

Soil Chemical property variation under different conservation agriculture practices, in Bako Tibe District, West Shoa, Ethiopia

ABSTRACT

Conservation agriculture is claimed to be one of the solutions for the problems of poor agricultural productivity in sub-saharan countries. The impact of conservation agriculture depends on environmental factors such as slope, vegetation, soil type, rain fall pattern and intended crops. This study was conducted from 2013 to 2014 with the objective of assessing the impact of different conservation agriculture practices on soil chemical properties. Five treatments were selected for the study namely: Monocropping (maize) without crop residue, Monocropping (maize) with crop residue, Crop rotation (maize and haricot bean) with crop residue, Intercropping (Haricot bean with maize) with crop residue and a grazing land (Original land use). A randomized complete block design with four replications was used. A total of 40 composite soil samples (4 replication * 5 treatments * 2 soil depth: 0– 10 cm and 10–30 cm) were collected and analyzed for selected soil properties. Results showed that soils in the study area were moderately acidic, and contained medium level of available phosphorus (AP) (7.33 ± 0.58 mg/kg), but low concentration of total N ($0.176 \pm 0.02\%$). Soil pH, soil organic carbon (SOC), total nitrogen (TN), C/N, and AP did not significantly differ ($p=0.958$, $p=0.998$, $p=0.219$, $p=0.140$ and 0.568) respectively, among the treatments after four years of conservation agricultural practices. Therefore, conservation agriculture has little effect on soil properties in short term, but it may take longer time to influence on different soil chemical properties in the study area.

Keywords: Composite; Conservation agriculture; Crop residue; Intercropping; monocropping

27 **1. INTRODUCTION**

28 Soil is a base of nourishing life on earth and sustains the maintenance of all terrestrial ecosystems [1].
29 Reducing soil resource degradation, increasing agricultural productivity, reducing poverty, and
30 achieving food security are major challenges of the countries in tropical Africa. The causes of soil
31 degradation in Ethiopia are cultivation on steep and fragile soils, erratic and erosive rainfall patterns,
32 declining use of fallow, and limited recycling of dung and crop residues to the soil, limited application
33 of external sources of plant nutrients, overgrazing and deforestation [2, 3]. Management practices in
34 the areas of intensive agriculture may affect soil properties as they vary according to soil formation
35 factors such as parent material, topography and climate [4].

36 Continuous utilization of inadequate methods of soil management, including the removal of crop
37 residues and burning, intensive tillage, and monocropping farming practices that expose the soil to
38 leaching and erosion leads to decline of soil fertility. Compared to tillage based agriculture,
39 conservation agriculture (CA) has the potential to decrease soil loss, enhance levels of soil organic
40 matter, increase plant available soil water, and save costs due to fewer or no tillage operations [5].
41 Current uses of different conventional agricultural practices are the major threat to land productivity
42 and soil fertility decline, but few studies identify the limitation of conventional agricultural practices.


43 One of the main challenges in Western Oromia generally and particularly to Bako district, where maize
44 is the main staple and major producing crop, is continuous monocropping with residue removal through
45 burning and use for other purposes [6]. Bako agricultural center has been undertaking a controlled
46 study on different conservation agricultural practices on farmers land. Taking this opportunity, the
47 objective of the research was to assess the impact of different conservation agricultural practices
48 namely: Monocropping with Residues (MCR), Crop rotation with residues (CRR.), and Intercropping
49 with Residues (ICR) on different soil chemical properties.

50 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

51 **2.1 Description of the Study Area**

52 The study was conducted in Bako district, western Oromia. Bako is located at 9° 08' N latitude and 37°
53 03' E longitude; about 251 km from Addis Ababa. The altitude where the soil samples were collected was
54 between 1670 and 1690 meter above sea level. The long term weather information revealed that the area
55 has unimodal rainfall pattern extending from March to October, but the effective rain is from May to

56 September [7]. The mean annual rainfall is about 1237 mm, with a peak in July. It has a warm humid
57 climate with annual mean minimum and maximum temperature of 14 °C and 29 °C, respectively and the
58 mean annual temperature is 20 °C. Soils at the study site are dominantly Nitosols with reddish brown
59 colour. They are generally clay dominated with a pH between 5- 6 in surface soils [7].



60
61 Figure 1: Map of the Study area – Bako district.

62 2.2 Experimental Treatments and Design

63 **Treatments:** Two factors were considered for this study: agricultural practices and soil depths.

64 Factor A: Five treatments

65 Monocropping without crop residue (MC(-R))

66 Monocropping with crop residue, (MCR)

67 Crop rotation with residue, (CRR)

68 Inter cropping with residue (ICR)

69 Grazing land (GL) (Original land use) - selected as a (control)

70 Factor B: Two level of soil depth

71 0 -10 cm representing the top soil, and

72 10 -30 cm representing the subsoil

73 Among the five treatments mentioned above (Monocropping with crop residue, (MCR), Crop rotation
74 with residue, (CRR) and Inter cropping with residue (ICR) were represent conservation, whereas,
75 Monocropping without crop residue (MC(-R)) used as a conventional agricultural practice. The
76 agricultural lands were contiguous and have similar in practice year and environmental conditions (e.g
77 in soil condition and slope) except the difference in management practices and the GL from nearby
78 farmers land. The soil under GL was used as a check point to assess extent of changes through time
79 in soil properties.

80 **Design:** A 2x5 factorial arrangement of treatments in randomized complete block design (RCBD)
81 replicated four times, was used. Based on the design 40 samples were collected from all the
82 treatments.

83 **2.3 Soil Sample Collection**

84 Each treatment was replicated 6 times among those replication we select 4 plots randomly from each
85 treatment for sampling. 10m x 10m plot size was arranged in all treatments using randomized
86 complete block design (RCBD). To minimize the border effect soil samples were collected from 8m x
87 8m plot size since the main plots size was 10m x 10m and having a minimum distance of 1m between
88 each main plot. In each plot the soil samples were collected from two soil depths (0-10cm and 10-
89 30cm) at the corners and centre of the plots. Then the samples from each plot were bulked to have a
90 composite sample at 0-10 and 10-30 cm layers, and a total of 40 composite soil samples were
91 collected from the study area.

92 **2.4 Soil Analysis**

93 The soil samples were first air-dried at room temperature crushed and mixed with mortar and sieved
94 using 2mm mesh size. Samples were then analyzed for soil chemical properties at Bako Agriculture
95 Research Center soil laboratory. The pH of the soils was measured in water and potassium chloride
96 (1M KCl) suspension in a 1:2.5 (soil: liquid ratio) potentiometrically using a lass-calomel combination
97 electrode [8]. According to Walkley and Black [9] wet digestion method was used to determine soil
98 carbon content. Total N was analyzed using the Kjeldahl digestion, distillation and titration method as
99 described by Black [10] by oxidizing the OM in concentrated sulfuric acid solution (0.1N H₂SO₄).
100 Available phosphorous (AP) was determined according to the standard procedure of Bray II method
101 [11].

102 2.5 Data Analysis

103 The soil chemical properties were subjected to analysis of variance using the general linear model (GLM)
104 procedure of statistical analysis system (SAS) statistical software version 9.0.2004. The Analysis of
105 variance (ANOVA) was employed to test the variations among the treatments. The least significance
106 difference (LSD) was used to find difference $P < 0.05$ among treatment means.

107 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

108 3.1 Soil Chemical Properties

109 3.1.1 SOC, SOIL PH, TN AND C/N RATIO

110 The interaction among the agricultural practices including the grazing land with soil depth was not
111 statistically significant for soil pH, SOC, TN, C/N ratio and AP ($p=0.958$, $p=0.998$, $p=0.219$, $p=0.140$ and
112 0.568 respectively). Although SOC, TN and AP under selective agriculture practices was not statistically
113 significant ($p=0.936$, $p=0.330$, and $p=0.827$ respectively). Regarding to soil depth, soil pH and C/N ratio
114 were not significantly ($p=0.589$ and $p=0.460$ respectively) different at a given soil depths (Table 1).

115 Table 1: Summary of ANOVA for pH, SOC (%), N (%), AP (mg/kg), and C/N ratio under different
116 agricultural practices and soil depths.

Source of variation	Df	pH		SOC (%)		TN (%)		C/N ratio		AP (mg/kg)	
		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	

117
118 As displayed in Table 1 the soil pH under different agricultural practices was not statistically different
119 which meant agricultural practices had no effect on soil pH within short period of time. On the other
120 hand, slight increase was observed on the mean value of soil pH as indicated in Table 2 under all
121 agricultural practices with soil depth. The soil pH values observed in the study area were within the
122 range of moderate acidic soil as indicated by Foth and Ellis [12]. Numerous scholars [13, 14, 15, 16]
123 reported that soil pH was lower in cultivated land than grazing land, this might be due to the depletion
124 of organic matter because of intensive cultivation and also due to the highest microbial oxidation that
125 produces organic acids, which provide H ions to the soil solution. Similar to these studies, the mean

126 value of soil pH was relatively lower under agricultural practices than grazing land but no statistical
127 difference was observed among all agricultural practices, and grazing land. According to Du Preez, et
128 al [17] soil pH was significantly higher under conservation agriculture than conventional agriculture
129 practices after 11 years of practices. Based on this finding, the absence of differences in pH under all
130 the agricultural practices could be attributed to the age of conservation agriculture practices which
131 were only four years old.

132 Soil Organic Carbon (SOC) concentration was not significantly different among the agricultural practices
133 and the grazing land, while the overall mean of SOC concentration was in the range between 2.23 to
134 2.41% (Table 2). Consistent with the present study, SOC was not affected by conservation agriculture
135 within four year of practice when compared to conventional agriculture [18, 19]. In contrast Nyamadzawo
136 et al [20] and Gwenzi et al [21] reported that SOC was higher under conservation agriculture after five and
137 ten years of practice, respectively. They attributed the low SOC content in continuous cultivated soils of
138 conventional agriculture to reduced inputs of organic matter obtained from crop residues and frequent
139 tillage which encouraged oxidation of organic matter. So, according to Nyamadzawo et al [20] and Gwenzi
140 et al [21] the SOC might change after practicing conservation agricultural for greater than four years.

141 The mean value of total N content varied from 0.15 to 0.20% under agricultural practices and the grazing
142 land. After practicing conservation agriculture for four consecutive years, total N did not differ significantly
143 when compared to conventional agriculture (Table 2).

144 Following the rating of total N of > 1% as very high, 0.5 to 1% high, 0.2 to 0.5% medium, 0.1 to 0.2% low
145 and < 0.1% as very low N status as indicated by Landon [22] in the current all the agricultural practices
146 and the grazing land have low content of total N. The low level of nitrogen in the practices may imply that
147 fertilizer additions have not replaced the total N lost due to harvest removal, and /or leaching [23]. In
148 agreement with the present study Saito et al [24] reported that there was no significant difference in total
149 N under conservation agriculture practices after practicing for four years in Benin. Whereas, Ben-Moussa
150 et al [19] and Enfors et al [25] reported that total N was significantly higher under four years' conservation
151 agriculture practices than conventional due to the addition of manure on the experimental fields. Crop
152 residue management, intercropping, and crop rotation in the present study can potentially increase total N
153 in the soils, but the level of influence might depend on the age of the practice. In this study the values of
154 C/N ratio was not significantly different among the agricultural practices and the grazing land.
155 Furthermore, the C/N ratio had a very narrow range between 12.2 and 15.4 as indicated in Table 2.

156 Hence, the C/N ratio was below 16.6 for all the soils in the study area which indicates that there could be
 157 release of available form of N to the soil system through the mineralization process of soil OM. The
 158 observed values of C/N ratios may suggest that there was no problem of N immobilization which could
 159 significantly affect the availability of N for crop uptake.

160 3.1.2 Available Phosphorus

161 The interaction of agriculture practices with soil depth was not significantly different ($p=0.568$) for available
 162 P (Table 1). According to Landon [22] available soil P level of 5-15 mg/kg is rated as medium, and
 163 accordingly the available P of the study area was found in the medium range. Ben-Moussa et al [19]
 164 reported that available P was similar in the soils of conservation agriculture when compared to
 165 conventional agriculture practices within four years of practices in Tunisia. In contrast, conservation
 166 agriculture practice for 11 years showed that available P increased when compared to conventional tillage
 167 practice [17]. Based on these findings, the present study may suggest that the available P could change
 168 after 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 to
 170 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 mean	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 different
173 from each other at $p < 0.05$. **Monocropping without Residues (MC(-R)), Monocropping with Residues
174 (MCR), Crop rotation with residues (CRR.), Intercropping with Residues (ICR), Grazing land (GL).

175 **4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

176 The results of this study showed that the conservation agricultural practices did not influence the soil
177 chemical properties like; soil pH, SOC, TN, C/N, and AP within consecutive four years of practice. Hence,
178 conservation agriculture becomes more pertinent, because of the need to maintain and restore soil
179 productivity through retained crop residues. Despite that it is also necessary to understand the dynamics
180 of soil properties and associated with conservation agriculture practices. Therefore, this finding suggests
181 that conservation agricultural practices namely: crop residue retention, crop rotation with crop residue,
182 and intercropping with crop residue in Bako (study area) may require longer years of practice before their
183 influence on different soil chemical properties are visible. Thus, further study on conservation agriculture
184 practices in chronosequence should be considered to identify the years needed for the practices to bring
185 impact on soil chemical properties.

186 **5. REFERENCES**

- 187 1. Belay S. 2003. Integrated watershed management approach to sustainable land management
188 (Experience of SARDP in East Gojjam and South Wollo). PP.127-136.
- 189 2. Hurni H. 1988. Degradation and conservation of the resources in the Ethiopian highlands. *Mountain*
190 *Research and Development*. 8: 123-130.
- 191 3. Jones J. 2003. Agronomic handbook: management of crops, soils, and their fertility. CRC press LLC,
192 N.W. Corporate Blvd., Boca Ratio, Florida.
- 193 4. Celik I. Barut Z. Ortas I. Gok M. Demirbas A. Tulun, Y. Akpinar C. 2011. Impacts of different tillage
194 practices on some soil microbiological properties and crop yield under semi-arid Mediterranean
195 conditions. *International Journal of Plant Production* 5:237-254.
- 196 5. Teklu E. 2011. Tillage effects on physical qualities of vertisol in the central highlands of Ethiopia.
197 *African Journal of Environmental Science and Technology* 5:008-1016.
- 198 6. Wakene N. 2001. Assessment of important physicochemical properties of Nitisols under different
199 management systems in Bako Area, western Ethiopia. A Thesis submitted to School of Graduate
200 Studies, Alemaya University, Ethiopia. 93p.
- 201 7. Legesse D. Gemechu G. Tesfaye K. and Getahun D. 1987. Bako mixed farming zone, Wellega and
202 Shewa Regions. Diagnostic survey report No. 1. Institute of Agricultural Research, Department of
203 Agricultural Economics and Farming Systems Research, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- 204 8. Van Reeuwijk L.1992. Procedures for soil analysis, 3rd Ed. International Soil Reference and
205 Information Center (ISRIC), Wageningen, the Netherlands. 34p.
- 206 9. Walkley A. and I.A. Black. 1934. An examination of the Degtjareff method for determining soil
207 organic matter and a proposed modification of the chromic acid titration method. *Soil Sci.* 37: 29-
208 38.

- 209 10. Black C.1965. Methods of soil analysis. Part I, American Society of Agronomy. Madison,
210 Wisconsin, USA. 1572p.
- 211 11. Bray K. and L.T Kurtz. 1965. Determination of total organic and available forms of phosphorus in
212 soils. *Soil Sci.* 59: 39-45.
- 213 12. Foth HD. and BG Ellis. 1997. Soil fertility, 2nd Ed. Lewis CRC Press LLC., USA.
- 214 13. Abebe Y. 1998. Evaluation of the Contribution of Scattered *Cordia africana* Trees to Soil Properties in
215 Cropland and Rangeland Ecosystems in Western Oromia, Ethiopia. M.Sc. Thesis, Swedish
216 University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden.112p.
- 217 14. Islam K. & Weil R. 2000. Soil quality indicator properties in mid-Atlantic soils as influenced by
218 conservation management. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 55:69–78.
- 219 15. Wakene N. and Heluf G. 2003. Influence of land management on morphological, physical-chemical
220 properties of some soils of Bako, Western Ethiopia. *Agropedology* 13:1-9.
- 221 16. Gebeyaw T. 2007. Soil fertility status as influenced by different land uses in maybar areas of south
222 Wello zone, north Ethiopia, M.Sc. Thesis Submitted to School of Graduate Studies, Alemaya
223 University, Ethiopia. 86p
- 224 17. Du Preez CC, Steyn JT. and Kotze E. 2001. Long-term effects of wheat residue management on
225 some fertility indicators of a semi-arid plinth sol. *Soil and Tillage Research.* 63: 25-33.
- 226 18. Biolders C. Michels K. and Bationo A. 2002. On-farm evaluation of ridging and residue management
227 options in a sahelian millet-cowpea intercrop. Soil quality changes. *Soil use and Management*, 18:
228 216-222.
- 229 19. Ben-Moussa M. Ben-Hammouda M. and Noura S. 2010. Comparative effects of conventional and no-
230 tillage management on some soil properties under Mediterranean semi-arid conditions in north-
231 western Tunisia. *Soil and Tillage Research.*106:247-253.
- 232 20. Nyamadzawo G. Chikowo R. Nyamugafata P. Nyamangara J.and Giller K. 2008. Soil organic carbon
233 dynamics of improved fallow-maize rotation systems under conventional and no-tillage in central
234 Zimbabwe. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, 81:85-93.
- 235 21. Gwenzi W. Gotosa J. Chakanetsa S. and Mutema Z. 2009. Effects of tillage systems on soil organic
236 carbon dynamics, structural stability and crop yields in irrigated wheat (*triticum aestivum* L.)-cotton
237 (*gossypium hirsutum* L.) rotation in semi-arid Zimbabwe. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*,
238 83:211-221.
- 239 22. Landon J. 1991. Booker tropical soil manual: A Handbook for Soil Survey and Agricultural Land
240 Evaluation in the Tropics and Subtropics. Longman Scientific and Technical, Essex, New York.
- 241 23. Malo D. Schumacher T. and Doolittle J. 2005. Long-term cultivation impacts on selected soil
242 properties in the northern Great Plains. *Soil and Tillage Research.*81: 277-291.
- 243 24. Saito K. Azoma K. and Oikeh S. 2010. Combined effects of *stylosanthes guianensis* fallow and
244 tillage management on upland rice yield, weeds and soils in southern Benin. *Soil and Tillage*
245 *Research*, 107: 57-63.
- 246 25. Enfors E. Barron J. Makurira H. Rockström J. and Tumbo S. 2010. Yield and soil system changes
247 from conservation tillage in dry land farming: A case study from north eastern Tanzania. *Agricultural*
248 *Water Management* 22: 156-165.