

1
2 **Evaluating the Effects of Staking and Planting**
3 **Dates on the Yields of African Yam Bean,**
4 ***Sphenostylis stenocarpa* in Nigeria**
5

6
7
8 **E. O. Ogah**

9 **+234 8030916284; E-mail; emmamarg2005@yahoo.com**
10

11 Department of Crop Production and Landscape Management, Ebonyi State
12 University PMB 053 Abakaliki, Nigeria
13

14
15 **ABSTRACT**

16 **Aims:** To evaluate the effects of staking and planting dates on the grain/tuber yields of African
17 yam bean.

18 **Study design:** The fields were laid out in split-plots in randomized complete block design

19 **Place and duration:** Field experiments were conducted at Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki,
20 Nigeria during 2009/10 farming seasons.

21 **Methodology:** Three different planting dates were used as the main-plot treatments, while
22 staking and non-staking formed the sub-plots. Seven accessions of African yam bean were
23 planted in the sub-plots. Five plants were randomly selected from each accession/treatment and
24 tagged for data collection. Each seedling was staked independent after germination, while the
25 non-staked plants were allowed to trail on the ground guided. Collected data were subjected to
26 analyses of variance. Mean separation was by Student Newman's Keuls test.

27 **Results:** The results indicated that all the African yam bean accessions performed better when
28 they were staked and planted earlier in May of each season with greater grain/tuber yields, which
29 differed significantly ($P < 0.05$) from those that were not staked and planted later either in June or
30 July of each season. Of all the accessions assessed, TSs86 was the most productive with the
31 highest grain yield and differed significantly ($P < 0.05$) from the rest of the accessions, while
32 TSs84 had the least grain yields. Results on the tuber yields showed the same trend in relation to
33 the treatments. The tuber yield showed that some accession could produce above 2 tons of
34 tubers per hectare; however tuber yield showed inverse relationship to that of the grain yield

35 across the accessions with the highest tuber yield was recorded in TSs93 and least in TSs86.

36 **Conclusion:** for increased grain/tuber yields of African yam bean in Nigeria, it has to be staked
37 and **planted early in the season.**

38 **Keywords:** *Sphenostylis stenocarpa*, staking, planting dates, yields

39 1. INTRODUCTION

40 Nigeria is one of the African countries that are endowed with varieties of grain leguminous plants
41 that are required for sustainable food security. Unfortunately, one major causes of food insecurity
42 experienced in many African countries and Nigeria in particular is the underutilization of some
43 potential food security crops in the continent (Saka *et al.*, 2004, 2007). Amongst the underutilized
44 crops with high food potential in Nigeria is African yam bean (*Sphenostylis stenocarpa*, Hochst.
45 Ex. A. Rich). African yam bean (AYB) is one of the most important grain and tuberous legumes of
46 tropical Africa. **It is cultivated as a secondary crop with yam** and other crops in many parts of
47 Africa mainly by subsistence farmers despite its nutritional values (Potter 1992, Amoatey *et al.*,
48 2000 and Klu *et al.*, 2001). The seed grain and tuber are the two major organs of immense
49 economic importance as food for Africa with regional preferences (Potter 1992, Klu *et al.*, 2001,
50 Adewale 2010, Adewale and Dumet 2011 and Ene-Odong 1992). While the seeds are preferred
51 in the West African countries, the tubers are preferred both in the east and central Africa. African
52 yam bean has huge potential for food security in Africa. According to Uguru and Madukaife,
53 (2001), AYB is well balanced in essential amino acid and has higher amino acid content than
54 **pigeon pea, cowpea and bambara nut.** The grain is a good source of proteins, fibre and
55 carbohydrate. It is rich in minerals such as phosphorus, iron and potassium. However, the under-
56 exploitation of the crop has subjected it to be classified as minor grain legumes (Saka *et al.*,
57 2004).

58
59 Of all the factors militating against increased African yam bean production in Nigeria is its low
60 grain yield, when compared with other legumes (cowpea) and tuber crops (sweet potatoes) under
61 monocrop conditions (Saka *et al.*, 2007). Several factors have been reported to be responsible
62 for the low grain yield recorded in the field. Of all the factors that challenges increased AYB
63 production, the most important one is the cultural practices involved in its production. African yam
64 bean is a vigorously climbing herbaceous vine whose height can reach 1.5–3 m or more
65 with many branches which twines on any available stake (Adewale, and Dumet, 2011). Hence
66 the believe that AYB requires a stake in its production and no wonder the practice of
67 intercropping it with other crops that either requires stake too, like yam or with a crop that may
68 provide a stake like cassava or millet (Klu *et al.*, 2001, Adeniyani *et al.*, 2007). According to

69 Adeniyani *et al.*, (2007) AYB requires staking under monocropping for improved grain yield. To
70 provide stakes for a better growth and yield requires extra effort and cost.

71

72 Although several references have been made to the use of the AYB tubers as a source of starch
73 and proteins in West Africa (Ene-Obong 1992; Porter 1992, Adewale and Dumet 2011),
74 unfortunately many AYB farmers do not even know that it produces tubers talk less of harness
75 the potential in supplementing their protein requirements. Others on the other hand attach no
76 importance to the bean tubers as their yields were considered very poor compare to that of yam
77 (Klu *et al.*, 2001).

78

79 Furthermore the appropriate time of planting for enhanced yields has not been ascertained. The
80 knowledge of these factors is necessary in guiding rural farmers that may want to engage in its
81 production. Hence the objectives of this study were to evaluate the effect of staking and date of
82 planting on the grain/tuber yields of AYB in Nigeria.

83

84 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

85 Field experiments were conducted at the experimental farm of the Faculty of Agriculture and
86 Natural Resources Management, Ebonyi State University Abakaliki during 2009 and 2010 farming
87 seasons under rain fed conditions. Abakaliki lies within 7° 30'E, 5° 45'N with a mean annual
88 rainfall of 2000 mm. The fields were laid out in split-plots in randomized complete block design.

89 Three different planting dates (May 4th, June 2nd and July 1st) for 2009/10 were used as the main-
90 plot treatments, while staking and non-staking formed the sub-plots. Seven promising accessions
91 of African yam bean (TSs 9, TSs 48, TSs84, TSs86, TSs93, TSs94 and TSs166) collected from
92 IITA genetic bank were randomly planted in the sub-plots. The AYB accessions seeds were
93 planted in rows in each plot with a variety occupying a row. The seeds were sown at 2 seeds per
94 hole at a planting spacing of 1 m x 0.7 m inter and intra spacing. Each treatment was replicated
95 three times. Thinning was done after three weeks of planting to one seedling per stand. Five
96 plants were randomly selected from each accession/treatment and tagged for data collection.
97 Forty kilograms per hectare of compound fertilizer 15: 15: 15 NPK was added to all the plots at
98 three weeks after germination to boost growth. Staking was done three weeks after germination
99 using strong stake each measuring about 3 m high. Each seedling was staked independent of
100 another to avoid mixing the accessional yields, while the non-staked plants were allowed to trail
101 on the ground and were guided to avoid missing with other accessions. The experimental plots
102 were weeded at three weeks intervals.

103 At harvest, data were collected on the total grain yield of individual plants based on the
104 treatments and assessed per accession from the tagged plants. Estimate of grain yield per unit

105 area was done when the grains were dry using the tagged plants. The pods were threshed and
106 winnowed. The results were extrapolated to kilogram per hectare for each accession and
107 treatment. Equally the estimate of tuber yield per unit area was done when the plants were
108 mature and leaves dried using the tagged plants. The tubers were harvested using hoe, weighed
109 and the results were extrapolated to tons per hectare for each accession and treatment.

110

111 2.1. Statistical analyses

112 Collected data were subjected to analyses of variance through computer software (SAS, 2003).
113 The mean separation was carried out by Student Newman's Keuls ($P < 0.05$) test. Pearson
114 correlation coefficient (r) was used to determine the relationship between yields, planting dates
115 and staking.

116

117 3. RESULTS

118 The results indicated that staking and date of planting significantly affected the grain/tuber yields
119 of African yam bean. Highest grain yields were observed when AYB accessions were staked
120 compared to the accessions that were planted non-staked (Table 1). On the other hand, the non-
121 staked AYB had the lowest grain yield (Table 2). Amongst the accessions assessed, TSs86 when
122 staked gave the highest grain yields across the experimental periods and differed significantly
123 ($P < 0.05$) from the rest of the accessions, while TSs84 when staked and non-staked gave the
124 poorest grain yield.

125

126 On the other hand, the highest grain yields were recorded when African yam beans were planted
127 earlier in May 4th of each season, which differed significantly ($P < 0.05$) from those planted in either
128 June or July of each season. In other words, there were decreases in grain yields with delay in
129 the planting dates with the least grain yield recorded on AYB planted on July of each season.

130

131 In the two planting seasons, the highest grain yields were recorded during the 2009 farming
132 season than in 2010 across the accessions and planting dates.

133

134 The results of the tuber yields indicated that the tuber yield per plant varied across the accessions
135 and planting dates throughout the experimental periods. In overall, TSs86 gave the least tuber
136 yield across the experimental periods and differed significantly from others, while TSs84 gave the
137 highest tuber yield indicating an inverse relationship between tuber yield and grain yield (Tables 3
138 and 4). Similarly African yam bean accessions planted earlier gave higher tuber yield across all
139 the accessions and differed significantly ($P < 0.05$) from those planted later with the highest tuber
140 yield recorded in May of each season while the least was gotten in July of each season.

141

142 There were significance positive correlations between dates of planting, grain yield and tuber
143 yields ($r = 0.67$ and 0.45 , $P < 0.05$) respectively; staking and grain yield ($r = 0.56$, $P < 0.05$); staking
144 and tuber yield ($r = 51$, $P < 0.05$ for 2009 and 2010 respectively). On the other hands there was
145 significant negative correlation between grain yield and tuber yield ($r = 0.69$, $P < 0.05$).

146

147

148 4. DISCUSSION

149 The highest grain yield observed when African yam beans were staked under this study could be
150 due to the importance of staking on the yields of African yam bean. The yield increase might
151 probably be due to the advantageous effects of staking which provided support for the numerous
152 branches of the crop. Similar results have been reported by Adeniyani *et al.* (2007). According to
153 them when AYB was intercropped with maize/kenaf, the maize/kenaf served as life stakes for the
154 AYB which in turn gave higher grain yield compared to sole AYB that was not staked. It has been
155 reported that AYB is a vigorous, herbaceous, climbing leguminous plant whose height could be
156 up to 1.5-2 m. Hence, as a climbing crop it needs a stake for proper vegetative growth. The
157 vegetative growing stage is characterized with the profuse production of trifoliolate leaves which is
158 required for an enhanced grain yield (Milne-Redhead and Polhill 1971).

159

160 Yield reductions observed on all the accession under non-staking condition has been reported by
161 earlier researchers (Adeniyani *et al.*, 2007). According to them, when AYB is not staked it lacks
162 the support given by the stake material which assist it in repositioning the leaves for adequate
163 sunlight it require for proper growth. It has equally been reported that staking plays a significant
164 role in tuber formation of most climbing plants like yam.

165

166 On the other hands, the significant increase in grain yield recorded early in the season may be
167 attributed to reduced pests infestation on the crop. AYB has been reported to be attacked by
168 several flower and post flower pest that results in low yield of the crop (Ameh and Okezie, 2005).
169 However it has been reported that such pests many a times do not infestation the crop early in
170 the season (Ogah *et al.*, 2012). According to them such serious pest of AYB like *M. vitrata* and
171 thrips were observed to have low infestation of the early planting crops. This is also in agreement
172 with (Akingbohunge, 1982, Asante *et al.*, 2001) who reported that cowpea planted in June or
173 July in Southern Nigeria usually escape severe *M. vitrata* infestation while those planted late in
174 August coincide with the peak population densities of the major post-flower pests resulting in
175 considerable reduction of grain yield. Conversely the low grain yield observed later in the season
176 may also be attributed to increased pest build up in the field thereby destroying the crop (Ogah
177 *et al.*, 2012). Similar results have been reported in cowpea in Uganda by (Karungi *et al.*, 2000). The
178 agronomic practices of planting crops at different dates are used in different parts of the tropics

179 especially in Africa (Okigbo and Greenland, 1976). This is evident in the present result that
180 showed significant differences on both the grain and tuber yield of AYB recorded across the three
181 planting dates. Improved crop cultivars and alteration in planting dates of crops have been
182 reported as an effective strategy in reducing pest damage and increasing crop yields by a number
183 of researchers (Prasa and Singh, 1997).

184

185 The fact that the accession that gave the highest grain yield was not the accession that gave the
186 highest tuber yield may be attributed to the influence of grain yield on the tuber yield. It has been
187 reported that grain yield of some legumes affect the development of tubers. This is in line with the
188 inverse tuber yield recorded in the present study. Accession that gave higher grain yields were
189 the accessions that gave the least tuber yield and this explains the significant negative correlation
190 observed under the study. The higher grain/tuber yields recorded in some varieties compared to
191 others may be due to differential genetic make of the different accessions.

192

193 **5. CONCLUSION**

194 The results presented showed that African yam bean has high potential in contributing to food
195 security in Nigeria. The high yield gain advantage recorded when AYB was staked over the non-
196 staked cropping calls for its cultural practices improvement. Furthermore, the tuber yield potential
197 of the crop indicated that if improved upon could stand to replace most of the tuber crops grown
198 in Nigeria whose yield have been dwindling following the current low soil fertility observed virtually
199 in all the ecologies in Nigeria. Thus, for improved growth and total yields of AYB, staking and
200 early plant are paramount cultural practices to be observed.

201

202

203

204

205 **Table 1: Effect of planting dates on grain yield (kg/ha) of AYB during 2009/2010.**

		2009			2010		
Varieties		May	June	July	May	June	July
		Grain yield	Grain yield	Grain yield	Grain yield	Grain yield	Grain yield
1	TSs 9	557.7b	456.9c	374.7c	511.1b	462.2b	343.0c
2	TSs 48	595.5a	517.8a	412.1b	591.0a	492.2a	384.0a
3	TSs84	425.0e	319.7e	277.1e	419.2e	403.5c	204.8e
4	TSs86	631.3a	520.0a	461a	521.6b	462.6b	353.9b
5	TSs93	512.0d	441.6cd	312.2de	491.0c	366.4d	344.8c
6	TSs94	544.7c	491.6b	343.4d	448.1d	311.8f	290.0d
7	TSs166	525.5d	393.9d	353.6cd	391.6e	344.0e	291.6d

206 Means followed by the same letter(s) do not significantly differ according to Student Newman
 207 Keuls (P < 0.05) test

208

209 **Table 2: Effect of staking on grain yield (kg/ha) of AYB during 2009/2010.**

S/N	Accessions	2009		2010	
		Staking	Non-staking	Staking	Non-staking
		Grain yield	Grain yield	Grain yield	Grain yield
1	TSs 9	463.1b	273.9c	438.8c	294.1a
2	TSs 48	508.5a	334.4a	489.1a	285.2b
3	TSs84	340.6c	171.8e	342.5e	189.1d
4	TSs86	537.4a	349.7a	446.0b	294.9a
5	TSs93	421.9d	241.8cd	400.7de	220.2c
6	TSs94	459.9b	290.3b	350.0d	153.7e
7	TSs166	424.3d	222.0d	342.4cd	244.0c

210 Means followed by the same letter(s) do not significantly differ according to Student Newman
 211 Keuls (P < 0.05) test

212

213

214 **Table 3: Effect of planting dates on tuber yield (t/ha) of AYB during 2009/2010.**

		2009			2010		
Varieties		May	June	July	May	June	July
		Tuber yield	Tuber yield	Tuber yield	Tuber yield	Tuber yield	Tuber yield
1	TSs 9	1.5c	1.4c	1.3c	1.2d	1.2c	1.0d
2	TSs 48	1.4cd	1.2d	1.0d	1.4c	1.1c	1.1d
3	TSs84	2.1a	2.0a	1.7a	1.9a	1.6a	1.4b
4	TSs86	1.3d	1.3cd	0.7e	1.4c	0.6d	0.4e
5	TSs93	1.9a	1.8a	1.5b	1.7b	1.6a	1.6a
6	TSs94	1.7b	1.4c	1.2cd	1.2d	1.3b	1.2c
7	TSs166	1.9a	1.6b	1.3c	1.5c	1.5a	1.4b

215 Means followed by the same letter(s) do not significantly differ according to Student Newman
 216 Keuls (P < 0.05) test

217

218

219

220 **Table 4: Effect of staking on tuber yield (kg/ha) of AYB during 2009/2010.**

221

S/N	Accessions	2009		2010	
		Staking	Non-staking	Staking	Non-staking
		Tuber yield	Tuber yield	Tuber yield	Tuber yield
1	TSs 9	1.8b	1.5b	1.7b	1.3b
2	TSs 48	1.4c	1.1d	1.4cd	0.9d
3	TSs84	2.0a	1.7a	2.0a	1.4ab
4	TSs86	1.7b	1.5b	1.6b	1.0cd
5	TSs93	2.1a	1.7a	1.7b	1.5a
6	TSs94	1.8b	1.3c	1.3d	1.2bc
7	TSs166	1.8b	1.6a	1.5c	1.1c

222 Means followed by the same letter(s) do not significantly differ according to Student Newman
 223 Keuls (P < 0.05) test

224

225

226 REFERENCES

- 227 Adeniyani ON, Akande SR, Baogun MO and Saka JO. Evaluation of Crop Yield of African
 228 Yam Bean, Maize and Kenaf Under Intercropping Systems. American-Eurasian J. Agric. &
 229 Environ. Sci. (2007: 2 (1): 99-102.
 230
- 231 Adewale D. African yam bean: a food security crop? IITA Research [r4dreview.org/.../exploiting-](http://r4dreview.org/.../exploiting-the-diversity-of-african-yam-bean)
 232 [the-diversity-of-african-yam-bean](http://r4dreview.org/.../exploiting-the-diversity-of-african-yam-bean), 2010 retrieved On 11th November.
 233
- 234 Adewale DB and Dumet DJ. Descriptor for african yam bean *Sphenostylis stenocarpa*
 235 (Hochst Ex. A. Rich) Harms IITA Research newsletter 1 -12.
 236
- 237 Akingbohunbe, A.E. (1982). Seasonal variation in cowpea cropping performance at Ile Ife,
 238 Nigeria and the relationship to insect damage. Insect Science and its application. 2011:
 239 3:287 – 296.
 240
- 241 Ameh GI and Okezie CEA. Pests and diseases of AYB. Bio Research. 2005: Vol. 3 (1) 14-
 242 20.
 243
- 244 Amoatey HM, Klu GYP, Bansa D, Kumaga FK, Aboagye LM, BenettLartey SO and
 245 Gamedoagbo DK. The African yam bean (*Sphenostylis stenocarpa*) a neglected crop in Ghana.
 246 West African Journal of Applied Ecology. 2000: Vol. 1. 53 – 60.
 247
- 248 Asante SK, Tamo M and Jackai LEN. Integrated management of cowpea insect pests
 249 using elite cultivars, date of planting and minimum insecticide application. African Crop
 250 Science Journal. 2001: Vol. 9 (4); 655 – 665.
 251
- 252 Ene-Odong EE and Okoye FI. Inter-relationships between yield and yield components in
 253 the African yam bean, *Sphenostylis stenocarpa* (Hochst ex. A. Rich.) Harms. Beitr. Trop.
 254 Landwirt. 1992: 30(3):283-290.
 255
- 256 Karungi JE, Adipala MW, Ogenga-Latigo S and Kyamanywa NO. Pest management in
 257 cowpea. Part 1. Influence of planting time and plant density on 18 cowpea field pests
 258 infestation in eastern Uganda. Crop Protection . 2000:19:231- 236.
 259
- 260 Klu GYP, Amoatey HM, Bansa D and Kumaga FK. Cultivation and uses of African yam
 261 bean (*Sphenostylis stenocarpa*) in the Volta Region of Ghana. The Journal of Food Technology
 262 in Africa. 2001: 6:74–77.
 263
- 264 Milne-Redhead E and Greenland DJ. Pages 670 – 674 in Flora of Tropical East Africa. Crown
 265 Agents for Oversea Government and Administrations. 1971: Millbank, London.
 266
- 267 Ogah EO and Ogah FE. Evaluating the effect of host plant resistance and planting
 268 dates on the incidence of legume pod borer (*maruca vitrata*, geyer) on African yam
 269 bean in Nigeria. African Crop Science Journal. 2012: Vol. 20, (3): 163 – 170.
 270
- 271 Okigbo BN and Greenland DJ. Intercropping system in tropical Africa. American Society of
 272 Agronomy MD. Wisconsin pp 63 - 101.
 273
- 274 Potter, D. 1992. Economic botany of *Sphenostylis* (Leguminosae). Economic Botany. 1976: 46:
 275 262-275.
 276
- 277 Prabhakar M, Singh Y, Singh VS and Singh SP. Economic injury levels of *Helicovera*
 278 *armigera* in chickpea as influenced by irrigation. Indian Journal of Entomology. 1998:
 279 60(2), 109-115.

- 280 Prasa CS and Singh VP. Impact of variety, sowing date and control measures on incidence of
281 pod borer, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hub.) and yield of chickpea. Annals of plant
282 Protection Sciences. 1997: 5: 26 – 28.
283
- 284 Saka JO, Adeniyon ON, Akande SR and Balogun MO. An Economic Evaluation of
285 Intercropping African Yam Bean, Kenaf and Maize in the Rain Forest Zone of Nigeria.
286 Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research. 2007: 2 (1): 01-08.
287
- 288 Saka JO, Ajibade S, RAdeniyon ON, Olowoyo RBJ and Ogunbodede BA. Survey of
289 underutilized grain legume production systems in the Southwest agricultural zone of
290 Nigeria. J. Agric. & Food Info., 6: 93-108.
291
- 292 SAS, (2003). The SAS Institute Inc. Cary. 2004: No. 27513, USA.
293
- 294 Uguru MI and Madukaife SO. Studies on the variability in agronomic and nutritive characteristics
295 of African yam bean (*Sphenostylis stenocarpa* Hochst ex. A. Rich. Harms). Plant
296 Production and Research Journal. 2001: 6:10 – 19.
297
- 298
- 299