

The impact of 14 years of conventional and no-till cultivation on the physical properties and crop yields of a loam soil at Grafton NSW, Australia

Author

So, HB, Grabski, A, Desborough, P

Published

2009

Journal Title

Soil & Tillage Research

DOI

[10.1016/j.still.2008.10.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2008.10.017)

Rights statement

© 2009 Elsevier B.V.. This is the author-manuscript version of this paper. Reproduced in accordance with the copyright policy of the publisher. Please refer to the journal's website for access to the definitive, published version.

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/30398>

Link to published version

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/01671987>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

1 **The impact of 14 years of conventional and no-till**
2 **cultivation on the physical properties and crop yields of**
3 **a loam soil at Grafton NSW, Australia**

4

5 **H B So¹, A Grabski² and P Desborough³**

6 ¹Griffith University, Center for Environmental System Research, Nathan, Queensland 4111, Australia., previously
7 The University of Queensland.

8 ²Thies Pty Ltd, Brisbane, Qld, Australia, previously the University of Queensland.

9 ³NSW Agriculture, Grafton NSW 2460.

10 **Corresponding Author:** H.B. So, h.so@griffith.edu.au

11

12

1 **Abstract.**

2 The impact of 14 years of continuous conventional (CT) or no-till (NT) cultivation on
3 surface soil structure and crop yields were examined on a weakly structured silty loam soil at
4 Grafton in N.S.W. The annual soybean yields of the NT treatments between 1981 and 1985 were
5 consistently less than or equal to those resulting from CT with an average of 2.46 t ha⁻¹ and 2.82 t ha⁻¹
6 respectively for the two treatments. However, CT was unable to sustain the greater yield, and from
7 1987 onwards the yields of the NT treatments have typically been greater than those of the CT with
8 averages of 2.14 t ha⁻¹ and 1.67 t ha⁻¹ respectively.

9 During the earlier years of the trial, soil porosity and crop yields were not greatly affected by
10 the different tillage techniques. During later years and at the end of the trial, however, soil porosity
11 and structural stability were greater under NT. Increased soil macroporosity (Saturated water content
12 of 0.61 for NT vs 0.40 for CT) and structural stability (Dispersed silt +clay contents of 10% for NT vs
13 30 % for CT) under long term no-till cultivation were consistent with higher saturated hydraulic
14 conductivity (189 for NT vs 23 mm/h for CT), higher infiltration and lower run-off under rainfall,
15 increased plant available water (12.5 % for NT vs 10.5 % for CT), water use efficiency, and crop
16 yields. The improvement in soil structure observed under NT is associated with the significant
17 increase in surface soil organic carbon contents (3.37 % for NT vs 1.67 % for CT) and is shown to be
18 the major contributor to the sustained improvement of crop yields.

19

20 **Keywords.** Conventional tillage, no-till, bulk density, structural stability, infiltration,
21 hardsetting soil.

1 **Introduction**

2 Past research into the long term effects of cultivation upon soil physical properties, has yielded many
3 apparently contradictory results (Lal et al, 1989). Tillage effects on soil properties are usually site
4 specific and depend upon the interaction of soil and climatic conditions, with soil and crop
5 management practices. So et al (2000) reviewed the effect of tillage and suggested that it might result
6 in marginal increases in crop yield in the short term, however in the longer term it may be neutral or
7 give rise to yield decreases associated with soil structural degradation. On marginal and degraded soils,
8 tillage may be required to prepare suitable seedbeds or to release adequate nitrogen through
9 mineralization, but in the longer term, tillage reduces soil organic matter content, increases soil
10 erodibility and the emission of greenhouse gases. Loss of organic matter often results in increased bulk
11 density of the surface soil because organic matter stabilize soil aggregates against slaking, dispersion
12 and collapse. Repeated cultivation tends to give rise to subsoil compaction (Soane and Ouwerkerk,
13 1994; Kirchhof, 1995), largely as a result of traffic and associated loading.

14
15 As crop growth is fundamentally determined by the supply of water and nutrient, and this supply is in
16 turn affected by the ability of the plants to grow an adequate root system to exploit them, tillage may
17 have different effects on the production system in the short and long terms. The availability of water to
18 crops and the development of the root system are greatly influenced by soil porosity. Hence, tillage
19 may immediately increase the total porosity of soils (Hamblin, 1984; Lindstrom and Onstad, 1984)
20 through the creation of a few irregular macropores (Pagliai et al, 1984). The increase in porosity and
21 the consequent mineralization of N following cultivation may result in increased yield over a similar
22 non-cultivated soil in the short term. However, prolonged continuous cultivation, such as the
23 conventional tillage (CT) system, tends to reduce soil porosity through the mechanical breakdown of
24 structure and compaction of the surface soil. Significant tillage-induced structural degradation of loam
25 soils can occur as early as 3 (Burch et al, 1986) to 5 years (Hamblin, 1984) after the commencement of
26 cultivation, and is typically associated with reductions in crop yields.

27

1 In contrast, the prolonged use of continuous no-till (NT) has been shown to gradually improve the
2 stability, macroporosity, and crop yields of loamy soils over time (Hamblin, 1984; Unger and Fulton,
3 1990). Within an NT system, soil porosity develops through the actions of the soil biota, which
4 typically occur in higher densities under NT. For example, Chan and Heenan (1993) and Goss et al
5 (1984) found a significant correlation between the increased macropore incidence and the greater
6 earthworm population densities found in the soil under extended NT.

7
8 Many farmers on unstable, degraded or partially degraded soils associated with long term cultivation,
9 faces the dilemma of whether to continue with the practice of repeated tillage (conventional tillage) for
10 growing their crops, or to change to a reduced or no till system as a means of improving the health of
11 their soil. A key question is whether the long term effect of possible increased yield outweighs the
12 possible short term effect of yield reduction following the change to reduced tillage. The objective of
13 this paper is to compare the effect of 14 years of conventional tillage and no-till on a fragile silty loam
14 soil in the context of mechanized Australian agriculture.

16 **Methodology**

17 A field experiment was conducted at a site in Grafton, NSW, which has previously been under
18 pasture for at least 5 years. The soil at the site had a weakly structured silt-loam A horizon (0-30 cm),
19 which abruptly changed into a more strongly structured B horizon grading from clay loam to medium
20 clay texture with depth. Such soils have been variously classified as red/yellow Podzolics (Stace at all,
21 1968), Kurosols (Isbell, 2002) or Ultisols (US Soil Survey staff, 1975). Under continuous cultivation,
22 the surface tended to be hardsetting, (i.e. very hard when dry but soft when wet) with a restricted water
23 holding capacity resulting in rapid changes from wet to dry in the surface soil. The site had a mean
24 annual rainfall of 850 mm and evaporation of about 1000 mm (Linnacre and Hobbs, 1977). It had a
25 uniform slope of 8 %.

26 The experiment began in 1981, and consisted of two tillage treatments (Conventional Tillage -
27 CT and No-till - NT) within a crop rotation consisting of rainfed summer soybean (*Glycine max* (L.) cv
28 Manta) and a winter cereal of oats (*Avena sativa*). Each treatment was replicated 3 times and each

1 replicate consisted of a field plot measuring 60m x 20m. NT treatments were never disturbed other than
2 during sowing operations, whereas CT treatments were chisel ploughed to a depth of 0.2 m and disk
3 harrowed twice prior to planting each crop. Superphosphate was applied at a rate of 400kg.ha⁻¹ four
4 weeks prior to the sowing of the soybeans, and an additional 100kg.ha⁻¹ was applied at sowing. Potassium
5 fertiliser was applied in some years according to soil test requirements, at rates of up to 100kg.ha⁻¹ K₂O.
6 Molybdenum was applied as a seed dressing. A four row no-till planter was used on both treatments.
7 Seedling counts were taken during the establishment phase of the soybean crop.

8 In 1995, undisturbed soil samples (76 mm diameter and 60 mm deep) were collected at 0.1 m
9 intervals to a depth of 0.5 m to determine soil bulk density (McIntyre and Loveday, 1974). Soil structural
10 stability was determined using the wet sieving technique (Kemper and Rosenau, 1986), and the
11 percentage dispersible silt and clay by the end over end shaking technique (Cook et al, 1992). Soil water
12 characteristics were determined on duplicate intact soil cores using the pressure plate technique (Klute,
13 1986). Soil strength measurements were made using a laboratory penetrometer on intact soil cores
14 (Daquiado et al, 1998). Hydraulic conductivity were measured at field saturation and at -4 hPa tension
15 using disc permeameters (Perroux and White,1988), Crop water use was monitored using a neutron
16 moisture meter (Graecen, 1981). Yield was measured using 1m x 1m quadrat sampling with 3
17 replications per plot.

18 During the last soybean crop, areas of the field plot were intentionally cleared to measure
19 infiltration of rainfall and its redistribution under prevailing field conditions. A rainfall simulator with an
20 intensity of 80mm/hr was used to determine the infiltration and runoff characteristics of the bare soil
21 using plots of 2 m x 1.5 m (Sheridan et al, 2000). The raindrop energy from the simulator is estimated at
22 29 J per mm of rain and is estimated as similar to the energy of natural rainfall. Undisturbed soil cores
23 were collected before and after the simulation (McIntyre and Loveday, 1974), to examine the
24 redistribution of infiltrated water. These cores were collected outside and adjacent to the plots which
25 received the same rainfall intensity.

26 Results were analysed using the statistical package MINITAB.

27 **Results and Discussion**

1 Although some deeper measurements were made, significant treatment effects were detected
2 only within the top 0.2 m of the soil profile. Previous work at the site by Harte and Desborough (1985)
3 and Thompson (1986) found that soil bulk density (measurements confined to top 0.2 m) was not greatly
4 affected by tillage during the early years of the trial. However, data from this work has shown that after
5 14 years, the NT surface soil has a significantly lower bulk density than the CT surface soil. (Fig 1a)

6 More importantly, Fig 1a shows that the bulk density of the CT surface soil did not change
7 significantly over the 14 years of the experiment, whereas bulk density of the surface soil significantly
8 decreased under NT. This indicates that a dominant effect was development of porosity under NT. The
9 greater organic matter content of the NT surface soil (see Table 1) is consistent with this conclusion, as it
10 is typically associated with greater biological activity (Graham and Haynes, 2006). Soil bulk density
11 below a depth of 0.2 m was similar under CT and NT.

12 The smaller values of dispersible silt and clay (Fig 1b), together with the greater mean weight
13 diameter (Fig 1c) indicate that the NT surface layers were more stable and better aggregated than the CT
14 soil. These differences in stability are consistent with those in soil organic matter content for the different
15 treatments. The collapse of larger unstable aggregates, and the associated increase in the smaller
16 aggregate sizes (Figure 1b and 2) is likely to contribute to the lower porosity and greater bulk density of
17 the CT surface soil.

18 The NT surface soil had a greater hydraulic conductivity at field saturation (K_{sat}) and a smaller
19 unsaturated hydraulic conductivity (K_{unsat}) than the CT surface soil. At -4 hPa suction, all pores
20 greater than 0.75 mm are drained, hence the difference between K_{sat} and K_{unsat} (at -4 hPa matric
21 potential) is due to the contribution of macropores with a diameter >0.75 mm known as the
22 transmission pores. The difference measured between K_{sat} and K_{unsat} was greatest for the NT soil, and
23 is consistent with the data of Chan and Heenan (1993).

24 As a result of the observed effects on soil porosity, soil water release characteristics were also
25 affected by tillage (Table 2). As expected, the soil water content at wilting point ($\Psi_M = -1.5$ MPa) was
26 similar for the two treatments. However, at field capacity ($\Psi_M = -0.01$ MPa) and at saturation ($\Psi_M = 0$
27 MPa), water content is strongly affected by soil structure and in the top 10 cm of the NT soil, it was

1 greater than for CT, leading to 22% more plant available water. This in turn may well have improved
2 establishment.

3 The greater number of macropores within the surface of the NT soil resulted in a
4 significantly greater amount of water between the matric potentials of 0 MPa and -0.01MPa, and
5 also between -0.01 MPa and -1.5 MPa. This is consistent with the greater hydraulic conductivity of
6 the NT soil, and suggests that water infiltration and redistribution characteristics of NT surface soil
7 are superior to those of the CT surface soil. As a result, the ability of NT surface soil to readily
8 transmit water, the overall potential of the NT profile to store and provide water for crops should be
9 superior to that of the CT profile.

10 Soil strengths above 2000kPa are thought to impede root extension and at a matric potential
11 of -1.5 MPa the overall strength of the CT surface soil was greater than that of the NT soil, and that
12 it also exceeded 2000 kPa (Table 3). The combination of reduced plant available water holding
13 capacity and greater soil strength suggests that the ability of roots to explore the soil may have been
14 inhibited to a significantly greater extent under CT. In the absence of root sampling, this remains
15 speculative. No significant differences in soil strength were detected between the treatments at
16 matric potentials of 0 MPa (saturation) or -0.01 MPa (field capacity). Differences at matric potential
17 of – 1.5 MPa is associated with the lower soil bulk densities under NT compared to CT (Fig 1).

18 Under simulated rainfall, the steady state infiltration rates of CT plots were significantly slower
19 than those of NT plots (5 mmh^{-1} and 25 mmh^{-1} respectively). These infiltration rates were consistent with
20 the soil water content profile data, which found that after the simulation, total water contents of the NT
21 and CT soil profiles had increased by 27 mm and 13 mm respectively. A reduction in infiltration
22 typically results in greater runoff and soil loss and the calculated soil losses during the rainfall simulation
23 were equivalent to 12.1 t ha^{-1} and 2.6 t ha^{-1} under CT and NT respectively. These infiltration rates were
24 much lower than the rates measured with the disc permeameter (Table 1) which indicates the
25 susceptibility of the aggregates of these fragile silty loam soils to degradation from raindrop impact.

26 Immediately prior to rainfall simulation, the initial soil profile water contents of the two
27 treatments were similar and could be plotted as a single line (Figure 3). Immediately after simulation,
28 significant changes to water content occurred at depths of 0.25 m and 0.075 m for the NT and CT

1 treatments respectively. Two days later infiltrated water had moved further into the profiles of both
2 treatments. These observations are consistent with anecdotal reports that very little run-off from the
3 NT fields relative to CT fields following intensive rainstorms is typical of the coastal regions of
4 Australia.

5 Surface sealing was observed on CT soil under rapid wetting from rainfall. The associated
6 reduction in surface soil porosity would have contributed to reduced infiltration and increased soil loss
7 of the CT soil. Similar results have been reported by Chan and Mead (1988), and Burch et al (1986). A
8 blanket of decaying plant residues, fungi, mosses, and lichens covered the NT soil, whereas the CT soil
9 was sealed with a bare hardsetting erosional crust. Seedling counts of 14 plants.m⁻² under CT, and 36
10 plants.m⁻² under NT were consistent with the greater strength of the CT surface soil when dry.

11 The relationship between crop yields and tillage practices has changed over time. The annual
12 soybean yields of the NT treatments between 1981 and 1985 were consistently less than or equal to
13 those resulting from CT (Figure 4) and average 2.46 t ha⁻¹ and 2.82 t ha⁻¹ respectively for the two
14 treatments. CT was unable to sustain the greater yield, and from 1987 onwards the yields of the NT
15 treatments have typically been greater than those of the CT (averages of 2.14 t ha⁻¹ and 1.67 t ha⁻¹
16 respectively).

17 **Insert Fig 4 here**

18 During the final cropping cycle of the trial, apparent total water use (the difference between
19 the total profile water content at beginning and end of the measurement period or cropping season,
20 plus the rainfall during that period) and crop yield were examined. The dry matter yield, grain yield
21 and the associated apparent water use efficiencies (WUE) of the winter oat crop were all greater under
22 NT (Table 4). It is most likely that greater evaporative losses from the soil in CT results in lower DM
23 WUE than in NT associated with the lower saturated and higher unsaturated hydraulic conductivities
24 in CT (Table 1). A reduced harvest index in plants grown on CT soils resulted in greater reduction in
25 grain WUE compared to plants grown on NT. The reasons are not clear, however observations show
26 significantly poorer growth on CT, most likely due to reduced root development associated with
27 greater soil strength in the CT soils (Table 3). Under dry temperate climatic conditions, Goss et al
28 (1978) found similar results with winter wheat where water uptake was significantly higher where

1 wheat was grown under no tillage systems compared to conventional cultivation. However in the
2 wetter years, no differences were observed between the two cultivation methods. Similar results were
3 obtained from dry matter sampling during the following soybean crop, however, limited rainfall and
4 extensive pest damage during the growth of that crop confounded the final yield data for both
5 treatments and could not be used. The large differences between the calculated WUE of the treatments
6 suggests that water is being lost from the CT system due to factors other than crop uptake. Reduced
7 infiltration and increased evaporation contributed to the greater apparent water use of the CT
8 treatments. Over 22 days in March 1994 a total of 68.9 mm of rain fell at the experimental site in low
9 intensity storms, and the cumulative evaporation was 67.7 mm. At the end of this period, 20 % of the
10 total rainfall was accounted for by the measured increase in the profile water content of the bare NT
11 soil, which reduced the apparent total water use. There was no measured increase in the profile water
12 content of the bare CT soil.

13

14 **Conclusions**

- 15 1. The early years following the introduction of no till cultivation on an unstable degraded silty
16 loam soil will result in a small depression of crop yields, thereafter no till consistently performs
17 better than conventional cultivation.
- 18 2. The result of long term no till cultivation has been an improvement in the aggregate stability and
19 macroporosity of the surface soil and hence, a greater potential for infiltration and storage of
20 water by the entire soil profile. Therefore, the structural improvement of the surface 10-15 cm of
21 the soil, through the use of long-term practice of no till cultivation, led to the sustainable
22 improvement of crop yields on these fragile soil.

1 *Acknowledgements*

2 The financial support for this research was provided by the Sugar Research and Development
3 Corporation, and NSW Agriculture. Assistance from Mr Mike Hughes and the staff of the NSW
4 Agriculture research station at Grafton is gratefully acknowledged.

5 **References**

- 6 Burch, G.W., Mason, I.B., Fischer, A.B., Moore, I.D., 1986. Tillage effects on soils: physical
7 and hydraulic responses to direct drilling at Lockhart, New South Wales. *Aust. J. Soil.*
8 *Research.* 24, 377-391
- 9 Chan, K.Y. , Heenan, D.P., 1993. Surface hydraulic properties of a red earth under continuous
10 cropping with different management practices. *Aust. J. Soil Res.* 31, 13-34.
- 11 Chan, K.Y. , Mead, J.A., 1988. Surface properties of a sandy loam soil under different tillage
12 practices. *Aust. J. Soil Res.* 26, 549-559.
- 13 Cook, G.D., So, H.B., Dalal, R.C., 1992.. Structural degradation of Vertisols associated under
14 continuous cultivation in Southern Queensland, Australia. *Soil and Tillage Research*
15 24: 47 - 64.
- 16 .Daquiado, N.P., 1998.. Assessing the limitations on soil productivity imposed by hardsetting
17 properties. Ph D Thesis, University of Queensland, Australia.221 p
- 18 Goss, M.J., Howse, K.R., Harris, W., 1978.. Effects of cultivation on soil water retention and
19 water use by cereals in clay soils. *Journal of Soil Science* 29: 475-488.
- 20 Graecen, E.L. (1981). Soil water assessment by the neutron method. C.S.I.R.O., Australia.
- 21 Graham, M.H., Haynes, R.J., 2006. Organic matter status and the size, activity and metabolic
22 diversity of the soil microbial community in the row and inter-row of sugarcane under
23 burning and trash retention. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 38: 21-31.
- 24 Hamblin, A.P., 1984. The effect of tillage on soil surface properties and the water balance of a
25 xeralficalfisol. *Soil and Tillage Research.* 4, 543-559.

1 Harte, A.J., Desborough, P.J., 1985. Internal Report, NSW Soil Conservation Service

2 Isbell, R.F, 2002. The Australian Soil Classification. CSIRO Pub., Collingwood, VIC, Australia ,

3 144 pp

4 Kemper, W.D. and Rosenau, R.C. (1986). Aggregate stability and size distribution. In A. Klute (Ed)

5 Methods of soil analysis, part 1. American Society of Agronomy Monograph no 9, p

6 425-42.

7 Kirchof, G., 1993.. Compaction properties of vertisols and their potential effect on

8 sunflower. PhD thesis, University of Queensland, St Lucia, Qld, Australia.

9 Klute, A (1986). Water retention: Laboratory methods. In A. Klute (Ed), Methods of soil

10 analysis, part 1. American Society of Agronomy Monograph no 9, p 635-62.

11 Lal, R., Logan,T.J., Fausey, N.R., 1989. Long term tillage and wheel traffic effects on a poorly

12 drained mollic ochraqualf in northwest Ohio. 1. Soil physical properties, root

13 distribution, and grain yield of corn and soybean. Soil & Tillage Research 14, 341-358.

14 Linacre, E., Hobbs, J., 1977.. The Australian Climatic Environment. John Wiley & Sons,

15 Brisbane.

16 Lindstrom, M.J., Onstad,C.A., 1984. Influence of tillage systems on soil physical parameters

17 and infiltration after planting. J. Soil & Water Conserv. March-April 1984, 149-152

18 McIntyre, D.S. and Loveday, J. (1974) Bulk Density. In J. Loveday (Ed) Methods for analysis of

19 irrigated soils. Tech. Comm. No 54, Comm. Bureau of Soils, Comm. Agric. Bureau, Farnham

20 Royal, England, p 38-42.

21 Pagliai, M., La Marca, M., Lucamante, G., Genovese, L., 1984. Effects of zero and

22 conventional tillage on the length and irregularity of elongated pores in a clay loam soil

23 under viticulture. Soil & Tillage Research. 4, 433-444.

24 Perroux, K.M., and White, I., 1988. Designs for disc permeameters. Soil Science Society of America

25 Journal 53, 324-329

26 Sheridan, G.J., So, H.B., Loch, R.J., Pocknee, C., Walker, C.M., 2000. Use of laboratory-

27 scale rill and interrill erodibility measurements for the prediction of hillslope scale

- 1 erosion on rehabilitated coal mine soils and spoils. Special issue: Australian Journal of
2 Soil Research 38, 285 - 297.
- 3 So, H.B., Kirchhof, G., Bakker, R., Smith, G.D., 2000. Low input tillage/cropping systems for
4 limited resource areas. In Morrison, JE(Ed).ISTRO 2000: Proc. International
5 Conference of the International Soil Tillage Research Organisation. CD-ROM,
6 USDA-ARS, Temple, Texas, USA
- 7 Soane, B.D., van Ouwerkerk, C., 1994.. Soil Compaction in crop production. Developments in
8 agricultural engineering. Elsevier Science, Amsterdam.
- 9 Soil Survey Staff, 1975. Soil taxonomy : a basic system of soil classification for making and
10 interpreting soil surveys. Handbk. US Dept. Agric.
- 11 Stace, H., Hubble, G., Brewer, R., Northcote, K., Sleeman, J., Mulcahy, M., Hallsworth, E.,
12 1968. A handbook of Australian soils. Relim Tech. Publ.: Glenside, South Australia.
- 13 Thompson, D., 1986.. Soil structure investigations in conservation tillage for crop and pasture
14 production on the north coast of NSW. In Cole, BE, Desborough, PJ (eds) Project team
15 meeting, Grafton, NSW, August 1986.
- 16 Unger, P.W., Fulton, L.J., 1990. Conventional and no-tillage effects on upper root zone soil
17 conditions. Soil and Tillage Research, 16, 337-344.

1 **Table 1 : Soil physical properties after 14 years of cropping. Organic matter data after Daquido**
 2 **(1998)**

3

Physical Property of the Soil	No-Tillage	Conv Tillage	l.s.d.	Prob %
Percentage organic matter	3.37	1.65	na	
Hydraulic conductivity saturated	189.4	28.0	75.5	0.01
of surface soil (mm/h) unsat(- 4 hPa)	2.3	10.8	7.8	0.05

4

5

1 **Table 2: Water contents (m^3/m^3) at different potentials, for CT and NT soils 14 years**
 2 **after commencement of the trial. Superscripts indicates significant**
 3 **differences at $P < 0.05$ within each depth interval.**

4

MATRIC POTENTIAL (MPA)	DEPTH					
	0 – 50 mm		50 – 100 mm		100 – 200 mm	
	CT	NT	CT	NT	CT	NT
0 (saturation)	0.40 ^a	0.61 ^b	0.47 ^a	0.50 ^a	0.53 ^a	0.51 ^a
- 0.01 (Field Capacity)	0.27 ^c	0.36 ^d	0.37 ^b	0.42 ^b	0.42 ^b	0.40 ^b
- 1.5 (Wilting Point)	0.06 ^e	0.11 ^e	0.21 ^c	0.22 ^c	0.24 ^c	0.23 ^c
Differences in water contents						
0 – 0.01 (drainable pores)	6.5	12.5	5.0	4.0	11.0	9.0
0.01 – 1.5 (available water)	10.5	12.5	8.0	10.0	18.0	17.0

5

6

1 **Table 3: Soil strength (kPa) under CT and NT at a matric potential of –**
2 **1.5 MPa after 14 years of treatments. Superscripts indicates**
3 **significant differences at P<0.05 within each depth interval.**

4

Depth	CT	NT	Average
0 – 5 cm	1874 ^a	1236 ^b	1555
5 – 10 cm	2898 ^a	1927 ^b	2413 ^c
10 – 20 cm	3709 ^a	2234 ^b	2972
Average	2827	1799 ^c	

5

6

1 **Table 4: Crop water use and yield data for the oats and soybean crops. N/A not available.**

2

Crop & treatment		Dry matter @ 80 days (t/ha)	Total 80 days water Use (mm)	DM Water Use Efficiency (kg/ha/mm)	Grain Yield (kg/ha)	Total seasonal water use (mm)	Grain Water Use Efficiency (kg/ha/mm)
Oats	NT	5.72	97.2	58.8	661	127.1	5.2
Oats	CT	4.45	97.1	45.8	290	131.8	2.2
Soy	NT	2.61	121.7	21.4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Soy	CT	1.74	125.3	13.9	N/A	N/A	N/A

3

4

1 **Figure captions**

2




3 Figure 1: The effect of cultivation on the bulk density (a), Dispersible silt + clay (b) and mean
4 weight diameter (c) as a function of depth. Bars indicate LSD at 5 % unless indicated
5 otherwise. The first year bulk density is taken from data of D.Thompson (1986)

6 Figure 2: Proportion of total aggregates in each size class. Bars indicate Lsd at 5 %

7 Figure 3: Initial distribution of water in the profile before the application of simulated rainfall of
8 40 mm, immediately and 2 days after simulation.

9 Figure 4: Soyabean yield during the 14 years of trial history. * significant at 5 %,
10 **highly significant at 1 %.


11



1
2
3
4
5

Fig 1: The effect of cultivation on the bulk density (a), Dispersible silt + clay (b) and mean weight diameter (c) as a function of depth. Bars indicate LSD at 5 % unless indicated otherwise. The first year bulk density is taken from data of D.Thompson (1986)

1



2

3 **Figure 2: Proportion of total aggregates in each size class. Bars indicate Lsd at 5 %**

4

5

6


7

8

9

10

11



1

2

Figure 3: Initial distribution of water in the profile before the application of simulated rainfall of 40 mm, immediately and 2 days after simulation.

3

4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13




Figure 4: Soyabeam yield during the 14 years of trial history. * significant at 5 %, **highly significant at 1 %.