Economic analysis of poultry manure and NPK fertilizer on the performance of pepper relay cropped with cassava

Adeola, R. G.1°; Makinde, E. A.2 and E. Ayanwuyi

¹Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Ladoke Akintola ²Department of Botany, Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos state, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT

ADDITICAL 3 A split-joit outwass adopted in conducting the the trial on the effects of NPK fertilizer and poultry manure on the performance of pepper relay cropped with Oko Jymor (a local varietyof cassava ilo togbomoso during 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 cropping seasons using PoultryManure (PM) and NPK fertilizer : no fertilizer, 120N + 80P + 50K kg/ha, poultry manure(PM alone) 6.250 kg/ha and 50W to 50 W instruct of NPK and PM. The cropping pattern,which was a local variety of cassava (*Oko Jyawo*) relayed into pepper at 1 month aftertransplanting (MAT) was the main plot while the fertilizer relations: Standard and the subplots.The experiments were replicated three times. Descriptive statistics and ANOVA were usedto analyze the data of growth and yield parameters. Partial budget analysis was used todetermine the economic benefits of the treatments. All the fertilizer restingtionantly (P = 0.05)affected the yields of both pepper and cassava.The yield of pepper under different fertilizer application was in the order NPK > (NPK +MM) > PM. All the fertilizer treatments yield do more than the control by 36¹ %a, 77 % and 35.6% in the following order: NPK along ages the highest to 400, 21 MM and DNA subset (NKK = 14) [MA was and 35.6% in the following order: NPK along ages the banefit on VAC, 31 MM allowed bytreatment with NVK fertilizer gaves the highest (13.640, 21 MM and MM along the order NPK = 0.07 %in the following order: NPK along the adoption could be used TM along to 2005and application of Ya MKK fertilizer appet he highest (25.67%) in the used of NAC, 31 MM allowed bytreatment with NVK fertilizer appet the highest to adoption could be considered for economicreasons. Besides, the use of NYK + 14 MW and adoption could be considered for economic(27%) but lower than NPK-tread plants. Its adoption could be considered for economic(27%) but lower than NPK-tread plants. Its adoption could be considered for economic(27%) but lower than NPK-tread plants. Its adoption couldA split-plot layout was adopted in conducting the the trial on the effects of NPK fertilizer and

Received: February 18, 2010 Accepted: December 22, 2010 *Correspondence author: <u>adeola20022000@yahoo.com</u>

34

International Journal of Organic Agriculture Research and Development Vol. 2 (2010).

INTRODUCTION

Pepper (Capsicum annuum) is a crop of tremendous economic and nutritional importance in Nigeria as it forms an important part of the diet, supplying some of the nutrients such as Ca, P, Fe and Na. It is an excellent source of vitamins. Pepper produces high amounts of vitamin C, provitamin A, E, P (citrin), B1 (thiamine), B2 (riboflavin), and B3 (niacin) (Bosland and Votava, 2000).

Within traditional agriculture, intercropping is very common and extremely sophisticated. The suitable land for food production is fixed or externely sophisticated in similate rank for hold production is faced of diminishing, yet farmers and agronomists are faced with the task of increasing productivity (Midmore 1993). In the light of this, a system integrating different practice of soil fertility maintenance, which will include the use of both mineral fertilizer, organic manure and intercopping which provides fast and good ground cover should be developed (Steiner, 1001) 1991).

Management of soil fertility in an intercropping system has a major influence on crop production. Several studies have revealed that intercropped mixtures extracted more nutrients from the soil than did single stands per unit area (Kassam and Stockinger, 1973; Oelsligle et al., 1976). High cost of nitrogen fertilizer has led to several research studies on the benefit of introgen fertilizer has led to several research studies on the benefit of intercorping with legumes. Cassava (Manihot esculenta) requires adequate fertilizer especially (K and N) for optimum growth and root yield (Obigbesan and Fayemi, 1976; Sitti-busaya and Kurmarohita, 1978). The cultivation of cassava in traditional agriculture is without the use of any form of fertilizer (Onwueme, 1994). The use of adequate levels feutriants for the analysis of constraints of the total to the several research studies of the total to the several total total total to the several total to use of any form of fertilizer (Onwueme, 1994). The use of adequate levels of nutrients by any crop is essential in order to increase its productivity and yield. Bosland and Votava (2000) reported that pepper required adequate amounts of major and minor nutrients to produce well. May (1982) recorded the highest yield of 12.3t/ha from N and P application rates of 150 kg/ha and 100 kg/ha respectively. Alabi (2006) found that P significantly increased pepper plant height, number of leaves and branches per plant and leaf area up to 125 kg P/ 1ha but concluded that poultry droppings increased the yield components of pepper more significantly than the phosphorous. Poultry manure is a form of farmyard manure (FYM) which may be deep litter, broiler litter or in-house air-dried droppings (MAFF/ADAS, 1991). Heathman *et al.* (1995) reported that poultry manure is a valuable organic source of essential plant nutrients and soil amendment to improve soil quality. Application of poultry manure to agricultural lands has been

soil quality. Application of poultry manure to agricultural lands has been found to be environmentally sound method of recycling essential nutrients.

Poultry manure contains a considerable amount of organic matter that has a Poultry manure contains a considerable amount of organic matter that has a positive effect on soil structure, tith, water holding capacity, aeration, pH buffering, CEC and microbial activity (Mullins *et al.*, 2002). Titiloye (1980) reported that 125 tonnes of poultry manure per hectare is equivalent to about 125 kg N, 55 kg P and 105 kg K. In comparing the uptake of N, P, and K from un-composted poultry in comparing the uptake of N, P. and K from un-composted poultry and the set of the set

in comparing the uptake of N, F, and K from the composited politry manure and green waste compost, Pearson *et al.* (1998) reported that N in un-composted poultry manure appeared to be more available for plant uptake than N in green waste compost. Research has also indicated that cassava responds well to application of FYM especially when fortified with some chemical fertilizer (Mandal *et al.*, 1973; and K umar *et al.*, 1977). The importance of integrated nutrient use in crop production in event users cannot be user a predomical in views of the bight set of chemical

recent years cannot be over-emphasized in view of the high cost of chemical fertilizer to meet crop nutrient requirements. Complimentary use of organic manure and mineral fertilizers has proved to be a sound strategy to maintain soil fertility in many parts of the world (Lombin *et al.*, 1991). However, farmers are likely to adopt alternative techniques for soil fertility improvement and increase productivity only if they become aware of the costs and benefits of such alternatives.

MATERIALSAND METHODS

Field trials on the effects of NPK fertilizer and poultry manure on the performance of pepper relay cropped with local variety of cassava were conducted in Ogbomoso during 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 cropping seasons. Ogbomoso is on Latitude 8 01 N, Longitude 4 06 E, about 310 m above sea level in the derived savannah belt of south-western Nigeria. The mean annual rainfall of the Experimental station was 1,062.18 with high intensity over a period of seven months (April to October). The land used for the experiment had been previously cropped to staple food crops such as cassava, maize, yam guinea corn and grain for two years. The soil is a ferric luvisol, locally classified as Iwo series. Composite samples of the topsoil (0 15 cm depth) were taken from the site and analyzed for their physical and chemical properties before the commencement of the experiment in each year

The experimental design for the trial was a split-plot fitted into a randomized complete block design with three replicates. The main plot was cropping pattern where cassava was relayed into pepper at MAT. The subplot was fertilizer at four levels namely:

36

International Journal of Organic Agriculture Research and Development Vol. 2 (2010).

No fertilizer, (I)

(iii)

- (ii) Fertilizer (alone), which was supplied in the form of urea, single super-phosphate and muriate of potash at 120 N + 80 P+50 K kg/ha
- Poultry manure (PM) at the rate of 6.3 t/ha. $\frac{1}{2}$ NPK fertilizer (60 N + 40 P + 25 K kg/ha.) + $\frac{1}{2}$ Poultry (iv) manure (3.15 t/ha.).

manure (3.15 tha.). Each plot was 5 m x 4 m planted with cassava at 1 m x 1 m and pepper at 1 m x 0.5 m spacing. Plant population density was thus 10,000 per hectare for cassava and 20,000 plants per hectare for pepper. The local late-branching of cassava (cultivar Oko iyowo) and Pepper cultivar NHVEB, released by the National Horticultural Research Institute (NIHORT), Ibadan, Nigeria in

the National Horticultural Research Institute (NIHORT), Ibadan, Nigeria in the year 2002 were used for the experiment. Partial budget analysis was used to determine the economic benefit of the treatments. A partial budget is a way of calculating the total costs that vary and the net benefits of each treatment in an on-farm experiment. The partial budget includes the average yields for each treatment, the adjusted yields and the gross field benefit (based on the field price of the crop). It also includes all the costs that vary for each treatment. (CIMMYT, 1988). All costs and benefits were calculated on hectare basis in Nigeria currency. The costs and benefits were calculated on hectare basis in Nigeria currency. The following concepts used in the partial budget analysis are defined as follows:

Adjusted yield: This is the experimental yield scaled down by a (i) given proportion to approximate the yields that farmers can obtain on their farms. The scaling down is necessary to prevent overestimation of the returns that farmers are likely to obtain from a treatment. In this experiment, 10 % was used in scaling down the cassava and pepper yield on the assumption that farmers can only achieve 90 % of the yield obtained in (ii) Acceptable Minimum Rate of Return (AMRR): This is the

minimum returns which farmers expect to earn from an enterprise or technology. It is the sum of the return to management and cost of capital. Returns below this, make an enterprise a failure.

(iii) Acceptable Minimum Return (AMR): This is the product of the AMRR and the total variable input cost of each treatment. The lowest AMR is required for the farmer to change to a new technology.

(iv) Gross farm gate benefit: This is the product of farm gate price of the output and adjusted yield. Net benefit: It is the difference between the farm gate benefit and (v)

(vi) Residuals: This is the difference between the net benefit and the

acceptable minimum return (AMR). Residual analysis is used as a decision criterion to recommend a treatment with the highest residual. (vii) Marginal Rate of Return (MRR): The ratio of the change in net benefit to change in total variable input cost between treatments (Alimi and

Manyong, 2000).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

All the fertilizer treatments yielded more than the control by 36 %, 37 % and 35.6 % (pooled data for the two seasons) in the following order: NPK alone (NPK + PM) and PM alone respectively. Significant differences were observed in the yield of pepper obtained across the fertilizer treatments in the following season (Table 1). Table 2 shows the partial budget analysis of different treatments of fertilizers on cassava/pepper intercrop. Partial budget analysis combines the information on physical input-output relationship with those of prices of input and output to determine the economic implications of the different treatments for the farmers. The input and output tries used in the conomic

treatments for the farmers. The input and output prices used in the economic analysis were the prevailing market prices during the period of the experiment.

experiment. The treatment with NPK fertilizer gave the highest net benefit of N 402, 319/ha followed by treatment with NPK + poultry manure that gave a net benefit of N375, 680 and no fertilizer treatment had the least net benefit net benefit of N375, 680 and no fertilizer treatment had the least net benefit of N 141,702 cropping season (Table 2). Among the fertilizer treatments, the cost of treatment with inorganic fertilizer was the highest (N59, 400) which also gave the highest corresponding net benefit with a residual of N 307, 279/ha. The highest cost involvement with the application of NPK alone could be attributed to the high cost of inorganic fertilizer. The use of poultry manure alone as organic fertilizer gave an appreciable increase (68.7 %) in the net benefit compared to zero application of fertilizers. Similar trend was observed in 2002/2003 cropping season. season.

The marginal rate of return (MRR) values in both years indicated The marginal rate of return (MRR) values in both years indicated that, changing from the no fertilizer control to NPK fertilizer were 2555 and 2680 % respectively while changing from the control to NPK + poultry manure were 2526 and 2830% in 2002 and 2003 respectively. In changing from no fertilizer to the use of poultry manure alone, MRR values of 2889% and 2825% in 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 eropping seasons respectively were recorded. These values imply that farmers must make extra investments of N10/ha. N 200/ha; N 9.260/ha. and N 7.200/ha. in changing from no fertilizer to NPK fertilizer, NPK + PM and PM alone respectively; in return, they will obtain extra benefits of N 273,443/ha; N 262,509/ha.

38

International Journal of Organic Agriculture Research and Development Vol. 2 (2010).

4,338d 13,422a 12,290b

illizer ertilize Poultr

No fertili NPK Fcr NPK + P

Table 1 Pepper and cassava yield

inal Rate n MRR 2.555 880 62,982 307,279 282,144 18,720 05,040 03,536 141,702 402,319 375,680 nu. 49,200 59,400 58,460 //ha Pepper 90,902 161,719 134,144 gate l 3,904 12,080 11,061 16,308 19,530 20,160 4,338 13,422 12,290 budget for e fruit y kg/ba cu/ha 8,120 1,700 2,900 **Fable:2 Partial**

ried varues applicability applicabil	wengyold wenge aplated joid applied predict withold of the AMM Applied Section applied by a point applied by		Cassava	Pepper	Casava	Pepper	Gross farm	Total	Not benefit	Net benefit Acceptable	**Residual	Margin:
Right year year fill fill <thfill< th=""> <th< td=""><td>Kipin yold gain gin fill fill</td><td>Treatments</td><td>average yield</td><td>average</td><td>adjusted. yield</td><td>adjusted yield</td><td>gate benefit</td><td>variable cost</td><td>#/ha</td><td>Minimum Return</td><td>-</td><td>of</td></th<></thfill<>	Kipin yold gain gin fill	Treatments	average yield	average	adjusted. yield	adjusted yield	gate benefit	variable cost	#/ha	Minimum Return	-	of
Na.100 4.064 16.290 3.657 18.105 2.952.00 13.887 5.770 5.132 r=2.1600 11.051 9.4400 11.2401 466.055 9.4400 01.2255 9.4400 11.2255 9.450 9.12.2555 9.4400 9.12.2555 9.4400 9.12.2555 9.4400 9.12.255 9.4400 9.02.355 9.4400 9.02.355 9.4400 9.02.355 9.4600 9.02.355 9.4600 9.02.305 9.4600 9.02.305 9.4600 9.02.305 9.4600 9.02.305 9.4600 9.02.305 9.4600 9.02.305 9.4600 9.02.305 9.4600 9.02.305 9.4600 9.02.305 9.4600 9.02.305 9.4600 9.02.305 9.4600	Ralion 4464 16,200 5.675 153,153 249,200 13,882 5,770 55,132 ra 21600 13,61 12,940 12,250 466,665 93,400 012,255 55,400 312,255 r 21,100 12,944 20,700 11,244 454,821 58,440 90,501 912,255 r 21,100 12,944 20,700 11,064 454,821 58,440 90,526 90,000 312,255 r 21,100 12,944 20,705 11,064 454,821 58,440 90,526 90,000 312,255 r 25,000 11,944 454,821 58,440 90,526 90,000 30,2356 30,506 r 25,000 10,912 24,000 137,255 56,400 30,526 30,506 30,506 r 25,000 10,912 24,000 137,255 56,400 30,526 30,506 30,506 r 25,000 10,912 24,000 137,256 56,400 30,526 30,506 30,506 r		Kg/ha	yield kg/ha	kg/ha	kg/ha	#/ha	#/ha		*AMR		Return
[15,1] 0,40 (12,24) 466,05 59,400 0,7360 012,255 [15,04] 0,700 11,604 45,421 38,460 96,260 93,260 012,255 [12,04] 0,700 11,604 45,421 38,460 96,260 93,266 90,205 [10,04] 2,452 39,465 56,400 317,226 90,206 96,400	[1,6,1] [9,40] [1,2,20] 466,69 [9,40] 40,726 9,400 40,726 9,400 11,225 [1,2,94] 20,700 11,604 45,415 34,400 30,736 30,705 30,705 [1,0,04] 20,815 34,400 317,226 30,501 30,735 30,705 [1,0,0] 2,0,00 3,426 317,226 30,500 30,735 30,705 [1,0,0] 2,0,00 31,726 56,400 317,226 90,506 30,606 [1,0,0] 2,0,00 317,226 56,400 317,226 90,506 30,606 [2,0,00] 2,1,162 7,1756 90,200 20,606 30,606 20,606	No fertilizer	18,100	4,064	16,290	3,657	183,05	249,200	133,852	78,720	55,132	
12.994 20.790 11,694 454,821 58,460 396,561 93,536 302,825 10,503 23,640 9,542 393,626 56,400 317,226 90,240 246,986	12.994 20.790 11.694 454.821 38,440 396,261 93.556 310,535 10.503 23.040 9.542 393,625 56,440 317,226 90,200 246,986 10.503 23.040 9.542 393,625 56,440 317,226 90,200 246,986 Castoru = #4,1768, Pagyore = #31,486 #.0187 7106 % a multiply 246,986 246,986	NPK Fertilizer	21,600	13,612	19,440	12,250	466,695	59,400	407,295	95,040	312,255	2,680
10,503 23,040 9,542 393,626 56,400 337,226 90,240 246,986	10.601 21.040 9.440 333.636 86.400 333.256 90.240 246.986 Cassera ==0.7,682, + ALNE - This was calculated using ALRR of 109.56, romalingly 2<	Npk + Poultry	23,100	12,994	20,790	11.694	454,821	58,460	396,361	93,536	302,825	2,830
10,503 23,040 9,542 393,626 56,400 337,226 90,240 246,986	10,503 21,040 9,542 393,626 56,400 337,226 90,240 246,986 Cassava =#4,17,Rg, Pepper = #31,A8(g, * AMR = This was calculated using AMRR of 100 % to multiply 246,986 246,986	Manure										
	NPK= Mineral fertilizer. Cassava =#4.17.%g Pepper = #31.48kg. * AMR = This was calculated using AMRR of 160 % to multiply	Poultry manure	25,600	10,503	23,040	9,542	393,626	56,400	337,226	90,240	246,986	2,825

and N 203,374/ha in that order. These results indicated that farmers stand to and N 205,374/na in that order. These results indicated that farmers stand to gain in return for every N1.0/ha on average invested in changing from no fertilizer option to NPK fertilizer they recover their N1.0 plus an extra of N 25,55 and N 26,80/ha in net benefits in 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 respectively while changing from no fertilizer option to NPK + PM will attract an extra of N 25,26/ha and N28,30/ha for every N 1.0/ha invested in both years. Interestingly, changing to the use of poultry manure alone attracted highest return of N 28.89/ha in 2001/2002 and N 28.25/ha in 2002/2002 for every N 1.0/ha invested.

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION The net returns from cassava + pepper intercrop were controlled by the yield and the prevailing market prices. Pepper contributed more to the net income with an average farm gate price of N31.48 per kilogram of fresh fruit of pepper compared to that of cassava at N4.17kg. Therefore, if emphasis is on increasing profit from the intercrop, the management of cassava + pepper intercrop should aim at increasing the yield of pepper. Adoption of NPK + PM could be considered as a more economically profitable fertility maintenance strategy since its use would alleviate the problem of hulkineses that is usually associated with organic

elleviate the problem of bulkiness that is usually associated with organic fertilizer use. It also reduces the cost of production compared to the treatment with NPK fertilizer alone.

REFERENCES

- Alabi, D. A. (2006). Effects of fertilizer phosphorous and poultry droppings treatments on growth and nutrient components of pepper (*Capsicum annuum L.*). African Journal of Biotechnology 5.8:671 677
- -677.
 Alimi, T. and V.M. Manyong, (2000). Partial Budgeting Analysis for On Farm Research. IITA Research Guide 65:.1-51.
 Bosland, P. W., and Votava, E. J. (2000). Peppers: Vegetables and Spice Capsicums. Wallingford Oxon 0X10 8DE UK: CABI International. 12-204.
- CIMMYT (1988). From Agronomic Data to Farmer Recommendations: An Economics Training Manual. Completely revised edition. Mexico, DF.
- Heathman, A. N., Shapley, S. J. S. and Robinson, J. S. (1995). Land application of poultry litter and water quality in Oklahoma, U.S.A.

40

International Journal of Organic Agriculture Research and Development Vol. 2 (2010).

Fertilizer Research 40:165-173.

- Kassam, A. H. and K. R. Stokinger, (1973). Growth and N-uptake of sorghum and millet in mixed cropping. Samaru Agricultural Newsletter 15: 8 32.
- Kumar, B. M. Mandal, R.C. and Magoon, M. L. (1977). Effect of farm yard manure and NPK on cassava. Symposium of the 4th International Society for Root Crops. Ottawa, Canada: International Development Research Centre. 122 124.
- Development Research Centre, 122 124.
 Lombin, L. G. Adepetu, J. A. and Ayotade, A.K. (1991). Organic fertilizer in the Nigerian agria nationculture: present and future. Abuja: Fertilizer Procurement and Distribution Division(F.P.D.D). 16 162
- MAFF/ADAS, (1991). Profitable utilization of livestock manures. New edition, London: Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, HMSO, 2081.
- HMSO. 2081.
 Mandal, R. C., Singh, K. D. and Maini, S. B. (1973). Effect of plant density, fertility level and shoot number on tuber yield and quality of tapicea hybrids. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* 18. 4: 449–452.
 May, K. W. (1982). Effects of planting schedule and intercropping on green gram (*Phaseolus aureus*) and bulrush millet (*Penisetum americanum*) in Tanzania. *Experimental Agriculture* 18: 149–156.
 Midmore, D. S. (1993). Agronomic modification of resource use and intercrop productivity. *Field Crops Research* 34: 239–245.
 Mullins, G. I., Bendfeldt, E. S. and Clark, R. A. (2002). Poultry litter as a *figritilear and amendment. Virginia cooperative extension Bulletin* 424-434.
 Ohisheson, G. Q. and Euverni, A. A. (1976). Investigations on Nigerian

- 424-434. Obigbesan, G O. and Fayemi, A. A. (1976). Investigations on Nigerian root and tuber crops. Influence of nitrogen fertilization on the yield and chemical composition of two cassava cultivars (Manihot esculenta). Journal of Agricultural Science. 89: 23
- Oelsligle, D. D., McCollum, E. E. and Kang, B. T. (1976). Soil fertility management in tropical multiple cropping.In: Papendick, R. I., Sanchez, P. A. and Triplet, G. B. Eds. *Multiple Cropping Symposium, American Society of Agronomy* Madison: Wisconsin. 1-378.
- Wisconsin. 1-378.
 Onwuene, I. E. and W.B. Charles (1994). Tropical Root Tuber Crops production perspectives and future prospects in F.A.O. *Plant Production and Protection Paper* 1-126.
 Pearson, A.J., Spiers, T. M. and Cant, G. (1998). Crop uptake of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium from soil amended with chicken