

DOI: 10.2478/v10129-010-0015-5

Beata Węgrzynek

Department of Plant Systematics, University of Silesia, Jagiellońska 28,  
40-032 Katowice; e-mail: beata.wegrzynek@us.edu.pl

## DIFFERENTIATION OF ARABLE FIELD WEED COMMUNITIES IN THE NORTHERN PART OF THE SILESIA UPLAND (S POLAND)

### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to present the role of the selected species (i.e. associations character species, endangered as well as the most expansive weeds) in arable field communities in the area of the Tarnowskie Góry Ridge and the Chełm, two mesoregions of the Silesian Upland (southern Poland). On the basis of 750 phytosociological relevés taken using the method of Braun-Blanquet (Braun-Blanquet 1964) between 1995 and 2009, eight weed associations as well as numerous rump communities were distinguished. Phytocoenoses without a significant contribution of the association character species comprised about 68% of the patches analysed in the cereal crop and about 12% of the communities established in the root plant crop. Very often the character species of cereal weed associations occurred sporadically or in small numbers. Some expansive weeds (e.g. *Apera spica-venti* (L.) P. Beauv., *Avena fatua* L., *A. ×vilis* Wallr., *Chenopodium album* L., *Echinochloa crus-galli* (L.) P. Beauv., *Elymus repens* L., *Galinsoga ciliata* (Raf.) S. F. Blake, *G. parviflora* Cav.) played an important role in the communities analysed. The vanishing of some weed species and the spread of others has resulted in the transformation of the composition and structure of the segetal communities. A vast majority of rare and endangered weed species in the studied area are considered to be very sensitive to modern agriculture methods, e.g. chemicalization, introduction of new crop cultivars, effective cleaning of seed materials, drainage etc. (Siciński 1998; Warcholińska 1998).

*Key words:* arable field weeds communities, Chełm, expansive weeds, rare weeds, Silesian Upland, Tarnowskie Góry Ridge

### INTRODUCTION

Interest in the problem of changes in the composition and structure of arable field (segetal) weed flora and vegetation has been increasing in recent years. High value of farmland and its role in preservation of biodiversity is widely discussed in Europe (e.g. Robinson *et al.* 2001) as well as in Poland (e.g. Siciński *et al.* 1978; Kornaś 1987a, 1987b; Wnuk 1989a, b; Heller 1998; Warcholińska 1998). The list of threatened segetal plant species in Poland was prepared (Warcholińska 1998). Moreover, some weeds, e.g. *Adonis flammea* Jacq., *Caucalis platycarpos* L., *Conryngia orientalis* (L.) Dumort. were included into the Polish Red Data Book of

Plants (Każmierczakowa and Zarzycki 2001). Since some of them, like the species mentioned above, and e.g. *Cuscuta epilinum* Weihe ex Boenn., *Lolium remotum* Schrank, *Spergula arvensis* L. ssp. *maxima* (Weihe) O. Schwarz, *Arnoseria minima* (L.) Schweigg. and Körte, *Lathyrus tuberosus* L., *Silene gallica* L., are character species for segetal weed associations (Kornaś 1950; Anioł-Kwiatkowska 1988; Matuszkiewicz 2001), their lack has resulted in changes in segetal communities on syntaxonomical level. The process of degradation and extinction of stenotopic or specific to diminishing crops weed associations is observed. Phytocoenoses of this type are disappearing and are being replaced by eurytopic ones (e.g. Sendek 1989, 1992; Wnuk 1989a, b; Heller 1998). On the other hand, some weeds in Poland are identified as very expansive on a regional and/or national scale (Rola and Rola 1996; Węgrzynek 2009a, and literature therein). They can play the role of dominants in agrophytocoenoses and thus led to establishment of rump communities (e.g. Warcholińska 1979, 1991; Wnuk 1989b; Węgrzynek 2003 a, b). Therefore, not only weed species, but also some weed associations are considered to be endangered (e.g. Warcholińska 1979; Sendek 1992) or even extinct (Heller 1998) in Poland.

The aim of the paper is to present the role of chosen weed species (i.e. rare and perishing, character segetal associations species as well as expansive ones) in the segetal communities of the northern part of the Silesian Upland (the Tarnowskie Góry Ridge and the Chełm mesoregions). This part of the Silesian Upland is characterized by a considerable soil differentiation, including the presence of mezozoic limestone elevations (Kondracki 1994). This creates suitable habitats for many interesting calcicolous plant species, including segetal weeds. In that area stations of the rarest endangered weeds in the Silesian Upland species are noted (Sendek 1989, 1992; Nowak 1999).

#### MATERIAL AND METHODS

The Silesian Upland is a macroregion located in southern Poland that covers an area of 3990 km<sup>2</sup>. Five mesoregions are distinguished within its borders, i.e. the Chełm, the Tarnowskie Góry Ridge, the Jaworzno Hills, the Katowice Upland and the Rybnik Plateau (Kondracki 1994). It is known as a region strongly affected by human activity including industrialisation and urbanisation. However, nearly 40% of the area is still under agricultural management (Rocznik statystyczny... Katowice 2007; Rocznik Statystyczny... Opole 2007). The areas studied were the Chełm (area ca 320 km<sup>2</sup>) and the Tarnowskie Góry Ridge (ca. 1010 m<sup>2</sup>) located in the northern part of the Silesian Upland (Kondracki 1994). They are regions where agriculture plays an important part in land management while in the other part of the Silesian Upland industry is the main branch of the economy. The considerable geological structure and soil differentiation, including the occurrence of Mesozoic limestone elevations and the presence of rendzina and brown soils rich in lime as well as podzolic poor acid sandy soils is also a distinguishing feature of the area researched

(Gilewska 1972; Kondracki 1994).

Field studies on segetal vegetation in the Silesian Upland were carried out in the years 1995-2008 (e.g. Węgrzynek 2003a, b, c, 2005a, b, 2006; Węgrzynek *et al.* 2007). During this period 750 phytosociological relevés were taken in various arable field crops in the area of the Chełm and the Tarnowskie Góry Ridge using the method of Braun-Blanquet (Braun-Blanquet 1964).

Systematics and the nomenclature of syntaxonomic units were based on Kornaś (1950) and Matuszkiewicz (2001). Plant species names were based on Mirek *et al.* (2002). Constancy classes and coefficients of cover of the chosen weed species are presented in the synthetic tables (Table 1, 2).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of 750 phytosociological relevés allows four cereal crop weed associations to be distinguished, i.e. *Arnoserido-Scleranthetum* (Edouard 1925) R.Tx. 1937,

Table 1

Participation of the chosen weed species in cereal crop communities in the Tarnowskie Góry Hump and the Chełm

Community number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Relevés no	22	15	16	53	16	11	12	305
No of species in relevè	20-29	25-33	16-25	18-29	19-28	28-34	22-35	12-21
Average no of species	23	27	21	21	23	30	27	17
Total no of species	88	74	69	109	92	86	101	129
soil pH	6.0-7.0	6.0-7.0	5.5-7.0	5.5-7.0	7.0-7.5	7.5-9.0	7.0-8.5	5.5-8.5
Average soil pH	6.6	6.5	6.2	6.3	7.3	7.9	7.6	6.8
<i>Ch. Papaveretum argemones:</i>								
<i>Veronica hederifolia</i>	IV <sup>-1</sup> 309	V <sup>1-1</sup> 337	.	.	I <sup>1</sup> 1	III <sup>1-1</sup> 144	II <sup>1</sup> 3	.
<i>Papaver dubium</i>	IV <sup>r-1</sup> 158	I <sup>1</sup> 1	.	.	I <sup>1</sup> 1	.	I <sup>1</sup> 1	.
<i>Papaver argemone</i>	V <sup>+2</sup> 655	V <sup>-1</sup> 418	.	.	.	.	I <sup>1</sup> 1	.
<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i>	II <sup>1-1</sup> 42	I <sup>1</sup> 1	.	.	.	.	.	.
<i>Erophila verna</i>	I <sup>r-1</sup> 2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
<i>Veronica triphyllos</i>	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.	.	.	.	II <sup>r</sup> 3	I <sup>r</sup> 1	I <sup>r</sup> 1
<i>Ch. Vicietum tetraspermae:</i>								
<i>Vicia villosa</i>	I <sup>+</sup> 2	V <sup>1-2</sup> 1125	V <sup>-2</sup> 1026	IV <sup>+2</sup> 610	IV <sup>+2</sup> 488	I <sup>1</sup> 1	I <sup>+</sup> 2	I <sup>1</sup> 1
<i>Vicia tetrasperma</i>	.	IV <sup>1-1</sup> 88	IV <sup>1-1</sup> 157	V <sup>r-1</sup> 226	V <sup>1-1</sup> 95	I <sup>1</sup> 1	I <sup>1</sup> 1	.
<i>Bromus secalinus</i>	.	II <sup>r+</sup> 3	I <sup>1</sup> 50	I <sup>-1</sup> 56	III <sup>+1</sup> 178	.	.	.
<i>Polyg. lapath. ssp. pallidum</i> var. <i>incanum</i>	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.	.	II <sup>+1</sup> 43	II <sup>+1</sup> 31	.	.	.
<i>Ch. Lathyro-Melandrietum:</i>								
<i>Lathyrus tuberosus</i>	.	.	.	.	I <sup>1</sup> 1	V <sup>1-2</sup> 857	III <sup>+1</sup> 49	.
<i>Melandrium noctiflorum</i>	.	.	.	.	I <sup>r</sup> 1	V <sup>r-1</sup> 9	II <sup>r-1</sup> 2	.
<i>Ch. Aperion spicae-venti:</i>								
<i>Apera spica-venti</i>	V <sup>+3</sup> 1828	IV <sup>+2</sup> 877	V <sup>-2</sup> 455	V <sup>+3</sup> 1293	V <sup>+3</sup> 1868	V <sup>+3</sup> 1251	IV <sup>+3</sup> 1251	V <sup>+5</sup> 5980

Table 1

Continued								
Community number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<i>Ch. Caucaledion lappulae:</i>								
<i>Avena fatua</i>	I <sup>-1</sup> 39	III <sup>-2</sup> 585	II <sup>-1</sup> 53	II <sup>+3</sup> 245	III <sup>+3</sup> 517	V <sup>+2</sup> 824	III <sup>+2</sup> 365	IV <sup>+4</sup> 3028
<i>Nestia paniculata</i>	I <sup>1</sup> 77	I <sup>1</sup> 1	.	.	I <sup>+1</sup> 59	V <sup>+1</sup> 219	IV <sup>+1</sup> 230	I <sup>1</sup> 1
<i>Consolida regalis</i>	II <sup>+</sup> 2	.	.	.	V <sup>+2</sup> 458	III <sup>+1</sup> 146	V <sup>+1</sup> 187	.
<i>Camelina microcarpa</i>	I <sup>-</sup> 2	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 2	III <sup>-</sup> 6	III <sup>+1</sup> 49	.
<i>Aet. cynapium</i> ssp. <i>agrestis</i>	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.	.	.	IV <sup>+1</sup> 147	III <sup>+</sup> 5	.
<i>Stachys annua</i>	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	II <sup>+1</sup> 3	II <sup>+1</sup> 3	.
<i>Euphorbia exigua</i>	.	.	.	.	.	III <sup>-1</sup> 74	II <sup>+1</sup> 47	.
<i>Valerianella dentata</i>	.	.	.	.	.	II <sup>+1</sup> 73	III <sup>+1</sup> 5	.
<i>Sherardia arvensis</i>	.	.	.	.	.	II <sup>1</sup> 143	II <sup>+1</sup> 92	.
<i>Fumaria vaillantii</i>	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	I <sup>+</sup> 1	II <sup>+1</sup> 4	.
<i>Melampyrum arvense</i>	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	II <sup>+1</sup> 73	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.
<i>Funaria schleicheri</i>	I <sup>-</sup> 1	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.
<i>Anagallis foemina</i>	.	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.	.
<i>Valerianella rimosa</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	II <sup>+1</sup> 2	.
<i>Nonea pulla</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	II <sup>+1</sup> 2	.
<i>Adonis aestivalis</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.
<i>Anag. arvensis</i> f. <i>azurea</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.
<i>Anagallisfoemina</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.
<i>Ch. Centauretalia cyani:</i>								
<i>Agrostemma githago</i>	II <sup>-1</sup> 117	.	.	.	II <sup>-1</sup> 89	III <sup>-1</sup> 76	II <sup>+1</sup> 93	I <sup>+</sup> 1
<u>Others:</u>								
<i>Elymus repens</i>	IV <sup>+1</sup> 178	IV <sup>-1</sup> 255	III <sup>+1</sup> 114	III <sup>+1</sup> 135	III <sup>+2</sup> 198	III <sup>+1</sup> 154	III <sup>-1</sup> 204	IV <sup>+3</sup> 1754
<i>Galium aparine</i>	V <sup>+2</sup> 482	V <sup>+2</sup> 625	II <sup>-2</sup> 227	III <sup>+2</sup> 411	IV <sup>+2</sup> 532	IV <sup>+2</sup> 753	III <sup>-1</sup> 139	IV <sup>+3</sup> 1234
<i>Avena × vilis</i>	I <sup>-</sup> 1	II <sup>+1</sup> 217	II <sup>-</sup> 2	II <sup>+3</sup> 245	I <sup>+1</sup> 59	II <sup>+2</sup> 289	III <sup>-1</sup> 253	IV <sup>+3</sup> 732

Explanations: 1 - *Papaveretum argemones*; 2 - community of intermediate character between *Vicietum tetraspermae* and *Papaveretum argemones*; 3 - *Vicietum tetraspermae sperguletosum*; 4 - *V. t. typicum*; 5 - *V. t. consolidetosum*; 6 - *Lathyro-Melandrietum*; 7 - rump community of the *Caucaledion lappulae* alliance; 8 - other rump weed communitie

*Papaveretum argemones* (Libb. 1932) Krusem. et Vlieg. 1939, *Vicietum tetraspermae* (Krusem. et Vlieg. 1939) Kornaś 1950 divided into subassociations (typicum, sperguletosum, consolidetosum), *Lathyro-Melandrietum noctiflori* (Oberd. 1957) (Table 1) as well as four root plant crop associations, i.e. *Echinochloo-Setarietum* Krusem. et Vlieg. (1939) 1940, *Galinsogo-Setarietum* (R. Tx. et Beck. 1942) R. Tx. 1950, *Lamio-Veronicetum politae* Kornaś 1950 with two subassociations – typicum and stachyetosum annui and *Oxalido-Chenopodietum polyspermi* Siss. 1950 (Table 2). Moreover, numerous communities of a rump or an intermediate character were noted (Tables 1, 2). Phytocoenoses of these types composed nearly 68% of the patches analysed in grain crops and about 12% in root plant cultivation.

Comparing the author's own field studies results with literature data (e.g. Kobierski

1974; Sendek 1989, 1992) far-reaching qualitative and quantitative changes in segetal communities were discovered. No patch of the rare *Caucalido-Scandicetum* association, which is considered endangered in Poland (Wnuk 1989a, b) was recorded. Localities of its character species that were relatively common in the area studied before 1945 i.e. *Adonis flammea*, *Bupleurum rotundifolium* L., *Caucalis platycarpus*, *Conryngia orientalis*, *Galium tricorntutum* Dandy, *Scandix pecten-veneris* L., *Thymelea passerina* (L.) Coss. and Germ., *Vaccaria pyramidata hispanica* (Mill.) Rauschert (Sendek 1989, and literature therein) were not confirmed.

Very often in the communities researched the list of character association species was not complete. Character species of cereal crop weed associations usually occurred sparsely or even sporadically. Typically spreading with the seed material (speirochoric) species, like *Adonis aestivalis* L. *A. flammea*, *Agrostemma githago* L., *Bromus arvensis* L., *B. secalinus* L., *Camelina sativa* (L.) Crantz, *Conryngia orientalis*, *Vicia tetrasperma* (L.) Schreb. (Kornaś 1987a, b) were among the weeds disappearing. Photophilous species which are easily dominated by fast-growing new cultivars of planted species, like *Adonis aestivalis.*, *A. flammea*, *Anagallis foemina* Mill. (Warcholińska 1998; Zarzycki *et al.* 2002) as well as dicotyledonous annual species which are very sensitive to herbicides e.g. *Adonis aestivalis*, *A. flamea*, *Anagallis foemina*, *Ranunculus arvensis* L., *Veronica opaca* Fr. (Wnuk 1989; Siciński 1998; Warcholińska 1998) showed a declining tendency.

Table 2  
Participation of the chosen weed species in root crop plant communities in the studied area

Community number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Relevès no	83	39	69	51	10	11	37
Number of species in relevè	15-29	13-28	16-27	18-25	21-26	20-25	12-24
Average no of species	22	23	22	25	23	22	18
Total no of species	114	101	131	132	90	76	41
Soil pH	5.0-6.5	5.5-7.0	5.5-7.5	6.0-7.5	7.0-8.0	6.0-7.0	5.5-7.5
Average soil pH	6.0	6.3	6.6	6.9	7.5	6.4	7.0
<i>Ch. Echinochloo-Setarietum:</i>							
<i>Echinochloa crus-galli</i>	V <sup>1-3</sup> 2020	V <sup>1-3</sup> 151	I <sup>1</sup> 1	I <sup>1</sup> 1	I <sup>1</sup> 1	II <sup>1</sup> 125	I 1
<i>Setaria pumila</i>	IV <sup>1-2</sup> 608	II <sup>-2</sup> 288	II <sup>-1</sup> 64		I 1	III <sup>1-2</sup> 5	I 8
<i>Ch. Galinsogo-Setarietum:</i>							
<i>Galinsoga parviflora</i>	II <sup>1-2</sup> 2	V <sup>1-2</sup> 751	V <sup>1-4</sup> 1796	III <sup>1-1</sup> 86	III <sup>1-1</sup> 50	V <sup>1-1</sup> 254	I <sup>1</sup> 1
<i>Galinsoga ciliata</i>	I <sup>1-1</sup> 2	V <sup>1-2</sup> 589	V <sup>1-2</sup> 729	II <sup>1-1</sup> 85	II <sup>1-1</sup> 47	III <sup>1-2</sup> 223	I 1
<i>Ch. Lamio-Veronicetum politae:</i>							
<i>Euphorbia helioscopia</i>	I <sup>-1</sup> 21	II <sup>+</sup> 3	II <sup>1-1</sup> 96	V <sup>-2</sup> 480	V <sup>1-2</sup> 1024	III <sup>1-1</sup> 189	.
<i>Sonchus asper</i>	I <sup>+</sup> 1	I <sup>-</sup> 1	I <sup>1</sup> 1	II <sup>-1</sup> 25	III <sup>1-1</sup> 49	.	.
<i>Lamium amplexicaule</i>	.	I <sup>1</sup> 1	I <sup>-</sup> 1	V <sup>-2</sup> 680	IV <sup>1-2</sup> 615	.	.

Table 2

Continued							
Community number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>D. subass. L.-V.p. stachyetosum annui:</i>							
<i>Neslia paniculata</i>	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	I <sup>+</sup> 1	III <sup>+</sup> 5	.	.
<i>Campanula rapunculoides</i>	.	.	.	.	IV <sup>+2</sup> 343	.	.
<i>Sherardia arvensis</i>	.	.	.	.	III <sup>+1</sup> 139	.	.
<i>Consolida regalis</i>	.	.	.	.	III <sup>+</sup> 5	.	.
<i>Stachys annua</i>	.	.	.	.	III <sup>+</sup> 5	.	.
<i>Melandrium noctiflorum</i>	.	.	.	.	II <sup>-1</sup> 47	.	.
<i>Camelina microcarpa</i>	.	.	.	.	II <sup>-1</sup> 25	.	.
<i>Anagallis arvensis</i> for. <i>azurea</i>	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.	.
<i>Euphorbia exigua</i>	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.	.
<i>Falcaria vulgaris</i>	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 2	.	.
<i>Fumaria vaillantii</i>	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.	.
<i>Lathyrus tuberosus</i>	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+2</sup> 2	.	.
<i>Melanpyrum arvense</i>	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.	.
<i>Ch. D. Oxalido-Chenopodietum polyspermi:</i>							
<i>Lapsana communis</i> D.	II <sup>-</sup> 23	II <sup>-1</sup> 28	I <sup>-1</sup> 17	II <sup>-1</sup> 43	II <sup>-1</sup> 48	V <sup>1-2</sup> 534	I <sup>1</sup> 40
<i>Oxalis stricta</i>	I <sup>+</sup> 1	I <sup>+</sup> 2	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.	.	V <sup>1-1</sup> 388	.
<i>Chenopodium polyspermum</i>	.	I <sup>1</sup> 1	.	.	.	V <sup>1-2</sup> 969	.
<i>Ch. Polygono-Chenopodietalia:</i>							
<i>Chenopodium album</i>	IV <sup>-4</sup> 778	IV <sup>1-4</sup> 302	IV <sup>+3</sup> 456	III <sup>1-4</sup> 450	IV <sup>+3</sup> 758	II <sup>-2</sup> 205	V <sup>3-5</sup> 5864
Others:							
<i>Elymus repens</i>	IV <sup>3-1</sup> 89	IV <sup>+2</sup> 205	III <sup>1-4</sup> 450	II <sup>+1</sup> 35	II <sup>-1</sup> 28	I <sup>+</sup> 1	IV <sup>3-4</sup> 3077
<i>Lythrum hyssopifolia</i>	.	.	.	.	.	I <sup>+</sup> 1	.

Explanations: 1 - *Echinochloo-Setarietum*; 2 - community of intermediate character between *Echinochloo-Setarietum* and *Galinsogo-Setarietum*, 3 - *Galinsogo-Setarietum*; 4 - *Lamio-Veronicetum politae typicum*; 5 - *L.-V. p. stachyetosum annui*; 6 - *Oxalido-Chenopodietum polyspermi*; 7- rump communities

Some very expansive weed species occurred very frequently and abundantly. In the studied area: *Apera spica-venti* (L.) P.Beauv., *Avena fatua* L., *A. xvilis* Wallr., *Echinochloa crus-galli* (L.) P. Beauv., *Elymus repens* L., *Galinsoga ciliata* (Raf.) S. F. Blake, *G. parviflora* Cav., *Chenopodium album* L., *Elymus repens* (L.) Gould and *Galium aparine* L. belong to this group. Special attention should be paid to *Avena xvilis* – a hybrid between *Avena fatua* and *A. stiva* L. The species has only been recorded in the studied area recently (Węgrzynek 2009). Expansive weeds have adapted to modern agricultural methods. They are characterized by a combination of features like a wide ecological tolerance range, enormous ecological plasticity, high fecundity, a persistent seed bank, and their ability to spread by different modes including generative and vegetative reproduction as well as hybridization

(Rol *et al.* 1989; Węgrzynek 2009, and literature therein).

The results show the considerable impoverishment and qualitative and quantitative losses especially grain plant weed communities. As numerous endangered weeds are speirochoric species and chemical weed control in the studied area is more often used in cereals crops than in root plant plantations, these communities are particularly endangered by modern seed cleaning techniques and chemicalization. Not only the single weed species, but also the whole agrophytocoenoses are threatened with extinction if any type of conservation measures are not implemented.

#### REFERENCES

- Anioł-Kwiatkowska J. 1988. *Lathyro-Melandrietum* Oberd. 1957 na czarnych ziemiach wrocławskich. Acta Univ. Wratisl. Prace Bot. 40: 15-35.
- Braun-Blanquet J. 1964. Pflanzensozioologie. Springer Verlag, Wien.
- Gilewska S. 1972. Wyżyny Śląsko-Małopolskie. W: Geomorfologia Polski. Klimaszewski M (red.). T. 1. PWN, Warszawa.
- Heller K. 1998. Dynamika zbiorowisk chwastów segetalnych upraw lnu włóknistego w Polsce na przestrzeni lat 1967-1996. Wydawnictwo Instytutu Włókien Naturalnych, Poznań, 127 pp.
- Każmierczakowa R., Zarzycki K. (red.) 2001. Polska Czerwona Księga Roślin. Wydawnictwa Instytutu Botaniki PAN, Kraków.
- Kobierski L. 1974. Rośliny naczyniowe Garbu Tarnogórskiego na Wyżynie Śląskiej. Rocznik Muzeum Górnośląskiego w Bytomiu, 8: 1-189.
- Kondracki J. 1994. Geografia fizyczna Polski. Mezoregiony fizyczno-geograficzne, PWN, Warszawa.
- Kornaś J. 1950. Zespoły roślinne Jury Krakowskiej. Część 1. Zespoły pól uprawnych. Acta Soc. Bot. Pol., 20(2): 361-438.
- Kornaś J. 1987a. Chwasty polne rozprzestrzeniane z materiałem siewnym. Specjalizacja ekologiczna i procesy wymierania. Zesz. Nauk. AR w Krakowie, 216(19): 23-36.
- Kornaś J. 1987b. Zmiany roślinności segetalnej w Gorcach w ostatnich 35 latach. Zesz. Nauk. UJ. Prace Bot., 15: 7-26
- Matuszkiewicz W. 2001. Przewodnik do oznaczania zbiorowisk roślinnych Polski. PWN, Warszawa.
- Mirek Z., Piękoś-Mirek H., Zajac A., Zajac M. 1995. Vascular Plants of Poland. a Checklist. Pol. Bot. Stud. Guideook Series, 15: 1-303.
- Nowak T. 1999. Atlas rozmieszczenia roślin naczyniowych na terenie wschodniej części Garbu Tarnogórskiego (Wyżyna Śląska). Materiały i Opracowania, 2: 1-103, Centrum Dziedzictwa Przyrody Górnego Śląska, Katowice.
- Robinson R.A., Wilson J.D., Crick H.Q.P. 2001. The importance of arable habitat for farmland birds in grassland landscapes. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 38: 1059-1069.
- Rocznik statystyczny województwa opolskiego 2007. WOS, Opole.
- Rocznik statystyczny województwa śląskiego 2007. WOS, Katowice.
- Rola J. and Rola H. 1996. Ekspansywne chwasty segetalne w uprawach rolniczych w Polsce. Zesz. Nauk. ART w Bydgoszczy. Rolnictwo 196(38): 17-22
- Rola J., Rola H., Kucharczyk A. 1989. Problem odporności chwastów na herbicydy w warunkach Polski. Mat. 29. Sesji Nauk. IOR., część I - referaty, ss. 57-74, Poznań.
- Sendek A. 1989. Gatunki *Caucalido-Scandicetum* (Libbert 1930) R.Tx. 1937 na Wyżynie Śląskiej. Zesz. Przyr. OTPN, 27: 37-43.
- Sendek A. 1992. Zbiorowiska chwastów zbóż progów środkowotriasowego na Wyżynie Śląskiej. Zesz. Nauk. AR w Krakowie, Sesja Naukowa, 33: 61-71.
- Siciński J. T. 1998. Ginące i zagrożone grupy ekologiczne na terenie województw sieradzkiego. Acta Univ. Lodz. Folia Bot. 13: 159-164.
- Siciński J.T., Sowa R., Warcholińska A.U., Wiśniewski J., Wnuk Z. 1978. Zróżnicowanie florystyczno-ekologiczne zbiorowisk segetalnych w Środkowej Polsce. Wyd. IUNG, ss. 27-40. Puławy-Opole.
- Warcholińska A.U. 1979. Współczesne przeobrażenia zbiorowisk segetalnych w środkowej Polsce. Acta Agrob. 32: 239-269.
- Warcholińska A.U. 1991. Właściwości i współczesne przemiany flory segetalnej Wzniesień Łódzkich na tle

- wybranych flor segetalnych środkowej Polski. Pam. Puławski, 459 pp.
- Warcholińska A.U. 1998. Właściwości zagrożonych segetalnych roślin naczyniowych Polski. Acta Univ. Lodz. Folia Bot., 13: 7-14.
- Węgrzynek B. 2003a. Roślinność segetalna Wyżyny Śląskiej. Część 2. Zbiorowiska chwastów upraw zbożowych ze związku *Aperion spicae-venti*. Acta Biol. Sil., 37(54): 87-119.
- Węgrzynek B. 2003b. Roślinność segetalna Wyżyny Śląskiej. Część 1. Zbiorowiska chwastów upraw zbożowych ze związku *Caucalidion lappulae*. Zubożale zbiorowiska chwastów zbóż ozimych i jarych. Acta Biol. Sil., 37(54): 120-150.
- Węgrzynek B. 2003c. Roślinność segetalna Wyżyny Śląskiej. Część 1. Charakterystyka badanego terenu. Systematyka i rozmieszczenie wyróżnionych zbiorowisk chwastów. Acta Biol. Sil., 37(54): 71-86.
- Węgrzynek B. 2005a. Endangered segetal communities of the Silesian Upland (south Poland). V International Conference. Anthropization and Environment of Rural Settlements. Flora and Vegetation. Proceedings. M. G. Kholodny Institute of Botany, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Kyiv. pp. 262-270.
- Węgrzynek B. 2005b. Roślinność segetalna Wyżyny Śląskiej. Część 4. Zbiorowiska chwastów upraw okopowych ze związku *Panico-Setarion* Siss. 1946. Natura Siles. Super. 8: 39-53.
- Węgrzynek B. 2006. Roślinność segetalna Wyżyny Śląskiej. Część V. Zbiorowiska chwastów upraw okopowych ze związku *Eu-Polygono-Chenopodion polyspermi* (Koch 1926) Siss. 1946. Natura Silesiae Superioris 9: 63-87.
- Węgrzynek B. 2009a. Alien plant species as the source of noxious weeds in Poland. In: Pyšek P. and Pergl J. (Eds.) Biological invasions: Towards a Synthesis. Neobiota 8: 111-121.
- Węgrzynek B. 2009b. Rodzaj *Avena* we florze i zbiorowiskach Wyżyny Śląskiej. Fragm. Flor. Geobot. Polonica 16(2): 263-271.
- Węgrzynek B., Tokarska-Guzik B., Trueman I.C., Cohn E. 2007. *Galinsoga* species in Poland: history of spread and habitat preferences of two successful alien weeds. In: Rabitsch, W., F. Essl and F. Klingenstein (Eds.): Biological Invasions – from Ecology to Conservation. Neobiota 7: 201-210.
- Wnuk Z. 1989a. *Caucalido-Scandicetum* R.Tx. 1937 (zespół *Caucalis daucooides-Scandix pecten-veneris*, *Caucalo-Scandicetum* Libbert 1930) w Polsce. Acta Univ. Lodz. Folia Bot., 6: 101-121.
- Wnuk Z. 1989b. Zbiorowiska segetalne Wyżyny Częstochowskiej na tle zbiorowisk segetalnych Polski. Monogr. Bot. 71: 1-118.
- Zarzycki K., Trzcicka-Tacik H., Różański W., Szelaż Z., Wołek J. and Korzeniak U. 2002. Ecological indicator values of vascular plants of Poland. W. Szafer Institute of Botany, Polish Academy of Sciences, 183 pp. Kraków.