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Executive Summary
This project has undertaken participatory on-farm research of farmer selected conservation tillage, crop establishment and weed management systems. The work was originated under RAFS, initially funded by NRSP for one year (1995/96) and then extended for a further two and a half years being completed in September 1998. It has been undertaken in close collaboration with R66551 (a Crop Protection Programme Project) investigating weed management alternatives. The project provided researcher and farmer evaluation of technologies that has facilitated the development of a series of Best Practice Guidelines undertaken in conjunction with other funding agencies, extension organizations and farmers (R7085).

Project Achievements:
The project has delivered the following Outputs:

1. **Assessment of the technical and socio-economic potential for improved conservation tillage**, through:
   - A workshop for research and extension staff to review the present status of soil and water conservation in semi-and Zimbabwe at project initiation.
   - Research station visits by farmers to view researcher managed conservation and weeding trials.
   - An initial PRA of on-farm areas targeted for participatory research.

2. **Participatory evaluation and development of tillage, planting and weeding options in cotton and make cropping systems.**
   These included on-station and on-farm assessment of winter, spring and no tillage land preparation options; planting using open plough furrow plant, third furrow plough and ripper systems; weeding by hand, plough and ox-cultivator combined with creation of tied ridges (post crop establishment) either by plough or cultivator with hilling blades, combining moisture retention and weeding operations. This has involved:
   - Quantification of agronomic responses to the alternative tillage, crop establishment and weeding options.
   - An evaluation of the condition and use of draught animal implements
   - Identification of farmers' decision making criteria and farmer appraisal of the systems options
   - An assessment of adoption patterns
   - An economic analysis of the alternatives, which will be finalised under R6655 following a further season of evaluation by farmer.

Through working closely with farmers the following criteria were identified as key to adoption:
- The need to match technologies to farmers' resources;
- The availability of draught animal power;
- The poor performance of farmers' draught animal implements due to poor Maintenance and use.
- Lack of skills amongst local artisans to provide Maintenance and repair facilities, or fabrication of simple tie-makers or ripper tines.
- Lack of access by farmers to reference material on existing or improved technologies, relying totally on local extension workers and other farmers for dissemination.
- Manufacturers being unwilling/unable to supply new implements without guaranteed sales.
- Farmers being unwilling/unable to adopt new systems due to lack of innovative implements and back up technical support.

3. **Description of soil water regimes and development of a soil-water model**
   Key Findings have been
   - Irrespective of soil type the quantity of water present in a soil profile at the beginning of the following season depends on the combined effect of the amount and distribution of rain in the previous season, the crop grown,
level of weed control and tillage practised.

- Generally tillage treatments that capture the most water are the wettest, however, the incomplete wetting up of pre-plant tied ridges early in a growing season frequently results in either poor crop establishment or a delay in planting.
- Conventionally tilled soils are more uniformly wet in the top 200 mm of the soil profile and significantly wetter than ridged structures early in the season.
- Furrows created by open plough furrow planting or with the ripper tine conserved more moisture early in the season than traditional third furrow planting and improved crop establishment.
- Mid season ridging with a plough, with the body attached, achieved efficient weed control and the ridges created increased water retention.
- Soil water regimes that develop under any tillage system are strongly influenced by the timing and frequency of weeding.
- In terms of crop water use, efficiency weeding at 2 and then b weeks after crop emergence performed, better than single weeding at four weeks.
- A weed management and water competition routine has been developed, to simulate the effect of weed management on crop performance. This routine has been incorporated in the PARCHED-THIRST crop growth model and calibrated with results from a 2-year weeding trial. The effects of weed competition on crop performance were assessed over a 30-year simulation period, for four levels of access to DAP and labour. The results demonstrate how sub-optimal crop management affects weed competition and crop production.

4. Project outputs have been promoted through:

- Annual reviews and evaluation field days with farmers, government and NGO extension staff.
- Options for tillage and demonstration have been provided by farmers leading to extension material being drafted and finalised in project R7085.
- Selected technologies have been promoted by the Cotton Training Centre
- 30 peer reviewed/edited papers, 13 unpublished reports/presentations and 7 project reports have been produced.

Contribution of Outputs to Project Goal:
The outputs of this project have contributed substantially towards the achievements of the Programme Purpose by ensuring that the Department for Research and Specialist Services, Agritex and NGOs have access to a range of efficient technologies that will permit more viable use of time or land which, depending on the livelihood strategy of particular farmers, might result in a reduced need for ploughing, a freeing-up of draught power, reduction of number of hours that women in particular spend weeding and a general improvement in the productivity of the system. In addition the project has increased the capacity of DR&SS and Agritex to carry out participatory research projects and led to the establishment of permanent Farmer Groups in Sanyati and Nembudziya, which have continued to experiment, evaluate and adopt dead level contours, runoff orchards and conservation tillage practices post project, and have provided a focus for inter farmer visits and networking arrangements between NGOs and farmers from other areas.

To date the technological options developed with the farmers in this project have been incorporated into: the Cotton Training Centre Syllabus and 1998 Training Manual; the CIMMYT Maize breeding programme; DR&SS Weed Research Team and Institute of Agricultural Engineering research and dissemination programmes, Agritex staff in Sanyati and Nembudziya Districts are promoting the technologies; Presentations have been made to numerous local, national and international workshops; The technologies have been included with others under NRSP SAPS Project R7085 which developed dissemination materials on soil and water management appropriate to the needs of the farmer.

Background
Semi-arid rainfed crop production in southern Africa is mainly conducted by farmers who are very conservation conscious but have limited resources. Previous conservation tillage research has tended to focus on tractor-based systems, whereas traditional systems use hand hoes or animal drawn mouldboard ploughs (preferably before the rains in October/November) and planting on the flat (Smith, 1988; Wilcock and Twomlow, 1993). Apart from nutrient deficiencies (Grant, 1981), the sandy soils cultivated by small holders in Zimbabwe have a poor structure, some are prone to surface crusting and compact under natural rainfall to develop layers that are resistant to root penetration. Water conservation is essential if crop reliability and yield is to be improved. Adoptable conservation measures are needed urgently as a rapidly increasing population is demanding more reliable cropping from marginal areas previously considered unsuitable for arable farming (World Bank, 1989).
Promotion of ‘improved’ conservation tillage practices in sub-Saharan Africa over the past twenty years has tended to be based on large scale dryland farming systems developed in the USA (e.g. Unger, 1984). Such systems do not take account of the technical, social and economic constraints faced by resource poor farmers (Willcocks and Twomlow, 1993; Twomlow et al., 1995). Projects have tried to address such issues (Willcocks, 1988) and further work needs to include agronomic, socioeconomic, meteorological, farm power and soil issues that relate to actual production systems (Willcocks et al., 1993). Improved technologies should not require costly inputs, unavailable skills nor compete for labour when crops or land demand attention (Barrow, 1988). Farmer uptake must be the goal and this will entail the innovative: use of existing implements and resources (Ellis-Jones and Mudhara, 1995).

Recent studies have examined the effects of tillage practices and land forms (e.g. potholes and furrows) on water conservation and cotton and maize yields in the semi-arid communal farming areas (Tagwira, 1992). Recommendations have been that crops should be planted on ridges along the contour to help reduce erosion and water logging and to improve rooting volume in shallow soils (e.g. Elwell and Norton, 1988; Gollifer, 1993). Sheet erosion is negligible under no-till tied ridging but the system may generate adverse edaphic micro-environments for crops (e.g. Vogel, 1993). The major disadvantages with ridges (Gollifer, 1993), are higher soil temperatures and rapid drying in the ridges, which can result in poor crop establishment and growth. Other problems with ridge systems, compared to flat cultivation practices, include a high labour requirement for construction, difficulties in planting and weeding, and ridge maintenance. Consequently, work is required to identify low input improved land and crop husbandry options that are appropriate to the wide range of environmental, social and economic constraints faced by the farmer, increasing available crop water and reducing the level of inputs (Ellis-Jones and Mudhara, 1995).

Evidence of demand for the research was accumulated from previous projects funded by DFID, GTL and the Government of Zimbabwe. The aim of these projects was to develop through on-station and on-farm researchers managed trials soil and weed control management systems that conserve water, soil and energy for rainfed crop production in semi-arid regions (Shumba et al., 1992; Willcocks et al., 1993; Hagmann, 1998). Results from these researcher-led initiatives showed that innovative cultivation and weeding practices that exploited existing hand hoes and mouldboard ploughs and enhanced the retention of scarce rain water could be developed. Results showed that pothering (Mashavira et al., 1995), ripping (Shumba et al., 1992), open plough furrow planting (Twomlow et al., 1994) and ridging up with the plough or ridger at first weeding (Ellis-Jones et al., 1993) could both enhance mid-season water conservation by as much as 20%, significantly reduced labour for weeding and make crop yields more reliable through better crop establishment. However, the generic applicability of these results to different wealth categories of farmers and their different biophysical resources was and the appropriate dissemination strategies were unknown.

**Project Purpose**

The Project addressed NRSP Semi-arid Purpose 1:

*Commodity production increased through improved conservation and use of water resources*

and Purpose 2:

*Risk reduction strategies enhanced through optimisation of land use and cropping patterns. The specific Project purpose was:*

*Improved techniques for water conservation tillage and weed control developed and promoted.*

The project undertook participatory on-farm evaluation of conservation tillage, crop establishment and complementary weed management systems that had been previously investigated through a series of researchers managed trials.

**Research Activities**

Planned inputs were all achieved either directly by this project or indirectly by feeding project outputs into other DFID-funded projects or Silsoe Research Institute-funded activities e.g.

- NRSP-funded project R7085 (Promotion of practical approaches to soil and water conservation for smallholder farmers in sub-Saharan Africa);
- Crop Protection Programme Project R6655 (Moisture Conservation through improved weed management in savannah cropping systems);
- Central Science Grant Project 0409 (Soil and water modelling under semi-arid conditions);
- SRI Studentship (Modelling tropical soil water regimes in semi-arid environments)
Output 1. Assessment of the technical and socio-economic potential for improved conservation tillage

1. A workshop for research and extension staff to review the present status of soil and water conservation in semi-arid Zimbabwe at project initiation.

AGRITEX/GTZ Conservation Tillage Project, GTZ CARD Programme, Silsoe Research Institute, and their collaborating institutions within AGRITEX and DR&SS agreed the need for a joint workshop to be held in April 1995 Msavingo (Twomlow et al., 1995). More than 70 delegates from participating organisations and other key contributors attended the workshop and used the opportunity for brainstorming, presenting papers and work programmes, sharing experiences and agreeing on necessary revisions of extension messages and current transfer strategies and on setting of priorities for future research activities. The main aim of the workshop was to present the state of affairs in the field of soil and water conservation and to formulate recommendations for research and extension.

The main outputs were of the April 1995 workshop:

Extension messages
1. Should contain options, not blanket recommendations.
2. Must be situation specific with regard to locations and to the prevailing production conditions.
3. Be specific for different management levels, especially taking care of the limited management capabilities of the disadvantaged groups of the rural population due to resource constraints.
4. They must integrate different aspects (soil fertility, conservation of soil and water, sustainability) in the framework of a holistic approach towards agricultural development.
5. They are to specifically address ecological issues

For more details see Annex A: (Accompanying Document)

1.2 An initial PRA of on farm areas targeted for participatory research and research station visits.

An initial PRA (Mazhangara et al., 1995) (Annex AO) was undertaken by a 16 person team comprised of research and extension staff from DRSS and AGRITEX. Field work was over a four day period using standard participatory techniques (group discussion, transect walks and mapping, matrix ranking of major problems and identification of farmers criteria for wealth ranking). Team members compiled notes from farmer discussion groups and individual interviews and these were used in the compilation of a report by a smaller (five person) working group which consolidated existing biophysical and socio-economic data with information provided by farmers. Information provided by farmers that was particularly relevant to the study included:

- Tillage practices (land preparation, planting and weeding).
- Implement ownership.
- Livestock ownership.
- Division of labour for the main household activities.
- Identification and ranking of the main problems.
- Characterisation of farmers according to resource availability.

For more details see Appendix AC (Accompanying report)

Although the PRA provided an important initial insight to how local farming systems in Zimuto relate to soil and water conservation technologies, it also provided opportunity for research and extension staff to interrelate with farmers forming a first step in the further identification, planning and implementation of on-farm research activities, which included:

- On farm trials over three seasons
- An assessment of the use and condition of farmers' implements (Chatizwa and Ellis-Jones, 1997; Chatizwa and Kosa, 1998).

Participatory monitoring and evaluation of research activities during and at the end of each season. The latter is reported in detail in Chatizwa et al., 1998 as well as in other publications. This included regular sometimes informal meetings of stakeholders to ensure their continued involvement in the project and that researchers fully understood how the alternative tillage and weeding systems fit with existing farming systems. Particularly important in this regard was a Workshop at Makoholi followed by discussion days with farmers involving visits to farms and field inspections across typical soil catenas and transects to review farmer practices and weed problems on various soil types. This helped to identify farmers' perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of the alternative
crop establishment and weeding methods and from this to rank the criteria that farmers themselves use in assessing the alternatives.

For more details see Appendix AK (Accompanying report)

Output 2 Participatory evaluation and development of tillage, planting and weeding options in cotton and maize cropping systems.

2.1 Quantification of agronomic responses to the alternative tillage, crop establishment and weeding options.

A range of tillage and weeding experiments were carried out during the life of the project and are summarised in Table 1. The trial designs at each site varied with the objectives of the experiment and included criss cross plot designs; with tillage/crop establishment strips as main plot factors and weeding treatments as cross plot factors; and conventional randomized block designs for pure weeding trials. Plot sizes varied from 10 m long by 6 m wide for on-station researcher managed trials to 20 m by 10 m plots for on-farm farmer managed trials, with a minimum replication of three plots per treatment combination and a maximum of eight (see Table 1). The tillage systems investigated included:

- Primary land preparation with an ox-drawn mouldboard plough:
  - winter ploughing (WP)
  - spring ploughing (SP)
  - winter and spring ploughing (WPSP)
  - no primary tillage (NT)

- Crop establishment techniques:
  - open plough furrow planting (OPFP), seed planted into furrows opened with a single pass of a plough at the desired inter-row spacing, and subsequently covered with a hand hoe.
  - ripper planting (RIP) Planting into a 0.2 to 0.3 m deep rip line created by a commercially available ripper tine mounted on a standard plough beam.
  - traditional farmer practice of third furrow planting (TFP), dropping seed into the plough furrow to be subsequently covered by the next pass of the plough.
  - pre-plant ridges: Tied Ridge and D) Tied Furrow; constructed in September of each season at 0.9 m intervals with an initial amplitude of 0.13 m and cross ties every 2.0 m.

- Weeding practices:
  - the common farmer practice of overall hand hoe weeding (HH),
  - ox-cultivator weeding with crop rows subsequently weeded by hand-hoe if necessary (OCHH)
  - ox-plough weeding with mouldboard left in place, with crop rows subsequently weeded by hand-hoe if necessary (OPHH). The ridges formed at weeding with the mouldboard plough were crossed tied at two to three m intervals (using hand hoes) to prevent water movement.

Trials planted with Maize seed (80 mm deep) were thinned to a 0.9 m by 0.3 m spacing after emergence. Fertilizer, 12 kg N, 21 kg P, and 14 kg K per ha, was applied at planting and crops were top dressed with 52 kg/ha of N at four, six and eight weeks after planting, unless the farmers specified other wise. Cotton seed was sown 30 mm deep in 1.0 m rows and thinned to 0.3 m between plants at the five leaf stage. Fertilizer, 12.5 kg N, kg P, and 25 kg K per ha, was applied at planting and crops were top dressed with 34.5 kg/ha of N at first flowering, unless the farmers specified otherwise. Plots were uniformly hand weeded as the need arose unless the experimental protocol stated otherwise.

Total maize grain yield and biomass was determined and adjusted to 12.5% moisture content. Total weed biomass was recorded at harvest from quadrats 0.5 by 0.5 m at five random positions in each plot unless experimental stated otherwise. Weed and crop data was subjected to an analysis of variance and treatment comparisons were made using paired t-tests ($P<0.05$).

---

3 Ripper tines were initially provided by the project as they were unavailable in Mshagashe or Zimuto. Local artisans were subsequently trained to fabricate the tine attachments.
Where the trials were established on farmers fields, the farmers were invited to review researcher managed trials. As a result, farmers made an input into the selection of technologies to be evaluated, the selection of host farmers, the design of field experimentation and primary land preparation. Host farmers were selected by the community in each area as representative of the three main wealth categories identified during the PRA exercises. The trials were consultative, managed by researchers and extensionists, but implemented by the farmers, and replicated across the main soil types of the area. The basic principles of the trials were discussed with the farmers and appropriate management practices agreed so that data from individual farms within an area could be compared and used in combined statistical analyses.

Statistical advice was provided by the resident biometricians at Silsoe and DRSS, with additional support from the Statistical Services Centre, reading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of experiment</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Reference and location with respect to this report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>soil physical characteristics</td>
<td>randomised blocks</td>
<td>Bruneau &amp; Twomlow 1999 (n=5) (Appendix V, p 157) Twomlow &amp; Bruneau 1999 (in press) (n=5) (Appendix W, p164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=replication)</td>
<td></td>
<td>van der Meer et al. (1998) (Appendix X, p178)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillage Experiments</td>
<td>randomised blocks</td>
<td>Dhlilwayo, 1996 (n=4) (Appendix AH, accompanying report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=replication)</td>
<td>Criss cross</td>
<td>Mashavira et al., 1995 (n=3) (Appendix C, accompanying report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mashavira et al., 1997 (n=3) (Appendix K, p71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Twomlow et al., 1997 (n=3) (Appendix E, p32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Twomlow &amp; Bruneau 1999 (in press) (n=5) (Appendix W, p164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeding Experiments</td>
<td>randomised blocks</td>
<td>Dhlilwayo, 1996 (n=4) (Appendix AH, accompanying document)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=replication)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riches et al., 1997 (n=4) (Appendix J, p56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Twomlow et al., 1997 (n=4) (Appendix M, 85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillage/crop establishment</td>
<td>randomised blocks</td>
<td>Dhlilwayo, 1996 (n=3) (Appendix I, p51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by weeding</td>
<td>Criss cross</td>
<td>Mashavira et al., 1997 n=3(Appendix K, p71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chatizwa et al., 1998 (n=3) (Appendix AK, accompanying report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Riches et al., 1998 (n=3) (Appendix Q, p115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Twomlow et al, 1998 (n=3) (Appendix N, p 91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Twomlow and Dhlilwayo 1999 (n=8) (Appendix AR, p 276)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. An evaluation of the condition and use of draught animal implements
This was achieved through farmer discussion groups, field days, individual interviews and formal surveys.

For more details see Appendices L (p81), AL (p224), AK (Accompanying report).

2.3 Identification of farmers' decision making criteria and farmer appraisal of the systems options
This was achieved through farmer discussion groups, field days, individual interviews and formal surveys.

For more details see Appendices P (p107), Q (p115), AJ (p240), AK (Accompanying report).

2.4 An assessment of adoption patterns.
This was achieved through farmer discussion groups, field days, individual interviews and formal surveys.

For more details see Appendix A and B (Accompanying report), Appendices Q (p 115)
A final survey of farmers adoption patterns is being carried out within R6655

2.5 An economic analysis of the alternatives, which will be finalised under R6655 following a further season of evaluation by farmers.
This was achieved through farmer discussion groups, field days, individual interviews and formal surveys and partial budgets calculated, based on yield and labour data collected from the agronomic trials.

For more details see Appendices E (p32), L (81), P (p107), AF (Accompanying report), AK (Accompanying report)
A final economic analysis of technologies is being carried out within R6655
Output 3 Description of soil water regimes for use in a soil-water model.

3.1 Soil water regimes described

Soil water content profiles were determined with a "Wallingford Neutron Probe Moisture Meter", at weekly intervals from planting of the first test crop at each site (Mashavira et al., 1995; Twomlow et al., 1997), or at set periods after an application of water using the sprinkler irrigation system to simulate homogenous rainfall events on a 10 x 10 m square (Twomlow, 1994; Bruneau and Twomlow, 1999). Measurements were made in up to three positions on the ridge system (top ridge, side ridge and furrow bottom) and in the planting line of the flat cultivation at 100 nun depth intervals to a maximum depth of 900 mm. These were supplemented by volumetric sampling of the top 150 mm of the profile. Each sampling position was replicated three times.

3.2 Soil and water data analysis.

Volumetric water content was subjected to an analysis of variance by date and by treatment and comparisons were made using paired t-tests ($P<0.05$). Total seasonal water use for each water regime was calculated from rainfall and the soil-water balance between the date of sowing and the harvest of the crop. No attempt was made to distinguish between soil evaporation or crop transpiration and drainage was assumed to be negligible. The ratio of total above-ground dry matter production (crop biomass) to total seasonal water use provided an estimate of water use efficiency (WUE) at harvest. WUE was expressed as:

$$\text{WUE (kg/ha/mm)} = \frac{\text{crop biomass (kg/ha)}}{\text{water use (mm)}}.$$  

For more details see Appendix C (Accompanying report), Appendices M (p85), V (p157) and W (p164)

3.3 Soil and water modeling

Using the data base of soil water records collected during this project a SRI PhD Student has been developing routines that simulate the effects of different tillage practices (land forms) and weed management regimes on soil water regimes and crop performance. Once the routines had been developed they were incorporated into the PARCH-THIRST crop growth model and a 30 year simulation carried out on crop performance for different farmer resource categories.

For more details see Appendices T (p142), U (p151), Y (p178) and AS (p282)

Output 4 Promotion of Project Outputs

Options for tillage and demonstration have been provided by farmers leading to extension material being drafted and finalised in project R7085.

Field days, annual reviews and evaluations were held in each area with farmer research groups, extension staff and NGOs in 1995, 1996, 1997 and 1998, and subsequently in 1999 through the Crop Protection Project R6655.

For more details see Appendix B (Accompanying report), Appendices Q (p115), AJ (p240), AK (Accompanying report)

Selected technologies have been promoted by the Cotton Training Centre. For more details see Appendix Z (p189):

Project results and innovative concepts have been presented to numerous workshops and conferences, supported by local, regional and international publications.
Outputs
The project has delivered the following Outputs:

Output I Assessment of the technical and socio-economic potential for improved conservation tillage, through:

- A workshop for research and extension staff to review the present status of soil and water conservation in semi-arid Zimbabwe at project initiation.
- Research station visits by farmers to view researcher managed conservation and weeding trials.
- An initial PRA of on-farm areas targeted for participatory research.

In Zimbabwe a host of Government, Non-Government Organisations, aid funding and development agencies are working towards developing soil and water conservation packages that can be adopted by smallholder farmers. In the past many of these programmes have concentrated on the technological package, with only limited consideration given to the constraints experienced by farmers and extensions services. For optimum tillage, planting and crop management systems to be developed, promoted and subsequently adopted, socioeconomic studies have shown that it is essential for researchers/extension/development agencies to understand the constraints within which individual farmers operate. Other experiences are that conventional transfer strategies, i.e. Master Farmer Training, T&V with interest groups, has not resulted in the expected rate of adoption of promoted conservation tillage technologies.

Promotion of improved conservation practices in Sub-Saharan Africa have rarely taken account of the practical, social and economic constraints faced by resource poor farmers. Problems faced by communal smallholder farmers in these areas cannot be solved by simply adaption and introduction of already existing technologies. Apart from technologies for maize and cotton successfully developed for high potential areas, technology does not exist or is inappropriate as it is perceived as too risky by farmers. To make research more effective more attention needs to be given to project identification, design and appraisal with active involvement and consultation with intended beneficiaries and stakeholders using more participatory methods that consider socioeconomic acceptability and identify dissemination pathways.

New technologies need to improve the supply and utilization of limited resources in these environments to satisfy the specific demands of the growing crop. At the same time they must not require costly inputs, unavailable skills nor increase the demand on labour. Farmer uptake is therefore dependent upon the innovative use of existing implements, and thereby making the best use of what is generally available.

Results of farmer managed trials so far indicate that effective, low cost, conservation tillage practices can be achieved using existing implements to enhance water conservation, which will allow: i) earlier and more even crop establishment; ii) reduce effect of mid-season droughts and iii) extend the growing season where there is an early cut off to the rains. In order to identify which systems are appropriate and acceptable to dryland conditions, smallholder farmers must be fully involved in the selection and development of those technologies under investigation.

The PRA exercises undertaken in July 1995 (Mazhangara et al., 1995) and 1997 (Chatizwa et al., 1998) described the existing crop production practices in the area (see Table 2), and involved farmers in the identification of issues and constraints related to crop production (Table 3), and thirdly the identification of future research activities. Transect walks, group discussions with farmers, extension staff and other key informants in the community, matrix ranking of constraints, wealth ranking of households (Table 2) and a review of on-station crop establishment and weed control research at Makoholi (Muza et al., 1996; Mashavira et al., 1997) were used (Table 4 and 5).
Table 2: Existing Farm Systems in Mshagashe Small Scale Commercial Farming Area and Zimuto Communal Area for Three Farmer Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FARMER WEALTH CATEGORY</th>
<th>1 Full DAP</th>
<th>2 Partial DAP</th>
<th>3 Little or no DAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full implements</td>
<td>Plough only</td>
<td>No DAP implements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Few labour constraints</td>
<td>Some labour constraints</td>
<td>Severe labour constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little outside income</td>
<td>Variable outside incomes</td>
<td>Remittances/relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular farm sales</td>
<td>Farm sales in good years</td>
<td>Subsistence production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil cajenam</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>VN</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Land preparation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter plough</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of manures</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crops</th>
<th>M;Mi; Cp;Bn</th>
<th>M;Gn; Bn;V Wheat</th>
<th>M/Ri;Gn V;Wheat</th>
<th>M;Mi; CP;Bn</th>
<th>M;Gn; Bn</th>
<th>M/Ri;Gn</th>
<th>M;CP; Bn</th>
<th>M;Gn</th>
<th>M/Ri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Crop establishment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>3 Nov/Dec</th>
<th>2 Oct-Dec</th>
<th>1 Aug/Sept-Dec</th>
<th>3 Nov/Dec</th>
<th>2 Nov/Dec</th>
<th>1 Aug-Oct</th>
<th>3 Dec/Jan</th>
<th>2 Dec</th>
<th>1 Aug-Nov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoe</td>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third furrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPFP</td>
<td>(* )</td>
<td>( * )</td>
<td>( * )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultivations</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of inputs</th>
<th>Seed</th>
<th>Fertiliser</th>
<th>Chemicals</th>
<th>Hired labour</th>
<th>Hired DAP or borrowed</th>
<th>Works for others at key periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>:</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M - Maize; Mi - finger millet; Cp - Cowpea; Bn - Bambara; M/Ri - Maize-rice intercrop; V - vegetables.

(*) - used by a few farmers, but not the dominant practice.

H - hoe; P - plough; C - cultivator

**Output 2: Participatory evaluation and development of tillage, planting and weeding options in cotton and maize cropping systems.**

This work has included both on-station and on-farm assessment of winter, spring and no tillage land preparation options; planting using open plough furrow plant, third furrow plough and ripper systems; weeding by hand, plough and ox-Cultivator combined with creation of tied ridges (post crop establishment) either by plough or cultivator with hitting blades, combining moisture retention and weeding operations. This has involved

- Quantification of agronomic responses to the alternative tillage, crop establishment and weeding options.
- An evaluation of the condition and use of draught animal implements.
- Identification of farmers’ decision making criteria and farmer appraisal of the systems options
- An assessment of adoption patterns
- An economic analysis of the alternatives, which will be finalised under R6655 following a further season of evaluation by farmers.
Table 3. Ranking of criteria used to assess technology according to Mshagashe and Zimuto farmers

1. Moisture conservation - making best use of moisture for planting;
2. Crop emergence - looking for technology to provide a good stand;
3. Soil loosening - to allow good root development;
4. Depth of planting - to optimise emergence over range of conditions;
5a. Timeliness - ease of implementation over a large area as fast as possible to make use of moisture;
5b. Reduced gap filling for minimising seed cost;
5c. Successful emergence with dry planting - especially in vleis;
6. Reducing seed toss by predators;
7. Flexibility - technology needed for range of soil types, ease of use, speed, labour need;
8. Weeding - farmers will accept weeds at crop emergence if advantages 1-7 result;
9a. Labour - need for technology which reduces labour demand, but will accept increased labour input if other advantages result;
9b. DAP - Although not all farmers have cattle they will hire to obtain advantages listed above (Note: It is rare for Mshagashe farmers to have a draught constraint).

Through working closely with farmers the following criteria were identified as key to adoption: • The need to match technologies to farmers' resources;
• The availability of draught animal power;
• The poor performance of farmers' draught animal implements due to poor 'Maintenance and use.
• Lack of skills amongst local artisans to provide Maintenance and repair facilities, or fabrication of simple tie-makers or ripper tines.
• Lack of access by farmers to reference material on existing or improved technologies, relying totally on local extension workers and other farmers for dissemination.
• Manufacturers being unwilling/unable to supply new implements without guaranteed sales.
• Farmers being unwilling/unable to adopt new systems due to lack of innovative implements and back up technical support.

With the cropping period in most semi-arid regions being relatively short (Figure 1), the timing of field operations is critical is considered critical. In our work we have examined the effects of tillage practices (primary land preparation) and land forms (e.g. potholes, furrows and ridge structures) on soil and water conservation and its subsequent impacts on crop establishment and weed control.

From our work it is clear that farmers in southern Africa already employ tillage practices with the aim of accomplishing several short-term goals including seedbed preparation, weed control and rainwater retention. In Zimbabwe farmers recognise that timely inter-row cultivation is important for both weed control and for maintaining a rough soil surface which can
Table 4. Zimuto farmers’ perceptions of advantages and disadvantages of technologies.

A. Establishment methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rip</th>
<th>‘FFP</th>
<th>OPFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disadvantage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Advantage</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Weeding Methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H11</th>
<th>OCIIH</th>
<th>OP HH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Disadvantage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Advantage</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5. Mshagashe farmers' perceptions of advantages and disadvantages of technologies. A.

#### Establishment methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIP</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
<th>TFP</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
<th>OPFP</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Good crop emergence; 2. Loosens plough pan; 3. Opens a small furrow; 4. Saves time; 5. Low draught requirement.</td>
<td>1. Weed growth between rows after emergence; 2. Poor for dry planting; 3. Covering seed with hoe is labour intensive.</td>
<td>1. Less work involved; 1 Seed is planted on moisture; 3. Less seed loss to predators; 4. Good weed control,</td>
<td>1. Poor emergence in vlei at dry planting due to clods; 2. High labour requirement; 3. Poor row spacing; 4. Poor emergence generally; 5. Requires gap tilling; 6. Inconsistent cultivation; 7. Inconsistent planting depth; b. Seed near plough pan, poor crop root growth.</td>
<td>1. Saves time; 1 Enables farmer to catch moisture; 3. Good emergence (100%).</td>
<td>1. Poor weed control; 2. Can be difficult to control depth - leads to poor emergence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B Weeding Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HH</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
<th>OCHH</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
<th>OPH</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. Kills all weeds.</td>
<td>1. Back breaking, labour intensive; 2. Slow.</td>
<td>1. Loosens soil, moisture conservation; 2. Quick; 3. Effective in inter-row; 4. Aerates soil; 5. Can produce ridges.</td>
<td>1. Reduced maize stand if crop is poorly spaced; 2. Only efficient when weeds are small.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>1. Large furrows encourage erosion; 2. Covers in-row weeds which are difficult to remove by hand; 3 Covers maize when plants are small.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
retain subsequent rainfall (Ellis-Jones et al., 1993). The widespread adoption of minimum-till and no-till systems in the capital-intensive agricultural systems of North America, Australia and other countries has been facilitated by innovations in equipment and herbicide technology (Halvorson et al., 1997). Modified tillage regimes, including no-till tied ridging, proposed as a sustainable conservation tillage system in both Zambia (Meijer, 1992) and Zimbabwe (Elwell and Norton, 1988), to reduce soil and water losses and improve the utilization of available draught power resources, have not been adopted on any scale. This is attributed to the resource needs of the system being beyond those available to many households. There are also other problems perceived by farmers, compared to flat cultivation practices, that include a high labour requirement for construction (Twomlow et al., 1997a), difficulties in planting and weeding (Meijer, 1992), and ridge maintenance, with no overall economic benefit (Table 6) compared to traditional systems they are intended to replace. Low resource-endowed farmers tend to choose cheaper and less labour demanding techniques for sustainable crop production. Recent studies in east Africa (Tengberg et al., 1998) have shown, that in general, farmers have a good understanding of their circumstances (biophysical and economic) and rationalise their farming practices to address these issues. Similar observations have been made in southern Africa, where our studies have confirmed that farmers have a good understanding of the strong relationship between crop growth, soil fertility, and water and labor availability (Table 7).

### Table 6  Economic analysis of method of ridging trial at Makoholi Experimental Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tillage system</th>
<th>Flat control</th>
<th>Ridged by hand</th>
<th>Ridged by plough</th>
<th>Ridged by ridger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grain yield, kg ha⁻¹</td>
<td>2772</td>
<td>2976</td>
<td>2682</td>
<td>2662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stover yield, kg ha⁻¹</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Purchased inputs Z$</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DAP cost Z$</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Labour cost Z$</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total Costs Z$ (2+3+4)</td>
<td>2538</td>
<td>2669</td>
<td>2628</td>
<td>2661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gross Margin Z$ (1-5)</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Total labour, hours</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Returns to labour Z$ h⁻¹</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((6+4)/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to cash expenditure Z$</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS⁻¹ (1/2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maize grain - 1050 Z$ t⁻¹ Maize stover - 30 Z$ t⁻¹ (Twomlow et al., 1997a)

### Table 7  Socio-economic and bio-physical factors considered by households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic factors</th>
<th>Biophysical factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land availability (and land tenure)</td>
<td>Rainfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour availability</td>
<td>Soil type and soil fertility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draught power availability</td>
<td>Soil moisture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement availability and condition</td>
<td>Crop establishment methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness and risk considerations</td>
<td>Weeding methods Profitability of farming systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in contrast to the majority of farmers in the rest of sub-Saharan Africa, smallholder farmers in semi-arid Zimbabwe rely heavily on draught animal power (DAP) and ox-drawn mouldboard ploughs for primary tillage and crop establishment. Seed is planted by hand into a furrow made by the plough and covered during the next pass, ensuring the maize germinates in a relatively weed-free seedbed. Farmers face the problem that the peak demand for DAP coincides with the time that animals are in weakest condition after a long dry sea (Shumba et al., 1992). Achieving timely planting and good germination is particularly important, which can be difficult for.
those without access to adequate DAP. Farmers recognise the need for weed control to remove weeds and allow enhanced capture of rainfall. Weed management is a key component of conservation tillage (Norton, 1987; Riches et al., 1997) and with weeding [with either hand tools or DAP implements] accounting for up to 60% of pre-harvest labour input for maize production (Akobundu, 1987; MLARR, 1992; Rogan and O'Neil, 1993), considerable strain is placed on household supplied labour. This can be reduced through the use of the ox-cultivator or plough.

Despite this investment in labour, our experimental evidence suggests that with the farmers existing weeding practice (a single weeding at 4 weeks) more than 30% of the potential yield of cereal crops is commonly lost to weed infestation. This may be due to late and inadequate weeding, with high labour demands for hoe weeding and a shortage of DAP and suitable implements for ox-cultivation contributing to weed problems (Chatizwa et al., 1998). In our studies, the optimum timing for weeding, based upon identification of the "critical period of competition" typically indicate the need to maintain maize free of weeds from 2 to 6 weeks from planting to achieve maximum water use efficiency and crop productivity (Table 8, Twomlow et al., 1997b), irrespective of the conservation tillage practices (Table 9, Twomlow and Dhliwayo, 1999).

Table 8. Total crop biomass (kg/ha), total crop water use (mm/ha) and water use efficiency (WUE, kg/mm) in response to time and frequency of weeding at Makoholi Experimental Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeding Treatment</th>
<th>1991/92</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1992/93</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>biomass</td>
<td>water use</td>
<td>WUE</td>
<td>biomass</td>
<td>water use</td>
<td>WUE</td>
<td>biomass</td>
<td>water use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weed at 2 wks</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>218.9</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3143</td>
<td>3964</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weed at 2+4+6 wks</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>210.3</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>4147</td>
<td>367.9</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weed at 4 wks</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>214.9</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>411.2</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kept weed free</td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>163.8</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>3178</td>
<td>393.1</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unweeded control</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>465.4</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.e.d.#</td>
<td>132.1***</td>
<td>6.63***</td>
<td>1.75***</td>
<td>496.5**</td>
<td>11.12***</td>
<td>1.467**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Significant treatment effect * P > 0.05; *** P>0.001

source: Twomlow et al., 1997b

Table 9. Maize grain yield (kg/ha), total crop water use (mm/ha) and water use efficiency (WUE, kg/mm) in response to conservation tillage and time of weeding at Makoholi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tillage</th>
<th>Grain</th>
<th>1994/95</th>
<th>Crop water use</th>
<th>WUE</th>
<th>1995/96</th>
<th>Grain</th>
<th>Crop water use</th>
<th>WUE</th>
<th>1996/97</th>
<th>Grain</th>
<th>Crop water use</th>
<th>WUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPFP</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPFP+MR</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1,981</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tied ridge</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tied Furrow</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2,577</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.e.d#</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td>4.4*</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>82.9***</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.44***</td>
<td>259.7***</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.29*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weeding Regime - weeks

|  | 1994/95 | Crop water use | WUE | 1995/96 | Crop water use | WUE | 1996/97 | Crop water use | WUE |
|  |  |              |     |         |              |     |         |              |     |
|  | OPFP    | 1,282     | 294 | 4.6 | 707 | 331 | 2.1 | 2,435 | 307 | 7.9 |
|  | OPFP+MR | 1,471     | 297 | 5.0 | 1,073 | 335 | 3.2 | 1,981 | 290 | 6.8 |
|  | Tied ridge | 1,280 | 290 | 4.4 | 1,495 | 332 | 3.2 | 1,349 | 312 | 11.0 |
|  | Tied Furrow | 1,234 | 304 | 4.1 | 302 | 335 | 0.9 | 2,577 | 300 | 8.6 |
|  | s.e.d#   | 158.6 | 4.4* | 0.947 | 82.9*** | 5.5 | 0.44*** | 259.7*** | 15.0 | 1.29* |

# Significant treatment effects * P<0.05; ** P<0.01; *** P<0.001

Weed management is therefore a key element in the design of any sustainable and adoptable tillage system aimed at raising smallholders' production and has a major impact on both yield and available soil water (Twomlow and Bruneau, 1999).
Our on-farm work has focussed on developing weed control strategies that complement primary tillage techniques for the majority of communal area farmers who cannot afford purchased inputs, including herbicides. Because of poor returns to cropping and an acute shortage of labour in many households, tillage/weed control systems should be based on low cost, labour saving technologies (Ellis-Jones and Mudhara, 1995). We have shown that the use of the mouldboard plough with body attached during weeding allows the creation of a ridge and furrow land form that can enhance soil water retention (Table 10, Riches et al., 1997). The soil thrown towards the crop row smothers weeds and reduces the need for subsequent labour-intensive inter-plant weeding. Labour productivity, in terms of grain/cotton harvested, can be considerably higher with this technique than following the use of existing hand hoe or cultivator followed by hoe systems. While 76% of households own a plough in southern Zimbabwe, only 23% own a cultivator, so "plough weeding" provides an opportunity for increasing the timeliness of weed control, for farmers who currently weed by hand, without the need for additional capital investment, if they have access to DAP.

**Table 10** Maize yields, labour requirements and returns to labour for four weeding systems at Makoholi Experimental Station.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yield kg ha&quot;</th>
<th>labour hours spent weeding</th>
<th>returns to weeding kg h'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>manual</td>
<td>mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-weed</td>
<td>5195</td>
<td>132.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivator</td>
<td>4552</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plough with body</td>
<td>4345</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plough less body</td>
<td>2766</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expt. s.e.</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-weed</td>
<td>2251</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivator</td>
<td>2092</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plough with body'</td>
<td>3047</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plough less body</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expt. s.c.</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-weed</td>
<td>3670</td>
<td>155.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivator</td>
<td>3990</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plough with body'</td>
<td>3896</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plough less body</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expt. s.e.</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Riches et al., 1997

* ridges were tied after weeding in 1993/94 and 1994/95

'labour for hand-hoeing estimated from on-farm records.

Prior work has shown the advantages of establishing a crop within either a rip line (Shumba, et al., 1992) or a planting furrow opened with a plough on winter or previously spring ploughed land (Mashavira et al., 1995; 1997; Mza et al., 1996; Twomlow et al., 1995). Although these techniques of crop establishment can reduce DAP inputs for seedbed preparation and allow timely planting, a heavier and earlier weed burden results than that for overall ploughing and planting together, the prevailing practice (Shumba et al., 1992). If combined with weeding with a plough (or a cultivator with ridging blades), timely planting, better soil water conservation, weed control and labour reduction can be achieved (Table 11).
Table 11 Maize Yield Response to Methods of Crop Establishment and Weeding on Spring Ploughed Land, Winter and Spring Ploughed Land and Unploughed Fallow Land in 1995/1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop Establishment</th>
<th>Spring Ploughed Land Grain Yield kg ha</th>
<th>Winter and Spring Ploughed Land Grain Yield kg ha</th>
<th>Unploughed Weedy Fallowed Land Grain Yield kg ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Labour h/ha</td>
<td>Return to Labour kg/h</td>
<td>Total Labour h/ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Plant</td>
<td>620.9</td>
<td>193.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Plough Furrow Plant</td>
<td>596.8</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rip to 0.3m depth</td>
<td>961.3</td>
<td>105.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method of Weeding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Grain Yield kg ha</th>
<th>Total Labour h/ha</th>
<th>Return to Labour kg/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hand-hoe</td>
<td>587.4</td>
<td>194.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox-Cultivator</td>
<td>953.5</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox-plough</td>
<td>638.0</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillage s.e.</td>
<td>187.2</td>
<td>6.05***</td>
<td>2.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeding s.e.</td>
<td>187.2</td>
<td>6.05*</td>
<td>2.3***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Significant treatment effect * P > 0.05, ** P > 0.01, ***P > 0.001

The law-draught, minimum tillage planting techniques for establishing the maize crop have been favourably received by farmers who have participated in or monitored the on-Farm trials in Zimuto and Mshagashe. The crop establishment methods selected by farmers for testing included: the traditional farmer practice of third furrow plough planting (TFP), planting in rip lines (RIP) and the innovative farmer practice of ploughing and planting every third row (OPFP). Weeding methods included: the use of hand weeding only (HH), ox-plough combined with the hand hoe (OPHH) and ox-cultivator combined with the hand hoe (OCHH). Planting into the rip line, made by a rip tine bolted onto the mouldboard plough beam, resulted in good crop stands at topland and vlei margin sites. This provided improved returns, when used in combination with hand weeding or the cultivator for weeding, on the Copland compared to the common farmer practice of planting behind the plough.

Maize grain yields were highest Vlei margin soils in the wet 1995/96 season, Toplands in the wet 1996/97 and Vleis in the dry 1997/98 season. In 1995/96 and 1996/97 seasons the best planting and weeding combinations on Topland and Vlei-margin soils was planting in a rip line followed by overall hand weeding. The best combination in the Vleis was traditional third furrow planting, dropping seed behind the ox-plough, followed by either ox-cultivating, or post plant tie-ridging with an ox-plough and in-row hand weeding. In the drier 1997/98 open plough furrow planting followed by weeding by hand or the ox-plough yielded the best on all soil types (Table 12).

For each season a partial budget analysis was undertaken for each combination, based on maize yields for each soil type (Ellis-Jones et al., 1998). Maize prices varied from Z$900 per tonne, paid by traders at the farm gate, up to Z$4000 per tonne when sold in small quantities. Labour is usually paid for undertaking a given task, which currently equates to Z$28 per day. DAP is rarely hired as share and borrowing arrangements are more common, but when it does occur ploughing costs range from Z$400 (winter ploughing) to Z$550 per ha (spring ploughing). Hiring DAP for weeding is not common but farmers indicate it would cost about Z$300 per ha. The best and worst technology options for crop establishment and weeding in terms of lowest and highest productivity are shown in Table 13, along with average maize yields and rainfall experienced in each season. Even with the contrasting rainy seasons experienced RIP and OPFP crop establishment methods proved the best options for toplands and vlei margins. HH proved the best weeding method for most soil types in most seasons though the ox plough shows its advantages for vlei sites where ridging is important for increasing rooting depth and improving drainage in a wet year, and conserving moisture in a dry year.

Table 12: Summary of Best and Worst Maize Yield Responses to Different Crop Establishment and Weed Control Combinations
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<td>Ox-plough</td>
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<tr>
<td>Weeding s.e.</td>
<td>187.2</td>
<td>6.05*</td>
<td>2.3***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soils Types</th>
<th>Best Options (kg/ha)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topland</td>
<td>RIPHH (1242)</td>
<td>RIPHH (4076)</td>
<td>OPFPHH (1789)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei margin</td>
<td>RIPHH (2685)</td>
<td>RIPOPHH (3094)</td>
<td>OPFPHH (1605)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei</td>
<td>TFPOCHH (1753)</td>
<td>TFPOPHH (3763)</td>
<td>OPFPOCHH (2717)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worst Options (kg/ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soils Types</th>
<th>Worst Options (kg/ha)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topland</td>
<td>OPFPCHH (580)</td>
<td>OPFPCHH (6205)</td>
<td>RIPOPHH (775)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei margin</td>
<td>OPFPHH (912)</td>
<td>TFPHH (2085)</td>
<td>RIPOCHH (550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei</td>
<td>RIPOCHH (855)</td>
<td>RIPOPHH (628)</td>
<td>RIPHH (1889)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Summary of results for three seasons showing average yields, best and worst productivity options, based on partial budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Types</th>
<th>Mean yields (kg per ha)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topland</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>3670</td>
<td>1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei-margin</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best productivity options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soils Types</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topland</td>
<td>RIP/HH</td>
<td>RIP/HH</td>
<td>OPFP/HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei-margin</td>
<td>RIP/HH</td>
<td>OPFP/OCHH</td>
<td>OPFP/HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei</td>
<td>RIP/HH</td>
<td>TFP/OCHH</td>
<td>OPFP/OCHH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worst productivity options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soils Types</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topland</td>
<td>TFP/OPHH*</td>
<td>TFP/OPHH*</td>
<td>TFP/OPHH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei-margin</td>
<td>TFP/OCHH*</td>
<td>TFP/OPHH*</td>
<td>TFP/OPHH*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei</td>
<td>TFP/HH</td>
<td>TFP/OCHH*</td>
<td>TFP/OCHH*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Partial budget analysis indicates that these options are worse than TFP/HH, the most widely used farmer practice (Ellis-Jones et al., 1998)

The low draught minimum tillage planting techniques of OPFP and RIP, were associated with greater weed infestations than observed on plots established by farmer practice of TFP (Table 14). High numbers of *H. meeusei*, *C. benghalensis*, *C. subulata*, *A. hispidum* and *E. indica* were found following OPFP and RIP. TFP tended to stimulate the emergence of *R. scabra* and *F. exilis*. Low numbers of some common species emerged following the use of OPHH, particularly *E. indica* and *A. hispidum*, compared to HH and OCHH. The weeding methods evaluated generally gave a similar level of weed control (Table 15) (Mabasa et al., 1998).
Table 14. Effect of crop establishment techniques on weed biomass (g/m) at 4 weeks after crop emergence across soil types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil type</th>
<th>Crop establishment technique (1996/97 season)</th>
<th>TFP</th>
<th>RIP</th>
<th>OPFP</th>
<th>SED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topland</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7.6*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei margin</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.9 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>23.1 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topland</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei margin</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>28.1 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.9*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# * = P<0.05 ns = not significant at P<0.05.

Table 15. Effect of weeding methods on weed biomass (g/m²) 4 weeks after crop emergence on three soil types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil type</th>
<th>Weeding method (1996/97 season)</th>
<th>HH</th>
<th>OPHH</th>
<th>OCHH</th>
<th>SED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topland</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.8*#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei margin</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24.6 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>33.3 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topland</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei margin</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>28.1 ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlei</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.9* #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = P<0.05 ns = not significant at P<0.05.

However, the poor performance of the draught animal weeding methods is largely due to the poor condition of the implements and their use. Implement assessment revealed that although some implements were less than five years old, most were substantially older with a number of ploughs and cultivators more than 30 years old being in regular use. Often parts were missing and farmers had little knowledge of maintenance or use. Only major parts were available in local stores, with running repairs being carried out only when absolutely necessary to ensure work could be continued. These practices have been confirmed to be fairly widespread throughout Zimbabwe (Chatizwa et al., 1997). Ripper attachments for ploughs and hilling blades for cultivators for ridging were not available. The lack of knowledge and non-availability of spare parts or innovative implements was seen as a major constraint in ensuring farmers are able to test and adopt the promising techniques.

Farmers have a deep understanding of the factors which need to be considered in achieving acceptable maize yields (Table 16). A number of tradeoffs have to be considered in achieving timely planting, good crop stands and acceptable levels of weeding with decision making largely dependent on access to resources. Timely planting in relation to periods of good seed-bed moisture are the key farmer criteria for selection of planting method. Category 1 uses the ox-cultivator supplemented by hand weeding. Category 2 rely largely on the hand hoe, but occasionally use the plough while category 3 farmers are restricted to the hand hoe. Availabilities of DAP, labour and appropriate implements are the key resources which guide farmers in selecting the crop establishment and weeding options available to them. Cat 1 households with the greatest access to DAP and labour seem prepared to accept
that earlier weeding will be needed following planting into rip lines or OPFP, if this consistently allows more timely planting and results in a good crop stand. Those households with low DAP and low labour are less willing to accept the tradeoff and see TFP as less risky and more appropriate method of saving both DAP and labour. Such households are unlikely to benefit from these technologies, unless a reduction in DAP requirements associated with widespread adoption of rip or OPFP techniques allow more timely borrowing or hiring. Reduced or no-tillage techniques without increasing weed burdens remains a priority concern for category 3 households.

Table 16. Farmers’ Perceptions of Crop Establishment and Weeding Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crop establishment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third furrow planting behind</td>
<td>Combines ploughing and planting, giving an overall saving</td>
<td>Poor germination Higher labour and DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plough</td>
<td>DAP and labour, Ensures early weed control</td>
<td>than rip and OPFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rip or Open Plough Furrow</td>
<td>Good crop emergence, DAP and labour reducing</td>
<td>Land has to be ploughed before planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Improves soil moisture retention</td>
<td>operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loosens plough pan</td>
<td>Early weed growth between crop rows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increases yields</td>
<td>Seed may not be well covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weeding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand hoe</td>
<td>Ensures clean weeding</td>
<td>Labour intensive and back breaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox-drawn five tine Cultivator</td>
<td>Labour saving and fast for interrow weeding</td>
<td>Weeds must be small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox-Drawn Plough with mouldboard</td>
<td>Labour saving, smothers weeds conserves moisture when</td>
<td>Crop damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ridges tied, promotes drainage in vleis</td>
<td>May cause erosion if ridges are not tied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output 3. Soil water regimes and development of a soil water

This work has made use of both on-station and on-farm data collected under this project and associated projects funded from SRLs Central Science Grant. To improve the effectiveness of crop production in these marginal rainfall regions, cultural practices which extend the period of water availability to the crop are essential. Unfortunately, little is known about the in situ hydrological properties of cultivated semi-arid soils in southern Africa. To help resolve the is situation during the course of this present project, detailed soil-water measurements have been made under a variety of conservation tillage/weed management systems to help explain the impact of the practices on crop yields and labour requirements (Table 1). We specifically investigated the hydrological and physical responses of three fersiallitic soils to conventional (flat) and improved (tied ridge) tillage practices (Twomlow and Bruneau, 1999) and gave special attention to the dynamic nature of soil surface characteristics early in the growing seasons. Previous work in sub-Saharan Africa having shown the importance of the first rain on soil-water recharge and subsequent crop growth (Vogel, 1993; Harris et al., 1994; Hoogmoed, 1999). Key Findings have been:

- Irrespective of soil type the quantity of water present in a soil profile at the beginning of the following season depends on the combined effect of the amount and distribution of rain in the previous season, the crop grown, level of weed control and tillage practiced.
- Generally tillage treatments that capture the most water are the wettest, however, the incomplete wetting up of pre-plant tied ridges early in a growing season frequently results in either poor crop establishment or a delay in planting.
-Conventionally tilled soils are more uniformly wet in the top 240 mm of the soil profile and significantly wetter than ridged structures early in the season.
- Furrows created by open plough furrow planting or with the ripper tine conserved more moisture early in the season than traditional third furrow planting and improved crop establishment.
- Mid season ridging with a plough, with the body attached, achieved efficient weed control and the ridges.
created increased water retention.

- Soil water regimes that develop under any tillage system are strongly influenced by the timing and frequency of weeding.
- In terms of crop water use, efficiency weeding at 2 and then 6 weeks after crop emergence performed, better than single weeding at four weeks.
- A weed management and water competition routine has been developed, to simulate the effect of weed management on crop performance. This routine has been incorporated in the PARCHED-THIRST crop growth model and calibrated with results from a 2-year weeding trial. The effects of weed competition on crop performance were assessed over a 30-year simulation period, for four levels of access to DAP and labour. The results demonstrate how sub-optimal crop management affects weed competition and crop production.

Long term monitoring has shown that at the end of the dry season, the quantity of water stored in the top 0.3m of the profile is negligible, typically below permanent wilting point (Twomlow and Bruneau, 1999). Yet, in the whole 0.9m of the profile the amount of water stored at the end of the dry season is more variable and depends on the combined effect of the amount and distribution of rain in the previous wet season, the type of crop grown and the tillage management.

At the beginning of the wet season, the recharge of the whole soil profile is of fundamental importance to subsequent crop establishment and can benefit from improved soil water storage in the previous season and tillage practices that help to catch the first rains of the wet season. In general terms the tillage treatment that impounds the most water (tied ridges) was the wettest, whatever the soil type, as long as the ridges were tied (Figure 2).

However, the incomplete wetting up of the tied ridges early in the wet season, irrespective of soil type, frequently resulted in poor crop establishment or a delay in planting until the ridge structure was fully wetted (Bruneau and Twomlow, 1999; Twomlow and Bruneau, 1999). This was in contrast to the conventionally tilled soils, which were more uniformly wet in the top 200 mm of the soil profile and significantly wetter than the ridged soils early in the wet season (Figure 3). Although it is possible to establish crops in the furrow bottom of the tied ridge system on most soil types, the crop is prone to water logging in wet seasons, and a crop in the furrow bottom prevents the use of animal drawn weeders used by many smallholder farmers. Irrespective of tillage technique, good weed management is critical to maximize the availability of water for crop growth (Table 7 and 8).

![Figure 2](image_url)  
Seasonal fluctuations in soil water content (mm) of the Ntini Sandy Loam for a 0.9 m deep profile in response to flat (■) and tied ridge (▲) cultivation for the 1993/94 season when ridges were tied late.
Unfortunately, computer simulation studies to date have often failed to relate crop responses to management restrictions and weed competition. To redress this situation, complementary PhD studies funded from SRI’s Central Science Grant have used the soil water data base collected and developed weed management and water competition routine, to simulate the effect of weed management on crop performance. The routines have been incorporated in the PARCHED-THIRST crop growth model and calibrated with results from a 2-year weeding trial (van der Meer et al., 1998ab, 1999ab).

Figure 3 Progression of wetting fronts for a conventional flat system compared to ridges constructed on Makoholi sand and Kadoma silty loam from an initially dry state to a wet state.

Table 17. Typical crop management scenarios available to farmers with different resources at their disposal. Winter ploughing takes place 21 days after the simulation indicates crop maturity. The four scenarios represent decreasing levels of weed control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farmer Category</th>
<th>Winter Ploughing</th>
<th>Planting</th>
<th>Weeding (weeks after emergence)</th>
<th>Reference in Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well-Resourced</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Timely</td>
<td>2+6</td>
<td>WP 2+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Resourced</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Timely</td>
<td>2+6</td>
<td>nWP 2+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly Resourced I</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Timely</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>nWP 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly Resourced II</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Late (21 days)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>nWP 4 LP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effects of weed competition on crop performance were assessed over a 30-year simulation period, for four levels of access to DAP and labour (Table 17) (van der Meer et al., 1999b). The results demonstrate how sub-optimal crop management affects weed competition and crop production. The timely access to sufficient DAP and labour is particularly crucial during planting operations, as a delay in planting can severely reduce crop performance.

Yield effects of the four scenarios are presented in Figure 4. The difference in yields between the treatments nWP 2+6 and nWP 4 show the effects of the application of two weedings rather than one weeding operation. This effect appeared to be strongest during seasons with above-average rainfall, and thus higher yields. Although the reductions in crop transpiration between these two treatments were limited (van der Meer, 1999), the predicted yields at the upper quartile showed a marked decrease from 1.85 to 1.44 ton.ha⁻¹. It was argued that because a well-developed crop has a higher potential transpiration rate, it will be more susceptible to within-season drought spells. The increased rate of depletion of the soil profile, due to weed competition for soil moisture, is likely to increase the detrimental effects of intra-seasonal drought spells on crop production. While winter ploughing and weeding frequency did affect crop performance, the most pronounced reductions in crop yields were found to be the result of the delay in planting (treatment nWP 4 LP). The effect of the planting
delay on annual weed transpiration was limited, but as crop establishment took place under sub-optimal conditions, crop development was badly affected. Furthermore, maturity was reached later in the season, and this increased the risk of experiencing an intra-seasonal drought. Weed control was limited as a result of the single weeding, and the additional water extraction by weeds further decreased the soil water availability to crops during such dry spells, leading to the simulated yield reductions.

Output 4. Project outputs have been promoted through:
- Annual reviews and evaluation field days with farmers, government and NGO extension staff.
- Options for tillage and demonstration have been provided by farmers leading to extension material being drafted and finalised in project R7085.
- Selected technologies have been promoted by the Cotton Training Centre
- 30 peer reviewed/editd papers, 13 unpublished reports/presentations and 7 project reports have been produced.

Contribution of Outputs:
The outputs of this project have contributed substantially towards the achievements of the Programme Purpose by ensuring that the Department for Research and Specialist Services, Agritex and NGOs have access to a range of efficient technologies that will permit more viable use of time or land which, depending on the livelihood strategy of particular farmers, might result in a reduced need for ploughing, a freeing-up of draught power, reduction of number of hours that women in particular spend weeding and a general improvement in the productivity of the system.

The direct contribution of the project outputs to meet the development need includes:

- introduction and adaptation of conservation tillage techniques for smallholder farmers;
- improved capacity of DR&SS and Agritex to carry out participatory research projects - also analytical and evaluation skills;
- training/workshops for farmers in the technologies;
- exposure of CARE field staff working with similar farmer groups to PTDA process and technologies;
- establishment of permanent of farmer research groups in Sanyati and Nembudziya following completion of the project in those areas;
- the training of local artisans, notably blacksmiths, to support the technologies that have been developed.

To date the technological options developed with the farmers in this project have been incorporated into:

- the Cotton Training Centre Syllabus and 1998 Training Manual;
- the CIMMYT Maize breeding programme;
- DR&SS Weed Research Team and Institute of Agricultural Engineering research and dissemination programmes;
Agritex staff in Sanyati and Nembudziya Districts are promoting the technologies;
Presentations have been made to numerous local, national and international workshops;
The technologies have been included with others under NRSP SAPS Project R7085 which
developed dissemination materials on soil and water management appropriate to the needs of
the farmer.

What is clear from this project is that there is no single method of soil and water management that will fit all
circumstances to achieve sustainable agricultural production at the small holder level in sub-Saharan Africa. Each
technology/option has advantages and limitations depending on the biophysical (soil and rainfall) resources, crops
grown, availability of crop residues and manures, farmer resources and Farmers' diverse and complex criteria for
decision making. However, significant increases in crop yields will only occur when improved conservation
practices, for example conservation tillage, are combined with improved soil fertility management (both organic
and inorganic) and effective weed management. Our research results also indicate that the performance of soil and
water management technologies is highly dependant, not only on an extreme variability of the soils natural
potential, but even more on the management capacity of farmers themselves. Unless smallholder farmers
themselves help develop the understanding and skills required to manage their land in a way which combines
production and conservation, the potential impact of all this knowledge and research will remain unfulfilled.

It is being increasingly recognised that farmers in sub-Saharan Africa often have a clear understanding of the
interrelationships between the range of issues, including available household resources, which need to be
integrated to achieve a good crop stand, and to grow a weed-free crop in synchronisation with available soil
moisture. Rather than being prescriptive, researchers and extensionists need to work closely with farmers to
explain more fully how and why a particular practice works, so that they are in a better position to determine for
themselves what they can and can not afford to do. The risks and benefits of technology options can then be
evaluated by farmers according to their criteria and their resources (Table 15). In southern Zimbabwe, for
example, many farmers seem prepared to accept that earlier weeding, with greater draught and labour inputs, will
be needed after planting into a rip line, so long as this consistently allows timely planting and results in a good
crop stand. Although farmers are looking for technologies which ease labour and DAP constraints, they are
prepared to accept certain tradeoffs to achieve the all-important crop stand with a minimum of risk. The success
with which tradeoffs in the system and flexibility in management decision-making can be maintained as the
season unfolds and weather patterns change, depend largely on a household's access to resources. Some 35% of
the communal farms in southern Zimbabwe, with only limited labour, and who either hire or borrow DAP from
other families, are probably unable to respond to the changing soil moisture situation by weeding with a plough,
for example, to conserve moisture on the dry sandy upland fields or to encourage drainage in the seasonally
inundated valley bottom vlei fields. It is difficult to foresee how these resource-constrained households can benefit
from the introduction of sustainable production methods, even those which involve limited modification of
existing systems, without considerable financial support.

In addition to the above our work has identified the urgent need for further training of farmers on implement use,
setting and maintenance as well the introduction of innovative implements such as rippers and sweep-tine
weeders, which will require support from manufacturers and rural artisans.


Unpublished Reports and Presentations


Internal Reports, working documents and presentations


Dhliwayo, H.1998. presented results to IFAD project operating in Midlands and Matebeleland, and IUCN project working in Sabi Valley Catchment Rehabilitation Project.

Plus twenty five overseas visit reports.
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