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.

A COMPARISON OF FOLIAR AND SOIL UPTAKE OF NUTRIENTS IN FRENCH BEAN (PHASEOLUS VULGARIS L.).

A THESIS PRESENTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF HORTICULTURAL SCIENCE IN SOIL SCIENCE

MASSEY UNIVERSITY

Susan Elizabeth Jolly 1986

ABSTRACT

An aspect of each of three factors relating to efficiency of fertilizer use were studied in glasshouse experiments using beans Phaseolus vulgaris var. Gallatin 50. These three factors were: the quantities that can be applied; physiological aspects of nutrient utilization following foliar uptake; and interactions with other sources of nutrient supply.

Distribution patterns of S^{35} , P^{32} and Zn^{65} were examined following application to soil and foliage of beans. It was found that a greater proportion of P^{32} and Zn^{65} was present in the fruit following foliar uptake than was the case following root uptake. This difference was not evident for S^{35} .

Retention of a commercial nutrient spray on the foliage of bean plants was measured and found to correlate well with both leaf area and leaf fresh weight.

The effect of sprays on leaf chlorophyll was also examined. Environmental effects were found to have more influence on leaf chlorophyll than nutrient sprays.

Root uptake of $P^{3\,2}$ was increased by spraying the foliage with either nutrient solution or water. It was concluded that the effect was water related and not connected with nutrient application.

The implications of the above findings were discussed in the

context of efficiency of fertilizer use.

I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the following people:

Professor J.K. Syers, for supervision and encouragement in this study.

Mr R.W. Tillman, for his supervision, inspiration and understanding throughout this study.

Mr A.G. Robertson, for many helpful discussions and comments on aspects relating to plant physiology.

Jacqueline Rowarth and Howard Nicholson for their invaluable aid with proof reading.

Martin Lewis, for his help with computing and graphics.

Members of the Soil Science department, especially Margaret Wallace whose help with analytical methods was much appreciated.

Hoescht (NZ) Ltd, for funding this project; and Massey University for the Helen E. Akers Scholarship, the Johannes August Anderson Scholarship, the Farmers Union Scholarship, the Sydney Campbell Memorial Scholarship and the Yates Corporation Bursary.

Finally, and most importantly, my parents, for their support and encouragement.

Table of Contents

page
ABSTRACTii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTSiv
TABLE OF CONTENTSv
LIST OF FIGURESx
LIST OF TABLESxii
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION1
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE5
2.1 Introduction
2.2 Pathway of nutrient movement during uptake
2.2.1 Roots6
2.2.1.1 Supply of nutrients to the root6
2.2.1.2 Movement into and across the root
2.2.2 Leaves8
2.2.2.1 Supply of nutrients to the leaf
2.2.2.2 Movement into and across the leaf10
2.2.2.2 Movement into and across the leaf

2.3	Trans	ocation11
	2.3.1	Root absorbed nutrients13
	2.3.2	Leaf absorbed nutrients14
2.4	Facto	s affecting uptake and translocation15
	2.4.1	Environmental factors15
		2.4.1.1 Light16
		2.4.1.2 Temperature16
		2.4.1.3 Moisture17
		2.4.1.4 Oxygen18
	2.4.2	Solution Factors19
		2.4.2.1 Composition
		2.4.2.2 Concentration20
		2.4.2.3 pH21
		2.4.2.4 Other solution factors22
	2.4.3	Plant factors22
		2.4.3.1 Age and position of absorbing tissue22
		2.4.3.2 Nutrient status of the plant24
		2.4.3.3 Plant species24
2.5	Inter	actions25
2.6	Crop	responses to fertilizers applied to soil and foliage27
	2.6.1	Fertilizers applied to the soil27
	2.6.2	Fertilizers applied to the Foliage29
		2.6.2.1 Nutrient levels and visual deficiency30
		2 6 2 2 Magatative Crowth

(i) Macronutrients3	2
(ii) Micronutrients3	3
2.6.2.3 Yield: Quantity3	3
(i) Macronutrients3	4
(ii) Micronutrients3	7
2.6.2.4 Yield: Quality3	9
2.6.2.5 Other responses4	1
2.7 Beans (Phaseolus vulgaris) and Foliar Fertilzers4	3
2.7.1 Botany4	3
2.7.2 Nutritional requirements4	4
2.7.3 Foliar fertilizers and beans4	5
2.8 Conclusions4	6
CHAPTER 3	
MATERIALS AND METHODS4	8
3.1 Preparation of plants4	9
3.2 Nutrient applications5	0
(i)Spraying5	0
(ii)Spot applications5	0
3.3 Plant tissue preparation5	0
3.4 Nutrient analyses	1
3.4.1 Total Sulphur5	1
3 4 2 Total Phosphorus	52

3.4.3 Total Zinc53
3.5 Isotope analyses53
3.5.1 Sulphur-3553
3.5.2 Phosphorus-3256
3.5.3 Zinc-6556
CHAPTER 4
DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS OF S ³⁵ IN BEANS PHASEOLUS VULGARIS59
4.1 Introduction
4.2 Method
4.3 Results
4.4 Discussion
CHAPTER 5
DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS OF P 32 AND ZN 65 IN PHASEOLUS VULGARIS74
5.1 Introduction
5.2 Methods
5.3 Results
5.4 Discussion
CHAPTER 6
THE CONTRIBUTION OF SPRAY RUNOFF TO PLANT RESPONSES TO NUTRIENT
THE CONTRIBUTION OF SPRAY RUNOFF TO PLANT RESPONSES TO NUTRIENT SPRAYS

6.1 Introduction88
6.2 Methods89
6.3 Results92
6.4 Discussion94
CHAPTER 7
EFFECT OF FOLIAR SPRAYS ON THE UPTAKE OF P ^{3 2} BY THE ROOTS104
7.1 Introduction
7.2 Method
7.3 Results107
7.4 Discussion
CONCLUSION115
SUMMARY118
RIBITOCPAPHY 122

LIST OF FIGURES

2-1	Contact angles of droplets on a surface9
2-2	Generalised crop response curve for fertilizer
	application showing ranges of positive response
	(I), no response (II) and negative response (III)28
3-1	Flow sequence for the determination of
	phosphorus in plant material54
3-2	Curve relating H-number and counting
	efficiency for S ³⁵ 57
3-3	Curve relating H-number and counting
	efficiency for Zn ⁶⁵ 58
4-1	Position of application of K_2SO_4 (0.05M) to
	soil and the first and third trifoliate leaves62
4-2	Autoradiographs of beans (Phaseolus vulgaris)
	following uptake of S ³⁵ applied to a leaf
	(a) and the soil (b)72
6-1	Chlorophyllometer calibration curve for
	Phaseolus vulgaris leaves grown under
	glasshouse conditions (high range setting).
	Scale factor = 1.391

6-2	Chlorophyll levels in first trifoliate
	leaf over the growing season. Data
	averaged over treatments and replicates95
6-3	Minimum day humidities over the growing period97
6-4	Maximum day temperatures over the growing period99
6-5	Retention of Complesal solution on Phaseolus vulgaris as a function of fresh weight (r=0.76)102
6-6	Retention of Complesal solution on Phaseolus
	vulgaris as a function of leaf area (r=0.78)103
7-1	Diagram of pot showing position of labelled
	soil at time of transplanting107

LIST OF TABLES

4-1	Total Sulphur in plant parts (μg g ⁻¹)65
4-2	Recovery of applied S^{35} in plant parts and distribution of S^{35} within the plants
4-3	Ratios (α) of specific activity of plant parts to the average specific activity of the whole plant
5–1	Total P and Zn (µg g ⁻¹) in bean plants (average over treatments)78
5-2	Ratios (α) of specific activity of plant parts to the average specific activity of the whole plant for P ³² and Zn ⁶⁵ 80
5–3	Recoveries of applied P ³² in plant parts and distribution within the plants82
5-4	Recoveries of applied Zn^{65} in plant parts and distribution within the plants84
5-5	Quantities of S and P supplied by one application of Complesal 12-2-5 and Zn supplied by one application of multimicro at recommended rates and assuming retention of 5 ml of solution per plant and plant dry

	weight of 5 g86
6-1	Dry weights of tops (g)93
6-2	Estimate of the nutrient that can be
	supplied to the surface of the leaf
	in a single application of Complesal
	12-2-5 solution, as a proportion
	of the total plant requirements100
6-3	Estimate of the nutrient that can be
	supplied to the surface of the leaf
	in a single application of Complesal
	multimicro solution, as a proportion
	of the total plant requirements101
7-1	Analysis of plant tops109
7-2	ANOVA for response to spraying111
7-3	Dry weights and root length estimates
	for sprayed and unsprayed plants
	(average of three replicates)