

## Original Research Article

# The Effect of Different Organic Nutrients on Some Quality Properties of Popcorn (*Zea mays L. everta*)

Haktan CIHANGIR<sup>1</sup>, Abdullah OKTEM<sup>2\*</sup>

Corresponding author : [aoktem@harran.edu.tr](mailto:aoktem@harran.edu.tr), Tel.: +90-414-3183686; Fax: +90-414-3183682

<sup>1</sup>Type Agriculture and Rural Development Support Institution, Mardin, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>University of Harran, Faculty of Agriculture, Department of Field Crops, Sanliurfa, Turkey

### ABSTRACT

**Aims:** Study was aimed to find out the effect of different organic nutrients on some quality properties of popcorn.

**Study design:** Trial was designed in complete randomized block design with three replications. Ant-Cin-98 popcorn cultivar was used in the study. Each parcel comprised 4 lines. The planting was made into a depth of 5-6 cm along the lines 5 meters long with a row spacing of 70 cm and intra row of 20 cm.

**Place and Duration of Study:** This study was conducted in Diyarbakır - Cermik conditions of Turkey between 2010 and 2011.

**Methodology:** The effect of conventional and fifteen different organic materials (peat, compost, cattle manure, chicken manure, horse manure, sheep manure, pigeon manure, vermicompost, seaweed + cattle manure, compost + humic acid, cattle manure + humic acid, chicken manure + humic acid, horse manure + humic acid, sheep manure + humic acid, peat + humic acid) to some quality parameters of popcorn were evaluated in the study.

**Results:** According to the investigated results, the highest and the lowest values were ranked between 19.98% (peat + humic acid) and 17.26% (vermicompost) for cob ratio, 138.65 g (seaweed + cattle manure) and 122.48 g (chicken manure) for 1000-kernel weight, 81.29 kg hl<sup>-1</sup> (horse manure + humic acid) and 75.62 kg hl<sup>-1</sup> (vermicompost) for test weight, 19.71 cm<sup>3</sup> g<sup>-1</sup> (peat) and 17.17 cm<sup>3</sup> g<sup>-1</sup> (sheep manure + humic acid), for popping volume 5.92% (peat) and 3.65% (horse manure + humic acid) for number of unpopped kernel.

**Conclusion:** Higher values obtained from organic nutrient sources than conversional application in all tested quality parameters. The implementation of organic fertilizers together with humic acid in popcorn produced better results in comparison to alone implementation of organic fertilizers. Also it was determined that use of natural enemies of *Trichogramma* spp against corn borer can be possible without any chemicals.

**Keywords:** Organic nutrients, popcorn, popping volume, test weight

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The corn is also used in human nutrition directly and indirectly in addition to the use as industrial raw material and animal feed in the world. Although dent corn (*Zea mays L. indentata*) varieties comprise the vast majority of corns grown both in world and in Turkey,

\* Tel.: +90 414 3183686; fax: +90 414 3183686.

E-mail address: [aoktem@harran.edu.tr](mailto:aoktem@harran.edu.tr).

25 no statistics **so far** related to the cultivation area, manufacture and consumption amount of  
26 popcorn (*Zea mays L. everta*) **is available** in Turkey. It is reported that planting is made  
27 around the provinces of Adana, Canakkale, Adapazari, Antalya, Isparta and Burdur, in  
28 Aegean and Mediterranean Regions of Turkey [1]. Consumption of popcorn is increasing  
29 every passing day in Turkey.

30 The sub type of corn having grains popped when heated is popcorn. Popcorn is directly used  
31 in human nutrition. It generates pressure inside the grain through expansion when the  
32 humidity in the endosperm is heated because its grain is hard, its hull is thick and  
33 impermeable. At the same time the starch in the endosperm transforms with the effect of  
34 heat. The hull can't resist this pressure and bursts by splitting suddenly. The volume of the  
35 grains burst expands and they are eaten by salting or adding oil. Its consumption rises also  
36 in Turkey because of low cost and easy to prepare with popping machines, in pans or pots.  
37 Popcorn is commonly consumed while watching cinema and soccer matches and television  
38 during winter months. Additionally, it is preferred much by children [2].

39 Nowadays environmental pollution has reached a significant level as a result of the use of  
40 synthetic and chemical inputs in excessive amounts due to the production increase within  
41 conventional agriculture system. Organic fertilizers/matters, which are essential inputs of  
42 organic agriculture systems that have become widespread in parallel with the interest of  
43 people in organic products, are made available for producers under a great variety of names  
44 and contents in the market. It is necessary to utilize these matters in various ways to prevent  
45 environmental pollution caused by wastes, and to enhance organic matter level of our soil.

46 Different results have been obtained in studies conducted in different parts of the world  
47 regarding the subject of the study. Anac and Okur [3] reported that application of Biofarm  
48 (certified organic fertilizer) and farm fertilizer as organic fertilizer (uncertified) to soil has led  
49 to significant increase in dry weight, mineral content and efficiency of corn compared to  
50 control. Yazici and Kaynak [4] reported that seaweed increases yield and quality in organic  
51 farming, regulate the growth of plants, increase resistance to pests and diseases, improves  
52 the structure of the soil. Seker and Ersoy [5] investigated the effects of different doses of  
53 compost, cattle manure, chicken manure and leonardit on the soil properties and the  
54 development of corn (*Zea mays L.*). They found as a result of the research that type and  
55 dose of used organic fertilizer affects soil properties and the corn's growth.

56 Shafiq et al. [6] stated that chicken manure affects positively some parameters such as plant  
57 height, seed number, 1000-kernel weight and grain yield values. Selcuk and Tufenkci [7]  
58 reported that increasing humic acid application provided significant increase in number of  
59 kernel per ear, ear length, plant height and 1000-kernel weight. Cengiz et al. [8] emphasized  
60 that effect of organic fertilizers on yield and quality of the corn plant were similar with  
61 chemical fertilizers.

62 In this study, it was aimed determining the effect of some organic nutritional sources on  
63 some quality properties of popcorn.  
64

## 65 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

### 66 **2.1. Material**

67 Experiment was conducted in Diyarbakır province Cermik district under second crop  
68 conditions. Ant-Cin-98 popcorn variety was used in the experiment. Organic nutrient sources  
69 were used in the study (Table 1). Amount of total pure nitrogen both conventional and  
70 organic growing were 17 kg da<sup>-1</sup> based on the regulation, principles and applications of

71 organic agriculture in Turkey [9]. According to nitrogen content of organic material, maximum  
 72 pure nitrogen amount ( $17 \text{ kg da}^{-1}$ ) was calculated for organic applications (Table 1). For  
 73 conventional applications total of  $17 \text{ kg da}^{-1}$  nitrogen,  $8 \text{ kg da}^{-1}$  phosphor and potassium (15-  
 74 15-15 NPK as bottom fertilizer and urea as top fertilizer) were given as pure per decare.  
 75 Nitrogen content of nutritional sources used in the study and the amount of fertilizer thrown  
 76 per decare were given in Table 1.

77 **Table 1. The nitrogen content of organic nutrient sources and applied amount**

	Nutritional Sources	N content (%)	The amount of applied ( $\text{kg da}^{-1}$ )
1	Conventional manure (urea)	46	$36.96 \text{ kg da}^{-1}$
2	Peat	1.2	$1416 \text{ kg da}^{-1}$
3	Compost	2.5	$680 \text{ kg da}^{-1}$
4	Cattle manure	3.5	$486 \text{ kg da}^{-1}$
5	Chicken manure	3.0	$567 \text{ kg da}^{-1}$
6	Horse manure	2.0	$850 \text{ kg da}^{-1}$
7	Sheep manure	2.0	$850 \text{ kg da}^{-1}$
8	Pigeon manure	6.0	$283 \text{ kg da}^{-1}$
9	Seaweed + Cattle manure	2.0 + 3.5	$51.5 \text{ kg da}^{-1} + 457 \text{ kg da}^{-1}$
10	Vermicompost	1.5	$1133 \text{ kg da}^{-1} + 140 \text{ g da}^{-1}$
11	Compost + Humic acid	2.5	$680 \text{ kg da}^{-1} + 140 \text{ g da}^{-1}$
12	Cattle manure + Humic acid	3.5	$486 \text{ kg da}^{-1} + 140 \text{ g da}^{-1}$
13	Chicken manure + Humic acid	3.0	$567 \text{ kg da}^{-1} + 140 \text{ g da}^{-1}$
14	Sheep manure + Humic acid	2.0	$850 \text{ kg da}^{-1} + 140 \text{ g da}^{-1}$
15	Peat + Humic acid	1.2	$1416 \text{ kg da}^{-1} + 140 \text{ g da}^{-1}$
16	Horse manure + Humic acid	2.0	$850 \text{ kg da}^{-1} + 140 \text{ g da}^{-1}$

78

79 **2.1.1. Climatic characteristics of the research area**

80 Climate values of 2010 and 2011 in which the research was conducted with long years were  
 81 given in Table 2. The average highest temperature ( $32.7^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) was observed in July, the lowest  
 82 temperature ( $12.0^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) in November between June-November months in 2010, and in 2011  
 83 the average highest temperature ( $31.5^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) in July, the lowest temperature ( $6.6^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) in  
 84 November in accordance with the data received from Diyarbakır Regional Directorate of  
 85 Meteorology. The highest value (61.8%) in terms of relative humidity occurred in October  
 86 2010, and the lowest value (22.3%) in August 2011. The water need of plants was met  
 87 through irrigation during the growing period.

88 **2.1.2. Soil characteristics of the research area**

89 Total salt content was found to be 0.03%, nitrogen content 1.19%, lime rate 9.8%,  
 90 phosphorus amount  $2.75 \text{ kg da}^{-1}$ , potassium amount  $82.05 \text{ kg da}^{-1}$  and soil pH 7.4 in the soil  
 91 sample taken from 30 cm soil depth in the place where trial was established in Diyarbakır  
 92 province Cermik district.

93 **Table 2. Rainfall, temperature and relative humidity values for 2010, 2011 and long**  
 94 **years in Diyarbakır province**

Months	Min. Temp. ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	Max. Temp. ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	Average Temp. ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	Rainfall (mm)	Relative humidity (%)
--------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------	-----------------------

June	2010	14.9	40.8	27.2	8.0	47.6
	2011	13.2	37.9	26.3	14.6	33.9
	Long years	16.9	33.7	26.3	7.2	36.0
July	2010	18.0	44.0	32.7	0.0	34.3
	2011	18.4	45.0	31.5	0.2	22.6
	Long years	21.7	38.5	31.2	0.7	27.0
August	2010	18.0	43.6	32.4	0.0	32.2
	2011	16.0	43.5	31.2	0.0	22.3
	Long years	21.0	38.1	30.3	0.3	27.0
September	2010	13.6	41.2	26.8	3.0	44.7
	2011	12.8	38.1	25.6	1.9	28.5
	Long years	16.0	33.1	24.8	2.6	31.0
October	2010	7.3	30.0	17.6	49.2	61.8
	2011	3.0	32.8	17.4	57.4	52.5
	Long years	10.1	25.3	17.2	30.8	48.0
November	2010	1.0	26.1	12.0	0.0	57.4
	2011	-4.7	19.9	6.6	104.0	61.1
	Long years	3.6	15.9	9.3	54.6	68.0

95 Resource: Anonymous [10].

## 96 2.2. Method

97 Before the starting of experiment, the trial area was planted with wheat in 2008 and 2009 for  
 98 making the area suitable for organic farming in which the trial would be established, and  
 99 wheat was cultivated and harvested without application of any chemical fertilizer and  
 100 agricultural pesticide. Physical and chemical properties of the trial area were determined by  
 101 taking soil sample from a depth of 0-30 cm on the trial area before planting.

102 The soil was made ready for planting by processing with goble-disc and then with disc-  
 103 harrow prior to planting. The trial was established with three replicates according to  
 104 randomized complete block experimental design. Each parcel comprised 4 lines. The  
 105 planting was made by hand into a depth of 5-6 cm along the lines 5 meters long with a row  
 106 spacing of 70 cm and intra row of 20 cm in 15-30 June. Most of the nutritional organic  
 107 sources were applied with planting. Also some part of seaweed manure was applied before  
 108 planting and the rest as foliar fertilizer in three times. An equal amount of water was given to  
 109 the parcels with sprinkler irrigation after planting for germination, and furrow irrigation  
 110 throughout the growing period due to lack of moisture in sufficient levels for output. A space  
 111 of 2 meters was left between parcels to hinder water passage between parcels and the  
 112 parcels were surrounded with berm.

113 Cultural measures (tractor and hand hoeing) were implemented to combat the weed.  
 114 Chemical pesticides were not used in the search, *Trichogramma sp.* predator that was  
 115 obtained from Adana Agricultural Research Institute Biological Control Unit was used within  
 116 scope of biological control against Corn Cob Worm which leads to great productivity losses  
 117 for corn plants. Values were taken from two rows in the middle after discarding 0.5m from  
 118 both beginnings and one rows situated at either sides of the parcel as edge effect during the  
 119 harvest between 20-25 September. Variance analysis was made with the values obtained by  
 120 using Totemstat-C software package, the significance of the differences between averages  
 121 were determined through Duncan multi comparison test [11]. In the study, the years were  
 122 subjected to variance analysis separately and jointly.

123 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

124

125 **3.1. Cob Ratio (%)**

126 Considering 2010-2011 year averages according to Table 3, cob ratio varied between  
127 percent 17.26-19.98 in different nutrient applications. The highest cob ratio value was  
128 determined to be 19.98% in peat + humic acid. The lowest cob ratio was obtained as  
129 17.26% from vermicompost application along combined averages in the trial.

130 **Table 3. Cob ratio (%) values found in popcorn grown using different nutritional**  
131 **sources and the groups formed according to Duncan Test**

<b>Nutritional Sources</b>	<b>2010<sup>ns</sup></b>	<b>2011<sup>ns</sup></b>	<b>Average<sup>‡</sup></b>
Conventional fertilizer	15.74	20.24	17.99 AB
Peat	14.44	22.40	18.42 AB
Compost	14.29	20.63	17.46 AB
Cattle manure	15.25	22.06	18.65 AB
Chicken manure	15.41	22.41	18.91 AB
Horse manure	15.37	20.01	17.69 AB
Sheep manure	15.46	19.39	17.43 AB
Pigeon manure	15.93	21.99	18.96 AB
Seaweed + cattle manure	15.73	24.16	19.95 A*
Vermicompost	15.30	19.21	17.26 B
Compost + humic acid	14.67	20.87	17.77 AB
Cattle manure + humic acid	15.50	22.92	19.21 A
Chicken manure+ humic acid	15.36	23.43	19.40 A
Sheep manure. + humic acid	15.71	22.14	18.92 AB
Peat + humic acid	15.51	24.45	19.98 A
Horse manure + humic acid	15.64	21.40	18.52 AB
<b>Average</b>	15.33 B	21.73 A	
<b>LSD</b>	Year: 2.014		
	2010-2011 Average nutritional sources: 2.539		

132 *\*There is no significant difference at 0.05 level according to Duncan Test among the*  
133 *averages falling within same letter group.*

134 *‡: P ≤ 0.01, †: P ≤ 0.05 ns: No significant*

135 **3.2. 1000-Kernel Weight (g)**

136 Considering 2010-2011 year averages according to Table 4, 1000-kernel weights varied  
137 between 122.48-138.65 g in different nutrient applications. While the highest 1000-kernel  
138 weight value was determined to be 138.65 g in seaweed manure + cattle manure, and  
139 afterwards this was followed by horse manure + humic acid (137.41) with sheep manure +  
140 humic acid (137.11) respectively. In the meantime, conventional fertilizer application ranked  
141 sixth among the applications with a 1000-kernel weight value of 132.41 g. The lowest 1000-  
142 kernel weight was obtained as 122.48 g from chicken manure application along combined  
143 averages in the trial. In terms of 1000-kernel weight, we can say that the abundance of all  
144 applications in second year compared to the first year resulted from both climate and  
145 environmental conditions and positive effect of nutritional sources.

146 The effect of nutritional sources plant on 1000-kernel weight in respect of corn plant was  
147 given by obtaining different results in different studies. Prasanna et al. [12] reported that they  
148 received the highest 1000-kernel weight from vermicompost in respect of corn plant, Shafiq

149 et al. [6] stated that chemical fertilizer yielded 1000-kernel weight higher than organic  
 150 fertilizers (chicken manure, farmyard manure, bio-manure).

151

152 **Table 4. 1000-kernel weight (g) values found in popcorn grown using different**  
 153 **nutritional sources and the groups formed according to Duncan Test**

<b>Nutritional Sources</b>	<b>2010<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>2011<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>Average<sup>†</sup></b>
Conventional fertilizer	123.38 a*	141.43 de	132.41 A-E
Peat	113.97 a-d	131.68 e	122.82 DE
Compost	105.78 cd	141.89 cde	123.84 CDE
Cattle manure	115.6 abc	144.02 bcd	129.81 A-E
Chicken manure	105.22 cd	139.73 de	122.48 E
Horse manure	117.10 ab	148.31 a-d	132.71 A-E
Sheep manure	118.27 ab	150.04 a-d	134.16 ABC
Pigeon manure	120.25 a	148.00 a-d	134.13 A-D
Seaweed + cattle manure	121.47 a	155.84 a	138.65 A
Vermicompost	104.40 d	148.73 a-d	126.56 B-E
Compost + humic acid	107.73 bcd	146.87 a-d	127.30 B-E
Cattle manure + humic acid	117.72 ab	148.64 a-d	133.18 A-E
Chicken manure+ humic acid	108.85 bcd	144.84 a-d	126.85 B-E
Sheep manure. + humic acid	120.30 a	153.92 ab	137.11 AB
Peat + humic acid	116.38 abc	143.64 cde	130.01 A-E
Horse manure + humic acid	121.00 a	153.82 abc	137.41 AB
<b>Average</b>	114.84 B	146.34 A	
	Year: 4.826		
<b>LSD</b>	2010 Nutritional sources: 10.021		
	2011 Nutritional sources: 10.175		
	2010-2011 Average nutritional sources: 9.841		

154 *\*There is no significant difference at 0.05 level according to Duncan Test among the*  
 155 *averages falling within same letter group.*

156 *†: P ≤ .01, ‡: P ≤ .05 ns: No significant*

157 Various results were obtained in different studies carried out related to 1000-kernel weight in  
 158 popcorn. Idikut et al. [13] 114.9-122.9 g; Ertas et al. [14] 54.8-64.6 g; Gokmen et al. [15]  
 159 129.0-213.0 g; Ozkan [16] 127.0-133.0 g; Tekkanat and Soylu [17] 114.68-175.93 g; Oktem  
 160 et al. [26] 291.0-342.0; Ozkaynak and Samancı [18] reported 1000-kernel weight varying  
 161 between 86.0-140.0 g in lines, 83.0-115.0 g in hybrids.

### 162 **3.3. Test weight (kg hectoliter<sup>-1</sup>)**

163 Average values of the proportion of test weight determined in different nutritional sources in  
 164 popcorn grown organically between 2010 and 2011 and the groups formed according to  
 165 Duncan multi comparison test were given in Table 5.

166 Considering 2010-2011 year averages, test weight ranged from 75.62 kg hectoliter<sup>-1</sup> (hl<sup>-1</sup>) to  
 167 81.29 kg hl<sup>-1</sup> in different nutrient applications. When examined the Table 5, the highest test  
 168 weight value was 81.29 kg hl<sup>-1</sup> in horse manure + humic acid application, and afterwards  
 169 respectively, peat + humic acid (80.58 kg hl<sup>-1</sup>) and sheep manure + humic acid (80.56 kg hl<sup>-1</sup>)  
 170 applications. Meanwhile, the lowest test weight was obtained as 75.62 kg hl<sup>-1</sup> from  
 171 vermicompost. The difference of nutrient elements in the structure of organic and  
 172 conventional nutritional sources at the end of the study, was seen affecting these fertilizer

173 sources at different levels. In the trial, the difference among fertilizer applications was found  
174 to be statistically significant.

175 As a result, the highest test weight of the parcel is administered with a growth regulator of  
176 humic acid organic fertilizer is taken. The studies have shown that humic acids in plant dry  
177 weight effects are available. Some researchers reported that fresh and dry weights  
178 increased significantly ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) with treated humic acid at different levels compared to  
179 control [6, 19, 20]. Asli and Neuman [21] reported that the humic acids reduce the dry weight  
180 of corn.

181 **Table 5. Test weight ( $\text{kg hl}^{-1}$ ) values found in popcorn grown using different nutritional**  
182 **sources and the groups formed according to Duncan Test**

<b>Nutritional Sources</b>	<b>2010<sup>‡</sup></b>	<b>2011<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>Average<sup>†</sup></b>
Conventional fertilizer	80.57 ab	76.55 e	78.56 AB
Peat	78.70 ab	80.62 abc	79.66 A
Compost	75.68 bc	79.47 bcd	77.58 AB
Cattle manure	76.43 abc	80.60 abc	78.52 AB
Chicken manure	75.98 abc	79.62 bcd	77.80 AB
Horse manure	78.13 abc	81.32 abc	79.73 A
Sheep manure	76.10 abc	79.82 bcd	77.96 AB
Pigeon manure	79.28 ab	80.63 bc	79.96 A
Seaweed + cattle manure	79.38 ab	79.25 cd	79.32 A
Vermicompost	73.47 c	77.77 de	75.62 B
Compost + humic acid	75.95 bc	82.78 a	79.37 A
Cattle manure + humic acid	76.87 abc	81.42 ab	79.14 AB
Chicken manure+ humic acid	80.95 a	79.80 bcd	80.38 A
Sheep manure. + humic acid	80.23 ab	80.88 abc	80.56 A
Peat + humic acid	79.75 ab	81.40 abc	80.58 A
Horse manure + humic acid	80.88 ab	81.70 ab	81.29 A
<b>Average</b>	<b>78.02 B</b>	<b>80.23A</b>	
	Year: 0.463		
<b>LSD</b>	2010 Nutritional sources: 4.445		
	2011 Nutritional sources: 1.955		
	2010-2011 Average nutritional sources: 3.346		

183 *\*There is no significant difference at 0.05 level according to Duncan Test among the*  
184 *averages falling within same letter group.*

185 *†:  $P \leq .01$ , ‡:  $P \leq .05$  ns: No significant*

### 186 **3.4. Popping Volume ( $\text{cm}^3 \text{g}^{-1}$ )**

187 Considering 2010-2011 year averages according to Table 6, popping volume varied between  
188  $17.17 \text{ cm}^3 \text{g}^{-1}$  and  $19.71 \text{ cm}^3 \text{g}^{-1}$  in different nutrient applications. When examined the Table  
189 6, the highest popping volume value was  $19.71 \text{ cm}^3 \text{g}^{-1}$  in peat application, and afterwards  
190 respectively, vermicompost ( $19.41 \text{ cm}^3 \text{g}^{-1}$ ) and pigeon manure ( $18.98 \text{ cm}^3 \text{g}^{-1}$ ) applications.  
191 Meanwhile, the lowest popping volume was obtained as  $17.17 \text{ cm}^3 \text{g}^{-1}$  from sheep manure +  
192 humic acid. The difference of nutrient elements in the structure of organic and conventional  
193 nutritional sources at the end of the study, was seen affecting these fertilizer sources at  
194 different levels.

195 Besides, even though no study has been carried out about popping volume in organic  
196 popcorn, different study results obtained related to popping volume as  $19.79\text{-}22.92 \text{ cm}^3 \text{g}^{-1}$

197 [14] ; 19.67-25.33 cm<sup>3</sup> g<sup>-1</sup> [18]; 18.50-35.25 cm<sup>3</sup> g<sup>-1</sup> [17]; 21.0-27.5 cm<sup>3</sup> g<sup>-1</sup> [22]; 28.1-28.7 cm<sup>3</sup>  
 198 g<sup>-1</sup> [16] have a nature supporting our research results.

199 **Table 6. Popping volume (cm<sup>3</sup>/g) values found in popcorn grown using different**  
 200 **nutritional sources and the groups formed according to Duncan Test**

<b>Nutritional Sources</b>	<b>2010<sup>ns</sup></b>	<b>2011<sup>ns</sup></b>	<b>Average<sup>‡</sup></b>
Conventional fertilizer	18.95	17.42	18.18 AB
Peat	20.41	19.00	19.71 A*
Compost	19.93	17.75	18.84 AB
Cattle manure	19.66	19.04	19.35 AB
Chicken manure	18.99	17.68	18.33 AB
Horse manure	19.02	18.43	18.72 AB
Sheep manure	19.00	17.64	18.32 AB
Pigeon manure	19.20	18.76	18.98 AB
Seaweed + cattle manure	18.54	16.65	17.60 AB
Vermicompost	20.56	18.26	19.41 A
Compost + humic acid	18.62	17.15	17.89 AB
Cattle manure + humic acid	18.27	18.09	18.18 AB
Chicken manure+ humic acid	18.95	17.65	18.30 AB
Sheep manure. + humic acid	17.40	16.93	17.17 B
Peat + humic acid	19.42	16.12	17.77 AB
Horse manure + humic acid	17.75	17.61	17.68 AB
<b>Average</b>	19.04 A	17.76 B	
<b>LSD</b>	Year: 0.467		
	2010-2011 Average nutritional sources: 2.011		

201 *\*There is no significant difference at 0.05 level according to Duncan Test among the*  
 202 *averages falling within same letter group.*

203 *‡: P ≤ .01, †: P ≤ .05 ns: No significant*

### 204 **3.5. Number of Unpopped kernel (%)**

205 Average values of number of unpopped kernel determined in different nutritional sources in  
 206 popcorn grown organically between 2010 and 2011 and the groups formed according to  
 207 Duncan multi comparison test were given in Table 7. Considering 2010-2011 year averages,  
 208 number of unpopped kernel ranged from 3.65% to 5.92% in different nutrient applications.  
 209 When examined the Table 7, the highest number of unpopped kernel value was 5.92% in  
 210 peat application, and afterwards respectively, chicken manure (5.63%) and compost (5.16%)  
 211 applications. Meanwhile, the lowest number of unpopped kernel was obtained as 3.65 %  
 212 from horse manure + humic acid. The difference of nutrient elements in the structure of  
 213 organic and conventional nutritional sources at the end of the study, was seen affecting  
 214 these fertilizer sources at different levels. In the trial, the difference among fertilizer  
 215 applications was found to be statistically significant.

216 Besides, even though no study has been carried out about number of unpopped kernel in  
 217 organic popcorn, different study results obtained related to non-popped grain rates as 12.43-  
 218 16.91% [14], 3.49-12.19% in lines and 6.33-9.94% in hybrids [18]; 2.42-9.90% [17]; 2.77-  
 219 3.48% [16], have a nature supporting our research results. Many researchers [14, 24, 25]  
 220 have found significant differences in non-popped grain rate which is among major quality  
 221 parameters of popcorn, and they reported that the impact of varieties had a largest share in  
 222 this situation.

223



224 **Table 7. Number of unpopped kernel (%) values determined in popcorn grown using**  
 225 **different nutritional sources and the groups formed according to Duncan Test**

<b>Nutritional Sources</b>	<b>2010<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>2011<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>Average<sup>†</sup></b>
Conventional fertilizer	6.48 abc	3.51 b-e	5.00 A-D
Peat	7.05 a*	4.79 a	5.92 A
Compost	6.72 ab	3.59 b-e	5.16 ABC
Cattle manure	4.86 def	3.84 bcd	4.35 CD
Chicken manure	6.97 a	4.28 ab	5.63 AB
Horse manure	5.27 b-f	3.88 abc	4.58 BD
Sheep manure	4.74 ef	3.18 cde	3.96 CD
Pigeon manure	5.47 a-f	3.45 b-e	4.46 BCD
Seaweed + cattle manure	4.88 c-f	2.67 e	3.78 D
Vermicompost	5.91 a-e	3.63 bcd	4.77 A-D
Compost + humic acid	4.41 f	3.46 b-e	3.93 CD
Cattle manure + humic acid	6.33 a-d	3.23 cde	4.78 A-D
Chicken manure+ humic acid	4.63 ef	3.51 b-e	4.07 CD
Sheep manure. + humic acid	4.67 ef	2.81 de	3.74 D
Peat + humic acid	4.65 ef	3.10 cde	3.88 CD
Horse manure + humic acid	4.50 ef	2.79 de	3.65 D
<b>Average</b>	<b>5.47 A</b>	<b>3.48 B</b>	
	Yıl: 0.467		
<b>LSD</b>	2010 Nutritional sources: 1.393		
	2011 Nutritional sources: 0.889		
	2010-2011 Av. Nutritional sources: 2.011		

226 \*There is no significant difference at 0.05 level according to Duncan Test among the  
 227 averages falling within same letter group.

228 †: P ≤ .01, ‡: P ≤ .05 ns: No significant

229

#### 230 **4. CONCLUSION**

231

232 It has been determined with this study that organic popcorn production can be made also by  
 233 using different nutritional sources under Diyarbakır ecological conditions. Higher values  
 234 obtained from organic nutrient sources than conversional application in all tested quality  
 235 parameters. Furthermore, it was observed that the implementation of organic fertilizers  
 236 together with humic acid in popcorn produced better results in comparison to alone  
 237 implementation of organic fertilizers. It has been proved that corn production can be made  
 238 without the use of chemical pesticides in the trial. *Trichogramma sp.* beneficial insects can  
 239 be introduced to local farmers and its use may be encouraged on corn planted areas.

240

#### 241 **REFERENCES**

242

- 243 1. Kun E. Warm Climate Cereals, Ankara University Printing House, Ankara, 1997.
- 244 2. Oktem A, Ulger A.C, Kirtok Y. Effects of different nitrogen doses and distances of row  
 245 spacing on grain yield and some agronomic characteristics of popcorn. Cukurova  
 246 University Journal of Agricultural Faculty, 2001;16(2):83-92.
- 247 3. Anac D, Okur B. Improving Soil Fertility in Natural Ways. Ecological (Organic, Biological)  
 248 Agricultural Organisation Society (ETO), p.37-73, 1996, Izmir.
- 249 4. Yazici K, Kaynak L. Possibilities of using seaweed in organic farming. Turkey 2nd  
 250 Ecological Symposium, 14-16 November 2001, Antalya, p. 344-352.

\* Tel.: +90 414 3183686; fax: +90 414 3183686.

E-mail address: aoktem@harran.edu.tr.

- 251 5. Seker C, Ersoy, I. Soil characteristics of different organic fertilizers and leonardit and their  
252 effects on development of corn (*Zea mays* L.). Selcuk University Journal of  
253 Agricultural Faculty, 2005;19(35):46-50.
- 254 6. Shafiq R, Bukhsh M.A, Ishaque M. Comparative performance and profitability of two corn  
255 hybrids with organic and inorganic fertilizers. Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Sciences  
256 2008;45(3):8-12.
- 257 7. Selcuk R, Tufenkci S. Effects of ascending doses of zinc and humic acid applications on  
258 yield and nutrient content of corn. Yuzuncu Yil University, Institute of Science,  
259 Master's Thesis, Van 2009.
- 260 8. Cengiz R, Yanikoglu S, Sezer MC. Effects of synthetic and organic fertilizers on yield and  
261 quality of corn (*Zea mays* L.). Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Ankara,  
262 2010;213-220.
- 263 9. Anonymous. Official gazette, <http://mevzuat.basbakanlik.gov.tr/>, Official Gazette Number:  
264 27676, Access date: 18.08.20103. 2010.
- 265 10. Anonymous, Monthly climatic report. Meteorological station. Sanliurfa. 2011.
- 266 11. Acikgoz N, Ilker E, Gokcol A. Assessment of Biological Research on the Computer.  
267 TOTEM, 2004;2, Izmir.
- 268 12. Prasanna K, Halepyati A. S, Desai B.K, Pujari B.T. Effect of integrated nutrient  
269 management on the productivity and nutrient uptake by maize (*Zea mays* L.).  
270 Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 2007;20(4):833-834.
- 271 13. Ildikut L, Yilmaz A, Yururdurmaz C, Colkesen M. Determination of morphological and  
272 agronomical properties of local popcorn genotypes. BİBAD Research Journal of  
273 Biological Sciences, 2012;5(2):63-69.
- 274 14. Ertas N, Soylu S, Bilgici N. A research on determination of physical properties of corn  
275 relations of quality parameters. Turkey 10. Food Congress, Erzurum, 21-23 May,  
276 2008.
- 277 15. Gokmen S, Sakin M.A, Yildirim A., Yield, yield components and quality specifications of  
278 some popcorn varieties grown in Tokat-Kazova conditions. Turkey VII. Field Crops  
279 Congress, 2007;1:330-333, 25-27 June 2007, Erzurum.
- 280 16. Ozkan A. Effects of different nitrogen levels on grain yields, agricultural properties and  
281 some quality parameters of two popcorn (*Zea mays everta* Sturt.) cultivars under  
282 Cukurova conditions. Department of Field Crops Institute of Naturel and Applied  
283 Sciences University of Cukurova, Phd Thesis, Adana,125p. 2007.
- 284 17. Tekkanat A, Soylu S. Determination of important quality characters and grain yield in  
285 popcorn cultivars. Selcuk University Journal of the Faculty of Agriculture,  
286 2005;19(37):41-50.
- 287 18. Ozkaynak E, Samanci B. Comparison of popcorn (*Zea mays everta* Sturt.) lines and their  
288 testcrosses for yield and yield-related traits. Akdeniz University Journal of the Faculty  
289 of Agriculture, 2003;16(1):35-42.
- 290 19. Dogru A, Darcin E.S, Tutar A, Dizman M, Koc Y. Effects of potassium humate to corn  
291 (*Zea mays* L.) plant growth. Sakarya University The Journal of Arts and Science,  
292 2012;1:25-35.
- 293 20. Sozudogru S, Kutuk A.C, Yalcin R, Usta S. 1996. The development of the bean plant  
294 humic acid and nutrient intake effect. Ankara University, Journal of the Faculty,  
295 No:1452, Ankara,
- 296 21. Asli S, Neumann P.M. Rhizosphere humic acid interacts with root cell walls to reduce  
297 hydraulic conductivity and plant development. Plant and Soil, 2010;336:313-322.
- 298 22. Koc N, Ekiz H, Soysal M, Pamukcu M, Erdal S, Toros A. Popcorn population breeding.  
299 Turkey 5. Field Crops Congress, Antalya 5-9 September 2005.
- 300 23. Song A, Eckhoff S.R, Paulsen M, Litchfield J.B. Effect of kernel size and genotype on  
301 popcorn popping volume and number of unpopped kernels. Cereal Chemistry,  
302 1991;68:464-466.

- 303 24. Gokmen S, Sencar O, Sakin M.A, Yılmaz I. Growing opportunities under Tokat-Kazova  
304 conditions the type of popcorn (*Zea mays* L. *everta* Sturt). Turkey 3. Field Crops  
305 Congress, 1999;1:287-292, 15-18 November 1999, Adana.  
306 25. Gokmen S, Sakin M.A. Determination of yield, yield components and some quality  
307 properties of popcorn. Turkey 3. Field Crops Congress, s.253-257, 17-21 September  
308 2001,Tekirdag.  
309 26. Oktem A., Ulger A.C, Coskun Y. Effects of some weed control methods on grain yield  
310 and yield components of corn (*Zea mays* L.) under Harran plain conditions. Journal of  
311 University Agricultural Faculty, 2004;8(1):51-57.