

# Growth response of *Dracaena fragrans* and *Cordyline terminalis* to growing medium Olosunde, O. M<sup>1</sup>., Adeleke, A. M<sup>1</sup>., Amusat, A. S.<sup>2</sup> and Ogundiran, O. B<sup>1</sup>.

**ABSTRACT:** Dracaena fragrans and Cordyline terminalis are important hardy foliage house plants. The quality of potting media plays a significant role in the performance of indoor plants. Therefore, a study to examine response of D. fragrans and C. terminalis to different growing media was conducted at the Federal University of Agriculture Horticultural Nursery, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria in 2009 and 2010. Treatments consisted of Dracaena varieties (D. fragrans and C. terminalis) and growing media (topsoil, rice husk, sawdust, topsoil + rice husk, topsoil + sawdust, rice husk + sawdust) and (topsoil, sawdust, wood shavings, topsoil + sawdust, topsoil + wood-shavings, sawdust + wood shavings) for first and repeat trials respectively. Treatments were arranged in a completely randomized design and replicated three times. Data collected on plant height, number of leaves, leaf area, chlorophyll content, number and length of roots were subjected to analysis of variance. C. terminalis was taller with more (34) leaves and longer (52 cm) roots but low chlorophyll content compared to D fragrans. Homogenous topsoil medium was generally poorer in most of the parameters measured. Interactive effects of varieties and growing medium was significant (p = 0.05). Growth responses of both varieties suggested that rice husk + topsoil and sawdust + topsoil composite media are the best for growing potted D. fragrans and C. terminalis.

Key words: foliage house plants, chlorophyll content, alternative growth medium, potted plants

# INTRODUCTION

It is widely recognized today that ornamental plants within towns, cities, residential areas and even office environments provide important practical and ecological benefits to the environment. Production of floricultural crops had significant impacts on economic growth and development of some countries (Society of American Florist 2006; Fakayode *et al.*, 2008) and can contribute greatly to economic emancipation of Nigeria and sub sahara countries by creating jobs for youth and middle age men and women (Fakayode *et al.*, 2008).

Indoor plants have also been known to have a marked impact on human health and provide psychological benefits. A well planned and planted interior landscape encourages productive and effective activities and reduces aggressive tendencies. Dracaenas such as *Dracaena fragrans* and *Cordyline terminalis* are recognized worldwide for their attractive foliage colour, shape and their ability to reduce component of indoor air pollution and remove carbon (iv) oxide  $CO_2$  which is correlated with lower work performance from indoor areas (Terran *et al.*, 2007). NASA Clean Air Study shown that *D. deremensis* helps in removing chemicals such as Xylene, Toluene and Formaldehyde from the atmosphere, reduce airborne microbes and increase humidity (Wolverton, 1996). Hence, the increased use of potted ornamental plants as decorations in many offices and residential areas. The rhizome of the mature plant is very sweet and used as food and medicine.

Dracaena fragrans and Cordyline terminalis belongs to the family Agavaceae and are important plants widely use for interior decoration across the globe. They have upright multiple unbranched stems with rosettes of arching broad evergreen leaves which forms a heavy but graceful tropical clump. Dracaena fragrans, also known as corn plant, Chinese money tree or cornstalk dracaena is native to West Africa, Tanzania and Zambia. Leaf colour ranges from green to grey green with various white striped patterns

<sup>1</sup> Horticulture Department, Federal University of Agriculture, P.M.B. 2240, Abeokuta, Nigeria

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Institute of Agricultural Research and Training, Obafemi Awolowo University, PMB 5029, Moor Plantation, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria

<sup>\*</sup>Author for correspondence (*E-mail: olatundeolosunde@yahoo.com*)

available. It has rosettes of glossy, green leaves, broadly striped and banded with light green and yellow down the centre. Cornstalk Dracaena has white flowers that are highly fragrant, hence the specific name 'fragans'. While Cordyline is believed to originate from East Asia and Polynesia and are popular worldwide for their intense leaf colours and shape producing interest and contrasts even in deep shade. They have large lanceolate leaves that may be edged, striped or blotched with shades or red, white and yellow. Dracaenas are recognized worldwide for their attractive foliage colour and shape.

Numerous factors affects the growth and productivity of plants, but importance of a good growth medium for production of potted ornamental plants for interior and exterior decorations cannot be overemphasised (Habibah *et al.*, 2008). An effective growth media should provide anchorage to the plant; hold sufficient available nutrient; be porous and well drained; relatively low in soluble salts; standardized and uniform; free from harmful soil pests and pathogens; biologically and chemically stable. Field soils commonly used for growing ornamentals are generally unsatisfactory because soils do not provide the aeration, drainage and water holding capacity required in the containers.

To improve this situation an alternative media sources for potted ornamental plants could alleviate the challenges associated with topsoil in terms of its heterogeneity in physical and chemical properties, environmental degradation and provide growers with additional options when selecting media. There is the need to source an alternative potting material if meaningful progress is to be made in pot plant production in Nigeria (Bayeri and Mbah, 2006; Ekwu and Mbah, 2001). The use of these readily available local materials and residues provides environmental benefits as ecosystem damage caused by soil or peat extraction is avoided and the impact of residue accumulation is minimized (Raviv et al., 1986). There are also economic benefits as the use of these residues means lower costs than conventional materials (Ingelmo et al., 1998).

Dracaena fragrans and Cordyline terminalis have become increasingly popular as interior and exterior ornamental plants because of their durability, versatility and retention of form and leaf colours. This study therefore investigated the effects of topsoil, wood shavings, sawdust and their mixtures on rooting characteristics and seedling growth of Dracaena fragrans and Cordyline terminalis.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Experiment was conducted at the Horticultural Nursery of the University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria situated in the rain forest-savanna transition zone (3°25'E and 7°25'N) between June, 2010 and February 2011. Treatments composed of two Dracaena varieties (Dracaena fragrans and Cordyline terminalis) and six growth media (topsoil, rice husk, sawdust, topsoil + rice husk, topsoil + sawdust, rice husk + sawdust) and (topsoil, sawdust, wood shavings, topsoil + sawdust, topsoil + wood-shavings, sawdust + wood shavings) for first and repeat trials respectively. The media components were mixed on equal volume (v/v) basis. Stem cuttings of *Dracaena* fragrans and Cordyline terminalis with lengths ranged from 15 cm - 20 cm were sourced from matured stock plants. The experiments were laid out in a Completely Randomized Design (CRD) with three (3) replicates. One cane cutting from each of the two dracaena varieties was grown in 7 litre plastic pots filled with growing media up to the 5 litre mark. Data were collected on number of roots per cutting, length of longest root, plant height, number of leaves, leaf area, and chlorophyll content (SPAG 502).

**Leaf area:** Non destructive sampling method was used for leaf area estimation. For each plant type, area of 100 leaves of varying sizes, from recently matured to fully matured leaves were determined by graph paper tracing method. The midrib length  $(X_1)$  and leaf breath  $(X_2)$  were measured and the product of length and breadth  $(X_3)$  for each leaf were determined. Leaf area as determined was regressed on each of these linear measurements, using two linear equations; Y = a + bX and Y = bX to describe the relationship between the leaf area and the linear measurements. The following equations were obtained;

### Dracaena fragrans

| Equation 1                         | Equation 2                     |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| $Y = -71.95 + 6.905X_1 r^2 = 0.96$ | $Y = 5.302X_1 r^2 = 0.91$      |
| $Y = -281.9 + 65.99X_2 r^2 = 0.81$ | $Y = 29.06X_2 r^2 = 0.55$      |
| $Y = 14.12 + 0.613X_3 r^2 = 0.97$  | $Y = 0.649 X_3^{-} r^2 = 0.97$ |

#### **Cordyline terminalis**

| Equation 1                         | Equation 2                 |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| $Y = -115.2 + 8.908X_1 r^2 = 0.96$ | $Y = 5.038 X_1 r^2 = 0.77$ |
| $Y = -150.7 + 42.37X_2 r^2 = 0.94$ | $Y = 21.03X_2 r^2 = 0.70$  |
| $Y = 1.163 + 0.684X_3 r^2 = 0.99$  | $Y = 0.689 X_3 r^2 = 0.99$ |

Linear equations Y = 0.649X ( $r^2 = 0.97$ ) and Y = 0.689X ( $r^2 = 0.99$ ), where  $X = L \times B$  with reasonable reliability and accuracy were used for the final leaf

area determination of Dracaena fragrans and Cordyline terminalis, respectively. Data on all the parameters measured were subjected to Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and treatment means separated using Fisher's Least Significance Difference (LSD) test at 5% probability level.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The results of chemical analysis of growing media show that N content of topsoil differed compared to sawdust, wood shavings or rice husk (Table 1). Topsoil had less quantities of both macro and micro nutrient elements but adequate for growth and maintenance of dracaenas.

The results revealed that variation among the growing media significantly influenced growth and appearance of Dracaena fragrans and Cordyline terminalis. The tallest height was observed in C. terminalis planted in topsoil than those in sawdust and

D. Fragrans in sawdust, rice husk + sawdust and rice husk only were the shortest (Table 2). The differences in height of C. terminalis planted in topsoil, topsoil +rice husk, topsoil + sawdust, rice husk + sawdust and rice husk and D. fragrans in topsoil, topsoil + rice husk, topsoil + sawdust, and rice husk + sawdust was insignificant (p=0.05). Significant effect of growing media on height was very pronounced at 16 WAP. However, *C. terminalis* was consistently taller than *D*. fragrans at 4, 8 and 12, except at 16 WAP, indicating that the former had early growth and probably establishment than the later which catches up with the former as the experiment progressed.

In the first trial, there were no differences in the number of leaves per plant among the treatments. However, C. terminalis planted in topsoil + sawdust medium produced highest number of leaves, followed by those in either topsoil only or topsoil + wood shavings while D. fragrans in sawdust, wood shavings,

|               | Table 1           Chemical properties of the growing media |          |          |             |             |       |             |             |             |             |  |
|---------------|--|----------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
|               |  |          |          |             |             |       |             |             |             | Γ.          |  |
| Growing media | N<br>(%)   | Р<br>(%) | K<br>(%) | Mg<br>mg/kg | Ca<br>mg/kg | (%)   | Cu<br>mg/kg | Mn<br>mg/kg | Zn<br>mg/kg | Fe<br>mg/kg |  |
| Topsoil       | 0.15   | 0.16     | 0.16     | 890         | 382         | 0.32  | 0.22        | 14.19       | 1.44        | 18.38       |  |
| Sawdust       | 1.06   | 0.75     | 0.07     | 1260        | 6050        | 33.01 | 0.04        | 26.0        | 12.6        | 1239        |  |
| Wood shavings | 1.07   | 0.46     | 0.06     | 930         | 3825        | 21.12 | 0.05        | 36.3        | 42.00       | 4009        |  |
| Rice husk     | 1.02   | 0.36     | 0.20     | 1295.0      | 333.0       | 0.14  | 38.0        | 62.9        | 346         | 1078        |  |

|  |                              |  | 1113  |  |   |   |   |  |  |
|--|------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| (%)  | (%)                          | (%)  | mg/kg   | mg/kg  | (%)   | mg/kg   | mg/kg   | mg/kg  | mg/kg  |
| 0.15   | 0.16                         | 0.16   | 890   | 382  | 0.32  | 0.22  | 14.19   | 1.44   | 18.38  |
| 1.06   | 0.75                         | 0.07   | 1260  | 6050   | 33.01   | 0.04  | 26.0  | 12.6   | 1239   |
| 1.07   | 0.46                         | 0.06   | 930   | 3825   | 21.12   | 0.05  | 36.3  | 42.00  | 4009   |
| 1.02   | 0.36                         | 0.20   | 1295.0  | 333.0  | 0.14  | 38.0  | 62.9  | 346  | 1078   |
|  |                              |  | Tabl  | • <b>?</b>   |   |   |   |  |  |
| I able 2         Height (cm) of Dracaena fragrans and Cordyline terminalis as influenced by growing medium |                              |  |   |  |   |   |   |  |  |
| <br>   | 0.15<br>1.06<br>1.07<br>1.02 | $\begin{array}{cccc} 0.15 & 0.16 \\ 1.06 & 0.75 \\ 1.07 & 0.46 \\ 1.02 & 0.36 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0.15 & 0.16 & 0.16 \\ 1.06 & 0.75 & 0.07 \\ 1.07 & 0.46 & 0.06 \\ 1.02 & 0.36 & 0.20 \end{array}$ | 0.15 0.16 0.16 890<br>1.06 0.75 0.07 1260<br>1.07 0.46 0.06 930<br>1.02 0.36 0.20 1295.0<br>Tabl | 0.15 0.16 0.16 890 382<br>1.06 0.75 0.07 1260 6050<br>1.07 0.46 0.06 930 3825<br>1.02 0.36 0.20 1295.0 333.0<br>Table 2 | 0.15         0.16         0.16         890         382         0.32           1.06         0.75         0.07         1260         6050         33.01           1.07         0.46         0.06         930         3825         21.12           1.02         0.36         0.20         1295.0         333.0         0.14 | 0.15         0.16         0.16         890         382         0.32         0.22           1.06         0.75         0.07         1260         6050         33.01         0.04           1.07         0.46         0.06         930         3825         21.12         0.05           1.02         0.36         0.20         1295.0         333.0         0.14         38.0 | 0.15       0.16       0.16       890       382       0.32       0.22       14.19         1.06       0.75       0.07       1260       6050       33.01       0.04       26.0         1.07       0.46       0.06       930       3825       21.12       0.05       36.3         1.02       0.36       0.20       1295.0       333.0       0.14       38.0       62.9 | 0.15         0.16         0.16         890         382         0.32         0.22         14.19         1.44           1.06         0.75         0.07         1260         6050         33.01         0.04         26.0         12.6           1.07         0.46         0.06         930         3825         21.12         0.05         36.3         42.00           1.02         0.36         0.20         1295.0         333.0         0.14         38.0         62.9         346 |

| Treatments    |                       | Weeks after planting |             |       |       |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|--|--|
|               |                       |                      | First trial |       |       | Second trial |       |       |       |  |  |
|               |                       | 4                    | 8           | 12    | 16    | 4            | 8     | 12    | 16    |  |  |
| D. fragrans   | Topsoil               | 0.00                 | 10.93       | 22.17 | 30.27 | 0.00         | 3.10  | 6.10  | 7.33  |  |  |
|               | Rice husk             | 0.00                 | 8.17        | 15.77 | 24.07 |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|               | Sawdust               | 0.00                 | 4.33        | 10.70 | 17.80 | 0.00         | 3.60  | 9.33  | 11.00 |  |  |
|               | Wood shavings         |                      |             |       |       | 0.00         | 4.37  | 10.00 | 11.67 |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Rice husk     | 0.00                 | 6.16        | 15.97 | 30.87 |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Sawdust       | 0.00                 | 7.87        | 17.33 | 31.40 | 0.00         | 3.33  | 10.67 | 12.33 |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Wood shavings |                      |             |       |       | 0.00         | 4.00  | 10.00 | 10.67 |  |  |
|               | Rice husk+Sawdust     | 0.00                 | 7.33        | 14.40 | 17.27 |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|               | Sawdust+Wood shavings |                      |             |       |       | 0.00         | 4.00  | 9.67  | 12.00 |  |  |
| C. terminalis | Topsoil               | 1.13                 | 25.47       | 36.83 | 50.80 | 4.67         | 8.50  | 13.67 | 18.67 |  |  |
|               | Rice husk             | 2.33                 | 15.77       | 22.57 | 29.57 |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|               | Sawdust               | 0.00                 | 20.30       | 23.57 | 26.13 | 3.87         | 7.67  | 13.33 | 16.00 |  |  |
|               | Wood shavings         |                      |             |       |       | 3.83         | 6.63  | 11.33 | 13.67 |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Rice husk     | 1.70                 | 17.77       | 25.23 | 34.30 |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Sawdust       | 2.63                 | 16.83       | 23.40 | 29.43 | 3.83         | 8.33  | 12.67 | 15.33 |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Wood shavings |                      |             |       |       | 4.33         | 9.90  | 14.00 | 14.33 |  |  |
|               | Rice husk+Sawdust     | 0.00                 | 19.67       | 6.33  | 34.17 |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|               | Sawdust+Wood shavings |                      |             |       |       | 5.00         | 10.43 | 14.67 | 16.00 |  |  |
|               | LSD(Plant type X      |                      |             |       |       |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|               | growing media)        | ns                   | 12.99       | 18.93 | 21.95 | 1.23         | 2.57  | 3.71  | 3.93  |  |  |
|               | LSD (Plant type)      | 1.25                 | 5.31        | 7.73  | ns    | 0.50         | 1.05  | 1.52  | 1.61  |  |  |
|               | LSD (growing media)   | Ns                   | ns          | ns    | 15.52 | Ns           | ns    | ns    | ns    |  |  |

LSD = Least Significant Difference at 5% probability level, ns = not significant

topsoil + sawdust topsoil + wood shavings had the least number of leaves (Table 3). Generally, *C. terminalis* produced more leaves than *D. fragrans* at 4 and 16 WAP. Plants in topsoil + sawdust or wood shavings produced the highest and least number of leaves, respectively.

The differences in the leaf area of C. terminalis and D. fragrans in all the growing media was insignificant (p<0.05) in both trials, except at 12 WAP in the second trial where *D. fragrans* planted in topsoil, sawdust or wood shavings had the least leaf area values (Table 4). Mean effect of growing media on leaf area was significant only at 8WAP in the second trial, plants in topsoil +wood shavings, topsoil + sawdust, wood shavings + sawdust and sawdust had broader leaves than other treatments. Similarly C. terminalis produced wider total leaf area than D. fragrans at 8 and 4, 8 and 12 WAP in the first and second trials, respectively. The findings from this study agrees with earlier studies by Bugbee, (2002) and Chen et al., (2002) that base materials for potting media influenced growth of ornamental foliage plants probably due to variations in their physcio-chemical properties. Similar observation was made by Bayeri and Mbah, (2006) that plants could respond differently to variation in physio-chemical properties of base materials used for composting growing media.

Results from Table 5 show that growing media significantly (p < 0.05) affected rooting characteristics, C. terminalis raised in topsoil + sawdust had more roots, followed by those in topsoil, rice husk, sawdust and D. fragrans in rice husk but fewer roots observed in sawdust medium. However in the second trial, C terminalis had similar number of roots across the growing media but statistically higher than roots produced by D. fragrans. Generally C. terminalis produced more roots than D. fragrans with highest number of roots recorded in plants grown in rice husk medium, particularly the first trial. C. terminalis that grew in topsoil, rice husk, sawdust, topsoil + sawdust, rice husk+ sawdust and D. fragrans rice husk, topsoil, topsoil + sawdust and rice husk+ sawdust treatments had longer roots. However in the second trial, longer roots was observed in C. terminalis planted in wood shavings, sawdust + wood shavings, topsoil + wood shavings and sawdust media than other treatments. D. fragrans planted in topsoil medium had the shortest roots. Growing media significantly affected root growth and elongation, longest roots recorded in plants raised in wood shavings, sawdust + wood shavings, followed by sawdust only, then topsoil + wood shavings and then topsoil medium. Also, roots produced by C. terminalis were longer than those by D. fragrans.

| Treatments    |                       | Weeks after planting |             |      |       |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------|------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|--|--|
|               |                       |                      | First trial |      |       | Second trial |       |       |       |  |  |
|               |                       | 4                    | 8           | 12   | 16    | 4            | 8     | 12    | 16    |  |  |
| D. fragrans   | Topsoil               | 0.33                 | 3.67        | 7.33 | 11.00 | 0.00         | 1.67  | 7.67  | 14.00 |  |  |
|               | Rice husk             | 0.00                 | 4.33        | 7.00 | 9.67  |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|               | Sawdust               | 0.33                 | 1.33        | 3.67 | 6.00  | 0.00         | 2.67  | 12.67 | 17.00 |  |  |
|               | Wood shavings         |                      |             |      |       | 0.00         | 3.00  | 11.67 | 13.67 |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Rice husk     | 0.00                 | 2.67        | 7.33 | 11.00 |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Sawdust       | 0.00                 | 3.33        | 6.67 | 11.67 | 0.00         | 2.00  | 11.33 | 13.33 |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Wood shavings |                      |             |      |       | 0.00         | 2.33  | 7.67  | 9.33  |  |  |
|               | Rice husk+Sawdust     | 0.00                 | 3.00        | 5.00 | 6.00  |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|               | Sawdust+Wood shavings |                      |             |      |       | 0.00         | 2.67  | 12.67 | 13.67 |  |  |
| C. terminalis | Topsoil               | 0.00                 | 5.00        | 9.33 | 13.67 | 4.67         | 9.67  | 15.67 | 23.00 |  |  |
|               | Rice husk             | 0.33                 | 4.00        | 5.33 | 7.67  |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|               | Sawdust               | 0.00                 | 4.67        | 6.33 | 8.00  | 5.67         | 11.33 | 16.00 | 17.67 |  |  |
|               | Wood shavings         |                      |             |      |       | 5.00         | 9.67  | 13.67 | 14.33 |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Rice husk     | 0.67                 | 4.00        | 6.33 | 7.67  |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Sawdust       | 0.33                 | 4.67        | 7.67 | 10.33 | 9.00         | 14.67 | 20.33 | 29.67 |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Wood shavings |                      |             |      |       | 7.33         | 12.33 | 18.00 | 23.00 |  |  |
|               | Rice husk+Sawdust     | 0.00                 | 4.33        | 7.00 | 10.00 |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|               | Sawdust+Wood shavings |                      |             |      |       | 4.33         | 9.00  | 14.00 | 18.33 |  |  |
|               | LSD(Plant type X      |                      |             |      |       |              |       |       |       |  |  |
|               | growing media)        | Ns                   | ns          | Ns   | ns    | 3.20         | 4.03  | 6.31  | 9.28  |  |  |
|               | LSD (Plant type)      | Ns                   | ns          | Ns   | ns    | 2.26         | ns    | ns    | 6.56  |  |  |
|               | LSD (growing media)   | Ns                   | ns          | Ns   | ns    | 1.31         | 1.65  | 2.58  | 3.79  |  |  |

 Table 3

 Number of leaves of Dracaena fragrans and Cordyline terminalis as influenced by growing medium

LSD = Least Significant Difference at 5% probability level, ns = not significant

|               | Leaf area (cm <sup>2</sup> ) of Dracaen | a fragrans | and Cordy   | line termina | <i>ilis</i> as influ | enced by g | rowing mee | dium     |       |  |  |  |
|---------------|---|------------|-------------|--------------|----------------------|------------|------------|----------|-------|--|--|--|
| Treatments    | Weeks after planting                    |            |             |              |                      |            |            |          |       |  |  |  |
|               |   |            | First trial |              |                      |            | Seco       | nd trial |       |  |  |  |
|               |   | 4          | 8           | 12           | 16                   | 4          | 8          | 12       | 16    |  |  |  |
| D. fragrans   | Topsoil                                 | 0.00       | 10.44       | 26.86        | 57.96                | 0.00       | 5.22       | 30.49    | 49.42 |  |  |  |
| Ũ             | Rice husk                               | 0.00       | 5.23        | 18.00        | 52.89                |            |            |          |       |  |  |  |
|               | Sawdust                                 | 0.00       | 4.02        | 12.49        | 25.79                | 0.00       | 10.06      | 35.88    | 50.92 |  |  |  |
|               | Wood shavings                           |            |             |              |                      | 0.00       | 7.82       | 34.20    | 61.81 |  |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Rice husk                       | 0.00       | 3.35        | 14.01        | 55.47                |            |            |          |       |  |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Sawdust                         | 0.00       | 4.28        | 20.40        | 51.61                | 0.00       | 8.57       | 50.17    | 76.75 |  |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Wood shavings                   |            |             |              |                      | 0.00       | 6.97       | 47.62    | 67.33 |  |  |  |
|               | Rice husk+Sawdust                       | 0.00       | 7.47        | 24.54        | 34.34                |            |            |          |       |  |  |  |
|               | Sawdust+Wood shavings                   |            |             |              |                      | 0.00       | 11.17      | 54.91    | 73.26 |  |  |  |
| C. terminalis | Topsoil                                 | 0.29       | 15.20       | 27.41        | 40.43                | 1.84       | 18.92      | 55.43    | 72.77 |  |  |  |
|               | Rice husk                               | 0.39       | 16.50       | 27.78        | 43.34                |            |            |          |       |  |  |  |
|               | Sawdust                                 | 0.00       | 12.18       | 19.83        | 25.24                | 4.89       | 18.83      | 56.10    | 74.07 |  |  |  |
|               | Wood shavings                           |            |             |              |                      | 3.86       | 17.98      | 49.30    | 67.23 |  |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Rice husk                       | 14.83      | 10.50       | 21.92        | 36.25                |            |            |          |       |  |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Sawdust                         | 0.00       | 9.91        | 17.19        | 26.83                | 3.67       | 18.90      | 54.40    | 74.37 |  |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Wood shavings                   |            |             |              |                      | 5.02       | 21.62      | 56.63    | 75.43 |  |  |  |
|               | Rice husk+Sawdust                       | 0.00       | 11.67       | 22.20        | 31.40                |            |            |          |       |  |  |  |
|               | Sawdust+Wood shavings                   |            |             |              |                      | 4.77       | 24.09      | 57.30    | 72.83 |  |  |  |
|               | LSD(Plant type X                        | Ns         | ns          | Ns           | ns                   | 2.89       | 6.33       | 21.39    | 28.74 |  |  |  |
|               | growing media)                          |            |             |              |                      |            |            |          |       |  |  |  |
|               | LSD (Plant type)                        | Ns         | 5.67        | Ns           | ns                   | 1.18       | 2.58       | 8.7      | ns    |  |  |  |
|               | LSD (growing media)                     | Ns         | ns          | Ns           | ns                   | ns         | 4.48       | Ns       | ns    |  |  |  |

Table 4
 Leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>) of *Dracaena fragrans* and *Cordyline terminalis* as influenced by growing medium

LSD = Least Significant Difference at 5% probability level, ns = not significant

Table 5

| Chlorophyll content and rooting characteristics of Dracaena fragrans and Cordyline terminalis as |  |
|--|--|
| influenced by source of fertilizer and growing medium  |  |

|               |                       | First                  | trial              |                        | Second trial           |                    |                        |  |  |
|---------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| Treatments    |                       | Chlorophyll<br>content | Number<br>of roots | Root<br>length<br>(cm) | Chlorophyll<br>content | Number<br>of roots | Root<br>length<br>(cm) |  |  |
| Plant type    | Growing media         |                        |                    |                        |                        |                    |                        |  |  |
| D. fragrans   | Topsoil               | 48.63                  | 14.00              | 19.27                  | 21.40                  | 4.00               | 12.17                  |  |  |
| 0             | Rice husk             | 43.47                  | 24.33              | 27.40                  |                        |                    |                        |  |  |
|               | Sawdust               | 36.43                  | 0.67               | 2.90                   | 20.23                  | 9.00               | 31.80                  |  |  |
|               | Wood shavings         |                        |                    |                        | 29.13                  | 10.00              | 37.80                  |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Rice husk     | 50.37                  | 8.67               | 11.53                  |                        |                    |                        |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Sawdust       | 53.20                  | 12.33              | 24.30                  | 33.60                  | 6.33               | 23.07                  |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Wood shavings |                        |                    |                        | 27.13                  | 5.00               | 16.73                  |  |  |
|               | Rice husk+Sawdust     | 33.20                  | 8.33               | 17.83                  |                        |                    |                        |  |  |
|               | Sawdust+Wood shavings |                        |                    |                        | 19.17                  | 8.33               | 30.20                  |  |  |
| C. terminalis | Topsoil               | 54.67                  | 30.00              | 41.47                  | 36.53                  | 36.33              | 50.00                  |  |  |
|               | Rice husk             | 27.13                  | 30.00              | 19.13                  |                        |                    |                        |  |  |
|               | Sawdust               | 23.73                  | 28.67              | 38.17                  | 32.90                  | 37.33              | 52.00                  |  |  |
|               | Wood shavings         |                        |                    |                        | 33.27                  | 32.00              | 64.33                  |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Rice husk     | 39.30                  | 9.67               | 12.20                  |                        |                    |                        |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Sawdust       | 36.03                  | 37.67              | 36.67                  | 35.43                  | 36.67              | 41.00                  |  |  |
|               | Topsoil+Wood shavings |                        |                    |                        | 31.93                  | 39.00              | 50.73                  |  |  |
|               | Rice husk+Sawdust     | 30.07                  | 12.33              | 21.20                  |                        |                    |                        |  |  |
|               | Sawdust+Wood shavings |                        |                    |                        | 27.90                  | 39.67              | 57.73                  |  |  |
|               | LSD(Plant type X      |                        |                    |                        |                        |                    |                        |  |  |
|               | growing media)        | 21.10                  | 24.31              | 27.28                  | 13.17                  | 10.02              | 13.97                  |  |  |
|               | LSD (Plant type)      | 8.61                   | 9.33               | Ns                     | 5.38                   | 4.09               | 5.70                   |  |  |
|               | LSD (growing media)   | 14.92                  | 17.19              | Ns                     | 9.31                   | Ns                 | 9.88                   |  |  |

LSD = Least Significant Difference at 5% probability level, ns = not significant

Results on the chlorophyll content among the treatments presented in Table 5 showed a least value for the chlorophyll content when *C. terminalis* and *D. fragrans* were planted in rice husk + sawdust and sawdust + wood shavings and sawdust only in the first and second trials, respectively. Effect of growing media on the chlorophyll content indicated a higher value in topsoil +sawdust medium and least in wood shavings + sawdust. This suggests that chlorophyll synthesis by both varieties is dependent on some specific attributes of base materials used for formulating potting media in this study which could have significant effects on the plants growth and appearance.

# CONCLUSION

The results from this study showed that there was marked difference in the establishment and growth of *C. terminalis* and *D. fragrans*. Mixing rice husk or sawdust with topsoil was the best alternative to homogenous topsoil only for sustainable production of potted *C. terminalis* and *D. fragrans*. The use of rice husk + topsoil or sawdust + topsoil composite medium could mitigate environmental concerns associated with removal of topsoil and disposal of rice husk and sawdust. Therefore, it is recommended for optimum growth of potted *C. terminalis* and *D. fragrans* 

# REFERENCES

- Bayeri, K. P. and Mbah, B. N. (2006), Effects of soiless and soil-based nursery media on seedling emergence, growth and response to water stress of African breadfruit (Treculia Africana Decne), African Journal of Biotechnology Vol. 5 (15), 1405-1410.
- Blanchard, M.G and Runkle, E.S. (2008) Container Opacity and Media Components Influence Rooting of Potted

Phalaenopsis and Doritaenopsis Orchids. Acta Horticuturae 788: 115-120.

- Bugbee, G. J. (2002), Growth of ornamental plants in container media amended with biosolids composts. *Composts Sci. Util.* 10: 92-98.
- Chen, J., McConnell, D.B., Robinson, C.A., Caldwell, R.D and Huang Y. (2002), Production of tropical ornamental foliage plants grown in container substrates amended with composts. *Composts. Sci. Util.* 10: 217-225.
- Ekwu, L. G. and Mbah, B. N., (2001), Effect of varying levels of Nitrogen fertilizer and some potting media on the growth and flowering response of Marigold (*Tagets erecta* L). *Nigerian Journal of Horticultural Science Vol. 5: pp.* 105–109.
- Fakayode, B.S., Adewumi, M.O., Rahji, M.A.Y and Jolaiya, J.A (2008), Variability and resource use in ornamenta plant nursery business in Nigeria. *European Journal of Social Sciences Vol.* 6 (4): 19-28.
- Habibah. S. A., Al-Shatti A. A. and Suresh N. (2008), Effect of Growing Media on Growth and Flowering Patterns of *Gardenia Jasminoides* under Arid Conditions. *European Journal of Scientific Research Vol.24 No.1, pp.* 69-73.
- Ingelmo, F., Canet, R., Ibanez, M.A., Pomares, F., Garcýa, J. (1998), Use of MSW compost, dried sewage sludge and other wastes as partial substitutes for peat and soil. *Bioresour. Technol.* 63, pp. 123–129.
- Raviv, M, Chen, Y, Inbar, Y, (1986), Peat and peat substitutes as growth media for container-grown plants. Martinus Nijhoff Publisher, Dordrech, pp. 257–287.
- Society of American Florist (2006), Overview of the Floriculture Industry. Society of American Florist Bulletin, 2006.
- Terran *et al.*, (2007), Use of living pot-plants to cleanse indoor air. Research Review.
- Wolverton, B.C. (1996), How to Grow Fresh Air. New York: Penguin Books.