#### ORIGINAL PAPER

### Niche-based assessment of contributions of legumes to the nitrogen economy of Western Kenya smallholder farms

John O. Ojiem · Bernard Vanlauwe · Nico de Ridder · Ken E. Giller

Received: 22 June 2006 / Accepted: 24 January 2007 / Published online: 16 February 2007 © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2007

Abstract Nitrogen (N) deficiency is a major constraint to the productivity of the African smallholder farming systems. Grain, green manure and forage legumes have the potential to improve the soil N fertility of smallholder farming systems through biological N<sub>2</sub>-fixation. The N<sub>2</sub>fixation of bean (Phaseolus vulgaris), soyabean (Glycine max), groundnut (Arachis hypogaea), Lima bean (Phaseolus lunatus), lablab (Lablab purpureus), velvet bean (Mucuna pruriens), crotalaria (Crotalaria ochroleuca), jackbean (Canavaensiformis), desmodium (Desmodium lia uncinatum), stylo (Stylosanthes guianensis) and siratro (*Macroptilium atropurpureum*) was assessed using the <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance method. The experiments were conducted at three sites in western Kenya, selected on an agro-ecological zone (AEZ) gradient defined by rainfall. On a relative scale, Museno represents high potential

J. O. Ojiem

Kenya Agricultural Research Institute, Regional Research Centre, P.O. Box 169, Kakamega, Kenya

B. Vanlauwe

J. O. Ojiem · N. de Ridder · K. E. Giller (⊠) Plant Production Systems, Department of Plant Sciences, Wageningen University, P.O. Box 430, 6700 AK Wageningen, The Netherlands e-mail: ken.giller@wur.nl

AEZ 1, Majengo medium potential AEZ 2 and Ndori low potential AEZ 3. Rainfall in the year of experimentation was highest in AEZ 2, followed by AEZ 1 and AEZ 3. Experimental fields were classified into high, medium and low fertility classes, to assess the influence of soil fertility on N<sub>2</sub>-fixation performance. The legumes were planted with triple super phosphate (TSP) at 30 kg P ha<sup>-1</sup>, with an extra soyabean plot planted without TSP (soyabean-P), to assess response to P, and no artificial inoculation was done. Legume grain yield, shoot N accumulation, %N derived from N<sub>2</sub>-fixation, N<sub>2</sub>-fixation and net N inputs differed significantly (P<0.01) with rainfall and soil fertility. Mean grain yield ranged from  $0.86 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$ , in AEZ 2, to  $0.30 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$ , in AEZ 3, and from  $0.78 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$ , in the high fertility field, to 0.48 Mg  $ha^{-\overline{1}}$ , in the low fertility field. Shoot N accumulation ranged from a maximum of 486 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> in AEZ 2, to a minimum of 10 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> in AEZ 3. Based on shoot biomass estimates, the species fixed 25-90% of their N requirements in AEZ 2, 23–90% in AEZ 1, and 7-77% in AEZ 3. Mean N<sub>2</sub>fixation by green manure legumes ranged from 319 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (velvet bean) in AEZ 2 to 29 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (jackbean) in AEZ 3. For the forage legumes, mean N<sub>2</sub>-fixation ranged from 97 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> for desmodium in AEZ 2 to 39 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> for siratro in AEZ 3, while for the grain legumes, the range was from 172 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> for lablab in AEZ 1 to

Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility Institute of CIAT, P.O. Box 30677, Nairobi, Kenya

3 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> for soyabean-P in AEZ 3. Lablab and groundnut showed consistently greater N<sub>2</sub>-fixation and net N inputs across agro-ecological and soil fertility gradients. The use of maize as reference crop resulted in lower N<sub>2</sub>-fixation values than when broad-leaved weed plants were used. The results demonstrate differential contributions of the green manure, forage and grain legume species to soil fertility improvement in different biophysical niches in smallholder farming systems and suggest that appropriate selection is needed to match species with the niches and farmers' needs.

#### Introduction

Soil fertility degradation is widely acknowledged as a major factor limiting productivity of the sub-Saharan Africa smallholder farming systems (Franzel 1999; Sanchez et al. 1997; Tarawali et al. 1999). This degradation is particularly significant in the east African highlands, where rapid population growth, continuous cropping, and restricted use of organic inputs and fertilizers have led to low productivity of the systems. According to Smaling and Braun (1996), the average annual mining of nitrogen (N) in parts of Western Kenya is up to 112 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>. Nitrogen deficiency is therefore a major factor responsible for the low productivity of Western Kenya smallholder systems.

Manure and mineral fertilizers are options for soil fertility restoration. However, as in many parts of sub-Saharan Africa, the use of animal manure in Western Kenya is limited because the quantities available on-farm are often insufficient to maintain soil fertility (Jama et al. 1997), while the use of mineral fertilizers is constrained by unreliable returns (Ruthenberg 1980; Anderson 1992), limited access to capital by smallholders (Hoekstra and Corbett, 1995), and unreliable markets for agricultural produce (Hassan et al. 1998). Therefore, N input via biological N<sub>2</sub>fixation, using appropriate legume species, is a feasible alternative to N from mineral fertilizers. However, in restoring the productivity of the systems, legumes are important as a component of an integrated soil fertility management (ISFM) strategy, since phosphorus (P) has to be acquired from elsewhere. Legumes also require P for effective N<sub>2</sub>-fixation, since P deficiency can prevent nodulation (Giller 2001). Even though legumes can play a major role in improving farm productivity in smallholder agriculture as short duration fallow species (Hudgens, 2000), current knowledge on N<sub>2</sub>-fixation performance under the non-ideal conditions encountered in African smallholder farming systems is limited, although some estimates have recently been made in Northern Tanzania (Baijukya 2004), and Zimbabwe (Chikowo et al. 2004).

Western Kenya is typical of the agricultural conditions found in the densely populated highlands of east and central Africa. Due to this, it is one of the benchmark sites for the African Highlands Initiative (AHI), a collaborative research initiative working on key issues of natural resource management and agricultural productivity. Smallholder farms in Western Kenya are characterized by a high degree of biophysical and socio-economic heterogeneity. Not only do farmers operate under diverse agro-ecological conditions, but there is also wide diversity in within-farm soil fertility and farmers have varying resource endowments. Tittonell et al. (2005a and b) observed differences in the fertility status of fields in three sites in Western Kenya, which were generally correlated with the resource endowment status of the farmers. For example, soil-extractable P was higher in the fields of high resource endowed farmers than in the fields of those with low resource endowment. These differences may affect legume N<sub>2</sub>-fixation and production.

Soil fertility variability and differential resource endowments give rise to niches with biophysical and socio-economic dimensions, or socio-ecological niches (Ojiem et al. 2006), into which legumes must fit in order to be widely accepted by farmers. N<sub>2</sub>-fixation and the provision of certain goods (grains, fodder, etc.) are among the major criteria legumes must meet in order to fit into the socio-ecological niches.

A number of different methodologies are available for assessment of  $N_2$ -fixation. However,

under field conditions, the <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance method (Peoples et al. 1989) has advantage over, for example, the <sup>15</sup>N enrichment method because no addition of <sup>15</sup>N fertilizer is required, and can therefore be used on-farm, provided appropriate non-N<sub>2</sub>-fixing reference plants are present. The choice of reference plants is a major factor that can influence the reliability of the methodology (Peoples et al. 2002). Maize is among the commonly used non-N<sub>2</sub>-fixing plants in on-farm measurements of N<sub>2</sub>-fixation because it is often readily available.

The objectives of this study were: (i) to assess the capacities of a range of grain, green manure, and forage legumes to fix atmospheric  $N_2$  under on-farm conditions across agro-ecological and soil fertility gradients in Western Kenya; (ii) to compare the net N contributions (N balance) of the grain, green manure and forage legume species through N<sub>2</sub>-fixation to the smallholder farming systems in Western Kenya; and (iii) to evaluate the suitability of maize as a reference crop in on-farm N<sub>2</sub>-fixation assessment using the <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance method.

#### Materials and methods

#### Sites description

The experiments were conducted on-farm in Museno, Majengo and Ndori in Western Kenya. The three sites were selected along an agroecological zone (AEZ) gradient and designated high, medium and low rainfall, based on a relative scale: Museno (high rainfall, AEZ 1), located in Kakamega district at 00°14' N and 34°44' E at an altitude of 1570 m above sea level (masl), with a mean annual rainfall of 2000 mm; Majengo (medium rainfall, AEZ 2), located in Vihiga district at 00°00' N and 34°41' E at an altitude of 1385 masl, with a mean annual rainfall of 1600 mm; Ndori (low rainfall, AEZ 3) is located in Bondo district at 00°02' and 34°20' E at an altitude of 1170 masl, with a mean annual rainfall of 1200 mm. All the sites have bimodal rainfall pattern, with the first season (the long rains) extending from March to August, and the second (the short rains), from September to December.

In each site, experimental fields were selected to capture the within-farm soil fertility variability, which is a common feature within smallholder systems (Tittonell et al. 2005a). Three fields each were chosen to represent high, medium and low soil fertility conditions. The selections were based on farmer knowledge of within-farm soil fertility variability and the history of crop performance. However, further soil fertility characterization was done by sampling the soil in all fields in each site, prior to sowing the legumes, for laboratory analysis. Composite soil samples (0–20 cm depth) were taken from nine spots and bulked. A subsample of about 1 kg for each field was then taken for chemical and physical analysis. The soil samples were air dried, crushed and ground to pass through a 2 mm sieve and analysed for pH (1:2.5 soil/water suspension), texture (hydrometer method), extractable P (bicarbonate-EDTA), total soil organic carbon (Walkley-Black) and calcium, magnesium and potassium extracted in ammonium acetate (Anderson and Ingram 1993). Total N (macro-Kjeldahl) and  $\delta^{15}$ N were also determined as indicated below for plant material. Although some soil fertility parameters did not show much variation, relatively large differences were observed in phosphorus (P), organic carbon (OC) and total N contents, especially between the high and the low fertility fields (Table 1). The farmer soil fertility classification took into consideration factors such as drainage properties of the field, soil depth, stoniness, presence of noxious weeds, etc, which are not captured in laboratory analysis but can affect crop performance.

Experimental design and plots establishment

The experiments were laid out in each field in randomized complete block design (RCBD) replicated in two blocks. Grain legume species: bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* (L.)) variety KK20; soyabean (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.) variety SB20; groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) variety CG 7; Lima bean (*Phaseolus lunatus* L.); and lablab (*Lablab purpureus* (L.) Sweet) variety cv Rongai; green manure legumes: velvet bean (*Mucuna pruriens*)

Table 1 Soil	fertility para	ameters of the 1	three categori	es of fields i	identified by farr	ners for experimer	itation in three agreed	o-ecological zones	in Wester	n Kenya, (	n = 3
Soil fertility category	pH (H <sub>2</sub> O)	% Total OC	% Total N	C:N ratio	$P mg kg^{-1} soil$	Ca cmol <sub>(c)</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup>	Mg cmol <sub>(c)</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup>	K cmol <sub>(c)</sub> kg <sup>-1</sup>	% Clay	% Sand	% Silt
AEZ I											
High	5.95	1.64	0.17	10:1	8.78	6.30	1.48	0.40	24	35	<del>1</del> 5
Medium	5.86	1.63	0.16	10:1	4.27	6.35	1.73	0.35	22	43	38
Low	6.20	1.48	0.13	11:1	3.37	5.43	1.93	0.23	21	38	11
AEZ 2											
High	5.86	1.50	0.19	8:1	15.42	6.96	2.10	0.36	22	33	<del>1</del> 8
Medium	5.43	1.46	0.17	9:1	8.00	5.82	1.65	0.43	16	36	<del>1</del> 6
Low	5.63	1.28	0.14	9:1	3.50	5.90	1.75	0.17	29	36	35
AEZ 3											
High	5.84	1.52	0.17	9:1	2.48	6.40	2.30	0.39	37	28	30
Medium	6.24	1.23	0.16	8:1	1.20	6.45	3.28	0.36	35	28	<del>1</del> 0
Low	5.70	1.32	0.16	9:1	1.15	6.40	2.55	0.30	25	45	30

🖄 Springer

G. Don); and jackbean (Canavalia ensiformis (L.) DC.); and forage legumes: desmodium (Desmodium uncinatum (Jacq.) DC.); stylo (Stylosanthes guianensis (Aublet) Sw); and siratro (*Macroptilium atropurpureum* (DC.) Urban) were planted in mid September 2003 in plots measuring 4.5 m wide by 5.0 m long. The species and varieties were selected from a legume screening trial the season before (Ojiem 2006). All the legumes were planted at recommended spacing. Soyabean was planted in rows spaced 0.50 m at 0.05 m intra-row spacing, while groundnut and bean were spaced 0.50 m inter-row and 0.10 m intra-row. Lima bean was spaced 0.25 m interrow, with 0.10 m intra-row spacing, while velvet bean, jackbean and lablab were planted in rows spaced at 0.60 m inter-row and 0.30 m intra-row. Crotalaria was drilled in rows spaced 0.30 m wide at a seed rate of 4 kg  $ha^{-1}$ . The legume seeds were not inoculated at planting because there is no existing infrastructure for supply of inoculants to smallholder farmers in the target area. In addition, previous research (Mureithi et al. 2003) did not demonstrate the need for artificial inoculation of similar legume species in several sites in Western Kenya. In all legume plots, except crotalaria, two seeds were placed in each planting hole, later thinned to one seed per plant at first weeding. Maize was planted as a control, spaced 0.75 m inter-row and 0.30 m intra-row. Phosphorus (P) was applied at the rate of 30 kg P ha<sup>-1</sup> to all legume plots and the maize plots. One soyabean plot was fertilized with P (soyabean+P) and an extra soyabean plot with no P fertilization (soyabean–P) was included in the trial to check response to P.

(L.) Walp); crotalaria (Crotalaria ochroleuca

#### Biomass production assessment

All the plots were sampled to determine legume biomass production. The above ground biomass was determined at near maximum dry matter accumulation, at mid pod filling stage. Biomass was determined by destructive sampling of plants in a 0.5 m by 0.5 m quadrat in 3 randomly selected positions within each plot, excluding the border rows. Biomass was immediately weighed in the field to determine fresh weight and then divided into two. One sub-sample was weighed with an electronic balance and then oven-dried at  $65^{\circ}$ C for 4 days to determine dry weight and moisture content, which were used to calculate dry matter production. The other sub-sample was processed and used for quantification of N<sub>2</sub>-fixation.

#### N<sub>2</sub>-fixation methodology and calculations

The proportion of legume N derived from N<sub>2</sub> fixation was determined using the <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance method (Peoples et al. 1989). This method is based on the principle that provided the <sup>15</sup>N enrichment ( $\delta^{15}$ N) of the plant-available soil N differs from atmospheric N<sub>2</sub>, the %N from N<sub>2</sub>-fixation can be determined. The %N from N<sub>2</sub>fixation calculated using the equation of Shearer and Kohl (1986) and Peoples et al. (1997) as follows:

$$\% N from N_2 - fixation = 100 \left( \frac{\delta^{15} N_{ref} - \delta^{15} N_{legume}}{\delta^{15} N_{ref} - B} \right)$$
(1)

where  $\delta^{15}N_{ref}$  is the <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance of the shoots of a non-N<sub>2</sub>-fixing reference plant deriving its entire N from the soil N;  $\delta^{15}N_{legume}$  is the <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance of the shoots of the N<sub>2</sub>-fixing legume plant growing in the same soil; and *B* is the  $\delta^{15}N$  of the test legume fully dependent on N<sub>2</sub>-fixation for growth, and a correction for isotopic fractionation during N<sub>2</sub>-fixation.

The legume shoot samples were air-dried to constant weight, ground to <1 mm in an electric mill in preparation for <sup>15</sup>N analysis. The <sup>15</sup>N analysis was done at the UC Davis Stable Isotope Facility, CA, USA, using a PDZ Europa 20–20 mass spectrometer. The <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance of the samples was computed using the equation of Shearer and Kohl (1986) as follows:

$$\delta^{15} N(0/_{00}) = 1000 [(R_{sample}/R_{standard}) - 1]$$
(2)

where  $\delta^{15}N$  is the <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance of the samples expressed as parts per thousand (‰); and *R* is the ration of <sup>15</sup>N/<sup>14</sup>N in the sample; and the atmospheric N<sub>2</sub> was used as the standard (R<sub>standard</sub>). By definition, the  $\delta^{15}N$  of the

atmosphere is zero. A range of broad-leaved weed plants and maize, growing in the same fields as the legumes, were used as reference plants, while B values were obtained from the literature (see Table 4).

#### Grain production assessment

Grain production was assessed in all the fields at each site. The species matured at different times and were harvested between November and December, 2003. The pods were sun-dried for several days and then threshed. Grain was then weighed and grain moisture content determined using an electronic moisture meter. Grain yield was calculated at 12% moisture content.

#### Statistical analysis

Data was subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure using SAS statistical software (SAS Institute Inc, Cary, NC, U.S.A.). A cross-site analysis was performed using agro-ecological zones, soil fertility and legumes as factors. Legume shoot <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance, %N derived from N<sub>2</sub>-fixation, legume biomass, shoot N content and grain yield were analysed. Where significant differences were detected between means, standard error of difference (SED) values were calculated and used to compare means.

#### Results

Legume establishment and performance

There was good legume emergence and growth at all sites. The legumes were well adapted to the agro-environmental conditions in the three agroecological zones and as a result, only minor incidence of pest and diseases were observed. The total amounts of rainfall received in AEZs 1 and 2 during the short rains 2003 season were nearly the same (Fig. 1a and b). However, in AEZ 2, a total of 788 mm of rainfall was received in the period between sowing (September) and harvesting (December), while in AEZ 1 only 428 mm was received over the same period. However, relatively higher rainfall was recorded in AEZ 1 in August, before legume sowing, which should have Fig. 1 Rainfall recorded during the experimentation period in: (a) Museno (AEZ 1);
(b) Majengo (AEZ 2); and (c) Ndori (AEZ 3) study sites in Western Kenya



recharged the soil with moisture. Nevertheless, the legume performance was relatively better in AEZ 2 than in AEZ 1. Rainfall was low in AEZ 3 (Fig. 1c). A total of 356 mm of rainfall was recorded during the season, about 50% of the normal rainfall for the zone. The rainfall gradient in 2003 was therefore considered to be in the sequence AEZ 2-AEZ 1-AEZ 3.

#### Legume grain yield performance

Grain yield significantly (P < 0.001) differed with species, AEZ and soil fertility (Table 2). Mean grain yield generally decreased with decreasing rainfall, ranging from  $0.86 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$  in AEZ 2, to 0.30 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> in AEZ 3. Similarly, grain yield consistently decreased with soil fertility. For example, in AEZ 1, grain yield of bean ranged from 1.25 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> in the high fertility field to  $0.37 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$  in the low fertility field. Similarly, the grain yield of soyabean+P ranged from 1.13 Mg  $ha^{-1}$  in the high fertility field to  $0.68 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$  in the low fertility field. Similar reductions in grain yield were observed in AEZs 2 and 3. In AEZ 1, bean (0.82 Mg  $ha^{-1}$ ), lablab  $(0.77 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1})$  and soyabean+P  $(0.85 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1})$ had the best grain vield performance, while in AEZ 2, soyabean+P (1.04 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>), lablab  $(1.05 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1})$  and groundnut  $(1.06 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1})$ performed best. In AEZ 3, the best grain yield was found with groundnut (0.31 Mg  $ha^{-1}$ ), Lima (0.33 Mg  $ha^{-1}$ ) and soyabean+P (0.34 Mg  $ha^{-1}$ ).

## <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance of the soil and reference plants

The detected <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance signatures  $(\delta^{15}N)$  for soil and non-N<sub>2</sub>-fixing reference plants varied between species in all AEZs (Table 3). Generally,  $\delta^{15}N$  signatures of maize plants of the same age as legumes, and growing in the same field, were lower than those of similar aged broadleaved weeds growing in the same field. In AEZ 1, the  $\delta^{15}$ N values for all reference plants ranged from +2.78 to  $+6.85^{\circ}_{\circ\circ}$ . The mean for maize samples was +3.20%, while the broad-leaved reference samples had a mean of +5.89%. The  $\delta^{15}$ N signatures for all reference plants were slightly higher in AEZ 2 compared with AEZ 1. The maize reference plants had a mean value of +3.61%, while the mean for broad-leaved weeds was +6.29%. Maize had relatively higher  $\delta^{15}N$ signatures in AEZ 3, with a mean of +4.14%. The mean for broad-leaved weeds was +5.74%. The  $\delta^{15}$ N signatures in the soils showed little variation between sites, with mean values ranging from +7.96% in AEZ 1 to +6.54% in AEZ 3. However, no consistent trends were observed in the relationship between  $\delta^{15}$ N and soil fertility status of the trial fields.

	u agru-courdi		י וווע טוווי	cguine :	pectes grain yr	בוח (מו זקי	Internit 0			Nulya, suut tams 2	Lebus cuus	
Species	Grain yield (1	Mg ha <sup>-1</sup> )										
	AEZ 1				AEZ 2				AEZ 3			
	High fertility field	Medium fertility field	Low fertility field	Mean	High fertility field	Medium fertility field	Low fertility field	Mean	High fertility field	Medium fertility field	Low fertility field	Mean
Bean	1.25	0.83	0.37	0.82	0.94	0.69	0.49	0.71	0.38	0.33	0.29	0.33
Groundnut	0.71	0.56	0.53	0.60	1.25	1.12	0.80	1.06	0.34	0.30	0.31	0.32
Lablab	0.84	0.69	0.78	0.77	1.40	0.96	0.78	1.05	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.06
Lima	0.76	0.72	0.61	0.70	0.49	0.53	0.41	0.48	0.50	0.45	0.33	0.43
Soyabean (+P)	1.13	0.74	0.68	0.85	1.39	0.94	0.79	1.04	0.53	0.42	0.34	0.43
Soyabean (-P)	0.84	0.57	0.44	0.62	1.05	0.84	0.54	0.81	0.30	0.29	0.13	0.24
Mean	0.92	0.69	0.57	0.73	1.09	0.85	0.64	0.86	0.35	0.31	0.24	0.30
***SED <sub>(Species)</sub>					0.08							
$***SED_{(Fertility)}$					0.06							
***SED					0.04							

SED = standard error of the difference in means, \*\*\* P<0.00

<sup>15</sup>N natural abundance of legumes and estimates of N<sub>2</sub>-fixation

There was no consistent trend between shoot <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance of the legume shoots and rainfall (Table 4). However, the mean  $\delta^{15}N$  of the green manure species (+0.48%) showed less enrichment than that of the grain (+0.97%) and forage legumes (+1.55%) in AEZ 1. A similar trend was observed in AEZ 2. However, in AEZ 3, the forage legume shoots showed relatively lower enrichment (+1.40%) than the grain legumes (+2.71%) and green manure legumes (+1.93%). Among the grain legumes, soyabean-P (+0.15%), soyabean+P (+0.37%) and lablab (+0.82%) showed the least shoot enrichment in AEZ 1, while in AEZ 2, soyabean-P (+1.36%), soyabean+P (+1.51%) and groundnut (+1.68%) were the least enriched. In AEZ 3, groundnut (+1.58%), lablab (+1.83%) and Lima (+2.47%), showed the least shoot enrichment. Among the green manure legumes, velvet bean (-0.70%)showed least shoot enrichment in AEZ 1, jackbean (-0.31%) in AEZ 2, and crotalaria (+0.49%)in AEZ 3, while for forage legumes, stylo was least enriched in AEZ 1 (+1.23%) and AEZ 2 (+1.42%), while siratro (+1.25%) was least enriched in AEZ 3.

The % N derived from atmospheric N<sub>2</sub>-fixation was significantly (P < 0.01) influenced by AEZ and legume species (Table 4). The use of maize as reference plant consistently resulted in smaller values of %N derived from N<sub>2</sub>-fixation than when broad-leaved weeds were used. The  $\delta^{15}N$  signatures of the broad-leaved weed plants, which were relatively consistent around 6%, were closer to the total soil  $\delta^{15}N$  (about  $8_{00}^{\circ}$ ) than the  $\delta^{15}N$ signatures of maize, which were around 3.5%. Based on this, the broad leaved weed reference plants were considered better indicators of the  $\delta^{15}$ N signatures of the available soil N, hence providing more accurate estimates of N2-fixation than maize. Therefore, based on broad-leaved weeds as reference plants, the legumes derived 35–90% of their N requirements from atmospheric N<sub>2</sub>-fixation in AEZ 1, 48–90% in AEZ 2 and 1-77% in AEZ 3. Averaged over species, the %N from N<sub>2</sub>-fixation was higher for green manure legumes than for grain and forage

Site	Farm No.	Soil fertility	Soil $\delta^{15}$ N (‰)	Reference plant	$\delta^{15}$ N (%	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
		status			Maize	Weeds
Museno: High rainfall zone	1	Low	8.61	Zea mays	3.82	
(AEZ I)	2	High	7.80	Bidens pilosa Zea mays	_ 3.36	6.20 -
	3	High	7.55	Bidens pilosa Zea mays	2.78	6.85
	4	Low	7.72	Bidens pilosa Zea mays	_ 2.79	3.98 -
	5	11.1	0.05	Galinsoga spp.	- - 2 17	6.00 5.79
	5	High	8.05	Zea mays Bidens pilosa	3.1/ -	5.63
	6	Medium	7.34	Zea mays Bidens pilosa	3.78 -	_ 6.11
	7	Medium	9.19	Zea mays Bidens pilosa	2.97	- 6.16
	8	Low	7.71	Zea mays Lantana trifolia Bidens pilosa	2.99 _ _	- 5.83 6.11
	9	Medium	7.73	Zea mays Lantana trifolia	3.15 -	_ 6.17
Majengo Medium rainfall zone	1	Mean High	7.96 6.87	– Zea mays	3.20 4.19	5.89 -
(AEZ 2)	2	Low	7.56	Bidens pilosa Zea mays	_ 3.58	5.88 - 5.14
	3	Medium	8.25	Lantana trifolia Zea mays Lantana trifolia	3.13	5.14 - 7.23
	4	High	7.72	Zea mays Bidens pilosa		- 615
	5	High	8.38	Zea mays Galinsoga spp	3.89	- 6.81
	6	Low	7.93	Zea mays Bidens pilosa	2.21	- 6 39
	7	Medium	7.87	Zea mays Bidens pilosa	6.19	- 6.82
	8	Medium	7.54	Zea mays Convza banariensis	3.05	- 6 42
	9	Low	7.15	Zea mays Convza banariensis	3.05	- 5.80
Ndori I ow rainfall zone (AFZ 3)	1	Mean Low	7.69 6.83	– Zea mays	3.61 4.13	6.29
	2	High	5.03	Bothriocline laxa	-	5.76
	2	Madium	5.75	Leonoptis nepetifolia	- -	5.82
	5	Levy	2.43 2.07	Zea mays Bidens pilosa Zea maya	4.40	_ 5.59
	4	Low	8.07	Zea mays Bidens pilosa	4.40	5.82
	5	Low	6.30	Zea mays Leonoptis nepetifolia	3.89 -	3.82
	6	Medium	6.06	Zea mays Leonoptis nepetifolia	4.40 -	6.30

**Table 3** Estimates of the  $^{15}N$  natural abundance signatures detected in soil, maize and broad-leaved non-N2-fixing reference plants in different agro-ecological zones and soil fertility conditions in Western Kenya

Table 3 continued

Site	Farm No.	Soil fertility	Soil $\delta^{15}$ N (‰)	Reference plant	$\delta^{15}$ N (%	, )
		status			Maize	Weeds
	7	High	6.60	Zea mays	3.92	_
				Bidens pilosa	-	6.30
	8	Medium	6.61	Zea mays	3.89	-
				Bidens pilosa	-	6.25
	9	High	7.05	Zea mays	4.03	_
		C		Leonoptis nepetifolia	_	6.44
				Bothriocline laxa	_	5.30
		Mean	6.54	-	4.14	5.74

legumes in AEZs 1 and 2. In AEZ 3, however, the %N from N<sub>2</sub>-fixation was higher for forage legumes than for green manure and grain legumes. Bean showed the least dependence on N<sub>2</sub>-fixation for its N requirements in AEZs 1 and 2, while in AEZ 3, soyabean+P showed the least dependence on N<sub>2</sub>-fixation for its N requirements.

Biomass production and N<sub>2</sub>-fixation by the green manure and forage legumes

Biomass production, shoot N yield and biological N<sub>2</sub>-fixation by the green manure and forage legume species were significantly (P < 0.01) influenced by AEZ and soil fertility (Table 5). However, performance was generally better in AEZ 2 than in AEZ 1 due to greater rainfall received in AEZ 2. Mean biomass production was highest  $(6.86 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1})$  in AEZ 2 and lowest  $(3.28 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1})$ in AEZ 3. Similar to biomass production, shoot N accumulation by the legumes was best  $(177 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1})$ in AEZ 2 and worst  $(85 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1})$  in AEZ 3.

 $N_2$ -fixation estimates reported are based on the above ground legume biomass. While estimates of total crop N fixed would provide a better assessment of the contributions of legumes, such an assessment is made difficult by the complications associated with the recovery of complete root systems. The capacity of the legumes to fix atmospheric  $N_2$  differed significantly (*P*<0.01) with AEZ, soil fertility and legume species. The green manure legumes generally fixed greater quantities of  $N_2$  than the forage legumes. For example, in AEZ 2, where the best  $N_2$ -fixation performance was recorded, mean  $N_2$ -fixation by the forage legumes (estimated using broad-leaved weeds as reference plants) was 35–37% of that of the green manure legumes, while in AEZ 3, where least N<sub>2</sub>-fixation was recorded, mean N<sub>2</sub>fixation of forage legumes estimated by broadleaved weeds was 12–21% of that of green manure species. N<sub>2</sub>-fixation reduced by 12% from high fertility field to medium fertility field, and by 22% from medium fertility field to low fertility field. Velvet bean and crotalaria had greater N<sub>2</sub>fixation than jackbean, among the green manure legumes. Crotalaria had the best N<sub>2</sub>-fixation in AEZ 1, fixing 154–232 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>, while in AEZ 2, velvet bean had the best performance, fixing 163–319 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>. N<sub>2</sub>-fixation was also best with crotalaria in AEZ 3 (56–95 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>). The amount of N contained in legume root biomass accounts for about 30% of the total plant N

163–319 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>. N<sub>2</sub>-fixation was also best with crotalaria in AEZ 3 (56–95 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>). The amount of N contained in legume root biomass accounts for about 30% of the total plant N (Khan et al. 2002; McNiel et al. 1997). When this contribution by the below ground biomass is taken into account, the N<sub>2</sub>-fixation estimates for crotalaria can be considered to be about 200– 302 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> in AEZ 1, and that for velvet bean in AEZ 2 about 212–415. Similarly, the contribution for crotalaria in AEZ 3 can be considered to be about 73–124 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>. Among the forage legumes, N<sub>2</sub>-fixation was greater with desmodium and stylo than with siratro.

The use of maize as reference crop consistently underestimated N<sub>2</sub>-fixation compared with broadleaved weeds. Averaged over species and soil fertility, mean N<sub>2</sub>-fixation estimated by broadleaved weeds, ranged from 139 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> in AEZ 2 to 51 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> in AEZ 3, compared with mean N<sub>2</sub>-fixation estimated using maize, which ranged from 94 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> in AEZ 2 to 40 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> in

ecological zones	in Western	Kenya, short rains	s 2003 s	eason			112-1126	2 IOI IIOII &	1a111, 51 C		age iegun		v agi 0-
Species	B-value	AEZ 1				AEZ 2				AEZ 3			
		Shoot $\delta^{15}N$ (‰)	%N fr	om N <sub>2</sub> -fixa	ation	Shoot $\delta^{15}N$ (‰)	%N fro	m N <sub>2</sub> -fixa	tion	Shoot $\delta^{15}N$ (‰)	%N fro	m N <sub>2</sub> -fixa	tion
			<sup>f</sup> Maize	<sup>g</sup> Weeds	hMean		<sup>f</sup> Maize	gWeeds	hMean		<sup>f</sup> Maize	gWeeds	hMean
Grain legumes			:		1		;	:	ì			:	
Bean	$-1.00^{a}$	2.22	50 23	35-59 57 77	53 60	2.44	25 20	48-61 65 72	56 70	3.24	18 16	12-43 12 67	37 50
Sovabean (-P)	-1.40 $-2.00^{ac}$	0.15	59 20	57-76 64-76	09 73	1.36	60 04	C/-C0	74 74	3.41	40 12	7-36	9 08 9 08
Sovabean (+P)	$-2.00^{ac}$	0.37	54	60-73	70	1.51	37	67-74	71	3.74	L	1-32	26
Lima	$-1.00^{d}$	1.35	44	53-70	99	2.46	25	62–71	68	2.47	32	28-53	49
Lablab	$-1.36^{c}$	0.82	52	59–73	70	1.75	37	66-75	72	1.83	42	38-59	55
Mean	I	0.97	47	55-71	67	1.87	34	63-72	69	2.71	26	22-48	43
Green manure les	səmmes												
Velvet bean	–2.09 <sup>b</sup>	-0.70	74	77–84	83	0.12	61	81-85	83	0.55	58	55-69	99
Jackbean	$-1.00^{d}$	1.41	43	52-69	65	-0.31	85	61–71	67	3.37	15	9-41	35
Crotalaria	-1.31 <sup>e</sup>	-0.46	81	84-90	88	1.41	45	87–90	89	0.49	67	65-77	74
Mean		0.48	99	71–81	LL	0.55	64	76-82	78	1.93	47	4362	55
Forage legumes													
Desmodium	-1.55 <sup>c</sup>	1.46	37	46–64	60	1.84	34	55-66	62	1.54	46	42–61	58
Siratro	$-1.99^{c}$	1.63	30	39–59	54	1.53	37	49–61	56	1.25	47	44-62	58
Stylo	-0.74°	1.23	50	58-74	70	1.42	50	66-75	72	1.45	55	52-69	99
Mean		1.55	39	48–66	61	1.69	41	57-67	63	1.40	49	46–64	61
Mean	I	1.01	48	57-72	67	1.51	42	65-73	69	2.17	36	34-56	50
SED <sub>(species)</sub>						0.43	6	Ι	6				
SED <sub>(AEZ)</sub>						0.15	m	I	m				
$SED_{(AEZ \times species)}$	_					0.19	4	I	4				
<sup>a</sup> Value from Peo	oples, 2005	(personal commur	nication										
<sup>b</sup> Okito et al. (20	(104)												
° Boddey et al. (	2000)												
d A second													

<sup>a</sup> Assumed <sup>e</sup> Gathumbi et al. (2002) <sup>f</sup> Percent N derived from atmospheric fixation estimated using maize as reference plant

<sup>g</sup> Percent N derived from atmospheric fixation estimated using several broad-leaved weed plants presented in Table 3 as reference plants

<sup>h</sup> Mean percent N derived from atmospheric fixation calculated using the mean Shoot  $\delta^{15}$ N values of the broad-leaved weed reference plants

	AEZ 1					AEZ 2					AEZ 3				
	<sup>a</sup> Shoot	Shoot N	N <sub>2</sub> -fix	ed (kg N	$ha^{-1}$ )	<sup>a</sup> Shoot	Shoot N	N2-fixe	sd (kg N	$ha^{-1}$ )	<sup>a</sup> Shoot	Shoot N	N <sub>2</sub> -fixe	d (kg N	$ha^{-1}$ )
	biomass (Mg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Maize	weeds	<sup>b</sup> Mean	biomass (Mg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Maize	Weeds	<sup>b</sup> Mean	biomass $(Mg ha^{-1})$	yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Maize	Weeds	<sup>b</sup> Mean
High fertility fiel	q														
Velvet bean	6.68	141	104	109 - 118	117	14.86	384	234	311–326	319	2.87	74	43	41-51	49
Jackbean	4.46	102	4	53-70	99	7.03	153	130	93–109	103	4.93	128	19	12-52	45
Crotalaria	8.01	264	214	222–238	232	9.48	311	140	140–271	277	3.64	76	51	49–59	56
Mean: GM	6.38	169	121	128–142	138	10.46	283	168	181–235	233	3.81	93	38	34-54	50
legumes	1		ļ					ł		l			ļ		ļ
Desmodium	5.76	153	57	70–98	92	5.92	157	53	86-104	97	3.07	81	37	34-49	47
Siratro	4.74	118	35	46–70	64	5.05	125	46	61–76	70	2.79	69	32	30-43	40
Stylo	4.94	126	63	73–93	88	5.18	133	67	88-100	96	3.17	81	45	42–56	53
Mean: forage	5.15	132	52	63–87	81	5.38	138	55	78–93	88	3.01	77	38	35-49	47
legumes															
Medium fertulity	þetd														
Velvet bean	7.23	146	108	112-123	121	13.96	334	204	271–284	277	3.18	67	39	37–46	44
Jackbean	2.57	70	30	36-48	46	4.18	100	85	61-71	67	3.24	82	12	7–34	29
Crotalaria	5.55	187	151	157-168	165	10.42	302	136	263-272	269	3.59	128	86	83–99	95
Mean: GM	5.12	134	96	102-113	111	9.52	245	142	198-209	204	3.34	92	46	44–60	56
legumes															
Desmodium	4.54	120	4	55-77	72	4.10	105	36	58-69	65	3.10	82	38	34–50	48
Siratro	4.34	108	32	42–64	58	4.49	112	41	55-68	63	2.72	67	31	29-42	39
Stylo	4.66	119	60	69–88	83	4.65	119	09	79–89	86	3.07	62	43	41-55	52
Mean: forage	4.51	116	45	55-76	11	4.41	112	46	64–75	11	2.96	76	37	35-49	46
legumes															
Low fertility field	4														
Velvet bean	8.42	178	132	137–150	148	8.37	196	120	159–167	163	3.85	73	42	40-50	48
Jackbean	5.82	120	52	62–83	78	7.39	155	132	95-110	104	4.10	113	17	10-46	40
Crotalaria	6.05	175	142	147–158	154	7.84	238	107	207-214	212	3.20	109	73	71–84	81
Mean: GM	6.76	158	109	115–130	127	7.87	196	120	154–164	160	3.72	98	44	4060	56
legumes			!						;	;					:
Desmodium	5.00	133	49	61-85	80	4.07	104	35	57–69	64	2.86	76	35	32-46	44
Siratro	4.35	108	32	42–64	58	3.03	75	28	37–46	42	3.14	78	37	34-48	45
Stylo	4.32	112	56	65-83	78	3.37	86	43	57-65	62	2.57	99	36	34-46	4
Mean forage	4.56	118	46	56-77	72	3.49	88	35	50 - 60	56	2.86	73	36	33–47	44
legumes															
Mean	5.41	138	78	87-104	100	6.86	177	94	121-139	135	3.28	85	40	37-51	50
**SED(Legumes)						0.67	20	I	I	21					
$^{**SED}_{(Fields)}$						0.28	6	I	I	6					
$**SED_{(AEZ)}$						0.15	5	I	I	S					

ItSED = Standard error of difference between means, \*\* P<0.01, GM = greenaThe above ground biomassbMean N<sub>2</sub>-fixation computed using broad-leaved weeds as reference plants

AEZ 3. Factoring in the contributions of the below ground biomass would increase these  $N_2$ -fixation estimates by about 30%, as discussed above. Averaged over all species and soil fertility,  $N_2$ -fixation estimated by maize and that estimated by broad-leaved weeds differed by 20–30% (Table 5). In AEZ 1, mean  $N_2$ -fixation estimated by broadleaved weeds, while in AEZs 2 and 3, mean  $N_2$ -fixation estimated by maize was 70% and 80% of that estimated by broad-leaved weeds, respectively.

### N<sub>2</sub>-fixation, N export and net N contributions of the grain legumes

The grain legumes shoot N yield, grain N accumulation and net N inputs from N<sub>2</sub>-fixation significantly (P<0.01) decreased with rainfall and soil fertility status (Table 6). Averaged over species and soil fertility, mean shoot N accumulation was greatest in AEZ 2 (135 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>) and least in AEZ 3 (40 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>). In contrast, mean N<sub>2</sub>-fixation estimated by broad-leaved weeds was greatest in AEZ 1 (76 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>) and least in AEZ 3 (20 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>).

Significant (P < 0.01) differences were observed between the grain legumes in shoot N accumulation, N<sub>2</sub>-fixation and net N contributions to soil N fertility. Generally, shoot N accumulation, N<sub>2</sub>fixation and net N inputs were best with lablab and groundnut and worst with bean in AEZ 1. In AEZ 2, lablab and soyabean+P generally had the best shoot N accumulation and N<sub>2</sub>-fixation. However, net N contribution to soil N fertility was negative for all the legumes in the high fertility field, except lablab, which had +42 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> contribution to soil N fertility. Generally, the grain legumes had small positive or negative net N contributions to soil N fertility in AEZ 2. In AEZ 3, most of the grain legumes had negative net N inputs, which indicated mining of soil N. When the N contributed by the below ground legume biomass would be taken into account all legumes would give positive net N inputs. Soil N mining was relatively greater with soyabean+P ( $-27 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1}$ ) and bean ( $-25 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1}$ ).

### Discussion

### $N_2$ -fixation by the legumes in response to AEZ and soil fertility

The <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance signatures detected in the legume shoots varied with AEZ (Table 4). The enrichment of the grain, green manure and forage legume shoots decreased with increasing rainfall, demonstrating greater N2-fixation potential by the legumes in AEZ 2 than in AEZs 1 and 3. Similarly, legume biomass production also varied with rainfall (Table 5). The higher rainfall received in AEZ 2 greatly enhanced legume growth, with biomass production ranging from  $3.0 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$  to  $14.8 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$ , which was much greater than the range from  $2.5 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$  to 8.4 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> for AEZ 1. In AEZ 3, where only about half the normal rainfall was recorded during the experimentation period, the species showed considerable reduction in performance. Biomass production ranged from 2.5 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> to 4.9 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>. Consequently, N<sub>2</sub>-fixation in AEZ 2 was generally greater than that in AEZs 1 and 2. The study was carried out for only one season and seasonal fluctuations can affect legume performance. However, the trends observed confirmed that rainfall is an important factor in legume productivity and suggest that the impact of the legumes on smallholder productivity, especially of the soil improving green manure species, is likely to diminish with rainfall.

The N<sub>2</sub>-fixation by the green manure, forage and grain legume species generally decreased with soil fertility status (Tables 5 and 6). Compared with the high fertility field, N<sub>2</sub>-fixation by the green manure and forage legume species reduced by up to 36% in the low fertility field, while that of grain legume species reduced by up to 44% in the low fertility field, compared with the high fertility field. This significant reduction in N<sub>2</sub>-fixation with soil fertility suggests that the N benefit of legumes is likely to be small in smallholder systems characterized by poor soil fertility.

 $N_2$ -fixation performance of the species showed interaction with AEZ and soil fertility. For the green manure legumes, crotalaria was the best species in  $N_2$ -fixation across the soil fertility

variable soil fe	rtility and ¿	agro-ecolc	ogical con	iditions in	Western K	enya, short	rains, 20	003 seaso	u						
Species	AEZ 1					AEZ 2					AEZ 3				
	<sup>a</sup> Shoot N yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	<sup>b</sup> Fixed N (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Grain N (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	N harvest index (%)	Net N input (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	<sup>a</sup> Shoot N yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	<sup>b</sup> N fixed (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Grain N (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	N harvest index (%)	Net N input (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	<sup>a</sup> Shoot N yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	<sup>b</sup> N fixed (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Grain N (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	N harvest index (%)	Net N input (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
High fertility fi	eld														
Bean	58	31	39	67	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	45	14	39	87	-25	21	8	13	62	Ś
Groundnut	179	124	35	20	+89	140	43	50	36	L-	70	41	12	17	+29
Soyabean (-P)	102	74	53	52	+21	120	43	64	53	-21	21	9	14	67	-8
Soyabean (+P)	160	112	73	46	+39	158	46	73	46	-27	39	10	28	72	-18
Lima	107	71	29	27	+42	82	10	23	28	-13	26	12	11	42	+1
Lablab	246	172	41	17	+131	486	86	44	6	+42	76	42	I	I	+42
Mean	142	97	45	38	52	172	40	49	43	6-	42	20	16	52	7+7
Medium fertilit	y field														
Bean	34	18	19	56	-1	46	18	19	41	<u>-</u>	14	5	10	71	- S
Groundnut	149	103	21	14	+82	113	50	58	51	ş	69	40	12	17	+28
Soyabean (-P)	62	45	26	42	+19	112	59	61	54	7-	24	7	15	63	-8
Soyabean	82	57	40	49	+17	145	79	64	44	+15	25	7	17	68	-10
(+P)															
Lima	79	52	17	22	+35	89	43	16	18	+27	28	13	15	54	-2
Lablab	201	141	32	16	+109	267	165	59	22	+106	81	45			+45
Mean	101	69	26	33	44	129	69	46	38	23	40	20	12	55	+8
Low fertility fit	sld														
Bean	23	12	10	43	+2	29	9	10	34	-1	18	7	9	50	-2
Groundnut	115	79	20	17	+59	123	50	33	27	+17	63	37	13	21	24
Soyabean (-P)	63	46	29	46	+17	106	58	30	28	+28	10	ю	5	50	-2
Soyabean	66	69	41	41	+28	125	55	41	33	+14	17	4	13	76	6-
(+P)															
Lima	70	46	18	26	+28	38	32	10	26	+22	27	12	14	52	-7
Lablab	163	114	28	17	+86	210	94	26	12	+68	98	54			+54
Mean	89	61	24	32	37	105	50	25	27	25	39	20	9	50	+11
Mean	111	76	32	34	44	135	53	40	36	13	40	20	13	52	8
$**SED_{(legumes)}$						20	18	5							
$**SED_{(fields)}$						6	6	2							
$SED_{(AEZ)}$						5	5	1							
<sup>a</sup> The above g	round biom	ass													

 $^{**} P < 0.01$ 

<sup>b</sup> Mean N<sub>2</sub>-fixation computed using broad-leaved weeds as reference plants

gradient in AEZ 1 (Table 5). In AEZ 2, however, velvet bean was the best in the high and medium fertility fields, while crotalaria was the best in the low fertility field. In AEZ 3, similar to AEZ 1, crotalaria had the best N2-fixation across the fertility gradient. For forage legumes (Table 5), desmodium was best in the high and low fertility fields in AEZs 1 and 2, while stylo was best in the medium fertility fields in the same zones. In AEZ 3, however, stylo was the best species in the high and the medium fertility fields, while siratro was the best in the low fertility field. For the grain legumes (Table 6), N<sub>2</sub>-fixation was best with lablab and groundnut across the fertility gradient in AEZs 1 and 3, while in AEZ 2, lablab and soyabean were the best species in N<sub>2</sub>-fixation across the fertility gradient. These observations have significant implications for species selection for the various biophysical niches.

There were strong linear relationships between legume shoot biomass and the computed  $N_2$ fixation in all the AEZs (Fig. 2), suggesting that  $N_2$ -fixation was highly dependent on the capacities of the legumes for growth and biomass accumulation in the different AEZs. There were differences in the  $N_2$ -fixation efficiencies in the three AEZs. The species fixed about 26 kg N per Mg of legume biomass in AEZs 1 and 2, and 14 kg per Mg of biomass in AEZ 3. These figures are in reasonable agreement with those obtained in the high and low rainfall zones in Bukoba in northern Tanzania (Baijukya 2004), and those obtained in different farming systems in eastern Australia (Peoples et al. 2001). Biomass production below about 2 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> resulted in virtually no N<sub>2</sub>-fixation.

Net N contributions to soil N fertility through  $N_2$ -fixation

Net N inputs by the grain legume species varied with AEZ and soil fertility (Table 6), indicating differential contributions by the legumes to soil N fertility maintenance in the AEZs. Mean net N input generally decreased with rainfall, ranging from 44 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> in AEZ1, to 8 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> in AEZ 3. This suggests that the capacity of the grain legumes to improve productivity could be fairly limited in the relatively lower rainfall AEZ 3, especially during a season with sub-normal precipitation. The performance of the individual species varied with AEZ. In AEZs 1 and 3, lablab and groundnut had consistently the greatest net N inputs across the soil fertility gradient, while in AEZ 2, lablab and groundnut had the greatest inputs in the high fertility field, lablab and Lima in the medium fertility field, and lablab and soyabean+P the greatest inputs in the low fertility field. In AEZ 3, only lablab and groundnut had positive net N inputs (Table 6). The net N inputs of the rest of the grain legumes were negative, with soyabean+P showing relatively greater soil N mining potential than the rest of the grain legumes. These results suggest that lablab and groundnut have the potential to make substantial contributions to the improvement of soil N fertility, besides contributing to the household food needs.

**Fig. 2** Relationship between shoot biomass production and shoot N fixed by the legume species in the three agroecological zones in Western Kenya, short rains 2003 season



The relatively large net N contribution by lablab resulted from its high N2-fixation capacity but relatively low N export (Table 6). However, lablab is a poor grain producer in certain environments, e.g. AEZ 3 (Table 2), hence farmers would be better off with groundnut, which had a lower net N input in AEZ 3 (24–29 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>) compared with lablab (42–54 kg N  $ha^{-1}$ ) (Table 6) but a relatively much greater grain yield (Table 2). A general assessment of such trade-offs was done for the grain legumes (Fig. 3). Legume grain yield and net N inputs to soil N fertility showed strong linear relationships in all AEZs. Grain yield was negatively correlated with net N input, indicating that the more grain a legume produces the less its contribution to soil N fertility. The relationships also indicated differences between the AEZs in the trade-offs between grain yield and N inputs for soil N fertility improvement. In AEZ 1, 128 kg N was traded-off for every 1 Mg of grain harvested, while in AEZ 2, 98 kg N was traded-off for every Mg of grain harvested. In AEZ 3, 143 kg N was traded-off for every Mg of grain harvested. In AEZ 1, net N input become negative at grain yield of 1.0 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>, while in AEZs 2 and 3, net N inputs were zero at grain yields of 0.90 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>, and  $0.40 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$ , respectively (Fig. 3). This shows that in AEZs 1 and 2, grain yields of up to 1 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> can be produced without much concern about soil N mining, while in AEZ3, yields of 0.5 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> are likely to result in soil N mining of about 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. Since grain legumes showed grain yield potential of up to 1.40 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> in AEZs 1 and 2 (Table 3), potential for soil N mining is high and a critical consideration of these tradeoffs is essential in deriving suitable legume options for smallholder systems with competing objectives of food production and soil fertility management.

# The $^{15}$ N natural abundance methodology and on-farm N<sub>2</sub>-fixation assessment

The flexibility of the <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance method (since no addition of <sup>15</sup>N-enriched fertilizer is required) makes it ideal for N<sub>2</sub>-fixation assessments on-farm. However, the reliability of the method depends on the choice of appropriate reference species (Peoples et al. 2002). The  $\delta^{15}$ N signatures of maize and the broad-leaved weeds used as reference species differed considerably. Except for one or two cases, the  $\delta^{15}N$  values for broad-leaved weeds plants were much greater than those for maize, and were closer to the  $\delta^{15}$ N signatures of the total soil N (Table 3). Due to this, large variations were obtained in the estimates of %N derived from N<sub>2</sub>-fixation. The %N derived from N<sub>2</sub>-fixation values computed using maize as reference plant were consistently smaller than those computed using broad-leaved weeds (Table 4), indicating that the use of maize as a reference crop underestimated N<sub>2</sub>-fixation by the legumes. The <sup>15</sup>N signatures detected in the soil varied slightly with field and AEZ. However, the values were between 5.93% and 9.19%, which was within the range recommended for the use of the <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance method for N<sub>2</sub>-fixation (Peoples et al. 1989).

Fig. 3 Relationship showing the trade-off between legume grain yield and net N contributions to soil N fertility considering only above-ground N contributions in the three agro-ecological zones in Western Kenya, short rains 2003 season. If the below-ground contributions would be considered the net inputs will be greater



Grain yield (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>)

#### Conclusions

The productivity of the legumes varied greatly with agro-ecological zones and soil fertility, suggesting that different legumes are needed for the improvement of productivity of smallholder farms in different agro-ecological zones and soil fertility conditions in Western Kenya. All the legume species (green manure, forage and grain legumes) studied were capable of fixing atmospheric N2 onfarm without artificial inoculation. Mean N2-fixation by the legume species differed greatly in the three agro-ecological zones, and ranged from 14-253 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in AEZ 2, to 5–77 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> in AEZ 3. Lablab and groundnut showed the greatest resilience in N<sub>2</sub>-fixation and net N input across the agro-ecological and soil fertility gradients. The results of the study indicate that maize is less appropriate as a non-N<sub>2</sub>-fixing reference species than the tested broad-leaved weeds in N2-fixation assessment using the <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance method. The study demonstrates that the green manure, forage and grain legumes studied have the potential for making significant contributions to the N economy and productivity of the smallholder systems through atmospheric N<sub>2</sub>-fixation. However, the potential of species vary in the different biophysical niches and careful selection is therefore needed to optimize productivity.

Acknowledgements The authors thank the Rockefeller Foundation for providing the grant that enabled the implementation of this study, and the Kenya Agricultural Research Institute for availing the facilities for the study, including some of the legume seeds, which were provided by the Legume Research Network Project (LRNP). The support of all the field assistants in the three trial sites is greatly appreciated. We sincerely thank the farmers in Kakamega, Vihiga and Bondo districts in Western Kenya for their willingness to participate in the on-farm trials. Ken Giller and Nico de Ridder thank the European Union for funding through AfricaNUANCES.

#### References

- Anderson JR (1992) Difficulties in African agricultural systems enhancement: ten hypotheses. Agri Syst 38:387–409
- Anderson JM, Ingram JSI (1993) Tropical soil biology and fertility: a handbook of methods. CAB International, Wallingford, UK

- Baijukya FP (2004) Adopting to changes in banana-based farming systems of northern Tanzania. PhD Dissertation, Wageningen University, Wageningen
- Boddey RM, Peoples MB, Palmer B, Dart PJ (2000) Use of the <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance technique to quantify biological nitrogen fixation by woody perennials. Nut Cycl Agroecosyst 57:235–270
- Chikowo R, Mapfumo P, Nyamugafata P, Giller KE (2004) Maize productivity and mineral N dynamics following different soil fertility management practices on a depleted sandy soil in Zimbabwe. Agric Ecosyst Environ 102:109–131
- Franzel S (1999) Socio-economic factors affecting the adoption potential of improved tree fallows in Africa. Agrofor Syst 7:305–321
- Gathumbi SM, Cadisch G, Giller KE (2002) <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance as a tool for assessing N<sub>2</sub>-fixation of herbaceous, shrub and tree legumes in improved fallows. Soil Boil Biochem 34:1059–1071
- Giller KE (2001) Nitrogen fixation in tropical cropping systems, 2nd edn. CAB International, Wallingford, UK
- Hassan RM, Murithi FM, Kamau G (1998) Determinants of fertilizer use and gap between farmer's maize and potential yields in Kenya. In: Hassan RM (ed) Maize technology development and transfer: a GIS application for research planning in Kenya. CAB International, Wallingford, UK, pp 137–178
- Hoekstra DA, Corbett J (1995) Sustainable agricultural growth for the highlands of eastern and central Africa: prospects to 2020. Prepared for the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). ICRAF, Nairobi
- Hudgens RE (2000) Sustainable soil fertility in Africa: the potential for legume green manures. Soil technologies for sustainable smallholder farming systems in East Africa. Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the Soil Science Society of East Africa, Nanyuki, Kenya, pp 63–78
- Jama B, Swinkles RA, Roland BJ (1997) Agronomic and economic evaluation of organic and inorganic sources of phosphorus in Western Kenya. Agron J 89:597–604
- Khan DF, Peoples MB, Chalk PM, Herridge DF (2002) Quantifying below-ground nitrogen of legumes. 2. A comparison of <sup>15</sup>N and non-isotopic methods. Plant Soil 239:277–289
- McNiel AM, Zhu C, Fillery IRP (1997) Use of in situ <sup>15</sup>Nlabelling to estimate the total below-ground nitrogen of pasture legumes in intact soil-plant systems. Austr J Agric Res 48:295–304
- Mureithi JG, Gachene CKK, Ojiem J (2003) The role of green manure Legumes in smallholder farming systems in Kenya: The Legume Research Network Project. Trop Subtropic Agroecosyst 1:57–70
- Okito A, Alves BRJ, Urquiaga S, Boddey RM (2004) Isotopic fractionation during N<sub>2</sub> fixation by four tropical legumes. Soil Biol Biochem 36:1179–1190
- Ojiem JO, de Ridder N, Vanlauwe B, Giller KE (2006) Socio-ecological niche: A conceptual framework for integration of legumes in smallholder farming systems. Int J Agric Sust 4:79–93

- Ojiem JO (2006) Exploring socio-ecological niches for legumes in smallholder farming systems of Western Kenya. PhD Dissertation, Wageningen University, Wageningen
- Peoples MB, Turner GL, Shah Z, Shah SH, Aslam M, Ali S, Maskey SL, Bhattraria S, Afandi F, Schwenke GD, Herridge DF (1997) Evaluation of the <sup>15</sup>N natural abundance technique to measure N<sub>2</sub>-fixation in experimental plots and farmers' fields. In: Rupela OP, Johansen C, Herridge DF (eds) Extending nitrogen fixation research to farmers' field: proceedings of the international workshop on managing legume nitrogen fixation in the cropping systems of Asia. ICRISAT, Hyderabad, India, pp 57–75
- Peoples MB, Faizah AW, Rerkasem B, Herridge DF (eds) (1989) Methods for evaluating nitrogen fixation by nodulated legumes in the field. ICIAR Canberra, Australia
- Peoples MB, Bowman AM, Gault RR, Herridge DF, McCallum MH, McCormick KM, Norton RM, Rochester IJ, Scammell GJ, Schwenke GD (2001) Factors regulating the contributions of fixed nitrogen by pasture and crop legumes to different farming systems of eastern Australia. Plant Soil 228:29–41
- Peoples MB, Boddey RM, Herridge DF (2002) Quantification of nitrogen fixation. In: Leigh GJ (ed.) Nitrogen fixation at the millennium. Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, pp 357–389
- Ruthenberg H (1980) Farming systems in the tropics, 3rd edn. Clarendon Press, Oxford, UK

- Sanchez PA, Shepherd KD, Soule MJ, Place FM, Buresh RJ, Izac AMN, Mokwunye AU, Kwesiga FR, Nderitu CG, Woomer PL (1997) Soil fertility replenishment in Africa: an investment in natural resource capital. In: Buresh RJ, Sanchez PA, Calhoun FG (eds) Replenishing soil fertility in Africa. Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI, USA, pp 1–46
- Shearer GB, Kohl DH (1986) N<sub>2</sub>-fixation in field settings: estimations based on natural <sup>15</sup>N abundance. Aust J Plant Phys 13:699–756
- Smaling EMA, Braun AR (1996) Soil fertility research in sub-Saharan Africa: new dimensions, new challenges. Comm Soil Sc Plant Anal 27:365–386
- Tarawali G, Manyong VM, Carsky RJ, Vissoh PV, Osei-Bonsu P, Galiba M (1999) Adoption of improved fallows in West Africa: lessons from mucuna and stylo case studies. Agrofor Syst 47:93–122
- Tittonell P, Vanlauwe B, Leffelaar PA, Rowe EC, Giller KE (2005a) Exploring diversity in soil fertility management of smallholder farms in western Kenya. I. Heterogeneity at region and farm scale. Agric Ecosyst Environ 110:149–165
- Tittonell P, Vanlauwe B, Leffelaar PA, Shepherd KD,
  Giller KE (2005b) Exploring diversity in soil fertility
  management of smallholder farms in Western Kenya
  II. Within-farm variability in resource allocation,
  nutrient flows and soil fertility status. Agric Ecosyst
  Environ 110:166–184