 0 1 4 0 0 0 1 1 Liquid Fertilizer (TakinaRuwa) 0 0 0 2 7 0 0 2 7 4 4 Organic manure +Inorganic Fertilizer 25 89 25 89 26 93 25 89 101 90 AGRONOMIC PRACTICES 27 96 21 75 25 89 26 93 99 88 <tr< td=""><td>Pit Latrines</td><td>10</td><td>36</td><td>8</td><td>29</td><td>2</td><td>7</td><td>11</td><td>39</td><td>31</td><td>28</td></tr<>	Pit Latrines	10	36	8	29	2	7	11	39	31	28	
Horse waste27414276211413Donkey waste72527147251715INORGANIC FERTILIZERN.P.K.269326932796258910493UREA269326932796258910493Super phosphate (SSP)001400011Liquid Fertilizer (TakinaRuwa)0027002744Organic manure +Inorganic Fertilizer258925892693258910190AGRONOMIC PRACTICES27962175258926939388Crop Rotation25892486248623829686Crop Residues00311141454Bush Burning725414144141614	Ashe	21	75	20	71	20	71	21	75	82	73	
Donkey waste 7 25 2 7 1 4 7 25 17 15 INORGANIC FERTILIZER INORGANIC FERTILIZER 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 UREA 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 Super phosphate (SSP) 0 0 1 4 0 0 0 1 1 Liquid Fertilizer (TakinaRuwa) 0 0 2 7 0 0 2 7 4 4 Organic manure +Inorganic Fertilizer 25 89 25 89 26 93 25 89 101 90 AGRONOMIC PRACTICES 27 96 21 75 25 89 26 93 93 99 88 Crop Rotation 25 89 24 86 24 86 23 82 96 86 Grop Residues 0 0 3 11 1 4	Horse waste	2	7	4	14	2	7	6	21	14	13	
INORGANIC FERTILIZER N.P.K. 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 UREA 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 Super phosphate (SSP) 0 0 1 4 0 0 0 1 1 Liquid Fertilizer (TakinaRuwa) 0 0 2 7 0 0 2 7 4 4 Organic manure +Inorganic Fertilizer 25 89 25 89 26 93 25 89 101 90 AGRONOMIC PRACTICES 27 96 21 75 25 89 26 93 99 88 Crop Rotation 25 89 24 86 23 82 96 86 Crop Residues 0 0 3 11 1 4 14 16 14	Donkey waste	7	25	2	7	1	4	7	25	17	15	
N.P.K. 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 UREA 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 Super phosphate (SSP) 0 0 1 4 0 0 0 1 1 Liquid Fertilizer (TakinaRuwa) 0 0 2 7 0 0 2 7 4 4 Organic manure +Inorganic Fertilizer 25 89 25 89 26 93 25 89 101 90 AGRONOMIC PRACTICES 27 96 21 75 25 89 26 93 99 88 Crop Rotation 25 89 24 86 24 86 23 82 96 86 Crop Residues 0 0 3 11 1 4 1 4 5 4 Bush Burning 7 25 4 14 1 4 16 14	INORGANIC FERTILIZER											
UREA 26 93 26 93 27 96 25 89 104 93 Super phosphate (SSP) 0 0 1 4 0 0 0 1 1 Liquid Fertilizer (TakinaRuwa) 0 0 2 7 0 0 2 7 4 4 Organic manure +Inorganic Fertilizer 25 89 25 89 26 93 25 89 101 90 AGRONOMIC PRACTICES 27 96 21 75 25 89 26 93 99 88 Crop Rotation 25 89 24 86 23 82 96 86 Crop Residues 0 0 3 11 1 4 14 16 14	N.P.K.	26	93	26	93	27	96	25	89	104	93	
Super phosphate (SSP) 0 0 1 4 0 0 0 1 1 Liquid Fertilizer (TakinaRuwa) 0 0 2 7 0 0 2 7 4 4 Organic manure +Inorganic Fertilizer 25 89 25 89 26 93 25 89 101 90 AGRONOMIC PRACTICES 90 88 Crop Rotation 25 89 24 86 24 86 23 82 96 86 Crop Residues 0 0 3 11 1 4 1 4 5 4 Bush Burning 7 25 4 14 1 4 16 14	UREA	26	93	26	93	27	96	25	89	104	93	
Liquid Fertilizer (TakinaRuwa) 0 0 2 7 0 0 2 7 4 4 Organic manure +Inorganic Fertilizer 25 89 25 89 26 93 25 89 101 90 AGRONOMIC PRACTICES 90 88 Crop Rotation 25 89 24 86 24 86 23 82 96 86 Crop Residues 0 0 3 11 1 4 1 4 5 4 Bush Burning 7 25 4 14 1 4 16 14	Super phosphate (SSP)	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Organic manure +Inorganic Fertilizer 25 89 25 89 26 93 25 89 101 90 AGRONOMIC PRACTICES 90 88 Mix Cropping and Intercropping 27 96 21 75 25 89 26 93 99 88 Crop Rotation 25 89 24 86 23 82 96 86 Crop Residues 0 0 3 11 1 4 1 4 5 4 Bush Burning 7 25 4 14 1 4 16 14	Liquid Fertilizer (TakinaRuwa)	0	0	2	7	0	0	2	7	4	4	
AGRONOMIC PRACTICES Mix Cropping and Intercropping 27 96 21 75 25 89 26 93 99 88 Crop Rotation 25 89 24 86 23 82 96 86 Crop Residues 0 0 3 11 1 4 1 4 5 4 Bush Burning 7 25 4 14 1 4 16 14	Organic manure +Inorganic Fertilizer	25	89	25	89	26	93	25	89	101	90	
Mix Cropping and Intercropping27962175258926939988Crop Rotation25892486248623829686Crop Residues00311141454Bush Burning7254141441614	AGRONOMIC PRACTICES											
Crop Rotation 25 89 24 86 23 82 96 86 Crop Residues 0 0 3 11 1 4 1 4 5 4 Bush Burning 7 25 4 14 1 4 14 16 14	Mix Cropping and Intercropping	27	96	21	75	25	89	26	93	99	88	
Crop Residues 0 0 3 11 1 4 5 4 Bush Burning 7 25 4 14 1 4 14 16 14	Crop Rotation	25	89	24	86	24	86	23	82	96	86	
Bush Burning 7 25 4 14 1 4 4 14 16 14	Crop Residues	0	0	3	11	1	4	1	4	5	4	
<i>y z y y y y y y y y y y</i>	Bush Burning	7	25	4	14	1	4	4	14	16	14	
Fallowing 2 7 2 7 0 0 0 4 4	Fallowing	2	7	2	7	0	0	0	0	4	4	
Kraaling 15 54 4 14 0 0 4 14 23 21	Kraaling	15	54	4	14	0	0	4	14	23	21	
Mixed Farming 2 7 2 7 0 0 2 7 6 5	Mixed Farming	2	7	2	7	0	0	2	7	6	5	
Agroforestry 2 7 1 4 0 0 0 3 3	Agroforestry	2	7	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	

Author's field work, 2017

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The study concludes that Majority of the small holder farmers in the Kano close settled zone are male in their productive age that had attended one level of education or another, married and had farming experience for more than fifteen years. This study clearly shows that the most adopted soil fertility enhancement techniques were small ruminants manure, ashes manure, cattle dung manure, and grasses and compound sweeping Inorganic fertilizer is largely utilized by most of the farmers especially NPK and Urea. Organic manure is incorporated with inorganic fertilizers which are use by majority of the respondents. In terms of agronomic practices, majority of the respondents practice mixed cropping, intercropping and crop rotation.

It is therefore recommended that farmers should try to adopt other techniques such as mixed farming, improved fallow, kraaling manure method and modern agro forestry as these no doubt would improve the fertility and condition of the farm land. It is also recommended that farmers should always be encouraged in the appropriate adoption of soil fertility enhancement techniques via suggestions or/and advice by extension services and public enlightenment.

REFERENCES

Adeola, R. G. (2010). Influence of Socio-Economic Factors on the Adoption of Soil Conservation Measures in Ibadan/Ibarapa Agricultural Zone of Oyo State: *Report and Opinion Journal Vol 2 (7) pp 42*

Akinola, A.A., Alene, A.D., Adeyemo, R., Sanogo, D., Olanrewaju A.S., Nwoke, C., and Nziguheba G. (2010). Determinants of adoption and intensity of use of balance nutrient management systems technologies in the northern Guinea savannah of Nigeria. *Quarterly Journal of International Agriculture*, Vol. 49 (2).pp 25-45.

Damisa, M.A. and Yohanna, M. (2007). Role of rural women in farm management decision making process: Ordered Probit Analysis. *Trend in Applied Science Research Journal Vol 2 (3)* 241-245

Food and Agricultural Organisation (2005). Improving the Relevance and effectiveness of agricultural extension activities for women farmers

Food and Agriculture Organization, (FAO) 2008. Water andCereals in Dry lands, The FoodandAgricultureOrganization of the United Nations and Earthscan. Malta:Gutenberg Press Ltd. Accessed on 22/04/2015.

Kabuli, A., Phiri, M.A.R. and Abdi Khalil, E. (2005). Economic Assessment of the Benefits of Soybeans incorporation in smallholder maize-based farming systems and the factors affecting its adoption in Malawi. *African Crop Science Conference Proceedings*, Vol. 7. pp. 881-885

Key, G., Whitfield, G.M., Dicks, L., Sutherland, W. J. and Bardgett, R. D. (2013). Enhancing Soil Fertility as an Ecosystem Service: Evidence for the Effects of Actions. NERC Knowledge Exchange Programme on Sustainable Food Production, the University of Cambridge, Cambridge

Maconachie, R. (2012) Reconciling the mismatch: evaluating competing knowledge claims over soil fertility in Kano, Nigeria. *Journal of Cleaner Production* vol. 31, pp 62-72. www.elsevier.com/locate/jclepro

Martins O, Gideon O, and Beatrice S, (2010). Determinants of the speed of adoption of soil fertility enhancing technologies in western Kenya: Contributed paper presented at the joint 3th African Association of Agricultural Economists (AAAE) AND 48THAgricultural Economists Association of South Africa (AEASA) Conference, Cape town, South Africa, Accessed on 10/10/2015.

Mortimore, M. and Adams, W.M. (1999) Working the Sahel: Environment and society in northern Nigeria. Rout ledge, London.

Mortimore, M. 1993. The intensification of peri-urban agriculture: The Kano close-settled zone, 1964 - 1986. In: Turner, B.L., Kates, R.W. and Hyden, G. (Eds). *Population Growth and Agricultural Change in Africa*. University Press of Florida.

Muhammad-Lawal, A., Omotesho, K. F., Adekola, O. F.andAdekunle, D. (2014) Assessment of Land Management Practices in Food Crops Production among Small Scale Farmers in Kwara State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agricultural Management and Development*

Ogbonna, K.I., Idiong, I.C. and Ndifon, H.M (2007). Adoption of soil management and conservation Technologies by small scale crop Farmers in south Eastern Nigeria: Implications for sustainable crop production. *Agricultural Journal*. vol.2 (2). Pp. 294-298.

Onasanya, A.S. (2007) Crop farmers' use of environmentally sustainable agricultural practices in Ogun State, *Journal of Environmental Extension*: vol.6:75-78.

Olofin, E.A, Nabegu, A.B & Dambazau, A.M (2008) Wudil within Kano Region: A Geographical Synthesis

Oyewole, S.O. and Ojeleye, O. A. (2015). Factors influencing the use of improved farm practice among small-scale farmers in Kano State of Nigeria. *Net Journal of Agricultural Science*, Vol. 3(1), pp. 1-4. Accessed on 16/09/2015.

Simon, B.P., Ndaghu, A.A., Yohanna, I. (2013) Awareness of Sustainable Agricultural Land Management Practices among Crop Farmers in Northern Part of Taraba State, Nigeria. *ARPN Journal of Science and Technology*. VOL. 3, NO. 5, pp. 557-562.

Soyebo, K.O., Farinde, A.I. and Dionco-Adetayo, E. (2005). Constraints of oil palm production in Ife Central Local Government Areas of Osun State. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(1): 55-59.

Yusuf, A.M., (2001). Soil Assessment and Indigenous Soil Management Strategies in the Semi-Arid North Eastern Nigeria. Unpublished PhD. Thesis. Department of Geography, Bayero University, Kano. Yusuf, A. M. (2010). Popularity, costs and use of organic manure among the small holder farmers in the Kano close-settled zones, Kano state, Nigeria. *Journal of social and management studies*. VOL.13. NO.1.

Yusuf, A.M. (2014). Soil Fertility Management. In A.I. Tanko and Momale (Eds) Kano: Environment, Society and Development. London and Abuja. Adonis & Abbey Publishers.