

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**EFFECTS OF PLANT GROWTH REGULATORS ON
VEGETATIVE DEVELOPMENT AND SEED PRODUCTION OF
BIRDSFOOT TREFOIL (*Lotus corniculatus. L*)**

SUPANJANI

1991

**EFFECTS OF PLANT GROWTH REGULATORS ON
VEGETATIVE DEVELOPMENT AND SEED PRODUCTION OF
BIRDSFOOT TREFOIL (*Lotus corniculatus. L*)**

A Thesis presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Agricultural Science
at Massey University
Palmerston North
New Zealand

SUPANJANI

1991

ABSTRACT

Effects of chemical manipulation of a crop of birdsfoot trefoil (*Lotus corniculatus* L.) grown for seed in two consecutive years were investigated in this study. In the first year, treatments included Cultar (paclobutrazol) at 0.5 or 1.0 kg a.i./ha, Cycocel (chlormequat chloride) at 1.5 or 3.0 kg a.i./ha and Alar (daminozide) at 2.0 or 4.0 kg a.i./ha applied twice at either the late vegetative stage (October) or at the early flowering stage (November). None of these treatments affected seed yield (average 549 kg/ha), or umbel components (pods per umbel, seeds per pod and thousand seed weight).

In the second year, at the same stages of plant development, Cultar and Cycocel were applied at the same rates as previously, with an additional treatment added using RSW-0411 (triapenthenol) at 0.5 or 1.0 kg a.i./ha. Again, no seed yield improvement was obtained by any chemical treatment, but average seed yield being increased 27% from 769 kg/ha by 6 days delay in harvesting from 41 to 47 DAPF. Shoot length was reduced by chemical applications, especially at the time of rapid growth, and Cultar had the strongest and longest retarding capability. However, plant branching was not improved by any treatment. Although early flowering pattern was increased by October Cultar application at the higher rate and peak flowering pattern by November Cultar application at either rate, total reproductive structures at harvest in treated plants were similar to those in untreated plants due to flower abortion. Cultar applications in the first year had no carry-over effects on seed production in the second year, but delayed early plant growth in terms of ground cover. Plant growth regulators had no effect on the quality of the subsequently harvested seeds.

Effects of Cultar, Cycocel and RSW-0411 applied at higher rates in October on reproductive abortion were examined in flowers produced during the flowering

season in the second year. Chemical treatments increased flower abortion by 20%, especially in the early flowers. However, there was no effect on abortion of pods in an umbel, on abortion of ovules or seeds in a pod, or on seed weight. Time of flowering also modified flower abortion rate (late flowers having up to 48% greater flower survival than early flowers), and seed development rate (being slower in early season flowers), had no effect on pod abortion and seed abortion (average 44% and 70%, respectively). Flower abortion was first found as early as 10 DAOF. Pod abortion occurred consistently after flower opening, and ovule or seed abortion occurred particularly in the early stages of seed development.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Bismillahirrahmanirrahim

In the name of Allah, the most gracious and most merciful

I would like to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to Prof. Murray J. Hill, my chief supervisor and Director of Seed Technology Centre, for his warm encouragement and continuous supervision throughout this study and his patience in reading and correcting this manuscript.

I would also like to express my grateful thanks to Dr. John G. Hampton, my co-supervisor, for his wise advice and constructive criticism of this work.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to:

*The New Zealand Ministry of External Relations and Trade for financial assistance during my study in New Zealand.

*Dr. Peter Coolbear, Mrs. Karen Johnstone and Mr Craig McGill for their assistance in so many ways.

*All my fellow-students at the Seed Technology Centre and my Indonesian friends for their help, moral support and joyful company.

*Ms. N. Elizabeth of the Botany Department Massey University for her help in taking the photomicrograph of plate 3.5.

Finally, my deepest gratitude and thanks to my parents, my wife Susi and my daughter Nia, whose love, emotional support, patience and encouragement have been invaluable during my study in New Zealand.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF PLATES	x
LIST OF APPENDICES	xi
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE : LITERATURE REVIEW	4
1.1. Terminology	4
1.2. Origin and distribution	5
1.3. Agronomic aspects	6
1.3.1. Forage quality	6
1.3.2. Likely role in temperate agriculture	8
1.3.2.1. Environmental requirements	8
1.3.2.2. Likely role in New Zealand pastures	9
1.3.3. Establishment	11
1.3.4. Grazing management	13
1.4. Description of the plant	14
1.4.1. Vegetative structure	14
1.4.2. Reproductive structure	16
1.4.3. Dry matter distribution	17

1.5.	Seed production (both potential and actual): Effect of environment	18
1.5.1.	The influence of environment on vegetative growth	18
1.5.2.	The influence of environment on reproductive growth	21
1.5.3.	The influence of environment on seed yield and seed yield components	25
1.5.4.	The influence of environment on seed harvest	28
1.6.	Problems in seed production	29
1.6.1.	Three major obstacles in seed production	30
1.7.	Plant growth regulators	32
1.7.1.	Paclobutrazol (Cultar)	33
1.7.2.	Triapenthenol (RSW-0411)	35
1.7.3.	Chlormequat chloride (Cycocel)	36
1.7.4.	Daminozide (Alar)	37
CHAPTER TWO : MATERIALS AND METHODS		38
2.1.	Site and treatments	38
2.2.	Vegetative development	40
2.3.	Inflorescence production	40
2.4.	Reproductive abortion	41
2.5.	Seed yield, seed yield components, and harvest index	44
2.6.	Seed yield potential	45
2.7.	Seed quality	46
2.8.	Statistical analysis	46
CHAPTER THREE : RESULTS		47
3.1.	Crop growth and development	47
3.2.	Flowering pattern	53
3.3.	Reproductive abortion	57
3.4.	Seed yield and seed yield components	67
3.5.	Residual effects of Cultar	74
3.6.	Seed quality	75

CHAPTER FOUR : DISCUSSION 76

BIBLIOGRAPHY 88

APPENDICES 107

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
2.1 Cultural management and experimental details	39
3.1 Reproductive structure distribution on shoots and reproductive categories of <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> at 13 January 1990	58
3.2 Effect of plant growth regulators applied in October on number of floret buds per inflorescence (15 days before open flower), florets per blooming inflorescence and floret bud survival at different times of flower production. (1989-1990).....	59
3.3 Effect of plant growth regulators applied in October on florets per inflorescence or pods per umbel measured at 0, 5, 10, 20, and 30 DAOF in inflorescences produced at four different times. (1989-1990)	62
3.4 Effect of plant growth regulators applied in October on number of ovules per ovary or seeds per pod measured at 0, 5, 10, 20, and 30 DAOF in inflorescences produced at four different times. (1989-1990)	64
3.5 Effect of plant growth regulators applied in October on the survival of umbel, pods per umbel, seeds per pod and total seeds measured at 0, 5, 10, 20, and 30 DAOF in inflorescences produced at four different times. (1989-1990)	66
3.6 Effect of plant growth regulators applied in October on thousand seed weight (grams) measured at 0, 5, 10, 20, and 30 DAOF in inflorescences produced at four different times. (1989-1990)	67
3.7 Effect of plant growth regulators on seed yield, harvest recovery and harvest index of <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> seed crop grown in two consecutive years (1988-1990).....	68
3.8 Effect of plant growth regulators on seed yield components at 2 February 1989 and 21 February 1990 harvests.	72
3.9 Total reproductive structures, measured from the whole season, at 19 January 1990 and at harvest (21 February 1990), and seed yield potential (1989-1990)	73
3.10 Effect of plant growth regulators on dry matter distribution of <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> at harvest 21 February 1990	74
3.11 Germination test of harvested seeds <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> in 1990	75

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
3.1 Effect of plant growth regulators at higher rates on the longest main shoot length of the second year seed crop (1989/1990)	49
3.2 Effect of plant growth regulators at higher rates on the development of main shoot numbers of the second year <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> seed crop (1989/1990)	50
3.3 Effect of plant growth regulators applied at higher rates on the development of lateral shoot numbers of the second year <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> seed crop (1989/1990)	50
3.4 Effect of Cultar, RSW-0411 and Cycocel applied at higher rates on general plant growth of the second year seed crop (1989/1990).....	52
3.5 Flowering patterns of the second year <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> seed crop (1989/1990) as affected by Cultar applied at two different times and two different rates.....	54
3.6 Flowering patterns of the second year <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> seed crop (1989/1990) as affected by RSW-0411 applied at two different times and two different rates.....	54
3.7 Flowering patterns of the second year <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> seed crop (1989/1990) as affected by Cycocel applied at two different times and two different rates.....	55
3.8 Flowering patterns of the second year <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> seed crop (1989/1990) as affected by residual Cultar applied at two different times and two different rates in the first year seed crop (1988/1989)	55

LIST OF PLATES

PLATE	PAGE
2.1. <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> 1989/1990 seed crop showing tagged inflorescences with different colored of plastic tags, each representing a different monthly tagging time, and a bamboo stick as a position marker of the tagged flowers in the field.	42
2.2 An example of an X-ray photograph of pods used to count the number of seeds per pod in late flowers, showing (A) seeds at 20 DAOF and (B) seeds at 30 DAOF.....	44
3.1 <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> plants showing a variation in a sample taken from 25 cm row at 13 October 1989 (58 days after last grazing).	48
3.2 <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> crop at 23 days after application (11 November 1989) showing some October Cultar treated plots which look greener and more prostrate compared to other plots	48
3.3 <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> crop at 12 January 1990 (one day after peak flowering) showing differences in flowering intensity of control plants (A) and plants treated with 1.0 kg a.i. Cultar/ha in November (B)	56
3.4 Flower development of <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> , showing floret or pod abortion, petioles without pods and decayed umbels	61
3.5 Seed development of <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> , showing some shrivelled seeds (arrows) at any developmental stage. The seeds were photographed with 20x magnification from seed samples of early flowers (31 December 1989)	63
3.6 Crop condition at 15 January (six days before harvest) showing crop greenness and great variation within a plot. At harvest the crop looks greener	69
3.7 An example of an X-ray photograph of harvested pods used to determine the number of seeds per pod, showing the variation which occurs between two replicates of pods from the same treatment (Cultar 1.0 kg a.i./ha plants treated in November). (A) A greater portion of seeds had matured, (B) a greater portion of seeds are shrivelled or are not yet mature	71

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	PAGE
1 Monthly daylength and temperature changes (A) and monthly rainfall (B) at Palmerston North, New Zealand, during 1988-1990	107
2 Detailed weather data at Palmerston North, New Zealand during the flowering period in 1989/1990	108
3 Main shoot length and the number of nodes in the longest main shoot of the second year <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> seed crop (1989/1990)	108
4 Effect of plant growth regulators applied at higher rates on the monthly development of numbers of plants, main shoots, lateral shoots and secondary lateral shoots.	109
5 Effect of plant growth regulators applied at higher rates on the monthly development of shoots, dead material and total dry weight of <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> in 1989/1990	110
6 Effect of plant growth regulators applied at higher rates on the monthly development of the proportion of lateral shoot to main shoots and secondary lateral shoots to lateral shoots of <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> in 1989/1990	112
7 Effect of plant regulators applied in October on pod length development measured at 0, 5, 10, 20, and 30 DAOF in inflorescences produced at four different times. (1989-1990)	113
8 Residual effect of Cultar application in the 1988/1989 crop on seed yield and harvest index of the subsequent year <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> seed crop (1989/1990)	114
9 Residual effect of Cultar application in the 1988/1989 crop on seed yield components and seed yield potential of the subsequent year <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> seed crop (1989/1990)	114
10 Residual effect of Cultar application in the 1988/1989 crop on dry matter distribution of the subsequent year <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> seed crop (1989/1990)	115
11 Raw data of <i>Botrytis cinerea</i> investation on 30 DAOF pods of flowers produced at peak flowering time 1989/1990.	115
12 Raw data of harvested seed yield in 1989	116
13 Raw data of seed yield of the first harvest in 1989	116
14 Raw data of seed yield of the first harvest in 1989	117

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Birdsfoot trefoil (*Lotus corniculatus* L.) is a perennial herbage legume introduced into New Zealand about one hundred years ago. It grows and persists on most soil types but has special value in marginal soils. Its superiority in herbage production and persistency compared to other conventional legumes, such as white clover, red clover and lucerne, has been recorded when the species was grown under infertile, acid, dry or poorly drained soils (Chevrette *et.al.*, 1960; Hunt and Wagner, 1963; Charlton *et.al.*, 1978; Morton, 1981; Scott and Charlton, 1983; Chariva, 1986; Widdup, *et.al.*, 1987; Enright and Floate, 1988; Fraser, *et.al.*, 1988; Chapman *et.al.*, 1990a). Nutritive value of this species also compares favourably with other commonly used legumes (MacDonald, 1946; Smith, 1964; John and Lancashire, 1981) and declines less rapidly with advancing maturity (Mays and Washco, 1960; Taylor *et.al.*, 1973; Collins, 1982), and therefore it can be used for summer grazing to provide a more even availability of forage throughout the grazing season. The non-bloating characteristic of this species, makes it a good substitute or alternative for lucerne in improving pasture productivity (Marten and Jordan, 1979; Marten *et.al.*, 1987).

Because of these merits, birdsfoot trefoil will likely become an important species in current development of low input sustainable agriculture. Uncertain wool and meat market conditions in recent years has resulted in a dramatic decline in fertilizer use in New Zealand (Nicholls *et.al.*, 1990). This situation is confounded by the need to develop pasture on marginal soils. It could therefore be expected that this species will become a better alternative to more conventional species which need high soil fertility. A similar trend has occurred in the USA (Knight, 1985). In addition, favourable climatic conditions for seed production offer promise to New Zealand

farmers by allowing them to benefit from birdsfoot trefoil seed production for self-sustainability and for export in the future (Hampton *et.al.*, 1990)

The widespread use of *Lotus corniculatus* in pastoral systems, however, has been reportedly slow, and inconsistent. Unreliable seed production has been considered to be the major limiting factor. Commercial seed yields reportedly range from 50 to 400 kg/ha with 100 kg/ha considered average and 400 kg/ha excellent (McGraw and Beuselink, 1983). The best seed yields obtained, however, are still considerably lower than the crop's seed yield potential of 675-1125 kg/ha estimated by Seaney and Henson (1970) from crops grown under favourable environmental conditions.

A number of aspects have been identified as major factors which may be responsible for poor seed production in birdsfoot trefoil (McGraw and Beuselink, 1983). In particular, the protracted flowering period of the plant causes difficulty in defining the proper harvest time. Also, low assimilate distribution to reproductive parts combined with the pod dehiscence nature of the plant can contribute to great losses of seed during harvesting.

Successful seed production in birdsfoot trefoil depends on seed yields which are governed by the number of shoots and subsequently the number of inflorescences produced during the period of peak flowering (Li and Hill, 1988). Management practices for improving seed yields can probably be directed through manipulating plant structure, particularly through maximizing the number of potentially fertile shoots. Mechanical manipulation through cutting or grazing the plant at any time during spring has been found to have detrimental effects on seed production (Anderson and Metcalfe, 1957; Bader and Anderson, 1962a), since cutting simply removes older shoots and new crown-shoots grow and replace them (Li, 1989).

Chemical manipulation by the use of plant growth regulators has been proven to increase seed yields in several plants. Cultar (paclobutrazol) has been successfully used in *Lotus uliginosus* (Clifford and Hare, 1987); RSW-0411 (triaclopyrifol) in oil seed rape (Child, 1987); Cycocel (chlormequat chloride) in wheat and barley (Kust, 1986); and Alar (daminozide) in red clover (Jakesova and Svetlik, 1986). The effects of these chemicals have occurred particularly through increasing and synchronizing branching or tillering, and by shortening shoot growth and hence reducing lodging. The present study examined the value of plant growth regulators as a shoot manipulator for improving seed yield in *Lotus corniculatus*. Their effects on reproductive structure and abortion was also investigated during the flowering season of the plant.