Mississippi State University Scholars Junction

**MAFES Research Bulletins** 

MAFES (Mississippi Agricultural and Foresty Experiment Station)

4-23-1983

## The Effect of planting date, row spacing and variety on soybean yield in Mississippi

H. F. Hodges

Normie W. Buehring

Robert E. Coats

John McMillan

Ned C. Edwards

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/mafes-bulletins

#### **Recommended Citation**

Hodges, H. F.; Buehring, Normie W.; Coats, Robert E.; McMillan, John; Edwards, Ned C.; and Hovermale, Carl H., "The Effect of planting date, row spacing and variety on soybean yield in Mississippi" (1983). *MAFES Research Bulletins*. 817.

https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/mafes-bulletins/817

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the MAFES (Mississippi Agricultural and Foresty Experiment Station) at Scholars Junction. It has been accepted for inclusion in MAFES Research Bulletins by an authorized administrator of Scholars Junction. For more information, please contact scholcomm@msstate.libanswers.com.

#### Authors

H. F. Hodges, Normie W. Buehring, Robert E. Coats, John McMillan, Ned C. Edwards, and Carl H. Hovermale



- H. F. Hodges, Professor and Agronomist, and F. D. Whisler, Professor and Agronomist, Mississippi State University Department of Agronomy
- N. W. Buehring, Associate Agronomist, MAFES Northeast Branch
- R. E. Coats, Superintendent, MAFES Black Belt Branch
- John McMillan, Associate Agronomist, MAFES Coastal Plains Branch
- N. C. Edwards, Associate Agronomist, MAFES Brown Loam Branch
- C. Hovermale, Assistant Agronomist, MAFES South Mississippi Branch

Content	
	Page
Objectives	2
Procedure	2
Results	3
Date of Planting	3
Row Spacing	4
Varieties	4
Plant Height	5
Soil Moisture	6
Morphogenetic Development (Growth Stages)	6
Discussion	9
Date of Planting	9
Row Spacing	9
Flowering	9
Root Development	10
Cultural Considerations	11
References	11
Acknowledgment	11

# 

### The Effect of Planting Date, Row Spacing and Variety on Soybean **Yield in Mississippi**

Ē

**LOZ** 

AGE

ACRE/

BEAN

SOY

ЧO

The acreage and economic imctance of soybean has increased bidly in Mississippi during reit years. The increase in acreage d numbers of producers has used some concern that ailable date-of-planting inforation is sometimes limited and t based on locally derived data. me have observed that working ys during which some soybean reage can be planted often are ailable in mid-April; however, formation available on the effect early planting on yields is nited.

Some soybeans in nearly every mmunity are planted in July ch year. During the ten-year riod (1969-78), 50% of the soybean reage in Mississippi was not anted by June 1, and 33% still as not planted by June 10 (Figure

Soybeans are photoperiod sentive and the long days of late ine and early July in Mississippi event flowering while the shorter ivs of late July and August cause owering. Planting too early uses premature flowering, and te-planted beans often are iniced to flower before the regetative factory" is large ough to supply adequate notosynthetic materials for opmum seed production. Belowarly or too late.

National ggest that the greatest Marchant, 1981).



Figure I. Percent of total Mississippi soybean acreage not planted by specified dates (1969-78 average).

Source: Mississippi Crop and Livestock Reporting Service, Mississippi Weather and Crop Report, (1969-78).

ormal yields normally can be differences between 20- and 40-inch spected from beans planted too rows occurred when yield levels were relatively high and in seasons magazines have in which rainfall was well disported farmer experiences and tributed. Adequate rain during the ata from reputable scientists and pod-filling period is thought to be stitutions showing yield increase especially important. These results om narrow-row (solid-seeded) are different from the findings in oybeans in the mid-West. Row- Indiana, Illinois and Ohio but are pacing data from Heatherly (per- similar to results found in several onal communication) on Sharkey experiments from other southern ay at Stoneville, Mississippi, states (Egli, 1976 and Parker and

A row-spacing study at Holly Springs, Mississippi, in 1967 through 1970 found Lee and Bragg to yield slightly more in 20- than in 30- or 40-inch row spacings at most plantings. In 1967, the only year in which a very late planting was conducted, Lee produced 11.0, 7.4 and 5.2 bu/acre when planted in 20-, 30- and 40-inch rows, respectively.

The scarcity of information about the effect of date of planting

and row spacing on the perfordeterminant-type mance of soybeans (such as those most widely grown in Mississippi) led to initiation of this study at five locations (Verona, Starkville, Brooksville, Raymond and Poplarville) in 1976. A sixth location (near Newton) was added to the study in 1977. These locations represent a diverse group of soil and climate regions in the non-delta section of Mississippi. The general soil characteristics by study areas are as follow:

Northeast Mississippi (Verona)---Silty clay loam soil, slowly permeable to water,

The objectives of the study were to determine (1) the optimum time to plant soybeans at each location, (2) the relative yield reduction one should expect by planting before

The general plan followed at all locations was to begin planting soybeans on April 15 and plant at two-week intervals until July 1. Soil moisture at the various locations and in different years caused the planting schedule to vary. At some locations (e.g., Newton and Poplarville) there was only limited space available, and the numbers of planting dates were restricted.

Soil moisture at each location was monitored at different depths throughout the growing season. Considerable variation in rainfall from year-to-year and among locations was an important determinant of planting schedules. Appendix Table 7 presents the rainfall distribution throughout the growing season at each location and year.

Forty-, 30- and 7-inch row spacings were evaluated at all locations except Newton and Raymond where 40- and 7-inch primarily surface drained. High water table present through much of the year.

Blackbelt (Brooksville)---Clay to clay loam soil, shallow to chalk. The experimental site varies with 18 inches to chalk on one end of the field to about 12 inches on the other. The experimental plots were arranged so that each treatment received an equal number of plots on the deep as well as on the shallow soil

MAFES Plant Science Farm (Starkville)---Sandy clay loam soil, slowly permeable to water. Some evidence of plow pan. The

#### Objectives

and after the optimum planting season, (3) the optimum row spacing and the effect of planting date upon the response of soybeans to different row spacings and (4) the Brown Loam (Raymond)-Deep silt loam soil, minc evidence of a genetic pan 20-21 inches deep.

site was deep chiseled before the

crop year. High water table

present through much of the

Coastal Plains (Newton)-

Sandy loam soil, with plow part

8-10 inches deep under norma

cultivation. The soil was deer

chiseled before the 1977 cros

vear.

year.

South Mississippi (Poplar) ville)---Sandy loam soil er cessively well drained.

interaction of different maturia varieties with these management practices.

#### Procedure

spacings were evaluated. The 40and 30-inch spacings were planted with a conventional planter, and the 7-inch spacings were planted with a grain drill. Manufacturers and models of equipment varied among locations. Planting rates were about 45 lbs of seed/acre when planted in 30- and 40-inch rows and about 60 lbs/acre when planted with the grain drills. Stand establishment generally was not a problem; however, stand establishment was poor in some of the late plantings when soil moisture was low and soil surface temperatures were high. Germination of the Hill seed was low in 1978, and poor stands resulted even though seeding rates were increased. Data are reported for plots where stands were reasonable but are not included in the statistical analysis.

Plots planted with a conventional planter were four rows wide except at Raymond where plots were eight rows (20-ft wide). Plots

planted with a grain drill were 8 10-ft wide at all locations. Lengt of plots varied from 25 to 50 ft.

Pests were controlled as need and control varied consideral among locations and years. We control was generally satisfact to excellent except at Starkville 1978, Newton in 1979 and Pople ville in 1978 and 1979. A combination tion of cultivation and herbicide was used on plots planted wit conventional planters, and o casional hand weeding was use on plots planted with a grain dr

The early-planted (mid and la April) beans were sprayed 1: quently in early May to contribe bean leaf beetle. Late-season 1 sects (fall armyworm, velvet beat caterpillar, the green clover wo and the cabbage looper) were serious problem at Brooksville a Starkville only in 1977. One inse ticide treatment controlled the pests in late July and early Augus however, large populations of c age loopers and velvet bean caterillars developed in early eptember and seriously defoliated le late-planted soybeans at tarkville in 1977. The earlierlanted beans were damaged but ot completely defoliated by these isects.

The plots at Verona, Starkville, rooksville and Newton were arvested by hand in 1976 and ith a small-plot combine in 1977-9. Harvest at Poplarville was with

small commercial combine in 976 and by hand in the other ears. The plots at Raymond were arvested with a field combine ach year. Beans from all handarvested plots were threshed with small stationary thresher. The wo center rows of plots planted with a conventional planter and a strip 5-ft wide from plots planted with a grain drill were combined.

The plots were laid out in a candomized three-split block lesign with planting date the first split, row spacing the second split and variety the third split. The Raymond trial was replicated three times, and trials at the other locations were replicated four times.

The data were summarized by years and subjected to Duncan's New Multiple Range Test. The over-years summaries were subjected to Student Newman Kuel's Test. June planting had an average yield

#### Results

#### **Date of Planting**

Data were summarized across all row spacings and varieties, but data for some years were excluded from the averages because of yearto-year variations in planting dates. There was little interaction of row spacings and planting dates or varieties and planting dates.

The highest yields at Verona, Starkville and Brooksville were from the late-April or early May plantings. The average reduction in yield observed for mid-April plantings compared to the op-



Figure 2. Four-yeor (1976-79) average yields of soybeans at Verano and Starkville (overages of Centennial, Forrest and Tracy, by row spacings and planting dates).

June planting had an average yield reduction of 33%. Yields from beans planted in June and July were lower with each delay in planting date. A typical yield response to different planting dates is illustrated in Figure 2. Yields were highest from plantings in May and early June. Each day of delay in planting on 30-inch rows after June 10 resulted in a yield decrease of about 0.7 bu/acre/day. Yields of beans planted on 30-inch rows on June 10, 15 and 25 averaged 34, 30 24 bu/acre, respectively. and However, beans planted on 30-inch rows in mid- and late-April produced 34 bu/acre or more.

Results at Newton and Raymond

were inconsistent (Table 1). Yields at Newton were lowest for beans planted in mid-April, but the highest average yield at Raymond was in plots planted April 19. Yield reduction from planting through May and until June 4 ranged from 1-17%, and reductions after June 4 were relatively steep with progressively later planting dates.

The limited data available from South Mississippi show results similar to those observed in North Mississippi. Days available for planting during any particular time period are limited because of the low water-holding capacity of the sandy soils at that location. Hence, there were fewer planting dates at Poplarville than at other locations.

Table 1. The effect of planting date on soybean yields, averages of all varieties and row spacings, by location, 1976-79.

									Locat	gn						
Verona		-	Stark	ville		Brooksvi	11e		Newton	/		Raymo	nd	Poplar	ville	
Planting		%	Planting		%	Planting		%	Planting		%	Planting		% Planting		%
Date	Bu/A	Max.2	/ Date	Bu/A N	lax.	Date	Bu/A	Max.	Date	Bu/A	Max.	Date	Bu/A	Max. Date	Bu/A	Max.
April 16- 20	29.9 c <u>3</u>	85	April 14- 16	29.3 C	85	April 14- 20	20.4 C	83	April 15- 21	19.1 I	60	April·19	37.6 A	100 April 17- 28	24.5 1	B 83
April 29- 30	35.0 A	100	April 28- May 2	33.9 A	99	April 28- 30	24.6A	100	May 2- 3	23.2 (	; 73	April 27- May 5	32.9 B	88 May 11- 18	29.6	A 100
May 19- 24	32.8 B	94	May 16- 24	34.3 A 1	100	May 15- 20	22.9 B	93	May 16- 28	31.9 A	100	May 19- 24	37.2 A	99 June 6- 18	25.2	B 85
June 6- 13	32.6 B	93	May 30- June 8	31.1 B	91	June 1- 5	20.8 C	85	June 6 14	27.1 H	85	May 28- June 14	31.1 B	83		
June 28- July 26	27.3 D	78	June 15- 18	19.1 D	56	June 14- 15	16.1 D	66				June 21- 22	27.9 C	74		
			June 30- July 12	10.2 E	30	June 29- July 2	9.3 E	38				June 29- July 6	25.3 D	67		
						July 14- 18	4.2 F	17				July 12- 20	15.3 D	41		

 $\frac{1}{}$  Results are from only three years of data (1977-79).

 $\frac{2}{}$  Percent maximum yield at each location is percent of yield at the planting date with the highest average.

3/ Within each column, values followed by the same letter are not different at a probability level equal to or less than 0.05 as determined by the Student-Newman-Keul's Test.

#### **Row Spacing**

The row-spacing results are presented as averages over all planting dates, varieties and years (Table 2). Generally, there was no difference between the average yield of soybeans seeded with a grain drill in 7-inch rows and those planted in 30-inch rows. However, yields from the narrower spacings usually were greater than for beans planted in 40-inch rows.

The yield response (averages of the three highest-yielding varieties) to different row spacings at different planting dates at Verona and Starkville is presented in Figure 2. The data were summarized in this way because we suspected that the narrow row spacings would improve yields only in high-yielding situations. The 7- and 30-inch row spacings were generally higher yielding than the 40-inch row spacings. There was little interaction between row spacings and planting dates; however, the greatest differences among the row spacings were for May and June plantings, the least for April and July plantings.

Table 2. The effect of row spacing on soybean yields, averages of all varieties and planting dates, by location, 1976-79.

			L	ocation		
Row spacing	Verona S	tarkville	Brooksville	Newton <sup>1</sup> /	Raymond	Poplarvill
(inches)		• • • • •	Bus	hels/Acre		
40	31.2 AB <sup>2/</sup>	25.0 B	15.7 B	27.4 A	28.3 A	26.5 B
30	32.1 A	29.0 A	18.1 A			25.0 B
7	29.9 B	29.1 A	18.5 A	25.9 A	29.2 A	29.9 A

 $\frac{1}{}$  Data for 1977-79 only.

2/ Within each column, numbers followed by the same letter are not significantly different at the 0.05 probability level as determined by the Student Newman Kuel Test.

The effect of planting date or variety on soybean yield response to row spacing was slight. There was a tendency for the latestplanted beans to yield better in the 7-inch spacing than in 30- or 40inch spacings.

#### Varieties

Our data show that the interation between row spacings and planting dates was small. The later-maturing varieties, Tracy and Centennial, usually were the

Table 3.	Table 3. The effect of varieties on soybean yields, averages of all planting dates, row spacings and years, by location, 1976-79.							
<u> </u>	Location							
Variet	9	Verona	Starkville	Brooksville	Newton1/	Raymond	Poplarville	
		• • • •	• • • • • •	.bushels/acre		• • • • •		
		3/		14.0 5			10.0 -	
HILL		28.9 0	22.9 C	14.8 B	23.9 B	24.1 B	19.8 E	
Forrest		32.3 B	24.9 C	15.3 B	27.8 A	29.9 A	23.8 D	
Tracy	27	35.7 A	30.6 A	19.6 A	28.7 A	29.3 A		
Lee 74/Cei	ntennial <u></u>	34.6°C	30.9 A	19.1 A		32.0 A		
Bragg		23.8 D	27.9 B	17.8 A	16.2 AB	28.3 A	29.7 B	
Davis							28.7 B	
Pickett							26.3 C	
Сорр							32.5 A	
<u>1</u> / Data for <u>2</u> / Lee 74 location <u>3</u> / Within differe by the	Pickett    20.3 C   Cobb    32.5 A   1/ Data for 1977-79 only.   2/ Lee 74 was representative for this maturity group in 1976 at all locations except Starkville, Centennial was used in 1977-79.   3/ Within each column, values followed by the same letter are not different at a probability level to or less than 0.05 as determined by the Student-Newman-Kuel's Test.							

ghest yielding of the varieties sted at all planting dates and row acings (Table 3).

Tracy had the highest yield and e lowest yield reduction when anted in early April. Yields of prrest, Centennial and Tracy veraged over the three northern cations were 22, 15 and 9% lower, spectively, from mid-April plantg than from planting at the otimum time (Table 4). Forrest, an arly-maturing variety, generally elded less in northern Mississippi hen planted in April; however, orrest yields were similar to yields f Tracy and Centennial when lanted in May and June. Bragg ielded less than the other varieties hen planted early; however, it is usceptible to stem canker, a disase that causes more damage to usceptible varieties when planted arly.

The general response of varieties o planting date (photoperiod) is ne same, but some varieties are hore sensitive than others. The tata in Table 5 illustrate this. The host nodes were developed on lants in plots planted in May. lanting earlier or later resulted in ever nodes. Hill appeared to be hore sensitive than Tracy, and racy was more sensitive than bragg. Table 4. Soybean yield and percent reduction at three planting dates (early, optimum and late), by variety and location,

			L	ocation	
Planting			Northern		South Central
Date	Variety	Mi	.ssissippi <u>l</u> /		Mississippi 2/
			% Reduction		% Reduction
	Bu/	Acre	from May 15-25	Bu/Acre	from May 15-25
April 15-20	Hill	22	15	25	29
	Forrest	25	22	29	22
	Tracy	31	9	31	14
	Centennial	29	15	39	9
	Bragg	24	14	38	4
May 15-25	Hi11	26	0	35	0
	Forrest	32	0	37	0
	Tracy	34	0	36	0
	Centennial	34	0	43	0
	Bragg	28	0	29	0
June 30-July 2	Hi11	15	42	21	40
	Forrest	17	47	25	36
	Tracy	17	50	24	37
	Centennial	20	41		
	Bragg	18	36	26	10
				-	

! Northern Mississippi data are averages of three row spacings at Verona, Brooksville, and Starkville over four years.

2/ South Central Mississippi data are averages of two row spacings at Raymond and Newton.

#### **Plant Height**

Plants at maturity (averages of all varieties tested at Brooksville in 1976) were slightly taller in the 7inch spacing than in the 30- or 40inch rows (Table 6). Plant height declined rather dramatically when soybeans were planted after mid-June.

#### Soil moisture

Soil-water changes at 6-inch intervals, beginning at 21 inches below the soil surface, in plots planted in early May are presented in Figure 3A. All depths dried rapidly soon after June 1 and were recharged to field capacity by a mid-June rain. From that point, there was a long dry period in which the 21-inch depth dried fastest and to the greatest extent. It appeared that the May-planted beans were capable of extracting water from deep in the soil. The soil was dried from the surface; i.e., the 6-inch layer centered at 21 inches below the surface dried before the 6inch layer immediately below it, and that layer dried faster than the next deepest layer. Apparently, soil water was removed gradually from areas explored by roots as they grew progressively deeper.

Soil water changes did not differ (P < .05) among depth intervals on adjacent plots where beans were planted in July (Figure 3B). Apparently these late-planted beans were not capable of rooting sufficiently deep to remove significant amounts of water from any of the depths measured. This condition prevailed even though the surface soil was quite dry and the plants showed severe stress. Soil water content in the deeper strata (21 to 39 inches) was near field capacity during this period.

#### Morphogenetic development (growth stages)

Stages of development were monitored throughout the growing seasons at Starkville in 1978 and 1979 and in a similar experiment in 1980. (In the 1980 experiment, the same varieties as in previous years plus Bedford were planted April 30, May 12 and June 3. Later plantings were not made due to dry weather.) Dates of flowering were recorded as the time at which flowers appeared



Table 5. Effect of planting date and variety on node numbers, ty planting date and variety, Verona,

Planting		Variety						
Date	Hill	Hill Tracy Brag						
		nodes/plant						
4-16-76	12.6	14.5	16.6					
2-29-76	12.7	17.2	17.0					
5-25-76	12.5	15.9	17.5					
4-16-77	13.3	14.8	16.2					
4-29-77	13.0	19.1	19.3					
5-19-77	14.6	19.3	19.9					
6-09-77	11.7	16.8	16.3					

Table 6. Plant height at maturity, averages of all varieties tested a Brooksville in 1976, by planting date and row width.

Planting		Row Width			
Date	7	30	40		Average
			inches .	• • • • •	
4/20	31	27	28		28.7
4/30	35	28	28		30.3
5/20	32	27	25		28.0
6/14	29	22	25		25.3
7/02	23	18	17		19.3
7/15	12	13	15		13.3
Average	27.0	22.5	23.0		

t any of the upper four nodes on e mainstem. Plant maturity was corded when some of the pods ecame mature pod colored.

Numbers of days from planting om flowering to maturity for each ates in 1979 are presented in igure 4. This year was selected to arieties. Hill, however, usually period. equired a few more days to flower

matures earlier. This is a trait for which Hill has been noted previously; however, its fruiting period is shorter.

Numbers of days from flowering flowering and numbers of days to maturity appear to be influenced strongly by planting date. f the five varieties at five planting However, in contrast to days to flower, the varietal effect seems to be greater at the early planting epresent a year when there was dates than at the late planting elatively little crop stress. In dates; i.e., at early planting dates ontrast, 1978 and 1980 were both there are several days difference ears in which a hot, dry period among varieties in the length of ccurred during much of the grow- time from flowering to maturity. ng season. The data show that Bragg required 80 days compared ays from planting to flowering are to about 50 days for Hill when nfluenced strongly by planting planted on May 1. As the planting ate. In the plots planted May 1, all date was delayed, the difference in arieties except Bragg flowered at length of reproductive period he same time. The general trend among varieties was much less. or the later plantings was for the Thus, in late plantings, the ater-maturing varieties to require primary effect of varieties with nore days between planting and later maturity is delayed flowering, lowering than did the early not an extension of the pod-filling

Data collected in 1980 (a hot and han did Forrest even though it dry growing season) show that length of time from planting to flowering was shorter in the hot season, and the varietal effect on days to flowering was less. Numbers of days from flowering to maturity, however, were longer. The later-maturing varieties (Tracy, Centennial and Bragg) required much longer from flowering to maturity at each planting date than did the earlier-maturing varieties (Hill, Forrest and Bedford). Thus, the hot weather appeared to shorten the time required to flower for all varieties tested but lengthened the period between flowering and maturity. Part of this lengthening probably was due to a delay in fertilization and the successful setting of pods. Due to the hot, dry weather in 1980, the early flowers were aborted, resulting in a long period during which additional flowers were produced. So, the time during which seed actually were being filled may not have been much different.



Figure 4. Time from planting to flowering and from flowering ta maturity af soybeans grown on the MAFAS Plant Science Farm in 1979, by variety and planting date.

		0		, ,			·····, ····
	R-2	<u>R-3</u>	<u>R-4</u>	<u>R-5</u>	<u>R-6</u>	R-7	R-8
				-date			
Hill 2/							
PD 1-1/	7/16-7/26	7/26-7/29	7/29-8/4	8/04-8/8	8/08-8/26	8/26-9/05	9/05-9/08
2	7/17-7/28	7/28-8/4	8/04-8/9	8/9-8/21	8/21-8/28	8/28-9/06	9/06-9/09
3	8/02-8/7	8/07-8/13	8/13-8/19	8/19-8/29	8/29-9/6	9/06-9/09	9/09-9/15
4	8/11-8/17	8/17-8/23	8/23-8/27	8/27-9/3	9/03-9/12	9/12-9/16	9/16-9/21
5	8/12-8/14	8/14-8/31	8/31-9/3	9/03-9/9	9/09-9/21	9/21-9/26	9/26-10/02
Forrest							
PD 1	7/06-7/28	7/28-8/03	8/03-8/08	8/08-8/24	8/24-9/08	9/08-9/13	9/13-9/21
2	7/17-8/01	8/01-8/08	8/08-8/16	8/16-8/30	8/30-9/13	9/13-9/17	9/17-9/21
3	8/02-8/06	8/06-8/12	8/12-8/25	8/25-9/03	9/03-9/15	9/15-9/21	9/21-9/27
4	8/07-8/16	8/16-8/23	8/23-8/29	8/29-9/07	9/07-9/15	9/15-9/21	9/21-9/27
5	8/13-8/24	8/24-8/28	8/28-9/06	9/06-9/11	9/11-9/29	9/29-10/03	10/03-10/10
Tracy							
FD 1	7/06-8/04	8/04-8/12	8/12-8/23	8/23-8/30	8/30-9/21	9/21-9/24	9/24-10/01
2	7/17-8/09	8/09-8/13	8/13-8/25	8/25-9/03	9/03-9/21	9/21-9/24	9/24-10/03
3	8/08-8/12	8/12-8/19	8/19-8/27	8/27-9/04	9/04-9/24	9/24-9/28	9/28-10/03
4	8/08-8/20	8/20-8/27	8/27-9/02	9/02-9/09	9/09-9/26	9/26-10/01	10/01-10/06
5	8/14-8/22	8/22-8/28	8/28-9/07	9/07-9/19	9/19-9/30	9/30-10/03	10/03-10/08
Centennial	1						
PD 1	7/17-8/10	8/10-8/19	8/19-8/29	8/29-9/07	9/07-9/25	9/25-10/01	10/01-10/08
2	7/14-8/14	8/14-8/23	8/23-9/02	9/02-9/09	9/09-9/29	9/29-10/01	10/01-10/10
3	8/01-8/19	8/19-8/27	8/27-9/02	9/02-9/09	9/09-9/29	9/29-10/04	10/04-10/10
4	8/08-8/24	8/24-8/29	8/29-9/06	9/06-9/18	9/18-10/01	10/01-10/05	10/05-10/12
5	9/14-8/26	8/26-9/02	9/02-9/07	9/07-9/22	9/22-10/03	10/03-10/11	10/11-10/17
Bragg							
PD 1	7/21-8/15	8/15-8/18	8/18-8/26	8/26-9/08	9/08-10/01	10/01-10/09	10/09-10/17
2	7/24-8/15	8/15-8/18	8/18-8/30	8/30-9/11	9/11-10/01	10/01-10/10	10/10-10/18
3	8/08-8/17	8/17-8/24	8/24-9/01	9/01-9/11	9/11-10/01	10/01-10/10	10/10-10/20
4	8/14-8/24	8/24-8/29	8/29-9/06	9/06-9/19	9/19-10/07	10/07-10/10	10/10-10/20
5	8/22-8/27	8/27-9/02	9/02-9/06	9/06-9/19	9/19-10/07	10/07-10/13	10/13-10/22
1/ Growth	stages from Feh	r & Caviness	, 1977.				
2/ Planti	ng Dates, pp 1	= Maw 1 DD	2 = Max 16	PD 3 = Juno	5 PD 4 = Tu	ne 18 PD 5 =	July 2.
rianti	ng Dates; PD I	- Hay I, FD	2 - May 10,	TD 5 - Suile	J, ID 4 - JU		

Table 7 contains data on the calendar time required for each variety at each planting date in the 1979 experiment to progress through the different reproductive growth stages (Table 8). This table can be used to estimate the length of time to maturity. It also may be used to compare the effect of planting date and variety on the rate of progression through the various reproductive growth stages. The growing season in 1979 was relatively cool and wet, es pecially during the reproductive period. By comparing the developmental rate of these soy bean varieties with the same varieties in different years, some idea of the effect of weather or developmental rate can be gained

	Table 8. Reproductive stages of development of soybean
	R1 time of first flower
1	
	R2 time when flowers are extended to any of the upper four nodes
	on the main stem
2	
1	P2 beginning and (2/16 inch long at any of the fact and a
)	ks beginning pod (3/16-inch long at any of the four uppermost nodes
1	
9	R4 Tull pod (3/4-inch long or longer at any of the four uppermost
f	nodes )
	R5 beginning seed (slight seed enlargement can be felt)
*	
1	R6full seed (pod containing green seed that fill the cavity of pod
) (	at any of the top four nodes)
-	
<u> </u>	R7beginning maturity (leaves turning yellow and one pod on mainste
	has reached mature pod color)
-	R8full maturity (95% of pods have reached mature pod color)
e	
e	Five to 10 days of drying weather are required before R8 beans have les
1	than 15% moisture.
	Source: Fehr and Caviness, 1977.

#### ate of Planting

Results of this trial are similar to nose from trials in other states. he response to planting dates by dapted varieties was compared to linois, Kentucky, South Carolina nd Florida. Varieties best adapted p each location were tested at everal planting dates. The yield esponse to planting dates was imilar at each location. Examination of our results on the effect of date of planting on soybean yields (Figure 2, Table 1 and Appendix Tables 1-6) reveals marked declines in yields of soybeans planted after June 10. Comparison of these data with the historic planting practices of Mississippi producers (Figure 1) shows that 33% of the Mississippi soybean

acreage is planted too late for optimum production. Producers need to find ways to plant more acreage during the optimum planting period (May 1 to June 10). The data (Table 1) show that soybeans planted in northern Mississippi as early as April 15-20 yield more than those planted after June 10.

#### ow Spacing

Soybeans grown in 7-inch rows ver the soil surface more quickly nd should reduce erosion, but ere are some reasons for using is production practice with ution. Generally it is more difcult to get uniform seed placeent (in-the-row and depth) with a ain drill than with a row planter. e had some poor stands from anting with a grain drill where lanting conditions were marginal ut did get acceptable stands with w-planting equipment. Grainrills, however, are being improved or better depth control and placeent in the row. Because of the reater risk in stand establishment ith old types of grain drills, more eed/acre may need to be planted rith a grain drill than when lanting in rows.

The reasons for differences in sults of row-spacing research in idwestern states and results from

#### lowering

The variety determines how ort days have to be before flowerg is induced. Young seedlings owing under conditions that do ot induce flowering normally ave five to eight immature leaf ids and vegetative nodes in the owing tip of the stem. An adtional immature leaf is formed as e oldest buds grow and become sible. The next immature node our study and from studies at several other locations---e.g., south Georgia and South Carolina (Parker and Marchant, 1981 and Palmer, 1980)---are not completely understood. Midwestern research reports 5-15% increases in yields of soybeans planted in narrow rows (20 inches or less) over yields with 30-inch and wider row spacings.

This difference in response may be caused by combinations of soils and weather that prevail in the southern states. The high temperatures in the southern states cause high rates of water use, and this, in association with frequent short-period droughts, exposes crops to short periods of drought stress. The soils on which soybeans are produced in Mississippi are often fine textured and have low hydraulic conductivity that results in slower water movement than in the midwestern coarser textured soils or fine textured soils with more organic matter and a more developed soil structure. Thus, a uniform distribution of soybean plants over the soils used in this study may result in a more rapid use of available water early in the season and reduce the availability of stored water later in the season. Unless an excellent distribution of rain occurs during the growing season (especially July, August and September), the narrow-rows (drilled crop) are exposed to more serious drought stress than are crops planted on 30-inch row spacings. Also, stands in some of our late-planted plots were poor, especially the drill-seeded plots, which may be the reason for failure to obtain a higher yield in late, drill-seeded beans than in beans planted on the 30- and 40-inch rows.

becomes floral rather than vegetative when the photoperiod becomes short enough for leaves to induce flowering, and the plant will begin to flower when that developing bud matures. The plant then ceases to grow additional mainstem nodes.

Some stem elongation and branch growth may occur after the apex becomes floral. First flowering usually is apparent near the middle of the main stem, and flowers seemingly develop at random at nodes on the main stem. Flowering on the branches occurs in much the same pattern but a few days later than on the main stem.

Late-planted beans often are induced to flower when the first true leaf is exposed, and this causes the newly formed buds in the tip of the stem to be floral. As soon as the five to eight preformed leaf buds have developed, this floral bud will be the next to mature and the plant begins to flower. This usually is long before the "vegetative factory" is large enough to supply adequate photosynthetic materials for optimum seed production. Such small plants can be expected to yield less per plant; therefore, higher yields from late-planted beans can be expected if narrower plant spacings are used. However, this is not always evident due to

#### **Root Development**

The above-ground and belowground plant parts grow normally during vegetative development. Roots may grow 5 to 8 ft deep under good soil conditions, but there generally are not enough very deep roots to supply all the water needed to the developing leaves.

Many small secondary and tertiary roots live for only a short time, and they die faster if conditions become less favorable. Their replenishment depends on a ready supply of organic nutrients in the form of sugars supplied by the leaves. Thus, if above-ground conditions become unfavorable for growth or other plant parts become too competitive for available sugars, roots die faster than replacement roots are developed.

Developing seed become a repository for large quantities of the sugars produced by leaves. About two weeks normally are required from flowering until the developing seed begin to add significant dry weight, after which the seed grow rapidly and, apparently because of their proximity to the leaves, receive the major part of the sugars available from the leaves. Therefore, during the period of maximum seed growth (from about two weeks after flowering until maturity), root numbers decrease and total root length decreases. This causes the plant to become more dependent on fewer

other growth limiting factors.

In general, the late-maturing varieties are less sensitive to photoperiod than are early- or midseason varieties. Results from south Georgia showed the most nodes/plant from early May planting and the fewest from early July planting. Bragg and Hutton had 12 and 13 nodes, respectively, when planted in early July compared with the earlier maturing Essex which had only 10 nodes. Beans planted in early April had two to three fewer nodes than those planted in early May but one t three more nodes than thos planted in early July. Centennie planted in mid-June at Starkville Mississippi, produced 20 nodes of plants 39 inches tall but, whe planted in late July, averaged onl 9.5 nodes/plant and 8.6 inches tal

Flower racemes originate from buds at the nodes. The more nodes the more chances for racemes when the days become short enough t stimulate flower formation.

roots for its water and nutrient supply.

This occurs in Mississippi during August and September for early varieties and during late August, September and October for late varieties. The plants are most susceptible to drought during this time. This also is a period of very high evaporative demand. The combination of intra-plant competition for nutrients, which results in a decreasing root mass, and the high evaporative demand of the atmosphere forces the crop into a highly dependent situation relative to available water supply. The crop needs a soil with excellent waterholding capabililties and a reasonable seasonal distribution of rain if it is to reach its yield potential.

In late-planted beans, which flower while the plant is still small, the intra-plant competition for available nutrients limits root development. In such cases, the smaller root mass forces the plant into a less competitive position relative to removal of available soil water than exists for plants that have had adequate time for vegetative growth and root development before flowering. Such late-planted beans are more dependent on a uniform distribution of rainfall during the growing season.

The failure of July-planted beans

to root deeply in Mississipp probably is caused by the interna competition of one plant part with another for available carbon hydrates. The late-planted bean are induced to flower before the have a chance to develop a large root system, and a major part of the available carbonydrates is used i seed production rather than fc leaf, stem and root growth.

Premature flowering results in a self-destructive situation for the plant in a dry environment because the plant is unable to feed the rock to support the growth it need. Thus, the late-planted crop is much more dependent on timely rainfal than is the crop planted at the optimum time.

Data on growth-stages were not collected on the experiments it Mississippi during the south relatively cool and wet growin; season in 1979. Similar data wei: collected for the varieties Esse Davis, Bragg and Hutton at Tifton Georgia. A three-year average (1 the planting date, flowering and maturity-date data shows that the length of time to flowering s considerably shorter at that latitude than at Starkville. Brag required 82 and 52 days fro planting to flowering at Starkvil<sup>4</sup> when planted in early May ard early July, respectively. In soul: Georgia, Bragg required only ( and 40 days to develop flowers aft 1

anting in early May and early ily, respectively. In south eorgia, the day length will be norter in summer than in north lississippi. Therefore, it appears the critical short-day length ecessary to induce flowering in ragg occurs 12 to 20 calendar ays earlier at Tifton, Georgia than t Starkville, Mississippi.

#### **Cultural Considerations**

Two very serious constraints on te planting are difficulty in btaining stands and water-related roblems.

Row-planted beans can be ultivated and herbicides can be ost-directed for weed control; hereas, weed control in drilllanted beans must be acomplished entirely with over-the-

gli, D. B. 1976. Planting Date, Row Width, Population Growth Regulation, p. 56-62. *World Soybean Research*, L. D. Hill The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.

arker, M. B. and M. W. Marchant.

The length of time from flowering to maturity for soybeans at the more southernly latitude was longer than that at Starkville. Bragg required 108 days from flowering to maturity in south Georgia when planted in early May but only 81 days at Starkville. When planted in early July, the length of Bragg's reproductive

top herbicides and canopy cover. Cultivation and post-directed herbicide applications for weed control are generally less costly than broadcast over-the-top herbicide applications. Beans on rows may be treated with herbicides over-thetop, in a band over the row or postdirected; however, only over-thetop applications can be used with

#### References

1981. Response of four soybean cultivars to row spacing and planting dates. Agron. J. 73:759-762.

Palmer, J. H. 1980. The Soybean Scene. FS 80-1. Cooperative Extension Service, Clemson Uni-

#### Acknowledgment

The financial support of the Mississippi Soybean Promotion Board is greatly appreciated as is the cooperation of Branch Station Superintendents, R. C. Albritton, W. A. Brock, E. G. Morrison and W. W. Kilby (retired). Dan Childress, R. L. Ivy, W. Stewart, A. Trent, T. Stewart, J. K. Young and T. K. Porter helped in various aspects of conducting this study, and their assistance is sincerely acknowledged.

period was reduced to 68 days at the more southernly latitude and 55 days at Starkville. The effect of relatively small changes in day length (as influenced by northsouth location and planting dates) obviously can have a large effect on the development of soybeans.

solid-seeded beans.

Late-season insect populations frequently are such a serious threat to soybeans in south Mississippi that producers need to be alert to damaging infestations each season and be prepared to apply insecticides as needed.

versity, South Carolina.

Fehr, W. R. and C. E. Caviness. Stages of Soybean Development. Iowa State University Cooperative Extension Service Special Report 80. 1977.

			Row W	Yield*			
Lanting			ICOW M				
Date	Variety	7	1070	30	40	Average	
			1976	,			
				bushels	/acre <sup>1/</sup>		
4/16	Kent	20.4	с	27.4 d	26.2 c	24.2	
	Hill R	46.2	ab	38.0 Ъ	44.0 a	42.7	
	Forrest	38.5	Ъ	40.2 Ъ	37.2 b	38.6	
	Tracy	49.3	а	50.3 a	48.7 a	49.1	
	Lee 74	40.4	ab	36.5 Ъ	38.3 Ъ	38.4	
	Bragg	29.3	С	28.8 d	27.7 c	28.6	
	Average	37.3		36.9	37.0	37.1	
4/29	Kent	25.7	d	34.1 bc	36.5 ab	32.1	
	Hill	36.4	b	34.7 bc	34.2 ab	35.1	
	Forrest	42.4	а	35.2 bc	40.9 a	39.5	
	Tracy	43.4	а	43.4 a	40.5 a	42.4	
	Lee 74	33.1	С	41.2 ab	34.2 ab	36.2	
	Bragg	17.0	е	31.0 c	29.0 b	25.7	
	Average	33.0		36.6	35.9	35.2	
5/25	Kent	34.5	ab	31.1 Ъ	36.4 b	34.0	
	Hill	38.0	ab	42.0 a	45.3 a	41.8	
	Forrest	35.6	ab	43.7 a	42.2 ab	40.5	
	Tracy	40.4	а	44.2 a	46.2 a	43.6	
	Lee 74	32.2	Ъ	44.4 a	40.4 ab	39.0	
	Bragg	31.6	Ъ	33.9 Ъ	34.7Ъ	33.4	
	Average	35.4		39.9	40.9	38.7	
6/30	Kent	21.4	Ъ	25.2 a	21.8 a	22.8	
	Hill	28.1	а	28.9 a	25.0 a	27.3	
	Forrest	28.4	а	28.9 a	22.7 a	26.7	
	Tracy	27.9	а	29.3 a	24.2 a	27.1	
	Lee 74	27.0	а	27.5 a	26.8 a	27.1	
	Bragg	27.3	а	29.5 a	27.6 a	28.1	
	Average	26.7		28.2	24.7	26.5	

Appendix Table 1. (Continued)								
		Yi	eld*					
		Row W	idth (inche	s)				
Planting								
Date	Variety	77	30	40	Average			
			1977					
			hucholo/o	070				
			Dusneis/a	CI e				
4/16	Hill	21.6 by	25.9 cx	26.4 b x	24.6			
	Forrest	36.8 a xy	40.6 a x	32.6 а у	36.7			
	Tracy	33.3 a x	37.7 ab x	35.7 ах	35.6			
	Centennial	31.9 a x	36.0 b x	34.2 a x	34.0			
	Bragg	12.6 c z	18.2 d y	20.4 c x	17.1			
	Average	27.2	31.7	30.0	29.6			
	merage	27.2	31.7	50.0	29.0			
4/30	Hi11	26.1 b у	34.1 b x	30.5 b x	30.2			
	Forrest	41.9 a x	46.4 a x	41.8 a x	43.4			
	Tracy	42.7 a x	43.9 a x	39.3 a x	42.0			
	Centennial	38.9 a y	44.5 a x	40.4 a y	41.3			
	Bragg	11.0 с у	20.4 c x	18.4 c x	16.6			
	Average	32.1	37.9	34.1	34.7			
5/19	Hill	36.7 b х	33.4 b х	31.7 с х	33.9			
-,	Forrest	52.4 a x	37.9 a y	37.5 a y	42.6			
	Tracy	38.1 b x	37.9 a x	33.1 bc x	36.4			
	Centennial	35.5 b x	37.9 а х	36.4 ab x	36.6			
	Bragg	9.4 c y	15.1 с х	14.9 d x	13.1			
		24.4	20 /	20.7	20 5			
	Average	34.4	32.4	30.7	32.5			
6/09	Hill	31.7 b xy	36.5 a x	31.0 a y	33.1			
	Forrest	37.8 a x	33.8 ab x	34.1 a x	35.2			
	Tracy	32.7 ab x	37.4 a x	31.6 a x	33.9			
•	Centennial	33.1 ab x	33.9 ab x	31.7 a x	32.9			
	Bragg	14.8 с у	27.8 b х	19.9 b у	20.8			
	Average	30.0	33.9	29.7	31.2			
7/06	Hf11	22.2 ab x	18.9 c x	16.5 c x	19.2			
,,,	Forrest	28.2 a x	27.7 a x	22.0 abc x	26.0			
	Tracy	25.2 ab x	20.1 bc x	23.1 ab x	22.8			
	Centennial	24.7 ab x	26.2 ab x	26.9 а х	25.9			
	Bragg	20.0 b х	16.8 c x	17.2 bc x	18.0			
	Average	24.1	21.9	21.1	22.4			
				continue	d			

Appendix	Table 1. (Con	ntinued)						
		Yi	eld*					
Dlanting	Row Width (inches)							
Date	Variety	7	30	40	Average			
			1978					
			bushels/	acre				
4/17	2/ <sub>Hill</sub>	27.8	29.0	23.7	26.8			
4/1/	Forrest	26.8 bc x	31.4 a x	29.8 bc x	29.3			
	Tracy	34.8 a x	37.6 a x	37.3 a x	36.6			
	Centennial	33.0 ab x	30.2 a x	33.5 ab x	32.2			
	Bragg	22.7 c x	24.8 a x	27.2 c x	24.9			
	Average	29.4	31.0	31.9	30.8			
5/19	Hill $\frac{3}{}$		27.8	24.4	26.1			
5715	Forrest	35.8 a x	30.7 a x	30.6 b x	32.4			
	Tracy	39.2 a x	33.8 a x	38.1 a x	37.0			
	Centennial	40.9 a x	36.4 a x	38.7 a x	38.7			
	Bragg	28.1 b x	29.3 а х	30.6 b x	29.3			
		26.0	20 5	24 5	2/ 2			
	Average	36.0	32.5	34.5	34.3			
6/6	Hill	$30.0 \frac{3}{}$	3/	<u> </u>				
	Forrest	39.4 b y	45.3 ах	42.5 ab xy	42.4			
	Tracy	40.0 b y	47.7 ах	41.2 ab y	43.0			
	Centennial	45.6 a x	48.9 a x	45.9 a x	46.8			
	Bragg	36.0 b y	47.8 a x	37.4 b у	40.4			
	Average	40.2	47.4	41.8	43.2			
6/28	Hill	29.2	25.6	22.5	25.8			
	Forrest	39.6 a x	37.1 а х	34.6 a x	37.1			
	Tracy	38.4 a x	33.0 a y	33.0 a y	34.8			
	Centennial	40.2 a x	37.4 a x	33.1 a y	36.9			
	Bragg	35.8 a x	37.8 a x	32.8 a x	35.5			
	Average	38.5	36.3	33.4	36.1			
		1	979					
	and the second sec							
4/20	Hill	22.9 bx	26.3 bx	26.2 bx	25.2			
	Forrest	5.8 cy	14.6 cx	13.5 cx	11.3			
	Tracy	41.4 ax	38.4 ax	41.5 ax	40.4			
	Centennial	18.5 by	30.1 abx	25.6 bxy	24.7			
	Bragg	0.8 cx	1.2 cx	1.4 cx	1.1			
	Average	17 4	22 1	21.1				
	eruge	-/.7						
				CO	ntinued			

			Row h	leld* lidth (	inche	es)		
lanting Date	Variety	7		30		40		Average
				bush	els/a	acre		
5/21	Hi11	25.4	bev	26.9	bcv	23.4	bv	25.2
-,	Forrest	22.4	cV	23.8	cv	22.6	bv	22.9
	Tracy	34.0	av.	37.5	ax	32.6	av	34.7
	Centennial	28.8	abv	31.5	by	30.5	av	30.3
	Bragg	12.9	dy	17.8	dxy	21.4	bx	17.4
	Average	24.7		27.5		26.1		
6/13	Hill	33.2	ax	34.1	bx	26.0	ax	31.1
	Forrest	37.8	ax	35.8	bxy	27.4	ay	33.7
	Tracy	39.8	ax	35.4	bx	29.2	ay	34.8
	Centennial	40.2	ax	39.3	ax	32.6	ax	37.4
	Bragg	35.4	ax	28.6	сх	27.2	ax	30.4
	Average	37.3		34.6		28.5		
5/29	Hill	31.3	ax	23.8	bxy	18.9	abcy	24.6
	Forrest	25.6	ax	22.1	bxy	14.3	су	20.7
	Tracy	27.2	ax	25.9	abx	16.9	су	23.3
	Centennial	36.0	ax	33.5	ax	26.8	ax	32.1
	Bragg	33.5	ax	25.1	aby	24.0	aby	27.5
	Average	30.7		26.1		20.2		
justed	to 13% moist	ure.						
Within the sam bility Duncan' within followe	each row widd e letter (a, of equal to o s New Multip a date and wi d by the same	th and b, c or les le Ran ithin e lets	d plar or d) ss thange Te a van cer (x	ating d are n an 0.05 est. V riety a cor y)	ate, ot d: as d alues re no	values ifferen letermi s acros ot diff	s foll nt at ined b ss row Ferent	owed by a proba- y width, if
/ Hill se was inc Hill wa	ed was of poor reased, the s s therefore of	or q <b>u</b> a result exclud	ality ing y led fr	and, a vield m com dat	lthou ay be a ana	igh pla e artif alysis.	nting ficial	rate ly low.
/	harvested by	ecaller	ofr	noor st	and.			

end of table.

			Yield	*	(i.e. h		
lanting			ROW W	1000	inch	.es)	
Date	Variety	7		30		40	Average
			19	76			
				bus	shels	/acre -	
4/16	Kent	14.6	$c^{1/2}$	8.9	с	9.2	c 10.9
	Hill	33.0	b	24.1	b	19.6	b 25.6
	Forrest	36.5	ab	21.4	Ъ	17.0	bc 25.0
	Tracy	53.7	а	42.2	а	39.8	a 45.2
	Lee 74	45.7	ab	31.4	ab	36.1	a 37.7
	Bragg	46.6	ab	33.0	ab	35.4	a 38.3
	Average	38.3		26.8		26.1	
4/28	Kent	11.4	с	14.6	b	15.8	c 13.9
	Hill	28.0	b	33.8	а	25.2	bc 29.0
	Forrest	28.2	b	38.3	а	25.9	b 30.8
	Tracy	38.9	а	46.8	а	34.6	ab 40.1
	Lee 74	45.1	а	43.2	а	39.7	a 42.7
	Bragg	40.6	а	43.8	а	40.6	a 41.7
	Average	32.0		36.7		30.3	
5/24	Kent	34.9	с	28.1	Ъ	22.7	c 28.6
	Hill	46.4	Ъ	35.0	b	33.3	b 38.2
	Forrest	53.6	а	52.3	а	44.6	a 50.2
	Tracy	45.3	b	46.0	а	42.0	a 44.4
	Centennial	40.2	bc	48.5	а	42.8	a 43.8
	Bragg	44.3	b	44.6	а	44 <b>.</b> 1	a 44.3
	Average	44.1		42.4		38.2	
6/8	Kent	10.7	с	13.1	d	18.0	c 13.9
	Hill	31.4	b	27.4	С	25.2	bc 28.0
	Forrest	37.3	ab	27.9	С	27.4	ab 30.9
	Tracy	36.3	ab	32.9	Ъ	30.2	ab 33.1
	Centennial	40.9	а	38.8	а	35.6	a 38.4
	Bragg	42.8	а	35.4	ab	32.4	ab 36.9

Appendix Ta	able 2. (Contir	ued)			
		Yield Row Width	j* (inches)		
Planting Date	Variety	7 <u>3</u> (	) 40	Average	2
		bu	ushels/acre-		
7/12	Kent Hill Forrest Iat Tracy h Centennial Bragg	e maturity a narvest	and fall rain	ns prevented	
		1977			
			bushels/	acre	
4/14	Hill Forrest Tracy Centennial Bragg	14.5 b y 14.5 b y 22.6 ab y 27.2 a x 24.4 ab y	22.8 c x 26.1 bc x 35.9 a x 34.5 a x 28.3 b xy	22.3 bc x 20.6 c xy 31.8 a xy 28.6 ab x 29.0 ab x	19.9 20.4 30.1 30.1 27.2
	Average	20.6	29,5	26.5	25.5
5/2	Hill Forrest Tracy Centennial Bragg	26.9 a x 30.0 a x 36.1 a x 36.5 a x 30.9 a x	27.8 b x 26.6 b x 38.8 a x 33.9 ab x 27.7 b y	21.2 a x 22,8 a x 30.4 a x 31.7 a x 25.2 a z	25.3 26.5 35.1 34.0 27.9
	Average	32.1	31.0	26.3	30.0
5/16	Hill <u>2</u> / Forrest <u>2</u> / Tracy <u>2</u> / Centennial <u>2</u> / Bragg <u>2</u> /	12.6 a y 11.4 a y 13.2 a y 16.4 a y 11.5 a y	27.1 a x 29.0 a x 34.0 a x 31.5 a x 26.8 a x	16.5 b y 20.1 ab xy 29.1 a x 22.4 ab xy 19.5 ab x	18.7 20.2 25.4 23.4 19.3
	Average	13.0	29.7	21.5	21.4
5/30	Hill Forrest Tracy Centennial Bragg	23.2 b x 30.0 a x 34.0 a x 28.8 ab x 22.6 b x	22.4 bc x 28.0 ab x 30.1 a x 27.1 ab x 21.0 c x	13.9 c y 22.8 ab x 28.5 a x 21.8 b y 19.8 bc x	19.8 26.9 30.9 25.9 21.1
	Average	27.7	25.7	21.4	24.9
			C	ontinued	

Appendix Ta	able 2. (Cor	ntinued)			
		1	lield*		
		Row Wie	Ith (inches	)	
Planting	··· ·	7	20		
Date	Variety	/	30	40 Av	verage
	-		bushels/a	acre	
6/15	u-11	11 5 o v	14628	15 0 c v	12 7
0/10	Forrest	143ax	14.0 a x	1/1 ab v	15.0
	Tracy	10.9 a x	11.1 a x	11.1 ab x	11.0
	Centennial	10.3 a x	14.0 a x	10.6 ab x	11.6
	Bragg	9.0 a x	11.1 a x	7.5 b x	9.2
	Average	11.2	11.3	11.6	12.1
7/6	Plots not h	narvested du	le to very	poor stands (	caused by
	intense rai	infall July	9.		
			1978		
	3/				
4/15	Hill <u>-</u>	16.0	20.4	18.9	18.4
	Forrest	19.2 c x	24.4 b x	24.2 b x	22.6
	Tracy	22.8 bc x	26.2 b x	27.2 ab x	25.4
	Braga	32.7 a x	20.0  h	33.7 a x	34.0 28.7
	DI Agg	20.7 aD x	29.0 D X	20.4 aD x	20.1
	Average	25.8	29.4	28.4	27.9
4/28	Hill	21.3	15.8	12.5	16.5
1, 20	Forrest	27.6 b x	24.1 b x	19.0 b x	23.6
	Tracy	40.7 a x	35.3 a x	34.7 a x	36.9
	Centennial	37.2 a x	41.0 a x	32.4 a x	36.9
	Bragg	36.7 a x	35.1 a xy	30.4 a y	34.1
	00		, ,		
	Average	35.5	33.8	29.1	32.8
5/17	Hill	22.0	22.3	20.2	21.5
	Forrest	31.9 с х	26.7 b x	18.7 b y	25.8
	Tracy	42.5 ab x	42.4 a x	39.1 a x	41.3
	Centennial	47.8 a x	40.9 a y	37.9 a y	42.2
	Bragg	38.2 b x	36.6 a x	35.6 a x	36.6
	Average	40.1	36.6	32.7	36.5
6/5	Hill	13.3	15.8	17.4	15.5
	Forrest	17.4 с у	28.3 a x	18.6 a y	21.4
	Tracy	27.6 b x	33.6 a x	26.6 a x	29.3
	Centennial	31.2 ab xy	36.6 a x	25.6 a y	31.1
	Bragg	38.4 a x	28.8 a y	25.3 a y	30.8
	Average	28.6	31.8	24.0	28.2 continued

Appendix I	Cable 2. (Cor	tinued)			
		y D 1(4	lield*		
Planting	-	KOW WIC	ith (inches)		
Date	Variety	7	30	40 A	verage
	-		bushels/a	acre	
6/30	Hill <u>4</u> /	4/	4/	4/	
	Forrest	2.8 a x	5.5 a x	4.4 a x	4.2
	Tracy	3.9 a x	7.8 a x	4.7 a x	5.5
	Centennial	4.8 a x	6.9 a x	5.6 a x	5.8
	Bragg	4.0 a x	6./ax	6.6 a x	5.8
	Average	3.9	6.7	5.3	5.3
			1979		
5/1	Hill	28.5 cx	28.0 ax	23.6 cx	26.7
	Forrest	35.1 bcx	41.6 ax	28.9 bcx	35.2
	Tracy	45.8 ax	41.1 axy	37.5 ay	41.5
	Centennial	43.8 ax	40.8 ax	34.0 aby	39.5
	Bragg	39.1 abx	34.9 ax	33.1 abx	35.7
	Average	38.5	37.3	31.4	
5/16	Hill	27.4 cx	31.8 cx	26.3 cx	28.5
·	Forrest	34.3 bcxy	39.6 ax	30.5 bcy	34.8
	Tracy	42.3 abx	41.8 ax	37.6 ax	40.6
	Centennial	46.9 ax	38.8 aby	35.0 aby	40.2
	Bragg	32.6 bcx	35.6 bcx	34.2 abx	34.1
	Average	36.7	37.5	32.7	
6/5	Hill	34.8 bx	34.8 bcx	29.1 cy	32.9
	Forrest	37.8 abx	37.1 bxy	33.8 by	36.2
	Tracy	43.4 ax	42.0 axy	38.5 ay	41.3
	Centennial	43.6 ax	42.8 ax	33.2 Ъу	39.9
	Bragg	29.1 abz	31.9 cy	36.2 abx	32.4
	Average	37.7	37.7	34.2	
6/18	Hill	23.0 bx	18.0 bx	14.5 bx	18.5
	Forrest	34.4 ax	23.3 by	16.0 bz	24.2
	Tracy	41.6 ax	30.7 ay	17.9 bz	30.1
	Centennial	38.7 ax	32.4 axy	27.0 ay	32.7
	Bragg	32.7 ax	22.2 by	17.7 by	24.2
	Average	33.9	25.3	18.6	
				continue	ed

Appendix Table 2. (Continued) Yield\* Row Width (inches) Planting 40 7 30 Average Date Variety -----bushels/acre----19.7 cx 7/2 Hill 20.7 bx 17.0 ax 19.1 21.7 bx 22.6 bcx 22.7 ax 22.3 Forrest 27.0 abx 27.9 ax 21.1 ax 25.3 Tracy 29.7 ax 28.5 Centennial 31.4 ax 24.3 ay Bragg 28.7 abx 26.1 abx 24.0 ax 26.3 25.2 21.8 25.9 Average end of table \*Adjusted to 13% moisture.  $\frac{1}{1}$  Within each row width and planting date, values followed by the same letter (a, b, or c) are not different  $(1^{\circ} < .05)$ of equal to or less than 0.05 as determined by Duncan's New Multiple Range Test. Values across row widths within a date and within a variety are not different if followed by the same letter (x, y, or z).  $\frac{2}{2}$  Poor stands were obtained in soybeans planted 5/16 due to dry weather. This was especially a problem with those plots planted on 7-inch rows.  $\frac{3}{1}$  Hill seed was of poor quality and, although planting rate was increased, the resulting yield may be artificially low. Hill was therefore excluded in data analysis. Was not harvested because of poor stand.

		Daaa	Yield*		_
Planting		Kow	Width (inch	les)	
Date	Variety	7	30	40	Average
			1976		
			bushels	s/acre	
		1/			
4/20	Kent	19.8 $c^{1/}$	16.4 e	13.3 c	16.5
	Hill	26.6 b	25.6 cd	24.5 Ъ	25.6
	Forrest	34.2 a	22.9 d	22.8 Ъ	26.6
	Tracy	38.6 a	36.2 a	31.6 a	35.5
	Lee 74	36.8 a	32.6 ab	24.0 Ъ	31.1
	Bragg	31.9 ab	29.0 bc	20.7 Ъ	27.2
	Average	31.3	27.1	22.8	
4/30	Kent	24.8 р	15.2 c	13.1 c	17.7
47.50	Hill	25.2 b	22.2 b	21.0 b	22.8
	Forrest	34.3 a	24.2 b	24.3 ab	27.6
	Tracy	33.4 a	33.2 a	28.0 a	31.5
	Lee /4	34.4 a	28.0 a	23.6 ab	28.7
	Bragg	31.2 a	23.0 b	21.0 b	25.3
	Average	30.6	24.4	21.8	
5/20	Kent	28.2 c	20.5 Ъ	13.9 b	20.9
	Hill	32.5 bc	26.4 ab	23.0 a	27.3
	Forrest	35.5 ab	37.1 a	20.8 ab	31.1
	Tracy	35.2 ab	36.4 a	28.6 a	33.4
	Lee 74	39.4 a	37.5 a	26.6 a	34.5
	Bragg	35.4 ab	33.8 a	26.5 a	31.9
	Average	34.4	32.0	23.2	
6/14	Kent	27.2 в	26.9 a	16.2 в	23.4
0, 2.	Hill	36.6 a	30.2 a	30.2 a	32.3
	Forrest	39.0 a	27.7 a	29.3 a	32.0
	Tracy	37 5 2	325 2	30 4 a	33 5
	Lee 74	38 2 a	35.6 a	32 9 a	35.6
	Bragg	37.2 a	33.8 a	34.2 a	35.1
	Average	35.9	31.1	28.9	
	0				
				contin	ued

Г

Appendix Table 3. (Continued)					
		Y	ield*		
		Row W	ldth (inches	5)	
Planting	Variety	7	30	40	Average
Date	vul 100				
	-		bushels/a	acre	
7/02	Kent	17.6 b	12.7 cd	12.0 ab	14.1
	Hill	22.4 ab	19.4 ab	12.9 ab	18.2
	Forrest	22.1 ab	12.2 d	11.6 b	15.3
	Tracy	20.6 b	16.4 bcd	12.6 ab	16.5
	Lee 74	27.4 a	18.7 abc	14.3 ab	20.1
	Bragg	27.5 a	23.7 a	16.2 a	22.5
	A	22.0	17 0	10.0	
	Average	22.9	1/.2	13.3	
7/15	Kent			`	
	Hill				
	Forrest	Late matur:	ity and fal	l rains prev	vented
	Tracar	harvest			
	Lee 74				
	Bragg				
	00				
			1977		
1 17 1		7 7 1	10 0 1	<b>F</b> ( 1	7 0
4/14	HILL	1.1 b xy	10.9  b x	5.4 5 y 9.5 h y	/.8
	Tracy	16.8 a xv	19.3 a x	16.0 a v	17.4
	Centennial	18.0 a x	18.7 a x	17.8 a x	18.2
	Bragg	15.1 a x	18.0 a x	15.9 a x	16.3
	A	10 5	15.0	12.0	1/ 1
	Average	13.5	10.9	12.9	14.1
4/28	Hill	9.2 b x	9.3 b x	7.4 b x	8.6
	Forrest	12.4 b x	12.6 b x	8.3 b y	11.1
	Tracy	18.6 a x	19.9 a x	15.1 a y	17.9
	Centennial	18.5 a x	19.1 a x	16.7 a x	18.1
	bragg	10.2 A X	10.3 a x	1J.2 A X	10.0
	Average	15.0	15.8	12.5	14.5
E la c		0 -			7.1
5/13	Hill	8.7 C X	6.9 b xy	5.7 b y	/.1
	Tracy	14.1 b v	0.9 D XY	0.2 D y 14.0 a y	15.3
	Centennial	17.7 a x	16.3 a x	16.9 a x	17.0
	Bragg	12.9 b y	17.4 a x	15.5 а ху	15.3
	A	10.0	10 5	10.1	10.0
	Average	12.8	13.5	12.1	12.8
				continue	bd

Appendix Table 3. (Continued)						
		Y	ield*			
Dlanting		Row W	idth (inche	<u>s)</u>		
Date	Varietv	7	30	40	Average	
					<u>Invertuge</u>	
	-		bushels/a	cre		
6/15	Hill	4.3 ах	2.6 ах	3.0 ах	3.3	
	Forrest	4.2 a x	6.2 a x	4.5 a x	5.0	
	Tracy	4.1 a x	4.8 a x	3.6 a x	4.2	
	Centennial	7.2 a x	5.2 a x	4.7 a x	5.7	
	Bragg	5.9 a x	4.3 ах	4.9 a x	5.0	
	Average	5.2	4.6	4.1	4.6	
6/30	Hill	1.6 b x	1.8 a x	0.8 c x	1.4	
,	Forrest	1.5 b x	2.8 a x	2.5 ab x	2.3	
	Tracy	4.5 a x	1.6 a v	1.4 bc v	2.5	
	Centennial	1.9 b x	2.4 a x	3.8 a x	2.7	
	Bragg	2.4 b x	2.7 a x	2.3 bc x	2.5	
	Average	2.8	2.7	2 0	2 5	
	nverage	2.0	2.7	2.0	2.5	
			1978			
	2/					
4/17	Hill <u>2/</u>	16.0	11.0	10.2	12.4	
	Forrest	15.6 a x	14.4 a x	14.1 a x	14.7	
	Tracy	8.9 b x	12.6 ab x	9.8 b x	10.4	
	Centennial	6.2 b x	4.8 c x	8.4 b x	6.5	
	Bragg	6.0 b у	8.3 bc x	9.3 b x	7.9	
	Average	9.2	10.0	10.4	9.9	
5/15	u:11	16 6	17 5	15.8	16 6	
J/1J	Forrost	10.0 17 8 a v	186 a v	$181 \circ v$	18.2	
	Tracy	13.7 ab v	18 6 a v	183 a v	16.0	
	Contonnial	13.7 ab x	76bv	13.0 a x	0.5	
	Bragg	10.2 bc x	14.9 a x	15.9 a x	13.7	
	Average	12.4	14.9	16.3	14.5	
6/1	Hill	15.3	18.6	14.7	16.2	
	Forrest	17.1 a y	25.8 а х	17.2 b y	20.0	
	Tracy	23.4 a x	25.5 ах	22.5 a x	23.8	
	Centennial	19.4 a x	21.6 a x	17.2 b x	19.4	
	Bragg	20.5 a x	20.7 a x	17.8 ab x	19.7	
	Average	20.1	23.4	18.7	20.7	
				continu	ed	

Appendix T	able 3. (Con	tinued)			
			Yield*		
		Row W	idth (inche	s)	
Planting Date	Variety	7	30	40	Average
			1		
			busneis/a	cre	
6/15	Hill	3.6	5.4	6.0	5.0
	Forrest	18.4 a X	10.2 a x	10.5 a x	1/./
	Centennial	19.9 a x	21.0 a x	18.2  ab  vv	18 0
	Bragg	15.7 a x	22.0 a x	20.2 a x	19.3
		17 (	0.0 1	10 7	10.0
	Average	17.6	20.1	18./	18.8
6/30	Hill	/			
	Forrest	1.1 b y	3.2 a y	6.1 a x	3.5
	Tracy	4.3 a x	4.8 a x	5.6 a x	4.9
	Centennial	0./ by	3.6 a xy	5./ax	3.3
	Bragg	Z.I ab y	3.5 a x	6.) a x	4.0
	Average	2.0	3.8	6.0	3.9
7/14	Hill				
	Forrest	9.6 a x	3.4 ау	0.7 су	4.6
	Tracy	5.3 a x	4.3 a x	1.7 ab y	3.7
	Centennial	7.2 a x	6.3 a x	2.3 a x	5.4
	Bragg	5.1 a x	4.6 a x	1.4 b x	3.7
	Average	6.8	4.6	1.6	4.3
			1979		
4/18	Hi11	13.9 bx	12.2 bx	12.6 bx	12.9
	Forrest	14.5 bx	13.0 bx	9.0 bx	12.1
	Tracy	1 <b>7.</b> 8 abx	17.2 bx	14.1 bx	16.3
	Centennial	24.9 ax	23.7 ax	22.1 ax	23.6
	Bragg	16.9 bx	15.6 bx	15.3 bx	15.9
	Average	17.6	16.4	14.6	
4/30	Hill	19.0 ax	15.7 ax	13.3 bx	16.0
	Forrest	23.9 ax	17.1 ax	12.0 bx	17.7
	Tracy	34.1 ax	25.2 ax	20.5 abx	26.6
	Centennial	33.7 ax	22.8 ax	25.6 ax	27.4
	Bragg	28.7 ax	20.9 ax	16.5 abx	22.0
	Average	27.9	20.3	17.6	
				continu	ed

		Ro	w Wi	Yield:	k	.)		
lanting			W WL		Inches			
Date	Variety	7		30		40		Average
				bu	chole/	acro-		
				Du	SIICE 57	acre-		
5/17	Hill	9.7	by	21.3	cdx	14.4	bxy	15.1
	Forrest	19.2	ax	13.7	dx	15.5	bx	16.8
	Tracy	23.9	ax	29.3	abx	26.5	ax	26.6
	Centennial	25.6	az	34.5	ax	30.0	ay	30.0
	Bragg	23.8	ax	24.2	bcx	25.4	ax	24.5
	Average	20.5		25.0		22.4		
6/5	Hill	15.3	bx	19.0	abx	18.7	ax	17.7
	Forrest	11.7	bx	17.0	bx	15.5	ax	14.8
	Tracy	20.3	abx	25.9	ax	18.9	ax	21.7
	Centennial	26.1	ax	29.2	ax	27.3	ax	27.5
	Bragg	20.4	abx	26.1	abx	21.8	ax	22.8
	Average	18.8		23.4		20.5		
6/15	Hill	5.2	bx	2.8	abx	4.0	bcx	4.0
	Forrest	1.1	cx	1.1	bx	1.0	dx	1.1
	Tracy	13.8	ax	13.4	ax	2.2	cdx	9.8
	Centennial	13.1	ax	7.8	abx	7.3	ax	9.4
	Bragg	2.6	су	3.3	abxy	4.4	bx	3.5
	Average	7.2		5.7		3.8		
6/29	Hill	6.6	bx	10.8	ax	8.4	ax	8.6
	Forrest	10.0	abx	10.7	ax	9.3	ax	10.0
	Tracy	11.0	abx	10.3	ax	9.2	ax	10.2
	Centennial	14.5	ax	10.9	ax	10.6	ax	12.0
	Bragg	11.9	ax	16.2	ax	10.5	ax	12.9
	Average	10.8		11.8		9.6		
							e	end of table

by the same letter (a, b, or c) are not different at a probability of equal to or less than 0.05 as determined by Duncan's new Multiple Range Test. Values across row widths within a date and within a variety are not different if followed by the same letter (x, y, or z).

2/ Hill seed was of poor quality and, although planting rate was increased, the resulting yield may be artificially low. Hill was therefore excluded in data analysis.

3/ Plots not harvested due to poor stands.

Planting Date		itera	0	
Date		Row Width	(inches)	
	Variety	7	40	Average
		1977		
		bus	hels/acre <sup>1/</sup>	
4/15	Hill	21.5 a x <sup>1</sup> /	25.4 b х	23.4
.,	Forrest	28.7 a x	30.0 ab x	29.4
	Tracy	26.4 a x	35.8 ах	31.1
	Bragg	21.2 a x	28.0 b x	24.6
	Average	24.4	29.8	27.1
5/2	H+11	31 3 b x	291 a v	30.2
572	Forrest	39.4 ab x	29.5 a x	34.4
	Tracy	43.5 a x	36.5 a v	40.0
	Bragg	33.0 b x	33.3 a x	33.2
	Average	36.8	32.1	34.5
5/16	Ht11	37.7 a x	32.8 h x	35.2
5710	Forrest	37.1 a x	38.5 b x	37.8
	Tracy	47.7 a x	44.7 a x	46.2
	Bragg	37.6 а х	36.8 b x	37.2
	Average	40.0	38.2	39.1
		1978	}	
/ / 21	$\frac{2}{2}$	<u>2</u> /		2/
4/21	Forrest	 11 3 a v	 28/1 a v	10.8
	Tracy	76av	194 h x	13 5
	Bragg	11.2 a x	10.6 c x	10.9
	00			
	Average	10.0	19.5	14.7
5/2	Hill $\frac{2}{2}$	2/		$\frac{2}{2}$
-, -	Forrest $\frac{2}{2}$		29.1 a	$\frac{2}{2}$ ,
	Tracy <u>2</u> /		17.1 Ъ	<u> </u>
	Bragg	7.6 x	9.5 c x	8.6
	Average			
5/22 3/	Hill	29.0 a v	29 2 a v	29 1
0, 22	Forrest	27.6 a x	22.2 ab y	24.9
				continued

Appendix 18	ble 4. (Co	ntinued)		
		Yield Row Width	* (inches)	
Planting Date		7	40	Average
			bushels/acre-	
	Tracy	14.9 b x	19 0 b v	17 0
	Bragg	14.3 b x	12.9 c x	13.6
	Average	21.4	20.8	21.2
6/6 <u>3</u> /	Hill	12.7 b у	23.6 a x	18.2
	Forrest	19.6 a x	21.8 а х	20.7
	Tracy	12.9 b y	20.0 a x	16.4
	Bragg	15.0 b x	15.9 b x	15.4
	Average	15.0	20.3	17.7
		1979		
5/3	Hill	20.4 ax	29.0 ax	24.7
57 5	Forrest	21.9 ax	29.2 ax	25.5
	Tracy	23.9 av	36.2 ax	30.0
	Bragg	25.1 ax	33.3 ax	29.2
	Average	24.0	31.9	27.4
5/28	Hill	41.7 abx	33.0 ax	37.3
	Forrest	45.8 ax	34.3 ax	40.0
	Tracy	38.1 bx	28.9 ax	33.5
	Bragg	39.5 abx	35.1 ax	36.3
	Average	41.3	32.8	36.8
6/14	Hill	32.8 ax	33.7 bx	33.2
0/11	Forrest	32.3 ax	37.2 abx	34.7
	Tracy	37.3 ax	36.4 abx	36.9
	Bragg	43.3 ax	40.1 ax	41.7
	Average	36.4	36.9	36.6
6/27	Hill	36.7 ax	27.4 by	32.0
	Forrest	39.9 ax	27.8 by	33.9
	Tracy	39.3 ax	30.9 bx	35.1
	Bragg	44.0 ax	35.6 ay	39.8
	Average	40.0	30.4	35.2 end of table

\*Adjusted to 13% moisture.

 $\frac{1}{1}$  Within each row width and planting date, values followed by the same letter (a or b) are not different at a probability of equal to or less than 0.05 as determined by Duncan's New Multiple Range Test. Values across row widths, within a date and within a variety are not different if followed by the same letter (x or y). <u>2</u>/

Not harvested because of poor stand.

3/ New source of Hill seed.

Dlaubius		Yield*	the (impless)		
Planting	Variatu		<u>(inches)</u>	Avoraço	
Date	Vallety		976	Average	
		bu	$shels/acre^{1/}$ -		
4/10	Vont	$33.5 \frac{1}{2}$	28 3 5	30.9	
4/19	Hill	35 0 a	20.J a 36 6 a	35.8	
	Forrest	39.8 a	39.8 a	39.8	
	Troov	44 2 2	4130	42 8	
	I acy	44.2 d	41.J a	42.0	
	Lee 74	41.1 d	34.5 a	34.0	
	ыадд	55.0 a	J4.J a	54.0	
	Average	37.9	36.2	37.1	
5/05	Kent	43.7 a	29.2 c	36.4	
	Hi11	32.3 a	39.2 abc	35.8	
	Forrest	38.3 a	31.5 bc	34.9	
	Tracy	48.1 a	41.2 ab	44.6	
	Lee 74	42.1 a	46.6 a	44.4	
	Bragg	43.0 a	36.8 abc	39.9	
	Average	41.2	37.4	39.3	
5/19	Kent	45.3 a	35.3 b	40.3	
-,	Hill	39.9 a	40.2 ab	40.0	
	Forrest	46.3 a	47.0 a	46.6	
	Tracy	36.0 a	39.5 b	37.8	
	Lee 74	44.9 a	38.9 b	41.9	
	Bragg	39.2 a	35.2 b	37.2	
	Average	41.9	39.4	40.6	
6/04	Kent	12.5 a	10.4 c	11.4	
ŕ	Hill	23.6 a	17.0 b	20.3	
	Forrest	24.3 a	16.2 b	20.2	
	Tracy	17.4 a	20.3 ab	18.8	
	Lee 74	22.1 a	22.2 a	22.2	
	Bragg	23.0 a	22.1 a	22.6	
	Average	20.5	18.0	19.3	
				continued	

Appendix Ta	able 5. (Con	tinued)			
		Yield*			
Planting	<del></del>	Row Width	(inched)		
Date	Variety	7	40	Average	
		b	ushels/acre		
7/01	Kent	10.8 Ъ	12.7 b	11.8	
,,	Hill	23.9 a	15.3 ab	19.6	
	Forrest	20.6 a	17.2 ab	18.9	
	Tracy	20.0 a	15.3 ab	17.6	
	Lee 74	22.7 a	18.5 a	20.6	
	Bragg	24.2 a	17.6 ab	20.9	
	Average	20.4	16.1	18.2	
7/10	I' o mt	7 2 -1	3/		
//10	Kent U411	1.3 ab	10.0	12.0	
	HILL	13.7 a	10.9 a	12.3	
	rorrest	12./ ab	0.9 а	9.8	
	Tracy	6.4 b	7.0 a	6.7	
	Lee 74	11.8 ab	8.9 a	10.4	
	Bragg	7.8 ab	11.7 a	9.8	
	00				
	Average	9.9	8.9	9.8	
			1977		
4/29	Hi]]	18.8 d x	18.7 b x	18.8	
., 25	Forrest	24.1 cd x	25.1 b x	24.6	
	Tracy	39.0 a x	38.1 a x	38.5	
	Centennial	36.5 ab x	39.7 a x	38.1	
	Bragg	28.3 bc x	34.0 a x	31.2	
	00				
	Average	39.3	31.1	30.2	
6/22	H;11	20 6 b v	18 8 h v	19 7	
0722	Forrest	24 0 ab v	20.0 D X	26.7	
	Tracy	28 / a -	29.5 d X	20.7	
	Contonnial	18 / L	27.8 o m	20.7	
	Bragg	21 8 h ···	27.0 a x	23.1 2/. Q	
	DLASS	21.0 D X	27.7 a x	24.0	
	Average	22.6	26.5	24.6	
7/6	Hill	13.9 h x	14.1 c x	14.0	
	Forrest	13.4 b v	18.1 bc x	15.8	
	Tracy	18.6 a v	17.4  cm	18.0	
	Centennial	14.7 b v	$27.2 \text{ ab } \mathbf{x}$	18.5	
	Bragg	20.2 a x	23.3 a x	21.8	
	Average	16.2	19.0	17.6	ontinued -

Appendix	Table 5. (Co	ntinued)			
		Yield*	a algert lane pak an agrar ger ga taga ganger ger	a kan dan generatin generati generati generati generati generati dan	
Planting	ana an main a	Row Width (i	nches)	-	
Date	Variety —	7	40	Average	
		bush	els/acre		
7/27	Hill R		1 .	2.7	
	Forrest	Not narvested	due to	3.4	
	Contonnial	insect damage		3.0	
	Brago			2.5	
	DIGEE			2.5	
		1978			
4/27	<u>-</u> Hill	18.3	22.1	20.2	
	Forrest	25.0 b x	28.4 ах	26.7	
	Tracy	26.1 b x	34.3 a x	30.2	
	Centennial	37.2 а х	33.8 а х	35.5	
	Bragg	37.2 ах	34.8 a x	36.0	
	Average	31.4	32.8	32.1	
5/24	Hill	28 1	31 9	30.0	
3721	Forrest	32.7 a x	30.8 b x	31.8	
	Tracy	34.4 a x	34.9 ab x	34.6	
	Centennial	34.9 a x	4.05 a x	37.7	
	Bragg	37.7 ах	31.4 b x	34.6	
	Average	35.0	34.4	34.7	
6/21	Hill	26.1	22.2	24.2	
	Forrest	30.4 a x	27.8 ах	29.1	
	Tracy	30.2 a x	30.9 a x	30.6	
	Centennial	35.8 a x	38.2 a x	37.0	
	Bragg	35.9 a x	30.8 a x	33.4	
	Average	33.1	31.9	32.5	
7/12	$H_{11} = \frac{4}{4}$	4/		4/	
,,12	Forrest	14.0 a x	11.5 a x	12.8	
	Tracy	11.4 a x	10.4 a x	10.9	
	Centennial	14.2 a x	16.3 a x	15.2	
	Bragg	19.1 a x	14.3 a x	16.7	
	Average	14.7	13.1	13.9	
	U				
				continued	

		Yield*		
Planting		Row Width	(inches)	
Date	Variety	7	40	Average
		197	9	
	_			
			busilets/acto	
4/19	Hill	25.8 bx	33.5 bx	29.7
	Forrest	33.0 abx	42.6 abx	37.8
	Tracy	31.7 abx	39.1 abx	35.4
	Centennial	35.7 ay	49.6 ax	42.6
	Bragg	32.5 aby	43.9 abx	38.2
	Average	31.7	41.7	36.7
5/28	Hi11	39.0 bx	32.6 bx	35.8
0, -0	Forrest	43.0 bx	34.8 bx	38.9
	Tracy	45.0 abx	39.8 abx	42.4
	Centennial	53.5 ax	43.4 ax	48.5
	Bragg	43.2 bx	40.4 abx	41.8
	Average	44.8	38.2	41.5
6/20	U:11	22 2 23	20 6	21 0
0/29	nili Fammaat	55.2 CX	30.0  CX	20.2
	Forrest	42.9 ax	35.0 DCy	39.2
	Iracy	30.9 DX	33.2 DCX	30.0
	Centennial	42.4 ax	43.5 ax	43.0
	Bragg	41./ ax	37.4 by	39.6
	Average	39.4	36.4	37.9
7/20	Hill	24.6 bx	20.0 bx	22.3
	Forrest	31.5 ax	22.9 aby	27.2
	Tracy	26.9 abx	17.7 by	22.3
	Centennial	28.4 abx	26.1 ax	27.3
	Bragg	31.3 ax	22.1 aby	26.7
	Average	28.6	21.7	25.2
	Ŭ			end of table

\*Adjusted to 13% moisture.

1/ Within each row width and planting date, values followed by the same letter (a, b, or c) are not different at a probability of equal to or less than 0.05 as determined by Duncan's New Multiple Range Test. Values across row widths, within a date and within a variety are not different if followed by the same letter (x or y).

 $\frac{2}{Plots}$  not harvested due to shattering.

- 3/ Hill seed was of poor quality and, although planting rate was increased, the resulting yield may be artificially low. Hill was therefore excluded in the data analysis.
- $\frac{4}{-}$  Was not harvested because of poor stand.

Appendix '	Table 6. Yie pla 197	eld of soy enting dat 76-79.	beans, by pla e, MAFES Sou	anting date, th Mississig	variety and ppi Branch,
•			Yield*		
_	_	Row	Width (inch	es)	
Planting 	Variety	7	30	40	Average
			1976		
			bushels	/acre	
4/28	Hill	$47.4 a^{-1/2}$	25.9 ab	29.4 ab	34.2 a
.,	Forrest	27.5 ab	20.3 b	25.5 в	24.4 b
	Pickett 71	23.5 b	26.2 ab	28.8 ab	26.1 ab
	Davis	25.7 ab	18.1 b	27.0 b	23.6 b
	Bragg	33.7 ab	34.1 a	33.0 ab 🕚	33.6 a
	Cobb	33.8 ab	26.2 ab	36.1 a	32.0 ab
	Average	31.9	25.1	29.9	29.0
5/13	Hill	33.6 ab	25.2 Ъ	22.2 bc	27.0 bc
	Forrest	28.7 b	17.5 c	23.2 bc	23.2 cd
	Pickett 71	. 38.7 ab	31.1 ab	27.7 ab	32.5 ab
	Davis	22.9 b	14.8 c	16.5 c	18.0 d
	Bragg	53.3 a	34.4 a	32.2 a	40.0 a
	Cobb	44.4 ab	26.6 b	29.5 ab	33.5 ab
	Average	36.9	24.9	25.2	29.0
6/18	Hill	24.6 ab	19.7 a	16.5 b	20.2 ab
	Forrest	33.8 a	22.8 a	23.8 a	26.8 a
	Pickett 7]	22.3 ab	17.5 a	19.3 ab	19.7 b
	Davis	21.0 ab	19.8 a	22.8 a	21.2 ab
	Bragg	35.3 a	24.3 a	20.4 ab	26.7 a
	Cobb	17.5 b	21.5 a	19.0 ab	19.3 b
	Average	25.7	20.9	20.3	22.3
			1977		
4/28	Hill	11.6 с х	9.7 d xy	3.8 с у	8.4 c
	Forrest	19.0 bc	x 14.3 cd x	6.8 c x	13.4 c
	Pickett 71	28.1 ab	x 21.8 bc x	13.6 bc x	21.1 b
	Davis	29.1 ab	x 29.6 ab x	28.8 a x	29.1 a
	Bragg	30.2 ab	x 38.0 ab x	19.2 ab x	25.8 ab
	Cobb	36.4 a x	35.8 a x	26.6 a x	32.9 a
					continued

Ī

Appendix Ta	ble 6. (Con	ntinued)			
		Yie Row W	eld* idth (inchor	2)	
Planting	-		Luch (Luches	<u>&gt;/</u>	
Date	Variety	77	30	40	Average
			bushels/ad	cre	
	Average	25.7	24.9	16.5	
5/12 2/ <sub>6/2</sub>	Hill Forrest Pickett 71 Davis Bragg Cobb Average Hill Forrest 71 Davis Bragg Cobb	18.9 a x 32.4 a x 32.8 a x 34.2 ax 29.7 ax 34.8 ax	19.6 a x 26.2 a x 23.6 a x 22.5 ax 21.2 ax 24.0 ax 22.8 11.1 12.4 26.4 28.8 24.6 30.0 22.2	17.6 a x 18.9 a x 23.4 a x 23.5 ax 20.0 ax 26.5 ax 21.7 14.8 15.6 17.8 16.5 14.6 24.5 17.3	18.7 b 25.8 ab 26.6 ab 26.7 ab 23.6 ab 28.4 a
			1978		
4/21 <u>3</u> /	Hill Forrest Pickett 71	29.1 37.8 a x 38.1 a x	22.6 25.10 a xy 25.6 a x	18.6 22.8 by 35.0 a x	23.4 28.6 32.9
	Davis Bragg Cobb	34.4 a x 30.7 a x 31.6 a x	33.1 a x 30.0 a x 26.2 a x	35.6 a x 30.5 ab x 30.9 ab x	34.4 30.4 29.6
	Average	34.5	28.0	31.0	31.2
5/11	Hill Forrest Pickett 71	27.6 36.2 ab x 39.2 ab x	29.6 30.7 ab xy 33.6 ab x	19.7 25.6 a y 26.9 a x	25.6 30.8 33.2
	Davis Bragg Cobb	41.1 a x 28.2 b x 41.4 a x	38.0 a x 23.5 b x 29.8 ab y	33.6 a x 31.9 a x 31.3 a y	37.6 27.9 34.2
	Average	37.2	31.1	29.9	32.7
				conti	nued

Appendix	Table 6. (Con	tinued)			
		Yie Row Wi	ld* dth (inches)		
Planting	Variety	7	30	40 4	verage
Date	Variety		1 1 1-/		
	_		-bushels/acr	e	
6/12	Hill Forrest	28.3 30.7 a x	25.4 30.5 a x	15.3 21.5 b x	23.0
	Pickett 71	39.4 a x	22.5 a y	21.4 b y	27.8
	Davis	34.3 a x	26.6 a x	23.6 ab x	28.2
	Eragg Cobb	30.1 ах 42.6 ах	25.1 a x 30.8 a x	20.4 b x 30.0 a x	25.2 34.5
	Average	35.4	27.1	23.4	28.7
			1979		
4/17	IIi11 Forrest Pickett 71	0 by 0 by 0 by	16.5 cx 17.5 cx 19.9 cx	13.1 cx 16.9 bcx 17.6 bcx	9.8 11.5 12.5
	Davis Bragg Cobb	20.1 ay 23.5 axy 0 by	33.5 ax 26.9 bx 35.9 ax	24.5 bxy 18.3 bcy 38.7 ax	26.1 22.8 24.8
	Average	7.3	25.0	21.5	
5/3	Hill Forrest Pickett 71	21.5 bx 20.5 bx 22.9 bx	20.9 cx 27.1 cx 32.9 bx	19.7 cx 21.0 cx 29.8 bx	20.7 22.9 28.5
	Davis Bragg Cobb	41.0 ax 40.3 ax 52.6 ax	37.5 abx 37.0 abx 41.1 ay	30.2 bx 32.7 abx 37.9 ay	36.3 36.7 43.9
	Average	33.2	32.8	28.6	
5/18	Hill Forrest Pickett <b>7</b> 1	28.0 bx 32.3 bx 28.2 bx	26.8 cdx 20.8 dy 30.4 bcx	17.4 cy 25.6 bxy 30.9 abx	24.1 26.2 29.8
	Davis Bragg Cobb	34.3 bx 36.7 bx 58.7 ax	35.1 abx 37.7 abx 40.0 ay	32.0 abx 26.1 by 35.9 ay	33.8 33.5 44.8
	Average	36.4	31.8	28.0	end of table

\*Adjusted to 13% moisture.

- 1/ Within each row width and planting date, values followed by the same letter (a, b, c or d), are not different at a probability of equal to or less than 0.05 as determined by Duncan's New Multiple Range Test. Values across row widths, within a date and within a variety, are not different if followed by the same letter (x or y).
- 2/ Data in the June 2 planting were not included in analysis because drilled plots were not harvested due to poor stands caused by severe drought at planting. The data reported in this planting are averages of 3 replications.
- 3/ Hill seed was of poor quality and, although planting rate was increased, the resulting yield may be artificially low. Hill was therefore excluded in the data analysis.

vears and months. Rainfall (inches) by weeks. Annendix Table 7.

				Rainfall			
Month	Week	Verona	Starkville	Brooksville	Newton H	Raymond	Poplarville
				inches			
				1976			
pril	1-7	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
4	° 8–14	0.4	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
	15-21	0.5	0.0	0.0		0.3	0.2
	22-28	0.7	1.1	1.9		1.0	1.2
	29–30	0.2	0.0	0.1		0.1	0.5
	Monthly Total	1.8	1.1	2.0		1.4	1.9
ay	1-7	0.0	2.0	1.5		0.4	1.2
	8-14	2.0	2.7	2.9		3.8	1.0
	15 - 21	0.8	1.3	0.8		0.5	0.0
	22-28	0.7	0.4	0.9		1.4	1.9
	29-31	0.3	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
	Monthly Total	3.8	6.4	6.1		6.1	4.1
une	1-7	1.9	1.6	2.1		0.5	0.7
	8-14	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
	15-21	2.5	1.2	1.9		1.4	1.1
	22-28	0.6	1.2	1.3		1.5	0.3
	29-30	0.0	0.2	0.0		1.1	1.6
	Monthly Total	5.0	4.2	5.3		4.5	3.7
							,

38

Appendix Table 7. (Continued)

nond Foplarville		.4 4.9	.0 0.2	.5 0.2	.0 0.9	.0 1.2	.9 7.4	.3 1.9	.0 0.0	.0 0.2	.2 0.4	.0 2.0	.5 4.5	.3 3.1	.0 0.0	.1 0.0	.0 0.2	.3 0.0	.7 3.3	.0 -1/	.0 0.0	.0 1.5	.1 1.3	.2 2.9
l Newton Rayn		2	0.	.0	0.	0.	2.	0	.0	.0	1.	0.	1,	0.	.0	0.	0.	.0	0	0.	0.	.0	.0	1.
Raínfal. Brooksville	inches-	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.4	2.6	0.9	0.0	5.1	0.0	0.0	6.0	2.6	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4	1.2	0.0	0.5	1.1	0.8
Starkville		1.7	0.0	0.1	3.1	0.2	5.1	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.8	1.5	1.8	0.9	0.6	0.3	5.1	1.2	0.0	0.3	0.8	1.0
Verona		0.4	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.5	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.4	3.4	1.2	5.0	3.2	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.1	4.8	1.2	0.1	1.0	1.2	1.2
Meek		1-7	8-14	15-21	22-28	29-31	Monthly Total	1-7	8-14	15-21	22-28	29-31	Monthly Total	1-7	8-14	15-21	22-28	29-30	Monthly Total	1-7	8-14	15-21	22-28	29-31
Month		July	5					August	I					September						October				

			1	1																			
	Poplarville				0.5	0.0	3.0	0.8	0.0	4.3	2.6	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.2	3.2	0.9	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	1.3	inued
	Raymond	1.3			6.0	0.0	0.6	3.0	0.0	9.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.1	0.0	1.0	0.6	0.0	1.7	cont
	Newton				3.6	0.0	0.9	3.6	0.0	8.1	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.6	. 2.4	0.5	0.4	0.6	1.1	0.0	2.6	
	Brooksville	inches3.6		1977	2.9	0.0	0.2	3.7	0.0	6.8	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.1	0.9	
	Starkville	3.3			6.5	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.9	
	Verona	4.7			5.2	0.0	0.2	1.4	0.0	6.8	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.3	1.1	0.3	0.0	0.8	0.1	0.0	1.2	
able 7. (Continued	Week	Monthlv Total	•		1-7	8-14	15-21	22-28	29–30	Monthly Total	1-7	8-14	15-21	22-28	29-31	Monthly Total	1-7	8-14	15-21	22-28	29–30	Monthly Total	
Appendî.x Tê	Month				April						May						June						

Appendix Table 7. (Continued)

		Poplarville		1.6	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.4	8.1	0.4	1.5	4.2	0.8	1.3	8.2	2.7	2.5	0.3	0.3	0.9	6.7	0.4	1.1	0.0	1.4	0.0 ontinued
		Raymond		1.4	1.2	1.6	1.0	0.0	5.2	0.1	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.6	2.0	0.9	0.0	0.7	0.0	1.0	2.6	1.8	2.6	0.0	0.3	0.0 c
		Newton		0.0	1.5	1.5	1.5	3.2	7.7	1.1	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.2	1.9	4.2	0.9	0.4	0.0	2.1	7.6	0.7	1.1	0.0	5.1	0.0
	Rainfal	Brooksville	inches-	0.0	4.5	0.6	3.0	1.3	9.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	5.2	0.9	1.9	0.4	1.3	9.7	0.0	2.1	0.0	2.2	0.0
		Starkville		0.3	3.2	0.5	3.7	1.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	6.0	2.9	1.8	1.6	0.5	0.9	7.7	0.0	2.9	0.0	2.1	0.0
<b>b</b>		Verona		0.0	2.7	1.9	0.5	0.5	5.6	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.9	0.8	2.3	1.8	0.9	6.7	0.9	1.7	0.0	2.2	0.0
		Week		1-7	8-14	15-21	22-28	29-31	Monthly Total	1-7	8-14	15-21	22-28	29-31	Monthly Total	1-7	8-14	15-21	22-28	29–30	Monthly Total	1-7	8-14	15-21	22-28	29-31
or wrainodda		Month		July	1					August						September						October				

continued

1	1 1	I	[ ]																	
	Poplarville	2.9		0.0	۲.۶ 1.2	0.1	0.0	4.2	4.1	1.5	0.8	0.1	0.0	6.5	2.0	6.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	8.4
	laymond	4.7		0.0	1. 1. 1.	0.7	0.0	3*3	4.4	3.1	0.4	0.3	1.3	9.5	0.5	0.7	1.1	0.0	0.0	2.3
11	Newton F	6.9		0.0	2.4 0.4	0.4	0.0	3.7	2.1	3.0	0.3	0.4	0.0	5.8	0.5	1.7	0.1	0.2	0.0	2.5
Rainfe	Brocksville	inche: 4.3	1978	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	1.3	3.0	4.6	0.2	2.3	0.6	10.7	0.4	0.5	1.2	0.0	0.0	2.1
	tarkville	5.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.5	5.8	1.0	0.5	1.7	10.5	1.2	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
ed)	Verona S	4.8		0.0	1.1 1.2	0.3	0.0	2.6	7.0	2.0	0.1	1.2	1.9	12.2	0.7	0.9	1.2	0.0	0.0	2.8
fable 7. (Continu	Week	Monthly Total		1-7	o-14 15-21	22-28	29-30	Monthly Total	1-7	8-14	15-21	22-28	29-31	Monthly Total	1-7	8-14	15-21	22-28	29-30	Monthly Total
Appendix I	Menth			April					May						June					

Appendix Table 7. (Continued)

				Rainfa	11		
	Week	Verona	Starkville	Brooksville	Newton Ra	aymond	Poplarville
				inche			
	1-7	0.0	0.1	0.3	1.7	0.0	0.2
	8-14 15-21	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.4	1.4	0.5
	22-28	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	) ) ()
	29 - 31	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	1.8
	Monthly Total	1.7	1.8	1.8	3.3	3.4	5.8
ц.	1-7	1.0	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.0	1.9
	8-14	0.3	1.7	1.3	1.8	0.3	3.3
	15-21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.3	0.4
	22-28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
	29-31	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	2.6	0.2
	Monthly Total	1.4	2.0	1.5	2.9	3.2	6.7
mber	1-7	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0
	8-14	0.3	1.3	0.3	0.4	0.1	1.3
	15-21	1.9	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.5	0.0
	22-28	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.7	2.4
	29-30	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
	Monthly Total	2.3	2.0	1.9	0.4	1.5	4.0
er	1-7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	8-14	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.9	0.0
	15-21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
						Ū	continued

Poplarville 3.3 1.3 0.0 0.4 1.6  $0.4 \\ 0.2 \\ 0.0 \\ 0.0 \\ 0.4$ 0.0 0.0 7.0 0.4 0.0 6.3 0.0 13.7 6.6 continued 3.1 6.1 0.0 1.3 0.0 10.5 0.8 2.4 0.0 1.3 5.5 1.4 0.0 0.8 0.8 0.0 0.9 Raymond 0.0 0.2 3.5 7.4 0.0 1.4 0.0 12.3 1.6 0.1 1.7 1.3 4.7 1.6 0.1 0.3 0.3 0.0 Brooksville Newton Rainfall -inches-1979 2.1 16.2 0.0 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 19.1 1.1 2.8 0.0 1.9 6.5 0.4 0.0 0.0 1.1 Starkville 2.4 13.2 0.0 0.8 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.5 0.3 16.4 1.9 0.2 1.3 0.1 0.6 0.1 2.8 4.8 0.9 0.0 6.6 3.5 1.2 0.0 3.6 9.6 0.8 0.6 1.9 0.0 0.0 0.2 Verona (Continued) Monthly Total Monthly Total Monthly Total 15-21 22-28 29-31 22-28 29-31 15-21 22-28 29-30 15-21 22-28 29-30 1-7 8-14 1-7 8-14 8-14 1 - 7Week 7. Appendix Table Month April June May

	l ewton Raymond Poplarville		2.0 2.2 1.0	0.5 0.3 0.0	5.5 3.1 4.5	0.7 0.6 1.2	1.9 0.8 6.2	0.0 0.0	8.6 4.8 11.9	1.7 0.2 0.4	1.5 0.5 0.1	0.0 0.3 0.5	2.5 3.8 1.7	0.0 0.0	5.7 4.8 2.7	0.2 0.2 1.1	3.9 0.2 2.5	2.9 3.3 1.8	0.0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	7.0 3.7 5.4	continued
	Rainfall le Brooksville Ne	inches-	1.5	1.7	4.0	1.0	1.4	0.2	8.3	0.2	2.2	0.0	1.3	0.0	3.7	1.1	4.3	3.9	0.0	0.0	5.3	
	ona Starkvil		3 2.3	9 1.4	3 7.8	1 1.1	7 1.8	0.3	0 12.3	0.0 0.0	3 0.1	2 0.0	0.0 0.0	2 0.4	7 0.5	0 0.7	5 4.0	6 5.3	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	1 10.0	
re / (courruned)	Week Vero		Monthly Total 3.	1-7 4.	8-14 2.	15-21 0.	22-28 1.	29-31 0.	Monthly Total 9.	1-7 1.	8-14 0.	15-21 0.	22-28 4.	29-31 0.	Monthly Total 5.	1-7 1.	8-14 3.	15-21 2.	22-28 0.	29-30 0.	Monthly Total 7.	
Appendix Iab	Month			July						August						September						

	Poplarville		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.0	1.6 end of table				
	Raymond		0.0	0.1	0.0	0.5	1.6	2.2				
a11	Newton	S	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.0				
Rainf	Brooksville	inch∈	0.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.1				
	Starkville		1.2	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.6	2.2				
	Verona		1.0	0,3	0.0	0.5	0.1	1.9				
	Week		1-7	8-14	15-21	22-28	29-31	Monthly Total	not recorded.			
	Month		October						1/ Rainfall			