

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.

Pollination of 'Sundrop' Apricot

**An Analysis of the effect of Self Incompatibility and
Bloom Phenology on Fruit Set in Hawkes Bay**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Philosophy in Plant Science

at

Massey University

Paul Thomas Austin

1995

*To Mum who got me started,
Rosalind who kept me going,
and Charlotte who saw me finish.*

*For everything there is a season and a time for every purpose under heaven...
Ecclesiastes 3:1*

Abstract

A range of observational, experimental and simulated data are analysed to discover how self incompatibility, relative bloom phenology and dormancy alleviation affect fruit set on 'Sundrop' apricot in Hawkes Bay. The derivation of two mathematical models, one of cross pollination, the other of bud development, provides a unifying theme to the study.

Controlled pollination experiments demonstrated that 'Sundrop' displays gametophytic self incompatibility. Pollen tubes from 'Sundrop' pollen generally fail to penetrate styles of 'Sundrop' flowers and this prevents fruit set under Hawkes Bay conditions. Study of apricot pollen tube growth at five constant temperatures between 5° and 25°C suggested that the penetration failure was not due to adverse temperature conditions since self pollen tube penetration was strongest at 10° and 15°C, temperatures typical of Hawkes Bay during apricot bloom. Field observations of honey bee foragers illustrated the strong influence that weather conditions have on honey bee foraging activity, but showed that activity on 'Sundrop' flowers is normally sufficient to achieve satisfactory cross pollination.

Analysis of bloom records indicated that relative times of bloom of apricots in Hawkes Bay and other North Island sites vary considerably from year to year. A simple model of pollenizer pollen transfer was therefore derived to estimate the optimum pollenizer bloom divergence for 'Sundrop'. It indicated 'Sundrop' should bloom slightly before (1-2 days) a pollenizer. Optimum divergence was most sensitive to the durations of pollen release and floral receptivity. Delayed pollination experiments showed that the duration of receptivity of 'Sundrop' flowers was the same as petal lifespan. Significant opportunity for cross pollination was still predicted when the pollenizer bloomed as late as six days after 'Sundrop'. By this criteria, 'Trevatt' (the most commonly-used pollenizer) appeared satisfactory under most, though not all, conditions.

The pollen transfer model indicated that relative bloom phenology needed consideration for selection of pollenizers for 'Sundrop'. However, the 'Utah' chill unit index was a poor predictor of dormancy alleviation and bloom for apricots under Hawkes Bay conditions. Hence, a model of low temperature-mediated alleviation of dormancy incorporating a progressive shift in bud temperature response was established based on an analysis of dormancy as the depression of a 'thermal response window' and chilling as a twofold seasonal signal controlling window size. Initial evaluation confirmed that the resulting PHYSHIFT model was highly flexible and could reproduce many of the responses that dormant buds of *Prunus* species display to constant and cyclic temperature regimes. Hence, the results suggest that the PHYSHIFT model may offer more reliable prediction of relative bloom timing for the purpose of pollenizer selection than chill unit models.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank the many people who have each contributed in their own way to the completion of this thesis.

I especially thank my supervisors Prof. Errol Hewett, Dr Julie Plummer and Dr Dominique Noiton for their helpful guidance, patience and encouragement throughout this research project. My gratitude is also expressed to the apricot growers who gave me access to their orchards and either provided or collected data for me. In particular, I would like to thank Malcolm Campbell (Marae Kakaho), Paul Goldfinch (Bayview), Rex Graham and John Morton (Rex Graham Associates, Hastings), Kevin and Graham Hope (Twyford), Robin McDonald (Ohingaiti), Grant Baird (Mangaweka), Alan and Sally Cox (Greytown), Richard and Michael Ashby (Ponotahi) and Claire Mason (Rangiora).

My own efforts were the more fruitful for the technical advice and assistance offered by Hugh Neilson and Colin Tod (Department of Plant Science), by Simon Berry, Shane Max and the staff at Massey University Fruit Crops Unit, by Ray Johnson and the staff at Massey University Plant Growth Unit, by Sue Knowles, Alastair Currie, Linda Robinson, Dr Paul Gandar and Dr. Rod Bieleski of HortResearch and also by Dr Trevor Atkins (Hortvision Ltd). Much of the experimental work would not have been possible without the assistance of Dick Dale and my wife Rosalind. Acknowledgement is also given to Jim Watt for his helpful meteorological advice and to the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research for permission to use the temperature data from the Havelock North and Napier Airport meteorological stations.

My time in the Department of Plant Science was the more enjoyable for the support and friendship I received from the staff of the Department and from my fellow students. The cheerful help of Pam Howell, Colleen Hanlon, Hera Kennedy and Lois Mather made the Departmental office a welcome 'port of call'.

I would also like to acknowledge the help I received at home from my parents-in-law Dick and Janette Dale and from Paula, Colleen and Leonie. Finally, my wife deserves considerable credit for her willing involvement throughout and loving tolerance on occasion, and I have a little bundle of enthusiasm called Thomas to thank that my spare moments were filled with joy.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	General Introduction
1.1	Project Background 1
1.1.1	Significance of the Hawkes Bay Apricot Industry 2
1.1.2	Unreliable Fruit Set on 'Sundrop' Apricot 2
1.2	Apricot Pollination and Fruit Set 4
1.2.1	Reproductive Development of <i>Prunus</i> Species 4
1.2.1.1	<i>Flower bud initiation and development</i> 4
1.2.1.2	<i>Floral morphology</i> 5
1.2.1.3	<i>Pollen germination and tube growth</i> 6
1.2.2	Self-Incompatibility, Self-Sterility and Fruit Set 7
1.2.2.1	<i>Self sterility and self incompatibility in apricots</i> 7
1.2.2.2	<i>Manipulation of self-incompatibility</i> 11
1.2.3	Fruit Set and Pollen Transfer Dynamics 12
1.2.3.1	<i>Pollen transfer in apricot orchards</i> 12
1.2.3.2	<i>Environmental factors</i> 13
1.2.3.3	<i>Forager characteristics</i> 14
1.2.3.4	<i>Floral characteristics</i> 16
1.2.3.5	<i>Orchard characteristics</i> 18
1.2.3.6	<i>Bloom phenology and timing of floral receptivity</i> 19
1.2.4	Apricot Pollination and Fruit Set: Conclusions 22
1.3	Modelling Apricot Bloom Phenology 24
1.3.1	Cross Pollination and Phenological Modelling 24
1.3.1.1	<i>Introduction</i> 24
1.3.1.2	<i>The 'heat unit' concept</i> 24
1.3.2	Predicting Dormancy Alleviation and Bud Break 27
1.3.2.1	<i>Dormancy alleviation and 'chilling'</i> 27
1.3.2.2	<i>The 'chilling requirement' concept</i> 31
1.3.2.3	<i>Limitations of chill unit phenology models</i> 34
1.3.3	Modelling Apricot Bloom Phenology: Conclusions 35
1.4	References 37
Chapter 2	Self Incompatibility of 'Sundrop' Apricot
2.1	Introduction 52
2.2	Methods and Materials 54
2.2.1	General Techniques 54
2.2.1.1	<i>Emasculation and hand-pollination</i> 54
2.2.1.2	<i>Pistil preparation and dissection</i> 54
2.2.1.3	<i>Microscopy and photomicrography</i> 56
2.2.2	Pollen Viability and Self Incompatibility of 'Sundrop' 57
2.2.3	Temperature and Pollen Tube Development 59
2.3	Results 61
2.3.1	Viability of 'Sundrop' Pollen and Pistils 61
2.3.2	Self Incompatibility of 'Sundrop' 63
2.3.2.1	<i>Pollen tube development</i> 63
2.3.2.2	<i>Fruit set</i> 72
2.3.3	Temperature and Expression of Self Incompatibility 75
2.4	Discussion 82
2.5	References 87

Chapter 3	Honey Bee Foraging on 'Sundrop' Apricot	
3.1	Introduction	90
3.2	Methods and Materials	92
	3.2.1 Analysis of 'Sundrop' Nectar	92
	3.2.2 Honeybee Foraging	93
3.3	Results	96
	3.3.1 Nectar Availability in 'Sundrop' Flowers	96
	3.2.2 Honeybee Foraging	97
3.4	Discussion	101
3.5	References	107
Chapter 4	Bloom Phenology and Cross Pollination of 'Sundrop'	
4.1	Introduction	109
4.2	Methods and Materials	111
	4.2.1 Analysis of North Island Apricot Bloom Records	111
	4.2.1.1 Collection of bloom data	111
	4.2.1.2 Sites for collection of apricot bloom data	112
	4.2.2 Duration of Receptivity of 'Sundrop' Flowers	113
	4.2.2.1 Petal lifespan	113
	4.2.2.2 Post-pollination development of 'Sundrop' pistils	114
	4.2.2.3 Delayed pollination of 'Sundrop' flowers	115
	4.2.3 Modelling Bloom Divergence and Pollen Transfer	116
4.3	Results	121
	4.3.1 Analysis of North Island Apricot Bloom Records	121
	4.3.2 Duration of Receptivity of 'Sundrop' Flowers	124
	4.3.2.1 Petal lifespan and regressions of cumulative bloom	124
	4.3.2.2 Post-pollination development of 'Sundrop' pistils	128
	4.3.2.3 Delayed pollination of 'Sundrop' flowers	131
	4.3.3 Modelling Bloom Divergence and Pollen Transfer	137
4.4	Discussion	143
4.5	References	152
Chapter 5	Winter Development of Apricot Flower Buds	
5.1	Introduction	155
5.2	Methods and Materials	157
	5.2.1 General Techniques	157
	5.2.1.1 Estimation of hourly temperatures	157
	5.2.1.2 Chill hour and 'Utah' chill unit model calculations	157
	5.2.1.3 Forcing of apricot budwood cuttings	158
	5.2.1.4 Quantitative description of flower bud development	159
	5.2.2 Experimental Studies	162
	5.2.2.1 Bud development on 'Sundrop' spurs & extension shoots	162
	5.2.2.2 Bud development in Hawkes Bay apricot orchards	163
5.3	Results	167
	5.3.1 Quantitative Description of Flower Bud Development	167
	5.3.2 Winter Temperatures in Apricot Growing Regions	169
	5.3.3 Analysis of 'Utah' Chill Unit Model Performance	169
	5.3.3.1 Prediction of 5% Bloom	171

	5.3.3.2 Accuracy of chilling requirement estimates	174
	5.3.3.3 Accuracy of heat requirement estimates	184
5.4	Discussion	193
5.5	References	201

Chapter 6 A Bud Dormancy Model Proposal

6.1	Introduction	203
6.2	Model Concepts	206
	6.2.1 Structural Avoidance of Temperature Stress	206
	6.2.2 Dormancy in a Cyclic Environment	208
	6.2.3 'Chilling' as a Seasonal Signal	210
6.3	Model Equations	219
	6.3.1 A Modified Arrhenius Dormancy Model	219
	6.3.2 Application to Phenology Modelling	224
6.4	Discussion	228
6.5	References	235

Chapter 7 Evaluation of PHYSHIFT Dormancy Model

7.1	Introduction	239
7.2	Methods and Materials	241
	7.2.1 PHYSHIFT Simulation Program	241
	7.2.2 Model Verification	242
	7.2.3 PHYSHIFT Apricot Bloom Phenology Models	246
7.3	Results	248
	7.3.1 PHYSHIFT Simulation of Bud Development	248
	7.3.1.1 Constant temperature conditions	248
	7.3.1.2 Cyclic temperature conditions	256
	7.3.1.3 Field temperature conditions	263
	7.3.2 PHYSHIFT Models of Apricot Bloom Phenology	265
7.4	Discussion	269
7.5	References	277

Chapter 8 General Discussion

8.1	Project Overview	279
8.2	Experimental Implications	283
	8.2.1 Apricot Self Incompatibility	283
	8.2.2 Dormancy Depth versus Dormancy Duration	288
8.3	Modelling as a Horticultural Tool	308
8.4	Conclusions	314
8.5	References	317

Appendices

1	Interspecific Pollination of 'Sundrop' Apricot	325
2	PHYSHIFT.PAS: Dormancy Model Source Code	329
3	Sample Data Files for PHYSHIFT Programme	343
4	Published Controlled-Environment Experiments	346

List of Tables

Chapter 1

General Introduction

Table 1.1	Reported self sterility of 'European'-type apricots and recently-introduced cultivars arising from apricot breeding programmes.	10
Table 1.2	Factors influencing potential for honeybee-mediated cross-pollination.	13

Chapter 2

Self Incompatibility of 'Sundrop' Apricot

Table 2.1	Recording dates for measurement of fruit set after hand-pollination of 'Sundrop' trees at Fernhill Farm and FCU, 1991 and 1992.	58
Table 2.2	Maximum and minimum air temperatures at 1.5 metres during apricot bloom periods at FCU and Fernhill Farm Orchard, 1991 and 1992.	59
Table 2.3	Number of pollen grains retained on stigma, pollen tube growth one week after cross and self pollination of 'Sundrop' pistils and resulting fruit set: FCU, 1990.	61
Table 2.4	Pollen tube growth and final fruit set after pollination of 'CluthaGold' pistils with 'Sundrop' and 'CluthaGold' pollen: FCU, 1990.	62
Table 2.5	Fruit set at FCU in 1993 after reciprocal cross pollination of 'Sundrop' and 'CluthaGold' compared to pollination with 'Trevatt'.	62
Table 2.6	Analysis of variance for pollen tube development after self, cross and open pollination of 'Sundrop' pistils at Fernhill Farm Orchard, August 1991.	63
Table 2.7	Fruit set at pit-hardening and harvest after self, cross and open pollination of 'Sundrop' apricot flowers at FCU and Fernhill Farm Orchard.	70
Table 2.8	Analysis of variance for transformed proportions of fruit set at pit-hardening and harvest after self, cross and open pollination of 'Sundrop' flowers at FCU and Fernhill Farm Orchard, 1991 and 1992.	71
Table 2.9	Analysis of variance for counts of pollen tubes below stigma and in ovary, depth of stylar penetration and fraction of ovules penetrated after self and cross pollination of 'Sundrop' pistils incubated at 5°, 10°, 15°, 20° and 25°C.	73
Table 2.10	Estimated floral nectar content and progress of anthesis and petal fall for pollinated 'Sundrop' flowers incubated at 5°, 10°, 15°, 20°, and 25°C.	79
Table 2.11	Analysis of variance for regressions of ovary and ovule growth rates and pollen tube extension rate on temperature after cross and self pollination of 'Sundrop' flowers incubated at 5°, 10°, 15°, 20°, 25°C.	81

Chapter 3

Honey Bee Foraging on 'Sundrop' Apricot

Table 3.1	Categories used to describe honeybee foraging behaviour on apricot flowers.	95
Table 3.2	Nectar volume in apricot flower buds at 'balloon' stage in four Hawkes Bay orchards and Massey University Fruit Crops Unit, August 1992.	96
Table 3.3	Sugar composition of nectar from forced 'Sundrop' flowers as determined by gas-liquid chromatography of derivatized samples.	96
Table 3.4	Weather conditions at Fernhill Farm Orchard during observations of honeybee foraging, 5-9 August 1992.	97
Table 3.5	Foraging characteristics of honeybees visiting 'Sundrop' apricot flowers at Fernhill Farm Orchard, 5-9 August 1992.	99
Table 3.6	Calculation of honeybee foraging activity needed for a satisfactory apricot crop.	105

Chapter 4 Bloom Phenology and Cross Pollination of 'Sundrop'

Table 4.1	Cardinal bloom phases used to describe flowering of apricot cultivars.	111
Table 4.2	Commercial orchards used for observation of apricot flowering phenology.	113
Table 4.3	Analysis of variance of bloom phenology data for 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' apricots in North Island orchards.	121
Table 4.4	Bloom dates for 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' apricots in North Island orchards.	122
Table 4.5	Variation in dates of 5% Bloom for 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' apricots at Havelock North Research Centre, 1988-1989.	122
Table 4.6	Shoot type and time of bloom and petal fall on 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' apricots.	123
Table 4.7	Analyses of variance for Gompertz regression equations fitted to cumulative anthesis and petal fall data describing bloom on 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' apricots.	124
Table 4.8	Analysis of variance for ovary width, primary and secondary ovule length, style length, pollen tube number in ovary and ovule penetration fraction for emasculated and non-emasculated 'Sundrop' flowers, Fernhill Farm 1991.	130
Table 4.9	Analysis of variance for pollen tube development after progressively delayed pollination of emasculated 'Sundrop' flowers with 'Trevatt' pollen at Fernhill Farm orchard, 1991.	131
Table 4.10	Analyses of variance for fruit set at pit-hardening and at harvest on 'Sundrop' apricot after progressively delayed hand-application of 'Trevatt' pollen: Fernhill Farm orchard and FCU, 1991 and 1992.	133
Table 4.11	Analyses of variance for site, year and cohort effects on pistil development in 'Sundrop' apricot flowers emasculated at 'balloon' stage.	136
Table 4.12	Dimensions of pistils in 'Sundrop' flowers at the time of emasculatation at Fernhill Farm orchard and FCU in 1991 and 1992.	136

Chapter 5 Winter Development of Apricot Flower Buds

Table 5.1	Descriptions of stages of apricot flower bud development.	159
Table 5.2	Interpolated development stages used during early apricot floral bud break.	161
Table 5.3	Forcing dates of 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' apricot budwood cuttings.	164
Table 5.4	Regression equations describing the temperature relationships between two Hawkes Bay meteorological stations and three apricot orchards used for budwood collection.	165
Table 5.5	Adjusted numeric scale values for 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' flower bud development stages adjusted to linearise measured development rate at constant temperature.	167
Table 5.6	Analysis of variance of GDH°C estimates from 'Utah' chill unit models for 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' derived from bloom data for HNRC, 1984 to 1991.	171
Table 5.7	Accuracy of prediction of relative dates of 5% Bloom for 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' apricots.	173
Table 5.8	Analyses of variance for development of forced 'Sundrop' spur and extension shoot budwood collected from FCU May-August 1991.	174
Table 5.9	Fresh weight and pistil length for 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' flower buds from Campbell, Fernhill Farm and Stirling orchards.	177

Table 5.10	Analyses of variance for bud break and development on cuttings of 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' floral budwood collected from Campbell, Fernhill Farm and Stirling orchards.	181
Table 5.11	Equation and analysis of variance for multiple regression of date of bud break on date of leaf fall and parameters describing bud development at 20°C.	183
Table 5.12	Analyses of variance for daily air temperature maxima and minima for the four weeks preceding 5% Bloom and GDH°C sums for corresponding 'Utah' chill unit models for 5% Bloom.	184
Table 5.13	Analyses of variance for linear regressions of GDH°C sums for 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' chill unit models on daily temperature maxima and minima during the month preceding 5% Bloom at HNRC, 1984-1991.	187
Table 5.14	Analysis of variance for effects of orchard and cultivar on rates of flower bud development on 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' apricots at three Hawkes Bay orchards, June to September 1992.	190
Table 5.15	Rates of bud development of 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' apricot flower buds at Campbell, Fernhill Farm and Stirling orchards, 16 June to 23 August 1992.	191
Table 5.16	Dates of bud break for 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' apricots at three Hawkes Bay orchards in 1992 and GDH°C sums from predicted 'end of rest' to bud break.	191

Chapter 6

A Bud Dormancy Model Proposal

Table 6.1	Parameter values for the modified Arrhenius equation which provide three different temperature optima widths for the simulated growth rate response.	225
Table 6.2	Two alternative methods of modelling cultivar-specific phenological differences.	230

Chapter 7

Evaluation of PHYSHIFT Dormancy Model

Table 7.1	Details of simulated controlled temperature treatments used to compare output from the proposed PHYSHIFT model with actual dormancy alleviation and bud development.	243
Table 7.2	5% Bloom dates for 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' at HNRC in 1988 and 1989 compared with the dates at which an arbitrary simulated developmental position was reached given three rates of dormancy alleviation.	263
Table 7.3	Characteristics for PHYSHIFT models fitted to bud development data for 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' apricots at Campbell, Fernhill Farm and Stirling orchards in 1992.	265

Chapter 8

General Discussion

Table 8.1	A listing of the research objectives achieved in this study of the control of fertilization, pollenizer pollen transfer and pollenizer bloom synchrony as factors influencing reliability of fruit set on 'Sundrop' apricot in Hawkes Bay.	279
------------------	---	-----

List of Figures

Chapter 1	General Introduction
Chapter 2	Self Incompatibility of 'Sundrop' Apricot
Figure 2.1	Pollen tube count below stigma and at ovary entrance, depth of style traversed by longest tube and fraction of ovules penetrated 4, 8 and 12 days after controlled self and cross pollination of 'Sundrop' pistils at Fernhill Farm Orchard, 1991. 65
Figure 2.2	Photomontages of pollen tube penetration in 'Sundrop' styles eight days after pollination under field and controlled-temperature conditions. 67
Figure 2.3	Detail of pollen tube development after pollination of 'Sundrop' pistils with 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' pollen. 68
Figure 2.4	Detail of tissue morphology and pollen tube development at entry to ovary and ovules after pollination of 'Sundrop' pistils with 'Trevatt' pollen. 69
Figure 2.5	Pollen tube count below stigma and at ovary entrance and fraction of ovules penetrated 1, 2, 4, 8 and 12 days after incubation of self and cross pollinated 'Sundrop' pistils at 5°, 10°, 15°, 20° and 25°C. 74
Figure 2.6	Callose plug formation in pollen tubes 24, 48 and 96 h after pollination of 'Sundrop' styles incubated at 10° and 20°C with 'Trevatt' pollen. 76
Figure 2.7	Fraction of 'Sundrop' flower style length penetrated by pollen tubes from 'CluthaGold', 'Goldrich', 'Trevatt' and 'Sundrop' pollen at 5°, 10°, 15°, 20° and 25°C. 78
Figure 2.8	Dependence of pollen tube growth rate after cross and self pollination of 'Sundrop' flowers and corresponding ovary and ovule growth rates on incubation temperature. 80
Chapter 3	Honey Bee Foraging on 'Sundrop' Apricot
Figure 3.1	Map of Fernhill Farm Orchard, Hawkes Bay indicating position of apricot blocks, location of honeybee hive pallets and foraging observations and relative bloom phenology for July-August 1992 94
Figure 3.2	Honeybee foraging activity and corresponding air temperature and wind-run data during 'Sundrop' bloom at Fernhill Farm Orchard, August 1992. 98
Chapter 4	Bloom Phenology and Cross Pollination of 'Sundrop'
Figure 4.1	Simulation of cumulative bloom distributions (relative to 5% Bloom) for North Island apricots and proportions of receptive flowers and of flowers releasing pollen. 118
Figure 4.2	Gompertz functions describing cumulative anthesis and petal fall of 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' for five year/site records. 125
Figure 4.3	Proportions of open flowers of 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' calculated as difference of Gompertz functions describing cumulative anthesis and petal fall for five year/site records. 127
Figure 4.4	Development of emasculated and non-emasculated 'Sundrop' flowers after pollination with 'Trevatt' pollen at Fernhill Farm, 1991. 129
Figure 4.5	Pollen tube development in 'Sundrop' flowers eight days after application of 'Trevatt' pollen. 132

Figure 4.6	Reduced fruit set on 'Sundrop' due to delayed application of 'Trevatt' pollen and dependence of set on pollen tube number.	134
Figure 4.7	Simulated cumulative bloom for North Island apricots showing distributions of receptive flowers and flowers releasing pollen.	138
Figure 4.8	Daily floral products calculated at three pollenizer bloom divergence values and weighted for number of main cultivar flowers releasing pollen.	140
Figure 4.9	Effects of varying simulated pollenizer bloom divergence and bloom parameter values and of the observed bloom divergence for 22 North Island 'Royal Rosa'-'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt'-'Sundrop' bloom records on the calculated index of cross-pollination, I_{dt}	141
Figure 4.10	Pollen flow system diagram for apricot bloom divergence and pollen transfer model.	147

Chapter 5 Winter Development of Apricot Flower Buds

Figure 5.1	Flower bud stages used to describe bud development of 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' apricots in orchards and on forced cuttings.	160
Figure 5.2	Map of Napier/Hastings area of Hawkes Bay showing locations of principal orchards sampled for budwood during 1992.	163
Figure 5.3	Observed frequency of apricot flower bud development stages and corresponding adjusted numeric development scale.	168
Figure 5.4	Comparison of winter 'chilling' accumulation at four Hawkes Bay sites with other New Zealand and international apricot growing areas.	170
Figure 5.5	'Utah' chill unit requirements for three apricot cultivars and comparison of observed dates of 5% Bloom with predictions by corresponding models.	172
Figure 5.6	Development of forced 'Sundrop' flower buds on spurs and extension-shoots after exposure to natural winter temperatures at FCU or cool-storage at continuous 7°C.	176
Figure 5.7	Apricot leaf fall phenology and air temperature conditions for three Hawkes Bay orchards, March-August 1992.	178
Figure 5.8	Flower bud development on 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' budwood from Campbell, Fernhill Farm and Stirling orchards.	180
Figure 5.9	Distributions of daily air temperature maxima and their effect on GDH°C estimates of three 'Utah' chill unit models.	185
Figure 5.10	Distributions of daily air temperature minima and their effect on GDH°C estimates of three 'Utah' chill unit models.	186
Figure 5.11	Flower bud development on 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' apricots at three Hawkes Bay orchards, June to September 1992.	189
Figure 5.12	Divergence of bud temperature from air temperature and probable effect on the apparent relationship between temperature and development rate.	197

Chapter 6 A Bud Dormancy Model Proposal

Figure 6.1	Illustration of the role of intercept differentiation as a signal of relative developmental position in an annual environmental cycle.	211
Figure 6.2	Schematic interpretation of the induction and release of bud dormancy illustrating merging of higher and lower intercept development periods as the amplitude of the seasonal temperature cycle is reduced.	214
Figure 6.3	Chilling as a seasonal signal of declining and rising temperature trends for the synchronisation of plant growth with the ambient temperature cycle. I.	216
Figure 6.4	Chilling as a seasonal signal of declining and rising temperature trends for the synchronisation of plant growth with the ambient temperature cycle. II.	217

Figure 6.5 Simulation of varying bud growth rate using a modified Arrhenius dormancy model incorporating a 'physiological shift'. 221

Figure 6.6 Alternative strategies for representing different cultivar-specific responses of bud growth rate to ambient temperature within the proposed model. 226

Chapter 7 **Evaluation of PHYSHIFT Dormancy Model**

Figure 7.1 Flow diagram for simulation of dormancy alleviation and bud growth by PHYSHIFT model programme using temperature regimes which represent experimental treatments and field temperature conditions corresponding to phenological records. 241

Figure 7.2 Simulated development after 50 days (1200 h) constant temperature conditions and 14 days 'forcing' at 22°C using linear or power functions to relate dormancy alleviation to developmental position. 249

Figure 7.3 Simulated development after 50 days (1200 h) constant temperature conditions and 14 days 'forcing' at 22°C using a logistic function to relate dormancy alleviation to developmental distance. 251

Figure 7.4 Simulation of bud development under constant temperature regimes. I. 253

Figure 7.5 Simulation of bud development under constant temperature regimes. II. 255

Figure 7.6 Simulation of the effect of three durations of different constant temperature for two levels of initial relative dormancy 257

Figure 7.7 Simulation of enhanced bud dormancy alleviation due to cyclic diurnal temperatures. 258

Figure 7.8 Simulation of diurnal bud response profile under two cyclic temperature regimes at two levels of initial relative dormancy. 260

Figure 7.9 Simulation of a range of experimental cyclic temperature regimes 261

Figure 7.10 Response of three PHYSHIFT variables to air temperature data for Havelock North in 1988 and 1989 for $D_i = 0.00$ and three rates of dormancy alleviation set by d_{ref} 264

Figure 7.11 Derivation of PHYSHIFT models for 'Royal Rosa', 'Sundrop' and 'Trevatt' bud development from observed phenology at Campbell, Fern-hill Farm and Stirling orchards in 1992. 266

Chapter 8 **General Discussion**

Figure 8.1 A history of horticultural bud dormancy concepts with particular reference to the development of the concept of a chilling requirement and of chill unit-type phenology models. 289

Figure 8.2 Alternation of the relative position of the seasonal cycles of ambient temperature and plant thermal response window to illustrate its role as a determinant of plant growth and the concept of limitation as the cause of dormancy. 306

Figure 8.3 Potential integration of PHYSHIFT bloom phenology model and pollenizer pollen transfer model within a comprehensive pollination risk analysis modelling package. 311