E-ISSN: 2663-1067
P-ISSN: 2663-1075
www.hortijournal.com
IJHFS 2023; 5(1): 120-124
Received: 17-04-2023
Accepted: 20-05-2023

David C Nyaki
Institute of Agricultural Research, Selian Agricultural Research Institute, Arusha, Tanzania

Corresponding Author:
David C Nyaki
Institute of Agricultural Research, Selian Agricultural Research Institute, Arusha, Tanzania

Comparative analysis of open-field and protected vegetable cultivation in Arusha, Tanzania

David C Nyaki

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/26631067.2023.v5.i1b.206

Abstract
This research paper examines the comparative benefits, challenges, and economic viability of open-field and protected vegetable cultivation methods in Arusha, Tanzania. Protected environment structures (PES), such as greenhouses, polyhouses, and net houses, offer enhanced control over environmental factors, leading to improved yields and quality. This study provides a comprehensive analysis based on field data, and existing literature, highlighting the differences in productivity, resource efficiency, and sustainability between the two cultivation methods.

Keywords: Arusha, open-field, protected vegetable cultivation

Introduction
Agriculture is a cornerstone of the economy in Arusha, Tanzania, providing livelihoods for a significant portion of the population. Arusha, located in the northern part of Tanzania, is known for its fertile lands and favorable climate, making it a key region for agricultural activities. The region's agriculture sector primarily focuses on crops such as maize, beans, coffee, and horticultural crops, including a variety of vegetables. In recent years, vegetable cultivation in Arusha has seen considerable development due to increasing demand from both local and international markets. Vegetables such as tomatoes, cucumbers, lettuce, and bell peppers are among the most commonly cultivated crops. The adoption of advanced agricultural practices and technologies has played a crucial role in enhancing productivity and ensuring food security in the region. However, traditional open-field farming methods face significant challenges, including erratic weather patterns, pest infestations, and soil degradation. These issues often result in inconsistent yields and economic instability for farmers. For instance, the region experiences fluctuating rainfall patterns, which can lead to periods of drought or excessive rain, adversely affecting crop yields. Additionally, pest and disease outbreaks are common, further exacerbating the challenges faced by farmers. To address these challenges and enhance productivity, innovative agricultural practices like protected environment structures (PES) have been introduced in Arusha. PES, such as greenhouses, polyhouses, and net houses, create controlled environments that mitigate the risks associated with open-field farming. By regulating factors such as temperature, humidity, light, and pest exposure, PES can significantly enhance crop growth and productivity. The government of Tanzania, along with various non-governmental organizations (NGOs), has been promoting the adoption of PES through subsidies, training programs, and financial assistance. These initiatives aim to support farmers in transitioning to more sustainable and resilient farming practices. For example, the Tanzanian Horticultural Association (TAHA) has been actively involved in providing technical support and training to farmers on the use of PES. Despite these efforts, the adoption of PES in Arusha is still in its nascent stages, with many farmers hesitant due to the high initial costs and technical expertise required. However, the success stories of early adopters have demonstrated the potential of PES to transform vegetable cultivation in the region. Farmers who have adopted PES have reported significant increases in yields, improved quality of produce, and higher income levels.

Objective of study
The objective of this study is to conduct a comparative analysis of open-field and protected

vegetable cultivation in Arusha, Tanzania.

Methods and Materials

Study Area: The study was conducted in Arusha, Tanzania, a region known for its agricultural activities, particularly in vegetable cultivation. The climate in Arusha is conducive to agriculture with its moderate temperatures and sufficient rainfall, though it also faces challenges like unpredictable weather patterns and pest infestations.

Source: Google Map

Fig 1: Geographical structure of Arusha, Tanzania

Study Design

The study was performed between open-field and protected vegetable cultivation methods. Data was collected from multiple farms in the Arusha region that practice both types of cultivation. The study employed a mixed-method approach, combining quantitative data from agricultural records with qualitative insights from farmer interviews.

Materials

Crops Studied: Tomatoes, Cucumbers, Lettuce

Data Collection Tools: Yield measurement tools (scales, measuring tapes), Water and fertilizer usage logs, and Survey questionnaires for farmer interviews.

Data Collection

- **Yield and Quality:** Quantitative data on crop yields (tons per hectare) and quality ratings were collected from both open-field and PES farms.
- **Resource Use Efficiency:** Data on water, fertilizer, and pesticide usage were recorded to assess resource efficiency.
- **Economic Analysis:** Financial records were reviewed to determine initial investment, annual maintenance costs, and income from both cultivation methods.
- **Farmer Perception:** Surveys and interviews were conducted with farmers to gather qualitative data on their experiences, satisfaction levels, and perceived challenges with both methods.

Statistical Analysis

- Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the data.
- Comparative analysis was performed to identify significant differences in yields, resource use efficiency, and economic viability between the two cultivation methods.
- Statistical tests (e.g., t-tests) were conducted to assess the significance of the observed differences.

Environmental Impact Assessment

- Soil samples were collected and analyzed to assess soil degradation.
- Water usage records were reviewed to evaluate water consumption.
- Observations and farmer reports were used to assess the impact on local biodiversity.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Yield and quality comparison

Parameter	Open-Field Cultivation	Protected Cultivation (PES)
Tomato Yield (tons/ha)	15	45
Cucumber Yield (tons/ha)	12	35
Lettuce Yield (tons/ha)	10	30
Average Quality Rating	Moderate	High

Table 1 compares the yields and quality of tomatoes, cucumbers, and lettuce between open-field and protected cultivation methods in Arusha, Tanzania. The data shows significantly higher yields and better quality ratings for vegetables grown in PES.

Table 2: Resource use efficiency

Parameter	Open-Field Cultivation	Protected Cultivation (PES)
Water use efficiency	Low	High
Fertilizer use efficiency	Moderate	High
Pesticide use	High	Low

Table 2 presents the resource use efficiency for water, fertilizers, and pesticides in open-field versus protected cultivation. PES demonstrates higher efficiency in water and fertilizer use and lower pesticide requirements.

Table 3: Economic Analysis

Parameter	Open-Field Cultivation	Protected Cultivation (PES)
Initial Investment (USD)	1,000-2,000	10,000-20,000
Annual Maintenance (USD)	200-400	2,000-4,000
Annual Income (USD)	3,000-5,000	6,000-8,000
ROI (%)	50-100	100-150

Table 3 provides an economic comparison, detailing the initial investment, annual maintenance costs, and annual income for both cultivation methods. It highlights the higher initial costs and maintenance expenses for PES, but also shows a significantly higher annual income and return on investment.

Table 4: Farmer perception and adoption barriers

Parameter	Open-Field Cultivation	Protected Cultivation (PES)
Ease of Adoption	High	Moderate to Low
Technical Expertise Required	Low	High
Perceived Risk	Low	Moderate to High
Overall Satisfaction	Moderate	High

Table 4 summarizes farmer perceptions and the barriers to adopting PES. While PES requires higher technical expertise and has perceived higher risks, overall satisfaction among adopters is higher due to better yields and income.

Table 5: Environmental impact

Parameter	Open-Field Cultivation	Protected Cultivation (PES)
Soil Degradation	High	Low
Water Consumption	High	Low
Carbon Footprint	Moderate	Moderate
Biodiversity Impact	High	Low

Table 5 evaluates the environmental impacts of both cultivation methods. PES results in lower soil degradation, reduced water consumption, and less impact on biodiversity, though the carbon footprint remains comparable between the two methods.

Discussion

The data in Table 1 clearly indicates that protected cultivation methods, such as greenhouses, polyhouses, and net houses, result in significantly higher yields compared to open-field cultivation. Tomato yields in PES are three times higher than those in open fields, while cucumber and lettuce yields are nearly tripled. This substantial increase in productivity can be attributed to the controlled environment provided by PES, which optimizes growing conditions by regulating temperature, humidity, and light. Additionally, the quality of produce in PES is notably superior, as evidenced by higher average quality ratings. This is likely due to reduced pest and disease exposure and better nutrient management within these structures.

Table 2 highlights the resource use efficiency in open-field versus protected cultivation. Water use efficiency is significantly higher in PES, primarily because these systems employ precision irrigation methods such as drip irrigation, which minimizes water wastage. Fertilizer use is also more efficient in PES due to controlled application, reducing runoff and ensuring that nutrients are more effectively absorbed by the plants. The lower pesticide use in PES is a major advantage, as the enclosed environment reduces the risk of pest infestations, leading to healthier crops and a reduced need for chemical interventions. This contributes to more sustainable farming practices and lower environmental impact.

Economic data in Table 3 reveals that while the initial investment and annual maintenance costs for PES are higher, the long-term economic benefits are substantial. The annual income from PES is almost double that of open-field cultivation, with a return on investment (ROI) of 100-150% compared to 50-100% in open fields. This higher income is driven by increased yields and better quality produce, which commands higher market prices. Farmers in Arusha have reported a 35% increase in income from polyhouse cultivation, highlighting the economic viability of PES despite the higher upfront costs. Government subsidies and NGO support further enhance the feasibility of adopting PES.

Table 4 summarizes farmer perceptions and the barriers to adopting PES. While the ease of adoption for open-field cultivation is higher, PES requires more technical expertise and carries perceived higher risks. However, farmers who have adopted PES report higher overall satisfaction due to the benefits of increased productivity and income. The main barriers to adoption include high initial costs and the need for specialized knowledge. Addressing these barriers through training programs and financial support is crucial for wider adoption. The data suggests that with proper support, the adoption of PES could significantly improve agricultural outcomes in Arusha. The data in Table 5 demonstrates a significant reduction in soil degradation when using protected environment structures (PES) compared to open-field cultivation. Open-field farming often leads to soil erosion, nutrient depletion, and compaction due to continuous exposure to adverse weather conditions and intensive farming practices. In contrast, PES provides a controlled environment that minimizes soil disturbance and maintains soil health by protecting it from erosion and overexploitation. This not only preserves soil fertility but also enhances the long-term sustainability of agricultural practices. Table 5 shows that water consumption is markedly lower in PES. Open-field cultivation typically involves inefficient irrigation practices, leading to substantial water wastage. PES, however, employs precision irrigation methods like drip irrigation, which delivers water directly to the plant roots, reducing evaporation and runoff. This efficient water use is crucial in regions like Arusha, where water scarcity can be a significant issue. By optimizing water usage, PES contributes to the conservation of this vital resource and ensures the sustainability of vegetable farming. The carbon footprint for both open-field and PES cultivation is listed as moderate, indicating that while PES has many advantages, it also has areas that require attention regarding energy use. PES often requires energy for climate control and irrigation systems, which can increase greenhouse gas emissions if not managed properly. However, the reduction in pesticide and fertilizer use and the increase in yield efficiency can offset some of these emissions. Transitioning to renewable energy sources for powering PES can further reduce their carbon footprint, making them even more environmentally friendly. The impact on biodiversity is significantly lower for PES compared to open-field cultivation. Open-field farming can lead to habitat destruction, pesticide runoff, and monocropping, all of which negatively affect local biodiversity. PES, on the other hand, creates a barrier that protects crops from pests without the extensive use of chemicals. This results in less chemical runoff and a more balanced ecosystem. Furthermore, the controlled environment in PES allows for crop rotation and the cultivation of diverse crops, which can enhance biodiversity within and around the farming areas.

Conclusion

This study provides a comprehensive comparative analysis of open-field and protected vegetable cultivation methods in Arusha, Tanzania, focusing on productivity, quality, resource efficiency, economic viability, and environmental impact. The results indicate that protected environment structures (PES) such as greenhouses, polyhouses, and net houses offer substantial advantages over traditional open-field farming. PES significantly enhance crop yields and quality by providing a controlled environment that optimizes growing conditions and reduces exposure to adverse weather and pests. For instance, tomato yields in PES were three times higher than those in open fields, and the quality of produce was notably superior. In terms of resource efficiency, PES demonstrated higher water and fertilizer use efficiency and reduced pesticide use. This contributes to more sustainable farming practices, conserving vital resources and reducing the environmental footprint. For example, water use in PES was optimized through precision irrigation methods, significantly lowering water consumption compared to open-field farming. Economically, although PES require higher initial investment and maintenance costs, the long-term benefits include increased income and better return on investment. Farmers in Arusha reported a 35% increase in income from polyhouse cultivation due to higher yields and better market prices. Government subsidies and support from NGOs further enhance the feasibility of adopting PES. Environmental benefits of PES include reduced soil degradation, lower water consumption, and less impact on local biodiversity. The controlled environment within PES minimizes soil disturbance and protects against erosion, preserving soil health and fertility. Additionally, the reduction in chemical use and the ability to implement crop rotation within PES contribute to a healthier ecosystem. Despite these advantages, challenges such as high initial costs and the need for technical expertise must be addressed to facilitate broader adoption of PES. Providing training and financial support to smallholder farmers can help overcome these barriers.

References

1. Despretz H, Nordey T, Mensah AC. Protected cultivation of vegetables in Sub-Saharan Africa: Scope and impacts. In the Bio-economy Approach 2020 Mar 10 (pp. 130-148). Routledge.
2. Shango AJ, Maswi PB, Malya RB, Maro JF, Mwaipopo RE, Majubwa RO, *et al*. Advances and trends in ecological organic agriculture (EOA) technologies and research on fruit vegetables produced in Tanzania. CABI Reviews. 2022 Jul 15.
3. Nordey T, Basset-Mens C, De Bon H, Martin T, Déletré E, Simon S, *et al*. Protected cultivation of vegetable crops in sub-Saharan Africa: Limits and prospects for smallholders. A review. Agronomy for sustainable development. 2017 Dec;37:11-20.
4. Ndala RI. Detection and management of phytophthora infestans on tomato in Iringa and Arusha regions, Tanzania (Doctoral dissertation, NM-AIST).
5. De Putter H, Ngoma M. Effect of fertilizer, starting material and planting distance on yield of tomato and profit of farmers practice fields in Arusha. Applied Plant Research; c2009.
6. Nordey T, Faye E, Chailleux A, Parrot L, Simon S, Mlowe N, Fernandes P. Mitigation of climatic conditions and pest protection provided by insect-proof nets for cabbage cultivation in East Africa. Experimental Agriculture. 2020 Aug;56(4):608-19.
7. Aloyce A. Characterization and management of bacterial wiltcausing pathogen (s) of tomato in Tanzania (Doctoral dissertation, NM-AIST).
8. Zekeya N. Occurrence, seasonal variation and management of tomato leafminer (tuta absoluta meyrick.) in Tanzania (Doctoral dissertation, NM-AIST).

9. Mbogho AY, Mwashimaha R, Mbwambo O, Boni SB, Yarro J, Nyundo B, Zalucki MP, Ramasamy S. Comparative effects of *Plutella xylostella* (L.) (Lepidoptera: Plutellidae) and *Crocidolomia pavonana* (F.) (Lepidoptera: Crambidae) on cabbage yield in Tanzania. International Journal of Tropical Insect Science. 2021 Dec;41:2733-2738.