UNDER PEER REVIEW

Original Research Article

Socioeconomic Factors and Soil Fertility Management Practices Affecting Sorghum Production in Western Kenya: A Case study of Busia County.

ABSTRACT

A cross-sectional study was carried out in Busia County, Kenya to establish socioeconomic factors and soil fertility management aspects affecting sorghum yields. Structured interviews, questionnaires and observations were used during data collection. The variables of the study were: demographic factors, income, farmers' perception on soil fertility replenishing options, access to agricultural advisory services and yields of sorghum. The findings of the study are presented using descriptive statistics. The results indicate that women 86(57.3%) are predominant sorghum producing farmers in the County. Literacy level reveals majority 74(49.3%) of the farmers have primary education as optimum suggesting sorghum production to be through hands-on experience. Individual land ownership was the norm with most farms being 1.5 to 2.0 hectares. Income among the respondents is below USD 1.25 per day. Sorghum is ranked as very important 85(56.7%) and a resource against food shortage. Many farmers 62(41.3.0%) used traditional seed from previous harvest with 36(24.0%) purchasing seed from agro-dealers or being provided by non-Governmental organizations/ project participation. Intercropping is associated with food security, improved yields and land inadequacy and not to soil fertility restoration. Inadequate knowledge on the role of legumes and crop residue recycling in soil fertility improvement exists and 58(38.7%) of the farmers have access to agricultural information. Gender, social norms, literacy, fertilizer use, accessibility to advisory services and farmers' perception on soil fertility management options are concluded to impact on sorghum production in Busia County. A database of the alternative researched options to restore soil fertility and increase crop yields could be developed and demonstration plots on the same findings be set up to involve farmers' participation and perhaps facilitate adoption. Extension service delivery is provided to both men and women with emphasis on intercropping of cereals with nitrogen fixing legumes and residue management to improve soil fertility and enhance crop yields.

Key words*: Sorghum, demographic factors, income, soil fertility management, Busia County*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Socioeconomic factors influence agricultural production and thus, have to be considered when appraising the potential of a given farm. Social norms, constraints to knowledge, labour availability, financial and credit constraints [1, 2] are among the factors impacting on agricultural production. According to [3] and [4], women are the majority involved in smallholder food production. This notwithstanding, [5] pointed out that women constituted 60 % of the illiterate population in sub-Saharan Africa. The worker [6] was of the opinion that more years of formal education has direct influence on better understanding and adoption of new technologies. Other workers [7] reported that input prices and economies of scale with respect to inputs can also contribute intercropping of crops in a given piece of land. In Western Kenya, soil fertility has been noted as the major setback to improved yields [8, 9]. Research findings have indicated use of inorganic fertilizers [10, 11, 12] as a way of restoring the low inherent soil fertility in Western Kenya, Busia County inclusive. Other workers [13, 14] reported on intercropping as being a possible option to restore fertility in the depleted soils of the region. These research interventions are aimed at improving soil fertility and enhancing crop yields.

Despite the alternative ways put forward by the workers mentioned above, it is worth noting that sorghum (*sorghum bicolor* L. Moench), though ranked as the third most important staple food crop [15, 16], the farmers in the growing areas still experience periodic crop failure and this is a threat to food and income security. The unanswered questions then are: (i) what are the underlying factors responsible for the low sorghum production in Western Kenya and in particular Busia County? (ii) what are the farmers' references used in appraising interventions and promotion of relevant soil fertility management practices

UNDER PEER REVIEW

that can lead to sustainable soil fertility improvement and enhanced yields? There is need therefore, to consider the references used by farmers in appraising interventions and promotion of relevant soil fertility management practices.

Thus, the study sought to establish the underlying socio-economic factors and soil fertility management aspects that govern sorghum production in Busia County. It is anticipated that the results of the study will point out the factors that govern farmers' decision to utilize research based interventions. It is also hoped that understanding the farmers' basic principles of evaluating different soil fertility management practices would help in promoting relevant options for sustainable soil productivity.

2.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Study design and sampling Procedure

A cross-sectional study was carried out among sorghum smallholder farmers in Busia County, Kenya to identify socio-economic factors and soil fertility management aspects affecting the production of the crop. Structured interviews, questionnaires and observations were used to collect data from May to June, 2013. The variables under the study in regard to socio-economic factors were demographic factors and economic status of the households. In regard to soil fertility management aspects, the focus was on farmers' perception on use of agricultural inputs, agricultural advisory services, intercropping and recycling of crop residues. Sorghum growing areas in Busia County are Butula, Matayos, Funyula, Nambale and Busia Township. Using the divisions of each district, locations where farmers grew sorghum were stratified into two: lower and upper catchment leading to choice of stratified random sampling technique being used. Lists of farmers growing sorghum were obtained from Technical Assistants in the Ministry of Agriculture in the respective divisions and locations within the districts in the County. The names were then randomly selected as per the respective catchment and the villages. A sample population size was arrived at using the table on sample size selection and standardization equation,

$$n = (n0 \times N) / (1 + (n0 - 1))$$

Where; N is the known population; n is sample size; and n0 is the unknown population [17, 18].

Instruments of data collection were pre-tested in Butula district on 20 respondents [19] to ensure reliability and validity and revised before actual administering of the questionnaires. Information was also sourced from extension service providers from the Ministry of Agriculture, non-Governmental organizations and local leaders to facilitate formation of general opinion about behavour of the variables under investigation. The structured questionnaires were then administered to 150 farmers in a face-to-face interview and their responses recorded accordingly. Farmers' evaluation of major soil management practices was based on the advantages and disadvantages perceived about the different practices. The principle researcher guided and supervised the field work during data collection.

2.2 Statistical data analysis

The information derived from the respondents were sorted, coded and analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 18.0 (SPSS v18.0) [20] and descriptive analysis using MS-excel.

3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 Demographic factors of the smallholder sorghum farmers

3.1.1 Gender and age

Table 1 presents the demographic factors among the smallholder sorghum farmers. The results showed that majority of respondents were females 86(57.3%) and 64(42.7%) being male. The findings are in agreement with other works [21, 22, 23, 24, 4] who reported women participation to be above 50 %. The findings of this study reveal 57(38%) of the farmers aged between 38 and 47 years, 37(24.7%) aged

UNDER PEER REVIEW

between 28 and 37 years, with 30(20%) of them aged between 48 and 59 years. Other workers, [21] reported 30-39 years to be the majority (36.7%) while 40-49 years represented 26.6% of the respondents. Elsewhere, [25] researching on adoption of integrated natural resource management indicated majority of farmers to be between 31-40 years of age. The age bracket by the reports mentioned suggests that age group is considered to be prime, most productive in terms of energy, responsibility and food providers to the household. Sorghum is considered a traditional crop and thus the younger farmers prefer to grow maize in preference to sorghum.

Table 1: Demographic factors of Small Holder Sorghum Farmers

Demographic factors	Variable	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	64	42.7
	Female	86	57.3
	Total	**150**	**100.0**
Age (years)	18 -27	10	6.7
	28 -37	37	24.7
	38 -47	57	38.0
	48 – 59	30	20.0
	> 60 years	16	10.7
	Total	**150**	**100.0**
Marital status	Single	4	2.7
	Married	128	85.3
	Widowed	18	12.0
	Total	**150**	**100.0**
Level of Education	No formal education	10	6.7
	Adult education	2	1.3
	Primary education	74	49.3
	Secondary education	61	40.7
	Others	3	2.0
	Total	**150**	**100.0**
Family size	1-5 members	38	25.3
	6-10 members	96	64.1
	11-20 members	16	10.7
	Total	**150**	**100.0**

Source: Field survey May-June, 2013

3.1.2 Marital status, education level and household size

The data derived further highlights that most 128(85.3%) of the small holder farmers were married, with 18(12%) widowed and 4(2.7%) single. From the respondents, 74(49.3%) had primary education level, with 61(40.7%) having secondary education and 10(6.7%) had no formal education. Additionally, 2(1.3%) and 3(2.0%) had finished adult education as well as above diploma qualifications respectively. The findings indicate that majority of the small holder sorghum farmers had pre-secondary qualifications and thus, understanding and application of agricultural extension technical advices and practices may be a challenge. The study findings support the reports [26, 27, 13, 28, 2, 6, 29] that were of the opinion that education plays a role in the understanding and the practice of new interventions. Study results indicate the number of household ranged from 1 to 20. The highest family size 96(64.1%) had between 6 and 10 members, with 38(25.3%) being 1- 5 members in the family and 16(10.7%) 11-20 members. Family size noted agrees with data presented by [29] that the household size ranged between 7-9 members in Busia County. Family household is the major source of labour and thus imperative during farming activities such as planting, weeding and harvesting.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

3.1.3 Land ownership, size, income and ranking of sorghum crop among the respondents

Type of land ownership, total land size, income earned from growing sorghum and the ranking of the crop by the respondents is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Land ownership, farm size, income and perception of sorghum among the respondents

Economic Factor	Variable	Frequency	Percent
Type of ownership	Individual	82	54.7
	Family owned	63	42.0
	Leased	5	3.3
	Total	**150**	**100.0**
Farm size in hectares (ha)	< 0.2	10	6.7
	0.3 – 0.5	35	23.3
	0.6 – 0.9	41	27.3
	1.0 – 1.5	20	13.3
	1.5 – 2.0	44	29.3
	Total	**150**	**100.0**
Income from growing of sorghum (USD)	Less than 25	74	49.3
	Less than 63	67	44.7
	Above 125	8	5.3
	No response	1	.7
	Total	**150**	**100.0**
Ranking of sorghum among other crops	Very important	59	39.3
	Important	85	56.7
	Less important	6	4.0
	Total	**150**	**100.0**

Source: Field survey May-June, 2013. Exchange rate used was Kenya shillings 80 for 1USD

Data derived indicated 82(54.7%) of the farmers individually owned land, with 63(42%) being family owned (inherited) and 5(3.3%) leased the land for growing sorghum. In Busia County, the title deeds to the land is held by men implying that they do play a big role in decision making yet considering gender participation in crop production, women participation is over 50% [21]. The study findings are in line with [30] who highlighted ownership of land in Kenya to be on individual basis. Other works [27, 31, 32], reported majority of farmers in Western Kenya owned land and that land ownership was primarily by men.

The findings contrast with a report from Ejura-Sekyedumase district in Ghana [28] who indicated that more females (88.9%) than male (75.4%) had access to land as a result of the matrilineal system of inheritance practiced. Farm size was in the range of <0.2 to >1.5 hectares among the sample population. From the study 44(29.3%) of the farmers had 1.5- 2.0 hectares of land, (ha) while 41(27.3%) owned between 0.6 and 0.9 ha of land and 35(23.3%) between 0.3 and 0.5 ha. The findings on land size are similar to those established by [32] who reported 31.5% of the respondents to own farm size of 1-3 acres (0.4 to 1.2 hectares).

The obtained results from the sample population further indicated that most of the farmers 74(49.3%) earned income less than USD 25, with 67(44.7%) earning less than USD 63 and 5.3% earned above USD 125 at the end of sorghum growing season. On a daily basis, income of the respondents is The results tally with [29], who indicated income among the communities in Busia County as being below Kenya shillings 25, 500 per month equivalent to USD 10.625 (exchange rate of Kenya shillings 80 per US dollar). The findings also shows the income of the respondents falls below the International critical level of US dollar 1.25 per day [33].

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Majority 85(56.7%) of the farmers ranked sorghum as an important crop in comparison to other crops and 59(39.3%) ranking it as very important. The findings highlight the role sorghum plays in food security and as a cushion against unpredictable maize yields. The importance linked to sorghum by the respondents was based on fear of maize lethal necrotic disease (MLND) that had been reported [16] to have caused 100% maize loss in the primary MLND outbreak zones in Kenya speculation that the disease could spread to other maize growing areas in the country.

3.2 Soil fertility management practices of the sample population

3.2.1 Use of agricultural inputs and soil fertility replenishment

Table 3 presents use of agricultural inputs and soil fertility replenishment options among the respondents. The results showed that 117(78%) of the farmers bought agricultural inputs (seeds and inorganic fertilizer) of which 88(58.7%) expressed use of certified seeds. It is worth noting that farmers perceive that individual farmers that produce seed to sell means such seeds are certified since the original seed of such a progeny was bought from agro-dealers 3-4 years down the line. Further to this, 36(24.0%) of the farmers sourced seed from agro-dealers or non-Governmental organizations in the County through project participation.

Table 3: Agricultural inputs and fertilizer use by the respondents

Farm inputs	Category	Frequency	Percent
Buy Agricultural inputs bought	Yes	117	78.0
	No	33	22.0
	Total	**150**	**100.0**
Use certified sorghum seeds	Yes	88	58.7
	No	62	41.3
	Total	**150**	**100.0**
Source of improved seeds	Seed producers	5	3.3
	Relatives/neighbours	11	7.3
	Own seed	62	41.3
	Seed dealers/shops	36	24.0
	Project/organization	36	24.0
	Total	**150**	**100.0**
Fertilizer(s) applied	Inorganic fertilizer	47	31.3
	Farm yard manure	42	28.0
	Compost manure	20	13.3
	Recycling of crop residues	29	19.3
	None	12	8.0
	Total	**150**	**100.0**

Source: Field survey May-June, 2013

It was imperative to note that 62(41.3%) planted own seed stored from the previous harvest and the farmers were of the opinion that the seeds are safe since the grains are rarely attacked by storage pests. The farmers' perspective on source of sorghum for planting suggests the reason for the low yields of sorghum prevalent in the County.

Both inorganic 47(31.3%) and organic 91(60.0%) were used by the respondents. Majority of the respondents preferred organic fertilizer use due to their level of income and the high cost associated with inorganic fertilizers. The inorganic fertilizers used by the respondents were mainly sourced from projects run by NGOs and thus their use on sorghum production was limited.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

3.2.2 Intercropping as a farm practice among the respondents

Intercropping of sorghum with other crops and their respective percentages are outlined in Table 4. From the data collected, it can be deduced that majority of the farmers 81(54%) practiced intercropping of sorghum with various legumes with 37(24.7 %) being common beans and soybean standing at 8(5.3%). The farmers' perception on intercropping sorghum with green grams or cowpeas was to find a source of vegetables for the household during the short rains and for use during the dry season. The derived data also notes that a high percentage of the respondents 69(46.5%) do plant their crops as pure stands without intercropping.

Table 4: Crops intercropped

Crops intercropped with sorghum	Frequency	Percent
Maize	18	12.0
Common beans	37	24.7
soybeans	8	5.3
Green grams	10	6.7
Cow peas	4	2.7
Sim sim	4	2.7
Do not intercrop	69	46.0
Total	**81**	**100.0**

Source: Field survey May-June, 2013

3.2.3 Benefit of intercropping

The smallholder farmers' perceptions of advantages and disadvantages of intercropping in reference to crop yields and soil fertility improvement are presented in Table 5.From the findings, it was established that the smallholder sorghum farmers had varied opinions and perceptions on the importance of intercropping on crop yields and soil fertility improvement. Out of the sampled population, 45(30%) associated intercropping to improved crop yields, with 26(17.3%) noting that intercropping reduced yields and 11(7.3%) were of the opinion that intercropping of crops had no benefits. It was also noted that 68(45.3%) of the respondents do not practice intercropping hence could not give their opinions on the advantages and disadvantage of the practice. The practice was considered to be traditional and individual farmers intercropped their various crops depending on their objectives regardless of proper agronomic requirements of the crops. The results point out inadequate knowledge regarding intercropping among the respondents.

Table 5 Benefit of intercropping

	Improved		Reduced		No change		No response	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Crop yields	45	30.0	26	17.3	11	7.3	68	45.3
Soil fertility improvement	20	13.3	46	30.7	14	9.3	70	46.7

Source: Field survey May-June, 2013

With regard to soil fertility improvement, 20(13.3%) recognized intercropping improved soil productivity while 46(30.7%) were of the opinion that intercropping reduced soil productivity. A higher sample population, 70(46.7%) could not relate intercropping with crop yields and soil improvement. The respondents associated intercropping with food security, improved yields and subsequent sale of the surplus to meet the household needs and due to inadequate land. The findings indicate that importance of intercropping and growing of nitrogen fixing legumes for soil fertility is not understood by the respondents and lack information on the same. Thus, from the data derived, it was imperative to note that low crop yields could be attributed to intercropping without putting consideration other agronomic requirements of crop combinations. The report of the study supports other works [34] who pointed out that the importance of nitrogen fixing legumes in regard to soil fertility improvement is not well understood by the smallholder farmers in western Kenya.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

3.2.4 Recycling of crop residues for soil fertility improvement

Ultimate use of crop residues among the sample population is summarized in Figure 1. Majority of the farmers 80(53.3%) recycle the residues from sorghum by incorporating them into the soil to enhance its fertility, with 14(9.3%) using it for mulching and 9(6%) for fodder. However, 8(5.3%) of the respondents burn the crop residues and 7(4.7%) compost them. Out of the sample population, 32(21.3%) take the legume residues out of the field during harvest to shell the legume grain and neglect the residues thereafter. The results illuminate that though intercropping is practiced by the smallholder households, importance of soil fertility improvement through recycling of residues is not well understood as a soil fertility management practice among the respondents.



Figure1: Crop residue management among the respondents. *Source: Field survey May-June, 2013*

3.2.5 Accessibility to agricultural information

Table 6 presents contact of agricultural extension officers with the sample population. From the study most farmers; 92(61.3%) had no contacts with agriculture extension officers and 58(38.7%) did receive agricultural extension services and information. However, those farmers who had contacts comprised of 43 (28.7%) once, 10(6.7%) twice and 5(3.3%) thrice during the crop growing season.

The findings showed that there is limited accessibility of agricultural information and probably promotion of new technologies suited to the requirements of smallholder farmers with respect to the prevailing demographic factors and this could affect the overall productivity and crop yield improvement and sustainability.

Table 6: Accessibility to agricultural information

Contact with agricultural extension staff		Frequency	Percentage
Yes		58	38.7
No		92	61.3
How many times?	1	43	28.7
	2	10	6.7
	3	5	3.3
	Not at all	92	61.3

Source: Field survey May-June, 2013

UNDER PEER REVIEW

The results of the study indicate lack of dissemination of agricultural information, training and other related knowledge which could have had direct influence on the crop production. The workers, [35] had reported on wide communication gaps between researchers and farmers that had contributed to lack of awareness of new agricultural practices among smallholder households. According to [36], appreciable information from research activities in Western Kenya has been documented but not easily accessed and furthermore, in most cases they are outdated. The results of the study emphasizes the need to close the existing dissemination gaps and ensure research findings are communicated to the target farmers for awareness and possible adoption of new agronomic practices and soil fertility management options.

3.2.6 Yields of sorghum

In the year 2011, most of the farmers 90(60%) harvested between 1 and 2 bags, with 45(30%) harvesting 2-4 bags and 15(10%) harvested less than 1 bag. The number of bags harvested by farmers in 2012 varied. Most of the farmers 52(34.7%) harvested one bag of sorghum, with 29(19.3%) of them harvesting 2 bags, while 16(10.7%) harvested 3 bags, 15(10%) got 4 bags and 38(25%) harvesting less than a bag of sorghum. In terms of yields, there exists a close similarity in both years i.e. no remarkable change in yields suggesting stagnation rather than improvement. The findings imply that sorghum production is grown basically for subsistence but when the production is high some it is sold in the local markets. It agrees with report by [29] which indicate sorghum is grown as a subsistence crop. In case of maize crop failure, the yields of sorghum cannot probably be taken as a cushion against hunger.

CONCLUSION

Gender disparity, social norms and education level are demographic factors associated with the experienced low sorghum yields in Busia County. With regard to soil fertility management aspects, minimal fertilizer use, perception of the farmers on soil fertility management options and inaccessibility to advisory services are concluded to impact on sorghum production in the County. . A database of the alternative researched options to restore soil fertility and increase crop yields could be developed and demonstration plots on the same findings be set up to involve farmers' participation and perhaps facilitate adoption. Extension service delivery is provided to both men and women with emphasis on intercropping of cereals with nitrogen fixing legumes and residue management to improve soil fertility and enhance crop yields.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare they have no competing interests.

REFERENCES

1. Stoorvogel JJ, Antel JM., Crissman CC and Bowen W. The trade analysis model: integrated bio-physical and economic modeling of agricultural production systems. Agricultural Systems. 2004;80:43-66.
2. Chavas JP, Chambers RG and Pope RD. Production economics and farm management: a century of contributions. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2010.
3. World Bank. Gender equality in development. World development report. The World Bank. Washington DC. 2012.
4. Lastarria-Cornhiel S. Feminization of agriculture: Trends and driving forces. RIMISP, background paper for the world development report. 2006.
5. UNESCO. Education for all global monitoring report. Retrieved on 03.06.14 from UNESCO: www.afareport.unesco.org 2010.
6. Wakili AM. Technical efficiency of sorghum production in Hong local government area of Adamawa State, Nigeria. Russian Journal of Agric Socio-Econ. Sciences. 2012;6:1-6.
7. Zilberman D, Zhao J and Heiman A. Adoptoin vs adaption, with emphasis on climate change. Annual Review of resource Economics. 2012; 4.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

8. Kifuko MN, Othieno CO, Okalebo JR, Kimenye LN, Ndungu KW and Kipkoech AK. Effect of combining organic residues with Minjingu phosphate rock on sorption and availability of phosphorus and maize production in acid soils of western Kenya. Experimental Agriculture. 2007;43:51-66.
9. Kisinyo PO, Gudu SO, Othieno CO, Okalebo JR, Opala PA, Maghanga JK, et al. Effects of lime, phosphorus and rhizobia on *Sesbania sesban* performance in a Western Kenyan acid soil. African Journal of Agricultural Research. 2012;7(18):2800-2809.
10. Okalebo JR. Othieno CO, Woomer PL, Karanja NK, Semoka JRM and Bekunda MA. et al. Available technologies to replenish soil fertility in East Africa. Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosyst. 2006;76:153-170.
11. Vanlauwe B, Tittonell P, Mukalama J. Within-farm soil fertility gradients affect response of maize to fertilizer application in western Kenya. Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosyst. 2006;76:171-182.
12. Ngome AF, Becker M, Mtei KM and Mussgnug M. Fertility management for maize cultivation in some soils of Kakamega, Western kenya. Soil Tillage Res. 2011a;117:69-75.
13. Sanginga N and Woomer PL. (eds). Integrated soil fertility management in Africa: Principles, practices and developmental process. Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility Institute of the International Centre for Tropical Agriculture. Nairobi. 2009.
14. Mucheru-Muna M, Pypers P, Mugendi D, Kung'u J, Merckx R and Vanlauwe B. Staggered maize-legume intercrop arrangement robustly increases crop yields and economic returns in the highlands of Central Kenya. Field Crops Res. 2010;115:132-139.
15. Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa. Africa agriculture; Focus on staple crops. Nairobi, Kenya. 2013.
16. Ministry of Agriculture. Food security assessment report. Government printers; Nairobi. 2013
17. Cochran WG. Sampling techniques (2nd Edition). New York: John Wiley and Sons. 1963.
18. Krejcie RV, and Morgan DW. "Determining sample size for research activities" Educational and psychological measurement; Article 1970;30:607-610.
19. Kathuri NJ and Pals D A. Introduction to educational research. Egerton University, Njoro, Kenya: Education Materials Center. 1993.
20. Statistical Package for Social Scientist (SPSS). Version 18. Chicago. Prentice Hall. 2008.
21. Ogeto RM, Cheruiyot E, Mshenga P and Onyari CN. Sorghum production for food security. A socio-economic analysis of sorghum production in Nakuru County, Kenya. African Journal of Agricultural Research 2013;8(47): 6055-6067.
22. African Union Commission and GIZ. Making finance work for Africa. Policy brief on agricultural finance in Africa. 2012.
23. FAO. The state of food and agriculture 2010–2011: Women in agriculture: Closing the gender gap for development. Rome, Italy: Author. 2010-2011.
24. Doss CR. If women hold up half the sky, how much of the world's food do they produce? Background paper, 2011. State of Food and Agriculture Report (SOFA Report), FAO, Rome. 2010.
25. Okuthe SK, Kioli F and Abuom P. Socio cultural determinants of the adoption of integrated natural resource management technologies by small scale farmers in Ndhiwa division, Kenya. Current Research journal of Social Sciences. 2013;5(6):203-218.
26. Marenya PP and Barrett CB. Household-level determinants of adoption of improved natural resources management practices among smallholder farmers in western Kenya. Food Policy 2007;32: 515–536.
27. Chianu JN, Vanlauwe B, Mahasi JM, Katungi E, Aketch C, Mairurs FS et al. Soybean situation and outlook analysis: The case of Kenya. 2008.[www.icrisat.org/what-we-do] site visited on 08/06/2014.
28. Codjoe SSA. Population and food crop production in male and female households in Ghana. International Journal of Development Issues. 2010;(1): 68-85.
29. Adaptation to Climate Change and Insurance. Climate risk and vulnerability profiles for Homa Bay and Busia Counties, Kenya. 2013
30. Mbote P. "The land has its owners! Gender issues in land tenure under customary law'. International land coalition workshop. Nairobi, Kenya. 2005.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

31. Mugure A, Oino PG and Sorre BM. Land ownership and its impact on adoption of agro forestry practices among rural households in Kenya. A case of Busia County. International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies 2013;4(3):552-559.
32. Oino PG and Mugure A. Farmer-oriented factors that influence adoption of agro forestry practices in Kenya. Experinces from Nambale district, Busia County. International Journal of Science and Research IJSR). 2013;2(4)
33. United Nations. World economic and social survey. DESA. United Nations Publications, New York. 2013
34. Mahasi JM, Vanlauwe B, Mursoy RC, Mbehero P and Mukalama J. Increasing productivity of soybean in Western Kenya through evaluation and farmer participatory variety selection. Proceedings of the 12th Kenya Agricultural Research Institute Biennial Scientific conference, 8th - 12th November, 2010, Nairobi, Kenya. 2011 [http://www.kari.org/biennialconference/.htm] site visited on 09/06/2014.
35. Odendo M, Ojiem J, Bationo A and Mudeheri M. On-farm evaluation and scaling-up of soil fertility management technologies in western Kenya. Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems 2006;76:369–381.
36. Rege R. Harnessing institutional alliances and partnerships in agricultural information systems in Kenya. Quarterly Bulletin of IAALD, 2006;51(4): 215-222.