

01 **Advances in Integrated Soil Fertility**  
02 **Management in sub-Saharan Africa:**  
03 **Challenges and Opportunities**  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11

12 Edited by

13  
14 **Andre Bationo**

15 *Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility (TSBF) Institute of the International Centre for*  
16 *Tropical Agriculture (TSBF-CIAT), Nairobi, Kenya*  
17

18 **Boaz Waswa**

19 *Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility (TSBF) Institute of the International Centre for*  
20 *Tropical Agriculture (TSBF-CIAT), Nairobi, Kenya*  
21  
22

23 **Job Kihara**

24 *Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility (TSBF) Institute of the International Centre for*  
25 *Tropical Agriculture (TSBF-CIAT), Nairobi, Kenya*  
26

27 **Joseph Kimetu**

28 *Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility (TSBF) Institute of the International Centre for*  
29 *Tropical Agriculture (TSBF-CIAT), Nairobi, Kenya*  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

01 A C.I.P. Catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10

11 ISBN-13 978-1-4020-5759-5 (HB)  
12 ISBN-13 978-1-4020-5760-1 (e-book)  
13

---

14 Published by Springer,  
15 P.O. Box 17, 3300 AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands.  
16 *www.springer.com*  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 *Printed on acid-free paper*  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 All Rights Reserved  
47 © 2007 Springer  
48 No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted  
49 in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording  
50 or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception  
51 of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered  
and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

## Contents

Preface	xiii
<b>Part I: Setting the scene/Introductory papers</b>	
1. A critical analysis of challenges and opportunities for soil fertility restoration in Sudano-Sahelian West Africa <i>Schlecht E., Buerkert A., Tielkes E. and Bationo A.</i>	1
2. Appropriate technologies to replenish soil fertility in southern Africa <i>Mafongoya P.L., Bationo A., Kihara J. and Waswa B.S.</i>	29
3. Available technologies to replenish soil fertility in Eastern Africa <i>Okalebo J.R., Othieno C.O., Woomer P.L., Karanja N.K., Semoka J.R.M., Bekunda M.A., Mugendi D.N., Muasya R.M., Bationo A. and Mukhwaua E.J.</i>	45
4. Integrated Agricultural Research for Development: contributing to the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (IAR4D in CAADP) <i>Ralph von Kaufmann</i>	63
5. From Thousands to Millions: Accelerating Agricultural Intensification and Economic Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa <i>Maatman A., Wopereis M.C.S., Debrah K.S. and Groot J.J.R.</i>	75
6. Soil science, population growth and food production: some historical developments <i>Alfred E. Hartemink</i>	85
7. Development of an arable layer: A key concept for better management of infertile tropical savanna soils <i>Amézquita E., Rao I.M., Hoyos P., Molina D., Chavez L.F. and Bernal J.H.</i>	99
8. Food Security in Africa: The Challenges of Researchers in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century <i>James B. Kung'u</i>	105
9. Background, Current status and the African Context of the International Nitrogen Initiative <i>Mateete Bekunda, James Galloway, Keith Syers and Mary Scholes</i>	115
<b>Part II: Integrated Nutrient Management (INM)</b>	
10. Within-Farm soil fertility gradients affect response of maize to fertiliser application in western Kenya <i>Vanlauwe B., Tittonell, P. and Mukalama, J.</i>	121
11. Characterisation of soil degradation under intensive rice production in Office du Niger zone of Mali <i>Minamba Bagayoko, Mamadou K. N'Diaye, Mohamed Dicko and Bréhima Tangara</i>	133
12. Soil fertility issues in the Blue Nile Valley, Ethiopia <i>Per Ivar Våje</i>	139

01	13.	Overcoming phosphorus deficiency in soils of Eastern Africa: recent advances and challenges	149
02		<i>Generose Nziguheba</i>	
03	14.	Relative contribution of trees and crops to soil carbon content in a parkland system in Burkina	
04		Faso using variations in natural <sup>13</sup> C abundance	161
05		<i>Bayala J., Balesdent J., Marol C., Zapata F., Teklehaimanot Z. and Ouedraogo S.J.</i>	
06			
07	15.	Mineral fertilizers, organic amendments and crop rotation managements for soil fertility	
08		maintenance in the Guinean zone of Burkina Faso (West Africa)	171
09		<i>B.V. Bado, A. Bationo, Lompo, F, M.P. Cescas and M.P Sedogo</i>	
10	16.	Effect of planting technique and amendment type on pearl millet yield, nutrient uptake, and	
11		water use on degraded land in Niger	179
12		<i>Fatondji D., C. Martius, C.L. Biielders, P.L.G. Vlek , A. Bationo and B. Gerard</i>	
13			
14	17.	Short-term effects of cover crops on stem borers and maize yield in the humid forest of	
15		southern Cameroon	195
16		<i>Chabi-Olaye A., Nolte C., Schulthess F. and Borgemeister C.</i>	
17	18.	Improving cereal productivity and farmers' income using a strategic application of fertilizers in	
18		West Africa	201
19		<i>Ramadjita Tabo, Andre Bationo, Bruno Gerard, Jupiter Ndjeunga, Daniel Marchal, Bassirou</i>	
20		<i>Amadou, Mallam Garba Annou, Diakala Sogodogo, Jean-Baptiste Sibiry Taonda, Ousmane</i>	
21		<i>Hassane, Maimouna K. Diallo and Saidou Koala</i>	
22	19.	Advances in improving Agricultural Profitability and Overcoming Land Degradation in Savanna	
23		and Hillside Agroecosystems of Tropical America	209
24		<i>M. Ayarza, E. Barrios, I. Rao, E. Amézquita and M. Rondón</i>	
25			
26	20.	Integrating legumes to improve N cycling on smallholder farms in sub-humid Zimbabwe:	
27		Resource quality, biophysical and environmental limitations	231
28		<i>Regis Chikowo, Paul Mapfumo, Peter A Leffelaar and Keu E Giller</i>	
29	21.	Meat and bone meal as nitrogen and phosphorus fertilizer to cereals and rye grass	245
30		<i>Alhaji S. Jeng, Trond Knapp Haraldsen, Arne Grønlund and Per Anker Pedersen</i>	
31			
32	22.	Screening Legume Green Manure for Climatic Adaptability and Farmer Acceptance in the	
33		Semi-Arid Agro-ecological Zone of Uganda	255
34		<i>J.B. Tumuhairwe, M.C. Rwakaikara-Silver, S. Muwanga and S. Natigo</i>	
35	23.	Nutrient flows in smallholder production systems in the humid forest zone of	
36		southern Cameroon	261
37		<i>J. Kanmegne, Smaling E.M.A., Brussaard L., Gansop-Kouomegne A. and A. Boukong</i>	
38			
39	24.	Management of improved fallows for soil fertility enhancement in the western highlands	
40		of Cameroon	277
41		<i>Meppe F., Bilong P. and Nwaga D.</i>	
42	25.	Integrated Soil Fertility Management: Use of NUTMON to Quantify Nutrient Flows in Farming	
43		Systems in Central Kenya	283
44		<i>Kathuku A.N., S.K. Kimani, J.R. Okalebo, C.O. Othieno and B. Vanlauwe</i>	
45	26.	Optimizing Soil Fertility Gradients in the Enset ( <i>Ensete ventricosum</i> ) Systems of the Ethiopian	
46		Highlands: Trade-offs and Local Innovations	289
47		<i>Tilahun Amede and Endale Taboge</i>	
48			
49	27.	Consequences of Field Management and Soil Erosion on the Sustainability of Large Scale	
50		Coffee Farming in Kiambu	299
51		<i>Okoth P.F., Ng'ang'a J.K. and Kimani P.K.</i>	

Contents	vii
01 28. The Use of Erosion Proxies for the Spatial Assessment of Erosion in a Watershed and Modelling 02 the Erosion Risk in a GIS 311 03 <i>Okoth P.F., Oketch P.A. and Kimani P.K.</i>	
04 29. Bean Improvement for Low Soil Fertility Adaptation in Eastern and Central Africa 325 05 <i>Lunze L., Kimani P.M., Ngatoluwa R., Rabary B., Rachier G.O., Ugen M.M., Vicky Ruganza and</i> 06 <i>Awad elkarim E.E.</i>	
07 30. Combining <i>Tithonia diversifolia</i> and minjingu phosphate rock for improvement of P availability 08 and maize grain yields on a chromic acrisol in Morogoro, Tanzania 333 09 <i>S.T. Ikerra, E. Semu and J.P. Mrema</i>	
11 31. Improving food production using 'best bet' soil fertility technologies in the Central highlands 12 of Kenya 345 13 <i>Daniel Mugendi, Monicah Mucheru-Muna, Jayne Mugwe, James Kung'u and</i> 14 <i>Andre Bationo</i>	
15 32. Effects of organic and mineral sources of nutrients on maize yields in three districts of 16 central Kenya 353 17 <i>Kimani S.K., Esilaba A.O., Odera M.M., Kimenye L., Vanlauwe B. and Bationo A.</i>	
19 33. Effect of Combining Organic Leafy Biomass and Inorganic fertilizer on Tomato Yields and 20 nematodes control in Arenosols in Kinshasa Area 359 21 <i>Mafuka M. M., Nsombo M., Nkasa C. Ibwenzi K. and Taba K.</i>	
22 34. Nutrient Dynamics On Smallholder Farms In Teghane, Northern Highlands Of Ethiopia 365 23 <i>Assefa Abegaz, Herman van Keulen, Mitiku Haile and Simon J. Oosting</i>	
25 35. Nitrogen-15 Recovery in Cropped Soil Cores Fertilized With Potassium Nitrate and Clover 26 Residues 379 27 <i>Anne W. Muriuki, Larry D. King and Richard J. Volk</i>	
28 36. Evaluation of nitrogen fixation using <sup>15</sup> N dilution methods and economy of a maize-tepyary bean 29 intercrop farming system in semi-arid SE-Kenya 389 30 <i>Chris A. Shisanya and Nkanata M. Gitonga</i>	
32 37. Evaluation of cowpea genotypes for variations in their contribution of N and P to subsequent 33 maize crop in three agro-ecological zones of West Africa 401 34 <i>R.C. Abaidoo, J.A. Okogun, G.O. Kolawole, J. Diels, P. Randall and N. Sanginga</i>	
35 38. Variability of cowpea breeding lines to low phosphorus tolerance and response to external 36 application of Phosphorus 413 37 <i>A.K. Saidou R.C. Abaidoo, B.B. Singh, E.N.O. Iwuafor and N. Sanginga</i>	
39 39. The potential benefits of <i>Azolla</i> , Velvet bean ( <i>Mucuna pruriens</i> var. <i>utilis</i> ) and N fertilizers in rice 40 production under contrasting systems in eastern Uganda 423 41 <i>Crammer K. Kaizzi, Henry Ssali, Angella Nansamba and Paul, L.G. Vlek</i>	
42 40. Tied-ridging and integrated nutrient management options for sustainable crop production in 43 semi-arid eastern Kenya 435 44 <i>Miriti J.M., Esilaba A.O., Bationo A., Cheruiyot H., Kihumba J. and Thurania E.G.</i>	
46 41. Economic evaluation of local inputs in Meru South District, Kenya 443 47 <i>Monicah Mucheru-Muna, Daniel Mugendi, Jayne Mugwe and James Kung'u</i>	
48 42. Effect of Rock Phosphate, Lime and Green Manure on Growth and Yield of Maize in a Non 49 Productive Niche of a Rhodic Ferralsol in Farmer's Fields 449 50 <i>Tabu I.M., Bationo A., Obura R.K. and Khaemba J.M.</i>	

01	43.	Changes in Soil Organic Matter as Influenced by Organic Residue Management Regimes in Selected Experiments in Kenya	457
02		<i>Waswa B.S., Mugendi D.N., Vanlauwe B. and Kung'u J.</i>	
03			
04	44.	Effects of manure application on crop yield and soil chemical properties in a long-term field trial in semi-arid Kenya	471
05		<i>Kihanda F.M., Warren G.P. and Micheni A.N.</i>	
06			
07			
08	45.	Nutrient Recovery from Solid Waste and Linkage to Urban and Peri-Urban Agriculture in Nairobi, Kenya	487
09		<i>Mary Njenga, Stephen Kimani, Dannie Romney and Nancy Karanja,</i>	
10			
11	46.	Optimising crop productivity in legume-cereal rotations through nitrogen and phosphorus management in western Kenya	493
12		<i>Kihara J., Kimetu J.M., Vanlauwe B., Bationo A., Waswa B. and Mukalama J.</i>	
13			
14			
15	47.	Evaluation of the Potential of Using Nitrogen Fixing Legumes in Smallholder Farms of Meru South District, Kenya	503
16		<i>Jayne Mugwe, Daniel Mugendi, David Odee and John Otieno</i>	
17			
18	48.	Improved cassava varieties increase the risk of soil nutrient mining: an ex-ante analysis for western Kenya and Uganda	511
19		<i>Fermont A.M., Obiero H.M., van Asten P.J.A., Baguma Y. and Okwuosa E.</i>	
20			
21			
22	49.	Partial balance of nitrogen in a maize cropping system in humic nitisol of Central Kenya	521
23		<i>J.M. Kimetu, D.N. Mugendi, A. Bationo, C.A. Palm, P.K. Mutuo, J. Kihara, S. Nandwa and K. Giller</i>	
24			
25	50.	Integrated Soil Fertility Management Technologies: A Counteract to Existing Milestone in Obtaining Achievable Economical Crop Yields in Cultivated Lands of Poor Smallholder Farmers in Malawi	531
26		<i>Moses Wazingwa Munthali</i>	
27			
28			
29			
30	51.	Fertilizer nitrogen recovery as affected by soil organic matter status in two sites in Kenya	537
31		<i>Karunditu M.W., Mugendi D.N., Kung'u J. and Vanlauwe B.</i>	
32			
33	52.	Performance evaluation of various agroforestry species used in short duration improved fallows to enhance soil fertility and sorghum yields in Mali	547
34		<i>Bocary Kaya, Amadou Niang, Ramadjita Tabo and André Bationo</i>	
35			
36	53.	Nutrient balances for different farm types in Southern Mali	557
37		<i>S. Kanté, E.M.A. Smaling and H. van Keulen</i>	
38			
39	54.	Increasing the Productivity and Sustainability of Millet Based Cropping Systems in the Sahelian Zones of West Africa	567
40		<i>Traoré Samba, Birama S. Coulibaly, Amadou Koné, Minamba Bagayoko and Zoumana Kouyaté</i>	
41			
42	55.	Comparative short-term effects of different quality organic resources on maize productivity under two different environments in Zimbabwe	275
43		<i>Florence Mtambanengwe, Paul Mapfumo and Bernard Vanlauwe</i>	
44			
45	56.	Improving soil fertility through the use of organic and inorganic plant nutrient and crop rotation in Niger	589
46		<i>Adamou A., Bationo A., Tabo R. and Koala S.</i>	
47			
48			
49	57.	Biological system for improving the availability of Tilemsi phosphate rock for wheat ( <i>Triticum aestivum</i> L) cultivated in Mali	599
50		<i>A.H. Babana and H. Antoun</i>	
51			

Contents	ix
01 58. Managing manure heaps with agro-organic wastes and cover to reduce nitrogen losses during 02 storage on smallholder farms 611	611
03 <i>Gichangi E.M., Karanja N.K. and Wood C.W.</i>	
04 59. Soil characteristics and the performance of sorghum ( <i>Sorghum bicolor</i> (L) Moench) on tin mine 05 spoils of the Jos Plateau, Nigeria 619	619
06 <i>A.A. Yusuf, A.F. Eben-Johnson, V.O. Chude and I.Y. Amapu</i>	
07	
08 60. The development of a prototype land information system for the northern Guinea savanna of 09 Nigeria as a basis for agro-technology transfer 629	629
10 <i>Tabi F.O., Ogunkunle A.O. and Diels J.</i>	
11	
12 61. What role can planted fallows play in the humid and sub-humid zone of West and 13 Central Africa? 647	647
14 <i>Stefau Hauser, Christian Nolte and Robert J. Carsky</i>	
15 62. Balanced Nutrient Management System Technologies In The Northern Guinea Savanna Of 16 Nigeria: Validation And Perspective 669	669
17 <i>Kolawole G.O., Diels J., Manyong V.M., Ugbabe O., Wallays K., Dercon G., Iwuafor E.N.O.,</i> 18 <i>Falaki A.M., Merckx R., Deckers J., Tollens E., Vanlauwe B. and Sanginga N.</i>	
19	
20 63. Soil Erosion and Soil Inorganic-N Depletion as Influenced by Live hedges in Arable Steep-lands 21 of the Central Highlands of Kenya 679	679
22 <i>James K. Mutegi, Daniel N. Mugendi, Louis V. Verchot and James B. Kungu</i>	
23 64. Relationships between rhizobial diversity and host legume nodulation and nitrogen fixation in 24 tropical ecosystems 691	691
25 <i>Abdullahi Bala and Ken E. Giller</i>	
26	
27 65. Limestone, Minjingu Phosphate Rock and Green Manure Application on Improvement of Acid 28 Soils in Rwanda 703	703
29 <i>Nabahungu N.L, Semoka J.M.R and Zaongo C.</i>	
30 66. Evaluating performance and yield stability of some groundnut ( <i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.) varieties 31 under irrigation in three agroecological zones of the Senegal River Valley 713	713
32 <i>Madiama CISSE and Souleymane DIALLO</i>	
33	
34 67. Assessment of the contribution of tied ridges and farmyard manure application to sorghum 35 production in semi-arid areas of Tanzania 723	723
36 <i>Kabanza A.K. and Rwehumbiza F.B.R.</i>	
37 68. Evaluation of <i>Gliricidia sepium</i> , <i>Casuarina junghuhniana</i> and <i>Faidherbia albida</i> tree species for 38 improvement of crop production and fuelwood supply in Muheza districts, Tanzania 731	731
39 <i>Joel L. Meliyo, Marandu A.E.T. and Munuo E.</i>	
40	
41 69. Mineral N distribution in the soil profile of a maize field amended with cattle manure and mineral 42 N under humid sub-tropical conditions 737	737
43 <i>Nyamangara J.</i>	
44 70. Intensity cultivation induced effects on soil organic carbon dynamic in the western cotton area of 45 Burkina Faso 749	749
46 <i>Badiori Ouattara, Korodjouma Ouattara, Georges Serpantié, Abdoulaye Mando, Michel P.</i> 47 <i>Sédogo and André Bationo</i>	
48	
49 71. Assessment of improved soil fertility and water harvesting technologies through community based 50 on-farm trials in the ASALs of Kenya 759	759
51 <i>Gichangi E.M., Njiru E.N., Itabari J.K., Wambua J.M., Maina J.N. and Karuku A.</i>	

01	72.	Profitability of agro-forestry based soil fertility management technologies: the case of small holder food production in Western Kenya	767
02		<i>J.M. Maithya, L.N. Kimenye, F.I. Mugivane and J.J. Ramisch</i>	
03			
04	73.	Integrated natural resources management a strategy for food security and poverty alleviation in Kwalei village, Lushoto district, Tanzania	781
05		<i>Joel L. Meliyo, K.F.G. Masuki and J.G. Mowo</i>	
06			
07			
08	74.	Effects of total inorganic nitrogen and phosphorus availability on Maize Yields in the First post <i>Tephrosia vogelii</i> fallow	787
09		<i>Mkangwa C.Z., Maliondo S.M.S. and Semoka J.M.R.</i>	
10			
11	75.	Environmental hazards in African agriculture: factors influencing application of agrochemicals in Nakuru district, Kenya	795
12		<i>Lagat J.K., Wangia S.M., Njehia B.K. and Ithinji G.K.</i>	
13			
14			
15	76.	Assessment of indigenous soil and water conservation technology for smallholder farms in semi-arid areas in Africa and close spaced trash lines effect on erosion and crop yield	805
16		<i>Isaiah I.C. Wakindiki, B.O. Mochoge and Meni Ben-Hur</i>	
17			
18			
19			
20		<b>Part III: Belowground biodiversity</b>	
21	77.	<i>Prosopis africana</i> (Guill., Perrot et Rich.) Taub and <i>Entada africana</i> (Guill. et Perrot.) leaf litter decomposition and impact of biomass transfer on millet ( <i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> (L.) R. Br.) growth and development on station in Niger	815
22		<i>Larwanou Mahamane, Harouna Niandou Abdel-Aziz, Abasse Tougiani and Niang Amadou</i>	
23			
24			
25	78.	Soil microbial biomass carbon and nitrogen as influenced by organic and inorganic inputs at Kabete, Kenya	827
26		<i>Baaru M.W., Mugendi D.N., Bationo A., Verchot L. and Waceke W.</i>	
27			
28			
29	79.	Evaluating effect of mixtures of organic resources on nutrient release patterns and uptake by maize	833
30		<i>F.O. Ayuke, N.K. Karanja and S.W. Bunyasi</i>	
31			
32	80.	Mycorrhizal associations as indicators of forest quality after land use practices	845
33		<i>Onguene N.A.</i>	
34			
35	81.	Biomass production, N and P uptake of <i>Mucuna</i> after Bradyrhizobia and Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi inoculation, and P-application on acid soil of Southern Cameroon	853
36		<i>Jemo M., Nolte C. and Nwaga D.</i>	
37			
38	82.	Evaluating the effect of <i>Bacillus</i> and <i>Rhizobium</i> . bi-inoculant on nodulation and nematode control in <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> L.	863
39		<i>Karanja N.K., Mutua G.K. and Kimenju J.W.</i>	
40			
41			
42			
43		<b>Part IV: Participatory Approaches and Scaling up/out</b>	
44	83.	Integrated Soil Fertility Management Technologies: review for scaling up	869
45		<i>Michael Misiko and Joshua Ramisch</i>	
46			
47	84.	Costs and Returns of Soil Fertility Management Options in Western Kenya	877
48		<i>Paul L. Woomer</i>	
49			
50	85.	Modeling farmers' decisions on integrated soil nutrient management in sub-Saharan Africa: A multinomial Logit analysis in Cameroon	887
51		<i>Guy Blaise Nkamleu</i>	



Contents	xi
01 86. Opportunities for and constraints to adoption of improved fallows: ICRAF's experience in the	
02 humid tropics of Cameroon	901
03 <i>Degrande A., Asaah E., Tchoundjeu Z., Kanmegne J., Duguma B. and Franzel S.</i>	
04 87. The Effect of Socio-Economic Factors on a Farmer's Decision to Adopt Farm Soil Conservation	
05 Measures. An Application of Multivariate Logistic Analysis in Butere/Mumias District, Kenya	911
06 <i>Victoria E. Anjichi and L.W. Mauyo</i>	
07	
08 88. Farmer's perception of planted calliandra tree fallows for shortening fallow cycles in southern	
09 Cameroon	917
10 <i>Christian Nolte, Bernard Ondo Zo'o and Jean Paul Dondjang</i>	
11 89. Policies, Institutions and Market Development to Accelerate Technological Change in the	
12 Semiarid Zones of Sub-Saharan Africa	929
13 <i>Mark Winslow, Barry Shapiro and John Sanders</i>	
14	
15 90. Factors Influencing Choice and Adoption of Integrated Soil Fertility Management Technologies in	
16 Central Kenya Highlands	937
17 <i>Mureithi B.M., Kimani S.K., Odera M.M., Mwangi E.M. and Gachanja E.</i>	
18 91. Social capital and adoption of soil fertility management technologies in Tororo district, Uganda	943
19 <i>Lule Ali, N. M. Mangheni, P. C. Sanginga, R.J. Delve, F. Mastiko and R. Miiro</i>	
20	
21 92. Adoption of Leguminous Trees/Shrubs, Compost and Farmyard Manure (FYM) As Alternatives to	
22 Improving Soil Fertility in Trans Nzoia District-Kenya	951
23 <i>Nekesa. A.O., Okalebo, J.R. and Kimetto, S.</i>	
24 93. Participatory Diagnosis in the Eastern Drylands of Kenya: Are Farmers aware of their Soil	
25 Fertility Status?	957
26 <i>Kimiti J.M., Esilaba A.O., Vanlauwe B. and Bationo A.</i>	
27	
28 94. On-Farm Evaluation and Scaling-up of Soil Fertility Management Technologies in	
29 Western Kenya	965
30 <i>Odendo, M., Ojiem, J., Bationo, A. and Mudeheri, M.</i>	
31 95. The Resources-to-Consumption System: A Framework for Linking Soil Fertility Management	
32 Innovations to Market Opportunities	975
33 <i>Sanginga Pascal C.; Susan Kaaria, Robert Muzira, Robert Delve, Bernard Vanlauwe, Jonas and</i>	
34 <i>Nteranya Sanginga</i>	
35	
36 96. Scaling Up Options on Integrated Soil Fertility management in Western Kenya: The Case of	
37 COSOFAP: Challenges and Opportunities	987
38 <i>Qureish Noordin, John Mukalama, Daniel Rotich, Electine Wabwile and John Lynam</i>	
39 97. Socio-Economics of Soil Conservation in Kericho District, Kenya	995
40 <i>Kipsat M.J.</i>	
41	
42 98. Market Integration and Conduct Analysis: An Application to Cattle Markets in Uasin Gishu	
43 District, Kenya	1007
44 <i>Serem A.K, Maritim H.K, Kipsat M., Kisinyo P. and Nyangweso P.</i>	
45 99. Factors determining integrated soil fertility management in central Kenya highlands: Participatory	
46 Learning and Action (PLAR) model analysis	1013
47 <i>Odera M.M., Kimani S.K., Esilaba A.O., Kaiyare J.M., Mwangi E. and Gachanja E.</i>	
48	
49 100. Spatial Pricing Efficiency and Regional Market Integration of Cross-Border Bean ( <i>Phaseolus</i>	
50 <i>Vulgaris L.</i> ) Marketing in East Africa: The Case of Western Kenya and Eastern Uganda	1021
51 <i>L.W. Mauyo, J.R. Okalebo, R.A. Kirkby, R. Buruchara, M. Ugen, and H.K. Maritim</i>	

01	101.	Assessment of farmers' perceptions of soil quality indicators within smallholder farms in the	
02		central highlands of Kenya	1029
03		<i>Mairura F.S., Mugendi D.N., Mwanje J.I., Ramisch J.J. and Mbugua P.K.</i>	
04	102.	Initiating Rural Farmers to Participatory Research: Case of Soil Fertilization in Bushumba,	
05		East of DR. Congo	1041
06		<i>Paulin Njingulula Mumbeya and Ngongo Mulangwa</i>	
07			
08	103.	Farmers' participation in soil fertility management research process: Dilemma in rehabilitating	
09		degraded hilltops in Kabale, Uganda	1045
10		<i>Muzira R.N., Kabale farmers' groups, Pali P., Sanginga P. and Delve R.</i>	
11	104.	Integrated Soil Fertility Management and Poverty Traps in Western Kenya	1055
12		<i>J.K. Ndufa, G. Cadisch, C. Poulton, Q. Noordin and B. Vanlauwe</i>	
13			
14	105.	Moving methodologies to enhance agricultural productivity of rice-based lowland systems	
15		in sub-Saharan Africa	1071
16		<i>M.C.S. Wopereis and T. Defoer</i>	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			
41			
42			
43			
44			
45			
46			
47			
48			
49			
50			
51			

01  
02  
03  
04  
05 **Modeling farmers' decisions on integrated soil nutrient management**  
06 **in sub-Saharan Africa: A multinomial Logit analysis in Cameroon**  
07  
08

09 Guy Blaise Nkamleu

10 *International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, B.P. 2008, Messa-Yaoundé, Cameroon; Fax: (237) 2 237437,*

11 *E-mail: g.b.nkamleu@cgiar.org*  
12  
13

14 **Abstract**  
15

16 Much of the technical work on integrated soil nutrient management in sub-Saharan Africa has not considered the  
17 determinants of farmers' adoption decisions. It is important that technical research on these integrated soil nutri-  
18 ent management options be guided by consideration of the factors that determine farmers' decisions to combine  
19 organic and inorganic nutrients. Economists investigating consumer demand have accumulated considerable evi-  
20 dence showing that the observed decision choice on an agricultural technology is the end result of a complex set of  
21 inter-technology preference comparisons made by farmers.  
22

23 This study analyzes the factors that affect farmers' decisions to adopt different soil nutrient management practices  
24 in Cameroon. The technologies evaluated are inorganic fertilizers, organic fertilizers, and combine use of organic  
25 and inorganic fertilizers. A Multinomial Logit model was used to capture choice probabilities across these soil nutri-  
26 ent management categories. Data from a random survey of 217 peri-urban farmers are used in the investigation. The  
27 results show that the factors affecting farmers' choices across the soil nutrient management categories are different  
28 and should be taken into consideration in efforts to promote integrated soil nutrient management practices within  
29 agroecosystems in rural areas of Cameroon. The study ends by raising a number of implications for strategies to  
30 promote integrated soil nutrient management among peri-urban gardening and fruit tree farmers in Cameroon  
31

32 *Key words:* Cameroon; inorganic fertilizers; Multinomial Logit; nutrient management; organic fertilizers; Soil  
33 fertility  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 **Introduction**  
39

40 The major challenge facing agriculture in many parts  
41 of sub-Saharan Africa is how to increase farm produc-  
42 tion to meet changing food needs without degrading  
43 the natural resource base. A factor that limits sustain-  
44 able productivity increases is the inherent low fertility  
45 of the soils. The fertility status of the soils in the  
46 region is manifested by high soil acidity, aluminum  
47 toxicity, low nutrient reserves, nutrient imbalances and  
48 multiple nutrient deficiencies of low activity classes  
49 such as *Ultisols* and *Oxisols* (Nair 1993; SMSS 1986),  
50 and high levels of susceptibility to erosion, crust-  
51 ing and acidification of the *Alfisols* (Sanchez 1976).

Rapidly shortening fallow -a result of high demo-  
graphic pressure- threatens the ecological sustainabil-  
ity of slash-and-burn agricultural systems (Kleinman  
et al. 1995; Smaling et al. 1993).

Although the use of chemical fertilizers can help  
improve the fertility of these soils, the amounts used  
by farmers are extremely low, averaging less than 10  
kg of fertilizer nutrients per hectare in sub-Saharan  
Africa (Pretty 1995). Even with the supplementary use  
of chemical fertilizers, crop yields have been found  
to decline under continuous cultivation due to declin-  
ing of organic matter levels under continuous cul-  
tivation (Kang et al. 1995; FAO 1985; Moormann  
and Greenland 1980). In several parts of sub-Saharan

01 Africa, the food production strategy preferred by gov-  
 02 ernments has been the widespread promotion of inor-  
 03 ganic fertilizers. Coupled with the use of high levels  
 04 of fertilizer subsidies and subsidized interest rates on  
 05 smallholder agricultural credit, several countries expe-  
 06 rienced positive growth rates in food production in  
 07 the 1980's. In some countries like Malawi and Zim-  
 08 babwe, the use of hybrid maize and fertilizers became  
 09 widespread. But with the implementation of struc-  
 10 tural adjustment programs, currencies were devalued  
 11 and markets for inputs were liberalized, increasing the  
 12 prices of chemical inputs substantially, often rising to  
 13 several times the grain prices. The rising fertilizer-  
 14 grain price ratio led to a substantial decline in the  
 15 use of inorganic fertilizers, and the collapse of the so  
 16 called "green revolution" in Malawi (Carr 1997) and in  
 17 other parts of sub-Saharan Africa. It is now widely rec-  
 18 ognized that for sustainable food production, efforts  
 19 must now be directed towards other sources of soil  
 20 nutrients. Given the potential adverse effects of chem-  
 21 ical fertilizer on the environment, strategies for soil  
 22 nutrient management on tropical soils have increas-  
 23 ingly focussed on integrated soil nutrient management  
 24 technologies (FAO 1991, cited in Conway 1997). This  
 25 involves the combined use of both organic and inor-  
 26 ganic soil nutrient sources, including biological nitro-  
 27 gen fixation, crop rotations, cereal legume intercrops,  
 28 improved fallows, composting, green manuring, ani-  
 29 mal manure, and chemical fertilizers (Waddington et al.  
 30 1998; Conway 1997; ICRAF 1996; Nair 1993). Such  
 31 strategies rely on the use of nutrients that are both exter-  
 32 nal and internal to the farm agroecosystems, with par-  
 33 ticular emphasis on better nutrient cycling and lowering  
 34 the costs of soil nutrient management.

35 Farmers already use animal manure, green manure,  
 36 composts and chemical fertilizers, often in an inte-  
 37 grated manner, for the maintenance of soil fertility. But  
 38 socio-economic ex-post adoption studies of integrated  
 39 soil fertility practices of farmers in West and Central  
 40 Africa are few (Matlon 1994; Kabore 1988; Prudencio  
 41 1983). A larger number of studies have examined the  
 42 use of chemical fertilizers with the objective of bet-  
 43 ter targeting chemical fertilizer-based interventions in  
 44 farming systems (Adesina 1996; Posner and Crawford  
 45 1992; Hailu 1990; Daramola 1989; Kelly 1988; Falusi  
 46 1975). Although more limited, studies of farmers' use  
 47 of organic nutrient sources, especially animal manure,  
 48 have also been conducted in areas where there exist  
 49 important crop livestock interactions (Coulibaly 1995;  
 50 Siridie and Giraudy 1994; Matlon 1994; Williams et al.  
 51 1993; Adesina 1992; Prudencio 1983). Many authors

have argued that there is need to consider complemen-  
 tary use of organic and inorganic nutrients in strategies  
 for soil fertility improvement (Conway 1997; Matlon  
 and Adesina 1997; Sanders et al. 1996; Matlon 1994;  
 Adesina 1992; Bationo and Mkwunye 1991).

Current efforts to promote the use of integrated  
 soil nutrient management among farmers in East and  
 Southern Africa have shown that there are some  
 scope for reducing the use of inorganic fertilizers by  
 optimal combination of organic and inorganic inputs  
 (Waddington et al. 1998). However, much of the tech-  
 nical work on integrated soil nutrient management in  
 sub-Saharan Africa has not considered the determi-  
 nants of farmers' adoption decisions. It is important  
 that technical research on these integrated soil nutri-  
 ent management options be guided by consideration of  
 the factors that determine farmers' decisions to com-  
 bine organic and inorganic nutrients. This paper seeks  
 to help fill this gap.

Several studies that examined the determinants of  
 farmers' decisions to adopt soil fertility manage-  
 ment technologies have focussed on one technology  
 (Adesina 1996; Daramola 1989; Falusi 1975). In stud-  
 ies where more than one technology was considered  
 (Matlon 1994; Hailu 1990; Kabore 1988; Prudencio  
 1983), the analytical methods used did not permit the  
 integrated analysis of decision probabilities across dif-  
 ferent soil nutrient management categories. Because  
 farmers' decisions on organic and inorganic soil nutri-  
 ent management strategies may be interdependent – as  
 they both require the use of cash and/or labor, both  
 of which are limiting, smallholder farm models used  
 to examine farmers' adoption decisions should con-  
 sider adoption decisions across input categories in an  
 integrated manner. It has been maintained out that  
 to achieve sustainable production increases without  
 depleting soil nutrient resources, it will be increasingly  
 important to consider integration of these nutrients,  
 with particular attention to the agronomic, ecologi-  
 cal and socio-economic factors in decision making  
 (Conway 1997).

The objective of the paper is to assess the factors  
 that affect farmers' choices between organic, inorganic  
 sources of nutrients, and integrated soil nutrient man-  
 agement in Cameroon. A multinomial Logit model  
 (Cramer 1991; Maddala 1983) is used to capture deci-  
 sion choices across these alternative strategies. The  
 paper is divided into five sections. Section two dis-  
 cusses the survey methods and analytical model. Sec-  
 tion three presents the empirical model specification,  
 while section four discusses the results. The paper ends

01 in section five with conclusions and recommendations  
02 for improving farmers' use of integrated soil nutrient  
03 management within their agroecosystems.

## 07 **Materials and methods**

### 09 *Survey*

11 To examine farmers' use of different soil nutrient man-  
12 agement strategies, a survey was conducted in two  
13 peri-urban areas of Cameroon from August to Decem-  
14 ber of 1995. The survey covered a total of 217 farmers  
15 randomly selected in the zones of Yaounde (82 farm-  
16 ers) and Bafoussam (135 farmers). The two zones are  
17 different in terms of agroecological factors, farming  
18 systems, degree of urbanization and population den-  
19 sity. Yaounde is situated at 730 m altitude, in the for-  
20 est margin. Rainfall is high and varies between 1,500  
21 mm to 2,000 mm per year. The major crops consist  
22 of industrial cash crops (primarily cocoa), and food  
23 crops like cassava, maize, cocoyams and groundnuts.  
24 Fruit trees are important in the home gardens (Tchatat  
25 1996), while the development of horticultural crops  
26 is intensive in peri-urban areas. The group of farms  
27 surveyed here is representative of home gardens and  
28 peri-urban horticulture farms. Bafoussam is located in  
29 the western highlands, with an altitude of 1,500 m. Soils  
30 are ferrallitic, and cropping systems are highly diverse,  
31 with the major crops being maize, beans, and cassava.  
32 Farmers also cultivate coffee in plantations. Livestock,  
33 mainly small ruminants (pigs, goats and sheep), are  
34 important in this zone.

35 Although reliable national statistics are unavailable,  
36 the use of composts by farmers is believed to be increas-  
37 ing in these peri-urban areas in Cameroon. Commer-  
38 cialized composts are made from recycled urban wastes  
39 and sold to farmers in peri-urban areas in small pack-  
40 ages, as well as in 25 kg and 50 kg bags. In addi-  
41 tion, farmers use decomposed plant material, kitchen  
42 refuse, and household wastes. These are often left in  
43 heaps around the household and left to decompose. The  
44 decomposed material is then applied to fields differen-  
45 tially, depending on the type of field (home garden or  
46 food crop field), cropping history and distance of the  
47 fields to the homestead. Farmers also burn vegetation  
48 and apply ash. They also perform direct application  
49 of animal refuse, crop residues and household waste.  
50 Almost all farmers make direct applications of refuse  
51 and residues. In this study, the analysis excludes those

cases and organic fertilizer is referred here to composts  
(bought or self manufactured).

A first rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) was used to  
assess the utilization patterns of the lands in the two  
above-mentioned peri-urban zones. This was followed  
by a detailed household survey to identify relevant  
agroecological factors (cropping systems, land, water  
and soil fertility management strategies etc.), and  
socioeconomic characteristics of farmers.

A list of farmers established from the RRA allowed  
the opportunity of selecting households randomly, with  
known probability of selection.

### *Analytical model*

Few studies have been made of how farmers make  
soil fertility decisions in SSA. Orasanu and Connolly  
(1993) claim that most research on decision-making  
has focused on the decision event, not the process.  
According to Ohlmer et al. (1998), current knowledge  
of the decision making process can be described as a set  
of eight functions or elements: values and goals, prob-  
lem detection, problem definition, observation, anal-  
ysis, development of intention, implementation, and  
responsibility bearing.

More recently, using psychological concepts,  
Nuthall (2001) argued that understanding decision  
capability requires more than a study of the decision  
processes used (e.g. as reported by Ohlmer et al. (1998)).  
The study of learning and thinking processes (cogni-  
tive psychology) is relevant and related to managerial  
ability. That is, it must be clear how humans observe  
information, how information is stored and retrieved,  
how it is processed and so on. These processes are  
assumed to be inherent/implicit in the decisions made  
by farmers in modeling decision making.

Economists investigating consumer demand have  
accumulated considerable evidence showing that the  
observed decision choice on an agricultural technology  
is the end result of a complex set of inter-technology  
preference comparisons made by farmers (Ohlmer et al.  
1998). Despite all the development in decision theories  
by anthropologists, sociologists, philosopher, farmers  
still largely rely on perception and intuition to make a  
decision (Nuthall 2001; Ohlmer et al. 1998).

Variables which affect farmers' access to informa-  
tion, and hence their perception (e.g. extension, educa-  
tion, media exposure, individual characteristics, etc.),  
are typically used in economic models of the determi-  
nants of adoptions (Polson and Spencer 1991; Kebede

et al. 1990). Several empirical studies have tried to capture the influence of socioeconomic variables on farmers' adoption decisions. In most cases, the use of Probit or Logit model is applied (Nkamleu 1999; Adesina 1996; Hailu 1990; Kebede et al. 1990; Rahm and Huffman 1984). In these models, farmers are assumed to make adoption decisions based upon an objective of utility maximization.

A multinomial Logit model (Nkamleu and Coulibaly 2000; Cramer 1991; Madalla 1983) is applied in this analysis. The advantage of multinomial Logit is that it permits the analysis of the adoption decisions across the various soil fertility management alternatives – allowing the determination of choice probabilities for different categories of soil nutrient management practices. This approach is more appropriate than Probit or Logit models which have been conventionally used in studies of farmer's adoption of soil fertility management practices (Hailu 1990; Daramola 1989), when there exist multiple soil nutrient management strategies. No study in West and Central Africa has applied the multinomial logit to analysis of farmers' soil nutrient management decisions.

Instead of having two dichotomous (0, 1) alternatives as in the multi variate Logit or Probit models, the Multinomial Logit has  $S$  possible states or categories that is  $s = 1, 2, 3, \dots, S$ , – which are disjunct and exhaustive (Cramer 1990).

In the analysis of the adoption of soil nutrient management systems in this study we consider four categories, namely, 1) farmer uses no organic or inorganic fertilizers, 2) farmer uses only chemical fertilizers, 3) farmer uses only organic fertilizers (defined as composted material made from decomposed plant material, kitchen refuse, and household waste), and, 4) farmer uses both organic and inorganic fertilizers (referred to henceforth in the paper as “integrated soil nutrient management”).

Because the multinomial Logit model does not treat these nutrient management categories in any continuous order, it is different from ordered Logit or Probit models (Ameniya 1981).

Let there be a random sample of farmers,  $I = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$ . Given four alternatives soil fertility management strategies,  $s = 1, 2, 3, 4$ , the multinomial logit model of soil nutrient management assigns probabilities  $P_{is}$  to events characterized as “ $i^{\text{th}}$  farmer in  $s^{\text{th}}$  category”. Let the vector of characteristics of the farmers be denoted by  $x_i$ . Following Cramer (1991), define  $Y^i$  as a vector of  $S$  categories in which there is a single nonzero element, and another vector  $I_s$  having

zeros everywhere but 1 at the  $s^{\text{th}}$  location. The event that the  $I^{\text{th}}$  farmer is found in the  $s^{\text{th}}$  nutrient management category or state can then be given as  $Y_i = I_s$ , with the probability  $P_{is} = P_r(Y_i = I_s)$ , for  $s = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . The multinomial probability model of soil nutrient management is then represented as  $P_{is} = P_s(x_i, \Theta)$ , where  $\Theta$  are unknown parameters to be estimated. To estimate this model there is need to normalize on one soil nutrient category, which is then referred to as the soil nutrient “reference state”. In this analysis we take the first category, i.e., farmers that do not use any fertilizers whether organic or inorganic as the “reference state”. The multinomial probability model for soil nutrient management decisions across  $S$  states ( $s = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ) can then be specified as:

$$P_s = (X_i, \Theta) = \exp(X_i^T \beta_s) / (1 + \sum_t \exp(x_i^T \beta_t)) \quad (1a)$$

for  $s$  not equal to 1

$$P_1 = (X_i, \Theta) = 1 / (1 + \sum_t \exp(x_i^T \beta_t)) \quad (1b)$$

Models (1a) and (1b) are used for the estimation of the multinomial soil nutrient management model. The Multinomial Logit model of investment in soil nutrient management technologies was estimated using LIMDEP© (Green 1992).

### Empirical model

An empirical specification is employed to investigate the relationship between socio-economic characteristics and the use of inorganic and organic fertilizers. Descriptions of variables included in the empirical model are given in Table 1. The discussion and justification for the independent variables included in the model are provided below.

EXP measures the number of years of farming experience of the farmer. With experience it is expected that farmers will be able to better assess the differential benefits of organic and inorganic inputs, and to apply optimal (financially) levels of inputs across their fields. It is hypothesized that EXP is positively related to the utilization of organic and inorganic fertilizers, and the use of both in a combined fashion.

GROUP measures whether or not the farmer belongs to a farmer's cooperatives. Since farmers in local organizations are more likely to be in contact with research, development and extension agencies, they are more likely to adopt innovations. Studies in Cameroon have



01 shown that farmers belonging to farmers' organizations  
 02 had significantly higher likelihood of adopting alley  
 03 farming (Adesina et al. 2000). It is hypothesized that  
 04 GROUP is positively related to adoption of inorganic,  
 05 organic, and integrated soil nutrient management.

06 AREA measures the cultivated area by the farmer in  
 07 square meter. The effects of farm size on the use of new  
 08 innovations is generally related to economies of scale  
 09 effects or lower acquisition costs by large farmers due  
 10 to preferential access to inputs and credit (Polson and  
 11 Spencer 1990; Norris and Batie 1987). However, for  
 12 organic and inorganic fertilizers, economies of scale  
 13 effects are not likely to occur. Due to high costs of  
 14 chemical fertilizers following the devaluation of the  
 15 currency and the removal of input subsidies, acqui-  
 16 sition costs have risen substantially. Besides, farmers  
 17 with large farms may also have sufficient land to put  
 18 some under fallow as a method of soil fertility main-  
 19 tenance. It is hypothesized that AREA is negatively  
 20 related to the use of organic and inorganic fertilizers,  
 21 and integrated soil nutrient management.

22 EXT measures the frequency of contacts by the  
 23 farmer with extension agents. Contact with extension  
 24 improves farmers' technology understanding, percep-  
 25 tion of profit potential (Nkamleu 1999). Because the  
 26 application of organic inputs, and especially integrated  
 27 nutrient management is more knowledge based, than  
 28 the use of inorganic fertilizers, farmers in contact with  
 29 extension agents may be better able to manufacture and  
 30 apply appropriate quantities of composts, and organic  
 31 and inorganic fertilizers. It is hypothesized that EXT is  
 32 positively related to the adoption of inorganic, organic  
 33 fertilizers, and integrated soil nutrient management.

34 EDUC measures the level of education of the farmer.  
 35 The effect of education on farm productivity and effi-  
 36 ciency has been intensely debated (Shultz 1975). Stud-  
 37 ies in developed agriculture have shown that education  
 38 improves allocative efficiency of farmers and farm pro-  
 39 ductivity. Huffman (1974) found that educated farmers  
 40 were better able to adjust to disequilibria created by the  
 41 introduction of nitrogen fertilizers for hybrid corn in  
 42 Iowa, by adjusting nitrogen application levels to shifts  
 43 in relative factor prices. Studies in developing countries  
 44 with smallholder agriculture have found that farmer  
 45 education significantly affects productive efficiency  
 46 among smallholder farmers (Rahm and Singh 1988).  
 47 Given that integrated soil nutrient management tech-  
 48 nologies are knowledge-based, it is expected that edu-  
 49 cation will enhance the probability of adoption of such  
 50 technologies. A recent study by Nkamleu and Adesina  
 51 (2000) showed that the level of education positively

affects the acceptance of chemical fertilizer in peri-  
 urban lowland systems of Cameroon. It is hypothesized  
 that EDUC is positively related to the adoption of inor-  
 ganic, organic fertilizers, and integrated soil nutrient  
 management relative to the reference state.

LVSTOCK indicates if the farmer keeps livestock.  
 Farmers with livestock may be better able to take  
 advantage of animal manure for soil fertility man-  
 agement on their fields (William et al. 1993). Because  
 farmers using livestock manure are less likely to buy  
 chemical fertilizers, a negative relationship is hypothe-  
 sized with the adoption of inorganic fertilizers. Farmers  
 with access to livestock manure are also less likely to  
 buy composts since both inputs are substitutes.

FMSIZE measures households' family size. Family  
 labor is the most important source of labor supply for  
 farm households. While labor is hired for activities such  
 as field clearing, application of organic and inorganic  
 inputs rely exclusively on family labor inputs. Due to  
 the high labor demands for applying organic and inor-  
 ganic fertilizers, the larger the family size the higher  
 the labor available for application of these inputs. It  
 is hypothesized that FMSIZE is positively related to  
 the adoption of organic and inorganic fertilizers, and  
 of integrated soil nutrient management practices .

SEX indexes the gender of the farmer (0 = female,  
 1 = male). In an analysis of the adoption of chemical  
 fertilizers by rice farmers in Cote d'Ivoire, Adesina  
 (1996) found that women's rice fields were less likely  
 to receive chemical fertilizers than men's fields –  
 reflecting the effects of capital constraints faced by  
 women. In Burkina Faso, Matlon (1994) found that  
 men generally had greater likelihood of adopting ani-  
 mal manure and inorganic fertilizers on their fields than  
 women. However, in Cameroon, the majority of the  
 food crop fields are managed by women. Also, because  
 women are in charge of the collection of household  
 refuse for use as composts, it is expected that the prob-  
 ability of their use of organic composts will be higher  
 than those of men. It is therefore hypothesized that SEX  
 is positively related to decision choices for organic fer-  
 tilizers, but negatively related to decisions for inorganic  
 fertilizers.

ASSET is the capitalized value of agricultural  
 mechanic equipments and is an index of capital assets  
 available to the farmer. Given that there is a posi-  
 tive correlation between capital assets and wealth,  
 farmers with higher asset values are more likely  
 to have financial resources for investments in soil  
 fertility management technologies. It is hypothesized  
 that ASSET is positively related to the adoption of

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Variables in Empirical model

Variable	Description	Mean	Standard deviation
EXPE	Years of farming experience.	13.544	11.47
GROUP	Whether or not the farmer belongs to a farmers' cooperative. 0 = No 1 = Yes.	0.54839	0.4988
AREA	Farm size (square meter).	16371	1.18E+05
EXT	Frequency of contacts with extension. 0 = have no contact, 1 = not frequent contacts, 2 = frequent contacts.	0.75115	0.7346
EDUC	Farmers' level of education proxy 0 = no formal education, 1 = primary school, 2 = secondary school, 3 = post secondary.	1.1889	0.79131
LVSTOCK	Indexes if the farmer keeps livestock: 0 = No 1 = Yes.	0.51152	0.50102
FMSIZE	Family size.	9.9032	9.9212
SEX	Gender of the farmer 0 = female, 1 = male.	0.76037	0.42785
ASSET	value of agricultural equipments (FCFA)	30344	67354
DIST	distance of field from the homestead (m)	6834.6	54661
CASHCRP	Cultivation of cash crops 0 = No 1 = Yes	0.5023	0.50115
REGION	Dummy variable for area. 0 = Yaoundé area, 1 = Bafoussam area.	0.62212	0.48598

organic and inorganic fertilizers, and integrated soil nutrient management.

DIST is the sum distance of the farmers' fields from the homestead. Due to the highly bulky nature of composts, transportation costs for use on distant fields will be very high. Farmers are thus more likely to apply them on fields closer to the homestead. Also, distant fields may lie longer in fallow and consequently have a better soil fertility index. It is hypothesized that DIST is negatively related to choice decisions on organic and inorganic fertilizers. Since farmers may not have sufficient amounts of either inorganic or organic nutrients for exclusive use on distant fields, it is more likely that farmers will pursue a strategy of mixing these inputs for distant fields. Thus, it is hypothesized that DIST is positively related to use of integrated soil nutrient management.

CASHCRP is a dummy variable, which indexes if the farmer cultivates a cash crop. Given higher returns to cash crop cultivation, farmers are likely to invest in soil nutrient management technologies for these crops. It is hypothesized that CASHCRP is positively related to farmers' choice of the three soil nutrient management technologies relative to the reference state.

REGION is a dummy variable which takes the value of 1 for farmers in Bafoussam area and 0, for Yaounde area. Very high population pressure and evident problems of soil nutrient depletion in Bafoussam have

increased the sensitivity of farmers to investment in soil nutrient management. Commercialized composts made from urban wastes are extensively used by farmers in the region. The Yaounde zone is in a forest zone, where relatively low population density does not yet pose major problems for soil fertility. It is hypothesized that the probability of adoption of organic and inorganic fertilizers, and integrated soil fertility management practices will be higher in the Bafoussam area than in Yaounde. A positive sign is hypothesized for REGION.

The descriptive statistics on the variables included in the empirical models are given in Table 1.

## Results and discussion

Table 2 shows the distribution of farmers by their methods of soil nutrient management. Four categories were identified. First, 30% of the farmers did not use either organic or inorganic fertilizers. Second, 30% of the sample farmers used only inorganic fertilizers. Third, 26% relied on the use of organic soil nutrients alone. Fourth, 14% relied on integrated use of both organic and inorganic nutrients. The extent of use of soil nutrient management practices is higher in Bafoussam than Yaounde. This may be due to the very high population pressure in Bafoussam and rapid shortening of fallows



Table 2. Soil Fertility Management Categories for Sample Farmers by Region, Cameroon

	Bafoussam	Yaoundé	Total
Farmer uses neither inorganic or organic fertilizers	18 (13.3%)	47 (57.3%)	65 (30%)
Farmer uses only inorganic fertilizers.	53 (39.3%)	12 (14.6%)	65 (30%)
Farmer uses only organic fertilizers	36 (26.7%)	20 (24.4%)	56 (25.8%)
Farmer integrates the use of organic and inorganic fertilizers	28 (20.7%)	3 (3.7%)	31 (14.3%)
Total	82 (100%)	135 (100%)	217 (100%)

which have increased incentives for farmers' investment in better soil fertility management practices. In Yaounde, the existence of forest cover and sufficient amount of land for fallowing may explain the lower use of soil nutrient management technologies.

The model results are presented in Table 3. Percentages of correct prediction for each fertility management categories are gave in Table 4. As a whole, ten of the twelve variables included in the model had significant effects in explaining farmers' choices on the three soil nutrient management technologies relative to the reference state. GROUP has a positive effect on the adoption of the technologies, and was significant at 1% in influencing choice decisions on organic fertilizers. Grassroots farmers' organizations are making many efforts to convince farmers to experiment in alternatives to chemical inputs. AREA was significant and negatively related to adoption of inorganic fertilizers, organic fertilizers and integrated use of organic and inorganic fertilizers, at 1%, 1%, and 10%, respectively. For inorganic fertilizers it is likely that the relatively high costs of input use given the high quantities needed to fertilize large fields lowers the likelihood of use as farm size increases. The results suggest that smaller sized farms are more likely to adopt all soil fertility improvement strategies.

Contact with extension (EXT) is positively and significantly related to farmers' adoption of organic fertilizers, at 1% level, and integrated soil nutrient management, at 5% level. No significant effect was found for decision choice on inorganic fertilizers alone. The lack of significant effect on inorganic fertilizer use suggests that inorganic fertilizers are probably no longer viewed as "new" soil fertility management technologies by farmers. However, use of organic fertilizers (manufactured composts), and integrated soil nutrient management are relatively new to many farmers.

Farmer education (EDUC) had a positive effect on the adoption of organic fertilizers and integrated soil nutrient management, at 5% and 10%, respectively. Integrated soil nutrient management requires greater management skills than those required for the application of inorganic fertilizers alone or organic fertilizers alone, since it require combination of two inputs in correct proportions. These results suggest that increased farmer education improves likelihood of use of integrated soil nutrient management practices. The positive effect on the adoption of organic fertilizers suggest that educated farmers are better able to comprehend the benefits of biodegradable organic sources of nutrient management on their farms. EDUC has no significant effect on the adoption of inorganic fertilizers alone. These results suggest that farmer training could have a positive impact on adoption of organic fertilizers.

The possession of livestock (LVSTOCK) has a negative effect, significant at 1%, on the utilization of organic inputs for soil fertility management. Purchased composts made from urban wastes and internally manufactured composts from household wastes (includes animal refuse) are substitutes for animal manure. Farmers using animal manure are less likely to adopt composts. It seems that farmers preferred to use manure directly than making compost with.

Family size (FMSIZE) has a positive and significant effect on the adoption of all three types of soil nutrient management practices. This result strongly suggests that the higher the availability of labor for application of these soil nutrient management practices, the greater the likelihood of adoption.

Sex (SEX) has a positive but non-significant effect on adoption of inorganic fertilizers and integrated soil nutrient management. However, SEX has a significant and negative effect on the use of organic

Table 3. Multinomial Logit Model of Investment in Soil Nutrient Management Practices, Cameroon

Variables	Coefficient		
	Inorganic fertilizers	Organic fertilizers	Integrated Soil Nutrient Management
Constant	-1.7969 (-1.944)**	-.8558 (-1.914)**	-8.1109 -4.993***
EXPE	2.94E-02 (0.93)	-6.25E-03 (-0.166)	1.67E-02 (0.467)
GROUP	0.66088 (1.22)	1.6031 (2.57)***	0.732 (1.098)
AREA	-5.09E-05 (-2.637)***	-1.86E-04 (-3.188)***	-2.90E-05 (-1.663)*
EXT	0.31292 (0.76)	1.3923 (3.137)***	0.98962 (2.186)**
EDUC	-0.28422 (-0.662)	0.99565 (2.045)**	0.80214 (1.624)*
LVSTOCK	-0.51411 (-0.818)	-2.4671 (-3.286)***	-0.87241 (-1.16)
FMSIZE	0.12185 (1.953)**	0.11112 (1.64)*	0.1057 (1.644)*
SEX	0.31702 (0.424)	-1.5015 (-2.114)**	1.4414 (0.992)
ASSET	1.19E-05 (1.783)*	1.70E-05 (2.329)***	1.38E-05 (1.875)*
DIST	-5.05E-05 (-1.17)	-1.77E-04 (-1.781)*	6.82E-05 (1.817)*
CASHCRP	0.81218 (1.362)	4.12E-02 (0.061)	0.95916 (1.384)
REGION	0.45664 (0.562)	1.9449 (2.367)***	3.9432 (3.326)***

$X^2(54) = 212.107$  \*\*\*.

Percentage of correct predictions of farmers by soil nutrient management categories = 65%

Sample = 217.

Values in parentheses are corresponding t-values. \*\*\*=Significant at 0.01; \*\*= significant at 0.05; \*= significant at 0.10.

Table 4. Percentages of prediction for each fertility management categories

Actual	Predicted				Total
	None	Organic Fertilizer	Inorganic Fertilizer	Integrated	
None	72.3%	10.8%	12.3%	4.6%	65
Organic Fertilizer	12.3%	70.8%	12.3%	4.6%	65
Inorganic Fertilizer	14.3%	5.4%	71.4%	8.9%	56
Integrated	9.7%	48.4%	12.9%	29%	31
Total	66	71	60	20	217

Percentages are given by the ratio of number predicted over actual number. For the option None for example, % of correct prediction is 72.3% (47/65). The row total should be equal to 1.

01 nutrients alone, suggesting that the probability of using  
 02 organic nutrients alone is higher for women than men.  
 03 This result contrasts with those obtained in Burk-  
 04 ina Faso by Matlon (1994) for animal manure use  
 05 between men and women, as well as Adesina (1996)  
 06 finding in Cote d'Ivoire for inorganic fertilizer use  
 07 by farmers. In these studies the authors found that  
 08 women had lower likelihood of use of these inputs  
 09 than men. In many parts of Sahelian West Africa, men  
 10 have control over the use of animal manure on their  
 11 fields since animal traction equipments belong to men.  
 12 Compost is made mainly from household waste, the  
 13 management of which is controlled by women. This  
 14 explains the higher likelihood of use of composts by  
 15 women.

16 Farm assets (ASSET) positively and significantly  
 17 influence the adoption of all of the three soil nutrient  
 18 management practices. Thus, the higher the capital  
 19 availability within farm households the greater is the  
 20 likelihood of farmers using all the three soil nutrient  
 21 management practices.

22 Field distance (DIST) is negatively related to the  
 23 use of inorganic fertilizers and organic fertilizers, but  
 24 positively related to the use of integrated soil nutrient  
 25 management practice. The coefficients are significant  
 26 at 10% for organic nutrients and integrated soil nutri-  
 27 ent management. This result corroborates the findings  
 28 of Adesina (1996) on inorganic fertilizer use in Cote  
 29 d'Ivoire, and Prudencio (1983) on animal manure use  
 30 in Burkina Faso. The distant fields are less intensively  
 31 cultivated and may thus have natural fertility. More-  
 32 over, such fields are also generally larger, the possibility  
 33 of using only inorganic or organic manure alone is  
 34 likely to be lower, since farmers may not have suffi-  
 35 cient amounts of either inorganic or organic nutrients  
 36 for exclusive use on those fields. Farmers are more  
 37 likely to pursue an integrated soil nutrient management  
 38 practice on such fields, combining organic and inor-  
 39 ganic nutrients. This particular finding will need further  
 40 investigation to better understand farmers' behavior on  
 41 distant fields.

42 Cultivation of cash crops (CASHCRP) positively  
 43 affects farmers' choice of the three soil nutrient man-  
 44 agement technologies, but the effect is not signifi-  
 45 cant. Region (REGION) is positively related to adop-  
 46 tion of all three soil nutrient management practices,  
 47 and is significant at 1% level, respectively, for use of  
 48 organic nutrients and integrated soil nutrient manage-  
 49 ment. These results indicate the probability of farmers'  
 50 adoption of soil nutrient management practices are  
 51 higher in the more densely populated areas than in areas

with low population densities. Globally, the economet-  
 ric model estimated has a good predictive power as  
 shown in Table 4.

The estimated coefficients in the multinomial logit  
 model were used to calculate the predicted probabilities  
 of farmers' adoption across the three soil nutrient man-  
 agement technologies. In the first scenario, three factors  
 were considered: gender, level of education, and inten-  
 sity of contact with extension agents. Results (Table 5)  
 show that the probability of adoption of organic fertil-  
 izers were higher for women than men, regardless  
 of the level of education and contacts with extension.  
 However, the probability of adoption of integrated soil  
 nutrient management is higher for men than women,  
 and increased with the level of education and con-  
 tacts with extension. In the second scenario, predictions  
 of decision probabilities across the three soil nutrient  
 management categories were developed using three  
 factors: zone, distance of the fields to the village or  
 homestead, and cultivated area. Results (Table 6) show  
 that while the probability of use of inorganic fertil-  
 izers declines with increasing distance of the fields  
 from the homestead, the probability of use of inte-  
 grated soil nutrient management increased with dis-  
 tance from the homestead. Second, the probability of  
 use of the three soil nutrient management technologies  
 declined with increasing farm size. Third, estimated  
 probabilities of use of inorganic fertilizer is higher in  
 Yaounde than in Bafoussam, but the probabilities of  
 use of organic nutrients and integrated soil nutrient  
 management technologies are higher in Bafoussam.

## Conclusions

This paper determined, using a multinomial Logit  
 model, factors that affect farmers' decision choices  
 across different categories of soil nutrient manage-  
 ment technologies in Cameroon. The results showed  
 that factors affecting farmers' adoption of inorganic  
 fertilizers, organic fertilizers and integrated soil nutri-  
 ent management are not necessarily the same, and  
 generalizations should be avoided. The results have  
 a number of implications for strategies to promote  
 integrated soil nutrient management among farmers in  
 Cameroon.

First, soil fertility management technologies, espe-  
 cially integrated soil nutrient management systems,  
 should be targeted more to the higher density areas. The

Table 5. Multinomial Logit Model's predicted probabilities of farmers' soil fertility management choices by gender, level of education and intensity of contact with extension

No contact with extension								
Women				Men				
	Inorganic fertilizer	organic fertilizer	Integrated soil nutrient management		Inorganic fertilizer	organic fertilizer	integrated soil nutrient management	
<b>Education</b>				<b>Education</b>				
0	0,430	0,013	0,016	0	0,490	0,002	0,055	
1	0,350	0,037	0,037	1	0,390	0,007	0,130	
2	0,260	0,100	0,081	2	0,270	0,017	0,270	
3	0,160	0,220	0,150	3	0,160	0,036	0,460	
Not Frequent Contact								
Women				Men				
	Inorganic fertilizer	organic fertilizer	Integrated soil nutrient management		Inorganic fertilizer	organic fertilizer	integrated soil nutrient management	
<b>Education</b>				<b>Education</b>				
0	0,480	0,042	0,034	0	0,530	0,007	0,120	
1	0,370	0,120	0,077	1	0,390	0,020	0,250	
2	0,230	0,260	0,140	2	0,230	0,043	0,450	
3	0,110	0,450	0,200	3	0,110	0,074	0,640	
Frequent Contact								
Women				Men				
	Inorganic fertilizer	organic fertilizer	Integrated soil nutrient management		Inorganic fertilizer	organic fertilizer	integrated soil nutrient management	
<b>Education</b>				<b>Education</b>				
0	0,480	0,130	0,068	0	0,510	0,021	0,220	
1	0,310	0,290	0,128	1	0,330	0,049	0,420	
2	0,150	0,500	0,180	2	0,160	0,088	0,610	
3	0,055	0,660	0,200	3	0,065	0,130	0,730	

rising population pressure on arable land creates incentives for farmers' adoption of soil nutrient management technologies.

Second, integrated soil nutrient management should be targeted to smallholder farms. The very high quantities of compost that would be needed for effective use on large farms may be non-economical; labor costs for transport and application over large fields may also be very high. Small farms can also better manufacture and use composts from household wastes in order to enhance nutrient cycling in their agroecosystems.

Third, results showed that the likelihood of use of organic nutrients and inorganic nutrients is lower for

fields far from the homestead. This implies that the use of such techniques is likely to be preferred by farmers on their home gardens, or fields close by the house. High levels of soil nutrient cycling have been reported in the home gardens in Cameroon (Tchatat 1996). Such fields are generally small enough for effective use of these inputs. Also, the proximity of these fields to the homesteads lowers farmers' transport costs for collecting and applying home-produced composts from household refuse or kitchen wastes. Distant fields are generally larger, the possibility of using only inorganic or organic manure alone is likely to be lower, efforts are needed to help farmers in integrated soil nutrient management for these fields. These could

Table 6. Multinomial Logit Model's predicted probabilities of decision choices among soil nutrient management practices in Cameroon by region, distance of the fields and cultivated area

YAOUNDE REGION						
AREA (ha)						
0.5 hectare			2 hectare			
Distance of field (km)	Inorganic fertilizer	organic fertilizer	integrated soil nutrient management	Inorganic fertilizer	Organic fertilizer	integrated soil nutrient management
0	0.519	0.175	0.011	0.436	0.019	0.012
10	0.474	0.045	0.032	0.319	0.004	0.029
25	0.290	0.004	0.115	0.169	0.2E-03	0.093
50	0.063	3.8E-05	0.486	0.037	2.9E-06	0.396
AREA (ha)						
5 hectare			10 hectare			
Distance of field (km)	Inorganic fertilizer	organic fertilizer	integrated soil nutrient management	Inorganic fertilizer	Organic fertilizer	integrated soil nutrient management
0	0.149	0.1E-03	0.008	0.014	1.2E-08	0.002
10	0.095	2.8E-05	0.017	0.008	2.1E-09	0.004
25	0.045	1.5E-06	0.048	0.004	1.5E-10	0.012
50	0.011	1.5E-08	0.220	0.001	1.7E-12	0.064
BAFOUSSAM REGION						
AREA (ha)						
0.5 hectare			2 hectare			
Distance of field (km)	Inorganic fertilizer	organic fertilizer	integrated soil nutrient management	Inorganic fertilizer	Organic fertilizer	integrated soil nutrient management
0	0.284	0.424	0.189	0.345	0.068	0.318
10	0.238	0.101	0.519	0.186	0.010	0.563
25	0.065	0.004	0.847	0.046	0.001	0.827
50	0.004	1.05E-05	0.979	0.003	9.9E-07	0.970
AREA (ha)						
5 hectare			10 hectare			
Distance of field (km)	Inorganic fertilizer	organic fertilizer	integrated soil nutrient management	Inorganic fertilizer	Organic fertilizer	integrated soil nutrient management
0	0.158	0.001	0.279	0.019	7.8E-08	0.102
10	0.079	7.6E-05	0.457	0.011	1.2E-08	0.185
25	0.021	3.02E-06	0.717	0.004	6.4E-10	0.389
50	0.001	8.6E-09	0.936	0.4E-03	2.8E-12	0.779

include integrated use of organic and inorganic nutrients, improved planted fallows or other agroforestry technologies.

Fourth, farmer education was found to have significant positive effect on the probability of use of organic nutrients and integrated soil nutrient management. The farming population in Cameroon is becoming increasingly dominated by younger farmers due largely to reverse migration from urban to rural areas arising from recent economic crisis (Pokam 1997). The

majority of the migrants are young educated workers that were retrenched from public sectors as a result of public sector adjustment programs. These growing populations of educated farmers will be better able to use integrated soil nutrient management techniques. However, there is need to also continue to target these technologies to non-educated farmers. One approach is to rely on farmer-participatory learning approaches, and researchers in Cameroon can learn from experiences elsewhere. Conway (1997) cites the case of the

01 Manor House Agricultural Centre in Western Kenya  
02 where farmers are being trained in the use of sustain-  
03 able agricultural practices. Farmers' use of composting  
04 in the area is increasing rapidly due to this approach.  
05 Extension agents can play an important role in this:  
06 results from this paper show that farmer contacts with  
07 extension agents have strong positive effects on farm-  
08 ers' use of organic nutrients and integrated soil nutrient  
09 management.

10 Finally, efforts to promote integrated soil nutrient  
11 management should consider the important role that  
12 farmers' organizations can play. Farmers' organiza-  
13 tions are effective in creating change within local com-  
14 munities. Results from this paper show that farmers  
15 in farmers' organizations have a higher likelihood of  
16 using organic fertilizers NGOs' activities on promot-  
17 ing organic farming in Cameroon are largely directed  
18 to farmer groups and for good reason: they create  
19 economies of scale in the diffusion of information to  
20 farmers on the benefits of nutrient cycling in rural  
21 communities.

## 22 References

- 23  
24  
25  
26 Adesina A.A. and Baidu-Forson J 1995. Farmers' perceptions and  
27 adoption of new agricultural technology: evidence from analysis  
28 in Burkina Faso and Guinea, West Africa. *Agricultural Economics*  
29 13: 1–9. Elsevier science publisher.
- 30 Adesina A.A. 1992. Village-level studies and sorghum technol-  
31 ogy development in West Africa: Case study in Mali. pp.147–  
32 168. In: Mook J.L. and Rhoades R.E. (eds). *Diversity, farmer  
33 knowledge and sustainability*. Cornell University Press.
- 34 Adesina A.A., Mbila D., Guy B., Nkamleu G.B. and Endamana D.  
35 2000. Econometric analysis of the determinants of adoption  
36 of alley farming by farmers in the forest zone of Southwest  
37 Cameroon. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 158:1:  
38 1–11.
- 39 Adesina A.A. 1996. Factors affecting the adoption of fertilizers by  
40 rice farmers in Cote d'Ivoire. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*  
41 46: 29–39.
- 42 Ameniya T. 1981. Qualitative response models: A survey. *Journal of  
43 Economic Literature*. Vol. XIX (December): 1483–1536.
- 44 Bationo A and Mokwunye A.U. 1991. Alleviating soil fertility  
45 constraints to increased food production in West-Africa: The  
46 experience of the Sahel. *Fert. Res.* 29: 95–115.
- 47 Carr S.J. 1997. A green revolution frustrated: lessons from the  
48 Malawi experience. *African Crops Science Journal* 5(1): 93–98.
- 49 Conway G. 1997. The doubly green revolution. Food for all in the  
50 21st century. London: Penguin.
- 51 Coulibaly O. 1995. Devaluation, new technologies and agricul-  
tural policies in the Sudano-Guinean zones of Mali. Unpublished  
Ph.D dissertation, Department of Agricultural Economics, Purdue  
University, West Lafayette, Indiana. USA.
- Cramer J.S. 1991. *The Logit Model for Economists*. Edward Arnold:  
London, New York.
- Daramola B. 1989. The study of socio-economic factors influenc-  
ing fertilizer adoption decisions in Nigeria: A survey of Oyo State  
farmers. *Fertilizer Research*, 20: 143–151.
- Falusi A.O. 1975. Application of multivariate Probit to fertilizer use  
decisions: Sample survey of farmers in three states of Nigeria.  
*J. Rural and Econ. Dev.* 9(1): 49–66.
- FAO 1985. Changes in shifting cultivation in Africa: Seven case  
studies. FAO Forestry Paper 50/1. FAO, Rome, Italy.
- FAO 1991. Issues and Perspectives in Sustainable Agriculture and  
Rural Development -Hertogenbosch (Netherlands), Conference  
on Agriculture and the Environment, 15019 April 1991 (Main  
Document, FAO Newsletter).
- Green W. 1992. LIMDEP Version 6.0. User's Manual and Reference  
Guide. Econometric Software, Incorporated. NY.
- Hailu Z. 1990. The adoption of modern farm practices in African  
agriculture: Empirical evidence about the impacts of household  
characteristics and input supply systems in Northern Ghana.  
*Nyankpala Agricultural Research Report No. 7*.
- Huffman W. 1974. Decision making: the role of education. *Amer. J.  
Agric. Econ.* Vol. 56: 85–97.
- ICRAF 1996. International Centre for Research in Agroforestry.  
Annual Report, 1996.
- Kabore P.D. 1988. Analyse economique de la fertilité des sols au  
Burkina-Faso. Thèse de Doctorat, CIRES, Université d'Abidjan,  
Côte d'Ivoire.
- Kang B.T., Hauser S., Vanlauwe B., Sanginga N. and Atta-  
Krah A.N. 1995. Alley farming research on high base status  
soils. pp. 25–39. In: Kang B.T., Osiname A.O. and Larbi  
A. (eds). *Alley Farming Research and Development. Proceed-  
ings of an International Conference on Alley Farming. Interna-  
tional Institute of Tropical Agriculture, 14–18 September 1992,  
Ibadan, Nigeria*.
- Kebede Y., Gunjal K. and Coffin G. 1990. "Adoption of New Tech-  
nologies In Ethiopian Agriculture: The Case Of Tegulet-Bulga  
District, Shoa Province". *Agricultural Economics* 4: 1. Elsevier  
Science Publishers, Amstredam.
- Kelly V. 1988. Factors affecting the demand for fertilizer in Senegal's  
peanut basin. Ph.D Thesis, Michigan State University, USA.
- Kleinman P.J.A., Pimentel D. and Bryant R.B. 1995. The eco-  
logical sustainability of slash-and-burn agriculture. *Agriculture,  
Ecosystems and Environment*, 52: 235–249.
- Madalla G.S. 1983. Limited dependent and qualitative variables in  
econometrics. Cambridge University Press, New York, 401 p.
- Matlon P.J. and Adesina A.A. 1997. "Agricultural growth and sustain-  
ability: prospects for semi-arid West Africa". In: Reardon T. and  
Vosti S. (eds). *Agricultural Sustainability, Growth, and Poverty  
Alleviation: Issues and Policies*. Johns Hopkins University Press,  
pp. 229–260.
- Matlon P.J. 1994. Indigenous land use systems and investments in  
soil fertility in Burkina Faso. pp. 41–69. In: Bruce J.W. and Migot-  
Adholla S.E. (eds). *Searching for Land Tenure Security in Africa*.  
Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company. Dubuque, Iowa, USA.
- Moormann F.R. and Greenland D.J. 1980. Major production systems  
related to soil properties in humid tropical Africa. In: *Priorities for  
Alleviating Soils Related Constraints to Food Production in the  
Tropics*. International Rice Research Institute, The Philippines.
- Nair P.K.R. 1993. *An Introduction to Agroforestry*. Kluwer Academic  
Publishers.
- Nkamleu G.B. and Adesina A.A. 2000. Determinants of Chemi-  
cal Input use in Peri-Urban Lowland Systems: Bivariate Probit  
analysis in Cameroon. *Agricultural Systems* 62: 111–121.



- 01 Nkamleu G. B. and Coulibaly O. 2000. Le choix des méthodes de  
02 lutte contre les pestes dans les plantations de cacao et de café au  
03 Cameroun. *Economie Rurale* No. 259 September–October, 2000,  
04 75–85.
- 05 Nkamleu G.B. 1999. Etat des lieux de l'agroforesterie au Cameroun: cas des provinces du centre, du sud-Ouest, et du Nord-Ouest. *Revue science et changements planétaire "Secheresse" Numéro 3*,  
06 Vol. 10, Octobre 1999. pp.165–170.
- 07 Norris P.E. and Batie S.S. 1987. Virginia farmers' soil conservation  
08 decisions: an application of Tobit analysis. *Southern J. Agric Econ.*  
09 52: 208–220.
- 10 Nuthall P.L. 2001. Managerial ability – a review of its basis and  
11 potential improvement using psychological concepts. *Agricultural*  
12 *Economics* 24: 247–262.
- 13 Ohlmer Bo, Olson K. and Berndt B. 1998. Understanding farmers'  
14 decision making processes and improving managerial assistance.  
15 *Agricultural Economics* 18: 273–290.
- 16 Orasanu J. and Connolly T. 1993. The Reinvention of Decision Making. pp. 3–20. In: Klein G.A., Orasanu J., Calderwood R. and Zsombok C.E. (eds). *Decision making in Action: Models and Methods*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.
- 17 Pokam W.K.J. 1997. Les migrations dans la zone de foret humide du  
18 Cameroun. International Centre for Forestry Research. Working  
19 Document No. 2, September. Yaounde. 93 p.
- 20 Polson R. and Spencer D.S.C. 1991. The technology adoption process  
21 in Subsistence agriculture: The case of cassava in Southwestern  
22 Nigeria. *Agricultural Systems* 36: 65–78.
- 23 Posner J.L. and Crawford E.W. 1992. Improving fertilizer recommendations for subsistence farmers in West Africa: The use of agro-economic analysis of on-farm trials. *Fert. Res.* 32: 333–342.
- 24 Pretty J.N. 1995. *Regenerating Agriculture*. Earthscan Publications  
25 Limited, London.
- 26 Prudencio Y.C. 1983. A village study of soil fertility management  
27 and food crop production in Upper Volta: Technical and economic  
28 analysis. Ph.D Dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson, USA.
- 29 Rahm M.R. and Huffman W.E. 1984. The Adoption Of Reduced  
30 Tillage: The Role Of Human Capital And Other Variables.  
31 *Amer. J. Agr. Econ.* 66: 405–413.
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- Rahm T. and Singh R.D. 1988. Farm households in rural Burkina Faso: Some evidence on allocative and direct returns to schooling, and male-female labor productivity differentials. *World Development* 16(3): 419–424.
- Siridie S. and Giraudy F. 1994. L'utilisation de la Fumure organique par les exploitations de la region CMDT, DPCG Suivi-Evaluation de Koutiala. *Enquete Specifique Regionale 94, DPCG, Suivi-Evaluation, CMDT, Bamako, Mali.*
- Sanchez P.A. 1976. *Properties and Management of Soils in the Tropics*. John Wiley, New York, USA.
- Sanders J.H., Shapiro B.I. and Ramaswamy S. 1996. *The Economics of Agricultural Technology in Semi-arid Sub-Saharan Africa*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- Shultz T.W. 1975. The value of ability to deal with disequilibria. *Journal of Economic Literature* 13: 827–846.
- Smaling E.M.A., Stoorvogel J.J. and Windmeijer P.N. 1993. Calculating soil nutrient balances in Africa at different scales. II: District scale. *Fert. Res.* 35: 237–250.
- SMSS (Soil Management Support Services) 1986. *Proceedings Symposium on Low Activity Clay (LAC) Soils*. SMSS, Washington DC.
- Tchatat M. 1996. *Le jardins de case Agroforestiers des terres humides du Cameroun: Etude de cas des zones forestières des province du Centre et du Sud*. Thèse de Doctorat d'Ecologie de L'Université Pierre et Marie Curie (Paris VI). 145 p.
- Waddington S.R., Murwira H.K., Kumwenda J.D.T., Hikwa D. and Tagwira F. 1998. Soil fertility research for maize-based farming systems in Malawi and Zimbabwe. *Proceedings of the Soil Fertility Network Results and Planning Workshop, 7–11 July 1997, at the Africa University, Mutare, Zimbabwe.*
- Williams T.O., Powell J.M. and Fernandez-Rivera S. 1993. Manure utilization, drought cycles and herd dynamics in the Sahel: Implications for cropland productivity. pp. 89–113. In: Powell J.M., Fernandez-Rivera Williams T.O. and Renard C. (eds). *Livestock and Sustainable Nutrient Cycling in Mixed Farming Systems of Sub-Saharan Africa, Vol. II: Technical Papers*. International Livestock Center for Africa, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

01  
02  
03  
04  
05  
06  
07  
08  
09  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51