Name: Denise Cote

Class: Horticulture 1100 Spring 2015

Date: May 5, 2015

Scientific Name:
Peperomia obtusifolia
Family: Piperaceae

Pronunciation: pep-per-ROE-mee-uh Ob-too-

siff-FOLE-leeuh (Gilman, 2007)



Image credit: zimmerpflanzen-faq.de

Plant Type:

Foliage plant; herbaceous; not cold tolerant (Floridata.com).

Common Names: Peperomia; Baby Rubber Plant. (Gilman, 2007).

Uses & Care:

Container or above-ground planter; mass planting; naturalizing; suitable for growing indoors.

Growing in partial to deep shade, Peperomia will thrive in moist, rich, organic soils or less fertile sandy soils. Although preferring high humidity, it must have welldrained conditions to avoid stem and root rot. Plant on 12- to 18-inch centers for quick establishment as a ground cover. (Gilman, 2007; Floridata.com)

Origin & Geography:

Not native to North America. Mexico to Northern South America and West Indies. (Missouri Botanical Garden).

USDA Zone:

10-12 (Missouri Botanical Garden; Gilman, 2007).

Cultivars:

- "Marble': creamy white/grayish green leaves
- 'Minima': Dwarf cultivar
- 'Variegata': border of creamy white with a central zone of dark green and grayish green leaf pattern. (Gilman, 2007).

Propagation: Peperomias are most easily propagated by division, but will also grow from stem or leaf cuttings (Floridata, 2001).

Light Requirements:	Pests:
Bright indirect light. Can thrive in partial shade.	Main pest problems is mites (Gilman,
(Missouri Botanical Garden; Gilman, 2007)	2007).
Diseases : Susceptible to stem and root rots due	Water Requirements: It is best to err on
to over-watering, poor drainage (Gilman, 2007).	the dry side when growing Peperomia.
	(Missouri Botanical Garden).
Narrative Description:	
The Peperomia obtusifolia is a common	
houseplant in North America. The plant	
typically ranges from .5 to 1 foot in height, and	
can spread from 1 to 2 feet in a large container	
or in the ground. The plant's habit is to spread	
with open density at a moderate rate.	
This plant's flowers are not showy. Flowers are	
long, somewhat dusty tendrils (Gilman, 2007;	
Floridata.com; Missouri Botanical Garden).	

References

- Floridata.com. (2001, January 6). Peperomia obtusifolia. Retrieved February 22, 2015, from http://www.floridata.com/ref/P/pepe_obt.cfm
- Gilman, E. F. (2007, June). FPS466: Peperomia obtusifolia: Peperomia, Baby Rubber Plant [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from Electronic Data Information Source of UF/IFAS Extension website: http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/pdffiles/FP/FP46600.pdf
- Missouri Botanical Garden. (n.d.). Peperomia obtusifolia. Retrieved February 11, 2015, from Plant Finder website:
 - http://www.missouribotanicalgarden.org/PlantFinder/PlantFinderDetails.aspx?kempercod e=b609

Works Consulted

- Mid-Florida Research and Information Center. (n.d.). Peperomia Production Guide. Retrieved February 22, 2015, from http://mrec.ifas.ufl.edu/foliage/folnotes/pep.htm
- Badgett, B. (n.d.). Types of Peperomias: Tips for Growing a Peperomia Houseplant. Retrieved February 22, 2015, from
 - http://www.gardeningknowhow.com/houseplants/peperomia/growing-peperomia-houseplants.htm

Website Evaluation Checklist

Choose one (1) of the websites that you **DID NOT** use to develop your plant information sheet. Using the CARP criteria, fill in the following worksheet about this one website.

 $We bsite\ address:\ http://www.gardeningknowhow.com/houseplants/peperomia/growing-peperomia-houseplants.htm$

Evaluation Criteria	Prompts	Summary & Discussion
Currency		
Currency	When was the article/site published? Is there a date available on the site somewhere? (published or copyright) Is the timeliness of the information important for your use?	Not sure. There is a copyright date for the whole website.
Authority		
	Who is the author of the article/website? What are their credentials? Why would you trust his/her information? Who is the owner/sponsor of the website?	The author doesn't have any apparent credentials. She cowrote a book but it is self-published. I'm not sure I would trust her information based on this. This website pays people to write articles and it is not at all clear who owns the site. They say they are gardeners but that means nothing in terms of authority. Lots of people are gardeners.
Audience		
	Who is the audience? Who are they writing this for? Is it for professionals or the average consumer?	The audience is clearly non-professionals.
Reliability		
	Does the site use references to other materials? Is the author a reliable source? Would you use the website for other information needs later (did	No, the only "references" are links to pages that advertise or to companies. I would not use this site again.

	you bookmark it?©)	
Relevance		
	Does the terminology used in the article/site relate to your research? Is it at a professional or consumer level?	There was some terminology but it wasn't enough to impress me. Plus, there's no references to the facts.
Purpose &/or Point of View		
	What is the article/website's purpose? What is their point of view? Are they trying to teach you or sell you something? Is the author trying to persuade you? Is their information one-sided? Watch for bias.	I think this site's purpose is to make us see advertisements. It is concerning that the authors of the articles are paid to develop content for the site. So, they are motivated to write a lot of short articles and may fudge information.
Summarize		_
Put it all together. Reflect on your evaluation process.	In less than 3 sentences, discuss why this website was not as valuable as the ones you ended up using in your plant information sheet.	I discarded this site because it had red flags in most of the CARP criteria. Since I was going after factual information and this site gave me no references, I did not feel confident in using it in my project.