

Measured Crop Performance

SMALL GRAIN

1981

D. T. BOWMAN, Assistant Professor

A. R. ADAMS, Research Assistant

E. L. JONES, Agricultural Research Supervisor

G. C. OLIVER, Agricultural Research Assistant

Department of Crop Science
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
AT RALEIGH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
COMPARING VARIETIES	1
EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE	5
Entries	5
Field Plot Design	5
Crop Management	5
Agencies Sponsoring Entries	8
Cooperators	8
SEASONAL CONDITIONS	9
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	9
Barley	9
Oats	9
Wheat	10
Wheat and Flour Analyses	10
 TABLES	
1. Characteristics of barley varieties	3
2. Characteristics of oat varieties	3
3. Characteristics of wheat varieties	4
4. Cultural practices for Small Grain - 1981	7
5. Summary of barley performance trials in the Piedmont	11
6. Summary of barley performance trials in the Coastal Plain and Tidewater	11
7. Barley performance at three locations in the Piedmont	12
8. Barley performance at one location in the Coastal Plain and two in the Tidewater	13
9. Summary of oat performance trials in the Piedmont	14
10. Summary of oat performance trials in the Coastal Plain and Tidewater	14
11. Oat performance at three locations in the Piedmont	15
12. Oat performance at one location in the Coastal Plain and two in the Tidewater	16
13. Summary of wheat performance trials in the Piedmont	17
14. Summary of wheat performance in the Coastal Plain and Tidewater.	17
15. Wheat performance at three locations in the Piedmont.....	18
16. Wheat performance at one location in the Coastal Plain and two in the Tidewater	20
17. Comparison of wheat entries for wheat and flour qualities from 1979-80 tests	22

1981

PERFORMANCE OF SMALL GRAIN VARIETIES IN NORTH CAROLINA

INTRODUCTION

Across the State of North Carolina during the fall of 1980, growers planted 69,000 acres of barley, 160,000 acres of oats, and 325,000 acres of wheat.

With the large number of commercially available and prospective varieties of barley, oats, and wheat, it becomes difficult for growers to select a superior variety suited for their particular area of the state. To make this decision the grower needs up-to-date, unbiased, reliable information. The Official Variety Testing Program through this report seeks to provide that type of information.

Information on varietal performance is presented from six test locations in the state--three in the Piedmont, one in the Coastal Plain and two in the Tidewater Region. Also included are multiple-year performance data on a selected number of varieties.

COMPARING VARIETIES

Performance of a variety cannot be determined with absolute precision. Even though the tests are conducted in a uniform manner, as much as possible, uncontrollable variability exists among experimental plots due to soil, fertility, moisture, insects, diseases, and other sources of variation. Because this variability exists, statistics are used as a tool to determine differences among varieties. The size of difference among varieties which may have been due to chance variation is listed in each table as the L.S.D. (least significant difference) and those varieties which do not differ by more than the L.S.D. are statistically not different. Those varieties that do differ by more than the L.S.D. are statistically different.

Varietal performance may appear inconsistent among locations within an area or among years at a particular location, thus it is important for the reader to examine results from more than one location within an area or more than one year at a particular location to obtain a more accurate picture of relative varietal performance. An effort has been made to facilitate comparisons among locations and years in this report.

The varieties which do not yield significantly less than the highest yielding variety are denoted by an asterisk (*) next to their yields. The relative performance of a variety across locations within an area or across years at a particular location can be easily evaluated by going across the table; those varieties which are most frequently marked by an asterisk would be highly desirable. Other agronomic characteristics may be as equally important as yield. All available data regarding pathologic and agronomic characteristics of the varieties are found in Tables 1, 2 and 3 for barley, oats, and wheat, respectively.^{1/}

It is suggested that the grower plant a small number of acres in a new variety when first determining if it is adapted to his farm.

^{1/}Special acknowledgment is due Drs. T. T. Hebert and C. F. Murphy for their assistance in describing the characteristics of the varieties.

Table 1. Characteristics of barley varieties*

Variety	Mildew resist- ance	Rust resist- ance	Scald resist- ance	Lodging resist- ance	Winter hardi- ness	Maturity	Test Weight lb/bu	Length of awns
Boone	Fair	Good	Fair	Good	Good	Early	High	Short
Clayton	Good	Excellent	Fair	Good	Good	Early	Medium	Awnless
Keowee	Good	Poor	Fair	Good	Good	Early	High	Short
Maury	Good	Medium	Good	Good	Good	Early	High	Awnless

Table 2. Characteristics of oat varieties*

Variety	Rust resist- ance	Smut resist- ance	Mosaic resist- ance	Maturity	Winter hardi- ness	Lodging resist- ance	Test Weight lb/bu
Carolee	Fair	Good	Fair	Medium	Fair	Good	Medium
Coker 227	Excellent	Good	Good	Med. Early	Good	Good	Med. High
Salem	Fair	Good	Good	Medium	Fair	Excellent	High
Brooks	Fair	Good	Good	Early	Good	Excellent	Med. High
Coker 716	Fair	Good	Good	Medium	Good	Excellent	Med. High
Firecracker	Fair	Good	Good	Early	Poor	Excellent	Med. High

*These characteristics based upon all available observations.

Table 3. Characteristics of wheat varieties*

Variety	Leaf rust resist- ance	Mildew resist- ance	Mosaic resist- ance	Maturity	Winter Hardi- ness	Lodging resist- ance	Height of Straw	Test Weight lb/bu	Soft Wheat Milling Quality
Arthur**	Good	Fair	Good	Medium	Excellent	Good	Semi-Dwarf	High	Good
Blueboy II	Good	Poor	Good	Medium	Excellent	Excellent	Semi-Dwarf	Medium	Good
Blueboy	Poor	Fair	Good	Medium	Excellent	Excellent	Semi-Dwarf	Medium	Good
Coker 747	Good	Good	Good	Medium	Good	Good	Semi-Dwarf	High	Good
Coker 762	Excellent	Good	Good	Medium	Fair	Fair	Semi-Dwarf	Medium	Good
Coker 797	Good	Good	Fair	Early	Good	Excellent	Semi-Dwarf	High	Good
Delta Queen	Good	Good	Good	Medium	Good	Good	Semi-Dwarf	High	Good
Pioneer brand S76	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Medium	Good	Excellent	Medium	High	Poor
Pioneer brand S78	Fair	Poor	Excellent	Medium	Good	Excellent	Medium	High	Poor
McNair 1003	Fair	Good	Good	Medium	Excellent	Excellent	Medium	Medium	Good
Roland	Good	Good	Good	Medium	Excellent	Good	Semi-Dwarf	High	Good
Roy	Good	Fair	Good	Medium	Good	Excellent	Semi-Dwarf	Medium	Good
Southern Belle	Good	Fair	Good	Early	Fair	Excellent	Semi-Dwarf	High	Fair
Stacy	Good	Good	Fair	Medium	Good	Good	Semi-Dwarf	High	Fair
Stoddard	Fair	Poor	Good	Medium	Good	Good	Medium	High	
Tyler	Poor	Good		Late	Good	Good	Medium	Medium	Good
Wheeler	Fair	Fair		Medium	Good	Good	Medium	Good	Good

*These characteristics based upon all available observations.

**Resistant to Hessian Fly.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

The state is divided into three physiographic regions and tests were located in the Piedmont, Coastal Plain, and Tidewater (Figure 1). Four tests were located on private farms^{2/} and two were on research stations.

Entries: Commercial varieties and experimental lines developed by public and private agencies are included in these tests. Any individual or firm may make application for having entries included by writing the Department of Crop Science, North Carolina State University at Raleigh. A fee is charged on an entry basis for all private entries. Entries about which further information was desired may have been included on a no-fee basis. A total of 6, 14, and 25 commercial varieties and experimental lines of barley, oats, and wheat, respectively, were evaluated in the 1980-81 season.

Field Plot Design: A randomized, complete block design with four replications was used at each location.^{3/} Each plot consisted of seven rows, seven inches apart, fifteen feet long with two feet between each plot.

Crop Management: Cultural practices, such as seed bed preparation, date of planting, fertilization and topdressing were in accord with good farming practices and were uniform for all entries at a given location (Table 4). Several months prior to planting each test, soil samples were obtained from the test field and fertilizer and lime applications were made accordingly.

^{2/}The cooperative spirit and civic-minded service rendered by the farmers who provided the land and the necessary cultural practices for these trials and the cooperation of the county agents are gratefully acknowledged.

^{3/}Statistical analyses were made in the statistical laboratory under the supervision of Dr. J. O. Rawlings and Mrs. Sandra Donaghy. This assistance is gratefully acknowledged.

1981




FIGURE 1—LOCATION OF SMALL GRAIN PERFORMANCE TRIALS

Table 4. Cultural practices for small grain tests - 1981.

Area and Cooperator	Fertilizer lbs/A & Grade	pH Results	Topdress lbs/A	Soil Type	Date of Planting	Date of Harvest
<u>Piedmont Area</u>						
Chatham County John Thompson	225 lbs. 0-46-0	6.1	75 lbs. 33.5% Amm. Nit.	Georgeville Silt Loam	November 7	June 16
Rowan County Clyde McSwain	900 lbs. 10-20-20	6.0	None	Cecil Sandy Loam	October 15	June 22
Stanly County Burleson Brothers	250 lbs. 10-20-20	6.4	75 lbs. 33.5% Amm. Nit.	Alamance Gravely Silt Loam	October 16	June 9
<u>Coastal Plain Area</u>						
Wayne County Wayland Price	500 lbs. 5-10-30	5.3	100 lbs. 30% Nit. Sol.	Goldsboro Sandy Loam	October 17	June 11
<u>Tidewater Area</u>						
Perquimans County Albert D. Eure	1100 lbs. 10-5-5	6.1	None	Portsmouth Fine Sandy Loam	October 21	June 17
Washington County John Smith	350 lbs. 3-15-30	6.0	65 lbs. 30% Nit. Sol.	Hyde Loam	October 23	June 10

Agencies Sponsoring Entries

Coker's Pedigreed Seed Company	Hartsville, South Carolina
Northrup King Company	Laurinburg, North Carolina
North American Plant Breeders	Brookston, Indiana
North Carolina Agricultural Expt. Sta.	Raleigh, North Carolina
Pioneer Hi-Bred International, Inc.	Tipton, Indiana
Purdue University Agricultural Expt. Sta.	Lafayette, Indiana
South Carolina Agricultural Expt. Sta.	Clemson, South Carolina
Virginia Agricultural Expt. Sta.	Blacksburg, Virginia

CooperatorsPiedmont

Chatham County: John Thompson, Route 4, Siler City, North Carolina
County Extension Chairman, John Cooper and Agricultural Extension
Agent, Carl Outz

Rowan County: Clyde McSwain, Superintendent, Piedmont Research
Station, Salisbury, North Carolina
County Extension Chairman, J. Harold Caudill

Stanly County: Ronnie Burlison, Route 1, New London, North Carolina
County Extension Chairman, J. Frank Simpson

Coastal Plain

Wayne County: Wayland Price, Route 4, Mt. Olive, North Carolina
County Extension Chairman, Wesley Townsend

Tidewater

Perquimans County: Albert D. Eure, Route 3, Hertford, North Carolina
County Extension Chairman, Richard H. Bryant

Washington County: John Smith, Superintendent, Tidewater Research
Station, Plymouth, North Carolina
County Extension Chairman, Guy M. Whitford

SEASONAL CONDITIONS

The 1980-81 small grain growing season was characterized by above-normal temperatures and below-average rainfall. Late season rains caused some regrowth and delayed harvest of small grains, particularly oats.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Barley

Barley performance is summarized across locations within regions (Tables 5 and 6). There was a significant location by entry interaction in the Piedmont indicating that entries differed significantly in response to the environment associated with locations in that region and this should be taken into consideration when examining the data in Table 5. Averaged across locations, Milton yielded significantly higher than all other entries in the Piedmont (Table 5). In the Tidewater, Milton and the experimental line, NC 75-140, were the highest yielders (Table 6).

Multiple-year data at individual locations are shown in Table 7 and 8. In the Piedmont (Table 7), the entries were severely lodged at Rowan and Stanly Counties due to late rains and subsequent late harvest. In the Coastal Plain and Tidewater (Table 8), the entries were again severely lodged at two locations (Perquimans and Wayne Counties). Outstanding yields were obtained at the Perquimans test even though lodging was prevalent.

Oats

Oat performance is first presented across locations within regions (Tables 9 and 10). In both regions there was significant location by entry interaction indicating that entries differed significantly in response to the environment associated with locations, and this should be taken into consideration when examining the data in Tables 9 and 10. In the Piedmont (Table 9), Brooks, Coker 716, Bob, NC 78-17, and NC 78-25 were the highest

yielders when averaged across locations. While in the Tidewater (Table 10), NC 77-32 and Coker 716 yielded significantly more than all other entries.

Oat performance across years at individual locations are presented in Tables 11 and 12. Lodging was a factor at Stanly County in the Piedmont (Table 11) and at Perquimans and Wayne Counties in the Coastal Plain and Tidewater (Table 12).

Wheat

Tables 13 and 14 summarize wheat performance across locations within regions. In both regions there was a significant locations by entry interaction indicating that entries differed significantly in response to the environment associated with locations, and this should be taken into consideration when examining the data in Tables 13 and 14. Lodging was not a major problem in either region. In the Piedmont (Table 13), Tyler and McNair 1003 significantly outyielded all other entries when averaged across locations while Roy and McNair 1003 were the top yielders in the Tidewater (Table 14).

Multiple-year data are presented in Tables 15 and 16. The increased interest in wheat production in North Carolina has resulted in a substantial increase in the number of wheat entries tested in recent years; therefore, data may be available from only one year for a number of entries.

Wheat and Flour Analyses

Coded samples of wheat from the 1979-80 Official Variety Tests were submitted for wheat and flour analyses to Statesville Flour Mills in Statesville. Such analyses are helpful in determining whether released varieties or potential varieties are suitable for the mills in terms of quality. Table 17 lists the results from the analyses. Special acknowledgment is due Statesville Flour Mills for their assistance in making available these data.

Table 5. Summary of barley performance trials in the Piedmont.

Variety or Line	Chatham County bu/A	Rowan County bu/A	Stanly County bu/A	Average		
				Yield bu/A	Test Wt. lbs/bu	% Lodging
Clayton	73.0*	96.3	66.0	78.5	43.7	64.6
Boone	79.3*	119.3**	78.8	92.5	46.8	87.0
Keowee	80.5*	106.3	71.1	86.0	46.5	66.7
Milton	84.4**	112.0*	100.4**	98.9**	47.2	68.3
+NC 75-140	81.5*	113.5*	82.1	92.4	43.9	59.2
+NC 77-11	72.8*	103.1	83.1	86.3	45.7	63.8
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>78.6</u>	<u>108.4</u>	<u>80.3</u>	<u>89.1</u>	<u>45.6</u>	<u>68.3</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	N.S.	11.6	16.8	6.3		
C.V. (%)	7.4	6.7	13.2	9.2		

Table 6. Summary of barley performance trials in the Coastal Plain and Tidewater.

Variety or Line	Perquimans County bu/A	Washington County bu/A	Wayne County bu/A	Average ^{1/}		
				Yield bu/A	Test Wt. lbs/bu	% Lodging
Clayton	105.4	71.4	72.7	88.4	48.0	42.5
Boone	108.8	73.3	86.7*	92.0	46.2	32.5
Keowee	112.0	72.9	75.8	92.4	47.5	43.8
Milton	119.4*	86.4**	81.5	102.9**	48.2	47.5
+NC 75-140	125.2**	78.4*	91.0**	101.8*	44.1	21.3
+NC 77-11	102.8	68.5	74.1	85.7	47.0	36.3
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>112.3</u>	<u>75.5</u>	<u>80.3</u>	<u>93.9</u>	<u>46.8</u>	<u>37.3</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	11.1	9.5	7.8	6.3		
C.V. (%)	6.4	7.8	6.5	7.0		

+Experimentals.

*Not significantly different from highest yielder.

**Highest yielder in test.

^{1/}Average of Perquimans and Washington Counties.

Table 7. Barley performance at three locations in the Piedmont.

Variety or Line	1981 bu/A	1980 bu/A	1979 bu/A	1978 bu/A	1981	
					Test Wt. lbs/bu	% Lodging
<u>Chatham County</u>						
Clayton	73.0*	61.2*	----	64.1* ^{1/}	44.7	1.3
Boone	79.3*	72.5*	----	72.7**	47.8	65.0
Keowee	80.5*	62.1*	----	67.4*	46.6	12.5
Milton	84.4**	73.6**	----	57.8*	47.3	15.0
+NC 75-140	81.5*	59.0*	----	70.8*	43.0	5.0
+NC 77-11	72.8*				46.4	13.8
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>78.6</u>	<u>58.5</u>		<u>63.2</u>	<u>46.0</u>	<u>18.8</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	N.S.	15.2 ^{2/}		N.S.		
C.V. (%)	7.4			9		
<u>Rowan County</u>						
Clayton	96.3	70.3*	79.3	99.1**	43.4	95.0
Boone	119.3**	85.4**	93.8*	90.2*	46.3	100.0
Keowee	106.3	80.0*	88.8*	93.2*	47.5	90.0
Milton	112.0*	85.1*	101.3**	94.4*	47.2	95.0
+NC 75-140	113.5*	80.9*	84.3	95.4*	44.2	77.5
+NC 77-11	103.1				45.5	82.5
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>108.4</u>	<u>76.5</u>	<u>84.4</u>	<u>88.1</u>	<u>47.7</u>	<u>90.0</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	11.6	15.2 ^{2/}	15.0	10.5		
C.V. (%)	6.7		12	8		
<u>Stanly County</u>						
Clayton	66.0	73.4*	39.7	43.3*	43.1	97.5
Boone	78.8	81.5**	65.4*	52.7**	46.4	96.3
Keowee	71.1	69.9*	58.9*	46.0*	45.3	97.5
Milton	100.4**	79.2*	66.6**	48.2*	47.0	95.0
+NC 75-140	82.1	81.5**	46.2	40.4*	44.6	95.0
+NC 77-11	83.1				45.2	95.0
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>80.3</u>	<u>74.0</u>	<u>50.9</u>	<u>44.2</u>	<u>45.3</u>	<u>96.1</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	16.8	15.2 ^{2/}	14.8	N.S.		
C.V. (%)	13.2		20	15		

^{1/}Orange County results.

^{2/}Taken from combined analyses.

+Experimentals.

*Not significantly different from the highest yielder.

**Highest yielder in test.

Table 8. Barley performance at one location in the Coastal Plain and two in the Tidewater.

Variety or Line	1981 bu/A	1980 bu/A	1979 bu/A	1978 bu/A	1981	
					Test Wt. lbs/bu	% Lodging
<u>Perquimans County</u>						
Clayton	105.4	46.1*	53.6*	78.6* ^{1/}	48.0	85.0
Boone	108.8*	46.2*	66.5**	63.7	47.2	65.0
Keowee	112.0*	47.9*	61.9*	87.9*	49.0	87.5
Milton	119.4*	55.7**	52.7*	68.2	48.8	95.0
+NC 75-140	125.2**	44.1	44.8	89.4**	46.4	42.5
+NC 77-11	102.8				47.1	72.5
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>112.3</u>	<u>47.5</u>	<u>56.2</u>	<u>68.6</u>	<u>47.8</u>	<u>74.6</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	11.1	11.0 ^{2/}	9.4	14.9		
C.V. (%)	6.4		12	10		
<u>Washington County</u>						
Clayton	71.4	70.3	61.5*	60.1	48.0	0.0
Boone	73.3	82.9**	75.9**	----	45.3	0.0
Keowee	72.9	80.2*	72.8*	66.6	46.0	0.0
Milton	86.4**	82.2*	74.5*	50.0	47.6	0.0
+NC 75-140	78.4*	77.9*	58.5	78.9**	41.9	0.0
+NC 77-11	68.5				46.9	0.0
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>75.5</u>	<u>74.7</u>	<u>61.5</u>	<u>60.8</u>	<u>46.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	9.5	11.0 ^{2/}	14.5	11.0		
C.V. (%)	7.8		16			
<u>Wayne County</u>						
Clayton	72.7	79.4*	50.8*	89.6*	38.4	98.3
Boone	86.7*	70.1*	57.2*	93.2*	43.1	71.3
Keowee	75.8	67.7	65.9**	93.8**	42.8	100.0
Milton	81.5	65.7	62.6*	65.4	43.2	100.0
+NC 75-140	91.0**	80.4**	48.2*	75.4	42.2	96.3
+NC 77-11	74.1				41.6	100.0
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>80.3</u>	<u>68.2</u>	<u>53.8</u>	<u>76.2</u>	<u>41.9</u>	<u>94.3</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	7.8	11.0 ^{2/}	19.3	10.6		
C.V. (%)	6.5		18	10		

^{1/}Lenoir County results.

^{2/}Taken from combined analyses.

+Experimentals.

*Not significantly different from highest yielder.

**Highest yielder in test.

Table 9. Summary of oat performance trials in the Piedmont.

Variety or Line	Chatham County bu/A	Rowan County bu/A	Stanly County bu/A	Average		
				Yield bu/A	Test Wt. lbs/bu	% Lodging
Carolee	98.1	114.4	117.5	110.0	36.6	47.9
Salem	100.6	127.2	116.1	114.7	38.4	27.1
Coker 227	112.6	143.5	111.4	122.5	40.6	38.3
Coker 716	126.2*	154.4	133.5*	138.0*	41.7	28.8
Brooks	119.7*	172.6**	126.0*	139.4**	36.3	30.0
Firecracker	104.9	141.1	121.8*	122.6	37.1	30.8
Bob	106.4	151.2	110.0	122.5	43.5	44.2
+Coker 76-30	114.3	158.8*	129.3*	134.1*	41.4	35.4
+Coker 80-20	102.2	152.6	122.2*	125.7	41.8	57.1
+NC 77-3	112.8	139.3	121.3*	124.5	37.8	30.8
+NC 77-32	114.5	122.1	137.8**	124.8	36.6	1.7
+NC 78-13	117.0	131.2	101.1	116.4	35.5	64.6
+NC 78-17	127.3**	152.0	126.9*	135.4*	38.3	40.4
+NC 78-25	120.7*	168.6*	114.2	134.5*	39.7	55.8
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>112.7</u>	<u>144.9</u>	<u>120.7</u>	<u>126.1</u>	<u>39.0</u>	<u>38.1</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	8.8	14.9	17.6	7.3		
C.V. (%)	5.7	7.6	9.2	7.7		

Table 10. Summary of oat performance trials in the Coastal Plain and Tidewater.

Variety or Line	Perquimans County bu/A	Washington County bu/A	Wayne County bu/A	Average ^{1/}		
				Yield bu/A	Test Wt. lbs/bu	% Lodging
Carolee	133.6	129.3	98.6*	131.4	36.8	79.4
Salem	130.3	140.2	87.2	135.2	39.6	20.6
Coker 227	128.8	122.9	90.5	125.8	38.3	45.0
Coker 716	162.4**	142.1	90.5	152.3*	39.1	21.9
Brooks	140.5	139.4	106.7**	139.9	36.8	37.8
Firecracker	131.6	145.5	99.6*	138.6	38.1	50.0
Bob	134.6	123.9	91.0	129.3	40.5	20.0
+Coker 76-30	134.8	143.2	99.6*	139.0	38.9	17.5
+Coker 80-20	117.1	129.2	95.8*	123.2	39.3	48.8
+NC 77-3	131.1	158.4*	95.8*	144.7	37.0	55.0
+NC 77-32	147.2*	167.6**	103.4*	157.4**	37.2	0.0
+NC 78-13	134.6	141.3	96.7*	138.0	35.9	95.6
+NC 78-17	149.2*	142.1	97.2*	145.7*	38.2	15.6
+NC 78-25	124.1	154.9*	95.8*	139.5	37.3	56.9
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>135.7</u>	<u>141.4</u>	<u>96.3</u>	<u>138.6</u>	<u>38.1</u>	<u>40.3</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	19.3	17.3	12.8	12.0		
C.V. (%)	9.1	8.4	7.4	8.7		

+Experimentals.

*Not significantly different from highest yielder.

**Highest yielder in test.

^{1/} Average of Perquimans and Washington Counties.

Table 11. Oat performance at three locations in the Piedmont.

Variety or Line	1981 bu/A	1980 bu/A	1979 bu/A	1978 bu/A	1981	
					Test Wt. lbs/bu	% Lodging
<u>Chatham County</u>						
Carolee	98.1	72.6		110.4* ^{1/}	35.1	21.3
Salem	100.6	67.1		109.3*	35.9	2.5
Coker 227	112.6	93.1*		105.5*	46.3	1.3
Coker 716	126.2*	94.2*		114.2**	48.5	0.0
Brooks	119.7*	99.0**			35.7	5.0
Firecracker	104.9	----			35.0	0.0
Bob	106.4				49.3	0.0
+Coker 76-30	114.3	91.4*			47.5	0.0
+Coker 80-20	102.2				48.1	1.3
+NC 77-3	112.8				37.1	0.0
+NC 77-32	114.5				35.9	0.0
+NC 78-13	117.0				34.7	31.3
+NC 78-17	127.3**				37.7	7.5
+NC 78-25	120.7*				45.2	23.8
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>112.7</u>	<u>84.7</u>		<u>110.8</u>	<u>40.9</u>	<u>6.7</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	8.8	11.0 ^{2/}		N.S.		
C.V. (%)	5.7			13		
<u>Rowan County</u>						
Carolee	114.4	88.6*	133.7*		37.2	33.8
Salem	127.2	90.1*	119.2		39.1	12.5
Coker 227	143.5	89.9*	142.8*	108.7**	37.1	18.8
Coker 716	154.4	94.7*	148.9**	106.6*	37.8	15.0
Brooks	172.6**	97.7**	140.3*		37.5	12.5
Firecracker	141.1	----			38.2	0.0
Bob	151.2				39.9	37.5
+Coker 76-30	158.8*	97.3*			38.7	15.0
+Coker 80-20	152.6				38.3	83.8
+NC 77-3	139.3				38.2	2.5
+NC 77-32	122.1				36.1	0.0
+NC 78-13	131.2				35.8	62.5
+NC 78-17	152.0				38.7	26.3
+NC 78-25	168.6*				36.7	45.0
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>144.9</u>	<u>90.7</u>	<u>128.9</u>	<u>103.5</u>	<u>37.8</u>	<u>26.1</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	14.9	11.0 ^{2/}	25.9	N.S.		
C.V. (%)	7.6		14	10		
<u>Stanly County</u>						
Carolee	117.5	56.8	90.4*	71.0*	37.5	88.8
Salem	116.1	54.5	99.7*	70.4*	40.4	66.3
Coker 227	111.4	67.5	96.5*	62.9*	38.3	95.0
Coker 716	133.5*	56.1	101.6**	85.9**	38.7	71.3
Brooks	126.0*	73.2*	91.0*		35.8	72.5
Firecracker	121.8*	----			38.2	92.5
Bob	110.0				41.3	95.0
+Coker 76-30	129.3*	82.2**			38.1	91.3
+Coker 80-20	122.2*				39.1	86.3
+NC 77-3	121.3*				38.3	90.0
+NC 77-32	137.8**				37.7	5.0
+NC 78-13	101.1				36.0	100.0
+NC 78-17	126.9*				38.5	87.5
+NC 78-25	114.2				37.4	98.8
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>120.7</u>	<u>62.1</u>	<u>90.7</u>	<u>72.9</u>	<u>38.2</u>	<u>81.5</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	17.6	11.0 ^{2/}	14.1	N.S.		
C.V. (%)	9.2		11	12		

^{1/}Orange County results.^{2/}Taken from combined analyses.

+Experimentals.

*Not significantly different from highest yielder.

**Highest yielder in test.

Table 12. Oat performance at one location in the Coastal Plain and two in the Tidewater.

Variety or Line	1981 bu/A	1980 bu/A	1979 bu/A	1978 bu/A	1981	
					Test Wt. lbs/bu	% Lodging
<u>Perquimans County</u>						
Carolee	133.6	83.2	111.0*	103.6* ^{1/}	38.8	100.0
Salem	130.3	74.6	120.0**	94.2	40.9	10.0
Coker 227	128.8	88.8*	112.8*	106.7*	39.5	90.0
Coker 716	162.4**	91.4*	108.5*	118.2**	39.9	40.0
Brooks	140.5	85.8	120.0**		38.5	48.8
Firecracker	131.6		110.4*		39.7	100.0
Bob	134.6				42.9	37.5
+Coker 76-30	134.8	93.6**			40.0	35.0
+Coker 80-20	117.1				40.6	97.5
+NC 77-3	131.1				38.4	77.5
+NC 77-32	147.2*				38.6	0.0
+NC 78-13	134.6				38.5	100.0
+NC 78-17	149.2*				39.9	13.8
+NC 78-25	124.1				39.0	100.0
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>135.7</u>	<u>82.9</u>	<u>92.8</u>	<u>106.3</u>	<u>39.7</u>	<u>65.1</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	19.3	7.2 ^{2/}	18.3	16.0		
C.V. (%)	9.1		12	5		
<u>Washington County</u>						
Carolee	129.3	92.2	72.2*	118.3*	34.8	58.8
Salem	140.2	99.8*	82.3*	129.4*	38.3	31.3
Coker 227	122.9	86.2	76.6*	139.0**	37.2	0.0
Coker 716	142.1	74.7*	71.7*	130.6*	38.3	3.8
Brooks	139.4	93.5*	85.1**		35.2	18.8
Firecracker	145.5				36.6	0.0
Bob	123.9				38.1	2.5
+Coker 76-30	143.2	101.3**			37.9	0.0
+Coker 80-20	129.2				38.0	0.0
+NC 77-3	158.4*				35.6	32.5
+NC 77-32	167.6**				35.8	0.0
+NC 78-13	141.3				33.2	91.3
+NC 78-17	142.1				36.5	17.5
+NC 78-25	154.9*				35.7	13.8
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>141.4</u>	<u>78.5</u>	<u>70.9</u>	<u>129.0</u>	<u>36.5</u>	<u>19.3</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	17.3	7.2 ^{2/}	15.0	N.S.		
C.V. (%)	8.4		15	9		
<u>Wayne County</u>						
Carolee	98.6*	84.1	90.6*	117.9	36.2	82.5
Salem	87.2	78.0	94.8*	132.6*	37.3	43.8
Coker 227	90.5	81.6	82.7*	137.6**	35.3	91.3
Coker 716	90.5	87.4*	96.7**	135.9*	36.0	93.8
Brooks	106.7**	88.1*	91.2*		32.4	97.5
Firecracker	99.6		89.6*	120.2	36.5	95.0
Bob	91.0				38.4	98.8
+Coker 76-30	99.6*	94.3**			35.4	91.3
+Coker 80-20	95.8*				35.3	100.0
+NC 77-3	95.8*				36.4	90.0
+NC 77-32	103.4*				35.9	32.5
+NC 78-13	96.7*				33.2	100.0
+NC 78-17	97.2*				37.3	82.5
+NC 78-25	95.8*				35.4	93.8
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>96.3</u>	<u>81.5</u>	<u>84.8</u>	<u>128.9</u>	<u>35.8</u>	<u>85.2</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	12.8	7.2 ^{2/}	20.1	12.7		
C.V. (%)	7.4		11	7		

^{1/}Lenoir County results.^{2/}Taken from combined analyses.

+Experimentals.

*Not significantly different from highest yielder.

**Highest yielder in test.

Table 13. Summary of wheat performance trials in the Piedmont.

Variety or Line	Chatham County bu/A	Rowan County bu/A	Stanly County bu/A	Yield bu/A	Average	
					Test Wt. lbs/bu	% Lodging
Arthur 71	46.6	68.0	50.9	55.2	59.8	42.1
Coker 747	63.2	81.8	52.8	65.9	60.1	13.3
Coker 762	67.3	71.7	71.2	70.0	58.8	18.8
Delta Queen	58.9	73.8	61.8	64.8	59.3	24.2
McNair 1003	68.8*	88.8*	73.6	77.0*	58.9	13.3
Pioneer brand S76	57.4	74.3	48.2	60.0	59.6	7.1
Pioneer brand S78	60.1	75.5	47.3	61.0	58.4	10.0
Roy	66.3	86.6*	59.8	70.9	59.0	3.8
Tyler	66.6	89.5*	78.9**	78.3**	59.8	6.7
Southern Belle	63.4	85.9*	55.7	68.4	60.6	18.8
Wheeler	52.1	79.6	62.7	64.8	60.3	18.8
Blueboy	63.0	90.2**	52.1	68.4	58.7	1.3
Blueboy II	59.3	73.8	43.4	58.9	59.0	5.0
Roland	69.5*	84.4*	53.8	69.2	60.0	0.4
Stacy	53.8	75.0	64.9	64.6	59.8	47.1
Stoddard	52.1	66.8	48.7	55.9	60.6	10.0
+Coker 79-16	56.9	87.8*	71.2	72.0	60.0	13.3
+NAPB 1273-29	52.8	73.6	58.1	61.5	60.4	35.0
+NC 78-7	72.6**	87.3*	64.7	74.9	57.9	31.7
+NC 78-47	61.8	69.7	56.2	62.6	61.2	37.1
+NC 75-138-3	65.6	69.7	62.2	65.9	60.0	22.1
+Purdue A1-8-7	62.5	80.8	58.4	67.2	60.6	23.3
+Purdue 9-4-1-1	64.9	77.9	56.0	66.3	60.5	0.0
+Va. 76-52-12	62.0	83.2	69.0	71.4	60.0	35.4
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>61.1</u>	<u>79.0</u>	<u>59.2</u>	<u>66.5</u>	<u>59.7</u>	<u>18.3</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	4.3	6.8	5.2	3.1		
C.V. (%)	5.5	6.5	6.9	6.4		

Table 14. Summary of wheat performance trials in the Coastal Plain and Tidewater.

Variety or Line	Perquimans County bu/A	Washington County bu/A	Wayne County bu/A	Yield bu/A	Average ^{1/}	
					Test Wt. lbs/bu	% Lodging
Arthur 71	68.0	37.6	53.3	52.8	60.7	0.0
Coker 747	73.1	56.7	59.8	64.9	61.4	0.0
Coker 762	75.5	59.1	58.1	67.3	58.7	9.4
Delta Queen	75.5	55.7	56.7	65.6	60.2	1.3
McNair 1003	83.5*	69.7**	68.3*	76.6**	60.9	0.0
Pioneer brand S76	66.6	41.3	49.2	53.9	60.4	0.0
Pioneer brand S78	61.5	45.1	53.6	53.3	59.2	0.0
Roy	83.5*	67.1*	57.4	75.3*	60.1	0.0
Tyler	78.9	63.7*	70.4**	71.3	60.4	0.0
Southern Belle	75.8	51.6	55.0	63.7	61.8	0.0
Wheeler	67.3	65.4*	63.7	66.3	61.7	0.0
Blueboy	76.5	58.9	58.9	67.7	59.3	0.0
Blueboy II	66.3	58.4	51.6	62.4	59.3	0.0
Roland	78.2	52.8	61.0	65.5	59.5	0.0
Stacy	75.5	47.0	52.6	61.3	60.8	0.0
Stoddard	61.3	44.1	51.9	52.7	61.2	0.0
Coker 797	76.2	54.5	52.4	65.4	61.2	28.1
+Coker 79-16	86.4**	56.7	62.2	71.5	61.0	0.0
+NAPB 1273-29	68.8	48.7	54.0	58.7	61.4	0.0
+NC 78-7	75.0	55.5	67.5*	65.3	59.0	0.0
+NC 78-47	79.9	48.5	56.9	64.2	61.8	0.0
+NC 75-138-3	72.9	61.0	61.5	66.9	61.4	6.9
+Purdue A1-8-7	74.5	48.5	57.9	61.5	61.1	0.0
+Purdue 9-4-1-1	73.6	39.6	55.2	56.6	61.6	0.0
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>73.9</u>	<u>53.6</u>	<u>57.9</u>	<u>63.8</u>	<u>60.6</u>	<u>1.9</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	6.7	6.7	4.4	4.6		
C.V. (%)	6.7	9.6	5.8	7.9		

+Experimentals.

*Not significantly different from the highest yielder.

**Highest yielder in the test.

^{1/} Average of Perquimans and Washington Counties.

Table 15. Wheat performance at three locations in the Piedmont.

Variety or Line	1981 bu/A	1980 bu/A	1979 bu/A	1978 bu/A	1981	
					Test Wt. lbs/bu	% Lodging
<u>Chatham County</u>						
Arthur 71	46.6	42.0		42.0 ^{1/}	59.9	0.0
Coker 747	63.2	57.1*		59.0	59.1	0.0
Coker 762	67.3	48.1		70.2**	60.9	0.0
Delta Queen	58.9	41.9		57.7	60.1	0.0
McNair 1003	68.8*	60.6**		53.0	59.4	0.0
Pioneer brand S76	57.4	48.5		51.1	59.8	0.0
Pioneer brand S78	60.1	46.9		56.8	58.7	0.0
Roy	66.3	58.5*			59.5	0.0
Tyler	66.6	58.8*			60.4	0.0
Southern Belle	63.4	56.2*			60.2	0.0
Wheeler	52.1	55.6*			60.7	0.0
Blueboy	63.0				58.0	0.0
Blueboy II	59.3				59.2	0.0
Roland	69.5*				59.5	0.0
Stacy	53.8				60.2	0.0
Stoddard	52.1				60.5	0.0
+Coker 79-16	56.9				60.7	0.0
+NAPB 1273-29	52.8				60.1	0.0
+NC 78-7	58.3				58.3	0.0
+NC 78-47	61.8				61.0	0.0
+NC 75-138-3	65.6				60.0	0.0
+Purdue A1-8-7	62.5				61.7	0.0
+Purdue 9-4-1-1	64.9				59.5	0.0
+Va. 76-52-12	62.0				60.7	0.0
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>61.1</u>	<u>50.5</u>		<u>55.6</u>	<u>59.9</u>	<u>0.0</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	4.3	7.2 ^{2/}		6.7		
C.V. (%)	5.5					
<u>Rowan County</u>						
Arthur 71	68.0	31.8	63.7	40.3	58.3	93.8
Coker 747	81.8	45.8	69.2	53.0*	59.2	23.8
Coker 762	71.7	47.6	65.2	55.0**	57.2	16.3
Delta Queen	73.8	35.9	57.5	45.6	57.2	33.8
McNair 1003	88.8*	41.6	81.6**	53.0*	57.6	10.0
Pioneer brand S76	74.3	38.9	72.6*	48.0	58.4	18.8
Pioneer brand S78	75.5	41.5	64.9	49.9*	56.9	22.5
Roy	86.6*	50.3	67.0		57.7	8.8
Tyler	89.5*	57.6**	78.0*		58.6	17.5
Southern Belle	85.9*	50.6*			60.3	36.3
Wheeler	79.6	38.1			59.2	28.8
Blueboy	90.2**				58.2	3.8
Blueboy II	73.8				58.2	12.5
Roland	84.4*				59.3	1.3
Stacy	75.0				58.8	77.5
Stoddard	66.8				59.7	25.0
+Coker 79-16	87.8*				58.7	76.3
+NAPB 1273-29	73.6				59.4	85.0
+NC 78-7	87.3*				57.1	65.0
+NC 78-47	69.7				60.2	87.5
+NC 75-138-3	69.7				58.9	20.0
+Purdue A1-8-7	80.8				59.1	41.3
+Purdue 9-4-1-1	77.9				59.4	0.0
+Va. 76-52-12	83.2				58.6	68.8
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>79.0</u>	<u>43.3</u>	<u>68.1</u>	<u>49.4</u>	<u>58.6</u>	<u>36.4</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	6.8	7.2 ^{2/}	10.9	5.3		
C.V. (%)	6.5		11	8		

^{1/}Orange County results.^{2/}Taken from combined analyses.

+Experimentals.

*Not significantly different from highest yielder.

**Highest yielder in test.

Table 15. (Continued.) Wheat performance at three locations in the Piedmont.

Variety or Line	1981 bu/A	1980 bu/A	1979 bu/A	1978 bu/A	1981	
					Test Wt. lbs/bu	% Lodging
<u>Stanly County</u>						
Arthur 71	50.9	34.8	47.0*	28.4*	61.3	32.5
Coker 747	52.8	40.9*	49.4*	29.3*	61.9	16.3
Coker 762	71.2	41.7*	45.1*	36.2*	58.5	40.0
Delta Queen	61.8	31.8	43.3	33.3*	60.5	38.8
McNair 1003	73.6	39.4*	51.6**	36.6**	59.9	30.0
Pioneer brand S76	48.2	31.8	43.9	27.6*	60.6	2.5
Pioneer brand S78	47.3	37.9*	47.1*	27.4*	59.7	7.5
Roy	59.8	45.1**	43.0		59.9	2.5
Tyler	78.9**	43.8*	48.4*		60.3	2.5
Southern Belle	55.7	40.8*			61.3	20.0
Wheeler	62.7	41.3*			61.0	27.5
Blueboy	52.1				60.0	0.0
Blueboy II	43.4				59.8	2.5
Roland	53.8				61.1	0.0
Stacy	64.9				60.6	63.8
Stoddard	48.7				61.7	5.0
+Coker 79-16	71.2				60.8	32.5
+NAPB 1273-29	58.1				61.6	20.0
+NC 78-7	64.7				58.3	30.0
+NC 78-47	56.2				62.6	23.8
+NC 75-138-3	62.2				61.0	46.3
+Purdue A1-8-7	58.4				61.0	28.8
+Purdue 9-4-1-1	56.0				62.6	0.0
+Va. 76-52-12	69.0				60.8	37.5
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>59.2</u>	<u>38.5</u>	<u>45.3</u>	<u>33.4</u>	<u>60.7</u>	<u>21.3</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	5.2	7.2 ^{2/}	6.8	N.S.		
C.V. (%)	6.9		10	23		

^{1/}Orange County results.

^{2/}Taken from combined analyses.

+Experimentals.

*Not significantly different from highest yielder

**Highest yielder in test.

Table 16. Wheat performance at one location in the Coastal Plain and two in the Tidewater.

Variety or Line	1981 bu/A	1980 bu/A	1979 bu/A	1978 bu/A	1981	
					Test Wt. lbs/bu	% Lodging
<u>Perquimans County</u>						
Arthur 71	68.0	38.9	58.8*	44.1 ^{1/}	62.2	0.0
Coker 747	73.1	46.7*	46.8	58.7	61.7	0.0
Coker 762	75.5	47.3*	41.4	69.5**	58.7	18.8
Delta Queen	75.5	37.4	37.0	49.5	59.8	2.5
McNair 1003	83.5*	47.7**	54.8*	55.6	60.4	0.0
Pioneer brand S76	66.6	43.5*	44.3	48.6	60.5	0.0
Pioneer brand S78	61.5	39.5	41.0	51.6	59.5	0.0
Roy	83.5*	43.8	40.2		60.2	0.0
Tyler	78.9	46.6*	61.5**		60.0	0.0
Southern Belle	75.8	40.4*			62.2	0.0
Wheeler	67.3	41.6*			61.6	0.0
Blueboy	76.5				58.9	0.0
Blueboy II	66.3				59.4	0.0
Roland	78.2				60.3	0.0
Stacy	75.5				61.4	0.0
Stoddard	61.3				61.6	0.0
Coker 797	76.2				61.1	56.3
+Coker 79-16	86.4**				61.5	0.0
+NAPB 1273-29	68.8				61.3	0.0
+NC 78-7	75.0				58.6	0.0
+NC 78-47	79.9				62.0	0.0
+NC 75-138-3	72.9				61.4	13.8
+Purdue A1-8-7	74.5				60.9	0.0
+Purdue 9-4-1-1	73.6				61.9	0.0
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>73.9</u>	<u>42.5</u>	<u>42.7</u>	<u>53.3</u>	<u>60.7</u>	<u>3.8</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	6.7	7.4 ^{2/}	14.6	9.7		
C.V. (%)	6.7		24	9		
<u>Washington County</u>						
Arthur 71	37.6	38.8	38.2	56.4	59.2	0.0
Coker 747	56.7	53.3*	49.6*	74.0*	61.2	0.0
Coker 762	59.1	49.4*	47.4*	78.9**	58.7	0.0
Delta Queen	55.7	42.7	41.4	69.4	60.5	0.0
McNair 1003	69.7**	49.0	51.3*	76.6*	61.4	0.0
Pioneer brand S76	41.3	38.5	49.9*	72.1	60.2	0.0
Pioneer brand S78	45.1	56.8**	50.4*	77.1*	59.0	0.0
Roy	67.1*	47.0	50.2*		60.0	0.0
Tyler	63.7*	43.3	57.2**		60.8	0.0
Southern Belle	51.6	56.6*			61.5	0.0
Wheeler	65.4*	47.0			61.8	0.0
Blueboy	58.9				59.6	0.0
Blueboy II	58.4				59.1	0.0
Roland	52.8				58.7	0.0
Stacy	47.0				60.2	0.0
Stoddard	44.1				60.9	0.0
Coker 797	54.5				61.3	0.0
+Coker 79-16	56.7				60.5	0.0
+NAPB 1273-29	48.7				61.6	0.0
+NC 78-7	55.5				59.4	0.0
+NC 78-47	48.5				61.6	0.0
+NC 75-138-3	61.0				61.4	0.0
+Purdue A1-8-7	48.5				61.4	0.0
+Purdue 9-4-1-1	39.6				61.3	0.0
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>53.6</u>	<u>42.1</u>	<u>45.4</u>	<u>70.7</u>	<u>60.5</u>	<u>0.0</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	6.7	7.4 ^{2/}	10.7	6.6		
C.V. (%)	9.6		16	6		

^{1/}Lenoir County results.^{2/}Taken from combined analyses.

+Experimentals.

*Not significantly different from highest yielder.

**Highest yielder in test.

Table 16. (Continued.) Wheat performance at one location in the Coastal Plain and two in the Tidewater.

Variety or Line	1981 bu/A	1980 bu/A	1979 bu/A	1978 bu/A	1981	
					Test Wt. lbs/bu	% Lodging
<u>Wayne County</u>						
Arthur 71	53.3	43.1	33.8*	53.4	59.7	3.8
Coker 747	59.8	49.*	37.6*	64.0	59.9	27.5
Coker 762	58.1	56.5**	48.0*	73.7**	54.6	35.0
Delta Queen	56.7	45.3	41.4*	56.8	58.1	10.0
McNair 1003	68.3*	54.3*	38.8*	65.8	59.0	16.3
Pioneer brand S76	49.2	39.7	28.3	47.4	59.3	0.0
Pioneer brand S78	53.6	35.3	29.4	46.8	59.3	0.0
Roy	57.4	40.3	28.0		58.5	5.0
Tyler	70.4**	54.1*	45.4**		59.5	5.0
Southern Belle	55.0	47.9			60.4	10.0
Wheeler	63.7	51.3*			59.6	0.0
Blueboy	58.9				59.0	3.8
Blueboy II	51.6				59.1	5.0
Roland	61.0				58.1	1.3
Stacy	52.6				58.2	30.0
Stoddard	51.9				60.1	2.5
Coker 797	52.4				58.1	88.8
+Coker 79-16	62.2				57.5	11.3
+NAPB 1273-29	54.0				58.9	7.5
+NC 78-7	67.5*				58.1	8.8
+NC 78-47	56.9				61.1	10.0
+NC 75-138-3	61.5				61.0	11.3
+Purdue A1-8-7	57.9				57.8	20.0
+Purdue 9-4-1-1	55.2				61.5	0.0
<u>Mean of Test</u>	<u>57.9</u>	<u>45.1</u>	<u>36.3</u>	<u>58.2</u>	<u>59.0</u>	<u>13.0</u>
L.S.D. (.05)	4.4	7.4 ^{2/}	14.2	5.8		
C.V. (%)	5.8		19	7		

^{1/} Lenoir County results.

^{2/} Taken from combined analyses.

+Experimentals.

*Not significantly different from highest yielder.

**Highest yielder in test.

Table 17. Comparison of wheat entries for wheat and flour qualities from 1979-80 tests.

Variety or Line	Wheat Analysis			Flour Yield	Flour Analysis							
	Test Weight	% Moisture	% Protein		% Moisture	Ash	% Protein	Agtron ^{1/}	Abs ^{2/}	Mix ^{3/}	MTI ^{4/}	Tol. ^{5/}
Hart	61.5	12.2	10.32	70.5	8.5	.64	10.20	43	51.0	2.50	105	2.5
Omega 78	61.2	12.2	11.32	78.6	8.2	.67	10.39	45	47.8	1.88	88	0.4
Abe	62.0	12.0	11.74	74.8	8.2	.69	10.38	43	47.5	2.13	85	1.9
Arthur 71	61.8	12.0	10.79	72.2	8.0	.68	11.16	44	49.0	4.50	95	4.6
McNair 1003	59.2	12.4	10.72	73.4	9.0	.65	9.68	42	49.7	2.62	102	2.0
Southern Belle	63.5	12.3	11.86	75.6	8.8	.65	10.36	45	52.5	4.62	110	5.1
Delta Queen	59.5	12.2	11.64	76.7	8.1	.72	10.29	34	51.2	5.50	70	5.3
Roy	58.5	12.4	10.32	74.0	8.3	.68	9.44	37	48.2	2.12	100	0.6
Pioneer brand S76	61.8	12.4	10.84	74.6	7.8	.71	9.75	36	48.9	3.50	115	2.1
Pioneer brand S78	61.8	12.5	11.24	69.0	8.0	.67	10.14	45	49.6	3.00	110	2.4
Coker 747	62.5	12.4	10.72	74.4	8.0	.66	9.86	39	48.4	1.62	98	0.9
Coker 762	58.5	12.2	10.99	73.4	8.6	.68	9.66	38	47.6	1.75	140	0.6
Coker 79-20	62.2	12.5	11.76	75.1	8.0	.69	10.70	39	50.6	3.00	115	3.1
Tyler	60.2	12.4	10.36	76.3	8.0	.72	9.72	35	48.3	2.12	95	0.8
Wheeler	62.0	12.4	11.60	77.0	8.3	.68	10.40	36	47.5	1.12	110	-0.1
NC 75-31	57.0	12.4	11.32	75.3	8.4	.72	9.54	28	47.4	1.38	122	0.1
NC 76-104	58.2	12.4	10.26	77.3	8.0	.76	9.98	21	50.2	3.38	90	2.9
NC 76-148	60.0	12.5	11.56	78.8	7.8	.74	10.42	38	51.0	3.75	85	4.0

^{1/}Flour color.

^{2/}Measure of water absorption.

^{3/}Optimum mixing time for dough.

^{4/}Mixing tolerance index.

^{5/}Mixing tolerance of dough.