Response of Soybean Grown on a Claypan Soil in Southeastern Kansas to the Residual of Different Plant Nutrient Sources and Tillage

D. W. Sweeney  
*Kansas State University, dsweeney@ksu.edu*

Philip Barnes  
*Kansas State University, lbarnes@ksu.edu*

Gary Pierzynski  
*Kansas State University, gmp@ksu.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://newprairiepress.org/kaesrr](https://newprairiepress.org/kaesrr)

Part of the Agronomy and Crop Sciences Commons

**Recommended Citation**  
Sweeney, D. W.; Barnes, Philip; and Pierzynski, Gary (2017) "Response of Soybean Grown on a Claypan Soil in Southeastern Kansas to the Residual of Different Plant Nutrient Sources and Tillage," *Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports*: Vol. 3: Iss. 2. [https://doi.org/10.4148/2378-5977.1381](https://doi.org/10.4148/2378-5977.1381)
Response of Soybean Grown on a Claypan Soil in Southeastern Kansas to the Residual of Different Plant Nutrient Sources and Tillage

Cover Page Footnote
Partially funded by U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service Conservation Innovation Grant.

This soil and water management is available in Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station Research Reports: https://newprairiepress.org/kaesrr/vol3/iss2/12
Response of Soybean Grown on a Claypan Soil in Southeastern Kansas to the Residual of Different Plant Nutrient Sources and Tillage

D.W. Sweeney, P. Barnes, and G. Pierzynski

Summary
Soybean yields measured from 2014 through 2016 were more than 50% greater from the residual from N-based turkey litter applications during 2011 through 2013 than in the control where no nitrogen (N) or phosphorus (P) was applied. However, residual from P-based turkey litter applications or fertilizer-only did not result in soybean yield different from the no N-P control. This residual effect on yield was largely due to increased pods per plant.

Introduction
Increased fertilizer prices in recent years, especially noticeable when the cost of phosphorus spiked in 2008, have led US producers to consider other alternatives, including manure sources. The use of poultry litter as an alternative to fertilizer is of particular interest in southeastern Kansas because large amounts of poultry litter are imported from nearby confined animal feeding operations in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri. Annual application of turkey litter can affect the current crop, but information is lacking concerning any residual effects from several continuous years of poultry litter applications on a following crop. This is especially true for tilled soil compared with no-till, because production of most annual cereal crops on the claypan soils of the region is often negatively affected by no-till planting. The objective of this study was to determine if the residual from fertilizer and poultry litter applications under tilled or no-till systems affects soybean yield and growth.

Experimental Procedures
A water quality experiment was conducted near Girard, KS, on the Greenbush Educational facility’s grounds from spring 2011 through spring 2014. Fertilizer and turkey
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litter were applied prior to planting grain sorghum each spring. Individual plot size was 1 acre. The five treatments, replicated twice, were:

- Control – no N or P fertilizer or turkey litter – no-till;
- Fertilizer only – commercial N and P fertilizer – chisel-disk tillage;
- Turkey litter, N-based – no extra N or P fertilizer – no-till;
- Turkey litter, N-based – no extra N or P fertilizer – chisel-disk tillage; and
- Turkey litter, P-based – supplemented with fertilizer N – chisel-disk tillage.

Starting in 2014 after the previously-mentioned study, soybean was planted in the plots with no further application of turkey litter or fertilizer. Prior to planting soybean, tillage operations were done in appropriate plots as in previous years. A subarea of 20 × 20 ft near the center of each 1-acre plot was designated for crop yield and growth measurements. Samples were taken for dry matter production at V3-V4 (approximately 3 weeks after planting), R2, R4, and R6 growth stages. Yield was determined from the center 4 rows (10 × 20 ft) of the subarea designated for plant measurements in each plot.

**Results and Discussion**

During 2014-2016, the residual effects of turkey litter and fertilizer amendments affected soybean yield and pods/plant (Table 1). The two treatments which had previously received a high application rate of turkey litter based on N requirements, regardless of tillage system, resulted in greater yields than from plots that had received low rates of turkey litter (P-based), commercial fertilizer, or no fertilizer N or P. Even though the average number of pods/plant was greatest where N-based turkey litter had been applied with no-till, the stand tended to be lower than where the N-based turkey litter was incorporated with tillage, but was only significant in 2015 (year interaction data not shown). Dry matter production was greatest early (V3) and late (R6) in the season where N-based turkey litter had been applied and incorporated with tillage than in the other residual treatments (Table 1).
Table 1. Residual effect of turkey litter and fertilizer amendments on following soybean yield, yield components, and dry matter production averaged across years (2014-2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residual amendment¹</th>
<th>Yield (bu/a)</th>
<th>Stand (x 1000)</th>
<th>Seed weight (mg)</th>
<th>Pods/plant</th>
<th>Seeds/pod</th>
<th>Dry matter</th>
<th>V4</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R4</th>
<th>R6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>3540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fert-C</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>3580</td>
<td>5250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL-N</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>5980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL-N-C</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>2210</td>
<td>4650</td>
<td>7310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL-P-C</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>3280</td>
<td>4710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD (0.05)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Control, no turkey litter or nitrogen (N) or phosphorus (P) fertilizer with no-till; Fert-C, commercial fertilizer incorporated with conventional tillage; TL-N, N-based turkey litter application with no-till; TL-N-C, N-based turkey litter application incorporated with conventional tillage; and TL-P-C, P-based turkey litter application and supplemental N application incorporated with conventional tillage.