

**THE EFFECTS OF IMPROVED FALLOWS AND TILLAGE MANAGEMENT ON SOIL
AND WATER CONSERVATION IN A SANDY SOIL**

BY

GEORGE NYAMADZAWO

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Philosophy**

**Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Engineering
Faculty of Agriculture
University of Zimbabwe
July 2004**

ABSTRACT

Research on improved fallows has concentrated on soil fertility benefits neglecting possible benefits to soil and water conservation. The objective of this study was to determine changes in infiltration rates, water and nutrient losses, hydraulic conductivity, soil porosity, water retention, aggregate stability and maize yields during the cropping phase in a maize-fallow rotation, under conventional tillage (CT) and no tillage (NT). The study was carried out on plots where a 2-year planted fallow-maize rotation was practiced since 1992/93 cropping season. Soil and water conservation were investigated using simulated rainfall at an intensity of 35 mm h^{-1} , infiltration rates were measured using double rings and hydraulic conductivity and porosity were measured using a tension infiltrometer. Soil samples for the measurement of soil water retention and aggregate stability were collected and measurements were done in the laboratory. Treatments evaluated were planted fallows of *Acacia angustissima* (*A. angustissima*) and *Sesbania sesban* (*S. sesban*), natural fallow (NF) and continuous maize (*Zea Maize*).

Improved fallows resulted in significantly higher ($P < 0.05$) infiltration rates. Steady state infiltration rates were not achieved in *A. angustissima* and NF but reached 24 mm h^{-1} and 5 mm h^{-1} in *S. sesban* and continuous maize at fallow termination (October 2000). At the beginning of the second season (October 2001), steady state infiltration rates were could not obtained again for both *A. angustissima* and NF under CT and NT as infiltration rates were $> 35 \text{ mm h}^{-1}$. Two years after fallow termination (October 2002) steady state infiltration rates averaged 21, 14 and 5 mm h^{-1} , for NF, *S. sesban* and continuous maize. Runoff losses from the same simulation measurements were significantly lower ($P < 0.05$) in fallows than in continuous maize. These losses were 44% in continuous maize compared to 22% in *S. sesban* and none in *A. angustissima* and NF plots after 30 minutes at fallow termination (October 2000). After one year, the average runoff loss across conventionally and NT plots increased to 57% for continuous maize, 30% for *S. sesban* and no losses for *A. angustissima* and NF. In October 2002, runoff losses were 63%, 61% and 45% for continuous maize, *S. sesban* and NF. In *A. angustissima* there were no runoff losses throughout the of study.

Aggregate stability using the water stable aggregation method, the macroaggregation index (Ima) was 550, 480, 450 and 300 for NF, *A. angustissima*, *S. sesban* and continuous maize respectively. In October 2002 Ima in CT plots had decreased to 270, 390 and 260 in for NF, *A. angustissima* and *S. sesban* respectively. Ima in NT plots also decreased to 290, 450 and 270 for NF, *A. angustissima* and *S. sesban* respectively. There were no changes in Ima in continuous maize for either tillage systems. Cumulative kinetic energy required to rupture aggregates also declined from 859, 568 and 395 joules g^{-1} of aggregate at fallow termination (October 2000) to 231, 395 and 236 for NF, *A. angustissima* and *S. sesban* respectively for CT plots and 372, 491 and 268 joules g^{-1} of aggregate for NT plots two years after fallow termination. There were no changes in the amount of energy required to break aggregates in continuous maize, ranging from 80-100 joules g^{-1} of aggregate over the two-year period. Using the different assessment methods, aggregate stability was significantly higher ($P < 0.05$) in fallows relative to continuous maize. No till resulted in significantly ($P < 0.05$) more stable aggregates than CT.

Improved fallowing also resulted in significantly higher ($P < 0.05$) soil water retention, hydraulic conductivity and an increase in the proportion of larger pore sizes one year after fallow termination. Hydraulic conductivity at 5 cm tension was between 0.7 and 0.9 cm h^{-1} , in improved fallows relative to 0.5 cm h^{-1} in continuous maize. Pores were significantly higher ($P < 0.05$) in fallows. At 5cm tension the number of pores m^{-2} varied from 285-443, whilst in continuous maize they were less than 256 pores m^{-2} . At 10cm tension the number of pores m^{-2} varied from 4500-8900 in fallows relative to 3900 pores m^{-2} in continuous maize. There were no significant tillage effects ($P < 0.05$) on water retention, hydraulic conductivity and porosity.

Maize yields were significantly higher ($P < 0.05$) in improved fallows than in continuous maize and NF for both 2001 and 2002. In 2001 maize yields were 1.8, 1.2, 0.7 and 0.5 t ha⁻¹ for *A. angustissima*, continuous maize, *S. sesban* and NF respectively under CT. Under NT yields were 1.3, 0.8, 0.7 and 0.2 t ha⁻¹ for *A. angustissima*, continuous maize, *S. sesban* and NF respectively. In 2002 yields under CT were 1.7, 1.3, 1.2 and 0.5 t ha⁻¹ for *S. sesban*, continuous maize, and NF and *A. angustissima* respectively. Corresponding yields under NT were 1.5, 0.6, 0.3 and 0.25 for *S. sesban*, continuous maize, NF and *A. angustissima* respectively. Generally CT out yielded NT ($P < 0.05$) during both cropping seasons irrespective of fallow treatment.

These results showed that fallowing resulted in reduced water and soil losses during the cropping phase compared to continuous maize cropping. Reduced water and soil losses were a result of increased infiltration rates and aggregate stability during fallowing. However these benefits decreased with the introduction of tillage as shown by the decline in infiltration rates and aggregation from fallow termination (October 2000) to October 2002. Therefore fallowing can improve soil and water conservation relative to continuous maize cropping. Among the fallows, *A. angustissima* and NF had the least soil and water losses, compared to *S. sesban*. However improved fallows proved superior to NF in maize yields because they fixed nitrogen, which is used during crop growth. The benefits of improved soil physical properties accrued during fallowing did not translate to improved yields in NF because the chemical fertility was more limiting than soil physical properties. This study demonstrated that fallowing improved soil and water conservation thereby emphasising the need for inclusion of improved fallows by farmers in their crop rotations.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACRONYM	MEANING
<i>S. sesban</i>	<i>Sesbania sesban</i>
<i>A. angustissima</i>	<i>Acacia angustissima</i>
NF	natural fallow
CT	conventional tillage
NT	no tillage
C	carbon
OC	organic carbon
SOC	soil organic carbon
SOM	soil organic matter
OM	organic matter
N	Nitrogen
P	Phosphorous
t	Tonnes
ha	hactares

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere gratitude goes to Mr Philip Nyamugafata for supervising and guiding me throughout my research. Special thanks also goes to Professor Ken Giller, my co-supervisor and to Dr Regis Chikowo and Tumira Musakatiza for their support especially during fieldwork. My special thanks also goes to my wife Rumbidzai and daughter, Nyasha for their support during the period of this research work.

I would also like to thank the ICRAF Zimbabwe Team for facilitating my work at Domboshawa and for allowing me to use their site for this research. I am grateful for the funds received from the European Union, improved fallows Project No. ICA4-CT2000-30011, which I used in carrying out this work

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
1.0. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Justification and problem statement	2
1.2. Hypothesis	2
1.3. Objectives	2
2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1. Use of fallows in agriculture	3
2.2. Soil fertility benefits of fallowing	3
2.3. Soil and water conservation	5
2.4. Organic matter additions from fallows	6
2.5. Improved fallows and soil physical properties	7
2.6. Infiltration rates and soil porosity in improved fallow systems	9
2.7. Tillage and soil and water conservation	11
2.7.1 Soil and water losses in Zimbabwe	11
2.7.2. Effects of tillage systems on soil physical Properties and water losses	13
2.7.3. Effects of tillage on maize yield	15
2.8. Summary of literature review	16

3. 0. GENERAL MATERIALS AND METHODS	17
3.1. Site description-Domboshawa	17
3.2. Plot management	19
3.3. Measurements	19
4.0. PARTIONING OF SIMULATED RAINFALL AND NUTRIENT LOSSES IN A SANDY SOIL UNDER IMPROVED FALLOW-MAIZE ROTATION	
22	
4.1. Abstract	22
4.2. Introduction	23
4.3. Materials and methods	24
4.4. RESULTS	27
4.4.1. Infiltration rates	31
4.4.2. Runoff and sediment losses	35
4.4.3. Nutrient losses	37
4.5. Discussions	38
4.6. Conclusions	42
5. RESIDUAL EFFECTS OF FALLOWS ON SOIL POROSITY, HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY AND SOIL WATER RETENTION IN A SANDY SOIL.	43
5.1. Abstract	43
5.2. Introduction	44
5.3. Materials and methods	45
5.4. RESULTS	50
5.5. Discussion	57
5.6. Conclusion	60

6.0. DYNAMICS OF AGGREGATE STABILITY AND ITS RELATIONSHIPS TO INFILTRATION RATES OF A SANDY SOIL UNDER MAIZE-IMPROVED FALLOW ROTATION	61
6.1. Abstract	61
6.2. Introduction	62
6.3. Materials and methods	63
6.4. RESULTS	66
6.5. Discussion	73
6.6. Conclusion	77
7.0 MAIZE YIELDS UNDER CONVENTIONAL AND NO TILLAGE UNDER A MAIZE- IMPROVED FALLOW ROTATION.	78
7.1. Abstract	78
7.2. Introduction	79
7.3. Materials and methods	80
7.4. RESULTS	80
7.5. Discussion	87
7.5. Conclusion	90
8.0. GENERAL DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	91
8.1. General discussion and conclusions	91
8.2. Recommendation	95
8.3. Areas of Further research	96
9.0 REFERENCES	97
10. APPENDICES	112

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1. Selected properties of the soils from Domboshawa study site.....	17
Table 4.1. A summary of steady state infiltration rates and infiltration rates decay coefficients plots under improved fallows, natural fallow and continuous maize during dry runs at Domboshawa, Zimbabwe.....	34
Table 4. 1. Runoff and soil losses from plots under improved fallows, natural fallow and continuous maize due to 30 minutes of simulated rainfall at Domboshawa, October, 2000-02.....	35
Table 4.3. A table showing the relationships between SOC, soil loss and runoff losses and shear strength, infiltration rate decay coefficient and steady state infiltration rates.....	36
Table 4. 4. Nutrient concentrations and carbon enrichment ratios in the sediments collected from planted and natural fallows and continuous maize treatments in October 2000–02 at Domboshawa.....	38
Table 5.1. Steady state infiltration rates using the Kostiakov model.....	51
Table 5.2. Macroporosity parameters estimated from ponded, tension and Poiseuille’s equation.....	51
Table 5.3. Hydraulic conductivity and mean pore sizes.....	52
Table 5.4. Differences in volumetric water content between 5 and 33 kPa. Values are averages for October 2000 and October 2002.....	56

Table 6.1. Relationship (R^2) between different methods of assessing aggregate stability and OC, infiltration rate decay coefficient and steady state infiltration rates..73

Table 7.1. Root length density (cm cm^{-3}) of maize measured at different soil depths and two distances from maize plant at different weeks after crop emergence...86

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1. Rainfall distribution at Domboshawa, 2000- 2001 and 2001 – 2002 seasons.....	17
Figure 3. 2. Experimental layout of the fallow trial at Domboshawa Training Centre.....	18
Figure 3.3. A photo showing the rainfall simulator during measurements at Domboshawa.	19
Figure 3.4. A photo showing the simulator nozzle, which discharges water.....	20
Figure 3.5. Photo showing the microplots (1m ²), from where runoff was collected.....	20
Figure 3.6. A photo showing runoff that is flowing from the plots.....	20
Figure4.1(a). Time to ponding at Domboshawa, October 2000.....	27
(b). Time to ponding at Domboshawa, October 2001.....	28
(c). Time to ponding at Domboshawa, October 2002.....	28
Figure4. 2(a). Time to runoff Domboshawa, October 2000.....	30
(b). Time to runoff at Domboshawa, October 2001.....	30
(c). Time to runoff at Domboshawa, October 2002.....	31
Figure 4.3 (a). Infiltration rates in the plots under <i>Sesbania sesban</i> fallow and continuous maize in October 2000 and 2001.....	32
(b) Infiltration rates in plots under NF and continuous maize subjected CT	

and NT during wet runs (12% moisture content) in October 2001	32
Figure 4.4(a). Infiltration rates <i>S. sesban</i> October 2002.....	33
(b) Infiltration rates in continuous maize October 2002.....	33
(c) Infiltration rates in NF October 2002.....	33
(d) Changes in infiltration rates in <i>S. sesban</i> from 2000 to 2001	33
Figure 4.5. Sediment load in continuous maize and <i>Sesbania sesban</i> treatments for October 2000 and October 2001 rainfall simulations.....	37
Figure 5.1. Double ring infiltration rates in (a) <i>A. angustissima</i> and (b) continuous maize.....	50
Figure 5.2(a). Soil water retention at different depths in October 2000.....	54
(b). Soil water retention at different depths in October 2002... ..	55
Figure 6.1(a). Macroaggrgation index, October 2000.....	68
(b) Macroaggrgation index, October 2001..... ..	68
(c) Macroaggrgation index, October 2002..... ..	68
Figure 6.2(a). Energy to break aggregates, October 2000.....	68
(b) Energy to break aggregates, October 2001.. ..	68
(c) Energy to break aggregates, October 2002.....	68
Figure 6.3(a) Fast wetting October 2000.....	69
(b) Fast wetting October 2001.....	69
(b) Fast wetting October 2002.....	69

Figure 6.4(a) Mechanical agitation test, October 2000.....	69
(b) Mechanical agitation test, October 2001.....	69
(c) Mechanical agitation test, October 2002.....	69
Figure 6.5(a) slow wetting, October 2000.....	70
(b) Slow wetting, October 2001.....	70
(b) Slow wetting, October 2002.....	70
Figure 6.6(a) Easily Dispersible Clay, October 2000.....	70
(b) Easily Dispersible Clay, October 2001.....	70
(c) Easily Dispersible Clay, October 2002.....	70
Figure 6.7. Regression values for cumulative I_{ma} v steady state infiltration rates, soil organic carbon and infiltration rate decay coefficients.....	72
Figure 7.1(a) Maize grain yields in 2000-2001 season.....	81
(b) Stover yield in 2000-2001 season.....	81
Figure 7.2(a) Maize grain yield in 2001-2002 season.....	82
(b) Stover yield in 2001-2002 season.....	82
Figure 7.4. Soil moisture during the 2000-2001 cropping season.....	84
Figure 7.5. Soil moisture during the 2001-2002 cropping season.....	85