

**COMPARING PLANT YIELD AND COMPOSITION WITH SOIL
PROPERTIES USING CLASSICAL AND GEOSTATISTICAL
TECHNIQUES**

by

ANNARI VENTER

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree MAGISTER SCIENTIA in Soil Science
in the Department of Plant Production and Soil Science
Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
University of Pretoria**

**Supervisor: Prof. A. S. Claassens
Co-supervisor: Prof. M. Van Meirvenne**

December 2003

616338066

COMPARING PLANT YIELD AND COMPOSITION WITH SOIL
PROPERTIES USING CLASSICAL AND GEOSTATISTICAL
TECHNIQUES

by

ANNARI VENTER

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree MASTER SCIENTIA in Soil Science
in the Department of Plant Production and Soil Science
Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
University of Pretoria

Supervisor: Prof. A. S. Claassen
Co-supervisor: Prof. M. Van Meirvenne

December 2003

AKADEMIESE TOEGESIGTE
ALFRED W. R. ...
2 APR 633.318
Aanwinningsnommer: i17345066 VENTER

Declaration**CONTENTS**

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is entirely my own original research, except where acknowledged, and that it has not at any time, either partly or fully, been submitted to any University for the purposes of obtaining a degree.

LIST OF FIGURES vii

ABSTRACT viii

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION 1

Signed: Date:

CHAPTER 2 THE EFFECTS OF SPATIAL VARIATION OF CERTAIN SOIL PROPERTIES ON THE WINTER YIELD OF A LUCERNE STAND 6

2.1 ABSTRACT 6

2.2 INTRODUCTION 7

2.3 MATERIALS AND METHODS 8

2.3.1 FIELD AND ANALYTICAL METHODS 8

2.3.2 STATISTICAL METHODS 10

2.4 EFFICIENCY AND DISCUSSION 11

2.4.1 SOIL CHARACTERISTICS 11

2.4.2 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS 12

2.4.3 SPATIAL ANALYSIS 13

2.5 CONCLUSIONS 17

CHAPTER 3 EXPLORING THE SPATIAL RELATIONS BETWEEN PLANT ELEMENT OFFSET OF A LUCERNE STAND AND SOIL PROPERTIES 19

3.1 ABSTRACT 19

3.2 INTRODUCTION 20

3.3 MATERIALS AND METHODS 21

3.3.1 FIELD AND ANALYTICAL METHODS 21

3.3.2 STATISTICAL METHODS 22

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
ABSTRACT	viii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: THE EFFECTS OF SPATIAL VARIATION OF CERTAIN SOIL PROPERTIES ON THE WINTER YIELD OF A LUCERNE STAND	6
2.1 ABSTRACT.....	6
2.2 INTRODUCTION.....	7
2.3 MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	8
2.3.1 FIELD AND ANALYTICAL METHODS.....	8
2.3.2 STATISTICAL METHODS.....	10
2.4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	11
2.4.1 SOIL CHARACTERISTICS.....	11
2.4.2 STATISTICAL ANALYSES.....	12
2.4.3 SPATIAL ANALYSES.....	13
2.5 CONCLUSIONS.....	17
CHAPTER 3: EXPLORING THE SPATIAL RELATIONS BETWEEN PLANT ELEMENT UPTAKE OF A LUCERNE STAND AND SOIL PROPERTIES	19
3.1 ABSTRACT.....	19
3.2 INTRODUCTION.....	20
3.3 MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	21
3.3.1 FIELD AND ANALYTICAL METHODS.....	21
3.3.2 STATISTICAL METHODS.....	22
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	63

3.4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	23
3.4.1	PLANT AND SOIL CHARACTERISTICS.....	23
3.4.2	SPATIAL ANALYSES.....	26
3.5	CONCLUSIONS.....	30
CHAPTER 4:	SPATIAL RELATIONS OF PLANT ELEMENT UPTAKE AND	
	YIELD OF A LUCERNE STAND OVER TIME.....	31
4.1	ABSTRACT.....	31
4.2	INTRODUCTION.....	32
4.3	MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	33
4.3.1	FIELD AND ANALYTICAL METHODS.....	33
4.3.2	STATISTICAL METHODS.....	33
4.4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	34
4.4.1	SPATIAL ANALYSES.....	37
4.5	CONCLUSIONS.....	44
CHAPTER 5:	SPATIAL VARIATION OF SOIL AND PLANT PROPERTES AND	
	ITS EFFECTS ON THE STATISTICAL DESIGN OF A FIELD EXPERIMENT.....	45
5.1	ABSTRACT.....	45
5.2	INTRODUCTION.....	46
5.3	MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	47
5.3.1	FIELD AND ANALYTICAL METHODS.....	47
5.3.2	STATISTICAL METHODS.....	48
5.4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	50
5.5	CONCLUSIONS.....	54
CHAPTER 6:	CONCLUSIONS.....	56
	REFERENCES.....	60
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	65

LIST OF TABLES

APPENDIX A	Soil analysis data.....	66
Table 2.1	Characteristics of the two experimental soils.....	9
APPENDIX B	Lucerne yield data.....	71
Table 2.3	A correlation matrix for soil properties and lucerne yield.....	12
APPENDIX C	Plant analysis data.....	77
Table 3.1	Statistical descriptions of some soil and plant properties.....	24
APPENDIX D	Soil profile descriptions.....	81
Table 3.3	Model parameters for winter and summer plant analysis.....	27
APPENDIX E	Photo gallery.....	84
Table 4.1	The correlation matrix of plant and soil properties and lucerne yield.....	35
Table 4.2	Regression models including all leaf elements.....	36
Table 4.3	A two-sample t-test between the winter and summer plant analyses and lucerne yield.....	36
Table 4.4	Model parameters for plant and soil properties and yield.....	38
Table 5.1	ANOVA of three different experimental designs.....	49
Table 5.2	Statistical description of soil and plant properties.....	51
Table 5.3	Correlation matrix of soil properties and lucerne winter yield.....	51
Table 5.4	Model parameters for soil and plant properties.....	52
Table 5.5	Summary of F probabilities (p) for the three experimental designs and covariance matrix.....	53

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Characteristics of the two experimental soils.....	9
Table 2.2	Statistical descriptions of topsoil properties and yield.....	11
Table 2.3	A correlation matrix for soil properties and lucerne yield.....	12
Table 2.4	Model parameters for soil properties and lucerne yield.....	14
Table 3.1	Statistical descriptions of some soil and plant properties.....	24
Table 3.2	A correlation matrix of some of the soil and plant properties.....	25
Table 3.3	Model parameters for winter and summer plant analysis.....	27
Table 4.1	The statistical description of plant and soil properties.....	35
Table 4.2	The correlation matrix of plant and soil properties and lucerne yield.....	35
Table 4.3	Regression models including all leaf elements.....	36
Table 4.4	A two-sample t-test between the winter and summer plant analyses and lucerne yield.....	36
Table 4.5	Model parameters for plant and soil properties and yield.....	38
Table 5.1	ANOVA of three different experimental designs.....	49
Table 5.2	Statistical description of soil and plant properties.....	51
Table 5.3	Correlation matrix of soil properties and lucerne winter yield.....	51
Table 5.4	Model parameters for soil and plant properties.....	52
Table 5.5	Summary of F probabilities (p) for the three experimental designs and covariance analysis.....	53
Figure 5.1	Trial layout of the three experimental designs overlaid on the estimate map of soil pH(H ₂ O).....	50
Figure 5.2	Semi-variogram and estimate map of pH(H ₂ O) using only 37 points.....	54

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	An aerial photograph of the field. The black dots depict the sampling points.....	9
Figure 2.2	Experimental variograms with the fitted models and maps of the kriged estimates for the pH(H ₂ O), K, Org. C and sand contents of the soil as well as the yield and predicted yield of lucerne.....	15
Figure 2.3	Calculated estimation errors on prediction of yield.....	17
Figure 3.1	An aerial photograph of the field. The black dots depict the sampling points.....	21
Figure 3.2	Experimental variograms with the fitted model for (A) Ca, (C) Mg, (E) K and (G) P content of the plants and (B) Ca, (D) Mg, (F) K and (H) P contents of the soil.....	26
Figure 3.3	Maps of the kriged estimates of the (A) Ca, (C) Mg, (E) K and (G) P contents of the plants and (B) Ca, (D) Mg, (F) K and (H) P contents of the soil.....	28
Figure 3.4	Experimental semi-variogram and estimate map of the predicted K in the plants.....	29
Figure 4.1	Mean yields of the six harvests from June 2001 (mid-winter) to February 2002 (summer).....	37
Figure 4.2	Estimation maps and experimental variograms with the fitted model for the winter and summer plant analyses as well as the soil Mg and K values.....	42
Figure 4.3	Estimation maps and experimental semi-variograms with the fitted model for the yield for: (a) June, (b) August, (c) September, (d) October, (e) November 2001 and (f) February 2002.....	43
Figure 5.1	Trial layout of the three experimental designs overlaid on the estimate map of soil pH(H ₂ O).....	50
Figure 5.2	Semi-variogram and estimate map of pH(H ₂ O) using only 37 points.....	54

ABSTRACT

Plant nutrient management plays a vital role in the success or failure of modern lucerne production. In South Africa, lucerne is produced under a wide range of climatic conditions, under dryland and irrigation and in some areas throughout the year. This means that there is a continuous demand for nutrients under a wide range of environmental conditions. The most important factors affecting the nutrient requirement of lucerne is yield, the cutting schedule, climate and management practices. To enable site-specific crop requirements, the spatial variation of soil and plant properties within a field can be managed with the use of geostatistical techniques. Some work has also been done to evaluate the use of geostatistics in the design of agricultural field experiments to provide better field characterization and improve plot layout. The aim of this study was to compare plant yield and composition with soil properties using both classical and geostatistical techniques. The study was conducted from June 2001 to February 2002 on an 18 ha lucerne stand in the Brits district in the North West Province. A rectangular area of 160 m X140 m was demarcated as the study area and comprised of two soil units (Hutton and Shortlands forms). Seventy-two sampling points (nodes) were laid out on a 20 m square grid, with an additional 90 sampling points laid out on a 2.5 m square grid at six randomly selected node points. Soil (0 – 300 mm) and plant samples were taken within a 0.6 m square at each of the sampling points for chemical analysis. Starting in June 2001, yield sampling was done on six occasions, at approximate intervals of 5 weeks. A randomized complete block design trial layout was superimposed on the geostatistical grid design and consisted of seven pseudo treatments, replicated four times. Basic statistical analyses were performed and spatial presentations of the variation of the plant and soil properties and lucerne yield were made using geostatistical analyses. Analyses of variance were used to test for differences between pseudo treatments for all plant and soil properties. The two soils on the study site, exhibited differences in certain properties, which caused a bi-modal population in the data. Poor correlations were found between plant nutrient uptake and soil properties as well as yield, with little or no resemblance when comparing their spatial distribution. This emphasizes the fact that the uptake of elements is not solely dependant on the concentrations thereof in the soil solution, but on other factors. Temporal variations in lucerne yield were also observed. Although there were large differences in spatial variation of lucerne yields across harvesting events, similar spatial patterns were evident. From

an analysis of variance of the RCB design it was concluded that the experimental field was homogeneous enough to lay out a standard block design experiment. However, scrutiny of the structure of spatial variability of pH(H₂O) revealed that the standard RCB designs did not provide homogeneous blocks with respect to soil variability. The consequent redesign of the experiment whereby all plots were randomly allocated to treatments and replications, led to dramatically different results: significant differences were obtained for plant and soil properties as a function of the pseudo treatments. From this study it is clear that spatial variability of soil and plant properties can jeopardize the results of a standard block design field experiment and it is therefore recommended that the layout of field experiments should be designed to the cognizance of the spatial variation of a soil property that correlated highly with a chosen response variate.

factors such as the age, growth stage, prior condition and genotype of the crop.

There are several factors affecting the nutrient requirements of lucerne of which yield, cutting schedule, climate and management are the most important (Lanyon & Griffiths, 1988). Studies show that there is a substantial increase in yield in response to nutrient applications and therefore nutrient requirement increase with increased yields.

Rhykerd and Overdahl (1972), found that the production of high-yielding lucerne removes much larger amounts of nutrients from the soil than grain crops such as maize or wheat. Thus, to obtain high yield levels, soil fertility status and plant nutrient concentrations must be monitored and adjusted to assure adequate nutrient availability. Lucerne has a high requirement for nutrient elements such as nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), potassium (K), calcium (Ca), magnesium (Mg) and sulphur (S). Essential micronutrient elements are, *inter alia* boron (B) and molybdenum (Mo). Of these elements N is obtained by symbiosis with certain N fixing bacteria, if conditions are ideal, and do not have to be supplemented.

The second factor that influence nutrient uptake is the cutting schedule. A close relationship exists between lucerne maturity and nutrient concentration. Lucerne is harvested at vegetative to early reproductive growth stages in high-yielding systems. When lucerne is harvested at a less mature growth stage, such as full bud rather than 10% blossom, the leaf-stem ratio is higher with a consistent increase in the concentration of P, K, Ca and Mg in the dry material.