

ABSTRACT

Cattle manure available to farmers is of low value as a fertilizer N and generally contains less than 1% N, which cannot sustain N requirements for high yielding crops like maize. The purpose of the study was to develop methodologies and practical interventions for improving quality and efficient utilisation of cattle manure. The study evaluated the effect of pit storage of manure (anaerobic decomposition), conventional heaping storage method (aerobic composting), crop residue incorporation and duration of storage on NH_3 volatilisation and quality of the manure. Mineralisation-immobilisation studies were carried out to determine nutrient release patterns from the resultant manures. Maize crop responses to N availability from the manures were investigated.

Maize straw mixed at a rate of 4.8kg straw to one tonne manure was the most effective in reducing N losses up to 88% in cattle kraals. Higher losses of up to 40 ugN g^{-1} manure were measured under aerobic manure composts compared to only 8 ugN g^{-1} under anaerobic storage. Low pH values below 7 and high moisture content explained for negligible N losses under anaerobic storage conditions. Most of the N in anaerobic manures was in the form of $\text{NH}_4\text{-N}$ while there was $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ accumulation in aerobic manures.

The dynamics of N mineralisation were described by first order kinetics with high rate constants of up to 0.068 day^{-1} for anaerobic manures. The course of N turnover for anaerobic manures suggested two phases, an initial exponential immobilisation phase lasting between 4 and 6 weeks followed by a mineralisation phase. The decomposition of aerobic manures in soil followed a slow linear immobilisation pattern with rate constants of up to 0.038 day^{-1} . Less than 28 kg ha^{-1} of N were taken up by the crop from aerobic manures compared with 35 kg in the control, resulting in depressed grain yields in the year of application. Increased N availability from aerobic manures leading to high N recoveries and grain yields were observed in subsequent seasons. Synchrony between N release and plant uptake was best achieved in treatments receiving anaerobic manures composted without straw for 3 months. Subsequently, higher grain yields were measured in treatments with anaerobic manures in the year of application. Overall, the cumulative yields were greatest with anaerobic manures. Losses from broadcast applications were 25 kg N t^{-1} and 19.3 kg N t^{-1} manure for anaerobic and aerobic manures respectively. Banding placement method reduced volatile N losses by 80% and grain yields were subsequently increased by 32% over conventional broadcasting.

It was concluded that the addition of straw with manure during handling and anaerobic storage for 3 months, enhances quality. By improving N concentration of manure by 0.1% N, anaerobic storage may provide an equivalent of 30kg of AN (ammonium nitrate), which reduces fertiliser costs required to offset the N deficit in aerobic manures. Placement of manure in bands improves efficient utilisation of the manure. Whilst aerobic manures may not improve crop yields in the year of application, regular application of the manure could improve soil quality in the long term, through soil organic matter build up which enhances soil physical properties, buffering capacity and microbial activities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work reported in this thesis was part of the Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility (TSBF)-Zimbabwe project on ‘organic matter management in smallholder sectors of Zimbabwe’. I would like to thank TSBF for providing financial support all the way. I also thank the Environmental Capacity Enhancement Program (ECEP) for providing initial funds towards the development of a research agenda. I would like to thank the Department of Research and Extension for allowing me time to pursue these studies. There are people who have made this DPhil. study possible. Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisors Dr. H.K. Murwira (TSBF-Zimbabwe) and Professor S. Mpeperekwi (Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Engineering-University of Zimbabwe (UZ) for their support, encouragement, valuable scientific advice and guidance throughout the experimental work and completion of the thesis. I am indebted to Dr. L.M. Mugwira for constructive scientific advice. I also thank Dr. C. Palm and Professor Ken Giller for their helpful initial comments. I thank Shamie Zingore for support in setting laboratory incubations and for assisting with curve fittings. The statistical advice by Mrs. Zinyandu (Biometrics- Department of Research and Specialist Services (DR &SS), and fellow research students, Regis Chikowo (Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Engineering-UZ) and Killian Mutiro (TSBF) was greatly appreciated. I am grateful to T. Mubhonderi, G Phiri, J. Gotosa and S. Chikwari for fruitful co-operation. Thanks also due to B. Mawoyo, D. Chako, S. Chipungare and B. Nzombe (Chemistry and Soil Research Institute) for analytical support. And last but not least, I thank Francis Dzvene (TSBF- research assistant) for support in on-farm trials.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	vii
CHAPTER 1.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 The communal area farming system.....	2
1.2 Availability of cattle manure in crop livestock farming systems.....	2
1.2.1 Production of cattle manure.....	3
1.2.2 Partitioning of N in cattle excrements.....	3
1.3. Cattle manure as a soil fertility ameliorant.....	4
1.4. Quality of cattle manure produced in communal areas of Zimbabwe.....	4
1.4.1. Concepts of manure quality.....	4
1.4.2 Factors influencing effectiveness of manure.....	5
1.5 Ammonia volatilisation as a major process influencing quality of manure.....	6
1.5.1. Mechanism of ammonia volatilisation.....	6
1.5.2 Magnitude and extent of ammonia losses in storage and handling systems.....	8
1.5.3 Factors affecting ammonia volatilisation.....	9
1.6 Nitrogen mineralisation during decomposition of cattle manure.....	14
1.6.1 Decomposition of manure during storage and implications on ammonia volatilisation.....	14
1.6.2 Nitrogen mineralisation in aerobic and anaerobic manure in soil.....	15
1.6.3 Factors affecting decomposition of manure in soil.....	17
1.6.4 Decay series as an indicator of the percentage of N mineralised in successive seasons.....	20
1.7. Purpose of study.....	20
1.7.1 Structure of thesis.....	21
CHAPTER 2.....	23
TRADITIONAL STORAGE AND HANDLING PRACTICES OF CATTLE MANURE IN MANGWENDE.....	23
2.0 Abstract.....	24
2.1 Introduction.....	25
2.2 Materials and methods.....	26
2.3 Results.....	27
2.4 Discussion.....	34
2.5 Conclusion.....	36
CHAPTER 3.....	38
USE OF STRAW AS AN AMENDMENT TO IMPROVE MANURE QUALITY IN CATTLE KRAALS.....	38

3.0	Abstract.....	39
3.1	Introduction	39
3.2	Materials and methods.....	43
3.3	Results	45
3.4	Discussion.....	49
3.5	Conclusion.....	50
CHAPTER 4		51
THE EFFECT OF STORAGE METHOD, CROP RESIDUE INCORPORATION AND LENGTH OF COMPOSTING ON AMMONIA LOSSES FROM, AND QUALITY OF MANURE		51
4.0	Abstract.....	52
4.1	Introduction	53
4.2	Materials and methods.....	55
4.3	Results	58
4.4	Discussion.....	68
4.5	Conclusion.....	71
CHAPTER 5		73
NITROGEN MINERALISATION FROM AEROBICALLY AND ANAEROBICALLY TREATED CATTLE MANURES		73
5.0	Abstract.....	74
5.1	Introduction	75
5.2	Materials and methods.....	76
5.3	Results	80
5.4	Discussion.....	89
5.5	Conclusion.....	92
CHAPTER 6		94
MAIZE RESPONSE TO NITROGEN IN MANURES FROM DIFFERENT STORAGE SYSTEMS.....		94
6.0	Abstract.....	96
6.1	Introduction	97
6.2	Materials and methods.....	98
6.3	Results	107
6.4	Discussion.....	118
6.5	Conclusion.....	120
CHAPTER 7		122
THE EFFECT OF PLACEMENT METHODS OF AEROBIC AND ANAEROBIC MANURES ON NH ₃ LOSSES AND MAIZE GRAIN YIELD.....		122
7.0	Abstract.....	123
7.1	Introduction	124
7.2	Materials and methods.....	125
7.3	Results	129
7.4	Discussion.....	135

7.5	Conclusion.....	136
CHAPTER 8		
	CHAPTER 8	138
GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....		
	GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	138
8.0	Synthesis of results from the study.....	139
8.1	Nutrient cycling in manure management systems.....	141
8.2	Benefits of using straw in cattle kraals over other competing uses on-farm	142
8.3	Side effects connected with N loss reducing strategies	144
8.4	Effect of improved manure management system on farmer's investment returns in soil fertility	145
8.5	Labour implications.....	146
8.6	Suggested further research.....	147
REFERENCES		
	REFERENCES	149
ANNEX. Publication: Improving the management of manure in Zimbabwe. In: Managing Africa's Soils. No. 15.		
	ANNEX. Publication: Improving the management of manure in Zimbabwe. In: Managing Africa's Soils. No. 15.	173

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Quality of cattle manure produced under different farmer categories in Mangwende Communal Area	28
Table 3.1. Mean NH ₃ losses (kg N t ⁻¹) in cattle kraals with and without straw (n =6) ...	48
Table 3.2. MANOVA analysis of N loss differences between adjacent time levels (Wilks' Lambda Statistic)	48
Table 5.1. Kinetic functions for the fitting of cumulative experimental data by regression	79
Table 5.2. Selected chemical properties of manures from Mukudu farm in Mangwende Communal Area	80
Table 5.3 Selected chemical properties of manures from Musegedi farm in Mangwende Communal Area.	81
Table 5.4 Selected chemical properties of manures from Nhapi farm in Mangwende Communal Area.	81
Table 5.5. Nitrogen mineralisation/immobilisation kinetics in aerobic and anaerobic cattle manures mixed with soil.	88
Table 6.1. Chemical characteristics of aerobically and anaerobically decomposed manures used at Mukudu site	99
Table 6.2. Chemical characteristics of aerobically and anaerobically decomposed manures used at Musegedi site	100
Table 6.3. Chemical characteristics of aerobically and anaerobically decomposed manures used at at Nhapi site.....	100
Table 6.4. Initial soil characteristics at trial sites used in 1997/98 and 1998/99 seasons.	101
Table 7.1 Chemical characteristics of manures used in the study on effect of placement method (n = 3).	129
Table 7.2. Soil characteristics at trial sites used in the effect of placement methods of manure study (n = 3).	130
Table 7.3. Effect of method of application and manure quality on maize grain yield....	134

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1. Farmers' perceptions of causes of nutrient losses from manure	30
Figure 2.2. Farmers' methods for reducing of nutrient losses from manure	31
Figure 2.3. Practices used by farmers to mitigate nutrient losses from manure	33
Figure 3.1.. Manure management chain and potential interventions to reduce nutrient... 42	
Figure 3.2. Effect of straw on ammonia losses from freshly excreted dung	46
Figure 3.3. Cumulative N losses from urine and cowdung mixtures.....	47
Figure 4.1. Total N response to method of storage, crop residue incorporation and duration of storage during manure decomposition	59
Figure 4.2. Ammonia-N response to method of storage, crop residue incorporation and duration of storage during manure decomposition	61
Figure 4.3. Nitrate- N response to method of storage, crop residue incorporation and duration of storage during manure decomposition	62
Figure 4.4. Ammonia losses as affected by method of storage, crop residue incorporation and duration of storage during manure decomposition.....	64
Figure 4.5. pH response to method of storage, crop residue incorporation and.....	65
Figure 4.6. Moisture response to method of storage, crop residue incorporation and duration of storage during manure decomposition	67
Figure 5.1. Net N mineralisation of aerobic and anaerobic manures from Mukudu farm	84
Figure 5.2. Net N mineralisation of aerobic and anaerobic manures from Musegedi farm	85
Figure 5.3. Net N mineralisation of aerobic and anaerobic manures from Nhapi farm	86
Figure 5.4. Cumulative N mineralisation of aerobic and anaerobic manures	87
Figure 6.1. Effect of method of incorporating straw in manure on maize grain yield on total N concentrations. a) Mukudu b) Muzavazi c) Musegedi	105

Figure 6.2. Mean monthly rainfall distribution at Musami (Mangwende)	108
Figure 6.3. Effectiveness of manures from different storage systems on maize grain yield yield in the year of application (1997/98 season)	110
Figure 6.4. Immediate and residual effects of applying manure from different	111
Figure 6.5. Immediate and residual effects of applying manure from different	111
Figure 6.6. Mean apparent N recoveries (%) by maize growth with manures from.....	114
Figure 6.7. Relationship between maize grain yield and ammonia-N	115
Figure 6.8. Effect of method of incorporating straw in manure on maize grain yield ...	117
Figure 7.1. Cumulative NH ₃ losses from anaerobic and aerobic manures as influenced by placement methods	133