

Evaluation of multi-season intercropping in cassava (*Manihot esculenta*)

KURUVILLA VARUGHESE¹, MMEERABAI² and K SATHIES BABU³

National Agricultural Research Project, Kerala Agricultural University,
Sadanandapuram 691 550

Received: 5 March 1993

ABSTRACT

A multi-season intercropping study based on cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz) was conducted at Sadanandapuram during 1988-89 and 1989-90. The mean of land-equivalent ratio + area-time equivalent ratio proved superior in measuring the efficiency of the intercropping system than land-equivalent ratio, land-equivalent coefficient or area-time equivalent ratio. It could assess both the area and duration of each crop, was free from problems of overestimation or underestimation of resource utilization and was able to record not only the agronomic advantage but also the economic advantage in the intercropping system.

Intercropping is effective in optimizing the use of resources by growing 2 or more crops simultaneously on the same field. Measurement of production efficiency has always presented conceptual problems in intercropping (Pal *et al.* 1985). In multi-season intercropping, many of the indices overestimate or underestimate the actual land-use efficiency. Hence the present study was undertaken to find out the best index in measuring the efficiency of cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz)-based multi-season intercropping systems.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted at Sadanandapuram, situated at 9° 16' N and 76° 37' E at 91.44 m above mean sea-level, with a rainfall

^{1,2}Associate Professor, Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, KAU, Vellayani 695 522

³Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics

of 2 100 mm per annum in the midlands of south Kerala. The soil was gravelly clay-loam and lateritic in origin (Oxisol), with bulk density 1.24 g/cm³, water-holding capacity 43.67%, pH 5.3, electrical conductivity 0.07 mmhos/cm at 25°C, available N 360 kg/ha, available P 5.40 kg/ha and available K 70 kg/ha. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design and was replicated thrice for April-May planting of rainfed 'M4' cassava during 1988-89 and 1989-90. The main crop of cassava was planted by 2 systems, viz normal equidistance planting with a spacing of 0.90 m x 0.90 m and paired row planting with a spacing of 1.35 m x 0.90 m x 0.45 m. In the first intercrop 'TMV 2' groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) and 'Kanakamoni' cowpea [*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp.] were taken, and in the second intercrop 'Kanakamoni' cowpea and 'KM 1' blackgram (*Phaseolus mungo* L.) were taken. The treatment combinations were: T₁, cassava

normal equidistance planting + groundnut; T₂, cassava normal equidistance planting + cowpea; T₃, cassava paired row + groundnut; T₄, cassava paired row + cowpea; T₅, cassava paired row + groundnut + cowpea; T₆, cassava paired row + groundnut + blackgram; T₇, cassava paired row + cowpea + cowpea; T₈, cassava paired row + cowpea + blackgram; T₉, cassava normal equidistance; T₁₀, cassava paired row; T₁₁, groundnut; T₁₂, cowpea (first and second crops), and T₁₃, blackgram (second crop). All the recommended packages of practices were followed for the main crops and the intercrops (KAU, Mannuthy 1988). Cassava was harvested 300 days after planting, whereas cowpea, groundnut and blackgram were harvested at 105, 90 and 85 days after sowing respectively.

Land-equivalent ratio (LER) was calculated as per Mead and Willey (1980). Land-equivalent coefficient (LEC) is the product of LER of intercrops (Adetiloye *et al.* 1983) and was calculated as:

$$\text{LEC} = \frac{Y_a}{Y_a} \times \frac{Y_b}{Y_b} \dots \times \frac{Y_i}{Y_i}$$

where Y_a , yield of crop 'a' in intercropping; Y_a , yield of crop 'a' in sole cropping; Y_b , yield of crop 'b' in intercropping; Y_b , yield of crop 'b' in sole cropping; Y_i , yield of crop 'i' in intercropping; and Y_i , yield of crop 'i' in sole cropping. In land-equivalent coefficient the advantage in production efficiency was from 0.25-1 and 0.037-1 in 2 and 3 crop mixtures.

Area-time equivalency ratio (ATER) was worked out by the formula suggested by Hiebsch and McCollum (1987):

$$\text{ATER} = \sum_{i=1}^n (t_i^M / t_i^I) \times (Y_i^I / Y_i^M)$$

where t_i^M , duration of crop 'i' in sole cropping; t_i^I , total duration of intercropping system; Y_i^I , yield of crop 'i' in intercropping;

Y_i^M , yield of crop 'i' in monocropping; and n, total number of crops in intercropping system.

The mean of LER + ATER was calculated to counterbalance the overestimation or underestimation of probabilities of each value (Mason *et al.* 1986). The coefficient of correlation of benefit : cost ratio was computed according to Snedecor and Cochran (1967), with LER, LEC, ATER and mean of LER + ATER to find out the economic and agronomic advantages in intercropping.

As there was no pronounced seasonal variation during the 2 years, the pooled average was considered for analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The production efficiency of intercropping system using LER showed that T₄ was the best system, followed by T₇ and T₈ (Table 1). These treatments recorded 70, 63 and 56% more land-use efficiency than T₁₀. The highest LEC was also noticed in T₄ (which was better than T₂), indicating the superiority of paired row planting of cassava + cowpea (Table 2). In T₅ and T₈ the LEC was less than 0.25, indicating interspecific competition. Thus a second crop was not found viable in cassava due to shade effect even in paired row planting. The LEC of T₆ could not be calculated due to failure of second intercrop, showing the limitation of LEC for measuring production efficiency. When LER of the second intercrop becomes 0, LEC of the whole mixture becomes 0. The LEC of the mixture excluding the second intercrop was worked out to be 0.34. It corroborates the finding of Adetiloye *et al.* (1983) that the LEC of productivity of the mixture depends more on increase in productivity of less productive or dominated component of the mixture.

Area-time equivalency ratio was also highest in T₄, followed by T₇. In all the treatments ATER values were lesser than LER

Table 1 Yield of cassava and intercrops under different intercropping systems (pooled mean data of 2 years)

Treatment	Cassava yield (tonnes/ha)	Yield of I intercrop (kg/ha)		Yield of II intercrop (kg/ha)	
		Groundnut	Cowpea	Cowpea	Blackgram
T ₁	21.92	657			
T ₂	19.65		1 746		
T ₃	22.57	942			
T ₄	23.14		1 815		
T ₅	22.69	860		21	
T ₆	20.17	817			N
T ₇	21.70		1 627	44	
T ₈	20.22		1 801		N
T ₉	20.48				
T ₁₀	20.91				
T ₁₁		2 327			
T ₁₂			3 097	782	
T ₁₃					852
CD (P = 0.05)	NS				

T₁, Cassava normal equidistance planting + groundnut; T₂, cassava normal equidistance planting + cowpea; T₃, cassava paired row planting + groundnut; T₄, cassava paired row planting + cowpea; T₅, cassava paired row planting + groundnut + cowpea; T₆, cassava paired row planting + groundnut + blackgram; T₇, cassava paired row planting + cowpea + cowpea; T₈, cassava paired row planting + cowpea + blackgram; T₉, cassava normal equidistance planting (sole crop); T₁₀, cassava paired row planting (sole crop); T₁₁, groundnut (sole crop); T₁₂, cowpea (first and second crop, sole crops); and T₁₃, blackgram (second crop, sole crop)

N, Negligible

Table 2 Efficiency of cassava-based intercropping systems using different indices

Treatment	Cost of cultivation (Rs/ha)	Gross income (Rs/ha)	Net income (Rs/ha)	LER	LEC	ATER	Mean of LER + ATER	Benefit : cost
T ₁	20 135	25 864	5 729	1.35	0.30	1.14	1.25	1 : 1.28
T ₂	17 139	24 890	7 751	1.52	0.54	1.12	1.32	1 : 1.45
T ₃	19 276	28 225	8 949	1.48	0.43	1.18	1.33	1 : 1.46
T ₄	17 319	28 584	11 265	1.70	0.65	1.28	1.49	1 : 1.65
T ₅	20 748	27 911	7 163	1.49	0.01	1.19	1.34	1 : 1.35
T ₆	20 679	25 870	4 391	1.31	*	1.09	1.20	1 : 1.21
T ₇	18 008	25 712	7 704	1.63	0.03	1.21	1.42	1 : 1.43
T ₈	18 241	25 643	7 402	1.56	1.01	1.14	1.35	1 : 1.41
T ₉	13 853	20 480	6 626					1 : 1.48
T ₁₀	13 890	20 907	7 017					1 : 1.51
T ₁₁	11 340	13 961	2 621					1 : 1.23
T ₁₂	11 613	10 135	-1 478					1 : 0.87
T ₁₃	5 239	3 358	-1 881					1 : 0.64

*Second intercrop failed

The returns from cassava @ Re 1/kg, groundnut and blackgram @ Rs 6/kg and cowpea @ Rs 3/kg

Details of treatments are given with Table 1

values, indicating the underestimation of resource utilization. Mason *et al.* (1986) also made similar observations. The mean of LER + ATER and the benefit : cost ratio was the highest in T₄, giving a return of Rs 1.65/Re invested. The mean of LER + ATER was very closely correlated with benefit : cost ratio than with LEC, ATER and LER. Hence LER + ATER was a better measure of resource-utilization efficiency, as it correlates both agronomic and economic advantages in multi-season intercropping. The coefficients of correlation of LER, LEC, ATER and mean of LER + ATER with BCR were 0.8977^{*}, 0.6206^{NS}, 0.8035^{*} and 0.9210^{**} respectively.

REFERENCES

- Adeiloye P O, Ezedinma F O C and Okogbo B N. 1983. A land equivalent coefficient (LEC) concept for the interactions in simple to complex crop mixtures. *Ecological Modelling* 19 : 27-39.
- Hiebsch C K and McCollum R E. 1987. Area x time equivalent ratio : a method for evaluating the productivity of intercrops. *Agronomy Journal* 79 : 15-22.
- KAU, Mannuthy. 1988. *Package of Practices: Recommendations (Crops)*, pp 56-62. Directorate of Extension, Kerala Agricultural University, Mannuthy, Trichur.
- Mason S C, Leihner D E and Vorst J J. 1986. Cassava-cowpea and cassava-peanut intercropping. I. Yield and land use efficiency. *Agronomy Journal* 78 : 43-6.
- Mead R and Willey R W. 1980. The concept of land equivalent ratio and advantages in yield from intercropping. *Experimental Agriculture* 16 : 271-8.
- Pal M, Singh K A and Ahlawat I P S. 1985. Cropping systems research. I. Concept, needs and directions. *Proceedings of National Symposium on Cropping Systems*, held during 3-5 April 1985 at Central Soil Salinity Research Institute, Karnal, pp 1-17.
- Snedecor W G and Cochran G W. 1967. *Statistical Methods*, pp 172-98. Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi.