

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 STUDY OF THE
EFFECTS OF PLANT SPACING
AND
IRRIGATION ON SEED PRODUCTION
AND
SEED DEVELOPMENT IN SIRATRO
(Macroptilium atropurpureum)

A THESIS PRESENTED IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN SEED TECHNOLOGY
AT MASSEY UNIVERSITY
PALMERSTON NORTH
NEW ZEALAND

SUNANTA JUNTAKOOL

1983

A STUDY OF THE
EFFECTS OF PLANT SPACING
AND
IRRIGATION ON SEED PRODUCTION
AND
SEED DEVELOPMENT IN SIRATRO
(*Macroptilium atropurpureum*)

A THESIS PRESENTED IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN SEED TECHNOLOGY
AT MASSEY UNIVERSITY
PALMERSTON NORTH
NEW ZEALAND

SUNANTA JUNTAKOOL

1983

ABSTRACT

Since 1980 the Thai government has been interested and active in increasing livestock production by improving the productivity and quality of natural and sown grassland. The introduction of forage legumes, particularly Siratro (*Macroptilium atropurpureum*), is one of the ways in which this can and is being achieved.

The present study was carried out in two parts - the first involving two field trials conducted in Thailand during the wet and the dry season, and the second involving a controlled climate study at Palmerston North (N.Z.). The aim of the field trials was to investigate the effects of plant spacing, and during the dry season the effect of irrigation on Siratro seed production. In the controlled climate study a more detailed investigation was undertaken of the effects of water stress on plant growth and development and subsequent effects on seed yield. Particular attention was also given to relevant aspects of seed development in the latter study.

Irrigation during the dry season produced relatively small but significant increases in plant dry weight and LAI and led to a significant increase in seed yield by the final harvest 40 days after peak flowering. By comparison, plant spacing had a marked effect on plant components and seed yield showing a negative response on a per plant basis but a positive response on a per unit area basis with increasing plant density.

During the longer growing period of the wet season experiment, plant growth was substantial and again showed the same significant responses to increasing plant density stated above. Maximum seed yield per hectare was achieved at very high plant population densities approximately 15 x 15 cm spacings.

The major contributions to seed yield in both trials were inflorescence numbers and especially pod numbers, reflecting their sensitivity

to water stress and plant competition. Numbers of seeds per pod and individual seed weight were relatively insensitive to those environmental factors.

The growth room study clearly showed that early and extended soil moisture stress can cause a severe reduction in plant weight, branch development, leaf number and LAI, leading to a significant reduction in seed yield. However, soil moisture stress imposed at peak flowering resulted in a significant increase in seed yield compared with adequate moisture to final harvest. This beneficial effect was again due mainly to the increase in the number of inflorescences and pods formed on the primary and particularly the secondary branches. Numbers of seeds per pod and individual seed weight were again unaffected by water stress.

The development of Siratro seed followed two obvious phases viz the growth and food reserve accumulation phase and the ripening phase. Water stress reduced the time from anthesis to seed maturity and increased the percentage of hard seed^v when imposed early at the mid-vegetative stage. at harvest

Plant spacing and irrigation had little or no effect on seed quality characteristics of Siratro, as quality appeared to be more dependent on stage of maturity. High seed quality can be achieved by harvesting Siratro 20 - 30 days after peak flowering.

The possibility of growing Siratro for seed production in Thailand is also discussed.

* * * * *



SIRATRO

INFLORESCENCE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a great pleasure to express my sincere thanks to a number of people who have contributed to the completion of this thesis.

Professor B.R. Watkin, my chief supervisor, whose understanding, willingly provided guidance, patience in discussing research problems, interpreting the results and most importantly offering constructive criticism, has been highly appreciated.

Dr M.J. Hill, my second supervisor, to whom I owe a great debt of gratitude for his criticism, suggestions, encouragement, understanding and patience in going over drafts of writing. For all of these, I feel so very grateful to him.

Assistant Professor Sanan Junkam, local supervisor, for his support, help and guidance during my field experiment in Thailand.

The field staff at the Dairy Promotion Organisation of Thailand for provision of land and facilities. Without their co-operation this project could never have been completed.

Mr Ian Warrington and other members of the Plant Physiology Division, D.S.I.R. for the use of controlled climate facilities for the environmental study.

The staff of the Seed Technology Centre, Massey University, for provision of facilities, general assistance and also their encouragement.

The staff of the Photographic Unit, Massey University, for their assistance with photography.

The staff of the Massey University library for their assistance in obtaining numerous publications.

Dr I.L. Gordon and Mr R.C. Seddon for their biometrical help.

The financial assistance provided by a New Zealand Bilateral Aid Scholarship which enabled me to complete this study programme.

Mrs Valerie Oram, for her excellent work in typing this thesis.

All my friends for their help and encouragement.

Finally, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to those people who are so close and very dear to me. My parents for their love, support and encouragement throughout the completion of my study. My husband, Niyom, for his love, sacrifices, concern and understanding. His patience, support and unfailing encouragement at times of despair and frustration have contributed so much to the completion of my study. To him, I am so very grateful. Mr and Mrs Eustace whose genuine concern, care and understanding have made my living in New Zealand as pleasant as it should be despite all of the difficulties arising at times during the process of thesis preparation. Sutevee, my best friend, for the cheerful, moral support and encouragement. Her friendship has been much valued.

* * * * *

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--|-------------|
| TITLE | i |
| ABSTRACT | ii |
| SIRATRO INFLORESCENCE PHOTOGRAPH | iv |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | v |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | vii |
| LIST OF TABLES | x |
| LIST OF FIGURES | xiv |
| LIST OF PLATES | xv |
| LIST OF APPENDICES | xvii |
| | |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | |
| <u>SECTION A : LITERATURE REVIEW</u> | 5 |
| | |
| A.1 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF SIRATRO | 5 |
| A.2 EFFECT OF PLANT DENSITY ON VEGETATIVE GROWTH, REPRODUCTIVE DEVELOPMENT AND SEED YIELD | 7 |
| A.2.1 Effect of Plant Density on Vegetative Growth | 7 |
| A.2.2 Effect of Plant Density on Plant Morphology | 7 |
| A.2.3 Effect of Plant Density on Reproductive Growth | 8 |
| A.2.4 Effect of Plant Density on Seed Yield and Seed Components | 9 |
| A.2.5 Effect of Plant Arrangement | 12 |
| A.3 EFFECT OF WATER STRESS ON PLANT GROWTH AND YIELD | 12 |
| A.3.1 Water Stress and Morphological Effects | 12 |
| A.3.2 Water Stress and Physiological Effects | 14 |
| A.3.3 The Effect of Water Stress at Different Stages of Growth | 15 |
| A.4 ADAPTION AND ADAPTIVE MECHANISMS TO WATER DEFICITS | 18 |
| A.5 SEED DEVELOPMENT | 21 |

| | <u>PAGE</u> | |
|--|--|------------|
| A.6 | CURRENT FARMING PRACTICE | 26 |
| A.6.1 | Site Selection | 26 |
| A.6.2 | Crop Establishment | 27 |
| A.6.3 | Harvesting | 32 |
| <u>SECTION B : FIELD EXPERIMENT</u> | | 33 |
| B.1 | THE EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING AND IRRIGATION ON SEED PRODUCTION OF SIRATRO IN DRY SEASON PLANTING | 33 |
| B.1.1 | MATERIALS AND METHODS | 33 |
| B.1.1.1 | Experimental site and land preparation | 33 |
| B.1.1.2 | Field procedures | 33 |
| B.1.1.3 | Plant measurements | 39 |
| B.1.1.4 | Definitions | 40 |
| B.1.2 | RESULTS | 47 |
| B.1.2.1 | Plant growth and development | 47 |
| B.1.2.2 | Seed yield and yield components | 53 |
| B.1.2.3 | Seed quality | 58 |
| B.1.3 | DISCUSSION | 67 |
| B.2 | THE EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON SIRATRO SEED PRODUCTION DURING THE WET SEASON | 69 |
| B.2.1 | MATERIALS AND METHODS | 69 |
| B.2.2 | RESULTS | 72 |
| B.2.2.1 | Plant growth and development | 72 |
| B.2.2.2 | Seed yield and components | 75 |
| B.2.2.3 | Seed quality | 81 |
| B.2.3 | DISCUSSION | 84 |
| <u>SECTION C : CONTROLLED ENVIRONMENT EXPERIMENT</u> | | 86 |
| C.1 | THE EFFECT OF WATER STRESS ON VEGETATIVE GROWTH, SEED YIELD AND SEED DEVELOPMENT IN SIRATRO | 86 |
| C.1.1 | INTRODUCTION | 86 |
| C.2 | EFFECT OF WATER STRESS IMPOSED AT DIFFERENT GROWTH STAGES | 87 |

| | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--|-------------|
| C.2.1 MATERIALS AND METHODS | 87 |
| C.2.1.1 Environmental conditions | 87 |
| C.2.1.2 Treatments | 88 |
| C.2.1.3 Measurements | 89 |
| C.2.1.4 Harvesting | 93 |
| C.2.1.5 Statistical analysis | 94 |
| C.2.2 RESULTS | 94 |
| C.2.2.1 Growth and development | 94 |
| C.2.2.2 Seed yield and components | 107 |
| C.2.2.3 Seed quality | 115 |
| C.2.3 DISCUSSION | 121 |
| C.3 EFFECT OF WATER STRESS ON SIRATRO SEED DEVELOPMENT | 123 |
| C.3.1 MATERIALS AND METHODS | 123 |
| C.3.2 RESULTS | 124 |
| C.3.3 DISCUSSION | 134 |
| <u>SECTION D : GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION</u> | 137 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 148 |
| APPENDICES | |

* * * * *

LIST OF TABLES

| <u>TABLE</u> | | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--------------|--|-------------|
| B.1.1 | EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND PLANT SPACING ON TOTAL PLANT DRY WEIGHT (GM/PLANT) AT EACH HARVEST | 48 |
| B.1.2 | EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND PLANT SPACING ON TOTAL PLANT DRY WEIGHT PER UNIT AREA (KG/HA) | 49 |
| B.1.3 | EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND PLANT SPACING ON LEAF AREA (CM ²) PER PLANT AT EACH HARVEST TIME | 51 |
| B.1.4 | EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND PLANT SPACING ON LEAF AREA INDEX (LAI) AT EACH HARVEST | 52 |
| B.1.5 | EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND PLANT SPACING ON SEED YIELD (GM/PLANT) AT EACH HARVEST | 54 |
| B.1.6 | EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND PLANT SPACING ON SEED YIELD PER UNIT AREA (KG/HA) AT EACH HARVEST | 55 |
| B.1.7 | EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND PLANT SPACING ON INFLORESCENCE NUMBER PER PLANT AT EACH HARVEST TIME | 57 |
| B.1.8 | EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND PLANT SPACING ON POD NUMBERS PER PLANT AT EACH HARVEST TIME | 59 |
| B.1.9 | EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND PLANT SPACING ON NUMBER OF SEEDS PER POD AT EACH HARVEST | 60 |
| B.1.10 | EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND PLANT SPACING ON SEED WEIGHT (GM/100 SEEDS) AT EACH HARVEST TIME | 61 |
| B.1.11 | EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND PLANT SPACING ON PERCENTAGE OF SEED MOISTURE CONTENT AT EACH HARVEST TIME | 63 |
| B.1.12 | EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND PLANT SPACING ON THE GERMINATION PERCENTAGE OF SEED (NORMAL SEEDLINGS) AT EACH HARVEST TIME | 64 |

| <u>TABLE</u> | | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--------------|---|-------------|
| B.1.13 | EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND PLANT SPACING ON THE ABNORMAL SEEDLING PERCENTAGE AT EACH HARVEST TIME | 65 |
| B.1.14 | EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND PLANT SPACING ON THE HARD SEED PERCENTAGE AT EACH HARVEST TIME | 66 |
| B.2.1 | EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON TOTAL PLANT DRY WEIGHT (GM/PLANT) AT EACH HARVEST | 72 |
| B.2.2 | EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON TOTAL PLANT DRY WEIGHT (KG/HA) AT EACH HARVEST | 73 |
| B.2.3 | EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON LEAF AREA (CM ² /PLANT) AT EACH HARVEST | 74 |
| B.2.4 | EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON LEAF AREA INDEX AT EACH HARVEST | 74 |
| B.2.5 | EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON SEED YIELD (GM/PLANT) AT EACH HARVEST | 75 |
| B.2.6 | EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON SEED YIELD (KG/HA) AT EACH HARVEST | 77 |
| B.2.7 | EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON INFLORESCENCE NUMBER PER PLANT AT EACH HARVEST | 78 |
| B.2.8 | EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON POD NUMBER PER PLANT AT EACH HARVEST | 79 |
| B.2.9 | EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON NUMBER OF SEEDS PER POD AT EACH HARVEST | 79 |
| B.2.10 | EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON SEED DRY WEIGHT (100 SEEDS) AT EACH HARVEST | 80 |
| B.2.11 | EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON SEED MOISTURE CONTENT AT EACH HARVEST | 81 |

| <u>TABLE</u> | | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--------------|--|-------------|
| B.2.12 | EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON PERCENTAGE OF SEED GERMINATION AT EACH HARVEST | 82 |
| B.2.13 | EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON ABNORMAL SEEDLING PERCENTAGE AT EACH HARVEST | 83 |
| B.2.14 | EFFECT OF PLANT SPACING ON HARD SEED PERCENTAGE AT EACH HARVEST | 83 |
| C.2.1 | SCHEDULE OF TREATMENTS | 89 |
| C.2.2 | SCHEDULE OF HARVESTS | 93 |
| C.2.3 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON TOTAL PLANT DRY WEIGHT (GM/PLANT) | 95 |
| C.2.4 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON NUMBER OF GREEN LEAVES PER PLANT | 100 |
| C.2.5 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON LEAF AREA (CM ²) PER PLANT | 102 |
| C.2.6a | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON TOTAL BRANCH NUMBERS PER PLANT | 104 |
| C.2.6b | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON PRIMARY, SECONDARY AND TERTIARY BRANCHES PER PLANT | 106 |
| C.2.7a | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON SEED YIELD (GM/PLANT) | 107 |
| C.2.7b | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON SEED YIELD (KG/HA) | 108 |
| C.2.8a | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON TOTAL INFLORESCENCE NUMBERS PER PLANT | 109 |

| <u>TABLE</u> | | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--------------|---|-------------|
| C.2.8b | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON INFLORESCENCE NUMBERS ON THE MAIN STEM PER PLANT | 109 |
| C.2.8c | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON INFLORESCENCE NUMBERS ON THE PRIMARY, SECONDARY AND TERTIARY BRANCHES PER PLANT | 110 |
| C.2.9a | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON NUMBERS OF POD WHICH CONTRIBUTED TO SEED YIELD PER PLANT | 112 |
| C.2.9b | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON NUMBERS OF POD ON THE MAIN STEM PER PLANT | 112 |
| C.2.9c | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON NUMBERS OF POD ON THE PRIMARY, SECONDARY AND TERTIARY BRANCHES PER PLANT | 113 |
| C.2.10 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON THE NUMBERS OF SEEDS PER POD | 114 |
| C.2.11 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON THE 100 SEED WEIGHT (GM) | 115 |
| C.2.12 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON SEED MOISTURE CONTENT PERCENTAGE | 116 |
| C.2.13 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON GERMINATION PERCENT- AGE (NORMAL SEEDLING) | 117 |
| C.2.14 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON HARD SEED PERCENTAGE | 117 |
| C.2.15 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON ABNORMAL SEEDLING PERCENTAGE | 118 |
| C.2.16 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON SEED VIABILITY PERCENTAGE | 120 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| <u>FIGURE</u> | | <u>PAGE</u> |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| A.2.4 | DIAGRAM SUGGESTING THE DIRECT PATHS OF INFLUENCE OF SEVERAL STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS OF PLANTS UPON YIELD | 10 |
| B.1.1 | FIELD LAYOUT (DRY SEASON PLANTING) | 34 |
| B.2.1 | FIELD LAYOUT (WET SEASON PLANTING) | 70 |
| B.2.2 | THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AVERAGE SEED YIELD (KG/HA) AND PLANT POPULATION DENSITY | 76 |
| C.2.1 | SOIL WATER RETENTION CURVE OF NORTH CAROLINA MIXTURE | 90 |
| C.2.2 | RELATIVE WATER CONTENT (RWC) MEASUREMENTS | 92 |
| C.2.3 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON TOTAL PLANT DRY WEIGHT | 96 |
| C.2.4 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON NUMBER OF GREEN LEAVES PER PLANT | 101 |
| C.2.5 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON LEAF AREA PER PLANT | 103 |
| C.2.6 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON TOTAL BRANCH NUMBERS PER PLANT | 105 |
| C.3.1 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON CHANGES IN PHYSIO- LOGICAL COMPONENTS DURING SEED DEVELOPMENT OF SIRATRO | 125 |
| C.3.2 | EFFECT OF WATER TREATMENTS ON PERCENTAGE OF GERMI- NATION (NORMAL SEEDLINGS) AND SEED VIABILITY | 126 |

* * * * *

LIST OF PLATES

| <u>PLATE</u> | | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--------------|---|-------------|
| B.1.1 | FIELD LAYOUT (DRY SEASON PLANTING) | 35 |
| B.1.2 | IRRIGATION SYSTEM USING OVERHEAD SPRINKLER DURING DRY SEASON EXPERIMENT | 38 |
| B.1.3 | INFLORESCENCE | 42 |
| B.1.4 | SINGLE OPEN FLOWER | 43 |
| B.1.5 | CATEGORIES OF PODS | 44 |
| B.1.6 | FLORAL INITIATION STAGE | 45 |
| B.1.7 | PEAK FLOWERING STAGE | 46 |
| B.2.1 | FIELD TRIAL LAYOUT (WET SEASON PLANTING) | 71 |
| C.2.1 | WHOLE PLANT FROM TREATMENT W1 AT FINAL HARVEST (25 DAYS AFTER PEAK FLOWERING) | 97 |
| C.2.2 | WHOLE PLANT FROM TREATMENT W2 AT FINAL HARVEST (25 DAYS AFTER PEAK FLOWERING) | 98 |
| C.2.3 | WHOLE PLANT FROM TREATMENT W3 (CONTROL) AT FINAL HARVEST (25 DAYS AFTER PEAK FLOWERING) | 99 |
| C.2.4 | NORMAL AND ABNORMAL SEEDLINGS FOUND IN GERMINATION TESTS | 119 |
| C.3.1 | CHANGES IN POD SIZE AND COLOUR DURING DIFFERENT STAGES OF SEED DEVELOPMENT IN TREATMENT W1 | 128 |
| C.3.2 | CHANGES IN POD SIZE AND COLOUR DURING DIFFERENT STAGES OF SEED DEVELOPMENT IN TREATMENT W2 | 129 |

| <u>PLATE</u> | | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--------------|---|-------------|
| C.3.3 | CHANGES IN POD SIZE AND COLOUR DURING DIFFERENT STAGES OF SEED DEVELOPMENT IN TREATMENT W3 (CONTROL) | 130 |
| C.3.4 | CHANGES IN SEED SIZE AND COLOUR DURING DIFFERENT STAGES OF SEED DEVELOPMENT IN TREATMENT W1 | 131 |
| C.3.5 | CHANGES IN SEED SIZE AND COLOUR DURING DIFFERENT STAGES OF SEED DEVELOPMENT IN TREATMENT W2 | 132 |
| C.3.6 | CHANGES IN SEED SIZE AND COLOUR DURING DIFFERENT STAGES OF SEED DEVELOPMENT IN TREATMENT W3 (CONTROL) | 133 |

* * * * *

LIST OF APPENDICESAPPENDIX TABLE

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | RESULTS OF SOIL ANALYSIS (OVEN DRY BASIS) |
| 2 | CONTROLLED ENVIRONMENT CONDITIONS |
| 3 | CLIMATE LAB - N.C.S.U. PHYTOTRON NUTRIENT |
| 4 | PERCENTAGE OF SEED MOISTURE CONTENT (DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS) |
| 5 | 100 SEED FRESH WEIGHT (GM) (DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS) |
| 6 | 100 SEED DRY WEIGHT (GM) (DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS) |
| 7 | GERMINATION PERCENTAGE (NORMAL SEEDLINGS) (DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS) |
| 8 | VIABILITY PERCENTAGE OF SEED (DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS) |
| 9 | HARD SEED PERCENTAGE (DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS) |

APPENDIX FIGURE

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | STAGES OF PLANT GROWTH DURING FIELD EXPERIMENTS |
| 2 | CLIMATIC RECORDS DURING FIELD EXPERIMENTS |
| 3 | FLOWERING PATTERN IN EACH WATER TREATMENT |

APPENDIX PLATE

- 1 HALF VEGETATIVE GROWTH STAGE
- 2 FLORAL INITIATION STAGES FOR TREATMENTS W1 AND W3
- 3 PEAK FLOWERING STAGE
- 4 PLANT AT 10 DAYS AFTER PEAK FLOWERING
- 5 PLANT AT 15 DAYS AFTER PEAK FLOWERING
- 6 PLANT AT 20 DAYS AFTER PEAK FLOWERING
- 7 PLANT AT 25 DAYS AFTER PEAK FLOWERING
- 8 GERMINATION CAPACITY. COMPARISON BETWEEN SEEDS FROM TREATMENT W1 AND W3 (CONTROL) FROM PODS AT 8 DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS
- 9 GERMINATION CAPACITY. COMPARISON BETWEEN SEEDS FROM TREATMENT W1 AND W3 (CONTROL) FROM PODS AT 10 DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS
- 10 GERMINATION CAPACITY. COMPARISON BETWEEN SEEDS FROM TREATMENT W1 AND W3 (CONTROL) FROM PODS AT 12 DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS
- 11 GERMINATION CAPACITY. COMPARISON BETWEEN SEEDS FROM TREATMENT W1 AND W3 (CONTROL) FROM PODS AT 14 DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS
- 12 GERMINATION CAPACITY. COMPARISON BETWEEN SEEDS FROM TREATMENT W1 AND W3 (CONTROL) FROM PODS AT 16 DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS
- 13 GERMINATION CAPACITY. COMPARISON BETWEEN SEEDS FROM TREATMENT W1 AND W3 (CONTROL) FROM PODS AT 18 DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS

APPENDIX PLATE

- 14 GERMINATION CAPACITY. COMPARISON BETWEEN SEEDS
 FROM TREATMENT W1 AND W3 (CONTROL) FROM PODS
 AT 20 DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS
- 15 GERMINATION CAPACITY. COMPARISON BETWEEN SEEDS
 FROM TREATMENT W1 AND W3 (CONTROL) FROM PODS
 AT 22 DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS
- 16 GERMINATION CAPACITY. COMPARISON BETWEEN SEEDS
 FROM TREATMENT W1 AND W3 (CONTROL) FROM PODS
 AT 24 DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS
- 17 GERMINATION CAPACITY. COMPARISON BETWEEN SEEDS
 FROM TREATMENT W1 AND W3 (CONTROL) FROM PODS
 AT 26 DAYS AFTER ANTHESIS

* * * * *

INTRODUCTION

Although about half of the world's grazing animals are found in the tropics, most ruminant production is carried out on natural grasslands rather than on sown pastures. This is one reason why there is such a low animal output per unit area from many tropical pastures (Humphreys, 1978). In these natural grasslands, dominated by a wide range of graminaceous species, both the quantity and quality of the herbage sets a limit to production. The quantity produced is often severely limited by climate and by the low nitrogen availability of the soils, while pasture quality is influenced by both low crude protein content and the characteristic growth pattern of grasses which form the bulk of the diet. As a result, animal production is limited by the low nitrogen content and low digestibility of the feed for a considerable period of the year. Particularly during the dry period, this leads to low dry matter intake and low growth rates in grazing animals.

One reason for the poor nutritive value of many tropical pastures is the low proportion of high producing legumes in the sward. Although legumes may occur in abundance in some tropical grazing lands, edible herbaceous legumes do not usually improve yield or nitrogen status. For example, Humphreys (1978) stated that native legumes such as *Indigofera enneaphylla*, *Glycine* spp. and *Zornia diphylla* have been shown to contribute only 0.3 - 4.0% of the feed on offer in native grasslands and represent yields which seldom exceed 50 kg/ha.

Certainly the introduction of potentially high yielding legumes into natural grasslands can add nitrogen to the soil as well as providing herbage with an increased protein and nitrogen content (Jones *et al*, 1967), digestibility (Minson and Milford, 1966) and yield (Kretschmer, 1972). Such introductions have resulted in equally dramatic increases in animal production (Norman and Phillips, 1970). Shaw and 't Mannetje (1970) reported that the combination of fertilizers and a suitable tropical legume resulted in almost a doubling of liveweight gain per head and a sixfold increase in animal liveweight per hectare from

improved native grassland. This beneficial effect of the legume in promoting animal liveweight gains has been confirmed by many scientists (Norman and Stewart, 1964; Stobbs, 1965) even at relatively high stocking rates (Norman, 1970).

Perennial pasture legumes give a longer sequence of feed production than annual legumes. They are also often capable of fixing larger amounts of nitrogen than annuals. A number of perennial legumes have been found to produce acceptable amounts of high quality herbage in association with grasses and have shown persistence under grazing pressure. In Thailand generally, and in the North-east Region in particular, a number of perennial legumes have shown promise for pasture improvement. Amongst these, Siratro (*Macroptilium atropurpureum*) has been very successful. Although it is a relatively new pasture legume to Thailand, its use since it was first introduced in 1962 has greatly increased (Wickham, 1976). Since 1962 Siratro has been used in many pasture improvement projects particularly at Khon Kaen University (Annual Report 1976-1980) and in land development at Borabu, Mahasarakham province. Such early work provided important information on the value and potential of forage legumes for increasing animal production from native grasslands in Thailand and justified the associated and subsequent research on forage legume seed production (Wickham, 1976; Wickham *et al*, 1980; Hare and Waranyuwat, 1980).

An important aspect of the more general acceptance and usage of pasture legumes in Thailand is the extent to which reliable supplies of high quality seed can be maintained at reasonable prices. In many tropical countries seed supply has been a major constraint to pasture development. Accompanying this has been the need to develop seed production skills, commercial processing and seed quality controls as the basis of an efficient seed industry. Certainly with the wider use of tropical grasses and legumes by village farmers and government organisation in North-east Thailand, seed production has increased dramatically in importance. Currently seed and pasture production have a special place in nearly all livestock development projects in Thailand (Hare and Waranyuwat, 1980).

The present studies on Siratro seed production were therefore initiated in an attempt to add to the background of knowledge on the growth and development of this species. It was hoped that the results of such a study might be useful as the basis of recommendations and assistance to Thai farmers.

The study was divided into two main sections - a field experiment designed to study the effects of plant spacing on seed production following dry season and wet season plantings, and a controlled environment experiment designed to study Siratro growth and development under differing levels of water stress.

In particular, the objectives of the field study, carried out in Thailand, were:

1. to study the effects of plant spacing on seed production in terms of both seed quantity and quality;
2. to study the effects of irrigation on seed production with particular reference to a dry season planting;
3. to compare the performance of this crop sown at two different times of the year to determine the more suitable sowing time for Siratro seed production in Thailand.

The objectives of the controlled environment study, carried out in New Zealand, were:

1. to examine the role of water stress on plant growth and subsequent seed development and yield;
2. to study the effect of water stress imposed at different stages of growth on reproductive development and the components of seed yield;

3. to follow the sequence of seed development with particular reference to seed yield and quality.

* * * * *