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## INTRODUCTION

Switchgrass is considered by many agronomists to be one of the more desirable native forage species of the Great Plains. It is used for grazing, for hay, and for soil conservation purposes. It is a vigorous productive warm season grass with wide adaptation and good seeding characteristics.

A wide range of morphological variation has generally been recognized in switchgrass. The present study was designed to investigate this variation and the interrelationship of various morphological characters. It was felt that the results of such a study would contribute to a better overall understanding of the species.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Hoover (1939) described switchgrass as a perennial occuring widely throughout the United States but being most useful in the Great Plains. Hoover (1939), Weaver and Fitzpatrick (1932), Wheeler (1950) and Hitchcock (1950) all described switchgrass as producing an abundance of leafy forage which can be grazed or made into hay. It spreads by both rhizomes and seed, the later usually being produced in abundance. Weaver and Fitzpatrick (1932) found that although abundant seed is produced, the germination rate is low. They stated, however, that those seedlings which do emerge develop rapidly and begin tillering within five to seven weeks.

Cornelius and Johnston (1941) studied biotypes of switch-
grass from Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, and North Dakota for differences in plant type as related to rust resistance. They found that of the material studied a selection from Blackwell, Oklahoma possessed not only the best resistance to the rust Uromyces graminicola but was leafy, fine-stemmed, and of good forage quality. Ross (1939) found that the only characters associated with rust resistance were erect type of growth and the presence of a waxy bloom.

Nielsen (1944) studied morphological variation in switchgrass, and found positive and highly significant regressions between plant height and the magnitude of other aerial vegetative characters. He studied plant height, leaf length and width, diameter of various nodes, and panicle length. In addition he made chromosome number determinations for the isolates studied. He found significant variation within groups of plants having the same chromosome number and between groups of plants having the same chromosome number and between groups of plants having different chromosome number.

Weaver and Fitzpatrick (1932) found that fully developed switchgrass plants in close stands usually have one to three dead basal leaves and six to seven living ones on a coarse woody stem, two to five mm. in thickness. They found that the leaves average fourteen to twenty-four mm . in width, and that they roll in dry weather. They also reported the panicle as being twelve to twenty inches long and sixteen to twenty inches wide.

## METHODS AND MATERIALS

Seed for this study was obtained from a plant introduction nursery and from switchgrass breeding nurseries at Kansas State University. The introduction nursery had been grown from seed collected throughout Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas. The breeding nurseries consisted of selections from the variety Blackwell and of seed progenies of earlier breeding nurseries (table 1).

During the summer of 1954 , seed was collected from plants which had been selected on the basis of morphological appearance. This seed was germinated in vermiculite in greenhouse pots during February, and the seedlings were transplanted into flats in midMarch. To facilitate comparison of greenhouse and field results the same planting plan was used for both greenhouse and field plantings. The selections were grouped as follows into five classes according to the physical appearance of the seed parent: tall and non-leafy, tall and leafy, medium tall and leafy, medium tall and non-leafy, and short and leafy. Selections were randomized within groups, and the groups were randomized in each of three replications.

Actual measurements were made of the following characters: leaf length, leaf width, internode diameter, panicle length, number of tillers per plant and two aspects of plant height. Two measurements of the average height of the top collar were made in the greenhouse at different dates. A measurement of the average height of the vertically-extended tips of leaves was make in the field. Visual ratings were made for greenhouse vigor, field
vigor, extent of heading and leafiness.
The following measurement procedures were used. Many of the leaf tips were damaged, necessitating a modified leaf length measurement. It was found that all leaf tips were undamaged to a point having a width one-half that of the leaf width at the ligule. Therefore that point was used to determine a relative leaf length. The leaf arising from the third node above ground was used for leaf length and width determinations. Notes on leaf length and width, internode diameter, and panicle length consisted of five random measurements per plant of the first five plants of a row. The remaining measurements were an average of one random measurement on each of the first five plants of a row. Leaf width was taken in mm. one cm . from the ligule. Internode diameter was measured with a micrometer calibrated in hundredths of inches, the third internode above the ground being used for all determinations. Panicle length was taken as the distance in cm. from the lowest panicle branch to the tip of the mature panicle. The number of tillers per plant was determined by actual count, the small initial shoots being ignored. Average height of leaf tips in the field was measured in cm . as the distance from the ground to the vertically-extended tips of the top leaves. Height of collars in the greenhouse was taken in cm. as the average height to the top collars for each selection. For field vigor, greenhouse vigor and leafiness, plants were rated one to five with one representing the maximum and five the minimum condition with respect to each plant character. The following ratings were used to denote the various stages of
heading: fully headed, most heads out of the boot leaf, all heads remaining partially enclosed in the boot leaf, and no heads emerging from the boot leaf. The visual ratings were an average for each selection.

A germination study was conducted in the following manner. Fifty seeds of each selection were placed on moist filter paper in a petri dish. They were treated for mold, shaded by dark heavy blotter paper, and maintained at 65 to 70 degrees F. Germination counts were made on the first, second, fourth, sixth, eighth, eleventh and thirteenth days.

The study was originally designed to include comparisons of the parent clones with their respective progenies. Accordingly, an additional field planting, in which each of the parent clones was replicated nine times, was established adjacent to the progeny planting. Because of drought conditions, however, mortality among the parent clones was so high that this phase of the study had to be abandoned.

An analysis of variance was conducted for each measurement and L.S.D.'s were determined wherever the "F" test showed significance. Simple and partial correlation coefficients were determined for all comparisons that were considered valid.

Photographs of the greenhouse seedlings were taken with a graflex camera, $4^{\prime \prime} \times 5^{\prime \prime}$, on tri-X daylight black and white film.

## EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

Mean leaf length for selections varied from 27.0 to 45.9 cm .
(table 2) with differences anong selections being highly significant (table 17). Simple correlation coefficients between leaf length and leaf width, panicle length, number of tillers per plant, and height of leaf tips were highly significant, but the partial correlation coefficients were low (table 34). In some cases class names were misleading as they pertained to the seed parent and the open-pollination progeny did not always reflect the parent characters. Many of the means for "shorter" classes were greater than the means for "taller" classes (table 32).

Mean leaf width varied from 9.2 to 14.4 mm , with all classes having approximately the same range (table 3). Significant differences were found in all sources of variation (table 18). Many class mean differences were significant but in disagreement with the relationships suggested by the class names (table 32). Simple correlation coefficients were high for all characters except internode diameter (table 33). Partial correlation coefficients were low (table 34).

Mean panicle length ranged from 28.1 to 47.8 cm . (table 4). Significant differences were found in all sources of variation except replications (table 19). Simple correlation coefficients between panicle length and all other characters except internode diameter were highly significant (table 33). The only significant partial correlation coefficient was that of panicle length with height of leaf tips.

Mean internode diameter varied from 0.0918 to 0.1632 inches (table 5), and differences were highly significant for all sources of variation (table 20). Simple correlation coefficients
showed that internode diameter was not correlated with the other vegetative characters (table 33). Class mean differences were small with four being significant at the 5 per cent level (table 32).

Mean number of tillers varied from 27.5 to 58.9 per plant (table 6). Analysis of variance showed significant differences among selections (table 29), but only one class mean difference was significant (table 32). Simple correlation coefficients were all high except that with internode diameter (table 33). The partial correlation coefficient involving number of tillers and the height of tips of leaves was significant at the 1 per cent level (table 34 ).

In height of the tips of leaves (which could be considered a plant height measurement) selection means ranged from 25.8 to 56.0 cm . (table 7), and there was significant variation among selections (table 28). Class mean differences varied considerably (table 32). All correlation coefficients were high except that involving internode diameter (table 33). Height of the leaf tips exhibited high partial correlations with panicle length, leaf width, and number of tillers per plant, (table 34).

Average height of the top collar (in the greenhouse) ranged from 5.3 to 18.3 cm , on April 25 (table 8). However, differences proves to be non-significant for all sources of variation (table 25).

The average height of the top collar on May 7 varied from 9.3 to 33.0 cm . with the range of the tall leafy class being great enough to include the ranges of the other classes (table 9).

All sources of variation exhibited differences which were significant at the 1 per cent level (table 24 ). All calculated simple correlation coefficients were high (table 33).

Greenhouse vigor ratings (plate I) were generally low (tables 10 and 11 ), but ratings for both dates exhibited significant differences as shown in tables 22 and 23. The May 7 data agreed very closely with those of April 25. Consequently only the May 7 note was used in correlation studies. Greenhouse vigor was highly correlated with field vigor and with the height of the top collar (table 33). The correlation coefficient with the latter was negative, since high vigor was indicated by a low number.

Ratings for field vigor were generally higher than those in the greenhouse (table 12), but showed approximately the same variation (table 26). There were many significant differences between class means (table 32).

Selections varied significantly in degree of heading (table 27). Degree of heading was highly correlated with field vigor (table 33).

Selections differed significantly in type of growth (table 30), but the differences between class means were very small (table 32 ). In leafiness, selections exhibited a small range of variation (table 15) and failed to differ significantly (table 31).

Germination counts indicated considerable differences among selections (table 16), and the analysis on total germination showed significant variation among progenies (table 21). Three class mean differences were significant at the 5 per cent level.

Table 1. Source of plants studied

*Plants used in germination test

Table 2. Leaf length

| Selection : |  | Replication means |  | Ranked means |  | Class |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | selection | : mean | mean |
| tall leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6281 | 25.96 |  |  | 31.68 | 27.80 | 6331 | 45.88 |  |
| 6282 | 30.80 | 32.56 | 30.08 | 6336 | 44.20 |  |
| 6287 | 30.80 | 28.92 | 31.08 | 6345 | 42.56 |  |
| 6292 | 35.52 | 34.60 | 32.88 | 6341 | 40.99 |  |
| 6297 | 28.44 | 31.18 | 28.48 | 6318 | 40.01 |  |
| 6304 | 2.9 .40 | 31.84 | 44.08 | 6304 | 35.11 |  |
| 6308 | 32.16 | 30.76 | 33.32 | 6292 | 34.33 |  |
| 6318 | 37.04 | 41.96 | 41.04 | 6308 | 32.08 |  |
| 6331 | 44.44 | 44.60 | 48.60 | 6282 | 31.15 |  |
| 6336 | 45.36 | 44.24 | 43.00 | 6287 | 30.27 |  |
| 6341 | 46.56 | 43.80 | 32.60 | 6297 | 29.37 |  |
| 6345 | 46.64 | 40.28 | 40.76 | 6281 | 28.48 | 36.20 |
| tall non-leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6275 | 29.12 | 28.72 | 27.80 | 6277 | 30.97 |  |
| 6277 | 30.48 | 31.32 | 31.12 | 6321 | 28.56 |  |
| 6280 | 30.08 | 29.12 | 25.88 | 6275 | 28.55 |  |
| 6288 | 27.60 | 25.80 | 28.56 | 6280 | 28.36 |  |
| 6321 | 29.60 | 28.04 | 28.04 | 6329 | 28.28 |  |
| 6329 | 27.96 | 29.28 | 27.60 | 6288 | 27.32 | 28.67 |
| medium leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6283 | 26.60 | 31.44 | 29.40 | 6301 | 34.25 |  |
| 6291 | 29.52 | 32.92 | 31.72 | 6319 | 33.68 |  |
| 6293 | 32.56 | 35.52 | 30.92 | 6299 | 33.13 |  |
| 6294 | 27.92 | 30.08 | 30.36 | 6293 | 33.00 |  |
| 6296 | 25.40 | 29.12 | 26.52 | 6298 | 32.44 |  |
| 6298 | 32.80 | 34.24 | 30.28 | 6291 | 31.39 |  |
| 6299 | 31.68 | 33.68 | 34.04 | 6294 | 29.45 |  |
| 6301 | 34.80 | 33.92 | 34.04 | 6283 | 29.15 |  |
| 6319 | 32.16 | 39.00 | 29.88 | 6296 | 27.01 | 31.50 |
| medium non-leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6300 | 33.16 | 31.88 | 28.30 | 6323 | 35.28 |  |
| 6320 | 31.84 | 31.48 | 33.84 | 6320 | 32.39 |  |
| 6323 | 36.80 | 33.92 | 35.12 | 6300 | 31.11 | 31.93 |
| short leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6289 | 28.36 | 30.52 | 28.12 | 6349 | 40.41 |  |
| 6324 | 33.88 | 34.08 | 31.32 | 6347 | 38.87 |  |
| 6327 | 37.64 | 35.24 | 30.88 | 6339 | 37.81 |  |
| 6328 | 35.56 | 35.28 | 33.80 | 6328 | 34.88 |  |
| 6339 | 34.52 | 43.95 | 34.96 | 6327 | 34.59 |  |
| 6347 | 39.20 | 43.40 | 34.00 | 6324 | 33.09 |  |
| 6349 | 42.96 | 40.68 | 37.60 | 6289 | 29.00 | 35.52 |

LSD for selection means $=4.40$
Replication means involve 25 measurements

Table 3. Leaf width

| Selection : |  | Replication means |  | Ranked means |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Class } \\ & \text { mean } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | selection | : mean |  |
| tal1 leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6281 | 9.70 |  |  | 9.60 | 9.48 | 6331 | 14.37 |  |
| 6282 | 10.88 | 10.64 | 9.56 | 6336 | 13.99 |  |
| 6287 | 10.36 | 9.68 | 9.76 | 6345 | 13.68 |  |
| 6292 | 10.76 | 10.32 | 10.16 | 6341 | 13.39 |  |
| 6297 | 10.00 | 9.08 | 9.60 | 6318 | 11.95 |  |
| 6304 | 9.84 | 9.52 | 14.12 | 6304 | 11.16 |  |
| 6308 | 10.00 | 10.16 | 9.68 | 6292 | 10.41 |  |
| 6318 | 12.32 | 12.28 | 11.24 | 6282 | 10.36 |  |
| 6331 | 15.40 | 13.72 | 14.00 | 6308 | 9.95 |  |
| 6336 | 15.56 | 13.32 | 13.08 | 6287 | 9.93 |  |
| 6341 | 15.96 | 14.24 | 9.96 | 6281 | 9.59 |  |
| 6345 | 15.56 | 12.96 | 12.52 | 6297 | 9.56 | 11.45 |
| tall non-leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6275 | 9.68 | 9.32 | 9,00 | 6280 | 10.44 |  |
| 6277 | 10.80 | 10.36 | 9.88 | 6277 | 10.35 |  |
| 6280 | 11.04 | 10.24 | 10.04 | 6321 | 9.93 |  |
| 6288 | 9.60 | 10.39 | 9.72 | 6288 | 9.90 |  |
| 6321 | 10.24 | 9.68 | 9.88 | 6329 | 9.51 |  |
| 6329 | 10.40 | 9.12 | 9.04 | 6275 | 9.33 | 9.91 |
| medium leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6283 | 10.48 | 10.08 | 10.00 | 6301 | 10.99 |  |
| 6291 | 10.60 | 10.72 | 10.04 | 6294 | 10.91 |  |
| 6293 | 10.02 | 9.60 | 9.12 | 6298 | 10.77 |  |
| 6294 | 10.92 | 10.72 | 11.08 | 6291 | 10.45 |  |
| 6296 | 10.00 | 10.32 | 9.68 | 6319 | 10.28 |  |
| 6298 | 11.28 | 10.76 | 10.28 | 6299 | 10.21 |  |
| 6299 | 10.44 | 10.28 | 9.92 | 6283 | 10.15 |  |
| 6301 | 10.26 | 11.00 | 11.72 | 6296 | 10.00 |  |
| 6319 | 10.84 | 10.04 | 9.96 | 6293 | 9.58 | 10.37 |
| medium non-leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6300 | 11.36 | 10.44 | 9.76 | 6320 | 10.87 |  |
| 6320 | 11.24 | 10.36 | 11.00 | 6300 | 10.52 |  |
| 6323 | 11.20 | 10.20 | 10.08 | 6323 | 10.49 | 10.63 |
| short leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6289 | 9.32 | 9.28 | 8.92 | 6349 | 12.95 |  |
| 6324 | 10.24 | 9.84 | 9.92 | 6347 | 12.68 |  |
| 6327 | 10.16 | 9.48 | 9.08 | 6339 | 10.72 |  |
| 6328 | 10.08 | 9.92 | 10.28 | 6328 | 10.09 |  |
| 6339 | 9.84 | 11.88 | 10.44 | 6324 | 10.00 |  |
| 6347 | 12.80 | 13.68 | 11.56 | 6327 | 9.57 |  |
| 6349 | 13.00 | 13.04 | 12.80 | 6289 | 9.17 | 10.73 |

LSD for selection means $=1.37$
Replication means involve 25 measurements

Table 4. Panicle length


LSD for selection means $=18.59$
Replication means involve 25 measurements

Table 5. Internode diameter


LSD for selection means $=.0515$
Replication means involve 25 measurements

Table 6. No. of tillers per plant

| Selection | : | Replication | means | : | Ranked means <br> selection : mean |  | : | C1ass mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | : |  |  |  |  |
| tal1 leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6281 | 31.1 | 35.1 | 39.2 |  | 6336 | 58.90 |  |  |
| 6282 | 39.1 | 27.4 | 51.0 |  | 6331 | 55.33 |  |  |
| 6287 | 34.0 | 35.9 | 50.1 |  | 6341 | 51.43 |  |  |
| 6292 | 31.6 | 38.9 | 23.3 |  | 6345 | 47.70 |  |  |
| 6297 | 40.9 | 32.4 | 45.8 |  | 6308 | 47.60 |  |  |
| 6304 | 48.1 | 48.1 | 39.5 |  | 6318 | 45.86 |  |  |
| 6308 | 39.3 | 42.3 | 61.2 |  | 6304 | 45.23 |  |  |
| 6318 | 42.4 | 50.3 | 44.9 |  | 6287 | 40.00 |  |  |
| 6331 | 45.5 | 56.3 | 64.2 |  | 6297 | 39.70 |  |  |
| 6336 | 56.7 | 59.6 | 60.4 |  | 6282 | 39.16 |  |  |
| 6341 | 47.8 | 35.9 | 70.6 |  | 6281 | 35.13 |  |  |
| 6345 | 58.4 | 50.4 | 34.3 |  | 6292 | 31.26 |  | 44.78 |
| tal1 non-leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6277 | 33.1 | 36.6 | 47.1 |  | 6321 | 47.83 |  |  |
| 6280 | 44.7 | 31.7 | 48.6 |  | 6280 | 41.66 |  |  |
| 6285 | 52.2 | 54.0 | 50.3 |  | 6329 | 39.70 |  |  |
| 6288 | 30.7 | 29.7 | 39.9 |  | 6277 | 38.93 |  |  |
| 6321 | 34.2 | 55.6 | 53.7 |  | 6275 | 34.33 |  |  |
| 6329 | 35.3 | 30.2 | 53.6 |  | 6388 | 33.43 |  | 41.15 |
| medium leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6283 | 33.8 | 44.0 | 51.5 |  | 6293 | 45.76 |  |  |
| 6291 | 29.7 | 50.1 | 46.6 |  | 6319 | 44.90 |  |  |
| 6293 | 34.6 | 50.3 | 52.4 |  | 6299 | 43.70 |  |  |
| 6294 | 23.8 | 43.5 | 43.6 |  | 6283 | 43.10 |  |  |
| 6296 | 35.1 | 34.1 | 36.8 |  | 6291 | 42.13 |  |  |
| 6298 | 35.2 | 49.9 | 36.5 |  | 6298 | 40.53 |  |  |
| 6299 | 46.8 | 42.1 | 42.2 |  | 6294 | 36.96 |  |  |
| 6301 | 37.8 | 38.0 | 24.5 |  | 6296 | 35.33 |  |  |
| 6319 | 39.1 | 53.3 | 42.3 |  | 6301 | 33.43 |  | 40.65 |
| medium non-leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6300 | 42.0 | $34 \cdot 5$ | 40.1 |  | 6323 | 42.93 |  |  |
| 6320 | 38.8 | 45.4 | 35.1 |  | 6320 | 39.76 |  |  |
| 6323 | 46.3 | 36.1 | 46.4 |  | 6300 | 35.53 |  | 39.41 |
| short leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6324 | 38.8 | 51.2 | 47.8 |  | 6349 | 49.76 |  |  |
| 6327 | 36.3 | 54.8 | 49.7 |  | 6327 | 46.93 |  |  |
| 6328 | 50.6 | 53.5 | 50.0 |  | 6324 | 45.93 |  |  |
| 6339 | 41.8 | 46.9 | 33.9 |  | 6339 | 40.86 |  |  |
| 6347 | 39.2 | 38.5 | 34.0 |  | 6347 | 37.23 |  |  |
| 6349 | 52.3 | 48.3 | 48.7 |  | 6289 | 27.53 |  | 42.80 |

LSD for selection means $=12.46$
Replication means involve 5 measurements

Table 7. Average height to tips of leaves

| Selection | : | Replication means |  | : | Ranked means |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Class } \\ \text { mean } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | : | selection | $:$ mean |  |  |
| tall leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6281 | 23.5 | 30.8 | 21.7 |  | 6345 | 52.87 |  |  |
| 6282 | 28.3 | 27.5 | 28.0 |  | 6331 | 52.47 |  |  |
| 6287 | 25.7 | 28.7 | 30.2 |  | 6336 | 50.30 |  |  |
| 6292 | 29.8 | 36.1 | 24.0 |  | 6318 | 46.17 |  |  |
| 6297 | 26.5 | 30.3 | 27.8 |  | 6341 | 45.07 |  |  |
| 6304 | 32.1 | 36.0 | 50.5 |  | 6304 | 39.53 |  |  |
| 6308 | 26.7 | 37.3 | 33.7 |  | 6308 | 32.57 |  |  |
| 6318 | 41.7 | 50.8 | 46.0 |  | 6292 | 29.97 |  |  |
| 6331 | 47.7 | 57.9 | 51.8 |  | 6287 | 28.20 |  |  |
| 6336 | 53.4 | 50.7 | 46.8 |  | 6297 | 28.20 |  |  |
| 6341 | 49.0 | 56.5 | 29.7 |  | 6282 | 27.93 |  |  |
| 6345 | 53.6 | 55.7 | 49.3 |  | 6281 | 25.33 |  | 38.22 |
| tall non-leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6275 | 31.0 | - 27.7 | 29.5 |  | 6288 | 32.17 |  |  |
| 6277 | 26.2 | 31.5 | 29.1 |  | 6285 | 31.47 |  |  |
| 6280 | 24.8 | 29.6 | 26.3 |  | 6275 | 29.40 |  |  |
| 6285 | 32.3 | 31.5 | 31.6 |  | 6329 | 29.20 |  |  |
| 6288 | 32.4 | 33.3 | 30.8 |  | 6277 | 28.93 |  |  |
| 6321 | 25.4 | 28.3 | 26.5 |  | 6280 | 26.90 |  |  |
| 6329 | 28.3 | 29.3 | 30.0 |  | 6321 | 26.73 |  | 29.26 |
| medium leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6283 | 25.2 | 26.7 | 30.2 |  | 6293 | 36.13 |  |  |
| 6291 | 23.3 | 30.5 | 27.5 |  | 6298 | 29.20 |  |  |
| 6293 | 31.7 | 41.2 | 35.5 |  | 6299 | 28.80 |  |  |
| 6294 | 25.6 | 27.1 | 30.2 |  | 6296 | 28.30 |  |  |
| 6296 | 26.1 | 29.2 | 29.6 |  | 6301 | 28.03 |  |  |
| 6298 | 30.2 | 32.4 | 25.0 |  | 6294 | 27.63 |  |  |
| 6299 | 26.6 | 30.8 | 29.0 |  | 6283 | 27.36 |  |  |
| 6301 | 28.3 | 27.9 | 27.9 |  | 6291 | 27.10 |  |  |
| 6319 | 26.3 | 28.7 | 25.1 |  | 6319 | 26.70 |  | 28.81 |
| medium non-1eafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6300 | 28.5 | 29.0 | 32.3 |  | 6320 | 33.83 |  |  |
| 6320 | 32.8 | 35.3 | 33.4 |  | 6300 | 29.93 |  |  |
| 6323 | 27.0 | 29.3 | 30.4 |  | 6323 | 28.90 |  | 30.89 |
| short leafy 620 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6289 | 22.3 | 28.3 | 26.9 |  | 6349 | 56.00 |  |  |
| 6324 | 26.5 | 33.4 | 27.7 |  | 6347 | 40.33 |  |  |
| 6327 | 29.4 | 35.3 | 32.7 |  | 6328 | 35.56 |  |  |
| 6328 | 32.8 | 42.1 | 31.8 |  | 6327 | 32.46 |  |  |
| 6339 | 33.2 | 35.6 | 27.6 |  | 6339 | 32.13 |  |  |
| 6347 | 43.7 | 43.8 | 33.5 |  | 6324 | 29.20 |  |  |
| 6349 | 62.4 | 56.8 | 48.8 |  | 6289 | 25.83 |  | 35.93 |

LSD for selection means $=6.39$
Replication means involve 5 measurements

Table 8.
Height top collar April 25


LSD for selection means $=6.13$

Table 9. Height top collar May 7


LSD for selection means $=5.62$

Table 10. Greenhouse vigor April 25


LSD for selection means $=0.94$

Table 11. Greenhouse vigor May 7


LSD for selection means $=1.32$

Table 12. Field vigor

| Selection |  | Replication |  | : | Ranked means |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Class } \\ \text { mean } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | means | : | selection | : mean |  |  |
| tall leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6281 | 3.5 |  | 3.1 | 3.2 |  | 6281 | 3.22 |  |  |
| 6282 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.1 |  | 6287 | 3.22 |  |  |
| 6287 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 3.1 |  | 6292 | 3.16 |  |  |
| 6292 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 3.2 |  | - 6282 | 3.13 |  |  |
| 6297 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.1 |  | 6297 | 3.10 |  |  |
| 6304 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 1.4 |  | 6308 | 2.93 |  |  |
| 6308 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.8 |  | 6304 | 2.30 |  |  |
| 6318 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 1.7 |  | 6341 | 1.93 |  |  |
| 6331 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 6345 | 1.66 |  |  |
| 6336 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.1 |  | 6318 | 1.63 |  |  |
| 6341 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 2.8 |  | 6336 | 1.33 |  |  |
| 6345 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 2.1 |  | 6331 | 1.30 |  | 2.41 |
| tall non-leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6275 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.8 |  | 6329 | 3.06 |  |  |
| 6277 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 2.6 |  | 6288 | 3.00 |  |  |
| 6280 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.8 |  | 6275 | 2.96 |  |  |
| 6285 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.9 |  | 6277 | 2.93 |  |  |
| 6288 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 6280 | 2.93 |  |  |
| 6321 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.8 |  | 6321 | 2.90 |  |  |
| 6329 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 2.8 |  | 6285 | 2.70 |  | 2.93 |
| medium leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6283 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 3.0 |  | 6296 | 3.13 |  |  |
| 6291 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 2.9 |  | 6283 | 3.00 |  |  |
| 6293 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 2.8 |  | 6291 | 2.96 |  |  |
| 6294 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.7 |  | 6298 | 2.90 |  |  |
| 6296 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.1 |  | 6299 | 2.90 |  |  |
| 6298 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 3.0 |  | 6319 | 2.86 |  |  |
| 6299 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 3.0 |  | 6294 | 2.83 |  |  |
| 6301 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 3.0 |  | 6293 | 2.70 |  |  |
| 6319 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.9 |  | 6301 | 2.66 |  | 2.88 |
| medium non-leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6300 | 3.0 | - 2.8 | 3.0 |  | 6300 | 2.93 |  |  |
| 6320 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.8 |  | 6323 | 2.93 |  |  |
| 6323 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 |  | 6320 | 2.43 |  | 2.76 |
| short leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6289 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 3.2 |  | 6289 | 3.26 |  |  |
| 6324 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.9 |  | 6327 | 2.93 |  |  |
| 6327 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 |  | 6324 | 2.83 |  |  |
| 6328 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.8 |  | 6328 | 2.60 |  |  |
| 6339 | 2.5 | $2 \cdot 3$ | 2.7 |  | 6339 | 2.50 |  |  |
| 6347 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.3 |  | 6347 | 2.03 |  |  |
| 6349 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 1.4 |  | 6349 | 1.30 |  | 2.49 |

LSD for selection means $=0.43$

Table 13. Heading

| Selection |  | Replication means |  | : | Ranked means |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Class } \\ \text { mean } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | selection | : mean |  |  |
| tall leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6281 | 2.3 |  |  | 2.1 | 2.8 |  | 6345 | 2.93 |  |  |
| 6282 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.3 |  | 6318 | 2.76 |  |  |
| 6287 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.2 |  | 6336 | 2.76 |  |  |
| 6292 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.7 |  | 6331 | 2.73 |  |  |
| 6297 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.2 |  | 6341 | 2.60 |  |  |
| 6304 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.9 |  | 6281 | 2.40 |  |  |
| 6308 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.3 |  | 6292 | 2.37 |  |  |
| 6318 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.5 |  | 6304 | 2.37 |  |  |
| 6331 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 3.0 |  | 6287 | 2.16 |  |  |
| 6336 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 3.0 |  | 6282 | 2.13 |  |  |
| 6341 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.5 |  | 6297 | 2.10 |  |  |
| 6345 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 3.3 |  | 6308 | 2.10 |  | 2.45 |
| tal1 non-leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6275 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.1 |  | 6321 | 2.66 |  |  |
| 6277 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.4 |  | 6280 | 2.36 |  |  |
| 6280 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.4 |  | 6277 | 2.20 |  |  |
| 6285 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 6329 | 2.20 |  |  |
| 6288 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 6275 | 2.13 |  |  |
| 6321 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.7 |  | 6285 | 2.00 |  |  |
| 6329 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.5 |  | 6288 | 2.00 |  | 2.22 |
| medium leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6283 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.3 |  | 6319 | 2.53 |  |  |
| 6291 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 2.3 |  | 6301 | 2.43 |  |  |
| 6293 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 2.0 |  | 6299 | 2.26 |  |  |
| 6294 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.2 |  | 6294 | 2.23 |  |  |
| 6296 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.1 |  | 6283 | 2.16 |  |  |
| 6298 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 2.2 |  | 6291 | 2.10 |  |  |
| 6299 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 2.7 |  | 6296 | 2.06 |  |  |
| 6301 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.9 |  | 6298 | 2.03 |  |  |
| 6319 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.8 |  | 6293 | 1.96 |  | 2.20 |
| medium non-leafy 6.100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6300 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 |  | 6323 | 2.60 |  |  |
| 6320 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 |  | 6320 | 2.16 |  |  |
| 6323 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 2.7 |  | 6300 | 2.06 |  | 2.27 |
| short leafy 62.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6289 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 2. 1 |  | 6347 | 2.80 |  |  |
| 6324 | 2.2 | $2 \cdot 3$ | 2.6 |  | 6349 | 2.46 |  |  |
| 6327 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 |  | 6339 | 2.40 |  |  |
| 6328 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 2.5 |  | 6324 | 2.36 |  |  |
| 6339 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.8 |  | 6328 | 2.30 |  |  |
| 6347 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 3.2 |  | 6289 | 2.10 |  |  |
| 6349 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.8 |  | 6327 | 2.10 |  | 2.36 |

LSD for selection means $=0.03$

Table 14. Type of growth


LSD for selection means $=3.24$

Table 15. Leafiness


LSD for selection means $=0.71$

Table 16. Accumulative germination counts by days (average of 3 replications)

| Selection : Days after start of study |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1st | 2nd | 4 th | 6th | 8 th | 11th | 13th |
| tall leary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6281 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| 6282 | 3.3 | 8.3 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 29.6 | 30.6 | 31.3 |
| 6287 | 0.6 | 2.6 | 9.0 | 12.0 | 13.6 | 14.0 | 14.3 |
| 6297 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 9.6 | 14.6 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 16.0 |
| 6304 | 7.6 | 10.0 | 12.6 | 24.3 | 15.3 | 15.3 | 15.3 |
| 6331 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 4.0 | 6.6 | 7.6 | 8.6 | 9.6 |
| 6336 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 3.0 | 4.6 | 6.0 | 6.6 |
| 6341 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 4.3 | 7.0 | 7.3 | 8.6 | 10.0 |
| 6345 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 3.6 | 6.3 | 7.6 | 9.6 | 11.3 |
| tall non-1eafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6277 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 11.0 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 11.6 |
| 6321 | 1.0 | 5.6 | 10.0 | 11.3 | 12.6 | 13.0 | 13.3 |
| 6329 | 1.6 | 5.3 | 16.6 | 21.0 | 22.6 | 23.6 | 24.6 |
| medium leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6283 | 4.3 | 6.3 | 9.6 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 11.6 | 11.6 |
| 6291 | 3.6 | 11.6 | 21.6 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 25.0 | 26.3 |
| 6293 | 1.3 | $3 \cdot 3$ | 6.3 | 11.3 | 13.0 | 13.6 | 13.6 |
| 6294 | 1.3 | 3.0 | 4.6 | 6.0 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 |
| 6299 | 0.0 | 0.3 | $3 \cdot 3$ | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| short leafy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6289 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 3.6 | 6.3 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |

Table 12. Analysis of variance of leaf length

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source of variation | D.F. |  | M.S. |
| Selections | 36 | $1800.36 \%$ |  |
| Replications | 2 | $622.22 \%$ |  |
| Selections X replications | 72 | $182.12 \%$ |  |
| Plants same sel. and rep. | 444 | $78.87 \%$ |  |
| Leaves same plant | 2220 | 13.95 |  |
| Total | 2774 |  |  |

Table 18. Analysis of variance of leaf width

| Source of variation : | D, |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source of variation : | D.F. 36 | M. $137.41^{\text {考 }}$ |
| Replications | 2 | 109.51 \% |
| Selections $X$ replications | 72 | 17.50\% |
| Plants same sel. and rep. | 444 | $5.08 \% *$ |
| Leaves same plant | 2220 | 0.70 |
| Total | 2774 |  |

Table 19. Analysis of variance of panicle length

| Sources of variation | $:$ | D.F. | $:$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Selections | 36 |  | M.S. |
| Replications | 1 | $943.30 \% \%$ |  |
| Selections X replications | 36 | 7.79 |  |
| Plants same sel. and rep. | 296 | $261.03^{* *}$ |  |
| Leaves same plant | 1480 | $116.14 * *$ |  |
| Total | 1849 | 24.70 |  |

Table 20. Analysis of variance of internode diameter

| : |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sources of variation : | D. | M.S. |
| Selections | 36 | $0.02111 * *$ |
| Replications | 1 | $0.07000 \%$ * |
| Selections X replications | 36 | $0.00166 * *$ |
| Plants same sel. and rep. | 296 | 0.00057*** |
| Stems same plant Total | 1480 1849 | 0.00009 |

Table 21. Analysis of variance of total germination count\#

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sources of variation | $:$ | D.F. | $:$ | M.S. |
| Selections | 17 |  | $181.48 \%$ |  |
| Replications | 2 | $40.57 \%$ |  |  |
| Error | 34 |  | 11.94 |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

\#Feb. 17 to Mar. 2
Table 22. Analysis of variance of greenhouse vigor, April 25

| Sources of variation | $:$ | D.F. | $:$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Selections | 37 |  | M.S. |
| Replications | 2 | $2.37^{* *}$ |  |
| Error | 74 | $7.61^{* *}$ |  |
| Total | 113 | 0.36 |  |

Table 23. Analysis of variance of greenhouse vigor, May 7

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sources of variation | $:$ | D.F. | $:$ | M.S. |
| Selections | 37 |  | $2.07^{* *}$ |  |
| Replications | 2 | $4.75^{* *}$ |  |  |
| Error | 74 | 0.66 |  |  |



Table 25. Analysis of variance of height top collar, Apr. 25

|  | $:$ | $:$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sources of variation | $:$ | D.F. | $:$ |
| Selections | 37 | 15.08 |  |
| Replications | 2 | $106.74 \% \%$ |  |
| Error | 74 | 14.22 |  |
| Total | 113 |  |  |

Table 26. Analysis of variance of field vigor, Sept. 2

|  | $:$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sources of variation | $:$ | D.F. | $:$ |
| Selections | 37 | $0.25^{* *}$ |  |
| Replications | 2 | $17.85^{* *}$ |  |
| Error | 74 | 0.07 |  |
| Total | 113 |  |  |

Table 27. Analysis of variance of heading, Aug. 15

| Sources of variation | $:$ | D.F. | $:$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selections | 37 |  |  |
| Replications | 2 | $0.287 \% *$ |  |
| Error | 74 | $0.990^{*}$ |  |
| Total | 113 | 0.026 |  |

Table 28. Analysis of variance of average height to tips of leaves

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sources of variation | $:$ | D.F. | $:$ |
| Selections | 37 |  |  |
| Replications | 2 |  | $145.75^{* *}$ |
| Error | 74 | 15.48 |  |
| Total | 113 |  |  |

Table 29. Analysis of variance of number of tillers per plant

|  | $:$ | $:$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sources of variation | $:$ | D.F. | $:$ |
| Selections | 37 | 138.43 |  |
| Replications | 2 | $307.78 * \%$ |  |
| Error | 74 | 58.81 |  |
| Total | 113 |  |  |

Table 30. Analysis of variance of type of growth

|  | $:$ | $:$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sources of variation | D.F. S. |  |  |
| Selections | 37 | $0.1562 \% \%$ |  |
| Replications | 2 | 0.0200 |  |
| Error | 74 | 0.0398 |  |
| Total | 113 |  |  |

Table 31. Analysis of variance of leafiness

|  | $\vdots$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sources of variation | $:$ | D.F. | $:$ | M.S. |
| Selections | 37 |  | 0.27 |  |
| Replications | 2 | 0.23 |  |  |
| Error | 74 | 0.19 |  |  |
| Total | 113 |  |  |  |

## Table 32. Differences between class means

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Class } \\ & \frac{\text { Clall }}{\text { tall leafy }} \end{aligned}$ | Compared with | Leaf length : Leaf widt |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Panicle } \\ \text { 1ength } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Internode } \\ \text { diameter } \end{gathered}$ | Panicle length | Internod diamete | No. of tillers per plant | Date of heading | Field height of : Type of tips of leaves: gronth |  | Vigor | Vigor May 7 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Vigor, } \\ & \text { Field } \end{aligned}$ | Height top of : Germicollar, May 7 : nation |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tall non- } \\ & \text { leafy } \end{aligned}$ | 7.47* | 1.60* | 1.56 | .0072* | 1.56 | .0072* | 3.63 | .2294* | 8.96* | \#. 0808 | \#.83* | \#.67* | \#.23* | 6.06* | \#2.64 |
|  | $\underset{\text { leafy }}{\substack{\text { medium } \\ \text { height }}}$ | 4.00* | 1.16* | 3.45* | . 0113 | 3.45* | . 0113 | 4.13* | .2552* | 9.41* | \#.0475 | \#.88* | \#.78* | \#.25* | 6.47* | \#0.66 |
|  | medium height non-leafy | 3.35* | 0.94* | 3.28* | . 0097 | 3.28* | . 0097 | 5.37 | .1775* | 7.33* | \#. 1275 | \#. 36 | \#.45 | \#.35* | 5.06* | ----- |
|  | short leafy | 0.71 | 0.81* | \#1.87 | . 0023 | \#1.87 | . 0023 | 1.98 | .0908* | 2.29* | \#.1779* | \#. 02 | . 00 | \#.08 | 2.87* | 5.80* |
| tall non-leafy | $\begin{gathered} \text { medium height } \\ \text { leafy } \end{gathered}$ | \#3.48* | \#0.44 | 1.91 | . 0041 | 1.91 | . 0041 | 0.50 | . 0258 | 0.45 | . 0333 | \#.05 | \#.11 | \#.02 | 0.41 | 1.98 |
|  | medium height non-leafy | \#4.13* | \#0.66 | 1.74* | . 0025 | 1.74* | . 0025 | 1.74 | \#.0519 | \#1.63 | \#.0467 | -47* | . 22 | \#. 12 | \#1.00 | ----- |
|  | short leafy | \#6.77* | \#0.79* | \#3.43* | \#.0049 | \#3.43* | \#.0049 | \#1.65 | \#.1386* | \#6.67* | \#.0971 | .81* | .67* | . 15 | \#3.19* | 8.44* |
| medium height leafy | medium height non-leafy | \#0.65 | \#0. 22 | \#0.17 | \#. 0016 | \#0. 17 | \#. 0016 | 1.24 | \#. 0777 | \#2.08 | \#. 0801 | .52* | . 33 | \#. 10 | \#1.41 | ----- |
|  | short leafy | \#3.29* | \#0.35 | \#5.34* | \#.0090 | \#5.34* | \#.0090 | \#. 15 | \#.1644* | \#7.12* | \#.1304* | .86* | .78* | .17* | \#3.60* | 6.46* |
| medium height nonleafy | short leafy | \#2.64* | \#0.13 | \#5.17* | \#. 0074 | \#5.17* | \#. 0074 | \#3.39 | \#.0867* | \#5.04* | \#.0504 | .34* | .45* | . 27 * | \#2.19* | ----- |

\#Differences at the 5 per cent level of significance
\#Differenenes in which the class in the second column had the
greater mean

Table 33. Simple correlation coefficients

|  | 2 | $: 3$ | : 4 | : 5 | : 6 | : 7 | : 8 | : 9 | : 10 | $\underline{\square}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | . 029 | . 800 | . 720 | . 623 | . 749 |  |  |  |  | -. 298 |
| 2 |  | . 002 | . 001 | . 001 | . 001 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  | .695 | .608 | .861 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  | .427 | .780 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  | .645 | .710 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  | . 929 |  | -.948 |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | -. 911 |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 883 |  | . ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -. 712 |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]Legend of Code No ${ }^{\circ}$.

1. Leaf length
2. Internode diameter
3. Leaf width
4. Panicle length
5. No. of tillers per plant
6. Average height to tips of leaves
7. Height top collar, May 7
8. Vigor in greenhouse, May 7
9. Vigor in field
10. Heading
11. Leafiness

Table 34. Partial correlation coefficients

|  | $:$ | 2 | 3 | $:$ | 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | -.2536 | .0247 | .1539 | -.0506 |  |
| 2 |  | -.1778 | -.0561 | .4709 |  |
| 3 |  |  | -.0651 | .4379 |  |
| 4 |  |  |  | .4897 |  |

5\% Level of significance . 339
$1 \%$ Level of significance .437
Legend of Code No's.

1. Leaf length
2. Leaf width
3. Panicle length
4. No. of tillers per plant
5. Height to tips of leaves

## DISCUSSION

Results of this study were in general agreement with the findings of Weaver and Fitzpatrick (1932) with respect to the size of the leaves, stems, panicle, and the overall height of a mature plant.

As mentioned earlier, switchgrass is useful for grazing, for hay production, and for soil conservation practices. Cornelius and Johnston (1941) are among the many who suggest that the best plant for these three uses would be a leafy, finestemmed plant of good height.

Results of the study of leaf length, leaf width, internode diameter, panicle length, height of leaf tips, and number of tillers per plant indicate that improvement of the species should not be difficult. High values for the simple correlation coefficients rl3, r15, 416, r35, r36, and r56 indicate that no adverse linkage or pleitropic relationships exist among leaf length, leaf width, number of tillers per plant, and plant height. Indeed it is likely that improvement in any one of these characters would be accompanied by improvement in each of the others.

Panicle length also was highiy correlated with the above characters. It is unlikely that panicle length would be directly involved in forage production, but it would presumably have an important bearing upon seed yield.

The lack of correlation between internode diameter and any of the other characters is encouraging. It indicates that selection for fineness of culns need not result in adverse changes in
other characters contributing to forage value.
Heterogeniety LSD values indicate significant intra-class variation in most instances, the greater differences occurring in the tall leafy and the short leafy classes. These two classes consistently exhibited the greatest ranges which often were great enough to include the ranges of other classes. The interclass differences were generally small, significance generally occurring in comparisons involving the tall leafy and short leafy classes.

Two types of switchgrass have generally been recognized, a smaller, fine-stemmed "upland" type, and a larger, coarsestemmed "lowland" type. In the present study no attempt was made to distinguish these two forms, although a recent investigation of materials in the source nurseries has indicated that the parents of lines 6345,6347 and 6349 were of the lowland type. These lines occurred in the tall leafy and short leafy classes, and an examination of the tabulated results strongly suggest that their inclusion in the study resulted in an increase in the variability found for most characters.

Results of recent studies indicate that the upland and lowland types differ cytologically, and that they may exist as distincy breeding populations. If this is true the high degree of variability demonstrated in the present study might be considered as being partly due to the inclusion of measurements from two distinct populations differing in their distribution of plant height, leaf width, etc. Additional research is required to determine whether the upland and lowland types should indeed

## EXPLANATION OF PLATE I

## Variation among selections <br> while in greenhouse.

PLATE I

be considered separate populations.
High values for the correlation coefficients r69, r78, and r56 suggest that "vigor" is largely a reflection of plant height and number of tillers per plant. Vigor appears to be a rather vague and indefinite term which, in this study at least, could well have been replaced by the more meaningful term "plant size".

It is interesting to note that differences in leafiness were less significant than were those in leaf length, leaf width, and other characters directly involved in leafiness. A large part of this apparent discrepancy is no doubt explained by the fact that "leafiness" was a visual rating which would lack much of the consistency of ratings based on actual measurements.

As shown in table 16, the ranking of the various selections with respect to percentage of germination did not become stable until about the tenth day, after which there was little additional germination. The apparent variation in rate of germination implies that sufficient time must be allowed in evaluation of seed sources for percentage germination. It is interesting to note that in the main study only one selection failed to produce a good proportion of healthy vigorous seedlings.

It is unfortunate that the parent-progeny portion of this study was lost. It would have helped establish the heritabilities of the characters studied.

## SUMMARY

A morphological study of switchgrass was established from
open-pollinated seed of selected clones. Progenies of the selected clones were established in the greenhouse and later transplanted to the field. Measurements were taken in the greenhouse and in the field. Fifteen sets of data, involving both actual measurements and visual ratings, were obtained and analyzed statistically.

The results showed high simple correlation among all factors contributing to plant yield except internode diameter. Only three partial correlation coefficients were significant. The inter-class variations were generally small with the greatest variation being present within the tall leafy and short leafy classes.

It was felt that improvement of the species should not be too difficult. A study of the correlation coefficients indicated that selections of tall plants with large leaves, slender culms, and many tillers was probably feasible.
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A study of morphological variation of various characters and their interrelationship was made as an aid to a better overall understanding of switchgrass.

From nurseries on the Kansas State University Agronomy farms seed clones were selected and classified as tall leafy, tall non-leafy, medium tall leafy, medium tall non-leafy and short leafy. The open-pollinated seed was collected and germinated in the greenhouse. Seedlings of each selection were transplanted to flats and later to the field. Observations were made on leaf length, leaf width, panicle length, internode diameter, height of tips of leaves, height of collar, number of tillers per plant, type of growth, heading, greenhouse vigor, field vigor and leafiness. The results were analyzed statistically.

The characters leaf length, leaf width, panicle length, height of leaf tips, and number of tillers per plant were highly correlated with one another. Internode diameter was not correlated with any other character, and the visual ratings were correlated only with the characters of which they were an estimate. High positive correlations among most yield-contributing characters indicated that improvement of the species would be possible by careful selection.

The class names, although accurately describing the seed parents, were not completely satisfactory for the open-pollination progeny; however the larger variations found within the tall leafy and short leafy classes were believed to have been due in part to the difference in genetic background. From recent studies it is felt that there are two distinctly different
types of switchgrass present in the Great Plains. It was
believed that both types were present in the study but were not analyzed separately.

A germination study of several selections used in the main study was made. The results showed considerable variation between selections in percentage germination. However, the seedlings used in the main study were generally easily established and in only one selection was there a shortage of plants caused by seedling mortality.

A parent-progeny study was begun but had to be abandoned because of high mortality of the parent clones.

It was felt that further work including a parent-progeny study would be of value.
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