http://www.pjbs.org



ISSN 1028-8880

# Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences

ANSIMet

Asian Network for Scientific Information 308 Lasani Town, Sargodha Road, Faisalabad - Pakistan

# Seed Yield and Monetary Returns as Influenced by Pure Crop and Intercrops Grown in Association with Wheat

Rahmat Ullah Khan, Abdul Rashid, Ahmad Khan and Said Ghulam Khan Arid Zone Research Institute (PARC), D.I. Khan, Pakistan

### Abstract

Midies were undertaken at Arid Zone Research Institute, D.I. Khan during 1996-97 and 1997-98 to determine the effect inferent intercropping combination viz., wheat + gram, wheat + rapeseed with pure crop of wheat, gram and rapeseed in maximum monetary returns. Data revealed that intercropping of wheat and gram sown in ratio of 1:1 and 3:1 gave inficantly maximum seed yield and higher returns over traditionally sown pure crop of wheat, gram and rapeseed both lever respectively. This above intercropping combination of (1:1) and (3:1) increased the monetary returns 65, 37 and per cent during 1997-98 while 162, 12 and 555 per cent during 1997-98 over sowing of pure crops of wheat, gram of rapeseed respectively.

### Moduction

Pakistan, dry land farming contribute a substantial nount to the economy of agriculture. The rainfed areas, ing a potential resource have not been explored efficiently eto mismanagement and traditional ways of farming. heat being a single largest crop of the rainfed areas ntribute 12.5 percent of the national wheat production wand Sharif, 1995) which is far less than the other lest growing countries. There are many factors to be lowed for the crop improvement but one of the important for which plays a pivotal role for crop improvement is hable intercropping. Intercropping is popular among small farmers in tropical and subtropical environments. The ited resources and subsistence level of farming in listan necessitates the practice of intercropping where it received much attention as a means of improving ercrop yield and land usage. In this context, the cesses which lead to the advantages and usual agement practices to maximize benefits have been emined (Wahua and Miller, 1978) which implies the ntitative and qualitative estimations of characters of rcropped species. Many researchers, using cereal me combinations, have studied yield and yield ponents of intercropped genotypes (Chandravanshi, 5; Cordero and Mc Collums, 1979; Galal et al., 1979; hand Doughal, 1967 and Rao and Willey, 1979). The iplicity of possible plant combinations and the action in the crop mixtures have complicated the tive intercropping system (Narrang et al., 1969).

ording to Perrin (1978), multiple cropping can be a wful component of cultural pest control, provided that tisfies the farmer's socio-economic objectives.

dawa (1985) reported that population of several pests assed under conditions of plant species diversity. Risch found inter-cropping as a measure for the control of the tipests. An examination of 150 published field studies lich 198 phytophagous species were studied showed 33 percent of the pest species were less abundant; 18

per cent were more abundant, 9 percent showed no difference and 20 percent showed a variable response in the intercropped crops. In Pakistan, no appreciable intercropping work has been done under the rainfed condition. However, for a given set of combination within a specific system, a method of arranging two crops for maximum yield benefits could be formulated.

Thus, the present study was designed to develop such a method, using wheat, chickpea and rapeseed in different sequence to determine the maximum monetary returns of intercroppings of wheat crop.

# Materials and Methods

Prior to seeding, soil samples were taken from the experimental sites for analysis. Results of the physical and chemical analysis of the soils are presented in Table I. The fertilizer @ 20-50-0 NPK kg/ha was broadcast and incorporated into the soil, using a rotavator for incorporation. The different intercropping combination viz., wheat + gram, wheat + rapeseed with pure crop of wheat, gram and rapeseed were evaluated for maximum monetary returns. For these combination wheat c.v, Inqilab, for chickpea c.v, NIFA-88 and for rapeseed c.v Shiralee were used at their recommended rate. The site received 256 mm and 221 mm rain prior to planting in the month of June to September. Meteorological data are reported in Table 2 a.b.

Table 1: Soil chemical and physical status of trial sites used in study.

Year	1996-97	1997-98	
OM (%)	0.70	0.60	
pН	8.20	8.30	
NH4N (ppm)	0.04	0.03	
P (ppm)	7.00	6.00	
K (ppm)	-	-	
Texture	Silty clay	Silty clay	

Table 2(a): Meteorological data of the trial sites used in

	study.		
Months	1996-97	1997-98	Seven year average* (1991-92 to 1997-98)
Oct.	15	86	21.29
Nov.	-	-	5.07
Dec.	9	4	9.14
Jan.	8	6	7.79
Feb.	-	15	15.00
Mar.	15	55	31.54
April.	69	39	36.35
Total	116	205	126.18

<sup>\*</sup> Mean monthly and long-term average precipitation(mm).

Table 2(b): Monthly mean temperature (°C)

Month	1996-97			1997-98		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
October	31	17	24	27	19	23
November	27	9	18	24	12	18
December	22	4	13	19	7 ·	13
January	20	6	13	20	4	12
February	22	6	14	23	7	15
March	25	11	18	24	12	18
April	30	16	23	33	19	26

<sup>1 =</sup> Mean Maximum 2 = Mean minimum 3 = Mean

The experiment was laid out in Randomized Complete Block Design, with 4 replication and a plot size of 1.8 x 5 m (6 rows/plot). The crops were cut according to their maturity using the treatments as follows:

Treatment with crop combination:

Pure wheat crop.

Pure chickpea crop.

Pure rapeseed crop.

Wheat + chickpea (1:1).

Wheat + chickpea (3:1).

Wheat + rapeseed (1:1).

Wheat + rapeseed (3:1).

Seed yield data from all treatments were collected on t four central rows in each plot and converted into pure of of wheat to determine the suitable crop combinations higher returns.

Data were analyzed using the analysis of variance (ANOV procedure and LSD (P< 0.05) values were calculated comparisons among means (Steel and Torrie, 1980).

## Results and Discussion

Yield of pure crops and inter-crops grown with wh (1996-97): Intercropping studies showed a signification different results over pure intercrops included in experiments. In case of wheat + gram intercroppi growing of 1 row of wheat and 1 row of gram or 3 row wheat and 1 row of gram proved to be superior of farmer's practice of planting pure crops. The combinations gave higher seed yield equivalent of wh and monetary returns over pure crops and other itercrops combinations (Table-3).

This increase in seed yield was 1.7 to 1.5 folds over wheat crop. It appeared also profitable over pure crop gram. Concerned to intercropping of wheat with rape at the same ratio gave 14 to 13 fold seed increase pure rapeseed crop. However all the intercropping ( higher returns over pure crops but wheat + gram grown in a combination of (1 : 1) and (3 : 1) appa significantly the best over pure crops as well as and intercrop (Table-3).

Yield of pure crops and inter-crops grown with 1997-98: Similar to previous year, during 1997-98 crop sequence, wheat + gram intercropping, growing row of wheat and 1 row of gram or 3 row of wheat a row of gram appeared the appropriate combination gave 2.5 to 2.6 fold yield increase over solid wheat whereas at the same ratio growing of wheat and rape increased the yield 3.5 and 3.0 fold over pure or rapeseed. However, all the intercrop proved to be sur and more profitable over traditional farming practi growing pure crops but growing of wheat and grams

Table 3: Yield of pure crops and intercrops grown with wheat during 1996-97

Table 3: Yield of pure cro Treatments	Yield of pure crop (kg/ha)	Yield of intercrop (kg/ha)	Seed yield equivalent of wheat	Gross return (Rs/ha)
	1762.1		1762.1C	14977.9
Wheat	1392.3	-	2129.4 BC	18099.9
Gram	108.3	<del>-</del>	159.1 D	1352.4
Rapeseed	1666.6	816.3	2915.1 A	24778.4
Wheat + Gram [1:1]	1524.3	782.7	2721.4 AB	23132.1
Wheat + Gram [3:1]		110.2	2271.3 ABC	19306.7
Wheat + Rapeseed [1:1]	1858.1	128.4	2046.9 BC	17398.8
Wheat + Rapeseed [2:1]	1000.1	120.4		734.2
LSD(0.05)	-			

N.S:Non significant.

Figure followed by the similar word do not differ significantly; Plot were seeded on 06-11-97. Seed yield of Gra Rapeseed sown an inter-crop, with wheat converted into main crop (Wheat), based on market price for Rs/100 kg Rapeseed = 1250Chickpea 1300; Wheat = 850;

Khan et al.: Wheat, gram rapeseed, intercropping ratio, yield and monetary returns, Pakistan

Table 4: Yield of pure crops and intercrops grown with wheat during 1997-98.

Treatments	Yield of pure crop (kg/ha)	Yield of intercrop (kg/ha)	Seed yield equivalent of wheat	Gross return (Rs/ha)
Wheat	1780.0	<del>-</del>	1780.0 C	12457.2
Gram	1944.6	-	4167.0 A	29169.0
Rapeseed	276.5	-	711.3 D	4979.1
Wheat + Gram [1:1]	1496.7	1425.9	4552.0 A	31865.4
Wheat + Gram [3:1]	1817.8	1376.8	4661.0 A	32626.3
Wheat + Rapeseed [1:1]	1944.1	208.8	2480.0 B	17368.4
Wheat + Rapeseed [3:1]	1512.0	260.4	2182.0 BC	15271.2
LSD(O.O5)			2102.0 BC	548.3

N.S: Non significant. Figure followed by the similar word do not differ significantly. Plot were seeded on 06-11-97. Seed yield of Gram and Rapeseed sown an inter-crop with wheat converted into main crop (Wheat), based on market price for Rs/100 kg: Wheat = 700; Chickpea = 1500; Rapeseed = 1800.

said combinations gave significantly higher seed yield equivalent of wheat and monetary returns over pure crops and other itercropping combinations (Table-4). Intercropping studies of wheat as major crop with chickpea and rapeseed under rainfed conditions revealed that growing of wheat with chickpea at the combination of (1:1) and (3:1) recorded higher seed yield equivalents of wheat and maximum returns as compared to pure cropping under rainfed conditions.

The said combinations appeared more profitable over pure crops due to better production of chickpea with its market value both the year respectively.

### References

- Alvi, A.S. and M. Sharif, 1995. Arid Zone agriculture and research in Pakistan. Progressive Farming, 15: 5-12.
- Baliddawa, C.W., 1985. Plant species diversity and crop pest control. An analytical review: Insect Sci. and Its Application, 6: 479-487.
- Birch, H.F. and H.W. Doughal, 1967. Effect of legume on soil N mineralization and percent N in grasses. Plant and Soil, 27: 292-296.
- Chandravanshi, B.R., 1975. Studies on intercropping in soybean under uniform and paired row planting systems. Proc. Intern. Workshop on Intercropping ICRISAT, India, pp: 17-20.

- Cordero, A. and R.E. McCollums, 1979. Yield components of interplanted annual crops in South USA. Agron. J., 71: 834-842.
- Galal, S., S. Hnidi, M.M. Abdalla and A.A. Metwally, 1979.
  Soybean and corn yield under different intercrop patterns. World soybean Res. Conf. Releigh, North Carolina, II.69.
- Narrang, S.D., N.J. Kaul and G.S. Gill, 1969. Intercropping of maize with soybean, Indian Farming, 19:21-22.
- Perrin, R.M., 1978. Pest management in multiple cropping systems. Agro-Ecosystems, 3: 93-118.
- Rao, M.R. and R.W. Willey, 1979. Stability of performance of sorghum/pigeon pea intercropping. Proc. Intern. Workshop on Intercropping, ICRISAT, India.
- Risch, S.J., 1984. Intercropping as cultural pest control: Prospects and limitations. Envir. Manag., 7: 9-14.
- Steel, R.G.D. and G.H. Torrie, 1980. Principles and Procedures of Statistics. McGraw Hill Book Co. Inc. New York.
- Wahua, T.A.T. and D.A. Miller, 1978. Relative yield totals and yield components of intercropped sorghum and soybean. Agron. J., 70: 287-291.