

## Prediction of the productivity of floodplain soils in Taraba state using productivity models

Tanko Bako<sup>1\*</sup>, Akila Bardey Istifanus<sup>1</sup>, Ezekiel Ambo Mamai<sup>2</sup>

1. Department of Agricultural and Bio-Resources Engineering, Taraba State University, Jalingo, Nigeria

2. Department of Soil Science and Land Resource Management, Federal University, Wukari, Nigeria

Corresponding author e-mail: [engbako@gmail.com](mailto:engbako@gmail.com)

### ARTICLE INFO

Received 11/12/2020; received in revised form 23/1/2021; accepted 15/2/2021.

DOI: [10.6092/issn.2281-4485/11775](https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2281-4485/11775)

© 2021 The Authors.

### Abstract

A study was carried out to quantify the productivity level of floodplain soils in Taraba state using Neill's Productivity Index (PI) and Modified Neill's Productivity Index ( $PI_M$ ). Fields and laboratory experiments were conducted to study the effects of locations on distribution of bulk density, available water capacity, pH, organic matter, available phosphorus, iron oxide and aluminium oxide at different soil depths, and its effects on soil productivity. The bulk density and available water capacity were found to increase with soil depths while the soil pH, organic matter, available phosphorus, iron oxide and aluminium oxide were found to decrease with soil depths at all the locations investigated. The results show that soil productivity index was significantly ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) affected by locations of the floodplains.

### Keywords

*physical, chemical, properties, Productivity Index*

### Introduction

Floodplain soils constitute the back bone of arable crop production in the semi-arid and arid savannah agro-ecological zones where precipitation (rainfall) is limited for agricultural productivity. The productivity of soil is reduced through soil degradation in form of erosion, contamination, deforestation and desertification (Nwite, 2013). Accurate estimate of future soil productivity is essential to make agricultural policy decisions and to plan the use of land from field scale to the national level. It is established that productivity capacities or expected yields are useful in determining the suitability of any soil for agricultural use. Different methods have been developed which attempt to numerically relate soil properties to its productivity. These include the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) and Erosion Productivity Impact Calculation (EPCI). However,

a simple numerical index model is now preferred to others because of its simplicity and applicability in many soils. The model widely used today in quantification of soil productivity is the productivity index (PI) model modified by Pierce *et al.* (1983). This productivity index is based on the use of physical and chemical properties to predict effect of soil erosion on productivity (Pierce *et al.*, 1983). The Southern Guinea Savanna Agro-ecological zone of Nigeria where Taraba State is located is characterized by diverse climatic, topographic and soil conditions. This region is one of the areas where seasonal flooding and soil erosion processes constitute key constraints to soil productivity. It is worrisome that in spite of the increasing interest in floodplain farming in Taraba State, there has been no studies reported in literature on the fertility assessment of the floodplain nor



### Application of productivity index models

The Neill Productivity Index (PI) model modified by Pierce *et al.* (1983) was used. This model was based on simple measurable soil properties. The equation is:

$$PI = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i \times C_i \times D_i \times F_i \times L_i \times J_i \times Wf_i \quad [1]$$

Where: PI = Productivity Index,  $A_i$  = Sufficiency for available water capacity for the  $i$ th soil layer,  $C_i$  = Sufficiency for pH for the  $i$ th soil layer,  $D_i$  = Sufficiency for bulk density for the  $i$ th soil layer,  $F_i$  = Sufficiency for clay content for the  $i$ th soil layer,  $L_i$  = Sufficiency for land slope for the  $i$ th soil layer,  $J_i$  = Sufficiency for organic matter content for the  $i$ th soil layer,  $Wf_i$  = Root weighting factor (based on depth of root zone) and  $n$  = Number of horizons in the rooting zone (soil layer).

The PI model developed by Pierce *et al.* (1983) was expanded to capture the influence of phosphorus (P), iron oxide (FeO) and aluminum oxide ( $Al_2O_3$ ) by Agber (2011) as follows:

$$(PI_M) = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i \times C_i \times D_i \times F_i \times L_i \times J_i \times Wf_i \times P_i \times Fe_i \times Al_i \quad [2]$$

Where:  $(PI_M)$  = Modified Neill productivity index,  $P_i$  = sufficiency for phosphorus content for the  $i$ th soil layer,  $Fe_i$  = sufficiency for iron oxide content in the  $i$ th soil layer and  $Al_i$  = sufficiency for aluminum oxide content in the  $i$ th soil layer.

### Determination of productivity index value

In these productivity indexes, the productivity terms were normalized to range from 0.0 (complete inhibition of root growth) to 1.0 (no inhibition of root growth) based on a response function for each property (Kiniry *et al.*, 1983) and related the levels of soil properties to their sufficiency. Sufficiencies were assigned to soil properties. The sufficiencies for available water capacity, pH, bulk density, clay content, land slope, organic matter content and root weighting factor were adopted and used as described by Pierce *et al.* (1983), the sufficiency for available phosphorus was adopted and used as described by Aduayi *et al.* (2002) and the sufficiencies for Extractable iron and aluminium were adopted and used as described by Ogunsola *et al.* (1989). Sufficiencies for each location were multiplied to estimate the productivity indexes.

### Results and Discussion

#### Properties of the floodplain soils

Tables 1 and 2 show the mean soil physical and chemical properties of the floodplain soils. The soil textures in these areas are mainly clay loam, which is medium texture. It was observed from the result that bulk density values increased with soil depth in all the floodplain locations investigated. The bulk density values of the flood plains were lower than  $1.6 \text{ g/cm}^3$ , thus rated medium, a range considered not to impede root penetration (Donahue *et al.*, 1990). Therefore bulk density will not be a retarding factor for crop cultivation in the study area. The ANOVA showed that bulk density of the floodplain soils were statistically insignificant for all the soil sample depths at  $P \leq 0.05$  level of significance. The results show that available water capacity increased with soil depth in all the floodplain locations investigated. Generally, the available water capacity of these soils is very high according to Landon (1991) ratings ( $>21$  % very high, 18-21 % high, 12-18 % medium, 8-12 % low and  $< 8$  % very low). The ANOVA showed that available water capacity of the floodplain soils were statistically insignificant for all the soil sample depths at  $P \leq 0.05$  level of significance. The soil pH values decreased with soil depth in all the floodplain locations investigated. Soil reaction was slightly acidic to neutral (Malgwi, 2007). The soil organic matter content is generally low in the soils according to Landon (1991) ratings ( $>20$  % very high, 10-20 % high, 4-10 % medium, 2-4 % low and  $< 2$  % very low). The low organic matter content of the flood plain soils has been attributed to factors such as continuous cultivation, frequent burning of farm residues commonly carried out by farmers in the area which tends to destroy much of the organic materials that could have been added to the soil (Yakubu, 2006). The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of the soil organic matter content test confirm the observed variations, in that, the differences amongst the different flood plain locations are statistically significant at 0.05 probability level for all the soil depths. The available phosphorus content of the floodplain soils decreased with increased in soil sample depths at all the locations examined. The available phosphorus content is generally at the medium range in the soils according to Cottenie (1980) ratings ( $>25 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$  very high, 18-25  $\text{mg kg}^{-1}$  high, 10-17  $\text{mg kg}^{-1}$  medium, 5-9  $\text{mg kg}^{-1}$  low and  $< 5 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$  very low). The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of the soil available phosphorus shows that the differences among the different flood plain locations are statistically significant

at 0.05 probability level at the soil depths of 0-20 cm and 20-40 cm but not statistically significant at the soil depth of 40-60 cm. The results showed that in all

the floodplain locations, extractable iron oxide tend to decrease at the lower depth.

**Table 1.** Mean soil physical properties of the floodplain soils at different locations

| Soil Depth (cm)       | Location | Particle Size Distribution |        |        | Textural class | $\rho_d$ (g/cm <sup>3</sup> ) | AWC m/m |
|-----------------------|----------|----------------------------|--------|--------|----------------|-------------------------------|---------|
|                       |          | % sand                     | % Silt | % clay |                |                               |         |
| 0-20                  | NWRS     | 34.9                       | 28.5   | 36.6   | CL             | 1.32                          | 0.25    |
|                       | TSRS     | 37.8                       | 26.2   | 36.0   | CL             | 1.31                          | 0.26    |
|                       | RKRS     | 36.0                       | 27.0   | 37.0   | CL             | 1.32                          | 0.26    |
|                       | GIRS     | 35.7                       | 27.5   | 36.8   | CL             | 1.31                          | 0.25    |
|                       | GDRS     | 35.0                       | 27.3   | 37.7   | CL             | 1.30                          | 0.26    |
| F-LSD <sub>0.05</sub> | -        | -                          | 0.55   | -      | -              | -                             |         |
| 20-40                 | NWRS     | 34.8                       | 28.5   | 36.5   | CL             | 1.32                          | 0.26    |
|                       | TSRS     | 36.7                       | 27.7   | 35.8   | CL             | 1.31                          | 0.26    |
|                       | RKRS     | 36.0                       | 27.3   | 36.7   | CL             | 1.32                          | 0.26    |
|                       | GIRS     | 36.7                       | 26.7   | 36.7   | CL             | 1.31                          | 0.26    |
|                       | GDRS     | 36.1                       | 26.9   | 37.0   | CL             | 1.32                          | 0.26    |
| F-LSD <sub>0.05</sub> | 1.08     | 0.85                       | -      | -      | -              | -                             |         |
| 40-60                 | NWRS     | 35.0                       | 28.5   | 36.5   | CL             | 1.33                          | 0.26    |
|                       | TSRS     | 36.3                       | 28.0   | 36.3   | CL             | 1.32                          | 0.27    |
|                       | RKRS     | 36.3                       | 27.7   | 36.0   | CL             | 1.33                          | 0.27    |
|                       | GIRS     | 36.3                       | 26.3   | 36.7   | CL             | 1.31                          | 0.27    |
|                       | GDRS     | 36.1                       | 26.7   | 37.3   | CL             | 1.32                          | 0.27    |
| F-LSD <sub>0.05</sub> | 0.82     | 0.81                       | -      | -      | -              | -                             |         |

The extractable iron oxide obtained is generally low in the soils according to Ogunsola *et al.* (1989) ratings (3.6 g/kg Low and 13.3 g/kg High). The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of the soil extractable iron oxides shows that the differences among the different flood plain locations are statistically significant at 0.05 probability level at all the soil depths investigated. The aluminium oxide value decreased with increasing soil depth. Values of extractable aluminium oxide obtained in the soils are low according to Ogunsola *et al.* (1989) ratings (0.2 g/kg Low and 3.0 g/kg High). The ANOVA of the aluminium oxide contents of the floodplain soils showed that the differences among the different flood plain locations are statistically significant at 0.05 probability level at the soil depths of 0-20 cm and 20-40 cm but were statistically insignificant at the soil depth of 40-60 cm.

### Productivity of the floodplain soils

Tables 3 shows the average soil properties for determining sufficiency, Table 4 show ascribed sufficiency values for

calculating soil productivity index and Table 5 shows the soil productivity index using productivity models. The physical and chemical properties of the studied soils were used to quantify the productivity of the floodplain soils. The sufficiency of the soil properties for each floodplain location was multiplied to estimate the PI and  $PI_M$  where, a value of zero indicates an absolutely limiting level of a soil property and a value of 1.0 indicated the optimum level (Kiniry *et al.*, 1983). According to Nwite and Obi (2008), high soil productivity index is a good indicator of soil capacity to support crop production for long period of time. The data showed that the mean values of PI calculated were 0.418, 0.446, 0.432, 0.422 and 0.413 for Nwuko, Tsokundi, Rafin-Kada, Gidan-Idi and Gindin-Dorowa floodplains respectively and the mean values of  $PI_M$  calculated were 0.261, 0.288, 0.283, 0.272 and 0.235 for Nwuko, Tsokundi, Rafin-Kada, Gidan-Idi and Gindin-Dorowa floodplains respectively. The variation in PI values is depending on the initial properties of each soil, within the root zone, which affect the sufficiency of each soil property.

**Table 2.** Mean soil chemical properties of the floodplain soils at different locations

| Depth (cm)            | Location | pH (H <sub>2</sub> O) | OM (%) | Avail P (%) | FeO (g/kg) | Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> (g/kg) |
|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------|--------|-------------|------------|---------------------------------------|
| 0-20                  | NWRS     | 7.37                  | 2.53   | 17.06       | 3.9        | 1.0                                   |
|                       | TSRS     | 7.03                  | 2.66   | 16.61       | 5.8        | 0.6                                   |
|                       | RKRS     | 6.87                  | 2.64   | 16.74       | 4.0        | 0.7                                   |
|                       | GIRS     | 6.81                  | 2.53   | 16.72       | 5.4        | 0.6                                   |
|                       | GDRS     | 7.06                  | 2.46   | 16.92       | 5.6        | 1.1                                   |
| F-LSD <sub>0.05</sub> |          | -                     | 0.08   | 0.111       | 0.56       | 0.30                                  |
| 20-40                 | NWRS     | 7.34                  | 2.46   | 16.20       | 3.6        | 0.7                                   |
|                       | TSRS     | 7.00                  | 2.66   | 16.49       | 5.5        | 0.5                                   |
|                       | RKRS     | 6.87                  | 2.63   | 16.70       | 3.8        | 0.7                                   |
|                       | GIRS     | 6.68                  | 2.53   | 16.66       | 5.3        | 0.5                                   |
|                       | GDRS     | 6.76                  | 2.45   | 16.89       | 5.4        | 0.8                                   |
| F-LSD <sub>0.05</sub> |          | -                     | 0.04   | 0.502       | 0.45       | 0.373                                 |
| 40-60                 | NWRS     | 6.88                  | 2.45   | 16.19       | 3.6        | 0.7                                   |
|                       | TSRS     | 6.88                  | 2.65   | 16.32       | 5.3        | 0.4                                   |
|                       | RKRS     | 6.77                  | 2.60   | 16.67       | 3.6        | 0.5                                   |
|                       | GIRS     | 6.62                  | 2.49   | 15.85       | 5.1        | 0.4                                   |
|                       | GDRS     | 6.67                  | 2.45   | 16.89       | 5.4        | 0.7                                   |
| F-LSD <sub>0.05</sub> |          | -                     | 0.14   | -           | 0.44       | -                                     |

The changes in soil organic matter content influenced PI values. The PI values were obviously higher than those values of PI<sub>M</sub>. These results showed that when three more parameters, i.e. available phosphorus (P), iron oxide (FeO) content and aluminium oxide (Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>) content were included in the model, the values of PI<sub>M</sub> decreased as compared with PI values. Contributions of iron and aluminium oxides to the soil productivity are decreasing with their contents. The sufficiencies of iron

and aluminium oxides are low therefore, restricted the soil productivity. The results also showed that the highest mean PI<sub>M</sub> of 0.288 was obtained in Tsukundi floodplain while the lowest mean PI<sub>M</sub> of 0.235 was obtained in Gindin-Dorowa floodplain. High productivity index indicated soil with improved soil properties; therefore, the most productive soil is Tsukundi floodplain soil. Evaluation of soil productivity was done according to Fernando (2002).

**Table 3.** Mean soil properties for determining sufficiency

| Soil Property                     | Location |          |            |           |               |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|------------|-----------|---------------|
|                                   | Nwuko    | Tsokundi | Rafin-Kada | Gidan-Idi | Gindin-Dorowa |
| AWC (m/m)                         | 0.26     | 0.26     | 0.26       | 0.26      | 0.26          |
| pH (H <sub>2</sub> O)             | 7.20     | 6.97     | 6.84       | 6.70      | 6.83          |
| Bulk density (g/cm <sup>3</sup> ) | 1.32     | 1.31     | 1.32       | 1.31      | 1.31          |
| Clay content (%)                  | 36.53    | 36.03    | 36.57      | 36.73     | 37.33         |
| Land slope (%)                    | 2        | 2        | 2          | 2         | 2             |
| Organic matter (%)                | 2.48     | 2.66     | 2.62       | 2.52      | 2.45          |
| Root weighting factor (cm)        | 60       | 60       | 60         | 60        | 60            |
| Phosphorus (%)                    | 16.48    | 16.47    | 16.70      | 16.41     | 16.90         |
| Iron oxide (g/kg)                 | 3.70     | 5.53     | 3.80       | 5.27      | 5.47          |
| Aluminium oxide (g/kg)            | 0.80     | 0.50     | 0.63       | 0.50      | 0.87          |

**Table 4.** *Ascribed sufficiency for calculating productivity index*

| Soil Property                     | Location |          |            |           |               |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|------------|-----------|---------------|
|                                   | Nwuko    | Tsokundi | Rafin-Kada | Gidan-Idi | Gindin-Dorowa |
| AWC (m/m)                         | 1.0      | 1.0      | 1.0        | 1.0       | 1.0           |
| pH (H <sub>2</sub> O)             | 1.0      | 1.0      | 1.0        | 1.0       | 1.0           |
| Bulk density (g/cm <sup>3</sup> ) | 0.8      | 0.8      | 0.8        | 0.8       | 0.8           |
| Clay content (%)                  | 1.0      | 1.0      | 1.0        | 1.0       | 1.0           |
| Land slope (%)                    | 1.0      | 1.0      | 1.0        | 1.0       | 1.0           |
| Organic matter (%)                | 0.87     | 0.93     | 0.90       | 0.88      | 0.86          |
| Root weighting factor (cm)        | 0.6      | 0.6      | 0.6        | 0.6       | 0.6           |
| Phosphorus (%)                    | 1.0      | 1.0      | 1.0        | 1.0       | 1.0           |
| Iron oxide (g/kg)                 | 0.80     | 0.75     | 0.80       | 0.75      | 0.75          |
| Aluminium oxide (g/kg)            | 0.78     | 0.86     | 0.82       | 0.86      | 0.76          |

**Table 5.** *Soil productivity index using productivity models*

| Productivity Index | Locations |          |            |           |               | F-LSD <sub>0.05</sub> |
|--------------------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|---------------|-----------------------|
|                    | Nwuko     | Tsokundi | Rafin-Kada | Gidan-Idi | Gindin-Dorowa |                       |
| PI                 | 0.418     | 0.446    | 0.432      | 0.422     | 0.413         | 0.00651               |
| PI <sub>M</sub>    | 0.261     | 0.288    | 0.283      | 0.272     | 0.235         | 0.00081               |

Comparing the calculated PI and PI<sub>M</sub> values with the relative data of productivity index, the productivity of floodplain soils obtained with PI is high (0.31 - 0.50) whereas with PI<sub>M</sub> all the floodplain soils have moderate productivity (0.11 - 0.30)(Fernando, 2002). The results showed that PI values were higher than PI<sub>M</sub> values; therefore, the PI<sub>M</sub> model did not reflect the actual productivity level. Productivity index (PI) provides a single scale on which soils may be rated according to their suitability for crop production. The results indicated that soil physical and chemical properties could be limiting or non-limiting factors on the productivity of soils.

### **Conclusions**

The result of this study indicated that the productivity status of Taraba state floodplain soils could be quantified using productivity index models. Sufficiency values of soil properties such as available water capacity, bulk density, rooting depth and soil pH could be used to quantify productivity index of soil.

### **References**

- ADUAYI E.A., CHUDE V.O., OLAYIWOLA S.O. (2002) Fertilizer use and management practices for crops in Nigeria. 3rd Edition, Federal Fertilizer Distribution Department, Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Abuja, 28-73.
- AGBER P.I. (2011) Testing the effectiveness of soil productivity assessment models in Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria. An Unpublished PhD Thesis Submitted to the Department of Soil Science, University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Benue state.
- AIKINS S.H.M., AFUAKWA J.J. (2012) Effect of four different tillage practices on soil physical properties under cowpea. Agriculture and Biology Journal of North America, 3(1):17-24. DOI: [10.5251/abjna.2012.3.1.17.24](https://doi.org/10.5251/abjna.2012.3.1.17.24)
- BRAY R.H., KURTZ L.T. (1945) Determination of total organic and available forms of phosphorus in soils. Soil Science, 59(1): 39-46. DOI: [10.1097/00010694-194501000-00006](https://doi.org/10.1097/00010694-194501000-00006)

DOI: [10.6092/issn.2281-4485/11775](https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2281-4485/11775)

---

- CHEICK O.D. (2014) Impact of tillage and soil amendments on cereal production in the Sahelian Zone of Mali. Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Crop and Soil Sciences, Faculty of Agriculture, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana. 101 pp.
- COTTENIE A. (1980) Soil and plant testing as a basis of fertilizer recommendations. FAO soil bulletin 38/2. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome. 115 pp.
- DONAHUE R.L., RAYMOND M.W., SCHICKLINE J.C. (1990) Soils: An Introduction to Soils and Plant Growth. Prentice Hall, India. 667pp. ISBN: 0138222886, 9780138222888, 0876923899, 9780876923894.
- FERNANDO D. (2002) A Framework to Make Decisions in Soil Conservation for Tropical Mountains. 17th World Congress of Soil Sci. (WCSS), 14-21 August 2002, Thailand Symp. No. 38.
- HENDERSHOT W.H., LALANDE H., DEQUETTE, E. (1993) Soil reaction and exchangeable acidity. In: Carter, M.R (ed). Soil Sampling and Methods of Analysis, Canadian Society of Science, Lawis Publication, London, pp. 141-145. ISBN-13: 978-0-8493-3586-0.
- KINIRY L.M., SCRIVENER C.L., KEENER M.E. (1983) A soil productivity index based upon predicted water depletion and root growth. Research. Bulletin 105, Columbia University of Missouri. pp. 1-26.
- LANDON J.R. (1991) Booker tropical soil manual: A Handbook for soil survey and agricultural land evaluation in the tropics and subtropics. NewYork: McGraw-Hill Pub. Co. 530pp. DOI: [10.4324/9781315846842](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315846842)
- MALGWI W.B. (2007). Characterization of salt affected soils in some selected location in the north western zone of Nigeria. An unpublished PhD Thesis submitted to Soil Science Department, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
- NWITE J.N. (2013). Evaluation of the productivity of automobile oil contaminated soil amended with organic wastes in Abakaliki, southeastern Nigeria. Ph.D Thesis, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, 1-130 pp.
- NWITE J.N., OBI M.E. (2008) Quantifying the productivity of selected soils in Nsukka and Abakaliki, southeastern Nigeria using productivity index. *Agro-Science*, 7(3): 170-178. DOI: [10.4314/as.v7i3.45549](https://doi.org/10.4314/as.v7i3.45549)
- OGUNSOLA O.A., OMOCHI J.A., UDO E.J. (1989) Free oxides status and distribution in soils overlying limestones areas in Nigeria. *Soil Science*, 147(4):245-251. DOI: [10.1097/00010694-198904000-00003](https://doi.org/10.1097/00010694-198904000-00003)
- OKO O.J., AREMU M.O., ANDREW C. (2017) Evaluation of the physicochemical and heavy metal content of ground water sources in Bantaji and Rafin-Kada settlements of Wukari Local Government Area, Taraba State, Nigeria. *Journal of Environmental Chemistry and Ecotoxicology*, 9(4): 43-53. DOI: [10.5897/JECE2017.0416](https://doi.org/10.5897/JECE2017.0416)
- PARFITT R.L., CHILDS C.W. (1988). Estimation of forms of Fe and Al: a review and analysis of contrasting soils by dissolution and Moessbauer methods. *Australian Journal of Soil Research*, 26(1): 121-144. DOI: [10.1071/SR9880121](https://doi.org/10.1071/SR9880121)
- PIERCE F.J., LARSON W.E., DOWDY R.H., GRAHAM W.A.P. (1983) Productivity of soils. Assessing long term changes due to erosion. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*. 38(1):39-44.
- YAKUBU M. (2006) Genesis and classification of soils over different geological formations and surfaces in the Sokoto plains Nigeria. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Soil science and Agricultural Engineering Department, Usmanu Danfodiyo University Sokoto.