TABLE OF CONTENTS	
TABLE OF CONTENTS	
	Page
Acknowledgements	iii
English Abstract	v
Thai Abstract	vii
Table of Contents	ix
List of Tables	xii
List of Figures	xv
Abbreviations	xviii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	7-1
1.1 Rationale	2
1.2 Research Questions	4
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEWS	5
CHAPTER 3 MATERIALS AND METHODS	7
3.1 Selection of the villages and households	7
3.2 Study areas	9
3.3 Geology and Geomorphology	11
3.4 Climate	13
3.5 Field survey	14
3.6 Laboratorial Methods	20
3.7 Land evaluation according to FAO/ITC-Ghent method	23

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)**

	Page
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS	25
4.1 The situation of three villages	25
4.2 Properties of individual fields	27
4.2.1 Kho Vang village	27
4.2.2 Na Ten village	44
4.2.3 Ta Lang Thap	58
4.3 Location profile selection	5 071
4.4 Soil profile description and laboratory results	78
4.5 Land evaluation by LSC/ITC-Ghent for fields	85
4.5.1 Assessment of the climate	85
4.5.2 Soil evaluation	85
4.6 Comparing Stock of organic carbon and nitrogen for all fields of	89
six selected farmers	
4.6.1 Weighting Corg and Nitrogen of the topsoil for all fields of	89
the selected farmers	
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION	94
5.1 Hypothesis I	94
5.1.1 Characterize individual fields	94
5.1.2 Comparison of soil fertility of the six soil profiles by	95
the LSC/ITC-Ghent method, Landon (1984) and Jahn (2006)	
5.2 Hypothesis II	105
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION	110 C 4 V
REFERENCES	112

# TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
APPENDICES	117
Appendix A Climate requirement for maize crop by Sys et al. (1993)	118
Appendix B Topographical and soil requirement for maize crop (Sys et al.1993)	119
Appendix C Evaluation of soil quality according to Landon (1984)	120
CURRICULUM VITAE	121

# ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่ Copyright<sup>©</sup> by Chiang Mai University All rights reserved

LIST OF TABLES		
Table	Page	
3.1 Six selected Thai households	8	
3.2 General information of three villages	10	
3.3 Topography, climate and soil requirement for crops (Sys et al. 1993	23	
and Graef 1999, modify)		
3.4 Index value for suitability classes	24	
4.1 General information of the six households	25	
4.2 Output and input of maize crop of Y1-kv from 2008 to 2010	29	
4.3 Results of the field work and lab-analysis data of Y1-kv	30	
4.4 Input and output of maize crop of Y2-kv 2008-2010	32	
4.5 Input and output of maize crop of Y3-kv 2008-2010	34	
4.6 Input and output of maize crop of H1, 2008-2010	37	
4.7 Input and output of maize crop of H2, 2008-2010	39	
4.8 Input and output of maize crop of H3, 2008-2010	41	
4.9 Field H4 information	42	
4.10 Input and output of maize crop of B1, 2008-2010	46	
4.11 Input and output of maize crop of B2, 2008-2010	48	
4.12 Input and output of maize crop of B3, 2008-2010	49	
4.13 Input and output of maize crop of B4, 2008-2010	50	
4.14 Input and output of maize crop of Y1-nt, 2008-2010	53	
4.15 Input and output of maize crop of Y2-nt, 2008-2010	54	
4.16 Input and output of maize crop of Y3-nt, 2008-2010	56	
4.17 Input and output of maize crop of BA1, 2008-2010	60	
4.18 Input and output of maize crop of BA2, 2008-2010	62	
4.19 Input and output of maize crop of RA3, 2008-2010	64	

# LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page	
4.20 Input and output of maize crop of BA4, 2008-2010	65	
4.21 Input and output of maize crop of T1, 2008-2010	67	
4.22 Input and output of maize crop of T2, 2008-2010	69	
4.23 Process and location of selected soil profile in Mr. Yen's fields	72	
4.24 Process and location of selected soil profile in Mr. Hac's fields	73	
4.25 Process and location of selected soil profile in Mr. Bien's fields	74	
4.26 Process and location of selected soil profile in Mr. Yen-nt's fields	75	
4.27 Process and location of selected soil profile in Mrs. Bau's fields	76	
4.28 Process and location of selected soil profile in Tuan's fields	77	
4.29 Description of soil profile Y at field	78	
4.30 Lab-analysis result-Profile Y	78	
4.31 Description of soil profile H at field	79	
4.32 Lab-analysis result-Profile H	79	
4.33 Description of soil profile B at field	80	
4.34 Lab-analysis result-Profile B	80	
4.35 Description of soil profile Y-nt at field	81	
4.36 Lab-analysis result-Profile Y-nt	81	
4.37 Description of soil profile BA at field	82	
4.38 Lab-analysis result-Profile BA	82	
4.39 Description of soil profile T at field	83	
4.40 Lab-analysis result-Profile T	84	
4.41 Climate Index and Climate Rating for maize crop	85	
4.42 Wetness rating and topographical rating for maize crop	86	
4.43 Soil physical rating for maize crop	86	
4.44 Soil chemical rating for maize crop	87	
4.45 Calculations of Soil Index from individual categories	87	

lble	Pa
6 Calculations of Land Index from Climate Rating and Soil Index	
7 Calculation the Land Index without the topographical factor	
8 Stock of Corg and N of the topsoil for all fields of Mr. Yen-kv (rich farm	er)
9 Stock of Corg and Nt of the topsoil for all fields of Mr. Hac (poor farmer)	) ~
50 Stock of Corg and Nt of the topsoil for all fields of Mr. Bien (rich farmer)	
51 Stock of Corg and Nt of the topsoil for all fields of Mr. Yen-nt (poor farm	ner)
52 Stock of Corg and Nt of the topsoil for all fields of Mrs. Bau (rich farmer	)
33 Stock of Corg and Nt of the topsoil for all fields of Mr. Tuan (poor farme	r)
Summarize land evaluation for the six soil profiles- LSC/ITC-Ghent	
2 Comparing labor ratio between rich and poor farmers	

## LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF FIGURES	
Figure	Page
3.1 Location of study site	9
3.2 Main geological units in Yen Chau district (Modified from sub-project B4)	12
3.3 Climate in Yen Chau from 1998 to 2007	13
3.4 Land forms according to FAO 2006	15
3.5 Land form units, drills and small profile	16
3.6 An example of the process with GIS to decide where to dig a soil profile	18
4.1 Plot locations of the rich (Y-kv) and poor (H) farmers in Kho Vang village	27
4.2 Y1-kv field information	28
4.3 Division of Y1-kv plot into landform units	29
4.4 Y2-kv field information	31
4.5 Division Y2-kv plot into landform units	33
4.6 Y3-kv field information	33
4.7 Division of Y3-kv plot into landform units	35
4.8 H1 field information	36
4.9 Division of H1 plot into landform units	37
4.10 H2 field information	38
4.11 Division of H2 plot into landform units	39
4.12 H3 field information	40
4.13 Division of H3 plot into landform units	41
4.14 Division of H4 plot into landform units	42
4.15 Plot locations of the rich (B) and poor (Y-nt) farmers in Na Ten village	44
4.16 B1 field information	45
4.17 Division of B1 plot into landform unit	46
4.18 B2 field information	47

LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)			
Figure	Page		
4.19 Division of B2 plot into landform units	48		
4.20 Division of B3 plot into landform units	49		
4.21 B4 field information	50		
4.22 Division of B4 plot into landform units	51		
4.23 Division of Y1-nt plot into landform units	52		
4.24 Y2-nt field information	53		
4.25 Division of Y2-nt plot into landform units	54		
4.26 Y3-nt field information	55		
4.27 Division of Y3-nt plot into landform units	56		
4.28 Plot locations of the rich and poor farmers in Ta Lang Thap village	58		
4.29 BA1 field information	59		
4.30 Division of BA1 plot into landform units	60		
4.31 BA2 field information	61		
4.32 Division of BA2 plot into landform units	62		
4.33 Division of BA3 plot into landform units	63		
4.34 BA4 field information	64		
4.35 Division of BA4 plot into landform units	66		
4.36 T1 field information	67		
4.37 Divided T1 plot into landform units	68		
4.38 T2 field information	69		
4.39 Division of T2 plot into landform units	70		
4.40 Comparison stock of Corg and N of the topsoil of 20 fields of	93		
six selected farmers			
5.1 Comparing Corg and Nt of the six soil profiles at upper horizons	101/5		
(topsoil and second horizon)			

## xiii

## **LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)**

Figure	Page
5.2 Average maize yield in three years (2008-2010)	103
5.3 Input of chemical fertilizer into maize's fields	103
5.4 Comparison of the rich and poor farmers' total upland field areas (ha)	105
5.5 Input of maize seed of the six selected farmers	106
5.6 Expenditure of chemical fertilizer 2008-2010	107



## **ABBREVIATIONS**

BD Bulk Density

BS Base Saturation

Ct Total Carbon

CECpot Potential Cation Exchange Capacity

Corg Organic Carbon

CC Concave-Concave

CS Concave-Straight

CV Concave-Convex

FAO Food and Agriculture Organization

Fig Figure

GIS Geographic Information System

GPS Global Positioning System

ha Hectare

HCL Hydrogen Chloride Acid

H<sub>2</sub>O Water

H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> hydrogen peroxide

ITC International Training Center

Ka Available Potassium

KCL Potassium chloride

kg Kilogram,

km Kilometer

LSC Land Suitability Classification

Nt Total Nitrogen

NPK Nitrogen-Phosphate-Postasium

Pa Extractable Phosphorus

SS Straight-Straight

SV Straight-Convex

SC Straight-Concave

UTM Universal Transverse Mercator

VS Convex-Straight

VV Convex-Convex

VC Convex- Concave

WGS World Geodetic System

% per cent

> greater than

less than

degree

<sup>0</sup>C degree Celsius