

## Mulching effect in selected ornamental plants

**N.R. Bhat, M.K. Suleiman, R.R. Bellen and L. AL-Mulla**

*Aridland Agriculture and Greenery Department, Kuwait Institute for Scientific Research, P.O. Box 24885 Safat, 13109, Kuwait, Email: mkhalil@kisar.edu.kw*

### Abstract

To further enhance the understanding of cultural needs and to promote efficient use of expensive water resources in ornamental plant production, it is important to conduct studies on fertilizer and irrigation requirements, identification and control of insect pest and disease and water conservation measures under local climatic conditions. The study reported in this paper was initiated in June 2002 to determine the effects of mulching on the growth and greenery impact of four proven adaptable introduced ornamental plants (*Vitex agnus castus* (VA), *Caesalpinia mexicana* (CM), *Myoporum parvifolium* (MP) and *Rosmarinus officinalis* (RO)). Organic mulches (processed bark or compost) procured locally were applied to the soil surface immediately after planting. Periodic data recorded during the first year after planting indicated significant individual effects (mulches and species). However, the mulch x species interactions were not significant at  $p=0.05$ . The processed bark was the better than compost in increasing plant height and canopy in MP and RO. However, VA plants in bark mulch had increased seedling height and larger canopies than those in unmulched plants. CM plant height was not affected by using mulch but the canopy increased by using bark as surface mulch. The root zone soil moisture regimes were similar in all treatments.

**Keywords:** Ornamental plants, drought, mulching effect, plant growth.

### Introduction

Kuwait is an arid country with a severely harsh climate. The summer months are extremely hot, with frequent sandstorms. Winter is mild with low, erratic rainfall (an average annual precipitation of around 100 mm). The mean temperatures in January and July are 8 and 44°C, respectively (Abdal *et al.*, 1993). Humidity is low (13% in June) and evaporation is extremely high (as high as 24.3 mm/day in summers). The virgin soil of Kuwait is nonsaline, moderate to very shallow in depth, sandy to sandy-loam in texture and has low water and nutrient retention capacities. Such conditions impose severe water stress on plants. Therefore, it is a common practice among landscape maintenance engineers to apply excess irrigation water to compensate for extreme arid conditions and low water retention capacities of the soils. While supplemental irrigation has contributed to an increase in greenery development, it has led to salinization of arable lands and adversely affected the long-term sustainability of plant production activities in the country. Additionally, it has resulted in the degradation of land and water resources in the country.

The Aridland Agriculture and Greenery Department of KISR has been continuously making efforts to introduce, test and naturalize drought- and heat-tolerant plants and standardization of water conserving cultural practices (Taha *et al.*, 1988; Bhat, 1997; Al-Zalzaleh, 2002). Recently, 30 new ornamental plants were introduced and evaluated in agricultural and bioremediated soils for their adaptability and growth performance under Kuwait's climate (Suleiman *et al.*, 2002). Majority of these plants showed good potential for growing under the local harsh climate. While these studies expanded the NGP plant palette, they also called for additional research efforts to optimize cultural practices to optimize their greenery and visual impacts. Proper irrigation scheduling based on actual water needs and the use of surface

mulches creates favorable soil moisture regimes; improve soil structure and moderate soil microclimate to support optimal plant growth and development (Robinson, 1988). The potential of organic mulch such as processed bark and composed green wastes to establish favorable water and nutrient regimes under harsh climatic conditions has also been recognized by a number of researchers (Tukey and Schoff, 1963; Greenly and Rakow, 1995; Dick and McKoy, 1993; Iles and Dosmann, 1999). In view of the benefits application of organic surface mulch, the effects of two organic mulches were investigated in the present study.

### Materials and methods


**Plant Materials:** Four proven potential introduced plant species, two each of shrubs (*Vitex agnus castus*, VA and *Caesalpinia mexicana*, CM), and ground cover (*Myoporum parvifolium*, MP and *Rosmarinus officinalis* RO), were selected for the mulch study. Hardened plants in 10 cm plastic containers were used as planting material.

**Installation of irrigation System:** Test plants were irrigated using a drip system comprising of a sixteen-station timer, polyethylene pipes and one emitter per plant that discharged 0.5 gallons of water per hr. Each time the plants were watered uniformly until the soil moisture reached the field capacity. The amount of water applied to each plant varied to suit the prevailing climatic conditions (Fig. 1).

**Planting:** Planting holes of appropriate sizes (*i.e.*, 60 x 60 x 60 cm for shrubs and 30 x 30 x 30 cm for ground covers) were prepared as per the planting plan. After placing shrubs and groundcover plants in these holes, they were backfilled with a 1:1 (v/v) mixture of soil and sphagnum peat moss, and pressed lightly to provide adequate anchorage for the plants.

**Mulching treatments:** Two types of organic mulch (processed pine bark and compost) procured locally were used in the study. Three to 4 cm deep layer of the mulch was applied uniformly to the surface of the soil after planting

**Irrigation:** The irrigation requirement was calculated using the evapotranspiration rate of 15 mm/day (Taha *et al.*, 1988) for July to September and then half the amount from October 2002 until May 2003. All mulch treatments received the same amount of irrigation water daily.



**Fig. 1.** Daily evapotranspiration rates used for determining the irrigation requirements of experimental plants

## Results and discussion

The effects of the two mulches on growth of four plant species were assessed in terms of periodic seedling survival, average height growth and seedling canopy. The observed differences were compared with soil moisture regimes in the root zone during the corresponding periods.

The initial seedling establishment was 100% in all the species. CM seedlings recorded the 92.85% survival in bark, 71.43% in compost mulch treatments and the control recorded 84.52% survival. A few RO in the compost treatment died during the later stages of development. Otherwise, the rest of the seedlings survived until the end of the experiment.

Plant species grew at different rates under using different mulche treatments (Fig. 2). In ten months, height increments in VA was 96.47, 95.26 and 67.03% using horticultural bark, compost and no mulch, respectively. Similarly, in CM, height increments were 392.92, 359.69 and 434.23%. In MP, height increments recorded 220, 274.22 and 195.02% and in RO, they recorded 195.17, 215 and 193.63 % by using horticultural bark, compost and no mulch, respectively.

VA performed best when using bark as a mulch surface, whereas, CM performed better without using mulch. In MP and RO, seedling height was improved by using compost as surface mulch.

Seedling canopy increased due to the application of bark in VA and CM (Fig. 3), whereas MP and RO benefited more from the compost mulch. The increase in plant canopy was the lowest in the control treatments in all the species.


The soil moisture fluctuated between 2.56 and 9.04 % and was

not influenced by either species or irrigation (Fig. 4). However, soil moisture status was similar in all treatments.


VA yielded the highest biomass in bark treatment, whereas CM, MP and RO yielded the highest biomass by using compost as surface mulch (Table 1). There was hardly any difference in yield in CM by using either mulch type. The yield was least in the control treatments in all the plant species.

Major benefits of soil mulching have been documented by several reserachers (Billeaud. and Zajicek, 1989, Hild and Morgan,1993, Lloyd, *et al.*, 2002, Wilen, *et al.*, 1999). Soil moisture conservation by reducing evaporation from the soil surface and reducing weed that can use as much or more water than ornamental plants. Moreover, mulch also holds water near the place it falls so that more of it enters the soil. Mulch usually breaks the impact of irrigation water, thus slowing water movement and keeps water in contact with the soil. Thick mulches reduce water runoff and soil erosion. Leaching and decomposition of organic mulch increases soil fertility. Also, micro-organisms activity increases in mulch-covered soil.

Mulch reduces salt buildup by reducing water evaporation that may be high in soluble salts. Mulches moderates soil temperatures making it cooler in summer and warmer in winter. Reports are available which demonstrate that the use of mulches such as tree bark, jute material greatly improved the plant performance and



**Fig. 2.** Seedling height of different species under different mulch treatments. (A) *Vitex agnus castus* and *Caesalpinia mexicana* (B) *Myoporum parvifolium* and *Rosmarinus officinalis*



**Fig. 3. Seedling canopy of different species under different mulch treatments. (A) *Vitex agnus castus* and *Caesalpinia mexicana* (B) *Myoporium parvifolium* and *Rosmarinus officinalis***

eliminated weed growth under the crop canopy (Sawant and Dayanand, 1994; Wofford and Orzolek, 1993). These materials have good promise in arid climates.


The study was conducted for assessing the effects of organic mulches on vegetative growth of four proven potential introduced ornamental plants. Results indicated significant benefits of application of processed bark as surface mulch in increasing plant height and canopy in VA. However, CM was not affected in height while using mulch and the canopy increased by using bark as mulch. MP and RO plants with compost mulch had higher seedling growth and larger canopy than those in the processed bark. The root zone soil moisture regimes were similar in all treatments

## Acknowledgements

The project team thank the management of Kuwait Institute for Scientific Research for financial support and interest in this project. The project team is grateful to the Manager, Aridland Agriculture and Greenery Department for her encouragement and consistent support during the implementation of the project.

## References

Abdal, M., C. Basham, D. Kater, M. Suleiman and H. Al-Zalzaleh, 1993. Contribution to greenery plan: Ornamental plant introduction/screening, and improvement of cultural and management practices.



**Fig. 4. Soil moisture fluctuation under different treatments**

**Table 1. Plant biomass in different species under different mulch treatments**

Species	Mulch type	Fresh weight (g)	Dry weight(g)
<b>Shrubs</b>			
<i>Vitex agnus castus</i>	Bark	173.55	88.85
	Compost	165.15	76.25
	Control	127.50	67.40
<i>Caesalpinia mexicana</i>	Bark	52.50	32.65
	Compost	42.25	33.25
	Control	59.80	24.95
<b>Groundcovers</b>			
<i>Myoporium parvifolium</i>	Bark	228.65	80.00
	Compost	247.15	90.60
	Control	173.85	79.75
<i>Rosmarinus officinalis</i>	Bark	49.85	33.40
	Compost	53.60	36.40
	Control	48.80	34.55

Kuwait Institute for Scientific Research.

Allen, R.G., M. Smith and L.S. Pereira, 1994. An update for the calculation of reference evapotranspiration. *International Council of Irrigation and Drainage Bulletin*, 43: 35- 92.

Billeaud, L.A. and J.M. Zajicek. 1989. Influence of mulches on weed control, soil pH, soil nitrogen content, and growth of *Ligustrum japonicum*. *J. Environ. Hort.*, 7(4): 155-157.

Dregne, H.E. and W.O. Willis, 1983. *Dryland Agriculture*. The American Society of Agronomy. Academic Press. Madison, Wisconsin, USA.

Dick, W.A. and E.L. McCoy, 1993. Enhancing soil fertility by addition of compost. In: *Science and Engineering of Composting: Design, Environmental, Microbiological, and Utilization Aspects*. Edited by H. A. J. Hoitink and H. M. Keener. Wooster, Ohio. Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, The Ohio State University, USA: pp. 622-644.

Greenly, K.M. and D.A. Rakow, 1995. The effects of wood mulch type and depth on weed and tree growth and certain soil parameters. *Journal of Arboriculture*, 21: 255-232.

Hild, A.L., D.L. Morgan, 1993. Mulch effects on crown growth of five southwestern shrub species. *J. Environ. Hort.*, 11(1): 41-43.

Houkal, D., V. Agarwal., I. Bagouri., O. Nasser., S. Nasri., N. Armer and M. Khan, 1988. Plant testing program for the waterfront project. Vol. III. Kuwait Institute for Scientific Research, Report No. KISR 2895, Kuwait.

Lloyd, J.E., D.A. Herms, B.R. Stinner, H.A.J. Hoitink, 2002. Comparing composted yard trimmings and ground wood as mulches. *BioCycle*.

- 43(9): 52-55.
- Iles, J.K., and M.S. Dosmann, 1999. Effect of organic and mineral mulches on soil properties and growth of Fairview Flame red maple trees. *Journal of Arboriculture*, 25: 163-167.
- KISR. 1996. National Greenery Plan. Kuwait for Scientific Research, Report No. KISR 4938, Kuwait.
- Robinson, D.W. 1988. Mulches and herbicides in ornamental plantings. *HortScience*, 23: 547-552.
- Sawant A.C. and Dayanand, 1994. Effect of moisture conservation practice on productivity of rainfed maize (*Zea mays*). *Indian Journal Agronomy*, 39: 472-473.
- Suleiman M., H. Al-Zalzaleh and N.R. Bhat, 2002. Evaluation of ornamental plants in bio-remediated soil. The Joint Kingdom of Saudi Arabia- Japan Symposium. *Proceedings of the New Attempt at Improvement and Rehabilitation of the Desert Environment: C-1-1 – C-1-5*.
- Tukey, R.B., and E.L. Schoff, 1963. Influence of different mulching materials upon the soil environment. *Proceedings of the American Society of Horticultural Science*, 82: 68-76.
- Wilén, C.A., U.K. Schuch, C.L. Elmore, 1999. Mulches and subirrigation control weeds in container production. *Journal Environ Hort.*, 17(4):174-180.
- Wofford, D.J. and M.D. Orzolek, 1993. No irrigating or weeding for ten years. In: *American Vegetable Grower*, November Issue. pp. 30-32.