

1
2
3 **Soil property variation under different conservation**
4 **agriculture practices, in Bako Tibe District, West Shoa,**
5 **Ethiopia**

6
7
8 **Abstract**

9 *Conservation agriculture is claimed to be one of the solution for the problems of poor*
10 *agricultural productivity in sub-saharan countries. The impact of conservation agriculture*
11 *depends on environmental factors such as slope, vegetation, soil type, rain fall pattern and*
12 *intended crops. This study was conducted from 2013 to 2014 with the objectives of assessing the*
13 *impact of different conservation agriculture practices on soil properties in Bako District, West*
14 *Shoa, Ethiopia, using five treatments were selected for the study namely: Monocropping (maize)*
15 *without crop residue, Monocropping (maize) with crop residue, Crop rotation (maize and haricot*
16 *bean) with crop residue, Inter cropping (Haricot bean with maize) with crop residue and*
17 *including a near by grazing land (Original land use). A completely randomized design with four*
18 *replications was used. A total of 40 composite soil samples (4 replication * 5 treatments * 2 soil*
19 *depth: 0–10 cm and 10–30 cm) were collected and analyzed for selected soil properties. The soils*
20 *in the study area were moderately acidic, and contain medium level of AP, but low*
21 *concentration of total N. Soil pH, SOC, TN, C:N, and AP did not significantly different among*
22 *the treatments after four years of conservation agricultural practices. Therefore, conservation*
23 *agriculture has little effect on soil properties in short term, but it may take longer time to*
24 *influence on different soil properties in the study area.*

25
26 **Keywords:** Crop residue; intercropping; soil property; mono cropping; conservation agriculture.

27 **1. Introduction**


28 Conservation agriculture (CA) is a widely-used terminology which refer to soil management
29 systems that result in at least 30% of the soil surface being covered with crop residues after
30 seeding of the subsequent crop (Jarecki MK and Lal R, 2003). CA practices are aiming to
31 produce high crop yields while reducing production costs, maintaining the soil fertility and
32 conserving water [Hobbs PR *et al.*, 2008]. It is not a single component technology but a
33 system that includes the cumulative effect of three basic components, minimum soil
34 disturbance, permanent soil cover and crop rotation tillage, in order to preserve soil health
35 and productivity (West TO, Post WM, 2002). CA is receiving an increasing attention in sub-
36 Saharan Africa as a sustainable alternative to contribute to food security and minimize
37 environmental degradation (FAO, 2006) especially aiming to maintain and improve yield. All
38 CA practices are not easy to apply, but farmers can increase their productivity benefits
39 through labour cost saving, reduction of production cost, and improvement of soil fertility.
40 Since one of the contributions of CA is labour saving, farmers can use the time they have
41 saved to expand the area they cultivate, or even to start other enterprises that earn more
42 money. CA increases soil moisture, and restores soil fertility, so stabilizing yields and
43 improving production over the long term.

44 Compared to tillage based agriculture, conservation agriculture (CA) has the potential to
45 decrease soil loss, enhance levels of soil organic matter, increase plant available soil water,
46 and save costs due to fewer or no tillage operations (Teklu, 2011). Current uses of different
47 conventional agricultural practices are the major threat to land productivity and soil fertility
48 decline in sub-Saharan Africa, but few studies were carried out to identify the limitation of
49 conventional agricultural practices. One of the main challenges in Western Oromia generally
50 and particularly to Bako district, where maize is the main stable and major producing crop, is
51 continuous mono cropping with residue removal through burning and/or used for other
52 purposes (Wakene N, *et al.*, 2011) [No references. you should check](#). Bako agricultural research
53 centre has been undertaking a
54 controlled study on different conservation agricultural practices on farmers land. Taking this
55 opportunity, this research initiated to assess the impact of conservation agricultural practices
56 namely: Mono-cropping with Residues (MCR), Crop rotation with residues (CRR.), and
Intercropping with Residues (ICR) on different soil properties.

57 2. Materials and Methods

58 2.1 Description of the study area

59 The study was conducted Bako district, western Oromia. Bako is located at $9^{\circ} 08' N$ latitude and
 60 $37^{\circ} 03' E$ longitude; about 251 km from Addis Ababa. The altitude where the soil samples
 61 collected was located ranged from 1670 to 1690 m.a.s.l². The long term weather information
 62 revealed that the area has unimodal rainfall pattern extending from March to October, but the
 63 effective rain is from May to September (Legesse *et al.*, 1987). The mean annual rainfall is about
 64 1237 mm, with a peak in July. It has a warm humid climate with annual mean minimum and
 65 maximum temperature of $14^{\circ} C$ and $29^{\circ} C$, respectively and the mean annual temperature is 20
 66 $^{\circ}C$. Soils at the study site are dominantly Nitisols with reddish brown colour. They are generally
 67 clay dominated with a pH in between 5- 6¹ in surface soils (Legesse *et al.*, 1987).



68
 69 Figure 1: Map of the Study area – Bako district.

70 2.2 Soil Sampling and Laboratory analysis

71 Four plots (10m x 10m) were randomly selected in each of the five treatments arranged in a
 72 RCBD. To minimize border effect soil samples were collected from 8m * 8m plot since the
 73 main plots have a minimum distance of 1m between the plots. In each plot (8m*8m), the soil

74 samples were collected from two soil depths (0-10 and 10-30cm) at the corners and centre of
75 the plots. Then the samples from each plot were bulked to form a composite sample at 0-10
76 and 10-30 cm layers, and a total of 40 composite soil samples (5 treatments* 2 soil depths *
77 4 plots) were collected for the study. The five treatments in this study are Monocropping
78 without crop residue (maize), Monocropping with crop residue (maize), Crop rotation with
79 crop residue (maize and haricot bean), Inter cropping with crop residue (haricot bean with
80 maize) and a nearby grazing land (Original land use). The samples were first air-dried at
81 room temperature and sieve (mesh size 2mm) in order to remove roots, litter and stones from
82 the soil samples. Then soil samples were analyzed at Bako Agriculture Research Center
83 (BARC) soil laboratory using all laboratory procedures.

84 **2.3. Statistical analysis**

85 Laboratory results were analyzed using General Linear Model (GLM) procedure of SAS
86 statistical software version 9.0.2004. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to test the
87 variations. For significant differences, mean separation using LSD was conducted at 5 % level of
88 significance.

89 **3. Results and Discussion**

90 **3.1 Soil Chemical Properties**

91 **3.1.1 SOC, Soil pH, TN and C:N Ratio**

92 The interaction among the agricultural practices including the grazing land with soil depth was
93 not significant for soil pH, SOC, TN, and C:N ratio ($p=0.958$, $p=0.998$, $p=0.219$, and $p=0.140$),
94 respectively. Soil pH, SOC, TN, and C:N ratio were not significant ($p=0.866$, $p=0.936$, $p=0.330$
95 and $p=0.196$), among the agricultural practices and the grazing land. Depth wise SOC and TN
96 were statistically significant ($p=0.0035$, and $p=0.0004$), while, soil pH and C:N ratio were not
97 significantly ($p=0.589$ and $p=0.460$), respectively different at a given soil depths (Table 1).

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107 Table 1: Summary of ANOVA for pH, SOC (%), N (%), AP [Write open name](#) (mg/kg), and
 108 C:N ratio under different agricultural practices and soil depths.

	Source of variation	pH		SOC (%)		TN Write open name (%)				C:N ratio	
		MS	P	MS	P	MS	P	MS	P	MS	P
Soil Depth (D)	1	0.041	0.589	2.618	0.0035	0.031	0.0004	3.310	0.460	9.180	0.087
Practices (P)	5	0.051	0.866	0.067	0.936	0.002	0.330	9.260	0.196	1.270	0.827
P*D	5	0.028	0.958	0.013	0.998	0.003	0.219	10.610	0.140	2.340	0.568
Error	36	0.138		0.267		0.002		5.940		2.979	

109

110 Soil pH increased with soil depth. Different agricultural practices systems for four years had no
 111 effect on soil pH (Table 2). Hence, the soil pH values observed in the study area are within the
 112 range of moderately acidic soil as indicated by Foth and Ellis (1997). Several authors Abebe
 113 (1998) [No references. you should check](#), Islam and Weil (2000), Wakene and Heluf (2003) and
 114 Gebeyaw (2007) reported that the soil pH was lower in cultivated land than grazing land, and this
 115 was attributed to the depletion of organic matter because of intensive cultivation.

116 In contrast to these studies, in the present study the mean value of soil pH was relatively lower
 117 under agricultural practices than grazing land but no statistical difference was observed among
 118 all agricultural practices, and grazing land. According to Du Preez, *et al.*, 2001, experimental
 119 research revealed that soil pH was significantly higher under conservation agriculture than
 120 conventional agriculture practices after 11 years of practices. Based on this finding, the absence
 121 of difference under all agricultural practices and grazing land could attribute to the age of
 122 conservation agriculture practices which were only four years old.

123 Soil Organic Carbon (SOC) concentration was not significantly different among the agricultural
 124 practices and the grazing land, while the overall mean of SOC concentration was in the range
 125 between 2.23 to 2.46%. Consistent with the present study, SOC was not affected by conservation
 126 agriculture within four years of practice when compared to conventional agriculture Biielders, *et*
 127 *al.*, (2002), Ben-Moussa, *et al.*, (2010). In contrast, Nyamadzawo, *et al.*, (2008) and Gwenzi, *et*
 128 *al.*, (2009), reported that SOC was higher under conservation agriculture after five and ten years
 129 of practice, respectively. They attributed the low SOC content in continuous cultivated soils of
 130 conventional agriculture to reduced inputs of organic matter obtained from crop residues and
 131 frequent tillage which encouraged oxidation of organic matter. So, according to Nyamadzawo, *et*

132 *al.*, (2008) and Gwenzi, *et al.*, (2009), the SOC might change after practicing conservation
133 agricultural for greater than four years.

134 The mean of total N content varied from 0.15 to 0.20% under agricultural practices and the
135 grazing land. After practicing conservation agriculture for four consecutive years, total N did not
136 differ significantly when compared to conventional agriculture (Table 2). Following the rating of
137 total N of > 1% as very high, 0.5 to 1% high, 0.2 to 0.5% medium, 0.1 to 0.2% low and < 0.1%
138 as very low N status as indicated by Landon (1991), all the agricultural practices and the grazing
139 land have low content of total N. The low level of nitrogen in the practices may imply that
140 fertilizer additions have not replaced the total N lost due to harvest removal, and /or leaching
141 Malo *et al.*, (2005). In agreement with the present study, Saito, *et al.*, (2010) reported that there
142 was no significance difference in total N under conservation agriculture practices after practicing
143 for four years in Benin. Whereas, Ben-Moussa., *et al.*, (2010), and Enfors, *et al.*, (2010) reported
144 that total N was significantly higher under four years' conservation agriculture practices than
145 conventional due to the addition of manure on the experimental fields. Crop residue
146 management, intercropping, and crop rotation in the present study can potentially increase total N
147 in the soils, but the level of influence may depend on the age of the practice.

148 The mean C:N ratio was not significantly different among the agricultural practices and the
149 grazing land, and the C:N ratio had a very narrow range between 12.2 and 15.4 (Table 2). A SOC
150 with high C:N ratio is low in quality as compared to SOC with low C:N ratio due to the increased
151 immobilization of N by micro-organisms Handayanto *et al.*, (1997). As a general guideline,
152 when the C:N ratio is greater than 30:1, N is immobilized by soil microbes while if C:N ratio is
153 less than 20:1, there is a release of mineral N in to the soil environment. The N released in to the
154 soil under the latter condition (C:N < 20:1) is available for plant uptake (Jones, 2003). In the
155 present study, the C:N ratio was below 16.6 for all the soils in the study area which indicates that
156 there could be release of available form of N to the soil system through the mineralization
157 process of soil OM. The observed values of C:N ratios may suggest that there was no problem of
158 N immobilization which could significantly affect the availability of N for crop uptake.

159 **3.1.2 Available Phosphorus**

160 Agriculture practices and or its interaction with soil depth was not significantly different
161 ($p=0.568$) for available P (Table 1). According to Landon (1991) available soil P level of 5-15
162 mg/kg is rated as medium, and accordingly the available P of the study area was found in the
163 medium range. Ben-Moussa., *et al.*, (2010) reported that available P was similar in the soils of
164 conservation agriculture when compared to conventional agriculture practices within four years

165 of practices in Tunisia. In contrast, conservation agriculture practice the 11 years showed that
 166 available P increased when compared to conventional tillage practice Du Preez, *et al.*, (2001).
 167 Based on these findings, the present study may suggest that the available P could change after
 168 exercising conservation agriculture for greater than four years of time.

169 Table 2: Mean \pm SE of total N (%), SOC (%), C:N ratio, AP (mg/kg) and pH of soil in relation
 170 to different agricultural practices including grazing land with soil depths.

Practices	Soil depth	TN (%)	SOC (%)	C:N ratio	AP (mg/kg)	pH
MC(-R)	0-10cm	0.16 \pm (0.03) ^a	2.44 \pm (0.17) ^a	16.62 \pm (2.90) ^a	7.50 \pm (1.19) ^a	5.50 \pm (0.14) ^a
	10-30cm	0.14 \pm (0.01) ^a	2.02 \pm (0.29) ^a	14.17 \pm (1.23) ^a	6.30 \pm (0.48) ^a	5.60 \pm (0.28) ^a
	Over all mean	0.15 \pm (0.02) ^A	2.23 \pm (0.19) ^A	15.39 \pm (1.53) ^A	6.88 \pm (0.64) ^A	5.55 \pm (0.11) ^A
MCR	0-10cm	0.20 \pm (0.02) ^a	2.57 \pm (0.24) ^a	12.67 \pm (0.60) ^a	7.80 \pm (0.95) ^a	5.50 \pm (0.30) ^a
	10-30cm	0.15 \pm (0.02) ^a	2.11 \pm (0.30) ^a	14.07 \pm (0.80) ^a	7.00 \pm (0.71) ^a	5.70 \pm (0.20) ^a
	Over all mean	0.18 \pm (0.02) ^A	2.34 \pm (0.19) ^A	13.37 \pm (0.53) ^A	7.40 \pm (0.64) ^A	5.60 \pm (0.17) ^A
CRR	0-10cm	0.20 \pm (0.01) ^a	2.61 \pm (0.26) ^a	13.30 \pm (0.80) ^a	7.00 \pm (0.91) ^a	5.60 \pm (0.27) ^a
	10-30cm	0.16 \pm (0.03) ^a	2.22 \pm (0.40) ^a	14.64 \pm (0.80) ^a	8.00 \pm (0.90) ^a	5.70 \pm (0.21) ^a
	Over all mea	0.18 \pm (0.02) ^A	2.41 \pm (0.23) ^A	13.95 \pm (0.59) ^A	7.50 \pm (0.63) ^A	5.65 \pm (0.16) ^A
ICR	0-10cm	0.18 \pm (0.02) ^a	2.53 \pm (0.22) ^a	14.50 \pm (0.78) ^a	7.30 \pm (0.80) ^a	5.60 \pm (0.20) ^a
	10-30cm	0.16 \pm (0.02) ^a	2.06 \pm (0.28) ^a	13.00 \pm (0.94) ^a	6.80 \pm (0.85) ^a	5.70 \pm (0.18) ^a
	Over all mean	0.17 \pm (0.01) ^A	2.29 \pm (0.19) ^A	13.75 \pm (0.63) ^A	7.00 \pm (0.53) ^A	5.65 \pm (0.11) ^A
GL	0-10cm	0.26 \pm (0.05) ^a	2.48 \pm (0.19) ^a	10.17 \pm (1.34) ^a	8.00 \pm (0.75) ^a	5.70 \pm (0.10) ^a
	10-30cm	0.14 \pm (0.01) ^a	2.01 \pm (0.25) ^a	14.17 \pm (0.66) ^a	7.50 \pm (0.65) ^a	5.80 \pm (0.14) ^a
	Over all mean	0.20 \pm (0.02) ^A	2.24 \pm (0.09) ^A	12.17 \pm (1.03) ^A	7.87 \pm (0.48) ^A	5.75 \pm (0.04) ^A

171

172 **Means within a column for the same depth followed by the same letter are not significantly*
 173 *different from each other at p < 0.05. **Monocropping without Residues (MC(-R),*
 174 *Monocropping with Residues (MCR), Crop rotation with residues (CRR.), Intercropping with*
 175 *Residues (ICR), Grazing land (GL).*

176 4. Conclusions and Recommendations

177 In the study area the local farmers widely practiced traditional farming systems. This farming
 178 system involves intensive and continuous cultivation which highly depleted the soil –fertility,
 179 reduced the production of the land and exposed the soil for leaching and erosion. Conservation
 180 agriculture per se is considered as one of the most effective management practices to obtain

181 mutual benefits in terms of erosion control, carbon sequestration and reduced input of energy and
 182 labour. Based on this the objective of the present study focused on the impact assessment of
 183 different conservation agricultural practices on soil properties. Accordingly, the results of the
 184 present study showed that the conservation agricultural practices did not influence the soil
 185 properties like; soil pH, SOC, TN, C:N, and Av.P within four years of practice. Therefore; this
 186 finding suggests that conservation agricultural practices namely: addition of crop residue, crop
 187 rotation with crop residue, and intercropping with crop residue in Bako (study area) may require
 188 longer years of practice before their influence on different soil properties are visible. Thus,
 189 further study on CA practices in chronosequence should be considered to identify the years
 190 needed for the practices to bring impact on soil properties.

191 5. References

- 192 ~~[Abebe Yadessa, 1998. Evaluation of the Contribution of Scattered *Cordia africana* Trees to Soil](#)~~
 193 ~~[Properties in Cropland and Rangeland Ecosystems in Western Oromia, Ethiopia. M.Sc.](#)~~
 194 ~~[Thesis, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden.112p.](#)~~~~[not referenced in](#)~~
 195 ~~[paper. You should check](#)~~
- 196 Ahmed Hussein., 2002. Assessment of spatial variability of some physicochemical properties of
 197 soils under different elevations and land use systems in the western slopes of Mount
 198 Chilalo, Arsi. M.Sc. Thesis, Alemaya University, Ethiopia. 111p.
- 199 Ben-Moussa M., Ben-Hammouda, M., and Nouira, S., 2010. Comparative effects of conventional
 200 and no-tillage management on some soil properties under Mediterranean semi-arid
 201 conditions in north-western Tunisia. *Soil and Tillage Research*.106:247-253.
- 202 Biolders, C. L., Michels, K. and Bationo, A., 2002. On-farm evaluation of ridging and residue
 203 management options in a sahelian millet-cowpea intercrop. Soil quality changes. *Soil*
 204 *use and Management*, 18: 216-222.
- 205 Du Preez, C. C., Steyn, J. T., and Kotze, E., 2001. Long-term effects of wheat residue
 206 management on some fertility indicators of a semi-arid plinth sol. *Soil and Tillage*
 207 *Research*, 63: 25-33.
- 208 Enfors, E., Barron, J., Makurira, H., Rockström, J., and Tumbo, S., 2010. Yield and soil system
 209 changes from conservation tillage in dry land farming: A case study from north eastern
 210 Tanzania. *Agricultural Water Management*.
- 211 FAO (Food and Agricultural Organization).2006. Fertilizer and Plant Nutrition Bulletin.
- Foth, H.D. and B.G. Ellis., 1997. Soil fertility, 2nd Ed. Lewis CRC Press LLC., USA.

- 212 Gebeyaw Tilahun., 2007. Soil fertility status as influenced by different land uses in maybar areas
 213 of south Wello zone, north Ethiopia, M.Sc. Thesis Submitted to School of Graduate
 214 Studies, Alemaya University, Ethiopia. 86p
- 215 ~~Gicheu, P., Gachene, C., Mbuvi, J., and Mare, E., 2004. Effects of soil management practices
 216 and tillage systems on surface soil water conservation and crust formation on a sandy
 217 loam in semi arid Kenya. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 75:173-184. not referenced in
 218 paper. You should check~~
- 219 Gwenzi, W., Gotosa, J., Chakanetsa, S., and Mutema, Z., 2009. Effects of tillage systems on soil
 220 organic carbon dynamics, structural stability and crop yields in irrigated wheat (*triticum*
 221 *aestivum* L.)-cotton (*gossypium hirsutum* L.) rotation in semi-arid Zimbabwe. *Nutrient*
 222 *Cycling in Agroecosystems*, 83:211-221.
- 223 Handayanto, E., Cadish, G., and Giller, K.E., 1997. Regulating nitrogen mineralization from
 224 plant residues by manipulation of quality. In: Cadish G and Giller KE (eds) *Driven by*
 225 *Nature: Plant Litter Quality and Decomposition*.
- 226 Hobbs PR, Sayre K, Gupta R. The role of conservation agriculture in sustainable agriculture.
 227 *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc.* 2008;363:543–555.
- 228 Islam, K.R., and Weil, R.R., 2000. Soil quality indicator properties in mid-Atlantic soils as
 229 influenced by conservation management. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*
 230 55:69–78.
- 231 Jarecki MK, Lal R. Crop management for soil carbon sequestration. *Crit. Rev. Plant Sci.*
 232 2003;22:471-502.
- 233 ~~Jones, J.B., 2003. *Agronomic handbook: management of crops, soils, and their fertility*. CRC
 234 *press LLC, N.W. Corporate Blvd., Boca Ratio, Florida*.~~
- 235 Landon, J.R. (Ed.), 1991. *Booker tropical soil manual: A Handbook for Soil Survey and*
 236 *Agricultural Land Evaluation in the Tropics and Subtropics*. Longman Scientific and
 237 Technical, Essex, New York.
- 238 Legesse Dadi, Gemechu Gedeno, Tesfaye Kumsa and Getahun Degu., 1987. Bako mixed
 239 farming zone, Wellega and Shewa Regions. Diagnostic survey report No. 1. Institute of
 240 Agricultural Research, Department of Agricultural Economics and Farming Systems
 241 Research, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- 242 Malo, D.D., Schumacher, T.E., and Doolittle, J.J., 2005. Long-term cultivation impacts on
 243 selected soil properties in the northern Great Plains. *Soil and Tillage Research*.81: 277-
 244 291.
- 245 Nyamadzawo, G., Chikowo, R., Nyamugafata, P., Nyamangara, J., and Giller, K. E., 2008. Soil

or
ga
nic
ca
rb
on
dy
na
mi
cs
of
im
pr
ov
ed
fal
lo
w-
m
aiz
e
rot
ati
on
sy
ste
ms
un
de
r

- 246 conventional and no-tillage in central Zimbabwe. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*,
247 81:85-93.
- 248 ~~Osunbitan, J. A., Oyedele, D. J., and Adekalu, K. O., 2005. Tillage effects on bulk density,~~
249 ~~hydraulic conductivity and strength of a loamy sand soil in southwestern Nigeria. *Soil*~~
250 ~~*and Tillage Research*, 82:57-64.~~ not referenced in paper. You should check
- 251 Saito, K., Azoma, K., and Oikeh, S. O., 2010. Combined effects of stylosanthes guianensis
252 fallow and tillage management on upland rice yield, weeds and soils in southern Benin.
253 *Soil and Tillage Research*, 107: 57-63.
- 254 Teklu Erkossa., 2011. Tillage effects on physical qualities of vertisol in the central highlands of
255 Ethiopia. *African Journal of Environmental Science and Technology* 5:008-1016.
- 256 Wakene Negassa, and Heluf Gebrekidan, 2003. Influence of land management on
257 morphological, physical-chemical properties of some soils of Bako, Western Ethiopia.
258 *Agropedology* 13:1-9.
- 259 West TO, Post WM. Soil organic carbon sequestration rates by tillage and crop rotation: A
260 global data analysis. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 2002;66:1930-1946.