INVESTIGATION OF THE AGRONOMIC AND PHYSIOLOGICAL RESPONSES OF COWPEA VARIETIES 'MI-35' AND 'BOMBAY COWPEA' TO MOISTURE STRESS AT SELECTED GROWTH STAGES

633.330 t.

PERMANENT REFERENCE

KALPANA BALAKRISHNAN NAIDU

By

A RESEARCH REPORT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENT OF THE ADVANCED COURSE

IN

PLANT PHYSIOLOGY

FOR THE AWARD OF

THE DEGREE OF THE BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN AGRICULTURE

FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE

EASTERN UNIVERSITY, SRILANKA



FAG145 Project Report Library - EUSL 2002

APPROVED BY

Head / Agronomy

Dr. Mrs. T. Mahendran Head/ Agronomy Faculty of Agriculture Eastern university Chenkalady Sri lanka

Date:....

Dr. (Mrs) T. Mahendran HEAD Dept. of Agronomy Faculty of Agriculture Eastern University, Sri Lanka.

> FROCESSED Main Library, EUSL

Supervisor

48949

Mr. S. Mahendren Lecturer Faculty of Agriculture Eastern University Chenkalady Sri Lanka

Date: 18/02/2003

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted in the Green house of Agronomy farm of the Eastern University, Srilanka to determine the Agronomic and Physiological responses of cowpea varieties 'MI-35' and 'Bombay cowpea' to moisture stress at the vegetative, flowering and pod development stages of the crop. The experiment was layed out in a spilt plot design with four treatments and four replications.

Moisture stress was imposed for different treatments for a period of 12 days at the above growth stages. Moisture stress treatments was imposed by withholding water completely at once. The control plants were regularly watered at four day interval. Moisture stress reduced the leaf area of cowpea and the leaf area was greatly reduced when the stress was imposed at the vegetative stage of the crop compared to the other growth stages. There was no complete recovery in the leaf area of plants after rewatering.

Stomatal resistance(RS) was significantly higher whereas Transpiration rate (TR), Leaf water potential(LWP) and Relative water, content(RWC) were significantly lower than their control values irrespective of the growth stages. The highest RS was observed at the pod developmental stage and the lowest was observed at the vegetative stage. There was not much difference in the TR, LWP and RWC values of plant at different growth stages.

There were no significant difference in the Harvest Index of these plants and the germination percentage of seeds when the stress was imposed at the above growth stages. Moisture stress reduced the yield of cowpea and the reduction was highest when the stress was imposed at the flowering stage.

I

CONTENTS

D	The second se	T
P.9.0	SA I	NO
1 42		10.

ABSTRACT		I
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT		11
CONTENTS		111
LIST OF FIGURES		VI
LIST OF TABLES		VII
LIST OF PLATES		VIII
CHAPTER 1 Introduction		1
CHAPTER 2 Review of literature		5
2.1 Effect of water deficit on plant growth		7
2.2 Cell division and enlargement		7
2.3 Differentiation		9
2.4 Root –shoot rations		9
2.5 Reproductive growth	*	10
2.6 Physiological response to water stress	1	10
2.6.1 Stomatal resistance	1	10
2.6.2 Transpiration ratio		12
2.63 Relative water content		13
2.64 Leaf water potential		14
2.7 Agronomic response		14
2.7.1 Leaf Area		14

2.7.2 Effiency of portioning		15
2.7.3 Implication to yield		16
2.7.4 Harvest Index		16
2.8 Cowpea		17
2.9 Botany		18
2.10 Seed Germination		19
2.11 Growth		20
2.12 Uses of cowpea		21
CHAPTER 3 Materials and methods		23
3.1 Location		23
3.2 Seeds		23
3.3 Treatments		23
3.4 Agronomic practice		24
3.4.1 Pot preparation	۶.	24
3.4.2 Seed treatment		24
3.4.3 Planting	λ,	24
3.4.4 Fertilizer	1	25
*3.4.5 Watering	1	25
3.4.6 Weed control		25
3.5 Experimental design		25
3.6 Soil moisture Measurement		25
3.7 Agronomic measurement		26
3.7.1 Leaf area		26

3.7.2 Total biomass		27
3.7.3 Seed germination Percentage		27
3.8 Physiological response		27
3.8.1 Diffusive resistance and t	ranspiration	27
3.8.2 Leaf water potential		27
3.8.3 Relative water content		27
3.9 Yield		28
CHAPTER 4 Results and discussion		29
4.1 General appearance of plant		29
4.2 Soil moisture characteristic curves		30
4.3 Agronomic response		32
4.3.1 Leaf area		32
4.4 Physiological response		33
4.5 Harvest index	8.	37
4.6 Yield		38
4.7 Germination percentage		39
1		
CONCLUSION	1	46
DEFEDANCE	3	47
KEFEKANCE		47

APPENDIX