32037

NAME OF AUTHOR / NOM DE L'AUTEUR: [illegible]

TITLE OF THESIS / TITRE DE LA THÈSE: The morphological variation associated with [illegible] in Bromus inermis [illegible]

UNIVERSITY / UNIVERSITÉ: The University of Alberta

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED / GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE: M.Sc. in Plant Breeding

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED / ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE: Spring 1977

NAME OF SUPERVISOR / NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE: [illegible]

DATED / DATÉ: [illegible] SIGNED / SIGNÉ: [illegible]

PERMANENT ADDRESS / RÉSIDENCE FIXE: [illegible]

[illegible]

Alberta, Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE MORPHOLOGICAL CHARACTERS ASSOCIATED WITH FORAGE YIELD IN BROMUS INERMIS LEYSS. AND THEIR INHERITANCE

by

CAROL MURCHISON

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

PLANT BREEDING

DEPARTMENT OF PLANT SCIENCE

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1977

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The morphological characters associated with forage yield in Bromus inermis Leyss. and their inheritance" submitted by Carol Murchison in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Plant Breeding.

....
Supervisor

....

....

....

Date.....October 25, 1976.....

Abstract

Eight clones of smooth bromegrass (Bromus inermis Leyss.) were selected from diverse sources and crossed in all possible combinations for an 8x8 diallel. Plants of the F_1, the reciprocal crosses, and parents were grown in the field at Edmonton, Alberta. Observations were recorded for the sward characters height, vigor, spread, and yield at two harvests. Tillers were classified according to type, being nonelongated, elongated, and headed. Observations were made four times during the growing season on tiller density, individual tiller weight, weight and area of leaves, stems, and heads per tiller, leaf number per tiller, stem length, leaf to stem ratio, and standard leaf weight.

Results showed that individual tiller weight was positively related to leaf area and standard leaf weight within the tiller type. Nonelongated tiller number was positively related to number of leaves per nonelongated tiller, while elongated and headed tiller number increased with increasing stem length. High standard leaf weight, leaf to stem ratio, and leaf weight was negatively associated with the number of elongated and headed tillers. There were negative correlations between the three tiller types.

Different tiller characters influenced yield of each of the two harvests. Characteristics of stems contribute more

yield than leaves. Standard leaf weight was frequently positively related to yield. Vigorous growth early in the season had a prominent effect on yield of the first harvest and was positively associated with the second harvest. Height at the time of each harvest was highly predictive of yield of the respective harvests. The taller plants yielded best.

General combining ability was significant for most of the characters observed. Fewer specific combining abilities were significant. Broad and narrow sense heritabilities were estimated. It was possible to identify sward and tiller characters which could be used in a selection index to develop the crop ideotype. On the basis of general combining ability effects the best yielding parent was a disease-susceptible clone, and one of the poorest was disease resistant.

Acknowledgements

Dr. [illegible] D. Walton and Mr. Hans Jahn made this thesis possible. I am very grateful to Dr. Walton for giving me the opportunity to do this research. Dr. Walton was always patient and encouraging; he gave generously of his time to this project. I sincerely appreciate the guidance he has given me throughout my plant breeding program.

Mr. [illegible] Jahn applied his energy and enthusiasm to the task of [illegible] collection. I am grateful not only for his tireless help, but also for the example of high quality workmanship he set.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS vi

LIST OF TABLES vii

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. LITERATURE REVIEW .... [illegible]
A. Morphological Characters Associated with Yield of Forage Grasses .... [illegible]
B. Statistical and Genetic Analysis .... [illegible]

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS .... [illegible]

IV. RESULTS .... [illegible]
A. General Trends in Tiller Characters .... [illegible]
B. The Associations Between Tiller Characters Within Tiller Types .... [illegible]
C. The Association Between Tiller Types .... [illegible]
D. Tiller Characters Associated With the Yield of the First Harvest .... [illegible]
E. Tiller Characters Associated With the Yield of the Second Harvest .... [illegible]
F. Tiller Characters Associated With Total Yield .... [illegible]
G. Dwarf Characters Associated With Yield .... [illegible]
H. The Genetics of Tiller and Dwarf Characters .... [illegible]

V. DISCUSSION .... [illegible]
A. The Accumulation of Photosynthates in Parts of Tillers .... [illegible]
B. The Accumulation of Photosynthates in Whole Tillers .... [illegible]
C. The Accumulation of Photosynthates in the Dwarfs .... [illegible]

VI. TABLES AND FIGURES .... [illegible]

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY .... [illegible]

LIST OF TABLES

1. [illegible] between [illegible] parents [illegible], [illegible] . . . . [illegible]

2. Mean values of [illegible] and [illegible] yield for eight parental [illegible] . . . . [illegible]

3. Simple correlations between tiller characters, presenting the first sampling date above the diagonal and the second sampling date below the diagonal . . . . [illegible]

4. Simple correlations between tiller characters, presenting the third sampling date above the diagonal and the fourth sampling date below the diagonal . . . . [illegible]

5. Tiller characters included in multiple regression equations for individual nonheaded tiller weight, [illegible] . . . . [illegible]

6. Tiller characters included in multiple regression equations for individual all headed tiller weight, [illegible] . . . . [illegible]

7. Tiller characters included in multiple regression equations for individual headed tiller weight, n=[illegible] . . . . [illegible]

8. Tiller characters included in multiple regression equations for nonheaded tiller number, n=[illegible] . . . . [illegible]

9. Tiller characters included in multiple regression equations for all headed tiller number, n=[illegible] . . . . [illegible]

10. Tiller characters included in multiple regression equations for headed tiller number, n=[illegible] . . . . [illegible]

11. Simple correlations between tiller characters at four sampling dates and yield, n=[illegible] . . . . [illegible]

12. Simple correlations between sward characters and yield, n=[illegible] . . . . [illegible]

13. Stepwise multiple regression analysis with first harvest yield used as the dependent variable, n=[illegible] . . . . [illegible]

14. Stepwise multiple regression analysis with first harvest yield used as the dependent variable, and sward characters deleted, n=[illegible] . . . . [illegible]

15. Stepwise multiple regression analysis with second harvest yield used as the dependent variable, n=[illegible] . . . . [illegible]

INTRODUCTION

[illegible] bermudagrass [illegible] is widely [illegible] the most [illegible] grasses, [illegible] when grown [illegible] grasses [illegible] fertilization and mixes well with [illegible] part [illegible].

The [illegible] bermudagrass varieties are better adapted to [illegible] and [illegible] southern [illegible]. The southern types are taller, [illegible] stemmed, more strongly creeping, and less leafy than northern varieties. The northern types turn green earlier in the year and remain green later in the fall than the southern types. They are more resistant than southern varieties to [illegible] and leaf spot diseases. Leaf spot diseases are a problem for bermudagrass [illegible] and attempts have been made to develop resistant varieties.

The [illegible] and northern type bermudagrasses, and the [illegible] resistant varieties represent a range of [illegible] types of bermudagrass. [illegible] the objective of this study [illegible] identify [illegible] characteristics of sward and [illegible] which influence yield of bermudagrass, and

[illegible]

[illegible] Physical Characters A[illegible]

[illegible] Tree Grasses

[illegible] Investigators have been seeking to establish [illegible] relationships between the variation [illegible] tiller morphology and yield of forage grasses and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. The relationships between tiller characteristics [illegible] selection may be simplified by using [illegible] characteristics [illegible] selection [illegible] complicated by such [illegible].

Anslow, [illegible] showed that rate of herbage production of timothy was [illegible] related to size of tillers at harvest. Wright, [illegible] correlated [illegible] of Dactylis glomerata with individual fertile tiller weight. Langer, [illegible] showed that [illegible] Festuca arundinacea [illegible] the number of tillers declined, increases in dry matter became [illegible] of unit tiller weight. Rogers and [illegible], [illegible], Anslow, [illegible] and Thomson, Wright, and Rogers, [illegible] related yield of Lolium perenne to tiller number. [illegible] and [illegible], [illegible] and Thomson, [illegible] found number and [illegible] of tillers of equal importance in determining growth rates of perennial ryegrass. Thomson, Wright, and Rogers, [illegible] observed a tendency for the relative importance of weight of individual fertile and sterile tillers to increase [illegible] ward [illegible] and [illegible] culture, [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] flowering [illegible] were [illegible] and [illegible] were [illegible] from the [illegible] maximum [illegible] were [illegible] varied [illegible] development. [illegible] concluded that [illegible] depend on both number and size of vegetative tillers present [illegible] the [illegible] tillers at the time of defoliation.

Tiller dens[illegible] perennial and Italian ryegrass [illegible] lium multiflorum [illegible] low and fall [illegible] later [illegible] and [illegible] increases [illegible] from early spring [illegible] maximum and then decreased until autumn [illegible] and [illegible] Langer, [illegible] Hunt and Brougham, [illegible] and [illegible] Templeton, [illegible] Hunt and Brougham, [illegible] decline in tiller density [illegible]

[illegible] tillers, but rather [illegible] tiller death and [illegible] new tiller initiation.

[illegible] Langer, Ryle, and Jewiss, 19[illegible] and [illegible] that inflorescence initiation reduced [illegible] while [illegible] Jewiss and McWilliam, 19[illegible], [illegible] and Jewiss, 19[illegible] have shown that [illegible] tillering. It was suggested [illegible] Langer, [illegible], and Jewiss, 19[illegible], Williams, 19[illegible], [illegible] and [illegible], 19[illegible], and [illegible] and [illegible], 19[illegible] that [illegible] contributed to the decline in tiller number. Jewiss and [illegible], 19[illegible] rejected this possibility, observing that [illegible] were approximately the same size.

[illegible], 19[illegible] and [illegible] and Black, 19[illegible] associated [illegible] growth rate with increasing [illegible] area. Cheard and [illegible], 19[illegible] found forage growth rate increased until almost complete light interception. Wilson and McGuire, 19[illegible] obtained highest [illegible] yield when [illegible]% of the incident light reached the base of the sward. Thompson, Wright, and Rogers, 19[illegible] and [illegible] and Edwards, 19[illegible] recommended selection for high optimum leaf area index. Taylor and Templeton, 19[illegible] found [illegible] leaf area index related to average dry matter [illegible] in [illegible] grass, but during certain periods little or no relationship existed. Anslow, 19[illegible] found [illegible] growth rate unrelated to photosynthetic area. He suggested other factors besides leaf area index which [illegible] the [illegible]

[illegible] with rate. There were [illegible] arrangement [illegible] leaves. The interaction of sward structure and carbon dioxide diffusion, leaf turnover [illegible], and [illegible] in the [illegible] of assimilation of an individual leaf during its life. Rhodes and [illegible], [illegible], Rhodes, [illegible], and Rhodes, [illegible] and [illegible], [illegible] concluded that canopy architecture was as important as [illegible] carbon dioxide exchange of individual leaves in determining crop productivity. Leafe, Stiles and Dickinson, [illegible] proposed that leaf arrangement in the [illegible] light [illegible] carbon dioxide exchange of [illegible] tillers of Lolium perenne as compared to reproductive tillers. Rhodes, [illegible] demonstrated higher yield from Lolium perenne when incident light was spread over a larger photosynthetic area. He concluded that area for area comparisons of leaf areas were not adequate to describe their relationship to yield since canopy structure is important in determining photosynthetic exposure.

The importance of rate of leaf turnover in the sward was recognized by Hunt, [illegible] and Hunt and Brougham, [illegible] who reported that leaf loss through senescence was one of the major determinants of yield. Simon, Davies, and Troughton, [illegible] found that greater losses due to death and decay in swards occurred when cutting height is increased and that this may account for the failure to see increases in production.

The contribution of a leaf to increasing dry weight of the plant depends upon the balance between its photosynthesis and respiration. Anslow, [illegible], Begg and Wright, [illegible], Hopkinson, [illegible], Pearce, [illegible], Alberquerque, [illegible], and Ludwig and Woledge, [illegible] reported a linear net assimilation rate with increasing age of leaves. Pearce, Brown, and Blaser, [illegible], and Brown and Blaser, [illegible] found that shading leaves decreased their photosynthetic ability. Some [illegible] have maintained that because of these limitations in photosynthetic ability, at high leaf area, shaded leaves become parasitic, respiring more photosynthate than they contribute. There is evidence, however (Brown and Blaser, [illegible] and Alberquerque, [illegible]) that respiration decreases as shading increases. Ludwig, Saeki, and Evans, [illegible], McCree and Troughton, [illegible], King and Evans, [illegible], and Wilfong, Brown, and Blaser, [illegible] demonstrated that respiration decreases in the lower leaves, being dependent upon substrate supply rather than light. Lower leaves have been shown by loss of weight not to act as metabolic sinks, suggesting that the respiratory load of a sward is not proportional to leaf area (Davidson and Donald, 1958, Watson, [illegible], Wilfong, Brown, and Blaser, [illegible] and Williams, Loomis, and Lepley, [illegible]). Wilson and Cooper, 1970 associated increasing net carbon dioxide exchange and net assimilation rate of Lolium perenne with smaller mesophyll cells. Leaf size and photosynthetic rate were negatively correlated because larger leaves have larger cells and there is a negative relationship between mesophyll cell size and rate of photosynthesis per unit leaf area (Cooper and Tr[illegible]key, 197[illegible], Wilson and Cooper, 196[illegible], 1969, and Rhodes, 197[illegible]). Rhodes, 1972 did however [illegible] small cell size associated with [illegible] lower leaf [illegible] lower yield.

[illegible]ems, especially the lower portions, represent a substantial proportion of yield (Anslow, 1967). Hunt and Brougham, 19[illegible] and Rhodes, 1971 found it is essential that the stems be erect enough to be collected by harvesting since no benefit derived from increased stubble height (Anslow, 1971, Davies and Troughton, 197[illegible] and Kneivel, Jacques, and Smith, 1971). Watson and Norman, 1937 and Thorne, 19[illegible] recognized the photosynthetic contribution of leaf sheaths. Langer, 1958 attributed high relative growth rates after ear emergence to the additional photosynthetic area of leaf sheaths and ears.

Langer, 1959 found rate of dry matter production was increased by increasing residual foliage after cutting, but Simon, Davies, and Troughton, 197[illegible] did not increase herbage production from perennial ryegrass by raising the height of cutting. By increasing the product of leaf area x time between harvests Sheard and Winch, 1966 increased the productivity of timothy, smooth brome, and cocksfoot. Davies, 19[illegible] decreased the leaf number of ryegrass by increasing the height of cutting because leaf laminae were removed but stem apices left intact. Simon, Davies and Troughton, 1972 found no influence of height of cutting on rate of leaf appearance in Lolium perenne.

In swards of Lolium perenne decreasing frequency of defoliation was associated with heavier tillers, more reproductive tillers, and higher total tiller number after the midsummer depression in tiller number (Anslow, 1967). Cutting either meadow fescue or timothy every four weeks did not alter the seasonal trend in tiller number (Langer, 1963). Knight, 1970 found number of sterile and fertile tillers of Dactylis glomerata reduced by frequent cutting but unaffected by harvesting at 4 to 6 week intervals. Uncut plants produced fewer reproductive tillers than plants which were defoliated.

Teel, 1956, Paulsen and Smith, 1967 and Reynolds and Smith, 1962 showed that productivity decreased with defoliation between the initiation of internode elongation to ear emergence because during this period shoot apices were susceptible to removal, carbohydrate reserves were minimal, and axillary buds were not developed. Kneivel, Jacques, and Smith, 1971 achieved maximum yields of smooth brome and timothy by cutting at early anthesis. Langer, 1959 found that cutting timothy before apices differentiated temporarily increased tiller number while cutting afterwards had the opposite effect.

Branson, 1953 found the proportion of vegetative to reproductive tillers in a sward influenced its regrowth, the more vegetative swards surviving best. For two weeks after defoliation of orchard grass increased ground cover was due almost entirely to leaf expansion of nonflowering tillers (Taylor and Templeton, 1966). Jewiss, 1972 said that amounts of regrowth depend on both number and size of vegetative tillers present at the base of reproductive tillers at the time of cutting. Anslow, 1967 found that a few, large tillers of *Lolium perenne* gave the same regrowth as many small tillers. Taylor and Templeton, 1966 reported that stubble of fertile tillers of orchard grass was higher in stored carbohydrates than vegetative tillers.

.. Statistical and Genetic Analysis

The method of stepwise multiple regression described by Draper and Smith, 1967 was applied to bromegrass by Walton in 1970. He used yield of each of two harvests as dependent variables, and also used multiple regression to determine the independent variables associated with some tiller characteristics. Walton associated increased yield of forage with increased winter survival and plant height. Stepwise [illegible] ression also showed relationships between leaf [illegible] nd stem weight and yield. The regression procedure [illegible] endencies between tiller number and stem weig[illegible] nt and standard leaf weight and between stand[illegible] and leaf number per stem. Also leaf weight [illegible] m area and stem area and leaf number we[illegible] regression. Much of the variation in tiller n[illegible]

Diallel crosses have been used by various workers to test the progeny of forage grass species (Dunn and Wright, 1970, Mishra, Drolsom, and [illegible], 1970, Robinson and Thomas, [illegible], Timothy, Thomas, and [illegible], [illegible], Mishra and Drolsom, [illegible], and Drolsom and Nielsen, 1976). The method of diallel analysis described in [illegible] by Griffing gives an estimate of general combining ability, specific combining ability, and reciprocal effects. Sprague and Tatum, 194[illegible], defined general combining ability (GCA) as the average performance of a line in hybrid combination, while specific combining ability (SCA) was the difference between the performance of a cross and the average performance of the lines in the cross.

The GCA variance is one quarter of the variance due to additive gene action, while the SCA variance is one quarter of the variance due to dominance, epistasis, and genotype by environment interaction (Gardner, [illegible]). Hanson and Carnahan, 195[illegible] reviewed the use of combining abilities for evaluating forage grasses. Robinson and Thomas, 19[illegible], Dunn and Wright, 1970, Mishra and Drolsom, 197[illegible], Walton, 1974, Tan and Dunn, 1976, Walton, 1976, and Tan, Tan, and Walton, 1976 found GCA larger than SCA for most morphological characteristics. Specific combining ability has been reported to be significant (Sleper and Drolsom, 1974, Walton, 1974, Tan and Dunn, 1976, and Drolsom and Nielsen, 1976). Knowles, 19[illegible], Mishra and Drolsom, 197[illegible], and Tan, Tan, and Walton, 1976 reported SCA larger than GCA for some [illegible] (Christie and Kalton, [illegible]) concluded that the relative importance of GCA and SCA depended upon the parental clones used. If the parents of the diallel have not undergone selection for their combining ability the variance for GCA was more important than the variance for SCA. If the parents have been selected for their combining ability the variance for SCA was more important than the variance for GCA. Where GCA is more important parents would be suitable for a multi-clone synthetic, whereas clones with high SCA effects would be used as parents for two-clone synthetics. Reciprocal effects were significant for some traits in orchardgrass ([illegible], [illegible], [illegible] and [illegible], [illegible], Christie and [illegible], [illegible], and Walton, [illegible]). Christie and [illegible], [illegible]) suggested that reciprocal effects are of little consequence in synthetic combinations when a number of clones is involved.

[illegible] ([illegible]) described individual tiller weight and number as inherited to some degree independently, but Thomson, Wright and Powers, [illegible] and Cooper and Edwards, [illegible] reported a negative correlation between tiller number and individual tiller weight. They also found differences between progeny in number and average and total dry weight of sterile and fertile tillers to be due to both general and specific combining ability.

Gardner, [illegible] and Wright, [illegible] derived procedures for estimating broad and narrow sense heritabilities. Broad

Broad heritability (h) is that portion of phenotypic variation which is heritable, while narrow sense heritability (h) is that portion of the heritable variation which is due to additive gene action. [illegible], [illegible] reported tiller weight and number is very sensitive to the environment. Troughton, 1971 said that the general level of energy substrates controls tiller number and size. [illegible], [illegible] was not enthusiastic about breeding for tiller number and weight as components of yield saying that tiller number is of limited predictive value in determining dry weight since there is considerable variation between plants in tiller weight.

Hunt and Brougham, [illegible] found significant differences among species in the amount of tissue present before a balance was achieved between leaf production and death. [illegible], Davies, and Troughton, 1972 and Cooper and Edwards, [illegible] found marked differences between genotypes in leaf weight and overall size. Cooper and Edwards, 1960 also found that selection for a rapid rate of leaf appearance in ryegrass resulted in smaller leaves and vise versa.

[illegible] MATERIALS AND METHODS

[illegible] in [illegible] A[illegible], [illegible] from [illegible]. The[illegible] were [illegible] [illegible] grown [illegible] shown at [illegible], and [illegible] was [illegible] from [illegible] established pasture in Alberta, [illegible] range of morphological type which is presented in Table 1. These eight parents were [illegible] in all [illegible] combinations [illegible] the [illegible] method [illegible] and Nielsen, [illegible] and the [illegible] diallel was established in the field at [illegible] in 19[illegible]. Four individual plants of each [illegible] of the eight parents, the [illegible] and the reciprocal [illegible] were planted in a plot [illegible] cm. The plots were arranged in a randomized block design. After two years of growth the four individual plants had grown together to form a sward completely covering the plot area. The sward [illegible] was harvested twice annually [illegible] flower.

At four dates in 19[illegible] each plot in three replications was sampled by clipping all plant material from an area [illegible] cm. x [illegible] cm. at four locations in the sward. The sampling dates were: May [illegible], June [illegible], June 2[illegible], and July 2[illegible], which correspond [illegible] the [illegible] with [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] were [illegible] the sample were [illegible] and [illegible] were [illegible] tillers. A [illegible] tiller [illegible] was [illegible] early in the [illegible], when [illegible] was [illegible] smaller [illegible] later in the [illegible] tillers [illegible] within [illegible]. The tiller [illegible] were [illegible] weight [illegible] tiller [illegible] leaf number per [illegible], stem length, individual tiller weight, leaf [illegible] stem weight, average area per leaf, and standard leaf weight. These were determined using a Hayashi-Denko, Model AAM-5 automatic area meter. Leaf sheaths were included in the stem. Weights were determined after the plant parts were dried at [illegible]. Standard leaf weight was the weight per unit area of [illegible]. Average leaf area was the average size of leaf for [illegible]. The sward characteristics observed were vigor, spread, and height to the flag leaf at the time of [illegible] harvest. Vigor and spread were rated early in the [illegible] by a visual score, [illegible] of [illegible] was used for the most vigorous plants, while 9 indicated maximum spread of the [illegible] in the plot. The observations were [illegible] as plot means.

[illegible] tiller [illegible] were [illegible] with [illegible] correlation and stepwise [illegible] tiller [illegible] were [illegible] tiller [illegible] dependent variables [illegible] were [illegible] analysis [illegible] F, and [illegible] between tiller characteristics was analyzed using simple correlation and stepwise multiple regression. [illegible] tiller weight and tiller number [illegible] were dependent variables in regression analysis using all other [illegible] characteristics as independent variables. The stepwise multiple regression procedure used enters independent variables into the regression equation according to the proportion of variation of the dependent variable for which they account. The regression analysis was considered complete when the introduction of a new independent variable [illegible] in a change of less than 1% of the variance of the dependent variable.

Initially, [illegible] of [illegible] analysis was used to identify [illegible] mean squares of characteristics of single tillers which [illegible] was significant variation between genotypes according to an analysis of variance. The [illegible] used for partitioning the general combining ability (GCA), specific combining ability (SCA), and reciprocal effects (RE) was

$$Y_{ijk} = u + g_i + g_j + s_{ij} + r_{ij} + e_{ijk}$$

were u is the population mean effect, g_i (or g_j) is the GCA effect for the i^{th} (or j^{th}) parents, s_{ij} is the SCA effect for the cross between the i^{th} and j^{th} parents such that $s_{ij} = s_{ji}$, r_{ij} is the reciprocal effect and e_{ijk} is the residual error associated with the ijk^{th} plot. Since the plants were not selected for any of the characteristics under study Model 2 was used and Method 2, including parents, F_1, and reciprocals was appropriate. Model 1 is used when parents have been selected for the characters under study. The data was also analysed using Model 1, Method 2 to generate estimates of general and specific combining ability effects, since this information was needed to select parents suitable for a breeding program. Following procedures developed by Gardner, 1963 and Wright, 1970 broad sense heritability (H_b) and narrow sense heritability (H_n) were estimated as:

$$H_b = (4\hat{\sigma}^2_g + 4\hat{\sigma}^2_s) / (4\hat{\sigma}^2_g + 4\hat{\sigma}^2_s + \hat{\sigma}^2_r + \hat{\sigma}^2_e)$$

$$H_n = 4\hat{\sigma}^2_g / (4\hat{\sigma}^2_g + 4\hat{\sigma}^2_s + \hat{\sigma}^2_r + \hat{\sigma}^2_e)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}^2_g$, $\hat{\sigma}^2_s$, $\hat{\sigma}^2_r$ and $\hat{\sigma}^2_e$ are the GCA, SCA, reciprocal, and error variance components, respectively. Zero was used as an approximation of negative variance after the manner of Mishra and Drolsom, 1972.

[illegible]

[illegible]

A [illegible] was [illegible] the total number [illegible] tillers increased from the first sampling date [illegible] tillers [illegible] sampling date and was [illegible] the [illegible] elongated tillers [illegible] tillers between the second and third sampling dates were [illegible] with [illegible]. The number and [illegible] of elongated tillers fell from the first to the third sampling date, then [illegible] after the first harvest. The number and [illegible] of headed tillers [illegible] from [illegible] the third sampling date, then fell after the first harvest. The number of headed tillers fell until the third sampling date, [illegible] until the fourth [illegible]. Elongated tillers of [illegible] types [illegible] were smaller at the third than the [illegible] sampling date. As the tillers [illegible] from [illegible] elongated tillers of [illegible], [illegible], and [illegible] increased in almost all characteristics, while [illegible] only increased in stem size. Between the second and third sampling dates the elongated tillers of [illegible] and [illegible] increased in [illegible] and became less stemmy. After the first harvest elongated tillers of [illegible] increased in leaf and stem [illegible], while [illegible] only increased in stem [illegible]. [illegible] elongated tillers [illegible] in weight and leafiness between the second and third sampling dates and produced stemmy regrowth. [illegible] grew before the first harvest [illegible]. Elongated tillers of [illegible], [illegible],

[illegible] area [illegible] and [illegible], [illegible], and [illegible] [illegible]. There is [illegible] variation in [illegible] tillers [illegible] (Table [illegible]).

The Relationship between Tiller Characters within Tiller Types

Generally, throughout the season, increasing individual tiller weight within a tiller type was positively correlated with increasing number, area, and weight of leaves per tiller, stem length and area per tiller, and head area and weight of the tillers (Tables [illegible] and [illegible]). Also the number, area, and weight of leaves, length, area, and weight of stems, and weight and area of heads were all positively correlated within tiller types (Tables [illegible] and 8). Multiple regression equations related individual tiller weight of each tiller type positively to the leaf area per tiller and standard leaf weight of tillers within that tiller type throughout the season (Tables 5, 6, and 7). At the first sampling date individual nonelongated tiller weight was [illegible]tively correlated with number of nonelongated tillers (Tables [illegible], [illegible], and 7). The leaf to stem ratio of [illegible] tillers was negatively related by multiple regression to individual tiller weight throughout the season (Table [illegible]).

The multiple regression equations showed that number of nonelongated tillers was positively related to number of leaves per tiller within the category throughout the season (Table [illegible]). Stem length of elongated and headed tillers were positively related by correlation and regression to number of tillers within their respective categories (Tables [illegible], and 10). Leaf to stem ratio of elongated tillers was negatively correlated with tiller number at the second sampling date (Table [illegible]). Regression analysis also related elongated tiller number and standard leaf weight negatively at the second sampling date (Table 9). Leaf to stem ratio of elongated tillers was negatively correlated with their tiller number at the fourth sampling date (Table 4), while multiple regression related leaf weight per elongated tiller negatively to their tiller number at this time (Table 9). Multiple regression related number of headed tillers negatively to the leaf weight per headed tiller and standard leaf weight of headed tillers at the second and third sampling dates respectively (Table 10). The standard leaf weight of headed tillers was negatively correlated with their tiller number at the third sampling date (Table 4).

[illegible]. The Association Between Tiller Types

Throughout the season, for nonelongated and elongated tillers, an increase in the weight of individual tillers of one type was associated with a decrease in the number of tillers of the other type (Tables [illegible],4,5, and 6). At the second sampling date the weight of leaves per elongated tiller was negatively related to number of nonelongated tillers (Tables [illegible] and [illegible]). At the third sampling date the size of leaves of nonelongated tillers was negatively related to number of elongated tillers (Table 9). By the time of the third sampling date stems had developed so that their increasing size was negatively correlated with size of nonelongated tillers (Table [illegible]). At the fourth sampling date number and weight of nonelongated tillers were negatively related to leaf and stem size of elongated tillers (Tables 4 and 5).

At the second and fourth sampling dates the nonelongated tillers resembled the elongated tillers in that both types of tillers increased in weight and number as the two types of tillers followed a similar growth pattern (Tables [illegible], [illegible], and [illegible]).

Nonelongated and headed tillers were associated negatively throughout the season (Tables 3,4,5, and 8). At the second sampling date increasing number of either nonelongated or headed tillers was associated with decreasing size of tillers of the other type (Tables [illegible] and [illegible]). At the fourth sampling date the tiller numbers of the two types of tillers were negatively correlated and number of nonelongated tillers was negatively correlated with individual headed tiller weight (Table 4).

Elongated and headed tillers were negatively related at the second and third sampling dates since increasing number of tillers of one type was associated with decreasing individual tiller weight of tillers of the other type (Tables 3,4,6, and 9). At the second sampling date the number of headed tillers was negatively related to leaf and stem characteristics of elongated tillers (Tables 8 and 10). At the third sampling date elongated tiller number was negatively related to nearly all characteristics of headed tillers, but there were positive correlations between size of elongated and headed tillers (Table 4). At the fourth sampling date also there were positive correlations between elongated and headed tiller characteristics (Table 4).

4. Tiller Characters Associated with the Yield of the First Harvest

At the first sampling date regression and correlation related the number of nonelongated tillers positively to first harvest yield (Tables 11,13, and 14). Regression also related the leaf area per nonelongated tiller positively to yield (Tables [illegible] and 14). At the second sampling date first harvest yield was positively correlated with the weight and number of headed tillers and the number, area, and weight of leaves per headed tiller (Table 11). Regression analysis related yield positively to the length of headed tiller stems (Tables 13 and 14). At the second sampling date first harvest yield was negatively correlated with number and weight of nonelongated tillers, their leaf number and weight per tiller, and their standard leaf weight (Table 11). Regression analysis also related number of leaves per nonelongated tiller negatively to yield (Tables 13 and 14). Regression and correlation associated the standard leaf weight of elongated tillers negatively with first harvest yield (Tables 11, 13, and 14) and the correlation of leaf to stem ratio of elongated tillers with yield was negative (Table 11).

At the third sampling date negative correlations with the first harvest yield predominated. The number of nonelongated tillers, their weight, average area per leaf, and their leaf number, weight, and area per tiller were all negatively correlated with yield (Table 11). Regression analysis related first harvest yield negatively to individual nonelongated tiller weight, weight of headed tiller stems, and the leaf weight per headed tiller (Tables 13 and 14). Positive correlations were found between first harvest yield and the stem lengths of elongated and headed tillers and the number of headed tillers (Table 11). Regression related the length of headed tiller stems positively to first harvest yield (Table 14).

By the time of the fourth sampling date none of the tiller characteristics were correlated with yield of the first harvest. Regression related number of nonelongated and elongated tillers positively, and individual nonelongated tiller weight and number of headed tillers negatively to first harvest yield (Tables 13 and 14).

5. Tiller Characters Associated with the Yield of the Second Harvest

At the first sampling date correlation and regression related number of nonelongated tillers positively to second harvest yield (Tables 11, 1', and 16), and regression showed a positive relationship between leaf area per nonelongated tiller and yield (Table 16).

At the second sampling date the number of elongated tillers was positively related to second harvest yield by regression (Table 15), and regression and correlation showed a positive association between yield and area of elongated tiller stems (Tables 11 and 16). There was a positive correlation between yield and elongated tiller stem length (Table 11). Correlation and regression related number of headed tillers and their stem length positively to yield of the second harvest (Tables 11, 15, and 16). Stem area per headed tiller was also positively correlated with yield (Table 11). At the second sampling date the standard leaf weight of both nonelongated and elongated tillers was negatively correlated with second harvest yield (Table 11). Regression related individual elongated tiller weight and stem weight per headed tiller negatively to yield (Table 15).

At the third sampling date regression analysis related number of elongated tillers positively to second harvest yield (Table 15). Regression and correlation showed positive associations between number of headed tillers and their stem length and second harvest yield (Tables 11, and 16). Stem area per headed tiller was also positive rrelated with yield (Table 11). Regression and correlation owed a negative association between yield and the sta d leaf weight of headed tillers (Tables 11 and 16).

At the fourth sampling date regression related nonelongated tiller number positively to second harvest yield (Table 15). The number of elongated and headed tillers, their weight, their leaf number and leaf area, the average area of their leaves, their stem lengths, areas, and weights were all positively correlated with the yield of the second harvest (Table 11). Regression analysis also showed positive associations between length of elongated tiller stems and num r of headed tillers and yield (Tables 15 and 16). There was a negative correlation between yield and standard leaf weight of nonelongated tillers at the fourth sampling date (Table 11). Correlation and regression showed a negative relationship between elongated tiller standard leaf weight and yield (Tables 11 and 16). Regression analysis also related elongated tiller leaf to stem ratio negatively to second harvest yield (Tables 15 and 16).

. Tiller Characters Associated with Total Yield

At the first sampling date number of leaves per tiller and number of nonelongated tillers were positively correlated with yield totalled over both harvests (Table 11). When the second sample was taken total yield was positively correlated with number and weight of headed tillers and their number and area of leaves per tiller. The size and number of nonelongated tillers was negatively correlated with total yield. At the third sampling date tiller number and stem length of headed, and stem length of elongated tillers were positively correlated with total yield. Number and weight of nonelongated tillers, their number, area and weight of leaves per tiller, and average area per leaf as well as standard leaf weight and leaf to stem ratio of headed tillers were negatively correlated with total yield. At the fourth sampling date number, leaf stem area, and stem length of elongated tillers were positively correlated with total yield. Leaf to stem ratio and standard leaf weight of elongated tillers were negatively correlated with total yield.

C. Sward Characters Associated with Yield

For the sward characteristics the correlations between combined and individual yields, vigor, and heights of both harvests were all significant (Table 12). For all sampling dates vigor accounted for most of the variation in first harvest yield (Table 13). Height at the first harvest was included in the regression equation on first harvest yield at the first, third, and fourth sampling dates (Table 13). Spread was included in the regression equation on first harvest yield at the first sampling [illegible]. Throughout the season height at the second harvest accounted for most of the variation in second harvest yield (Table [illegible]). The regression analysis indicated that vigor was an important component of second harvest yield at the first and third sampling dates (Table [illegible]).

[illegible]. The Genetics of Tiller and Sward Characteristics

The analysis of variance showed significant differences between genotypes for all characteristics reported in Table [illegible], except first harvest yield. [illegible]eneral combining ability was significant for nearly every trait studied (Table 17). Fewer specific combining abilities were significant. In most cases the mean square values for general combining ability were substantially larger than the values for specific combining ability. Reciprocal effects were significant for a few of the traits studied. The general combining ability effects of TA12 were consistently low for all traits, though only the total yield GCA effect of B42 was low (Table 17). The GCA effects for UA10 were high for total yield, second harvest yield, height at the second harvest, and vigor. SCA effects for selected characters are listed in Table 18.

The broad and narrow sense heritabilities are presented in Table 17. Of the tiller and sward characteristics related to yield broad sense heritabilities were high for height at the second harvest, leaf area per nonelongated tiller at the first sampling date, individual elongated tiller weight at the second sampling date, and, at the third sampling date, individual nonelongated tiller weight, and leaf and stem weight of headed tillers. At the fourth sampling date broad sense heritability was high for the number of nonelongated tillers. Intermediate magnitudes of broad sense heritability were recorded for height at the first harvest, vigor, number of nonelongated tillers early in the season, area of elongated tiller stems at the second sampling date, and length and weight of headed tiller stems at this time. At the third sampling date broad sense heritability of headed tiller number and stem length was intermediate, and at the fourth sampling date broad sense heritabilities of elongated tiller number and stem length were intermediate. Broad sense heritabilities of elongated tiller standard leaf weight were low at the second and fourth sampling dates, that of headed tillers was low at the third sampling date, and number of headed tillers at the fourth sampling date had a low broad sense heritability. Narrow sense heritabilities were low for nearly every characteristic associated with yield except height at the second harvest, individual elongated tiller weight at the second sampling date, weight of leaves per headed tiller and their stem weight at the third sampling date, and nonelongated tiller number at the fourth sampling date. Also at the fourth sampling date narrow sense heritabilities were not low for average area per leaf, area and weight of leaves per tiller, stem length and area, and

V. DISCUSSION

Walton, ([illegible]) found that increased standard leaf weight of bromegrass was negatively related to yield. [illegible] it could be associated with greater photosynthetic efficiency. In the present study morphological characters showed their relationship to dry matter accumulation at three levels of complexity. The relationships of tiller characters to yield should be discussed as their interaction in parts of tillers, whole tillers, and the complete sward.

1. The Accumulation of Photosynthates in Parts of Tillers

Both total area and photosynthetic efficiency of leaves, leaf sheaths, stems, and heads affect the contribution of tiller parts to the accumulation of photosynthates in a bromegrass sward. Increased leaf area per tiller is associated with increased individual tiller weight within the tiller type throughout the season (Tables [illegible] and [illegible]). At the first and third sampling dates increased leaf area per nonelongated tiller was associated with increased nonelongated tiller number (Tables [illegible] and [illegible]), yet at the third sampling date increasing average area per nonelongated tiller leaf was associated with an increase in the number of nonelongated tillers (Table [illegible]). Tillers have limited supplies of photosynthate with which they can either expand their leaf area per tiller or increase their tiller number, however greater photosynthetic ability can improve tiller survival. At the fourth sampling date leaf area per elongated tiller was positively related to the number of these tillers (Table 4), but leaf area per headed tiller was negatively related to their tiller number (Table [illegible]). Possibly the leaf area of headed tillers had expanded to the extent that further increases only added to shading and maintenance loss of dry matter. Generally increased stem area of elongated and headed tillers was positively associated with increased individual tiller weight and tiller number within the tiller type (Tables 3,4,[illegible], and [illegible]). At both the third and fourth sampling dates head area per headed tiller was positively related to the weight of individual headed tillers (Table 7) and at the fourth sampling date head area was positively associated with the number of headed tillers (Table 8).

Increasing standard leaf weight has been associated with increasing photosynthetic efficiency (Pearce et al., 1969). In this study increasing standard leaf weight of a tiller type was positively associated with increasing individual tiller weight of that tiller type throughout the season (Tables 3,4,5,6, and 7) but the relationship of standard leaf weight to dry matter accumulation depended on what use the tiller made of the photosynthates. At the first and third sampling dates number of nonelongated tillers was positively related to their standard leaf weight (Tables 3 and 5). Standard leaf weight and leaf to stem ratio of elongated tillers were negatively related to [illegible] tiller number at the second sampling date (Table [illegible]) [illegible] and leaf to stem ratio and leaf weight [illegible] headed tillers were negatively related to [illegible] for [illegible] fourth sampling date (Tables [illegible] and [illegible]). This suggests that while accumulation of photosynthates may be increased, [illegible] of photosynthates [illegible] for [illegible] weight [illegible] leaves [illegible] the weight of stems [illegible] headed tillers [illegible].

The [illegible] of standard leaf weight to yield [illegible] the plant's [illegible] of [illegible]. At the second sampling date standard leaf weight of headed tillers was negatively related to first and second harvest yield, while at the fourth sampling date it was negatively related to yield of the [illegible] harvest (Tables [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], and [illegible]). A similar [illegible] relationship exists between standard leaf weight of headed tillers, their tiller number, and the accumulation of dry matter. At the second sampling date number of headed tillers and their leaf weight per tiller were negatively related, indicating that an increase in leaf weight would be detrimental to the initiation of headed tillers (Table [illegible]). At the third sampling date number and standard leaf weight of headed tillers were negatively related (Tables [illegible] and [illegible]). Possibly the increased standard leaf weight contributes to [illegible] of some headed tillers due to increased competition between leaves. At the third sampling date leaf weight of headed tillers was negatively related with first harvest yield (Table 1[illegible]) and standard leaf weight of [illegible] ted tillers was negatively related to yield of the regrowth harvest (Tables 11 and 1[illegible]).

It has been suggested that the accumulation of dry matter in a grass sward would be maximized when photosynthates are invested in expanding larger photosynthetic area (Wyle, 19[illegible]). This would occur when leaf to stem ratio increased. It is seen however that [illegible] the leaf weight and leaf to stem ratio of elongated tillers at the second sampling date, and leaf to stem ratio at the fourth sampling date, were negatively related to yield (Tables [illegible] and [illegible]). At the third sampling date the leaf weight per headed tiller was negatively related to the first harvest yield (Table 1[illegible]), while leaf to stem ratio of headed tillers was negatively related to yield of the regrowth harvest (Table 1[illegible]). Thus as the weight of leaves increases there is greater competition between leaves and hence increased senescence. Other authors have stressed the need to control leaf development at certain times of the growing season to encourage tillering (Brown and Blaser, 19[illegible]). It seems that after a certain leaf to stem ratio is established, further attempts to increase weight of leaves results in only a transitory accumulation of photosynthate.

[illegible]. The Accumulation of Photosynthates in Whole Tillers

The three different types of tillers in the sward contribute in different ways to the accumulation of yield throughout the season. At the first sampling date the number of nonelongated tillers and their leaf area per tiller was positively related to yield of the first and second harvests (Tables 11,13,14,15 and 16). Ryle, 1964 found the expansion of a large photosynthetic area as early as possible in the season important to yield. Later on in the season however nonelongated tillers became a detriment to yield since they were not [illegible] enough to be cut at harvesting. Number and individual tiller weight of nonelongated tillers and their number of leaves per tiller were negatively related at the second and third sampling dates to first harvest yield (Tables 11, 13, and 14). The nonelongated tillers did, however, contribute to yield of the [illegible]growth harvest from the time of the fourth sampling when increased number of nonelongated tillers probably co[illegible]utes to better recovery from defoliation (Table 15). There was also a positive relationship between number of nonelongated tillers at the fourth sampling date and first harvest yield (Table 13). It is possible that the population of tillers present in the regrowth sward closely resembles the tiller population with which the bromegrass would initiate growth the next season. If this were the case then a high density of nonelongated tillers might give the sward superior early season growth. Elongated tillers could also contribute to the perennial habit of the bromegrass. Swards with a high density of headed tillers after the first harvest would have fewer tillers surviving until the next season but might have a higher seed yield. This would explain the positive relationship between elongated tiller number at the fourth sampling date and first harvest yield, and the negative relationship at this time between headed tiller number and yield of the first harvest (Tables 13 and 14).

The elongated tillers contribute more to the second harvest yield than the first. At the fourth sampling date the number of elongated tillers and their individual tiller weight was positively related to yield of the regrowth harvest (Table 11). This is probably the direct effect of more and larger tillers contributing to yield. Number of elongated tillers at the second and third sampling dates was positively related to second harvest yield (Table 15) but individual elongated tiller weight at the second sampling date was negatively related to yield of the regrowth harvest (Table 16). Taylor and Templeton, 1966 have emphasized the importance to recovery from defoliation of vegetative tillers which provide a rapidly expanding photosynthetic area after the first harvest. This study also suggests that elongated tillers supply carbohydrate reserves to the defoliated sward. If the elongated tillers use too much of their photosynthetic assimilates for growth before the first harvest, carbohydrate storage is reduced and the second harvest yield suffers. This is consistent with the observation from the general trends in tiller characteristics that elongated tillers of some genotypes grow best before, and others after the first harvest.

Headed tillers were positively related at the second sampling date to the first harvest yield, and at the fourth sampling date to the second harvest yield, through individual tiller weight and number (Tables 11,15, and 16). Investigators have associated maximum crop growth rate with inflorescence emergence, (Langer, 1959 and Anslow, 1965) which explains why headed tillers make the dominant contribution to yield. Weight of headed tiller stems at the third sampling date was negatively related to first harvest yield (Table 14). Possibly when tiller stems were heavy tiller number was reduced. Number of headed tillers at the second and third sampling dates was positively related to yield of the regrowth harvest (Tables 11,15 and 16). Reproductive tillers have been shown to store more nonstructrual carbohydrate for regrowth than vegetative tillers, (Taylor and Templeton, 1966) so possibly greater densities of headed tillers prior to the first harvest improve carbohydrate reserves. The weight of headed tiller stems at the second sampling date was negatively related to regrowth harvest yield (Table 16). A large increase in weight of stems early in the season may mean that less carbohydrate is stored in the roots for regrowth.

Increasing stem length of both elongated and headed tillers contributes throughout the season to the accumulation of dry matter (Table 11). First and second harvest yields were positively related to length of headed tiller stems at the second and third sampling dates (Tables 13,14, and 16). Length of elongated tiller stems at the fourth sampling date was positively related to second harvest yield (Table 16). Increasing stem length maintains dry matter in a harvestable condition because it raises the plant material above the height of cutting. Anslow, 1967 stressed the importance of erectness in relation to productivity of a sward. Also the greater stem length improves leaf distribution so light penetrates deeper into the sward, minimizing leaf loss through senescence.

3. The Accumulation of Photosynthates in the Sward.

The ability of nonelongated tillers to establish a large photosynthetic area early in the season makes them important to yield. Elongated tillers can grow in the regrowth sward and contribute to second harvest yield. The high crop growth rate characteristic of headed tillers makes a direct contribution to yield of both harvests. The stems of both elongated and headed tillers are important to yield. At the whole tiller level these specific tiller characteristics control the contribution which tillers make, through individual tiller weight and number, to yield.

Since different types of tiller contribute at different times of the year to the accumulation of yield, the ideal grass sward should enhance the production at different times of those specific tiller types which contribute most to yield. At the sward level of production the competetion between the three types of tillers is an important determinant of the weight and number of tillers. For nonelongated and elongated tillers an increase in the weight of individual tillers of one type was associated with a decrease in the number of tillers of the other type throughout the season (Tables 3,4,5, and 9). At the second sampling date this relationship was expressed through the weight of leaves per elongated tiller which was negatively related to number of nonelongated tillers (Tables 3 and 9). The bromegrass utilizes photosynthates in increasing weight of elongated tiller leaves rather than increasing the number of nonelongated tillers. It has been reported that photosynthate is transported from mature leaves first for the expansion of other leaves, and secondarily for the development of axil buds (Milthorpe and Ivins, 1966). This suggests competetion for carbohydrates which also occurs at the third sampling date when the size of leaves of nonelongated tillers was negatively related to number of elongated tillers (Table 9). By the time of the third sampling date stems had developed so their increasing size was negatively associated with the size of nonelongated tillers (Table 4). At the fourth sampling date number and weight of nonelongated tillers were negatively related to leaf and stem size of elongated tillers (Tables 4 and 8). Both these relationships are examples of competetion between types of tillers for light, the larger type of tiller reducing the growth of the smaller tiller.

At the second and fourth sampling dates the nonelongated tillers resembled the elongated tillers in that both types of tillers increased in weight and number as the two types of tillers followed a similar growth pattern (Tables 3,7, and 9). There are many other statistically significant but low positive correlations between tiller characteristics of nonelongated and elongated tillers. Mishra and Drolsom, 1972 found that size of tiller parts was correlated with whole tiller size in a similar manner. They concluded that the correlations reflected a relationship to general size. In this study the positive relationship found between tiller characteristics of different types of tillers is probably the result of general increases in size occurring in tillers of all types. This is also shown at the third and fourth sampling dates when there were positive associations between elongated and headed tiller characteristics (Tables 4,6, and 10).

Nonelongated and headed tillers were associated competitively throughout the season, with the larger headed tillers shading the nonelongated tillers. Williams, 1970 reported reduced nonelongated tiller number in swards with fertile tillers due to shade suppression of apical buds. In this study, at the second sampling date, increasing numbers of either nonelongated or headed tillers was associated with decreasing size of tillers of the other type (Tables 3 and 4). At the fourth sampling date the tiller numbers of the two types of tillers were negatively associated and number of nonelongated tillers was negatively related to individual headed tiller weight (Table 4).

Elongated and headed tillers were negatively related at the second and third sampling dates since increasing number of tillers of one type was associated with decreasing individual tiller weight of tillers of the other type (Tables 3,4,9, and 10). At the second sampling date the number of headed tillers was negatively related to leaf and stem characteristics of elongated tillers (Tables 3 and 10) probably because the bromegrass can either invest photosynthate in increasing the size of elongated tillers or use it to develop inflorescences. At the third sampling elongated tiller number was negatively related to nearl characteristics of headed tillers because the headed tillers were larger than the elongated tillers at this time, and so dominated in the competetion for light (Table 4).

Generally tiller characteristics which improved the competetive ability of a tiller were positively related to yield. For example, the stem length of elongated and headed tillers was positively related to number of tillers within their respective categories (Tables 3,4,9, and 10) and length of stems was positively related to yield (Tables 11,12,14, and 16). However, some competetive relationships between types of tillers are detrimental to the accumulation of dry matter. At the fourth sampling date the number and individual tiller weight of headed tillers were positively related to yield of the second harvest (Tables 11, 15, and 16). However these characteristics of headed tillers were negatively related with the number of nonelongated tillers at the fourth sampling date (Table 4) and greater number of nonelongated tillers at this time was associated with greater yield of the first harvest. The tiller characteristics which contributed to first harvest yield detracted at the same time from the second harvest yield.

Sward characteristics accounted for much of the variation in yield of both harvests (Tables 13 and 15). Early season vigor even influenced yield of the second harvest (Table 15). This agrees with Walton's (1976) findings that differences in winter survival are very important even in bromegrass which is usually regarded as being winter hardy. Height at the time of the respective harvests was also strongly positively related to yield (Tables 13 and 15). The spread of individual plants in the sward was only predictive of first harvest yield early in the season (Table 13).

The results of this study suggest that a bromegrass cut at two harvests should have, for maximum yield of the first harvest, a vigorous sward early in the season with a dense population of nonelongated tillers having a high leaf area.

Thereafter the population of nonelongated tillers should diminish. Two to three weeks later elongated tillers should be developed with long stems and high stem area, but not with so great a weight of leaves that competition becomes intense. Also at this time there should be a dense population of large headed tillers. At the time of the first harvest the elongated and headed tillers should have long stems but the stems and heads of fertile tillers should not be unduly heavy.

For maximum yield of the second harvest the bromegrass should have a dense population of nonelongated tillers with a high leaf area early in the season. Vigorous growth at this time is essential. Two weeks later a large number of headed tillers will make an important contribution to yield. Stems of elongated and headed tillers should be long and have a large photosynthetic area, but the stem weight of headed tillers should not be increased at the expense of stored photosynthate. Also the weight of elongated tillers should not be increased to the detriment of carbohydrate storage for regrowth. At the time of the first harvest there should be a dense population of headed tillers with long stems and a high stem area. Leaf weight of headed tillers should not be increased to the point that leaves become competetive. Three weeks after the first harvest the regrowth sward should have many and large elongated and headed tillers. The headed tillers should dominate the sward and leaf weight of elongated tillers should not increase so much as to become competetive. A large number of vegetative tillers and a small number of fertile tillers in the regrowth sward would improve yield of the first harvest in the following season. The ideal bromegrass would produce a tall sward throughout the season.

The ideotype stresses that stems are important in the accumulation and maintenance of photosynthate because increasing length of stems improves canopy structure and erectness of the sward. The contribution of leaves is variable because leaf senescence is a problem. Stems however did not senesce as rapidly as leaves since there was little tiller death in the bromegrass sward. Anslow, 1967 tried to cut forage grasses frequently enough to catch leaves before they became senescent, but received no increase in yield. It must be accepted that stem development is essential for maximum bromegrass yield. Between inflorescence emergence and anthesis crop growth rates are maximal (Anslow, 1965). Also, after the flag leaf emerges leaf loss declines (Ryle, 1964, Hunt and Brougham, 1966). Early anthesis would be the optimal time for cutting a bromegrass, since the desired development of stems would take place without increasing the loss of leaves. Delaying the first harvest until late anthesis may reduce the vigor of regrowth though no such effect was observed in this experiment. There is evidence that the lower apical buds are suppressed by stem elongation, the slower they are to initiate growth (Milthorpe and Ivins, 1966) so the sward could be harvested earlier or selections could be made for genotypes more resistant to defoliation.

The second harvest should also occur when stems are well elongated and sufficient seed development is advanced. Since early season vigor is so important the sward should have sufficient residual leaf area after the second harvest to enter the winter with a good supply of photosynthate.

All of the characteristics described in the ideotype should be considered when evaluating a bromegrasses' yielding potential, but it is necessary to limit criteria for inclusion in a specific selection index. These characteristics should be easy to measure and highly heritable. If only those characters with good narrow sense heritability are considered a selection index for first harvest yield would include, at the second sampling date, individual headed tiller weight and leaf weight per headed tiller. Also, at the fourth sampling date nonelongated tiller number could be included in the index with a positive coefficient. A plant breeder could select against high leaf and stem weight of headed tillers at the third sampling date.

If characters with good broad sense heritability are used in a selection index for first harvest yield the characters with positive coefficients would include height of the sward throughout the season, early season vigor, leaf area of nonelongated tillers at the first sampling date, number of elongated tillers at the second sampling, (at) length of headed tiller stems at the third sampling (f), and number of nonelongated tillers at the fourth sampling date. Characters which could be used to eliminate parents are individual elongated tiller weight at the second sampling date and individual nonelongated tiller weight and leaf weight per headed tiller at the third sampling date.

Of the characters influencing second harvest yield narrow sense heritability is high enough to select for height of the sward, leaf area per headed tiller at the third sampling date, and nonelongated tiller number at the fourth sampling date. Selection should eliminate those prospective parents with high individual elongated tiller weight at the second sampling date.

A selection index employing characters with high broad sense heritability would include height of the sward, vigor, leaf area per nonelongated tiller at the first sampling date, number of elongated tillers at the second sampling date, stem length and area of headed tillers at the third sampling date, and nonelongated tiller number at the fourth sampling date. These characters were positively related to yield, but individual elongated tiller weight at the second sampling date would be included in the index with a negative coefficient.

In both the present study and Walton's study in 19[illegible], tiller characters observed before the time of the first harvest accounted for more of the variation in yield of the [illegible] rather than the first harvest yield (Tables 1[illegible], 15, [illegible] and 1[illegible]). [illegible] that stored carbohydrates are important determinants of yield, and should be considered in yield prediction[illegible].

The [illegible] southern [illegible] bromegrass clones and disease resistant [illegible] (Walton, 197[illegible]) suggested that inbreeding [illegible] have reduced the vigor of the disease resistant plants. He stressed the importance of maintaining [illegible] diversity in the bromegrass population. The southern [illegible] have responded poorly to the Edmonton environment. [illegible] the disease susceptible synthetic [illegible] was slightly infected with foliar diseases early in the season.

The general combining ability effects of UA1[illegible] were [illegible] low for all characteristics, though only the [illegible] yield GCA effect of [illegible] was really low (Table 17). The GCA effects [illegible] the disease susceptible synthetic were [illegible] yield, second harvest yield, height at the second harvest, and vigor. Morphologically UA1[illegible] was uniform, [illegible] with an erect, [illegible] spreading habit and medium width [illegible] green leaves. UA[illegible] was the tallest clone, the first to [illegible] heading, and it showed good early season vigor. It meets the requirements for yielding ability suggested by the [illegible] ideotype. [illegible], a resistant clone, yielded least at the first harvest, while [illegible], the [illegible] selection from

Lincoln, gave the lowest yield of second and total harvests. Plants of B42 had the lowest tiller density throughout the season, with a spreading, prostrate habit. Leaves were pale blue-green and large in area. Individual tiller weight of nonelongated, elongated, and headed tillers was higher than that of any other clone throughout most of the season. UA1 showed variation in leaf morphology throughout the experiment, but the growth habit was always erect, nonspreading, with short stems and the highest tiller density after the first sampling date. It is interesting that the extremes of tiller weight and number gave the lowest yield. It was observed earlier that elongated tillers of B42 and UA1 grew least vigorously before defoliation, and recovered most vigorously, yet B42 and UA1 were widely different in contribution to total yield. This emphasizes the fact that other tiller types, besides elongated tillers, influence the accumulation of total yield, and that total yield is the result of two harvests both of which are controlled by different tiller characteristics. Walton, [illegible], Tan, Tan, and Walton, 1976, and Walton, 1976, also found UA1 relatively high yielding and UA12 less productive. The contribution of B42 was variable. UA10 appears to be the most valuable parent although UA9 yields almost as well. Unless there is no threat from [illegible] it would be better to use the selection from Ca[illegible]n [illegible] alone as a parent. The selection from [illegible] pasture, 42, yielded well at the first harvest but contributed less to the second harvest. It could be included in a synthetic designed for one harvest of hay. The selection from Magna would ensure a good seasonal distribution of yield. The results of this experiment suggest that selections from Carlton and Magna be combined in a synthetic cross, possibly with the addition of 43 and the disease susceptible synthetic.

Table 1. Bromegrass clones used as parents in an 8x8 diallel, 1973.

Clone	Description
UA9	Random selection from Carlton Northern type bromegrass nonspreading, fine stems, lodged
UA5	Random selection from Magna Intermediate northern - southern type bromegrass moderately spreading, some coarse stems broad, erect leaves
UA6	Random selection from Redpatch Southern type bromegrass spreading, tall stems many narrow leaves
UA12	Random selection from Lincoln Southern type bromegrass spreading, coarse stems broad leaves
P40	Selection showing resistance to Selenophoma bromigena and Pyrenophora bromi very coarse stems very broad pale blue-green leaves
E40	Selection showing resistance to Selenophoma bromigena and Pyrenophora bromi coarse stems broad pale blue-green leaves
UA10	Synthetic susceptible to foliar diseases nonspreading, tall stems early heading
43	Selection from old pasture in Alberta moderately spreading high tiller density



Figure 1. Seasonal trends in total tiller number

Table 2. Mean values of morphological characters and forage yield for eight parental bromegrass clones, 1975.

Parents	B40	B42	WA9	WA12	WA5	WA6	WA10	43	EXP. MEAN	STD. ERR.
SWARD CHARACTERS										
Total Yield (gm/plot)	222	261	265	216	267	276	283	255	253**	23.[illegible]
First Harvest Yield (gm/plot)	123	152	145	145	155	156	158	146	143	22.[illegible]
Second Harvest Yield (gm/plot)	98	109	120	71	112	11[illegible]	129	108	110**	1[illegible].8
Mean Height (cm)	72.4	72.4	69.9	52.4	7.9	66.0	73.9	68.1	70.7**	4.36
First Height (cm)	89.6	88.3	84.5	67.8	88.0	79.5	89.5	86.5	86.9**	5.64
Second Height (cm)	55.1	56.6	55.3	37.0	47.8	52.6	58.3	49.6	54.4**	5.25
Spread	3.0	2.6	3.0	2.6	3.0	2.5	2.6	2.3	2.7**	0.42
Vigor	3.3	4.0	4.0	2.3	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.6	3.5**	0.43
TILLER CHARACTERS										
First Sampling Date										
Nonelongated Tillers:										
Tiller number	13.6	28.3	37.3	42.3	29.6	38.3	40.0	46.0	32.4**	3.75
Whole Tiller Weight (gm)	0.18	0.16	0.11	0.13	0.15	0.13	0.12	0.14	0.15**	0.028
Leaf Number	3.1	3.3	3.3	3.2	2.8	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.2**	0.26
Leaf Area (cm)	31.0	24.5	15.6	31.9	22.8	23.3	24.4	21.4	22.7**	[illegible]
Standard Leaf Weight (mg/cm)	6.2	6.3	7.4	6.3	7.3	6.2	[illegible]	7.2	6.[illegible]	1.57
Average Leaf Area (cm)	10.1	7.2	4.5	6.5	8.0	6.6	[illegible].3	6.3	6.9**	0.99
Second Sampling Date										
Nonelongated Tillers:										
Tiller Number	3.3	4.6	5.3	7.0	6.6	3.6	5.3	6.3	6.8**	2.29
Whole Tiller Weight (gm)	0.14	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.[illegible]	[illegible].02	0.03	0.07**	0.0[illegible]
Leaf Number	3.2	2.8	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.3	1.3	2.1	2.5	0.52
Leaf Area (cm)	20.6	10.6	9.6	7.4	8.3	7.9	4.3	6.4	11.5**	[illegible]
Average Leaf Area (cm)	6.1	3.5	2.9	2.7	2.9	2.8	[illegible].4	2.3	2.9**	1.12
Standard Leaf Weight (gm/cm)	6.3	6.7	5.0	7.3	5.7	6.9	2.3	4.[illegible]	5.8*	2.11

Table [illegible]. Continued.

Parents	B40	B42	HA9	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	EXP. MEAN	STD. ERR.
Elongated Tillers:										
Tiller Number	8.3	17.3	26.6	26.3	22.6	19.3	23.[illegible]	12.6	19.1**	[illegible]
Whole Tiller Weight (gm)	0.62	0.56	0.50	0.43	0.53	0.40	0.40	0.31	0.51**	[illegible]
Leaf Number	4.9	4.0	4.0	4.4	4.6	4.0	4.0	4.6	4.3	[illegible]
Leaf Area (m)	62.4	1.2	46.2	35.[illegible]	44.3	25.1	41.8	28.6	45.3**	[illegible]
Leaf Weight (gm)	0.35	0.29	0.27	0.23	0.27	.26	0.26	0.15	0.27**	[illegible]
Standard Leaf Weight (m?/cm)	5.0	5.7	5.7	6.3	6.6	[illegible]	5.7	5.7	5.7**	[illegible]
Average Leaf Area (cm)	11.8	10.2	9.4	7.9		7.9	7.6	6.[illegible]	9.2**	[illegible]
Stem Length (cm)	30.3	33.3	33.0	24.3		22.3	29.3	29.6	31.0**	[illegible]
Stem Area (cm)	6.8	6.9	6.6	5.0	[illegible]	5.4	7.5	4.6	6.5**	[illegible]
Stem Weight (gm)	0.26	0.27	0.23	0.19	.25	0.23	0.22	0.15	0.24**	[illegible]
Leaf to Stem Ratio	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.3	1.0	1.0	1.1	[illegible]
Headed Tillers:										
Tiller Number	2.6	3.6	1.0	4.[illegible]	[illegible].3	7.3	7.[illegible]	12.3	[illegible]**	3.[illegible]
Whole Tiller Weight (gm)	1.14	0.56	0.22	0.41	0.50	0.31	0.60	0.79	0.61**	0.2[illegible]
Leaf Number	3.9	[illegible].7	2.6	3.9	2.7	5.6	4.1	5.[illegible]	3.6**	1.26
Leaf Area (cm)	79.5	50.4	19.4	30.7	39.0	51.3	43.0	51.8	43.1**	[illegible]
Leaf Weight (gm)	0.64	0.27	0.11	0.22	0.27	0.37	0.28	0.34	0.29**	[illegible]
Standard Leaf Weight (gm/cm)	7.7	3.7	2.0	5.3	3.7	6.3	4.7	5.7	4.6	[illegible]
Average Leaf Area (cm)	18.9	8.9	3.1	5.[illegible]	6.7	11.0	6.9	8.9	[illegible]**	3.[illegible]
Stem Length (cm)	[illegible]0.0	21.0	13.3	17.6	18.3	[illegible]	25.[illegible]	40.6	23.5**	[illegible]
Stem Area (cm)	[illegible].6	7.0	3.3	4.6	6.3	9.[illegible]	10.[illegible]	10.5	7.2**	0.2[illegible]
Stem Weight (gm)	0.54	0.29	0.11	0.19	[illegible]	0.41	0.31	0.44	0.32**	[illegible].126
Leaf to Stem Ratio	1.1	0.6	0.3	0.8	0.4	0.8	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.28

Table 2. Continued.

Parents	RH[illegible]	RH2	WA[illegible]	WA1[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	EXP. MEAN	[illegible]
Third Sampling Date										
Nonelongated Tillers:										
Tiller Number	[illegible]	1.3	1.[illegible]	1.[illegible]	[illegible]	1.3	[illegible]	1.6	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Whole Tiller Weight (gm)	0.01	0.02	0.02	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Leaf Number	0.4	1.0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	1.7	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leaf Area (cm)	2.1	4.1	[illegible]	2.[illegible]	1.5	2.5	1.[illegible]	5.2	3.2	0.22
Leaf Weight (gm)	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	[illegible]	0.01	0.02	0.01**	[illegible]
Standard Leaf Weight (mg/cm)	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.3	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	2.3	[illegible]
Average Leaf Area (cm)	[illegible]	2.3	1.1	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	2.3	1.2	[illegible]
Elongated Tillers:										
Tiller Number	2.0	5.[illegible]	13.0	17.[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Whole Tiller Weight (gm)	0.12	[illegible]	0.50	0.47	[illegible]	[illegible]	0.26	0.2[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leaf Number	3.1	4.5	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.1	[illegible]	[illegible]	5.5	5.1	[illegible]
Leaf Area (cm)	[illegible]	[illegible]	54.0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	41.1	[illegible]
Leaf Weight (gm)	0.06	0.1[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Standard Leaf Weight (mg/cm)	1.0	2.7	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	3.3	[illegible]	[illegible]
Average Leaf Area (cm)	4.4	7.1	[illegible]	7.[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stem Length (cm)	19.0	38.0	52.0	38.[illegible]	24.0	41.6	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Stem Area (cm)	2.0	4.7	[illegible]	[illegible]	4.5	[illegible]	4.1	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stem Weight (gm)	0.54	1.2[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	1.[illegible]	[illegible]	1.[illegible]	1.[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leaf to Stem Ratio	0.9	1.1	[illegible]	1.[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

Table 2. Continued.

Parents	P40	P42	UA7	UA12	UA5	UA6	UA10	43	EXP. MEAN	STD. ERR.
Headed Tillers:										
Tiller Number	16.2	17.6	18.0	19.6	19.6	21.3	21.0	20.3	18.2**	3.8[illegible]
Whole Tiller Weight (gm)	2.32	1.88	1.20	1.55	2.23	1.57	1.42	1.54	1.60**	0.227
Leaf Number	4.7	5.2	5.2	6.0	5.4	5.8	5.2	4.9	5.2**	[illegible]
Leaf Area (cm)	96.0	78.5	53.1	50.1	80.[illegible]	63.2	61.0	52.7	7[illegible].4**	[illegible]
Leaf Weight (gm)	0.48	0.39	0.29	0.29	0.46	0.35	0.29	0.26	0.35**	[illegible]
Standard Leaf Weight (mg/cm)	5.7	5.0	5.0	5.7	5.3	[illegible].7	4.7	5.0	5.2**	[illegible]
Average Leaf Area (cm)	18.2	14.0	11.0	8.9	14.7	10.7	11.2	10.5	12.2**	[illegible]
Stem Length (cm)	87.6	97.0	81.3	72.0	93.6	65.3	91.2	91.6	90.5**	5.42
Stem Area (cm)	27.4	26.9	16.1	14.1	26.3	18.7	19.8	20.4	22.3**	[illegible].25
Stem Weight (gm)	1.41	1.21	0.71	0.65	1.42	0.96	0.89	0.96	1.1[illegible]**	[illegible]
Head Area (cm)	18.0	11.8	8.1	8.7	12.[illegible]	10.0	9.4	10.7	11.2**	[illegible]
Head Weight (gm)	0.42	0.28	0.19	0.20	[illegible].35	0.25	0.22	0.20	[illegible].31**	[illegible]
Leaf to Stem Ratio	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Fourth Sampling Date										
Nonelongated Tillers:										
Tiller Number	6.6	11.0	13.6	24.3	[illegible].0	16.2	9.0	22.0	14.5**	[illegible]
Whole Tiller Weight (gm)	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.08	[illegible]	0.06	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leaf Number	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.[illegible]	2.[illegible]	2.[illegible]	[illegible]
Leaf Area (cm)	16.5	13.1	14.4	9.5	14.7	10.9	17.1	15.5	15.7*	[illegible]
Standard Leaf Weight (mg/cm)	4.7	4.0	4.7	6.3	3.7	5.[illegible]	3.7	4.[illegible]	5.[illegible]**	[illegible]
Average Leaf Area (cm)	24.[illegible]	19.3	19.5	13.1	22.4	16.6	23.2	19.[illegible]	2[illegible].5*	[illegible]

Table [illegible]. Continued.

Parents	B40	B4[illegible]	UA9	UA12	UA5	UA[illegible]	UA[illegible]	[illegible]	EXP. MEAN	STD. ERR.
Elongated Tillers:										
Tiller Number	10.3	16.6	13.3	15.6	15.3	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Whole Tiller Weight (gm)	0.34	0.2[illegible]	0.25	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Leaf Number	3.6	3.0	4.3	[illegible]	3.5	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Leaf Area (cm^2)	52.9	43.7	24.4	20.3	[illegible]	[illegible]	52.[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Leaf Weight (gm)	0.26	0.18	0.17	0.12	0.16	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Standard Leaf Weight (mg/cm^2)	5.0	4.7	6.0	7.[illegible]	5.7	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Average Leaf Area (cm^2)	55.2	44.6	22.5	21.9	22.6	22.7	44.7	24.[illegible]	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Stem Length (cm)	59.0	63.6	85.0	45.[illegible]	59.6	63.3	[illegible]	[illegible]	66.[illegible]**	[illegible]
Stem Area (cm^2)	13.1	11.9	11.3	[illegible]	10.7	9.9	17.[illegible]	[illegible]	11.[illegible]**	[illegible]
Stem Weight (gm)	0.35	0.29	0.29	[illegible]	0.26	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Leaf to Stem Ratio	3.0	2.6	2.5	[illegible]	2.[illegible]	2.5	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Headed Tillers:										
Tiller Number	0.6	0.3	1.0	0	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Whole Tiller Weight (gm)	0.15	0.05	0.11	0	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leaf Number	1.6	0.7	1.5	0	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leaf Area (cm^2)	15.2	4.4	14.9	0	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leaf Weight (gm)	0.10	0.03	0.06	0	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Standard Leaf Weight (mg/cm^2)	0.50	0.43	0.10	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Average Leaf Area (cm^2)	12.6	4.4	9.9	0	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stem Length (cm)	21.6	9.3	29.3	0	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stem Area (cm^2)	6.7	1.6	0.6	0	[illegible]	2.3	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stem Weight (gm)	0.20	0.07	0.17	0	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leaf to Stem Ratio	0.6	0.3	0.4	0	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

** significant at 1%, * significant at 5%.

Table 3. Simple correlations between tiller characteristics, presenting the first sa[illegible] below the diagonal. [illegible] all correlations shown significant at 1%.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Nonelongated tiller number	[illegible]			[illegible]						[illegible]			
2. Elongated tiller number	[illegible]												
3. [illegible] tiller number	[illegible]												
4. Total nonelongated tiller weight			[illegible]				[illegible]						
5. [illegible] elongated tiller weight	[illegible]		[illegible]										
6. [illegible] tiller weight	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]										
7. [illegible] per nonelongated tiller	[illegible]			[illegible]						[illegible]			
8. Leaf number per elongated tiller					[illegible]								
9. [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]	0.28	[illegible]						
10. [illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible]				
11. [illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible]			[illegible]		[illegible]			
12. [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible]			[illegible]				
13. [illegible]							[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		
14. [illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]		[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	0.88		
15. [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]			0.91	
16. [illegible] leaf weight				[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]			
17. Elongated tiller [illegible] leaf weight			[illegible]		[illegible]								
18. [illegible] leaf weight	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]	
19. [illegible] average leaf area	[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		
20. [illegible] leaf area			[illegible]	[illegible]	0.74				[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		
21. [illegible] leaf area	[illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]	
22. [illegible]											[illegible]		
23. [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]			[illegible]	
24. Elongated tiller stem area	[illegible]				[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]			[illegible]		
25. [illegible] tiller stem area	[illegible]	[illegible]	0.49			0.92	[illegible]		0.85			0.93	
26. Elongated tiller stem weight	[illegible]		[illegible]		[illegible]			[illegible]			0.85		
27. [illegible] stem weight	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]	
28. Elongated tiller leaf to stem ratio		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]
29. [illegible] tiller leaf to stem ratio	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]	

10f

...aracteristics, presenting the first sampling date above the diagonal, and the second sampling date ... differs significant at 1%.

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	.85	[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	0.84	0.21			
[illegible]		.93			[illegible]	0.21	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	-0.27	[illegible]	-0.24	0.92	-0.28	
[illegible]		[illegible]			0.82			[illegible]			[illegible]		0.66		0.67		0.61

2 of 2

Table 9. Simple correlations between tiller characteristics, presenting the third sampli[illegible] sampling date below the diagonal. df = 191, all correlations shown signifi[illegible]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	[illegible]
1. Nonelongated tiller number				0.54			0.7[illegible]			[illegible]			0.54			[illegible]
2. Elongated tiller number			0.2[illegible]		0.32	-0.44		0.[illegible]		[illegible]	0.[illegible]1	[illegible]		0.29		
3. Headed tiller number					0.22									-0.2[illegible]		
4. Individual nonelongated tiller weight		-0.[illegible]1					0.8[illegible]			[illegible]					0.2[illegible]	[illegible]
5. Individual elongated tiller weight	-0.53							0.66			0.[illegible]1			0.2[illegible]		
6. Individual headed tiller weight	-0.29		0.64		0.[illegible]4			0.3[illegible]	0.24			0.80			[illegible]	
7. Leaf number per nonelongated tiller				0.51						0.87			0.80			[illegible]
8. Leaf number per elongated tiller		[illegible]			0.5[illegible]	0.2[illegible]					0.[illegible]	-0.24		0.65	-0.[illegible]0	
9. Leaf number per headed tiller	-0.[illegible]	0.27	0.[illegible]3		0.2[illegible]	[illegible]		0.2[illegible]				0.4[illegible]			[illegible]	
10. Leaf area per nonelongated tiller		-0.36		0.85	0.22		0.58						0.3[illegible]		0.2[illegible]	0
11. Leaf area per elongated tiller	-0.40		0.24		[illegible]	0.42		0.61	0.[illegible]	0.30				0.7[illegible]		
12. Leaf area per headed tiller	-0.2[illegible]	0.21	0.[illegible]		0.21	0.93		0.2[illegible]	0.94		.41				[illegible]	
13. Leaf weight per nonelongated tiller		-0.61					0.61		[illegible]	0.86					0.23	
14. Leaf weight per elongated tiller	-0.55				0.37	0.29		0.57		0.21	0.89	0.25				
15. Leaf weight per headed tiller	-0.2[illegible]		0.6[illegible]		0.22	0.93		0.25	0.98		0.37	0.9[illegible]		0.27		
16. Nonelongated tiller standard leaf weight										-0.[illegible]	-0.41					
17. Elongated tiller standard leaf weight								0.28		-0.2[illegible]						
18. Headed tiller standard leaf weight	-0.21		0.45			0.63			0.6[illegible]			0.4[illegible]			[illegible]	0.
19. Nonelongated tiller average leaf area		-0.25		0.77	0.[illegible]6		0.31			0.94	[illegible]		0.77	0.26		-0
20. Elongated tiller average leaf area	-0.50		0.21		0.7[illegible]	0.3[illegible]		0.38	0.29	0.24	0.89	0.35		0.79	0.22	-0
21. Headed tiller average leaf area	-0.25		0.6[illegible]		0.2[illegible]	0.92		0.22	0.93		0.36	0.98		0.22	0.89	
22. Elongated tiller stem length	-0.24	0.58	0.30		0.[illegible]1	0.4[illegible]		0.68	0.41		[illegible]8	0.41		[illegible]	[illegible]	
23. Headed tiller stem length	-0.21	0.29	0.30		0.74	0.8[illegible]		0.2[illegible]	0.95		[illegible]	[illegible]			0.4[illegible]	
24. Stem area per elongated tiller	-0.44	0.33	0.25		0.[illegible]4	0.41		0.63	0.3[illegible]		[illegible]5	0.41		0.75	[illegible]	-0.
25. Stem area per headed tiller			0.55			[illegible]			0.5[illegible]			[illegible]			0.63	
26. Stem weight per elongated tiller	-0.43	0.2[illegible]	0.23		0.91	0.4[illegible]		0.54	0.[illegible]2		0.75	[illegible]		0.79	0.3[illegible]	
27. Stem weight per headed tiller	-0.2[illegible]	[illegible]	0.69		0.36	0.9[illegible]		0.2[illegible]	0.9[illegible]		0.41	0.93		[illegible]	0.91	
28. Head area			0.41		[illegible]	[illegible]			0.4[illegible]		0.2[illegible]	0.4[illegible]			0.4[illegible]	
29. Head weight			[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]			[illegible]	
30. Elongated tiller leaf to stem ratio		-0.2[illegible]														
31. Headed tiller leaf to stem ratio			0.48						[illegible]						[illegible]	

1of

[illegible] presenting the [illegible] sampling date above, and the fourth [illegible]
[illegible] all correlations shown significant at 1%

Table [illegible]. [illegible] characters included in multiple regression equations for individual nonelongated tiller weight, n=[illegible].

Character	Regression Coefficient	Standardized Regression Coefficient
First Sampling Date		
Leaf area per nonelongated tiller	0.00[illegible]***	[illegible].8[illegible]
Nonelongated tiller standard leaf weight	11.4[illegible]7***	0.45[illegible]
Nonelongated tiller number	-0.000[illegible]***	-0.[illegible]99
Intercept	-[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]***	
Second Sampling Date		
Leaf area per nonelongated tiller	[illegible]1***	[illegible].863
Nonelongated tiller standard leaf weight	[illegible]***	[illegible]
Leaf number per nonelongated tiller	-[illegible]***	-0.[illegible]
Elongated tiller number	[illegible]***	-0.0[illegible]
Leaf number per headed tiller	-0.001***	-[illegible]
Intercept	[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]**	
Third Sampling Date		
Leaf area per nonelongated tiller	[illegible]	0.9[illegible]
Nonelongated tiller standard leaf weight	[illegible]	0.[illegible]
Headed tiller standard leaf weight	[illegible]*	0.[illegible]
Leaf number per headed tiller	[illegible]***	0.1[illegible]1
Leaf number per nonelongated tiller	-0.004**	-0.169
[illegible] per headed tiller	-0.0007*	-0.065
[illegible]	-0.035	
[illegible]	0.5[illegible]7***	
Fourth Sampling Date		
Leaf area per nonelongated tiller	[illegible]38***	0.434
Nonelongated tiller standard leaf weight	[illegible]61***	0.274
Elongated tiller number	-0.0006***	-0.1[illegible]
Leaf number per nonelongated tiller	0.007**	0.09[illegible]
Intercept	-0.023	
[illegible]	0.[illegible]1***	

*** significant at 0.1%, ** significant at 1%, * significant at 5%.

Table [illegible]. Tiller characters included in multiple regression equations for individual elongated tiller weight, n=10[illegible]

Characters	Regression Coefficient	Standardized Regression Coefficient
Second Sampling Date		
Leaf area per elongated tiller	0.102***	.862
Elongated tiller standard leaf weight	5[illegible].200***	0.27[illegible]
Elongated tiller leaf to stem ratio	-0.112***	-0.18[illegible]
Stem area per elongated tiller	0.106***	0.11[illegible]
Elongated tiller stem length	-0.001***	-0.064
Intercept	-0.159	
R^2	0.647***	
Third Sampling Date		
Leaf area per elongated tiller	0.086***	0.591
Elongated tiller standard leaf weight	[illegible]1.046***	0.447
Headed tiller leaf to stem ratio	0.702***	0.30[illegible]
Elongated tiller leaf to stem ratio	-0.110***	-0.[illegible]
Headed tiller stem length	0.003***	0.165
Headed tiller number	-0.003**	-0.094
Intercept	-0.586	
R^2	0.821***	
Fourth Sampling Date		
Leaf area per elongated tiller	0.060***	0.860
Elongated tiller standard leaf weight	24.656***	0.287
Elongated tiller leaf to stem ratio	-0.013***	-0.167
Elongated tiller number	-0.002***	-0.190
Elongated tiller stem l.	0.0005***	0.127
Intercept	-0.052	
R^2	0.900***	

*** significant at 0.1%, ** significant at 1%, * significant at 5%.

Table [illegible]. Tiller characters included in multiple regression equations for individual headed tiller weight, n=19[illegible].

Characters	Regression Coefficient	Standardized Regression Coefficient
[illegible] Sampling Date		
Leaf area per headed tiller	0.110***	0.74[illegible]
Headed tiller standard leaf weight	93.215***	0.668
Headed tiller leaf to stem ratio	-0.328***	-0.344
Leaf number per headed tiller	-0.038***	-0.197
Stem area per headed tiller	0.169***	0.1[illegible]
Headed tiller number	-0.005***	-0.069
Intercept	-0.032	
R	0.967***	
Third Sampling Date		
Stem area per headed tiller	0.208***	[illegible]
Head area	0.470***	0.420
Headed tiller standard leaf weight	169.673***	0.263
Leaf area per headed tiller	0.101***	0.361
Headed tiller stem length	0.008***	0.141
Intercept	-1.611	
R	0.920***	
Fourth Sampling Date		
Leaf area per headed tiller	0.069***	0.803
Headed tiller standard leaf weight	19.659***	0.335
Head area	.352***	0.111
Stem area per headed tiller	-0.016***	-0.138
Intercept	0.0008	
R	0.9[illegible]***	

*** significant at 0.1%, ** significant at 1%, * significant at 5%.

Table 8. Tiller characters included in multiple regression equations f[illegible] nonelongated tiller number, n=19[illegible].

Characters	Regression Coefficient	Standardized Regression Coefficient
First Sampling Date		
Individual nonelongated tiller weight	-133.007***	-0.507
Leaf number per nonelongated tiller	11.742***	0.306
Nonelongated tiller standard leaf weight	1656.468***	0.2[illegible]
Intercept	4.962	
R	0.104	
Second Sampling Date		
Individual headed tiller weight	-2.[illegible]8***	[illegible]
Leaf number per nonelongated tiller	1.[illegible]67***	0.390
Leaf weight per elongated tiller	-13.453***	-0.289
Elongated tiller number	0.078**	0.171
Intercept	5.710	
R	0.405***	
Third Sampling Date		
Leaf number per nonelongated tiller	1.066***	0.840
Elongated tiller leaf to stem ratio	0.228*[illegible]	0.114
Leaf area per nonelongated tiller	-2.560***	-0.850
Nonelongated tiller average leaf area/	5.652***	0.712
Intercept	-0.061	
R	0.587***	
Fourth Sampling Date		
Leaf weight per elongated tiller	-61.931***	-0.474
Leaf number per elongated tiller	2.283*	0.209
Leaf number per headed tiller	-0.7[illegible]*	-0.153
Leaf number per nonelongated tiller	3.[illegible]*	0.195
Elongated tiller number	0.180*	0.176
Stem area per elongated tiller	-4.289*	-0.223
Intercept	0.154	
R	0.424***	

*** significant at 0.1%, ** significant at 1%, * significant at 5%.

Table 9. Tiller characters included in multiple regression equations for elongated tiller number, n=19[illegible].

Characters	Regression Coefficient	Standardized Regression Coefficient
Second Sampling Date		
Individual headed tiller weight	-10.749***	-0.498
Individual nonelongated tiller weight	-[illegible]9.677***	-0.299
Elongated tiller stem length	0.160***	0.204
Elongated tiller standard leaf weight	-1352.422**	-0.181
Intercept	[illegible]0.531	
R	0.372***	
Third Sampling Date		
Leaf number per elongated tiller	2.086***	0.482
Head area	-4.999***	-0.296
Leaf area per nonelongated tiller	-3.022**	-0.171
Leaf number per headed tiller	1.406*	0.134
Intercept	-4.292	
R	0.532***	
Fourth Sampling Date		
Elongated tiller stem length	0.210***	0.592
Individual nonelongated tiller weight	-[illegible]0.317***	-0.367
Leaf weight per elongated tiller	-68.292***	-0.533
Leaf area per elongated tiller	2.306***	0.401
Nonelongated tiller number	0.141**	0.143
Intercept	8.693	
R	0.629***	

*** significant at 0.1%, ** significant at 1%, * significant at 5%.

Table 10. Tiller characters included in multiple regression equations for headed tiller number, n=19[illegible].

Characters	Regression Coefficient	Standardized Regression Coefficient
Second Sampling Date		
Headed tiller stem length	0.276***	0.019
Leaf weight per elongated tiller	-21.3[illegible]**	-0.501
Elongated tiller stem length	-0.174***	-0.3[illegible]
Leaf weight per headed tiller	-10.870***	-0.411
Individual elongated tiller weight	13.[illegible]32*	0.423
Elongated tiller standard leaf weight	-407.181*	-0.088
Intercept	[illegible].271	
R^2	0.68[illegible]***	
Third Sampling Date		
Headed tiller standard leaf weight	-2608.982***	-0.332
Leaf weight per elongated tiller	-26.660***	-0.405
Elongated tiller standard leaf weight	6[illegible]1.476**	0.237
Intercept	34.455	
R^2	0.18[illegible]	
Fourth Sampling Date		
Headed tiller stem length	[illegible].053***	1.324
Leaf area per headed tiller	[illegible].[illegible]84*	-0.277
Stem weight per headed tiller	[illegible]88*	-0.283
Intercept	-0.063	
R^2	0.694***	

*** significant at 0.1%, ** significant at 1%, * significant at 5%.

Table 11. Simple correlations betw[illegible]n tiller characters at four sampling dates a[illegible] [illegible]eld
n=192, all correlations shown significant at 1%.

Tiller Characters	First Sampling date Total	First Sampling date Yield 1st. Harvest	First Sampling date Yield 2nd. Harvest	Second Sampling date Total	Second Sampling date Yield 1st. Harvest	Second Sampling date Yield 2nd. Harvest	Third Sampling date Total	Third Sampling date Yield 1st. Harvest	Third Sampling date Yield 2nd. Harvest	Fourth Sampling date Total	Fourth Sampling date Yield 1st. Harvest	Fourth Sampling date Yield 2nd. Harvest
Nonelongated tiller number	0.2[illegible]	0.22	0.18	-0.22	-0.20		-0.24	-0.24				
Elongated tiller [illegible]mber										0.29		0.32
Headed tiller number				0.26	0.22	0.18	0.26		0.27			0.34
Individual nonelongated tiller weight				-0.24	-0.23		-0.2[illegible]	-0.32				
Individual elongated tiller weight												0.29
Individual headed tiller weight				0.22	0.23							0.32
Leaf number per nonelongated tiller				-0.29	-0.20		-0.25	-0.25				
Leaf number per elongated tiller												0.22
Leaf number per headed tiller				0.26	0.27							0.34
Leaf area per nonelongated tiller							-0.26	-0.29				
Leaf area per elongated tiller										0.20		0.34
Leaf area per headed tiller				0.26	0.26							0.[illegible]
Leaf weight per nonelongated tiller				-0.24	-0.23		-0.[illegible]	-0.32				
Leaf weight per elongated tiller					-0.16							
Leaf weight per headed tiller				0.21	0.22							0.22
Nonelongated tiller standard leaf weight				-0.23	-0.23	-0.23						-0.26
Elongated tiller standard leaf weight				-0.[illegible]8	-0.23	-0.22				-0.2[illegible]		-0.24
Headed tiller standard leaf weight					0.18		-0.2[illegible]		-0.25			0.15
Nonelongated tiller average leaf area							-0.25	-0.29				
Elongated tiller average leaf area												0.32
Headed tiller average leaf area				0.23	0.22							
Elongated tiller stem length				0.27	0.19	0.25	0.20	0.1[illegible]		0.32		0.46
Headed tiller stem length				0.36	0.34	0.23	0.44	0.32	0.40			0.37
Stem area per elongated tiller				0.26		0.25				0.25		0.42
Stem area per headed tiller				0.34	0.33	[illegible]			0.21			0.30
Stem weight per elongated tiller												0.3[illegible]
Stem weight per headed tiller				0.21	0.24							0.35
Elongated tiller leaf to stem ratio					-0.25					-0.[illegible]		0.38
Headed tiller leaf to stem ratio							-0.19		-0.1[illegible]			

Table 12. Simple correlations between sward characters and yield n=192, all correlations shown significant at 1%.

	Total Harvest Yield	First Harvest Yield	Second Harvest Yield	Mean Height	First Harvest Height	Second Harvest Height	Spread
First Harvest Yield	0.861						
Second Harvest Yield	0.745	0.301					
Mean Height	0.527	0.310	0.581				
First Harvest Height	[illegible]	0.408	0.371	0.885			
Second Harvest Height	0.449		0.657	[illegible]	[illegible]		
Vigor	0.526	0.465	0.374	[illegible]	0.417	[illegible]	[illegible]

Table [illegible]. Stepwise multiple regression analysis with first harvest yield used as the dependent variable, n=192.

Characters	Regression Coefficient	Standardized Regression Coefficient
First Sampling Date		
Vigor	0.120***	0.2[illegible]
Nonelongated tiller number	0.007***	0.270
Height at first harvest	0.007***	0.[illegible]4
Spread	0.093*	0.200
Leaf area per nonelongated tiller	0.060	0.139
Intercept	-0.244	
R^2	0.354**	
Second Sampling Date		
Vigor	0.150***	0.352
Headed tiller stem length	0.003**	0.156
Leaf number per nonelongated tiller	-0.074**	-0.154
Elongated tiller standard leaf weight	-40.536*	-0.147
Intercept	1.291	
R^2	0.305**	
Third Sampling Date		
Vigor	0.136***	0.321
Individual nonelongated tiller weight	-3.180***	-0.211
Height at first harvest	0.006*	0.192
Leaf weight per headed tiller	-0.427*	-0.145
Intercept	0.682	
R^2	0.320**	
Fourth Sampling Date		
Vigor	0.162***	0.284
Nonelongated tiller number	0.007**	0.181
Height at first harvest	0.007**	0.227
Headed tiller number	-0.045*	-0.158
Individual nonelongated tiller weight	-1.250	-0.130
Intercept	0.205	
R^2	0.320**	

*** significant at 0.1%, ** significant at 1%, * significant at 5%.

Table 14. Stepwise multiple regression analysis with first harvest yield used as the dependent variable and sward characters deleted, n=19[illegible].

Characters	Regression Coefficient	Standardized Regression Coefficient
First Sampling Date		
Nonelongated tiller number	0.006***	0.282
Leaf area [illegible] elongated tiller	0.085**	0.107
Intercept	1.091	
R	0.087	
Second Sampling Date		
Headed tiller stem length	0.005***	0.245
Leaf number per nonelongated tiller	-0.[illegible]5***	-0.[illegible]
Elongated tiller standard leaf weight	-[illegible]1**	-0.191
Intercept	[illegible].906	
R	0.198*	
Third Sampling Date		
Individual nonelongated tiller weight	-2.014**	-0.200
Headed tiller stem length	0.012***	0.426
Stem weight per headed tiller	-0.254**	-0.265
Intercept	0.672	
R	0.209*	
Fourth Sampling Date		
Elongated tiller number	0.[illegible]8**	0.201
Headed tiller number	-0.043*	-0.151
Intercept	1.389	
R	0.049	

*** significant at 0.1%, ** significant at 1%, * significant at 5%.

Table [illegible]. Stepwise multiple regression analysis with second harvest yield [illegible] as the dependent variable, n=[illegible].

Characters	Regression Coefficient	Standardized Regression Coefficient
First Sampling Date		
Height at second harvest	[illegible]***	[illegible]
Nonelongated tiller number		[illegible]
Vigor	[illegible]*	[illegible]
Intercept	-[illegible]	
R	[illegible]	
Second Sampling Date		
Height at second harvest	0.016***	0.669
Elongated tiller number	[illegible]***	[illegible]
Headed tiller number	[illegible].008***	0.178
Intercept	[illegible]	
R	[illegible]***	
Third Sampling Date		
Height at second harvest	[illegible]***	[illegible]
Headed tiller number	0.008***	[illegible]
Elongated tiller number	[illegible]**	[illegible]
Vigor	0.046*	[illegible]
Intercept	-[illegible]	
R	0.510***	
Fourth Sampling Date		
Height at second harvest	0.016***	0.658
Elongated tiller leaf to stem ratio	-[illegible]***	-0.204
Nonelongated tiller number	0.007***	0.246
Headed tiller number	[illegible]***	0.171
Intercept	[illegible].223	
R	0.554***	

*** significant at 0.1%; ** significant at 1%; * significant at 5%.

Table 16. Stepwise multiple regression analysis with second harvest yield used as the dependent variable and sward characters deleted, n=192.

Characters	Regression Coefficient	Standardized Regression Coefficient
First Sampling Date		
Nonelongated tiller number	0.002**	[illegible].229
Leaf area per nonelongated tiller	0.050*	[illegible].178
Intercept	0.847	
R	0.[illegible]	
Second Sampling Date		
Stem area per elongated tiller	0.674***	[illegible]
Individual elongated tiller weight	-0.[illegible]38*	-[illegible]
Headed tiller stem length	0.00[illegible]**	[illegible]
Stem weight per headed tiller	-0.207*	-[illegible]
Intercept	[illegible].8[illegible]	
R	0.[illegible]	
Third Sampling Date		
Headed tiller stem length	0.00[illegible]	0.351
Number of headed tillers	0.006*	0.166
Headed tiller standard leaf weight	-44.031*	-0.144
Intercept	0.503	
R^2	0.225*	
Fourth Sampling Date		
Elongated tiller stem length	0.004***	0.384
Elongated tiller standard leaf weight	-53.453***	-0.228
Elongated tiller leaf to stem ratio	-0.037*	-0.166
Headed tiller number	0.030*	0.140
Intercept	1.15[illegible]	
R	0.3[illegible]***	

*** significant at 0.1%; ** significant at 1%; * significant at 5%.

Table 17. Mean square values for general and specific combining ability and heritabilities for sward and tiller characters in bromegrass progenies, 197[illegible].

Characters	Combining Ability General	Combining Ability Specific	Reciprocal Effects	Heritability	Heritability Narrow Sense
Sward Characters					
Yield (gm/plot):					
Total	[illegible]**	0.054	0.04[illegible]	0.4[illegible]	[illegible]
Second harvest	0.001**	0.010	[illegible].013	0.[illegible]4	0.[illegible]4
Height (cm):					
Mean	[illegible]**	24.56**	[illegible].69*	[illegible].78	0.56
First	[illegible].51**	32.04**	[illegible]	0.65	0.43
Second	[illegible].47**	24.30**	17.[illegible]	0.[illegible]	0.61
Spread	12.05	1[illegible].30**	1[illegible].[illegible]	0.41	0.32
Vigor	0.605*	0.[illegible]*	0.11[illegible]	[illegible].64	0.21
Tiller Characters					
First Sampling Date					
Nonelongated tillers:					
Tiller number	210.7[illegible]**	44.432	5[illegible].46	0.54	0.40
Whole tiller wt. (gm)	0.005**	0.001**	0.0[illegible]1	0.74	0.37
Leaf number	0.065	0.05[illegible]	0.033	0.33	0.02
Leaf area (cm)	[illegible].004**	0.177**	0.056	0.[illegible]	0.47
Second Sampling Date					
Nonelongated tillers:					
Tiller number	17.0[illegible]*	5.[illegible]**	4.16	0.59	0.25
Whole tiller wt. (gm)	0.003**	0.001**	0.0009	0.52	0.22
Leaf area (cm)	0.752*	0.229**	0.095	0.62	0.30
Stand. leaf wt.(mg/cm)	0.940**	0.2[illegible]4	0.231	0.42	0.33
Average leaf area (cm)	0.049*	0.017**	0.007	0.64	0.26
Elongated tillers:					
Tiller number	124.[illegible]**	16.94	[illegible]6.50	0.60	0.51
Whole tiller wt. (gm)	0.057**	0.007**	0.003	0.73	0.55
Leaf area (cm)	4.065**	0.412**	0.245	0.[illegible]	0.57
Leaf weight (gm)	0.018**	0.002**	0.0009	0.78	0.5[illegible]
Stand. leaf wt.(mg/cm)	1.160**	0.032	0.026	0.38	0.2[illegible]
Average leaf area (cm)	0.201**	0.015**	0.163**	0.91	0.67
Stem length (cm)	7[illegible].44	22.91*	22.20	0.40	[illegible]
Stem area (cm)	0.054**	0.010*	0.004	0.59	[illegible]
Stem weight (gm)	0.011**	0.002*	0.001	0.64	[illegible]
Leaf to stem ratio	0.055**	0.01[illegible]	0.016	0.30	0.[illegible]

Table 1[illegible] Continued.

Characters	Combining Ability General	Combining Ability Specific	Reciprocal Effects	Heritability Broad Sense	Heritability Narrow Sense
Headed tillers:					
Tiller number	[illegible].860**	0.[illegible]	[illegible]	0.54	[illegible]
Whole tiller wt. (gm)	[illegible].48**	0.05[illegible]	0.[illegible]	0.56	[illegible]
Leaf number	[illegible].013**	1.1[illegible]	1.07	0.86	[illegible]
Leaf area (cm)	[illegible].961**	[illegible].74	1.65	0.[illegible]	0.44
Leaf weight (gm)	.064**	[illegible]	[illegible].08	[illegible]	0.[illegible]
Average leaf area (cm)	[illegible].460**	0.06[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stem length (cm)	[illegible].36**	[illegible].7[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stem area (cm)	[illegible]*	[illegible].050*	0.[illegible]*	[illegible]	0.38
Stem weight (gm)	0.[illegible]1**	[illegible]	0.[illegible]	0.[illegible]	[illegible].40
Leaf to stem ratio	.1[illegible]*	0.[illegible]	[illegible].03[illegible]	[illegible]	0.[illegible]
Third sampling date					
Nonelongated tillers:					
Tiller number	[illegible]	[illegible]1*	0.1[illegible]	0.4[illegible]	0.1[illegible]
Whole tiller wt. (gm)	[illegible].003*	0.001	0.001	0.7[illegible]	0.[illegible]7
Elongated tillers:					
Tiller number	[illegible].71**	[illegible].40	5.02	0.47	0.35
Leaf number	1.[illegible]**	[illegible].40	0.3[illegible]	0.45	0.39
Stand. leaf wt. (mg/cm)	0.309**	0.085	0.1[illegible]5	0.30	0.19
Stem length (cm)	[illegible].58**	[illegible]**	30.70	0.5[illegible]	0.14
Leaf to stem ratio	0.1[illegible]*	0.00[illegible]	0.084	0.39	0.34
Headed tillers:					
Tiller number	55.[illegible]**	11.23*	7.[illegible]	0.5[illegible]	0.30
Whole tiller wt. (gm)	0.[illegible]**	0.[illegible]07**	0.055	[illegible]	0.63
Leaf number	[illegible]**	0.[illegible]	0.08[illegible]	0.4[illegible]	0.46
Leaf area (cm)	10.[illegible]**	0.70**	0.4[illegible]	0.82	0.7[illegible]
Leaf weight (gm)	0.[illegible]**	0.002**	0.[illegible]	[illegible].8[illegible]	0.70
Stand. leaf wt. mg/cm	0.102**	0.00[illegible]	0.[illegible]	0.3[illegible]	0.25
Average leaf area (cm)	0.34[illegible]**	[illegible].015**	0.[illegible]	[illegible]	0.7[illegible]
Stem length (cm)	[illegible]**	[illegible]**	35.[illegible]**	[illegible]	0.32
Stem area (cm)	0.[illegible]**	0.07[illegible]**	0.[illegible]**	0.81	0.53
Stem weight (gm)	0.296**	0.026**	0.024**	0.78	0.62
Head area (cm)	0.[illegible]**	0.020**	0.024**	0.30	0.59
Head weight (gm)	[illegible]21*	0.[illegible]7	0.008	0.3[illegible]	0.2[illegible]
Leaf to stem ratio	[illegible]*	0.00[illegible]	0.[illegible]*	0.30	0.2[illegible]

Table [illegible] Continued.

Characters	Combining Ability General	Combining Ability Specific	Reciprocal Effects	Heritability Broad Sense	Heritability Narrow Sense
[illegible] Sampling Date					
Non-elongated tillers:					
Tiller number	16[illegible].78**	1[illegible].44**	9.61	0.7[illegible]	0.[illegible]6
Leaf area (cm [illegible])	[illegible].267*	0.094	0.124	0.[illegible]	0.[illegible]
Stand. leaf wt. (mg/cm [illegible])	0.[illegible]60**	[illegible].04[illegible]	0.025	0.4[illegible]	0.37
Average leaf area (cm [illegible])	0.4[illegible]**	[illegible].111	[illegible].129	0.[illegible]0	0.[illegible]
Elongated tillers:					
Tiller number	[illegible]**	16.[illegible]*	13.77	0.5[illegible]	0.36
Whole tiller wt. (gm)	[illegible].0[illegible]**	[illegible].001	0.001*	[illegible].73	0.67
Leaf number	0.5[illegible]0**	0.12[illegible]**	0.214*	0.5[illegible]	0.43
Leaf area (cm [illegible])	[illegible].216**	[illegible].2[illegible]	0.251	0.74	0.72
Leaf weight (gm)	[illegible].009**	0.0006	0.0005	0.7[illegible]	0.66
Stand. leaf wt. (mg/cm [illegible])	[illegible].1[illegible]1**	0.017	0.032	.33	0.26
Average leaf area (cm [illegible])	[illegible]**	0.248	0.222	[illegible].73	0.[illegible]
Stem length (cm)	346.68**	[illegible].08	108.37	[illegible]1	0.51
Stem area (cm [illegible])	[illegible].372**	0.029	0.0[illegible]*		0.65
Stem weight (gm)	0.035**	0.003	0.058*		0.59
Leaf to stem ratio	0.[illegible]47*	0.341**	0.046**		[illegible].19
Headed Tillers:					
Tiller number	1.207**	[illegible].21	0.25	0.36	0.36
Whole tiller wt. (gm)	[illegible].017**	0.002	0.006	0.32	0.3
Leaf number	1.988**	0.364	0.526	0.35	0.33
Leaf area (cm [illegible])	[illegible].310**	[illegible].416	0.793	0.31	0.31
Leaf weight (gm)	0.006**	0.[illegible]006	0.002	0.29	0.27
Average leaf area (cm [illegible])	1.[illegible]59**	0.223	0.510	0.35	0.33
Stem length (cm)	602.48**	114.42	170.29	0.38	0.35
Stem weight (gm)	0.039**	0.006	0.015	[illegible].26	0.2[illegible]
Leaf to stem ratio	[illegible].321**	0.[illegible]9[illegible]	[illegible].164	0.42	0.39

** significant at 1%, * significant at 5%.

Table 18. General combining ability effects (g_i) for sward characters of bromegrass, [illegible].

Clone	Total Yield	First Harvest Yield	Second Harvest Yield	Mean Height	Height at First Harvest	Height at Second Harvest	[illegible]
B40	-3.64	-1.29	-2.26	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
B42	-3.78	-5.72	-2.05	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
UA9	11.78	3.65	[illegible]	[illegible]	-0.5766	[illegible]	[illegible]
UA12	-23.16	-7.72	-15.34	-7.4469	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
UA5	8.72	4.96	3.66	[illegible]	1.4714	[illegible]	[illegible]
UA6	-2.95	-3.97	0.95	0.2177	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
UA10	13.05	[illegible]	8.64	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
43	4.99	6.65	-1.68	-1.7656	[illegible]	-2.6156	[illegible]
STD.ER. (g)	7.27	5.60	3.71	1.0913	1.4104	[illegible]	[illegible]

Table 14a. Specific combining ability effects (s_i) for sward characters of bromegrass clones, 1975.
Total yield shown above the diagonal, mean height shown below the diagonal.

Clone	B40	B42	UA9	UA12	UA5	UA6	UA10	43
B40	-0.29 -5.17	-0.11	-0.06	0.07	0.02	0.2[illegible]	-0.03	0.17
B42	-3.81	0.19 -0.48	[illegible].01	-[illegible].3[illegible]	0.04	-0.16	0.03	0.29
UA9	-0.58	1.58	-0.17 -1.43	0.24	-0.13	0.11	-0.05	0.05
UA12	1.61	-5.85	0.69	0.03 -3.39	0.16	-0.11	0.19	-0.28
UA5	5.84	[illegible]	-1.78	[illegible].95	-0.09 -4.40	-0.08	0.08	-0.01
UA6	[illegible]	1.17	4.16	[illegible].38	-3.[illegible]	0.22 -[illegible].15	-0.19	-0.02
UA10	-0.55	0.68	-0.49	7.61	-0.67	0.41	0.02 -3.38	-0.05
43	4.81	4.21	-2.16	-6.21	[illegible].31	1.89	-3.80	-0.14 0.94

Total dry weight:
STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of two parent lines = 0.2520
STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of a parent line and a cross having that line as one parent = 0.2413
STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of a parent line and a cross not having that line as a parent = 0.2182
STD.ER. of the difference between effects of two crosses having one parent line in common = 0.1925
STD.ER. of the difference between effects of two crosses having no parent lines in common = 0.1782

Mean height:
STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of two parent lines = 3.7802
STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of a parent line and a cross having that line as one parent = 3.6193
STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of a parent line and a cross not having that line as a parent = 3.2738
STD.ER. of the difference between effects of two crosses having one parent line in common = 2.8872
STD.ER. of the difference between effects of two crosses having no parent lines in common = 2.6730

Table 19b. Specific [illegible]mbining ability effects (s_{ij}) for sward charact[illegible]rs of brome[illegible]ss clones, 1975.
Height [illegible] first harvest shown above the diagonal, height at sec[illegible] harvest shown below the diagonal.

Clone	B40	[illegible]	UA9	UA12	UA5	UA6	UA10	43
B40	-[illegible]	3.54	-2.58	4.35	3.08	-1.[illegible]5	-0.88	5.00
	-[illegible]							
B4[illegible]		1.57	-0.40	-6.25	[illegible].41	3.37	0.25	6.72
	-4.[illegible]	[illegible].64						
UA9			-1.32	2.86	-2.79	5.00	0.37	-1.14
	1.[illegible]	[illegible]	-1.54					
[illegible]A12				-5.77	4.98	[illegible].44	7.23	-7.87
	-1.11	-5.49	-1.45	-1.03				
[illegible]A5					-1.92	[illegible].12	0.49	-0.14
	4.63	3.58	-0.79	2.85				
UA6						-5.00	1.29	1.26
	0.9[illegible]	-1.02	3.34	[illegible].35	-2.39	-5.26		
UA10							-3.58	-5.19
	-0.26	1.10	-1.35	8.39	-1.85	-0.46	-3.17	
43								1.36
	4.64	1.67	-3.20	-4.53	0.80	2.52	-2.38	0.47

Height at first harvest:
STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of two parent lines = 4.8856
STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of a parent line and a cross having that line as one parent = 4.6776
STD.ER. of the difference between effects of a parent line and a cross not having that line as a parent = 4.2311
STD.ER. of the difference between effects of two crosses having one parent line in common = 3.7[illegible]15
STD.ER. of the difference between effects of two crosses having no parent lines in common = 3.4547

He[illegible] at second harvest:
[illegible].ER. of the difference between the effects of two parent lines = 4.5[illegible]20
STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of a parent line and a cross having that line as one parent = 4.3582
STD.ER. of the difference between effects of a parent line and a cross not having that line as a parent = 3.9421
STD.ER. of the difference between effects of two crosses having one parent line in common = 3.4766
STD.ER. of the difference between effects of two crosses having no parent lines in common = 3.2187

Table 19c. Specific combining ability effects (s_{ij}) for sward characters of bromegrass clones, 1975.
First harvest yield shown above the diagonal,
second harvest yield shown below the diagonal.

Clone	B40	B42	UA9	UA12	UA5	UA6	UA10	43
B40	-0.08	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.03
	-0.22							
B42		.02	0.02	-0.16	0.06	-0.04	0.02	0.13
	-0.07	0.17						
UA9			-0.06	0.20	-0.06	0.02	-0.01	-0.02
	[illegible]	0.30	-0.10					
UA12				-0.09	0.05	-0.01	0.04	-0.06
	0.09	-0.16	0.04	0.12				
UA5					-0.05	-0.01	0.08	-0.07
	-0.02	[illegible]	-0.07	0.17	-0.03			
UA6						0.06	-0.02	-0.01
	0.20	[illegible]	0.11	-0.10	-0.07	0.16		
UA10							0.08	-0.04
	-0.02	0.02	-0.08	0.14	0.07	-0.16	0.01	
43								0.08
	0.09	0.15	.08	-0.21	0.06	-0.01	-0.01	-0.15

First harvest yield:

STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of two parent lines = 0.1285

STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of a parent line and a cross having that line as one parent = 0.1231

STD.ER. of the difference between effects of a parent line and a cross not having that line as a parent = 0.1113

STD.ER. of the difference between effects of two crosses having one parent line in common = 0.0982

STD.ER. of the difference between effects of two crosses having no parent lines in common = 0.0909

Second harvest yield:

STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of two parent lines = 0.1940

STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of a parent line and a cross having that line as one parent = 0.1858

STD.ER. of the difference between effects of a parent line and a cross not having that line as a parent = 0.1680

STD.ER. of the difference between effects of two crosses having one parent line in common = 0.1482

STD.ER. of the difference between effects of two crosses having no parent lines in common = 0.1372

Table 19d. Specific combining ability effects (s) for sward characters of bromegrass clones, 1975.
Vigor shown below the diagonal.

Clone	B40	B42	UA9	UA12	UA5	UA6	UA10	43
B40	-0.35							
B42	-0.29	0.43						
UA9	-0.37	0.02	0.27					
UA12	[illegible]	-0.60	0.31	-0.31				
UA5	0.29	0.02	[illegible]	0.14	0.27			
UA6	0.37	[illegible]	[illegible]	0.06	-0.64	-0.56		
UA10	-0.14	-0.08	-0.33	0.70	-0.00	0.08	0.06	
43	0.16	[illegible]	-0.02	-0.64	0.14	0.22	-0.29	0.02

Vigor:

STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of two parent lines = 0.3728

STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of a parent line and a cross having that line as one parent = 0.3570

STD.ER. of the difference between the effects of a parent line and a cross not having that line as a parent = 0.3229

STD.ER. of the difference between effects of two crosses having one parent line in common = 0.2848

STD.ER. of the difference between effects of two crosses having no parent in common = 0.2636

VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alburquerque, H.F. 1967. Leaf area, and age, and carbohydrate reserves in the regrowth of tall fescue (Festuca arundinacea Schreb.) tillers. Ph.D. Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg.

Anslow, R.C. 1965. Li[illegible]ption and growth rate of a perennial ryegrass [illegible]oc. 9th Int. Grassld Congr., 403-405.

Anslow, R.C. 1965. Grass growth in midsummer. J.Br. Grassld Soc. 20:19-2[illegible].

Anslow, R.C. 1967. Frequency of cutting and sward production. J. Agric. Sci., Camb. 68:377-384.

Begg, J.E. and M.J. Wright. 1964. Relative effectiveness of top and basal leaves for the growth of vegetative shoots of reed canarygrass (Phalaris arundinacea L.) Crop Sci. 6:607-609.

Branson, F.A. 1953. Two new factors affecting resistance of grasses to grazing. J.Range Mgmt. 6:165-171.

Brougham, R.W. 1956. Effect of intensity of defoliation on regrowth of pasture. Aust. J. Agric. Res. 7:377-387.

Brown, R.H. and R.E. Blaser. 1968. Leaf area index in pasture growth. Herbage Abstracts 88:1-9.

Cooper, J.P. and K.J.R. Edwards. 1960. Selection for leaf area in ryegrass. Ann. Rep. Welsh Pl. Breed. Stn 1959:71-75.

Cooper, J.P. and S.A. Tricker. 1971. Variation in photosynthesis of the individual leaf. Ann. Rep. Welsh Pl. Breed. Stn 1970:9-10

Cowling, D.W. 1970. in Williams, R.D. 1970. Tillering in grasses cut for conservation, with special reference to perennial ryegrass. Herbage Abstracts 40: 383-389.

Davies, I. 1969. The influence of management on tiller development and herbage growth. Tech. Bull. 3 Welsh Pl. Breed. Stn 1-121.

Davies, I. 1972. The pattern of reproductive development and the leafiness of spring and early summer regrowths in two contrasting varieties of ryegrass. J. Agric. Sci. 78 : 7-35.

Donald, C.M. and J.N. Black. 1958. The significance of leaf area in pasture grow h. Herbage Abstracts. 38:1-6.

Draper, N.R. and H. Smith. 1967. Applied regression analysis. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.

Drolsom, P.N. and [illegible] Nielsen. 1970. Some characteristics of mutual pollination progenies of Bromus inermis. Crop Sci. 10:1[illegible]-1[illegible].

Dunn, G.M. and [illegible].A. Wright. 19[illegible]. Performances of diallel crosses of Bromus inermis for forage yield. Crop Sci. 10 :[illegible]-[illegible].

Gardner, C.O. 1963. Estimates of genetic parameters in cross-fertilizing plants and their implications in plant breeding. In Statistical genetics and plant breeding. W.D.Hanson and H.F.Robinson (eds.) NAS-NRC Pub. 982:225-252.

Gillet, M. 1967. Mise a fleurs et correlations entre talles chez Festuca pratensis Huds. C. r. hebd. Seanc. Acad. Sci., Paris 264:2634-2637.

Glenday, A.C. and S.B. Fejer. 1956. The use of discriminant functions in the selection of pasture plants, with particular reference to Lolium species. Proc. 7th Int. Grassld Congr. 461-470.

Green, J.O. 1970. in Williams, R.D. 1970. Tillering in grasses cut for conservation, with special reference to perennial ryegrass. Herbage Abstracts 40:383-389.

Griffing, B. 1956. Concept of general and specific combining ability in relation to diallel crossing systems. Aust. J. Biol. Sci. 9:463-493.

Hanson, A.A. and H.L. Carnahan. 1956. Breeding perennial forage grasses. USDA Tech. Bull. 1145.

Hopkinson, J.M. 1964. Studies on the expansion of the leaf surface IV. The carbon and phosphorus economy of a leaf. J. Exp. Bot. 15:125-129.

Hunt, L.A. 1965. Some implications of death and decay in pasture production. J. Br. Grassld Soc. 20:27-31.

Hunt, L.A. and R.W. Brougham. 1966. Some aspects of growth in an undefoliated stand of italian ryegrass. J. Appl. Ecol. 3:21-8.

Jewiss, O.R. and J. Woledge. 1967. The effect of age on rate of apparent photosynthesis in leaves of tall fescue (Festuca arundinacea Schreb.) Ann. Bot. 31:661-671.

[illegible], [illegible] and J.R. McWi[illegible]iam in Williams, R.D. 1970. Tillering in grasses cut for conservation, with spec[illegible]al reference to perennial ryegrass. Herbage Abstracts 40 :38[illegible]-389.

[illegible]ewiss, O.R. 197[illegible]. Tillerin[illegible] in [illegible]rasses-Its significance and [illegible]ntrol. J. Br. Grassl[illegible] Soc. [illegible]7:65-82.

King, R.W. and L.T. Evans. 1967. Photosynthesis in artificial communities of wheat, lucerne, and subterranean clover plants. Aust. J. Biol. Sci. 20:6[illegible]-[illegible].

[illegible], [illegible], A.V.A. Jacques, and [illegible] Smith. 1971. Influence of growth stage and stubble height on herbage yields and persistence of smooth bromegrass and timothy. Agron. J. 6[illegible]:[illegible]30-4[illegible].

Knight, R. 1965. The relation between yield and the reproductive phase in cocksfoot (Dactylis glomerata L.) in a winter rainfall environment. Aust. J. Agric. Res. 16:505-51[illegible].

Knight, R. 1970. The effects of plant density and frequency of cutting on the growth of cocksfoot (Dactylis glomerata L.) 1. The production of vegetative and reproductive tillers. Aust. J. Agric. Res. 21:9-17.

Knowles, R.P. 1950. Studies of combining ability in bromegrass and crested wheatgrass. Sci. Agric. 30:27[illegible]-302.

Langer, R.H.M. 1956. Growth and nutrition of timothy (Phleum pratense) 1. Life history of individual tillers. Ann. Appl. Biol. 44:166-187.

Langer, R.[illegible] 195[illegible]. A study of growth in swards of timothy and mea[illegible] fescue 1. Uninterrupted growth. J. Agric. Sci. 51:347-352.

Langer, R.H.M. 1959. A study of growth in swards of timothy and meadow fescue 2. The effect of cutting trea[illegible]ts. J. Agric. Sci. 52:273-281.

Langer, R.H.M., S.M. Ryle, and O.R. Jewiss. 1964. The changing plant and tiller populations of timothy and meadow fescue swards; 1. Plant survival and pattern of tillering. J. Appl. Ecol. 1:197-208.

Le[illegible] E.L., W. Stiles, and S.E. Dickinson. 1974. [illegible]ological processes influencing the pattern of [illegible]tivity of the intensely managed grass sward. Proc. [illegible]nt. Grassld Congr., 191-205.

Ludwig, L.J, T. Saeki, and L.T. Evans. 1965. Photosynthesis in artificial communities of cotton plants in relation to leaf area. I. Experiments with progressive defoliation of mature plants. Aust. J. Biol. Sci. 18 :1103-1118.

McCree, K.J. and J.H. Troughton. 1966. Non-existence of an optimum leaf area index for the production rate of white clover grown under constant conditions. Pl. Physiol. 41 :1615-1622.

Milthorpe, F.L. and J.D. Ivins. 1966. The growth of cereals and grasses. Butterworths, London.

Mishra, S.N. and P.N. Drolsom. 1972. Performance of diallel cross progenies for certain morphological traits in Bromus inermis Leyss. Crop Sci. 12:497-499.

Mishra, S.N. and P.N. Drolsom. 1973. Associations among certain morphological traits of diallel cross progenies in Bromus inermis Leyss. J. Agric. Sci. 81:69-76.

Nelson, C.J., K.H. Asay, and G.L. Horst. 1975. Relationship of leaf photosynthesis to forage yield of tall fescue. Crop Sci. 15:476-478.

Paulsen, G.M. and Dale Smith. 1969. Organic reserves, axillary bud activity, and herbage yields of smooth bromegrass as influenced by time of cutting, nitrogen fertilization, and shading. Crop Sci. 9:529-534.

Pearce, R.B., R.H. Brown, and R.E. Blaser. 1965. Relationships between leaf area index, light interception, and net photosynthesis in orchard grass. Crop Sci. 5:553-556.

Pearce, R.B. 1966. Photosynthesis in plant communities and individual leaves as influenced by leaf angle, leaf area index, and leaf age. Ph.D. Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg.

Pearce, R.B., G.E. Carlson, D.K. Barnes, R.H. Hart, and C.H. Hanson. 1969. Specific leaf weight and photosynthesis in alfalfa. Crop Sci. 9:423-426.

Reynolds, J.H. and Dale Smith. 1962. Trend of carbohydrate reserves in alfalfa, smooth bromegrass, and timothy grown under various cutting schedules. Crop Sci. 2:333-336.

Rhodes, I. 1971. The relationship between productivity and some components of canopy structure in ryegrass (Lolium spp.) 2. Yield, canopy structure, and light interception. J. Agric. Sci. 77:283-292.

Rhodes, I. 1972. Yield, leaf area index and photosynthetic rate in some perennial ryegrass (Lolium perenne L.) selections. J. Agric. Sci. 78:509-511.

Rhodes, I. 1973. Relationship between canopy structure and productivity in herbage grasses and its implications for plant breeding. Herbage Abstracts 43:129-133.

Rhodes, I. 1973. The relationship between productivity and some components of canopy structure in ryegrass (Lolium spp.) 3. Spaced plant characters, their heritabilities and relationship to sward yield. J. Agric. Sci. 80:171-178.

Robinson, L.R. and H.L. Thomas. 1963. Combining ability for seedling vigor in Bromus inermis Leyss. Crop Sci. 3:358-359.

Rogers, H.H. and A. Lazenby. 1966. Selection criteria in the breeding of grasses. Proc. 10th Int. Grassld Congr., 630-533.

Ross, J.G., Bullis, and K.C. Lin. 1970. Inheritance of in vitro digestibility in smooth bromegrass. Crop Sci. 10:672-673.

Ryle, G.J.A. 1964. A comparison of leaf and tiller growth in seven perennial grasses as influenced by nitrogen and temperature. J. Br. Grassld. Soc. 19:281-290.

Ryle, G.J.A. 1968. The Stapledon Memorial Lecture. Ann. Rep. Grasslds. Res. Inst., Hurley.

Sheard, R.W. and J.E. Winch. 1966. The use of light interception, grass morphology, and time as criteria for the harvesting of timothy, smooth brome, and cocksfoot. J. Br. Grassld. Soc. 21:231-237.

Sheehy, J.E. and J.P. Cooper. 1973. Light interception, photosynthetic activity, and crop growth rate in canopies of six temperate forage grasses. J. Appl. Ecol. 10:239-250.

Silsbury, J.H. 1966. Inter-relations in the growth and development of Lolium 2. Tiller number and dry weight at low density. Aust. J. Agric. Res. 17:841-847.

Simons, R.G., A. Davies, and A. Troughton. 1972. The effect of the height of defoliation on two clones of perennial ryegrass. J. Agric. Sci. 79:509-514.

Sleper, D.A. and P.N. Drolsom. 1974. Analysis of several morphological traits and their associations with digestibility in Bromus inermis Leyss. Crop Sci. 14:34-

Sprague, G.F. and L.A. Tatum. 1942. General vs. specific combining ability in single crosses of corn. J. Amer. Soc. Agron. 34:923-932.

Tan, G.Y. and G.M. Dunn. 1976. Genetic variation in stomatal length and frequency and other characteristics in *Bromus inermis* Leyss. Crop Sci. 16, in press

Tan, G.Y., W.K. Tan, and P.D. Walton. 1976. The genetics of vein and stomatal characters in *Bromus inermis* Leyss. Crop Sci. 16, in press

Taylor, T.H. and W.C. Templeton. 1966. Tiller and leaf behavior of orchardgrass (*Dactylis glomerata* L.) in a broadcast planting. Agron. J. 58:189-192.

Teel, M.R. 1956. The physiological age of bromegrass (*Bromus inermis* Leyss.) as it affects growth rate following defoliation. Diss. Abstr. 16:844.

Thomson, A.J., A.J. Wright and H.H. Rogers. 1973. Studies on the agronomy, genetics, and interrelationships of yield and its morphological components in a diallel set of families of *Lolium perenne* L. J. Agric. Sci. 80:511-52?.

Timothy, D.H., H.L. Thomas, and M.F. Kernkamp. 1959. Combining ability in *Bromus inermis* Leyss. Agron. J. 51 :25?-25?.

Troughton, A. 1965. Intravarietal variation in *Lolium perenne*. Euphytica 14:59-66.

Troughton, A. 1971. The relationship between the relative growth rates of the shoot system, number of tillers, and mean tiller size in *Lolium perenne*. Ann. Appl. Biol. 68 :1?3-202.

Walton, P.D. 1974. The evaluation of disease resistant clones of *Bromus inermis* Leyss. as breeding stocks. Can. J. Plant Sci. 54:743-747.

Walton, P.D. 1976. A genetic study of the factors which constitute forage yield in *Bromus inermis* Leyss. Zeitschrift fur Pflanzenzuchtung 75, in press

Watson, D.J. and A.G. Norman. 1939. Photosynthesis in the ear of barley, and the movement of nitrogen into the ear. J. Agric. Sci. 29:321-346.

Whittington, W.J. and T.A. O'Brian. 1968. A comparison of yields from plots sown with a single species or a mixture of grass species. J. Appl. Ecol. 5:209-213.

[illegible]ifong, E.T., [illegible].H. Brown, and R.E. Blaser. 1967. Relationships between leaf area index and apparent photosynthesis in alfalfa (Mediengo sativa L.) and ladino clover (Trifolium repens L.). Crop Sci. 7:[illegible]7-30.

Williams, W.A., R.[illegible] Loomis, and C.R. Lepley. 1965. Vegetative growth of corn as affected by population density. [illegible]. Components of growth, net assimilation rate, and leaf area index. Crop Sci. 5:215-219.

Williams, R.D. 197[illegible]. Tillering in grasses cut for conservation, with special reference to perennial ryegrass. Herbage Abstracts. 40:383-388.

Wilson, D. and J.P. Cooper. 1970. Effect of selection for mesophyll cell size on growth and assimilation in Lolium perenne L. New Phytol. 69:[illegible]33-248.

Wilson, D. and W.S. McGuire. 1961. Effects of clipping and nitrogen on competition between three pasture species. Can. J. Plant Sci. 41:631-642.

Wright, A.J. 197[illegible]. The derivation of heritability formulae. J. Agric. Sci. Camb. 75:1[illegible]-19[illegible].