

1
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

SOIL MICROBIAL POPULATIONS AND ACTIVITIES IN
REDUCED CHEMICAL INPUT AGROECOSYSTEMS¹

M. J. Kirchner², A. G. Wollum, II^{3,4}, and L. D. King³

¹ This work was supported in part by grant from the USDA-LISA Program and North Carolina Agricultural Research Service, Raleigh, NC 27695-7601. The use of trade names in this publication does not imply endorsement by the North Carolina Agricultural Research Service of the products used nor criticism of similar ones not mentioned.

² Present Address: Rt. 1 Box 12-B, Clewiston, FL 33440.

³ Professors, Department of Soil Science, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695-7619.

⁴ Corresponding author

2
3
4
5
6
7

SOIL MICROBIAL POPULATIONS AND ACTIVITIES IN
REDUCED CHEMICAL INPUT AGROECOSYSTEMS

8

ABSTRACT

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Crop management systems which reduce chemical inputs represent attempts by researchers and farmers to find a way to sustain productivity while reducing costs, protecting human health and maintaining the resource base. This study, conducted in the Piedmont of North Carolina, was initiated to determine how reductions in nitrogen (N) fertilization, and the use of crimson clover (*Trifolium incarnatum* L. var Tibbee) as a green manure would affect populations and activities of soil microorganisms. Four continuous corn (*Zea mays* L.) treatments were used: no-till (receiving herbicides and soil insecticides) with 0 to 140 kg N ha⁻¹ as NH₄NO₃; conventionally tilled receiving 140 kg N ha⁻¹ but no pesticides; and conventionally tilled with a crimson clover winter green manure but no fertilizer or pesticides. Populations were determined using selective media for total bacteria, Gram-negative bacteria, fungi, actinomycetes, *Bacillus* spp., and *Pseudomonas* spp.. Microbial activities were estimated by enzyme assays for acid and alkaline phosphatase, arylsulfatase, and β-glucosidase. Microbial biomass carbon (C) was determined following chloroform fumigation-extraction procedures and levels of available N were measured by an anaerobic incubation procedure. Surface

soil (0 - 7.5 cm) from the no-till treatment receiving 140 Kg N/ha contained significantly more fungi than did soil from the non-fertilized, no-till treatment. Microbial biomass C and available N were not affected by N addition, but activities of acid phosphatase and β -glucosidase were significantly higher in the fertilized soil than in the non-fertilized soil. Surface soil from a crimson clover/corn rotation contained significantly larger populations of *Bacillus* spp. (260% more), actinomycetes (310% more), and total bacteria (120% more) than did soil from the well-fertilized conventionally tilled, no pesticide treatment. In addition, microbial biomass C, available N, and activities of alkaline phosphatase, arylsulfatase, and β -glucosidase were significantly higher in surface soil in the crimson clover treatment compared to no clover surface soil. Although the soil biological properties changed significantly during the year, values remained constant relative to each other. Microbial numbers and activities were highest in the spring (peaking approximately in May), lowest in September, and reached a secondary peak in the fall (approximately in November). The effect of N fertilizer on soil biological properties deeper in the profile (7.5 - 30 cm) was similar to the effect in the soil surface. However, the numbers and activities of the soil microflora at a depth of 7.5 - 30 cm generally did not significantly differ between the crimson clover treatment

and the conventionally tilled, N fertilized treatment.
Incorporation of a crimson clover green manure as an
alternative to inorganic N fertilization appears to optimize
the internal cycling efficiency of the cropping system and
maximize use-efficiency of external resources.

2
3
4
5
6

INTRODUCTION

2 During the last 50 years, farmers in the United States
3 have dramatically increased crop yields through the use of
4 fertilizers, pesticides, and improved varieties (National
5 Research Council, 1989). Today, the rising costs of
6 chemical inputs and a host of environmental concerns have
7 caused farmers to consider alternative agricultural methods
8 to reduce costs and to protect human health and the resource
9 base. Some of these methodologies include using crop
10 rotations, leguminous winter cover crops as green manures,
11 reducing tillage, adding animal manures to the soil, and
12 integrated pest management procedures.

13 Changing the crop management system will change the
14 soil microclimate and affect the soil biota (Paul and Clark,
15 1989). Changes in the soil microflora may have significant
16 implications regarding the productivity and sustainability
17 of reduced chemical input (RCI) agroecosystems. Such
18 alternative systems represent an attempt to optimize the
19 internal cycling efficiency of nutrients and to maximize the
20 use-efficiency of external resources (Buchanan, 1990).
21 Although microorganisms make up only 1 - 8 % of the soil
22 organic matter they influence crop production by acting as
23 catalysts for biotransformations (Roder et al., 1988).
24 Through the processes of decomposition, immobilization, and
25 mineralization, soil microorganisms control the flow of
26 carbon (C), nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), and sulfur (S)
27 through the terrestrial ecosystem (Sarathchandra et al.,

1 1988). As farmers consider conversion to RCI systems they
2 must consider the effect of these systems on soil
3 microflora.

4 A common RCI system is the incorporation of a
5 leguminous green manure into the soil to supply N and
6 organic matter. This practice serves as an alternative to
7 inorganic N fertilization. Bolton et al. (1985) showed that
8 the incorporation of a leguminous green manure increased
9 soil microbial biomass and enzyme activities as compared
10 with soil which had been inorganically fertilized. Soil
11 from a rotation of oats (*Avena sativa* L.) and clover (*Trifolium*
12 *pratense* L.) was found to have significantly greater
13 microbial biomass, bacterial and fungal populations,
14 dehydrogenase activity, and CO₂ evolution as compared with
15 soil from a system of continuous corn (Fraser et al., 1988).

16 Fertilization affects the soil microbial biomass by
17 increasing root biomass, root exudates, and crop residues
18 and thus provides increased substrate for microbial growth.
19 Martyniuk and Wagner (1978) found microbial populations were
20 greater in fertilized soil than in non-fertilized soil.
21 Sarathchandra et al. (1988) found that N fertilization
22 increased levels of organic C in the soil. Any management
23 practice that increases total C accumulation should also
24 increase the size and activities of the soil microbial
25 biomass (Buchanan, 1990).

26 Roder et al. (1988) comment that interactions between

rotation treatments and organic soil amendments or
fertilizer treatments on microbial biomass have received
little attention. Therefore the study reported in this
paper had as its objectives a comparison of the soil
biological properties in RCI and conventional agroecosystems
and a description of the seasonal variation in the soil
biota. The treatments considered showed how the practices
of N fertilization and including crimson clover (*Trifolium
incarnatum* L. var Tibbee) in the rotation as a green manure
crop would influence populations and activities of the soil
microflora.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

2 The 6-hectare experimental site was established in the
3 fall of 1985 in the Piedmont of North Carolina near Raleigh,
4 at the North Carolina State University Research Unit 9. The
5 soils at Unit 9 are Cecil and Appling gravelly sandy loams
6 (Typic Kanhapludults) with 2 - 6% slope and moderate erosion
7 (Table 1) and are typical of the southern Piedmont of the
8 United States. Treatments were arranged in a randomized
9 complete block design with four replications of each
10 treatment based on landscape position and soil texture and
11 were designed for a long-term study to assess the agronomic
12 and economic feasibility of cropping systems utilizing
13 reduced rates of chemical inputs. Four treatments were
14 chosen for the present study (Table 2). A no-till corn
15 monoculture system (winter fallow), which received 0% or
16 100% of the recommended N fertilizer (140 kg N ha⁻¹ as
17 NH₄NO₃), showed the effect of reducing N fertilization on
18 soil biological properties. Only N fertilizer was used
19 because soil levels of P and K were considered adequate,
20 based on soil tests conducted by the North Carolina
21 Department of Agriculture Agronomic Division, Soil Testing
22 Laboratory. Reduced chemical input systems received N
23 either in the form of inorganic fertilizer (140 kg N ha⁻¹ as
24 NH₄NO₃) or as crimson clover grown as a green manure crop.
25 Comparing the RCI systems showed the effect of the green
26 manure vs N fertilizer on soil biological properties. Since
27 the no-till inorganic N treatments differed from the green

1 manure treatment in tillage and pesticide usage, the effect
2 of N fertilizer vs green manure could not be compared
3 directly.

4 Clover was established in early October by mowing corn
5 residue and weeds, disking to remove ridges, and planting
6 clover with a no-till drill at a rate of 22 kg seed ha⁻¹.
7 Clover seed was inoculated with a commercial preparation of
8 *Rhizobium trifolium* at planting. Clover plants were incorporated
9 into the soil on April 9, 1990 by chisel plowing and
10 disking. The crimson clover aboveground biomass was 4430 kg
11 ha⁻¹ containing 117 kg ha⁻¹ of N and having a C/N ratio of
12 16.4.

13 Soil samples were collected from the interrow in the
14 center of each plot every month from January, 1990 to
15 January, 1991. Approximately 20 cores were taken by
16 sampling every 1.5 meters with a soil probe (2-cm diameter)
17 to a depth of 7.5 cm. During the months of May, August, and
18 December additional samples were collected from a depth of
19 7.5 - 30 cm. For each sampling and plot, cores were pooled,
20 placed in plastic bags, and taken to the lab where the soil
21 was passed through a 2 mm sieve and stored in the dark at 4°
22 C. In most cases, analysis began within 48 hours of
23 sampling and all tests were completed within 2 weeks.

24 Soil moisture content was determined for all samples.
25 Soil pH value was measured in a soil-water suspension (1:1,
26 w/v). Selective media were used to enumerate populations of

1 soil microorganisms. Fungi were estimated using DPY medium
2 (Papavizas and Davey, 1959) and Martin's Rose Bengal agar
3 (1950). Fluorescent pseudomonads were estimated with the
4 medium developed by Sands and Rovira (1970) and Simon et al.
5 (1973). Actinomycete Isolation Agar (DIFCO) was used to
6 enumerate actinomycetes. Total numbers of bacteria were
7 measured by plating aliquots of soil suspension on tryptic
8 soy agar (TSA) (Martin, 1975) while Gram-negative organisms
9 were enumerated on TSA plates which included crystal violet
10 (0.004%). Pasteurization of dilution tubes (10 minutes at
11 85° C) followed by plating aliquots on nutrient agar was
12 used to enumerate *Bacillus* spp. (Wollum, 1982).

13 The activities of the soil enzymes acid and alkaline
14 phosphatase, arylsulfatase, and β -glucosidase were measured
15 with the method described by Tabatabai (1982).

16 Microbial biomass was determined using a
17 fumigation-extraction procedure which was a modification
18 (Vance et al., 1987; Sparling and West, 1988) of the
19 fumigation-incubation technique developed by Jenkinson and
20 Powlson (1976). Duplicate 15 g samples were used. After
21 labile organic C was extracted from both the fumigated and
22 the non-fumigated samples with 0.5 M K_2SO_4 , a 4 ml aliquot
23 of the extract was digested for 30 minutes at 150° C in the
24 presence of 1 ml of 0.066 M $K_2Cr_2O_2$ and 5 mls of concentrated
25 H_2SO_4 . After digestion, the samples were titrated with 0.034
26 N $FeNH_4SO_4$ and biomass calculated from organic C values.

2 From September 1990 to January, 1991 soil samples were
3 analyzed for N availability using a seven day anaerobic
4 incubation and measuring the increase of ammonium in the
sample (Keeney, 1982).

5 In October 1990, samples were collected to determine
6 whether the location from which the samples were collected
7 would affect the microbial properties measured. Samples
8 were collected from the interrow position from which the
9 monthly samples were taken, in the row and from a position
10 midway between the row and the interrow. These samples were
11 treated and analyzed in the same way as the monthly samples.

12 During July 1991, a study was conducted to determine
13 whether storing soil samples for several weeks at 4° C
14 influenced the soil biological properties measured. Samples
15 were collected from block 2 of each treatment and handled in
16 the same manner as the monthly samples. Starting within 24
17 hours of collection all tests were conducted on these
18 samples. Measurements were made on day 1, day 7, day 14,
19 and day 21 following sampling. Between testing times,
20 samples were stored in the dark at 4° C.

21 Statistical analyses were conducted using SAS
22 statistical packages (SAS, 1982). Analysis of variance was
23 performed on all data using PROC GLM to perform the ANOVA
24 procedures. Correlation coefficients were determined using
25 PROC CORR.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

EFFECT OF SAMPLING POSITION ON SOIL MICROBIAL PROPERTIES

Sampling position had little effect on the measurement of microbial properties. Generally the microbial properties were greater in the row than in the interrow or the mid-way position between the interrow and row (Table 3); however in most cases the differences were not significant. While the fungal populations measured with Martin's rose bengal medium decreased significantly from the row to the interrow position, the fungal populations measured by the DPY medium did not differ significantly by position. Likewise for the soil enzymes which were greater in the row, only the arylsulfatase values were significantly greater in the row than in the other sampling positions. Microbial biomass and available N were higher in the row samples but among sampling positions the differences were not significant.

EFFECT OF STORAGE ON SOIL MICROBIAL PROPERTIES

Generally, length of storage up to 21 days at 4° C had little affect on the soil microbial properties (data not shown). Available N, microbial biomass, alkaline phosphatase, arylsulfatase, β -glucosidase, fungi, and *Bacillus* spp. remained constant during the storage period. However, total bacteria, *Pseudomonas* spp. and acid phosphatase increased during 21 days of storage. For total bacteria, as measured on tryptic soy agar (TSA), the prestored value was 7.20 as compared to the highly significantly different value

1 of 7.67 log cfu's / g soil for the 21 day stored sample.
2 Although total bacteria increased significantly, the
3 increase of the Gram negative bacteria was not significant.
4 Gram negative bacteria ranged from 82 to 85% of the total
5 bacteria suggesting that there was no differential effect of
6 storage on Gram negative bacteria as compared to the Gram
7 positive bacteria. After 3 weeks of storage *Pseudomonas*
8 spp. had increased from 3.78 to 4.81 log cfu's / g soil and
9 the difference was significant at the $p = 0.003$ level. Acid
10 phosphatase increased 0.79 to 4.04 $\mu\text{moles p-nitrophenol g}^{-1}$
11 $\text{min}^{-1} \times 10^{-2}$ during storage. Since most assays were run
12 within 7 to 10 days of collection, the values reported
13 probably represent what would have been obtained had all
14 assays been run immediately after collection and would be
15 close to the true value. It should be pointed out that in
16 the main part of the study on microbial properties,
17 comparisons of assay values were always made between samples
18 that had been assayed after the same length of time of
19 storage. Thus while the reported values may not represent
20 the true value, comparisons among different samples are
21 valid for purposes of determining whether management schemes
22 had a different effect on the soil microbial properties.

23 THE EFFECT OF N FERTILIZATION ON SOIL MICROBIAL PROPERTIES

24 Generally, N fertilization increased microbial
25 populations. Differences between the treatments were not
26 large and high variability among replicates often prevented

the analyses of variance from detecting significant differences. When averaged across the 13 month sampling period only fungal populations were significantly greater in the fertilized treatment (Table 4). Results for fungal populations grown on Martin's rose bengal medium were similar to DPY medium, so only DPY results are shown. Measurements of soil enzymes showed greater microbial activity in the fertilized soil than in the unfertilized soil (Table 5). Significant differences were measured for the enzymes acid phosphatase and β -glucosidase. Microbial biomass levels appeared higher in the fertilized soil than in non-fertilized soil during 11 of the 13 monthly sampling, but differences between the two treatments were not significant (Table 6). Concentrations of available N measured during the last five months of the study did not differ significantly between treatments. Ammonium increases ranged from 19 to 44 $\mu\text{g NH}_4\text{ N g}^{-1}$ per week. The effect on N fertilization on microbial properties in the 7.5- to 30-cm soil zone was similar to that in the 0- to 7.5-cm zone. Microbial populations and activities were greater in the 0- to 7.5-cm zone than in the 7.5- to 30-cm zone and differences between the depths were statistically significant ($p < 0.10$) for all enzymes, fungal populations, actinomycete populations, and levels of available nitrogen (data not shown).

Higher populations and activities of soil microorganisms in fertilized soil as compared with

non-fertilized soil was due in part to increased growth of the corn crop as a result of fertilization. Greater crop yields result in greater crop residues, providing increased substrate for microbial growth. Increased residues will result in higher levels of soil organic matter which in turn contribute to better soil structure, infiltration, and soil water-holding capacity. Increased crop growth due to fertilization would increase root biomass and thus quantities of root exudates. Lynch and Panting (1980) noted that microbial biomass increases as root growth increases.

EFFECT OF GREEN MANURE ON SOIL MICROBIAL PROPERTIES

While N fertilization in the no-till treatments slightly increased microbial populations and activities, green-manuring with crimson clover had a much greater impact on soil microbial properties (Table 7). The soil into which the crimson clover had been incorporated contained significantly greater numbers of *Bacillus* spp., actinomycetes, and total bacteria when averaged across the year than did the soil from the N fertilized, conventionally tilled treatment which did not include clover. While populations of other groups of organisms appeared to be higher with the clover treatment, variability between replicates prevented the analyses of variance from detecting any other significant differences.

Microbial activity as measured by soil enzymes was significantly greater in the clover plots than the

1 non-clover plots (Table 5). Differences in enzyme
2 activities between the two treatments were significant for
3 alkaline phosphatase and β -glucosidase at $P < 0.05$, and for
4 arylsulfatase at $P < 0.01$. Soil from the clover treatment
5 had a significantly larger microbial biomass than did soil
6 from the N fertilized, conventionally, tilled treatment
7 without clover treatment (Table 6). In addition, when
8 averaged across the 5 months measured, levels of available
9 N were significantly higher in soil from the clover
10 treatment ($P < 0.05$). Ammonium accumulation ranged from 29
11 to $58 \mu\text{g NH}_4\text{-N g}^{-1}$ soil per week.

12 While green-manuring with crimson clover had a
13 significant effect on soil biological properties in the 0-
14 to 7.5-cm zone, few significant differences were found
15 between treatments in the 7.5- to 30-cm zone (data not
16 shown). Microbial populations and activities were
17 significantly greater in the surface soil than in soil at a
18 depth of 7.5 - 30 cm. Differences between the depths were
19 statistically significant ($p < 0.10$) for enzyme activities,
20 fungal and actinomycete populations microbial biomass, and
21 available N (data not shown). Although tests indicated a
22 larger and more active microbial biomass in the clover
23 treatment at the deeper depth, these differences were not
24 statistically significant. When the crimson clover was
25 plowed into the soil the bulk of the residue remained in the
26 top 10 cm. Consequently, the soil microflora were
27 concentrated in the zone with the greatest substrate.

1 The larger and more active microbial biomass in the
2 surface soil from the green manure plots results from the
3 green manure providing a source of C and N for microbial
4 growth. Cropping systems which increase inputs of C through
5 green manures, cropping sequences, or animal wastes have
6 been shown to have more microbes and greater microbial
7 activity than that found in systems which utilize fertilizer
8 inputs (Bolton et al., 1985; Fraser et al., 1988; Buchanan,
9 1990). This organic material (C/N ratio of 17) had been
10 plowed into the soil, providing intimate contact between
11 organisms and substrate. Green-manuring increases soil
12 organic matter levels leading to improved soil structure,
13 infiltration, fertility, and water-holding capacity. The
14 clover treatment had the highest soil moisture content of
15 any treatment for 12 of the 13 months that samples were
16 collected. The availability of a rapidly-decomposable
17 substrate and a greater supply of soil water produced a
18 better environment for microbial proliferation in the clover
19 plots than in the no-clover plots.

20 SEASONAL FLUCTUATIONS IN THE SOIL MICROBIAL ECOSYSTEM

21 Soil microbial properties in all treatments varied
22 significantly ($p < 0.05$) across the year (Tables 4, 5, 6,
23 and 7). Enzyme activities increased in the spring, reaching
24 a peak approximately in June (except for arylsulfatase which
25 peaked in April) and then dipped, reaching a low level in
26 August or September before reaching another peak in October
27 or November. Actinomycetes and *Bacillus* spp. remained

2 relatively constant across the year while populations of the
3 other organisms fluctuated in a manner similar to soil
4 enzymes. Populations of microorganisms peaked in April,
5 reached a low in August or September, and reached another
6 peak in October or November. The minimal fluctuation of
7 actinomycetes and *Bacillus* spp. is not surprising since
8 actinomycetes produce somewhat drought resistant conidia and
9 *Bacillus* spp. produce extremely drought resistant endospores
10 which could initiate colonies when plated on a rich medium.

11 Microbial biomass peaked in May or June, stayed rather
12 constant through October (although all non-clover plots
13 showed a late summer dip) and then dropped again to the
14 previous equilibrium level. These results agree with Gauger
15 (1987) and Buchanan (1990). Bottner (1985) showed that
16 drying the soil destroys a portion of the microbial biomass
17 although previous levels were restored upon rewetting. The
18 relatively constant biomass level in the clover plots during
19 the dry period suggests that the organisms were dormant
20 until water became more available. In the three non-clover
21 treatments water was less available and some of the
22 microbial biomass was probably destroyed during the drought
23 period of August and September.

24 Several factors combine to explain seasonal
25 fluctuations in soil microbial properties. As soil
temperature increases in the spring the numbers and
activities of soil microorganisms similarly increase. Also,

1 crop growth provides additional substrate for microbial
2 proliferation. Lynch and Panting (1980) showed that
3 microbial biomass increases with root growth as sloughed
4 root cells and root exudates provide C for microbial growth.
5 The growth of the clover in February and March, and corn
6 starting in April help to explain the increase in microbial
7 numbers and activities in the spring. The early spring
8 growth of the crimson clover helps explain why levels of
9 microbial biomass in the green manure plots began to
10 increase before the microbial biomass levels of the other
11 treatments.

12 Wardle and Parkinson (1990) suggest that microbial
13 biomass dynamics and turnover are largely controlled by the
14 dynamics of soil moisture. Soil moisture was significantly
15 correlated with every soil biological property. A long dry
16 period in August and September of 1990 dried the soil and
17 caused a drop in enzyme activities and numbers of organisms.
18 Between August 17 and October 5 a total of only 17 mm of
19 rain fell. Consequently enzyme activities and microbial
20 populations decreased during August and September. An
21 increase in soil moisture in October caused enzyme
22 activities and numbers of organisms to increase again. The
23 fall peak noted for most microbial variables could be
24 explained by the presence of adequate soil moisture, fresh
25 crop residues after harvest, and decomposing root tissue
26 providing a C source for microbial growth.

27 Although the management practices of fertilization and

1 green-manuring with crimson clover increased the
2 populations, activities, and biomass of the soil microflora,
3 the effect of the green manure was much more pronounced.
4 The main influence of fertilization increased crop residues,
5 root exudates and root biomass, providing additional
6 substrate for soil microorganisms, and improving the
7 environment for microbial growth. The incorporation of
8 crimson clover residues also provided microbes with a source
9 of C and N and the increased soil organic matter probably
10 led to higher soil water-holding capacity. The effect of
11 the green manure on soil biological properties was confined
12 largely to the soil surface (0 - 7.5 cm).

13 Each microbial property varied significantly across the
14 year. Microbial populations and activities increased in the
15 spring reaching a peak approximately in May or June, dropped
16 during the late summer, and climbed to another peak in
17 October or November. These seasonal fluctuations seemed to
18 be related to temperature, soil moisture, substrate
19 availability, and root growth.

20 According to Doran and Werner (1990) sustained
21 agricultural productivity may depend on the farmer's ability
22 to select management practices which will enhance soil
23 biological function in the fixation of atmospheric N and
24 recycling of nutrients. This study suggested that reducing
25 fertilizer inputs reduced both nutrient availability and the
26 system's internal cycling efficiency. However, the practice
27 of green-manuring with crimson clover represents an

1 alternative to inorganic fertilization and could optimize
2 the system's ability to cycle and supply nutrients. While
3 conventional cropping systems probably will produce greater
4 grain yields than RCI systems utilizing leguminous green
5 manures, the RCI system may be more economically and
6 ecologically feasible. The RCI system optimizes the
7 internal cycling of nutrients and maximizes the
8 use-efficiency of external resources.
9
10

LITERATURE CITED

- 1
2
3 Bolton, J., L.F. Elliott, P.R. Papendick, and D.F. Bezdicek.
4 1985. Soil microbial biomass and selected soil enzyme
5 activities: Effect of fertilization and cropping
6 practices. Soil Biol. Biochem. 17:297-302.
7
8 Bottner, P. 1985. Response of microbial biomass to alternate
9 moist and dry conditions in a soil incubated with ¹⁴C
10 and ¹⁵N-labelled plant material. Soil Biol. Biochem.
11 17:329-337.
12
13 Buchanan, M.A. 1990. Carbon and phosphorus cycling in
14 no-till and reduced chemical input maize
15 agroecosystems: Experimental and simulation analysis.
16 Ph.D. thesis. North Carolina State University.
17 Raleigh, NC.
18
19 Doran, J.W. and M.R. Werner. 1990. Management and soil
20 biology. p.207- 211. In: C.A. Francis, C.B. Flora, and
21 L.D. King (eds.). Sustainable Agriculture in Temperate
22 Zones. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York.
23
24 Fraser, D.G., J.W. Doran, W.W. Sahs, and G.W. Lesoing. 1988.
25 Soil microbial populations and activities under
26 conventional and organic management. J. Environ. Qual.
27 17:585-590.
28
29 Gauger, R.E. 1987. The effect of green manure crops on
30 microbial biomass and soil enzymes. M.S. thesis. Soil
31 Science Department. North Carolina State University.
32 Raleigh, NC.
33
34 Jenkinson, D.S. and D.S. Powlson. 1976. The effects of
35 biocidal treatments on soil. V: A method for measuring
36 soil biomass. Soil Biol. Biochem. 8:209-213.
37
38 Keeney, D.R. 1982. Nitrogen-availability indices.
39 p.727-728. In: A.L. Page, D.R. Keeney, and R.H. Miller
40 (eds.). Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2 - Chemical
41 and Microbiological Prop. 2nd Ed. Am. Soc. Agron.
42 Madison, WI.
43
44 Lynch, J.M., and L.M. Panting. 1980. Cultivation and the
45 soil biomass. Soil Biol. Biochem. 12:29-33.
46
47 Martin, J.K. 1975. Comparison of agar media for counts of
48 viable soil bacteria. Soil Biol. Biochem. 7:401-402.
49
50 Martin, J.P. 1950. Use of acid, rose bengal and
51 streptomycin in the plate method for estimating soil
52 fungi. Soil Sci. 69:215-232.
53

- 1 Martyniuk, S., and G.H. Wagner. 1978. Quantitative and
2 qualitative examination of soil microflora associated
3 with different management systems. Soil Sci.
4 125:343-350.
- 5
6 National Research Council. 1989. Alternative Agriculture.
7 National Academy Press. Washington, D.C. p.3-189.
- 8
9 Papavizas, G.C. and C.B. Davey. 1959. Evaluation of various
10 media and antimicrobial agents for isolation of soil
11 fungi. Soil Sci. 88:112-117.
- 12
13 Paul, E.A., and F.E. Clark. 1989. Soil Microbiology and
14 Biochemistry. Academic Press, San Deigo.
- 15
16 Roder, W., S.C. Mason, M.D. Cleff, J.W. Doran, and K.R.
17 Kniep. 1988. Plant and microbial responses to
18 sorghum-soybean cropping systems and fertility
19 management. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 52:1337-1342.
- 20
21 SAS. 1982. User's Guide: Statistics. SAS Institute Inc.
22 Cary, NC.
- 23
24 Sands, D.C. and A.D. Rovira. 1970. Isolation of fluorescent
25 pseudomonads with a selective medium. Appl. Microbiol.
26 20:513-514.
- 27
28 Sarathchandra, S.U., K.W. Perrott, M.R. Boase, and J.E.
29 Waller. 1988. Seasonal changes and the effects of
30 fertiliser on some chemical, biochemical and
31 microbiological characteristics of high-producing
32 pastoral soil. Biol. Fertil. Soils 6:328-335.
- 33
34 Simon, A., A.D. Rovira, and D.C. Sands. 1973. An improved
35 selective medium for the isolation of fluorescent
36 pseudomonads. J. Appl. Bacteriol. 36: 141-145.
- 37
38 Sparling, G.P. and A.W. West. 1988. Modifications to the
39 fumigation-extraction technique to permit simultaneous
40 extraction and estimation of soil microbial C and N.
41 Comm. Soil Sci. Plant Anal. 19:327-344.
- 42
43 Tabatabai, M.A. 1982. Soil enzymes. p. 903-947. In: A. L.
44 Page, D.R. Keeney, and R.H. Miller (eds.) Methods of
45 Soil Analysis. Part 2 - Chemical and Microbiological
46 Prop. 2nd Ed. American Society of Agronomy. Madison,
47 WI.
- 48
49 Vance, E.D., P.C. Brookes, and D.S. Jenkinson. 1987. An
50 extraction method measuring soil microbial biomass C.
51 Soil Biol. Biochem. 19:703-707.
- 52
53

1 Wardle, D.A., and D. Parkinson. 1990. Interactions between
2 microclimatic variables and the soil microbial biomass.
3 Biol. Fertil. Soils 9:273-280.

4
5 Wollum, A.G.,II. 1982. Cultural methods for soil
6 microorganisms. p.781-801. In: A.L. Page, D. Keeney
7 and R.H. Miller (eds.). Methods of Soil Analysis.
8 Part 2 - Chemical and Microbiological Prop. 2nd Ed.
9 Am. Soc. Agron. Madison, WI.
10

Table 1. Soil physical and chemical properties of the soils studied.

Treatment	Block	Humic Matter ¹ g/100 cm ³	Base Sat. (%)	Clay (%)	Sand (%)	Silt (%)	C.E.C. meq/100 cm ³	pH range during the study
No Fertilizer	1	0.4	81	23.8	61.7	14.5	6.2	6.0-7.0
	2	0.4	90	12.9	69.1	12.9	7.8	6.4-7.2
	3	0.6	84	17.7	66.7	15.6	7.7	6.1-6.8
	4	0.3	85	6.7	78.4	14.8	5.3	6.4-7.2
Fertilizer	1	0.4	77	26.4	54.9	18.7	6.9	5.5-6.6
	2	0.7	75	18.6	63.1	18.3	8.0	5.6-7.0
	3	0.5	82	15.4	68.6	16.0	6.8	5.5-6.6
	4	0.5	76	5.7	77.2	17.1	6.6	5.6-6.5
Clover	1	0.4	96	34.3	50.6	15.1	11.3	6.4-7.3
	2	0.3	87	32.6	50.3	17.1	9.2	6.2-7.0
	3	0.5	84	7.4	72.1	20.5	7.6	6.1-7.0
	4	0.5	93	11.2	69.5	19.3	11.2	6.4-6.9
No Clover	1	0.4	73	25.6	58.1	16.3	7.4	5.4-6.4
	2	0.6	71	8.7	76.0	15.3	5.5	5.4-6.4
	3	0.6	74	12.5	70.7	16.8	6.2	6.0-6.8
	4	0.3	79	6.6	81.1	12.3	5.8	6.0-6.9

¹ As determined by the North Carolina Department of Agriculture, Agronomic Division, Soil Testing Laboratory using an alkaline hydrolysis procedure.

Table 2. Description of the treatments studied.

Label	Tillage	Winter crop	Fertilizer	Pesticide ⁺
			kg ha ⁻¹	
No fertilizer	none	fallow	0	yes
Fertilizer	none	fallow	140	yes
Clover	Chisel plow/disk	crimson clover	no	no
No clover	Chisel plow/disk	fallow	140	no

⁺ 7.4 L alachlor (Lasso) ha⁻¹, 5 L glyphosate (Roundup) ha⁻¹, and 5 L atrazine (AAtrex) at planting; 0.035 kg nicosulfuron (Accent) ha⁻¹ postemergence; carbofuran (Furadan) was dropped with corn seed at 9 kg ha⁻¹.

Table 3. Effect of sampling position on some soil microbial properties.

SOIL MICROBIAL PROPERTY	CLOVER TREATMENT			FERTILIZER TREATMENT			SIGNIFICANCE	
	ROOT	SLOPE	INTER	ROOT	SLOPE	INTER	TREATMENT	POSITION
PLATE COUNTS	log # of CFU g ⁻¹ soil _{DW}							
<i>Bacillus</i>	6.57	6.48	6.65	6.16	6.22	6.22	* ¹	NS
Fungi (DPY)	5.45	5.36	5.49	5.35	5.30	5.39	*	*
Fungi (MRB)	5.62	5.38	5.17	5.39	5.13	4.95	**	**
<i>Pseudomonas</i>	4.06	4.02	4.52	4.61	4.09	4.05	NS	NS
Actinomycetes	6.36	6.46	6.31	6.05	6.09	5.83	*	NS
Total bacteria	7.96	7.84	7.65	7.60	7.30	7.30	*	NS
Gram neg. bact.	6.82	6.91	7.44	6.93	6.41	6.39	NS	NS
SOIL ENZYME LEVELS	(μmols of p-nitrophenol g ⁻¹ _{DW} min ⁻¹) X 10 ⁻²							
Acid Phosphate	8.97	8.07	7.96	6.90	6.61	5.42	*	NS
Alkaline Phos.	1.45	0.71	1.20	0.72	0.06	0.10	*	NS
Arylsulfatase	1.29	1.01	1.00	0.70	0.51	0.48	**	NS
β-Glucosidase	3.02	1.85	2.08	1.18	1.01	0.87	*	NS
MICROBIAL BIOMASS	μg of microbial C g ⁻¹ soil _{DW}							
	159.6	36.6	110.1	83.4	65.2	60.0	NS	NS
AVAILABLE NITROGEN	μg of NH ₄ ⁺ mineralized g ⁻¹ soil _{DW}							
	73.7	45.6	67.9	40.3	16.6	19.8	*	NS

¹ *, ** indicates significance at probability levels $p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$ respectively.

Table 4. Mean number colony-forming units (CFU) for different microorganisms from fertilized and nonfertilized soil (0 - 7.5 cm) sampled over a 13 month period.

Soil microbial property	JAN	FEB	MAR	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	Ave for the year
	----- log # of CFUs g ⁻¹ soil _{DW} -----													
<i>Bacillus</i> spp.														
no fertilizer	5.68	5.47	5.46	5.62	5.61	5.66	5.55	5.76	5.44	5.81	5.27	5.59	5.36	5.56
fertilizer	5.82	5.51	5.59	5.66	5.70	5.78 ^{1†}	5.52	5.72	5.53	5.90	5.70*	5.74	5.34	5.65
Fungi (DPY)														
no fertilizer	4.30	4.72	4.94	5.22	5.08	4.80	5.16	4.93	4.90	5.22	5.35	5.24	4.99	4.99
fertilizer	4.72	5.00	5.24	5.42	5.31	5.38 [†]	5.28	5.26*	5.20*	5.45 [†]	5.50	5.50*	5.26 [†]	5.27*
<i>Pseudomonas</i> spp.														
no fertilizer	4.42	4.78	5.59	5.44	5.01	4.14	4.16	3.70	3.75	3.62	5.28	5.44	4.45	4.60
fertilizer	4.29	4.98	5.75	5.68	4.84	4.82	3.95	3.91	4.32	3.95	5.36	5.46	4.51	4.76
Actinomycetes														
no fertilizer	5.81	5.60	5.40	5.90	5.63	6.06	5.91	6.16	5.91	6.35	5.93	6.28	5.68	5.89
fertilizer	5.74	5.38	5.78	5.97	5.64	5.96	5.80	6.33	5.94	6.04	5.56	6.27	5.86	5.87
Total bacteria														
no fertilizer	7.49	6.98	7.18	7.44	7.24	6.89	7.25	7.00	7.24	7.52	7.33	7.60	7.53	7.28
fertilizer	7.53	6.87	7.33	7.55	7.49	7.02	7.20	7.00	7.25	7.48	7.50	7.64	7.84 ^{**}	7.36
Gram negative bacteria														
no fertilizer	6.49	6.35	6.25	6.56	6.26	5.97	5.60	5.90	5.70	6.21	6.77	6.64	6.82	6.27
fertilizer	6.50	6.12	6.45	7.03	6.10	6.14 [†]	5.45	5.84	5.96	6.30	6.88	6.77	6.96	6.35

^{1†}, *, ** indicates significance at probability levels $p < 0.10$, $p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$ respectively

Table 5. Mean extracellular enzymes activities in surface (0 - 7.5 cm) soil samples collected over a 13 month period.

Soil microbial property	JAN	FEB	MAR	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	Ave for the year
	----- $\mu\text{mols of p-nitrophenol g}^{-1} \text{soil}_{\text{DW}} \text{min}^{-1} \times 10^2$ -----													
Acid Phosphatase														
no fertilizer	1.07	2.45	1.99	2.50	2.82	4.06	4.50	2.10	1.84	5.31	3.72	2.54	2.41	2.87
fertilizer	0.96	4.02*	3.24†	3.65	4.28*	7.06†	8.41	3.57	3.45	7.80	5.48	5.14*	5.08*	4.78**
Alkaline Phos.														
no fertilizer	0.37	0.52	0.73	0.99	0.83	1.44	0.71	0.31	0.63	0.72	1.32	0.62	0.87	0.77
fertilizer	0.59	0.52	0.93	1.44	0.84	1.50	0.58	0.73	1.39	0.83	0.75	1.00†	1.02†	0.93
Arylsulfatase														
no fertilizer	0.36	0.69	0.62	0.68	0.45	0.62	0.45	0.53	0.29	0.61	0.74	0.61	0.49	0.55
fertilizer	0.46*	0.63	0.83	0.96	0.42	0.47	0.51	0.70	0.37	0.74	0.64	0.84†	0.64	0.63
β -Glucosidase														
no fertilizer	0.81	0.72	0.61	1.04	1.08	1.99	1.60	0.72	0.64	0.80	1.71	1.18	0.79	1.05
fertilizer	1.31*	0.97	1.14	1.53	1.46	2.65	2.71*	1.43*	1.23	1.41*	1.83	2.19*	1.56†	1.65*
Acid Phosphatase														
clover	1.31*	3.39	3.57	4.76	4.78	8.17	8.03	2.92	3.96	9.52	7.01	5.08	5.26	5.21
no clover	0.66	3.12	2.31	3.23	3.70	6.11	6.74	2.23	2.90	7.17	5.71	4.39	4.52	4.06
Alkaline Phos.														
clover	2.10*	2.42*	2.22*	3.33*	3.08*	3.43*	2.24*	2.12†	2.27	2.71*	3.46†	3.23*	3.95†	2.81*
no clover	0.36	0.53	0.87	1.09	0.78	0.62	0.27	0.46		0.59	1.03	0.77	1.12	0.71
Arylsulfatase														
clover	0.89**	1.15	1.26**	1.46*	0.98**	0.72	0.92**	1.10**	0.43*	1.28*	1.64*	1.28**	1.45†	1.12**
no clover	0.29	0.64	0.57	0.68	0.42	0.54	0.29	0.56	0.29	0.66	0.70	0.65	0.61	0.53
β -Glucosidase														
clover	2.67†	2.29*	1.95*	3.04*	2.74	3.56*	3.63*	2.88†	2.05*	2.91*	4.44†	3.63*	3.34*	3.01*
no clover	1.17	1.14	0.92	1.31	1.54	1.98	1.99	1.14	0.96	1.44	2.32	2.02	1.79	1.52

†, *, ** indicates significance at probability levels $p < 0.10$, $p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$.

Table 6. Microbial biomass C for surface (0 - 7.5 cm) soil samples collected over a 13 month period.

Soil microbial property	JAN	FEB	MAR	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	Ave for the year
	----- μg of biomass C g^{-1} soil _{DW} -----													
Microbial biomass														
No fertilizer	78.0	78.6	68.3	59.8	48.9	144.4	93.6	63.7	68.8	81.3	64.8	41.7	40.5	71.7
fertilizer	38.4	78.8	94.0	96.1	56.8	180.2	122.3	68.7	95.4	100.3	55.8	52.3	66.8	85.1
Microbial biomass														
clover	88.2	84.0	121.6 [†]	166.7 [†]	182.3	188.0	165.2	151.0 [*]	155.8 [*]	150.7	113.6	71.1	99.5	133.7 [*]
no clover	97.8	67.1	73.0	96.4	96.7	133.1	151.7	93.4	84.2	102.2	57.6	64.1	72.2	91.5

[†], *, ** indicates significance at probability levels $p < 0.10$, $p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$ respectively.

Table 7. Mean number of colony-forming units (CFUs) for different microorganisms from surface soil of the clover and non-clover treatments soil (0 - 7.5 cm) sampled over a 13 month period.

Soil microbial property	JAN	FEB	MAR	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	Ave for the year
	----- log # of CFUs g ⁻¹ soil _{DW} -----													
<i>Bacillus</i> spp.														
clover	6.30	6.55 [†]	6.44	6.42	6.56 [†]	6.61 ^{**}	6.49 [*]	6.46 [†]	6.16 [†]	6.77 ^{**}	6.54 [*]	6.75 [*]	6.58 [†]	6.51 [†]
no clover	6.01	5.89	5.80	5.96	5.90	6.01	5.87	5.85	5.73	6.25	5.91	5.90	6.25	5.95
Fungi (DPY-5)														
clover	5.04	5.47	5.30	5.77 [*]	5.76 [†]	5.54	5.33	5.41	5.28	5.59	5.62	5.70	5.56	5.49
no clover	4.74	5.16	5.28	5.42	5.41	5.36	5.28	5.30	5.38	5.48	5.65	5.56	5.40	5.34
<i>Pseudomonas</i>														
clover	4.72	5.10	5.82	6.37 [†]	5.24	4.72	4.01	3.90	4.28	4.01	5.41 [*]	5.46	5.24	4.94
no clover	4.66	5.15	5.74	5.75	5.19	4.58	4.00	3.49	3.66	4.02	5.08	6.34	5.02	4.74
Actinomycetes														
clover	6.70	6.46 [†]	6.46 [*]	6.46 [*]	6.45 [†]	6.57 [*]	6.62	6.42 ^{**}	6.61	6.42 ^{**}	6.67	6.59 [*]	6.79 ^{**}	5.59 ^{**}
no clover	6.23	5.21	5.67	5.87	5.93	5.48	6.06	6.38	6.05	6.31	6.18	6.31	6.03	5.98
Total bacteria														
clover	7.93	7.52	7.72	8.65 [*]	7.94 [†]	7.65 [†]	7.82 [†]	7.78 [*]	7.54 [†]	8.08	7.88	8.11 [*]	8.12	7.90 [†]
no clover	7.51	7.48	7.13	7.84	7.48	7.22	7.63	7.35	7.23	7.71	7.84	7.84	8.01	7.56
Gram negative bacteria														
clover	7.00 [†]	6.32	6.71	7.62	7.03 [†]	6.42	5.76	6.11	5.92	6.84	7.16	6.98	7.20	6.70
no clover	6.63	6.82	6.28	6.99	6.59	6.10	5.92	5.88	5.63	6.59	7.24	6.86	7.17	6.52

[†], *, ** indicates significance at probability levels $p < 0.10$, $p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$.