

FEBRUARY 1977 DEPARTMENT OF AGRONOMY & SOILS AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION R. DENNIS ROUSE, Director DONALD L. THURLOW DEPARTMENTAL SERIES NO. 35 AUBURN UNIVERSITY AUBURN, ALABAMA

The following is a suggested list of varieties by planting dates for northern, central, and southern Alabama. Within planting dates, varieties are listed in order of maturity with early maturity ones listed first.

Northern Alabama

Plantings May 1 to 31 Essex, Forrest, Coker 136, McNair 600, Tracy, Lee 74, Centennial, Davis

Plantings June 1 to 30 Forrest, Coker 136, McNair 600, Lee 74, Tracy, Centennial, Davis, Bragg, Ransom

Central Alabama

Plantings April 20 to May 15 Forrest, Davis, McNair 600, Lee 74, Tracy, Centennial

Plantings May 16 to June 5 Davis, McNair 600, Lee 74, Tracy, Centennial, McNair 800, Bragg, Ransom, Hutton

Plantings June 6 to 30 Davis, Bragg, Ransom, Hutton, Coker 338

Southern Alabama

Plantings May 15 to May 31 Davis, McNair 600, Lee 74, Tracy, Centennial, McNair 800, Bragg, Ransom

Plantings June 1 to 30 Davis, McNair 800, Bragg, Ransom, Hutton, Coker 338, Cobb

## Table of Contents

		Page
	Introduction	1
1.	Experimental Procedures, Discussion of Data, Season Conditions, and Description of Data Recorded	2-5
	Sources of Seed Used in 1976 Tests	6-7
	Soybean Variety Descriptions and Disease Resistance	8
	Soybean Yield Data and Other Growth Characteristics by Location:	
	Northern Alabama	9
	Sand Mountain Substation, Crossville, Ala	10-17
	Tennessee Valley Substation, Belle Mina, Ala	18-20
	Upper Coastal Plain Substation, Winfield, Ala	21-26
	Central Alabama	27
	Black Belt Substation, Marion Junction, Ala	28-39
	Lower Coastal Plain Substation, Camden, Ala	40
	Prattville Experiment Field, Prattville, Ala	41-46
	Southern Alabama	47
	Brewton Experiment Field, Brewton, Ala	48-54
	Gulf Coast Substation, Fairhope, Ala	55-57
	Monroeville Experiment Field, Monroeville, Ala	58
	Wiregrass Substation, Headland, Ala	59-61

•

## INTRODUCTION

To properly evaluate a soybean variety it is necessary that it be grown at a number of locations, at various planting dates, and over a period of years. This will subject the variety to differences in soil and climatic conditions that occur throughout the State. The most common limiting factor in soybean production is inadequate moisture during pod development and filling. Thus, it is important that varieties from more than one maturity group be evaluated at each location. Since soybeans are highly photoperiodic, the blooming period, period of pod development and fill, and maturity date of a particular variety do not vary greatly from year to year. Continued testing and evaluation of soybean varieties and experimental strains by agricultural experiment stations are essential if farmers, county Extension agents, seedsmen, and other agricultural workers are to be provided with information to help them select varieties best adapted to their locality and individual requirements.

## EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

All tests were conducted at outlying units of the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station of Auburn University. A randomized block design with 4 replications was used at each of 10 locations. One to three planting dates were used at each location with the first plantings made at the optimum time for maximum yield. Plots were planted with regular commercial soybean planters equipped with a special seed hopper adapted for small plots. Plots were four rows wide and 23 feet long with 16 feet of the two center rows harvested for yield determinations. Row width varied from 36 to 40 inches depending on location. Seeding rates were 10 viable seed per foot of row based on germination at  $75^{\circ}$  F. All plot areas were fertilized according to soil test.

The entries in these tests included varieties released prior to 1976, a number of unreleased strains in the late stages of development from the USDA Regional Testing Program, and a number of commercial lines. Sources of seed are listed on pages 6 and 7.

## DISCUSSION OF DATA

Since results of field plot research are influenced by inherent soil differences and soil moisture availability, it is not possible to determine the exact yield of a variety at a given location. Varietal performance may vary from year to year because of variation in rainfall, temperature, diseases, and nematodes. Therefore, long term studies are necessary in order to properly evaluate varietal performance.

Differences in yield data for 1976, which may be due to chance, have been computed using Duncan's New Multiple Range Test at the 5% level of probability. Yields followed by the same letter are not considered to be significantly different; however, means not associated by a common letter are considered to be different. Coefficients of variation (C.V.) are footnoted in the tables. This value reflects the relative precision of the

NON BUNC

experiment, a small C.V. indicating more precision in estimating the relative performance of varieties.

### SEASONAL CONDITIONS

Early season moisture was good at all locations and good stands were obtained in all tests. Due to a lack of moisture in the southern part of the State in June and early July, plants were shorter than normal and lodging was not a problem in these tests. Lodging was, however, a problem in north Alabama at Belle Mina for the third year out of the last four. The early planting dates at Brewton Field, Black Belt Substation, and Sand Mountain Substation reflect this early moisture stress in plant height as these varieties are shorter than later plantings.

Good early season moisture was available in northern Alabama with adequate plant height obtained. This resulted in considerably more lodging than in the other areas of the State. The central and southern areas of the State were deficient in moisture during early August which resulted in lower than normal yields for the early maturing varieties. The total rainfall during pod development and fill stage from August 15 through September 30 for the past five years are shown in Table 1.

Sand Mountain Substation showed the lowest rainfall from the middle of August through September. There were also 25 days of moisture stress during this period. The Black Belt, Upper Coastal Plain, and Wiregrass substations had 20 or more moisture stress days during this period. All other locations had less than 15 days of moisture stress with the Gulf Coast Substation having less than 10 days.

In the northern part of the State the early varieties yielded best for early planting. For example the top two varieties at Sand Mountain and Tennessee Valley substations were Group V varieties with Essex yielding the best at each location with 39.9 and 41.8 bu/A, respectively. The early varieties did well at the second planting in the central and northern locations but were near the bottom of the list at southern locations.

The mid-season and late-season varieties yielded the best in central and southern Alabama for both early and late plantings.

Seed quality was good at most locations and in general the early varieties had the poorest quality, particularly when planted at the early planting dates.

Location	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	
	In.	In.	In.	In.	In.	
Black Belt Substation (Marion Junction)	3.85	4.88	9.87	7.72	6.20	
Brewton Experiment Field (Brewton)	3.10	8.43	8.19	9.77	5.34	•
Gulf Coast Substation (Fairhope)	6.76	12.77	10.40	14.54	8.33	
Lower Coastal Plain Substation (Camden)	· .	.—			9.37	
Monroeville Experiment Field (Monroeville)	-	<u> </u>	-	-	7.06	
Prattville Experiment Field (Prattville)	4.20	2.95	10.12	9.09	9.76	
Sand Mountain Substation (Crossville)	5.90	8.18	3.90	0.95	3,37	
Upper Coastal Plain Substation (Winfield)	4.81	4.82	8.71	7.45	5.15	
Tennessee Valley Substation (Belle Mina)	5.95	3.58	4.49	5.76	5.87	
Wiregrass Substation (Headland)		6.26	8.73	6.41	7.42	

Table 1. Rainfall by Location During the Period August 15 through September 30 for 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, and 1976

## DATA RECORDED

The yield of a crop is the primary factor of production when profits are to be maximized. Other characteristics which are important are plant height, height of first pod, maturity, lodging, and size and quality of seed.

Yield of soybeans was determined by cutting the two center rows of each plot and threshing with a plot thresher (or small plot combine). Plot yields were adjusted to 13% moisture and converted to bushels (60 pounds) per acre.

<u>First bloom</u> was taken as the date when there was one flower at any node on 10% of the plants.

<u>Maturity</u> was rated as the date when the pods were dry and most of the leaves had dropped. Under most conditions, the stems were also dry. Harvest date was approximately 7-10 days later than maturity date. Lodging was based on a scale of 1 to 5 according to the following criteria, see page 5 for illustrations:

1 - almost all plants erect.

- 2 either all plants leaning slightly (less than 45°) or a few plants down.
- 3 either all plants leaning moderately (approximately 45°) or 25 to 50% of the plants down.
- 4 either all plants leaning considerably (more than 45°) or 50 to 80% of the plants down.

5 - all plants down.

Shattering ratings were based on shattering of the border rows 14 days after maturity. The visual estimates were rated on a scale of 1 to 5 as follows:

no shattering
 1 to 3% shattering
 4 to 8% shattering
 9 to 19% shattering
 20% or more shattering

<u>Plant height</u> was determined as the average length of plants from the ground to the top extremity at time of maturity.

<u>Height of first pod</u> was determined as the average height of the lowest pods from the ground at maturity.

<u>Seed size</u> for each variety was determined from a composite sample of all replications at a given planting date and location. Seed size is reported as grams per 100 seeds.

Seed quality was based on a rating from 1 to 5 according to the following scale: (1) very good, (2) good, (3) fair, (4) poor, and (5) very poor. The factors considered were development of seed, wrinkling due to late harvesting and to excessive rain.

Purple stain ratings were given to seed samples on a scale of 1 to 5 as follows:

1 - no purple staining	4 -	9 to	19% staining
2 - 1 to 3% purple staining	5 -	20%	or more staining
3 - 4 to 8% purple staining			

### VARIETY DATA

Soybean varieties grown in Alabama are in Maturity Groups V, VI, VII, and VIII. The following is a list of the varieties and strains with source of seed for 1976 listed by maturity groups. For more information on these varieties see table 2.



Lodging was based on a scale of 1 to 5 according to the following criteria and illustrated by figures 1 through 5 respectively.

- 1 almost all plants erect.
- 2 either all plants leaning slightly (less than 45°) or a few plants down.
- 3 either all plants leaning moderately (approximately 45°) or 25 to 50% of the plants down.
- 4 either all plants leaning considerably (more than  $45^{\rm o})$  or 50 to 80% of the plants down.

5 - all plants down.



## Very Early Varieties - Maturity Group V

Coker 136	Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co., Harsville, South Carolina
Dare	Van Dyke Farms, Huntsville, Alabama
Essex	Bragg Farms, Toney, Alabama
Forrest	Bragg Farms, Toney, Alabama
Green Soy 74-35*	Green Seed Co., Gallatin, Tennessee
Mack	Phizer Genetics Inc., Cleveland, Mississippi
McNair 500*	McNair Seed Company, Laurinburg, North Carolina

Early Varieties - Maturity Group VI

1

Centennial	USDA Delta Branch Experiment Station, Stoneville, Mississippi
Davis	Alabama Foundation Seed Stock Farm, Thorsby, Alabama
E-X-C-E-L 200*	Mr. Percey J. Jannum, Cobden, Illinois
FFR 666	Farmers Forage Research Corp., Lafayette, Indiana
FFR 6024*	Farmers Forage Research Corp., Lafayette, Indiana
Green Soy 74-64*	Green Seed Co., Gallatin, Tennessee
Green Soy 74-7*	Green Seed Co., Gallatin, Tennessee
Lancer	North American Plant Breeders, Hutcheson, Kansas
Lee 68	Van Dyke Farms, Huntsville, Alabama
Lee 74	Alabama Foundation Seed Stocks Farms, Thorsby, Alabama
McNair 600	McNair Seed Co., Laurinburg, North Carolina
McNair 3130*	McNair Seed Co., Laurinburg, North Carolina
Tracy	Alabama Foundation Seed Stocks Farms, Thorsby, Alabama

## Mid-Season Varieties - Maturity Group VII

Bragg

Alabama Foundation Seed Stocks Farm, Thorsby, Alabama

Coker 277*	Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co., Hartsville, South Carolina
Coker 842*	Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co., Hartsville, South Carolina
FFR 667*	Farmers Forage Research Corp., Lafayette, Indiana
Green Soy 74-85*	Green Seed Co., Gallatin, Tennessee
McNair 800	McNair Seed Co., Laurinburg, North Carolina
McNair 3129*	McNair Seed Co., Laurinburg, North Carolina
Ransom	Alabama Foundation Seed Stocks Farm, Thorsby, Alabama

Late-Season Variety - Maturity Group VIII

Сорр	Alabama Foundation Seed Stocks Farm, Thorsby, Alabama
Coker 338	Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co., Hartsville, South Carolina
Hutton	Alabama Foundation Seed Stocks Farm, Thorsby, Alabama
McNair 3131*	McNair Seed Co., Laurinburg, North Carolina

\*Breeding line selections not yet released by seed company.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to express appreciation to J. E. Barrett, W. E. Brown, J. K. Boseck, J. T. Eason, F. T. Glaze, J.A. Little, R. A. Moore, Jr. L. A. Smith, and J.G. Starling for growing and harvesting variety tests, and W. H. Hearn, Research Data Analysis, for help in summarizing data.

						Reacti	on to i	Nematode	Nematode				
			Plant characteristics				Tar		- Phyto-	Purple	resistan	$tce^{1/}$	
		Pubes-	Flower	Pod	Hilum	Bacteria	Wild-	get	phthora	seed	Cyst	Root-	•
Group	Variety	cence	color	color	color	pustule	fire	spot	rot	stain	(Race 3)	knot	
		4 <sup>- 1</sup>						•					
V	Dare	Grav	White	Tan	Buff	R	R	R	MR	R	Ś	MR	
	Forrest	Tawny	White	Tan	Black	R	R	R	MR	MR	R	R	
	Essex	Gray	Purple	Tan	Buff	R	R	R	MR	R	S	S	
•	Mack	Tawny	Purple	Tan	Black	R	R	R	R	R	R	S	
VI	Davis	Grav	White	Lt. Tan	Buff	R	R	R	R	MR	S	S	
	Lee 68	Tawny	Purple	Tan	Black	R	R	R	VR	R	S	S	
	McNair 600	Tawny	Purple	Lt. Tan	Black	R	R	R	S	R	S	R	
	Centennial	Tawny	Purple	Tan	Black	R	R	R	R	MR	R	R	
	Tracy	Tawny	White	Tan	Black	R	R	R	R		S	S	
	Lee 74	Tawny	Purple	Tan	Black	R	R	R	VR	R	S	R	
VII	Bragg	Tawny	White	Tan	Black	R	R	R	R	S	S	R	
	McNair 800	Grav	White	Tan	Buff	R	R	R	S	S	S	S	
	Ransom	Tawny	Purple	Tan	Black	R	R	R	MS	R	S	S	•
VIII	Coker 338	Grav	Purple	Lt. Tan	Buff	R	R	MR	VS	S	S	S	
	Hutton	Brown	Purple	Tan	Black	R	R	R	S	S	S	R	
	Cobb	Gray	White	Tan	Buff	R	R	R	S	S	S	R	

Table 2. Physical Descriptions and Disease Resistance of Some Soybean Varieties Tested

<u>1</u>/VR-very resistant; R-resistant; MR-moderately resistant; S-susceptible; VS-very susceptible. These are ratings given these varieties by the breeders and are not based on performance in Alabama alone.

~

ω

## Northern Alabama

The test locations in north Alabama were on Decatur clay loam at Belle Mina, Hartsells fine sandy loam at Crossville, and Savannah fine sandy loam at Winfield. Soybeans of Maturity Group VI are full season varieties for this area. Varieties of Group VII maturity tend to be taller and later maturing in north Alabama than at more southern locations. Thus, lodging becomes a problem for these varieties in north Alabama. Lodging has been a problem for the past 4 to 5 years at both Crossville and Belle Mina and the taller varieties have not yielded well. It has been the shorter varieties of Group V maturity varieties that have been the best yielding varieties in early plantings at Crossville and Belle Mina locations.

Essex has been the highest yielding variety for the past 4 years at Crossville and Belle Mina with 38 and 53 bu/A, respectively, outyielding the second variety Forrest by 3 and 4 bu/A, respectively.

The best Group VI maturity variety was Davis in the early plantings at Crossville with Tracy yielding well at later plantings. At Winfield McNair 600, Lee 74, Davis, and Tracy yielded best for mid-May plantings.

New early lines that have looked good in north Alabama for the past 1 to 2 years are Coker 842 and McNair 500.

								· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	1st Bloom <u>2</u> /	Maturity <sup>2</sup> /	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod2/	Lodging2/	Shattering $\frac{2}{}$	Seed Size
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating	g/100 seed
Essex	39.9 a	7/14	9/21	27	6	1.3	1	13.7
Forrest	36.7 ab	7/17	9/25	36	8	2.0	1	12.1
Davis	36.5 abc	7/27	10/07	38.	8	2.5	1	14.8
FFR 666	35.5 bcd	7/21	10/05	34	8	2.8	1	12.1
Lancer	35.5 bcd	7/25	10/06	42	9	1.3	1	14.7
Lee 68	35.0 bcd	e 7/21	10/05	35	9	2.5	1	13.3
FFR 6024	34.8 bcd	e 7/21	10/05	35	8	2.5	1	12.7
Coker 842	34.8 bcd	e 7/22	10/06	35	7	1.8	· 1	13.0
McNair 500	34.7 bcd	e 7/18	10/01	36	7	2.3	1	12.3
Hutton	34.5 bcd	ef 7/28	10/14	40	10	4.5	1	16.2
; Lee 74	34.2 bcd	ef 7/23	10/06	36	9	2.5	1	12.9
Dare	33.6 bcd	ef 7/23	10/01	37	8	2.3	1	13.1
Mack	33.6 bcd	ef 7/17	9/25	37	6	3.0	1	15.3
E-X-C-E-L 200	) 33.1 bcd	ef 7/18	10/02	34	7	2.8	1	14.3
FFR 667	33.0 bcd	ef 7/18	10/12	39	10	2.5	1	
Bragg	32.9 bcd	ef 7/24	10/14	45	11	3.9	1	15.7
McNair 600	32.5 cd	ef 7/20	10/01	40	9	3.0	1	12.3
McNair 3130	32.4 cd	ef 7/27	10/12	42	9	2.3	1	15.6
Coker 136	32.3 cd	ef 7/22	10/01	40	10	1.8	1	13.9
FFR 5002	31.3 de	ef 7/14	10/02	46	9	2.8	1	14.8
Ransom	31.2	ef 7/21	10/13	40	10	1.8	1	15.1
Centennial	31.2	ef 7/22	10/11	43	10	3.0	1	16.0
Tracy	30.3	f 7/18	10/02	37	8	2.8	1	16.6

Table 3. Yields, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant First Pod Heights, Lodging, Shattering, and Seed Size and Quality <u>3</u>/ of Soybean Varieties When Planted May 4, 1976, at Sand Mountain Substation

C.V.% 9.5

 $\frac{1}{Y}$  ield adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P = .05).  $\frac{2}{An}$  explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

 $\frac{3}{\text{Seed}}$  quality and purple stain ratings were very good for all varieties in this test.

Dates 7/26 8/01 8/01	Dates 9/26	In. 30	In.	Rating	Rating	Rating	g/100 seed
7/26 8/01 8/01	9/26	30	· _				0,
8/01 8/01	10/10		1	1.3	1	1.0	13.4
8/01	10/10	37	9	1.8	1	1.0	14.8
0/00	10/07	41	11	2.3	1	1.5	14.8
. 8702	10/11	41	8	2.5	1	1.5	17.5
7/28	10/05	36	8	2.5	1	1.0	13.6
e 7/27	10/05	35	7	1.5	1	1.0	14.3
e 7/26	10/04	36	8	2.3	1	2.0	13.3
e 8/01	10/11	36	8	3.3	1	1.0	13.0
e 8/06	10/16	39	12	4.5	1	1.0	18.2
e 7/27	9/30	35	. 8	2.5	1	1.5	14.4
e 7/29	10/01	39	9	1.8	1	1.0	13.4
e 7/28	10/06	36	7	2.5	1.	1.0	17.4
e 8/04	10/14	43	11	2.8	1	1.0	17.0
e 8/08	10/15	40	10	2.5	1	1.0	17.3
e 7/29	10/05	32	7	3.0	1	1.0	12.7
e 7/2)	10/14	41	12	2.5	1	1.0	16.9
e 8/01	10/14	36	10	2.0	1	1.0	16.9
e 7/10	10/06	38	9	2.8	ī	1.0	12.9
	e 7/31 e 8/01 e 7/10	e $7/29$ $10/05$ $e$ $7/31$ $10/14$ $e$ $8/01$ $10/14$ $e$ $7/10$ $10/06$	e $7/29$ $10/05$ $52$ $e$ $7/31$ $10/14$ $41$ $e$ $8/01$ $10/14$ $36$ $e$ $7/10$ $10/06$ $38$	e $7/29$ $10/03$ $32$ $7$ e $7/31$ $10/14$ $41$ $12$ e $8/01$ $10/14$ $36$ $10$ e $7/10$ $10/06$ $38$ $9$	e       7/29       10/05       32       7       5.0         e       7/31       10/14       41       12       2.5         e       8/01       10/14       36       10       2.0         e       7/10       10/06       38       9       2.8	e       7/29       10/05       32       7       3.0       1         e       7/31       10/14       41       12       2.5       1         e       8/01       10/14       36       10       2.0       1         e       7/10       10/06       38       9       2.8       1	e       7/31       10/14       41       12       2.5       1       1.0         e       8/01       10/14       36       10       2.0       1       1.0         e       7/10       10/06       38       9       2.8       1       1.0

Table 4. Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, Shattering, and Seed Size and Quality<sup>3</sup>/of Soybean Varieties Planted May 26, 1976, at Sand Mountain Substation

C.V.% 8.2

 $\frac{1}{\text{Yield}}$  adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P = .05).  $\frac{2}{\text{An}}$  explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.  $\frac{3}{\text{Seed}}$  quality rating was very good for all varieties in this test.

4.

Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	,	lst bioom2/	Maturity $\frac{2}{}$	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod2/	Lodging2/	Shattering2/	Seed size
	Bu/A		Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating	Rating
Hutton	38 6		8/19	10/25	26	6	2.0	1	16.7
Color 942	27.2	ab	8/18	10/21	23	4	1.0	1	13.4
Coker 842	26.0	ab	8/10	10/21	27	6	2.3	.1	15.6
Coker 550	20.9	abc	8/17	10/27	24	4	2.3	1	17.2
Iracy	20.7	abc	0/1/	10/17	24	7	1.5	1	14.5
Bragg	30.0	abc	0/1/	10/22	21	5	2.0	ī	12.7
McNair 500	35.4	abcd	• 0/1/	10/21 10/17	24	5	2.5	1	15.7
Green Soy 74-	/ 35.0	abcd	0/1/	10/17	25	5	2.0	1	12.6
Forrest	33.4	bcd	8/10	10/20	• 2/	5 .	1.5	1	15.7
Ransom	33.3	bcd	8/18	10/25	24 07	5	2 0	1	14.0
Lancer	53.3	bcd	8/19	10/24	27	0	1.0	1	13.5
Coker 136	33.2	bcd	8/1/	10/22	22	ر ع	2.0	1	12.2
Centennial	32.9	cde	8/1/	10/21	28	2	2.0	1	12.2
McNair 600	32.3	de	8/17	10/19	25	4	1.5	1	12.0
Mack	32.0	de	8/17	10/15	24	4	2.5		13.0
Lee 74	31.9	de	8/18	10/21	22	5	2.3	1	13.4
Essex	31.6	de	8/16	10/15	18	4	1.3	1	13.3
Cobb	31.1	de	8/24	10/28	36	8	3.0	1	13.7
E-X-C-E-L 200	31.1	e	8/17	10/15	21	5	2.5	1 .	13.7
Davis	28.7	е	8/24	10/25	28	6	2.0	1	14.6
Dare	3/	•	8/17	10/15	15	3	1.0	1	14.6

Table 5. Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, Shattering, and Seed Size and Quality<sup>4/</sup> of Soybean Varieties When Planted June 17, 1976, at Sand Mountain Substation

C.V.% 7.6

 $\frac{1}{Y}$ ields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P = .05).  $\frac{1}{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

3/Yield not taken due to poor stand.

4/Seed quality and purple stain ratings were very good for all varieties in this test.

Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup>	lst bloom <u>2</u> /	Maturity <sup>2</sup> /	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod <sup>2</sup> /	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	Shattering $\frac{2}{}$
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Essex	36.9	7/08	9/21	26	6	1.1	1
Coker 842	33.3	7/16	10/01	35	7	1.6	1
Davis	32.1	7/26	10/10	38	9	2.6	1
Lancer	31.5	7/22	10/09	40	9	1.3	1
FFR 666	31.0	7/16	10/05	33	7	1.9	1
Hutton	31.0	7/24	10/14	38	8	3.6	1 .
Lee 68	30.4	7/16	10/04	34	8	2.0	1
FFR 6024	30.4	7/14	10/08	35	7	2.3	1
Forrest	30.4	7/10	9/25	36	7	2.0	. 1
McNair 600	30.3	7/17	10/05	39	8	2.4	1
Tracy	30.1	7/13	10/05	36	7	2.1	1
Mack	29.8	7/11	9/25	36	6	3.0	1
Ransom	29.7	7/16	10/13	39	9	1.8	1
Lee 74	29.6	7/17	10/05	35	8	2.3	1
Dare	29.3	7/15	9/25	36	7	2.4	1
Coker 136	28.3	7/17	10/03	38	<b>9</b> ·	1.5	1
Bragg	28.3	7/23	10/14	42	10	2.8	1
Centennial	26.8	7/16	10/09	40	10	2.4	1

Table 6. Two-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Caturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties with Average Planting Date May 3 at Sand Mountain Substation, 1975 and 1976

 $\frac{1}{Y}$ ield adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P=.05).  $\frac{2}{An}$  explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

L,

Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom2/	Maturity <sup>2/</sup>	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod <sup>2/</sup>	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	Shattering <u>2</u> /
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Hutton	34.2	8/06	10/17	40	10	4.1	1
Coker 842	34.2	7/30	10/09	37	8	2.0	1
Coker 136	33.1	7/30	10/08	41	10	2.1	1
Tracy	33.0	7/27	10/11	38	7	2.5	1
Ransom	32.8	7/30	10/16	37	10	2.3	1
Essex	32.4	7/21	9/26	29	7	1.1	1
Davis	32.2	8/06	10/14	39	8	2.6	1
Lee 74	32.0	7/30	10/10	35	7	3.4	- 1
Bragg	31.5	8/03	10/16	43	10	2.8	1.
McNair 600	30.5	7/28	10/08	38	7	2.8	· · 1
Forrest	30.5	7/26	10/04	36	7	2.4	1
Dare	28.6	7/28	9/29	39	8	1.9	1
D70-3185	27.6	7/29	10/12	40	10	2.1	1
Mack	27.3	7/26	10/01	36	7	2.4	1

Table 7. Two-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties with Average Planting Date May 25 at Sand Mountain Substation, 1975 and 1976

 $\frac{1}{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom <u>2</u> /	Maturity <sup>2</sup> /	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod <sup>2/</sup>	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	Shattering2/
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates -	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Hutton	35.3	8/18	10/24	31	8	2 6	1
Bragg	34.6	8/17	10/23	32	7	2.0	1
Coker 842	34.1	8/14	10/17	29	6	2.5	1
Tracy	33.3	8/14	10/16	30	6	2.4	1
Ransom	32.3	8/17	10/22	30	10	2.0	1
Сорр	31.3	8/23	11/06	37	10	2.1	1
Coker 136	31.2	8/15	10/17	20	о С	3.0	1
Lancer	31.1	8/17	10/20	29	6	2.1	1
Essex	30.3	8/10	10/09	) JZ 25	0	2.5	1
Lee 74	30.2	8/17	10/17	25	0	2.1	. 1
Forrest	29.8	8/12	10/14	27	/	3.0	1.
🛏 Centennial	29.6	8/1/	10/16	22	8	2.8	1
u Davis	29.2	8/22	10/21	21	/	2.6	1
McNair 600	29.1	8/15	10/21	21		2.6	1
Mack	28.2	8/12	10/10	32	6	2.4	1
Dare	27 6 3/	8/13	10/12	30	6	3.0	1
1/11 11		0/15	10/09	27	6	2.3	1.

Table 8. Two-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Teights, Lodging, and Stattoring of Soybean Varieties with Average Planting date June 18 at Sand Mountain Substation, 1975 and 1976

 $\frac{1}{2}$ /Yield adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

 $\frac{2}{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

 $\overline{3}$ /Yield data for 1975. No yield 1976 due to poor stand.

Table 9 .

· , ·

Three-Year Averages for Yield, Date of Maturity, Plant and First Pod Heights, and Lodging of Soybean Varieties Planted at Three Dates on Sand Mountain Substation, 1974 through 1976

		× · · · 2/	Plant 2/	Ht. 1st	Indain-2/
Variety	<u>Yield</u>	Maturity2/	<u>ht.='</u>	pod-	Lodging='
•	Bu/A	Date	Ln.	In.	Kating
	•	Averace pl	lanting day	to May 5	
Feeee	20 7	a/22	27	Le May J	1 1
Essex	25 0	0/27	27	7	
Forrest	34.7	9/2/		6	2.1
Tracy	24.7	10/04		0 8 · · · ·	3.1
Davis	22.2	10/10	40	0	3.4
Lee /4	33.4	10/05	20		2.3
FFR 666	33.3	10/04	32	1	2.0
Ransom	33.1	10/09	.38	9	2.3
Coker 136	32.8	10/02	41	8	2.4
Dare	32.6	9/2/	37	/	2.7
Lee 68	32.4	10/04	35	8	2.0
McNair 600	31.9	10/03	39	8	2.9
Hutton	30.7	10/14	39	9	3.4
Bragg	30.5	10/14	44	ġ	3.5
			1.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
•		Average p	lanting da	te May 25	
Essex	33.9	9/2/	29	/	1.5
Ransom	33.6	10/16	37	9	2.6
Tracy	32.6	10/11	37	1	2.8
Coker 136	32.6	10/08	40	9	2.3
Lee 74	32.3	10/10	35	1	3.5
Hutton	32.0	10/17	39	9	4.0
Forrest	31.5	10/02	36	7	2.9
Davis	31.3	10/14	39	8	2.9
Dare	31.1	9/29	38	7	2.3
McNair 600	30.9	10/08	37	7	3.3
Bragg	30.5	10/16	41	9	2.8
<u> </u>					
		Average p	lanting da	te June 20	
Essex	30.9	10/09	26	6	2.3
Tracy	30.3	10/16	32	6	3.0
Bragg	30.0	10/23	34	8	2.5
Coker 136	28.7	10/17	30	7	2.5
Hutton	28.2	10/24	29	7	3.1
Ransom	28.0	10/22	31	9	2.7
Forrest	27.5	10/14	32	8	3.0
McNair 600	27.1	10/18	33	6	2.7
Lee 74	26.4	10/17	27	7	3.4
Davis	25.0	10/21	32	7	2.7
Dare	23.74/	10/09	28	6	2.7

1/Yield adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. 2/An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.  $\overline{3}$ /Frost killed beans date October 3, 1975, 1976 average maturity dates are listed.  $\overline{4}$ /No 1976 yield due to poor stand.

Variety	Vield1/	Maturity2/	$\frac{Plant}{bt}$ 2/	Ht. 1st $\frac{1}{2}$	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /
variety	Bu/A	Date	Tn	In	Bating
	DU/N	Date			Nacing
		Average p	lanting dat	e May 7	
Essex	37.8	9/21	24	5	1.1
Forrest	34.5	9/26	33	6	2 3
Tracy	34 4	10/04	3/	5	2.5
Dowig	33.0	10/083/	37	6	2.0
Calor 136	33.3	0/30	37	7	3.0
Coker 150	22.2	9/30	2/	7	2.0
Dare		9/20	34	5	2.3
Lee /4	32.8	10/0/ <u>5</u> /	34	7	2.0
Ransom	32.2	,10/10	35	7	2.0
McNair 600	32.1	10/03	36	5	2.4
Lee 68	31./	10/063/	33	7	1.8
Bragg	31.2	10/14 <u>3</u> /	41	8	2.8
		Average n	lanting dat	e May 25	
Fecer	34 0	9/25	27	6	1 2
Coker 136	33 1	10/073/	38	Q	1.5
Tracy	33 0	10/093/	35	6	2.01
Panaom	32.0	10/163/	25		2.0
Ransom	22.9	10/10 = 10/10		/ . 0	2.2
Fermoat	22.2	10/202	27	с. С	3.5
Porrest	34.5	0/28	35	0	2.4
Dare	21.0	9/20	30	6	2.0
McNair 600	31.7	10/0/3/	36	6	2.8
Lee /4		10/103/	33 -	6	3.2
Davis	30.8	10/13 <u>3</u> /	. 37	7	2.7
Bragg	30.6	10/16 <u>3</u> /	39	8	2.4
•		Average n	lanting dat	e June 21	
Braga	32 2	10/223/	35	8 8	2 5
Freeze	32.2	10/073/	25	6	2.5
Ussex Untton	30.8	10/2/3/	30	.0	1.9
Dancom	30.0	10/242/	21	. 0	4.0
Callor 126	30.0	10/223/	21	0	2.3
Coker 150	29.0	$\frac{10}{143}$	20	7	2.2
rorrest MaNada (00	20.9	10/113/	32	7	2.8
McNair 600	28.3	10/15/	33	5	2.3
Davis	27.0	10/223/	33	/	2.4
Lee /4	27.3	10/18 <u>5</u> /	28	7	3.6
Dare		10/07 <u>3</u> /	29	5	2.3
1/Yield adjust	ed to 13% moi	sture and 60 p	ounds per b	ushel.	
$\frac{2}{An}$ explanati	on of data ar	id ratings is g	iven on pag	e 3 of this	report.
<u>3</u> /Average matu	rity for 1973	3, 1975,and 197	f; frost	killed soybe	ans on
October 3, 1	974.				

Table 10. Four-Year Averages for Yield, Date of Maturity, Plant and First Pod Heights, and Lodging of Soybean Varieties Planted at Three Dates at Sand Mountain Substation, 1973 through 1976

Variety	Yield <sup>1/</sup>	lst biocm <sup>2</sup> /	Maturity $\frac{2}{}$	Plant <u>2</u> / ht.	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	Seed size
	Bu/A	Dates	Date	In.	Rating	g/100 Seed
Essex	41.8 a	7/09	10/02	34	1.3	12.0
McNair 500	41.4 ab	7/19	10/01	40	3.0	11.0
Lee 68	40.9 abc	7/22	10/10	38	3.3	12.9
Ransom	40.5 abc	7/20	10/14	42	2.9	15.4
Lee 74	40.4 abc	7/23	10/10	39	2.9	11.6
FFR 667	40.1 abc	7/20	10/12	43	2.3	15 3
McNair 600	39.9 abc	7/20	10/09	42	3.4	13.6
Bragg	39.9 abc	7/25	10/14	47	3.8	14.9
Lancer	39.8 abc	7/23	10/09	44	2.3	16.5
McNair 3130	39.2 abc	7/25	10/16	46	2.8	15 3
FFR 6024	39.0 abc	7/22	10/08	38	3.0	11.8
Coker 842	38.7 abc	7/21	10/13	45	2.9	12.8
Dare	38.3 abc	7/18 .	10/02	37	2.3	12.6
Forrest	38.3 abc	7/13	10/02	40	1.9	12.2
Centennial	38.2 abc	7/20	10/13	45	3.8	12.9
E-X-C-E-L 200	37.2 abc	7/21	10/09	38	2.6	11.9
Hutton	36.3 abc	7/26	10/17	43	4.3	15.6
FFR 666	36.1 abc	7/20	10/07	37	2.4	11 9
FFR 5002	35.7 abc	7/14	10/07	51	2.4	16.4
Tracy	35.1 abc	7/17	10/06	42	3.5	16.8
Coker 136	34.4 bc	7/21	10/05	46	1.9	15 3
Davis	34.2 c	7/28	10/10	42	3.6	14 2
Mack	33.9 c	7/16	10/01	42	2.6	12 3

Table 11. Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant Height, Lodging, and Seed Size and Quality<u>3</u>/ of Soybean Varieties When Planted May 4, 1976, at Tennessee Valley Substation

C.V.% = 11.0

1/Yield adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P=.05). 2/An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report. 3/Seed quality rating was very good for all varieties in this test.

Var	iety	$Yield^{1/2}$	lst 100m <sup>2</sup> /	Maturity <sup>2</sup> /	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /
•		Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	Rating
Essex	1	51.9	7/09	10/01	33	1.1
Brage	r	46.4	7/22	10/17	48	3.8
Ransc	, m	46.4	7/17	10/17	42	2.8
Tracy	1	45.2	7/12	10/08	' 43	3.3
Lance	1	45.1	7/19	10/06	45	2.6
Forre	est -	45.0	7/11	10/02	38	1.9
McNai	r 600	44.1	7/15	10/08	42	3.7
Cente	ennial	44.1	7/15	10/12	45	3.8
Lee f	58	43.8	7/17	10/08	37	3.0
Lee 7	74	43.6	7/16	10/10	39	2.7
⊢ FFR 6	566	43.6	7/16	10/07	35	2.3
<sup>9</sup> FFR (	5024	43.5	7/15	10/09	36	2.8
Cokei	842	43.5	7/16	10/11	43	2.8
Mack		43.1	7/12	10/01	39	2.9
FFR S	5002	41.0	7/11	10/03	57	3.7
Dare		40.0	7/13	10/01	38	2.6
Davis	5	39.2	7/24	10/08	44	4.0
llutto	n	38.3	7/23	10/21	44	4.4
Coker	r 136	38.2	7/15	10/03	45	2.1

Table 12. Two-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant Height and Lodging of Soybean Varieties Planted May 3 at Tennessee Valley Substation, 1975 and 1976

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

. -

 $\overline{2}/\Lambda n$  explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Variety -	Yield1/	lst bloom <u>3</u> /	$Maturity^{3/2}$	Plant ht. <u>3</u> /		Lodging3/		
	Bu/A	Dates				Rating		
			Three-year av	erage plan	nting date May 5	•		• .
		·						
Essex	51.1	7/09	0/20	31		1.3		
Forrest	45.0	7/11	10/01	37		2.3		
Tracy	44.8	7/11	10/72/	42		3.4	•	
Ransom	43.0	7/17	10/152/	40		2.7		
Dare	41.9	7/13	10/01	38		2.6		
McNair 600	41.7	7/13	10/82/	41		3.5		
Bragg	41.5	7/23	10/142/	47		4.0		
Lee 74	41.2	7/16	$10/10\overline{2}/$	37		3.2		
FFR 666	40.9	7/15	10/72/	34	· · · ·	2.4		
Lee 68	40.5	7/16	10/92/	36		2.8		
Coker 136	38.3	7/15	10/04	45		2.1		
Hutton	36.6	7/24	10/192/	42		4.4		
o Davis	36.5	7/24	10/9 <u>2</u> /	43		4.3	•	
	•		Four-vear aver	age nlanti	ng date May 6			
-			Four year aver	age praner				
Essex	52.8	7/09	9/28	32		1.4		
Forrest	48.6	7/11	9/30	36		2.2		
Dare	45.1	7/14	9/29	37		2.5		
Ransom	43.4	7/17	$10/14\frac{4}{4}$	40	•	2.8		•
McNair 600	43.0	7/14	$10/8 \frac{4}{4}$	40		3.6		
Lee 74	42.7	7/16	$10/9 \frac{4}{4}$	37		3.3		-
Lee 68	42.6	7/16	$10/8 \frac{4}{4}$	36		3.0		
Coker 136	42.6	7/15	10/024/	43		1.9		
Bragg	42.4	7/22	10/14 <u>4</u> /	46		4.0		
FFR 666	42.3	7/15	$10/7 \frac{4}{4}$	34	•	2.6		۰.
Davis	38.9	7/24	10/10 <u>4/</u>	42		4.3		
Hutton	38.8	7/23	10/194/	42		4.4		
<u>l</u> /Yields adjus	ted to 13% mo	isture and 60	pounds per bushel	•	3/An explanation	of data and rati	ngs is giv	ven on pa
<u>2</u> /Maturity dat	e for 1975-76	; frost kill	ed soybeans Octob	er 3,	3 of this repor	t.		
1974	an a			· · · <u>/</u>	/Maturity date o	f 1973,1975 and	1976; fros	st killed
					- richarn Oatabar	3 107/		

		· · .							
Table 13.	Three and Four-Year	Averages for	Yield, First	Bloom and M	laturity Date	s, Plant	Height, and	Lodging of	
	Soybean Varieties at	Tennessee Va	alley Substat	ion, 1973 th	nrough 1976			•	

							-			•
	Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom <u>2</u> /	Maturity2/	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod2/	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	Shattering2/	Purple Stain	Seed size
		Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating	Rating	g/100 seed
	McNair 600	44.4 a	7/26	10/08	39	6	2.3	1 0	1.5	14.2
	McNair 3130	43.6 a	7/30	10/10	42	5	2.3	1	1.0	16.1
	Forrest	42.7 a	7/21	10/04	37	4	2.9	1	1.5	13 9
	Bragg	40.8 ab	7/30	10/10	46	7	3.8	]	1.5	14 6
	Essex	39.7 ab	7/21	10/04	30	5	1.5	1	1.0	13 5
	Lee 74	39.6 ab	7/25	10/09	34	5	3.4	1	1.0	13.6
	Davis	39.0 ab	8/02	10/07	38	5	2.0	1	1 5	16.1
	Coker 842	38.9 ab	7/26	10/08	39	5	1.1	1	1.0	16.1
	Hutton	38.6 ab	7/31	10/14	39	6	4.6	1	1.0	14.2
	Tracy	38.2 ab	7/21	10/16	39	5	3.5	1	1.0	16.5
	Mack	37.9 ab	7/21	10/04	37	4	3.9	1	1 5	15.0
2	E-X-C-E-L 200	37.8 ab	7/25	10/07	34	5	3.1	1	1.0	12.6
	Lee 68	37.6 ab	7/26	10/07	36	5	2.8	1	1.0	15.0
	FFR 5002	37.5 ab	7/21	10/05	45	6	2.8	1	2.5	14.1
	FFR 6024	37.0 ab	7/25	10/07	32	5	3.0	1	2.5	12.6
	Ransom	36.6 ab	7/26	10/11	39	7	2 1	1	1.0	16 2
	Coker 136	35.2 ab	7/26	10/04	39	7	1 4	1	2.0	16.2
	FFR 667	35.2 ab	7/26	10/13	43	7	2.8	1	2.0	10.2
	Lancer	34.8 ab	7/28	10/04	40	6	1.0	1	1.0	10.4
	McNair 500	34.7 ab	7/22	10/04	37	5	23	1	1.9	1/.0
	FFR 666	34.4 ab	7/25	10/05	34	5	2.0	1	1.0	14.)
	Centennial	33.6 ab	7/25	10/08	39	6	1 8	1	1.0	17.1
	Dare	30.5 b	7/22	10/04	36	5	2 5	1	1.0	14.4
	Q ** 04	2.0. (					<u> </u>	T	T.0	14.1

Table 14. Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, Shattering, and Seed Size and Quality<sup>2/</sup> of Soybean Varieties when Planted May 19, 1976, at Upper Coastal Plain Substation

C.V.% 19.6

 $\frac{1}{2}$ /Yield adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P=.05). 2/An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report. 3/Seed quality was very good for all varieties in this test.

Variety	Yield $\frac{1}{}$	lst bloom2/	Maturity <u>2</u> /	Plant ht.2/	Ht. 1st pod2/	Lodging2/	Shattering2/	Seed size
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating	g/100 seed
Essex	29.8 a	8/09	10/06	23	3	1.0	1	14.2
Mack	29.8 a	8/09	10/05	31	2	2.3	1	14.3
E-X-C-E-L 200	29.1 ab	8/13	10/12	31	5	1.8	1	11.9
Dare	29.0 ab	8/10	10/09	31	5	1.3	1	13.4
Forrest	28.3 ab	8/09	10/06	32	5	1.1	1	12.4
Coker 338	27.5 abc	8/18	10/26	.38	7	2.5	1	14.7
Coker 842	26.2 abcd	8/15	10/12	32	6	1.0	1	11.5
Lee 74	25.9 abcde	8/18	10/13	31	.4	2.4	1	12.2
Coker 136	25.3 abcdef	8/14	10/10	36	6	1.4	1	12.6
McNair 500	25.1 abcdef	8/10	10/04	30	4	1.6	1	11.8
$_{\rm N}^{\rm N}$ McNair 600	24.7 bcdefg	8/11	10/10	33	4	1.1	1	11.4
Соьр	23.2 cdefg	8,/25	10/26	40	5	1.8	1	12.2
Ransom	22.2 defgh	8/18	10/17	34	5	1.5	1	13.6
Lancer	22.0 defgh	8/18	10/13	31	4	1.0	1 .	12.8
Centennial	21.7 defgh	8/14	10/12	35	7	1.5	1	11.0
Bragg	21.0 efgh	8/18	10/17	40	7	2.5	1	12.5
Green Soy 74-7	20.7 fgh	8/12	10/07	38	5	2.1	1	15.1
Hutton	20.4 fgh	8/19	10/19	34	5	2.6	1	13.0
Tracy	19.9 gh	8/11	10/07	32	4.	1.6	1	15.6
Davis	14.9 h	8/23	10/20	30	4	1.5 <b>'</b>	1	12.3

Table 15. Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, Shattering, and Seed Size and Quality 3/ of Soybean Varieties when Planted June 15, 1976, at Upper Coastal Plain Substation

C.V.% 21.8

 $\frac{1}{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

 $\frac{3}{\text{Seed}}$  quality and purple stain ratings were very good for all varieties in this test.

Variety	Yield <u>1</u> /	lst bloom <u>2</u> /	Maturity <sup>2/</sup>	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod <sup>2</sup> /	Lodging <sup>2/</sup>	Shattering <sup>2</sup> /
• · · · ·	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
McNair 600	50.5	7/21	10/13	37	5	1.8	1
Hutton	49.6	7/28	10/21	41	7	3.9	1
Coker 842	49.3	7/22	10/11	38	6	1.2	1
Davis	48.7	7/29	10/09	: 38	5	2.0	1
Tracy	48.4	7/18	10/15	38	5	2.5	1
Lee 74	47.5	7/19	10/15	31	4	2.2	· 1
Essex	47.3	7/15	10/02	30	4	1.3	1
Bragg	46.9	7/27	10/16	44	7	3.0	1
Ransom	46.2	7/22	10/16	38	7	1.7	: <b>1</b>
Forrest	45.8	7/15	. 10/02	35	5	1.9	1
Centennial	44.9	7/19	10/15	39	6	1.4	1
Lancer	44.0	7/24	10/07	38	6	1.1	1
Mack	43.9	7/17	9/30	35	4	2.9	. 1
Coker 136	43.4	7/20	10/03	36	6	1.2	1
FFR 6024	43.4	7/18	10/14	31	5	2.1	1
Lee 68	41.9	7/22	10/08	34	. 5	2.0	1
FFR 666	41.6	7/20	10/10	31	5	1.5	1
Dare	41.6	7/17	10/03	34	6	1.9	1

Table 16. Two-Year Average Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties when Planted May 7, 1975-76, at Upper Coastal Plain Substation

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. 2/An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

23

.

			2 C				•	
	Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom2/	Maturity <sup>2/</sup>	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod <sup>2/</sup>	Lodging <sup>2/</sup>	Shattering <sup>2</sup> /
		Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
	Сорр	35.5	8/25	11/03	39	5	1.9	1
	Coker 338	35.3	8/19	10/29	37	6	2.0	. 1
	Lee 74	34.8	8/17	10/17	31	4	2.1	1
	McNair 600	32.6	8/15	10/16	, 31	3	1.1	1
	Forrest	32.6	8/12	10/12	30	4	1.2	1
	Mack	32.6	8/12	10/07	31	3	1.9	1
	Dare	32.1	8/12	10/11	31	4	. 1.5	1
	Bragg	31.6	8/19	10/23	36	5	2.6	1
	Ransom	31.3	8/19	10/25	33	5	1.6	1
	Coker 136	30.9	8/14	10/13	32	5	1.4	• 1
	Essex	30.6	8/12	10/09	22	3	1.0	. 1
24	Coker 842	30.4	8/18	10/16	31	4	1.0	1
	Tracy	30.3	8/16	10/16	31	4	1.9	1
	Hutton	29.7	8/20	10/27	34	6	2.7	1 .
	Centennial	28.6	8/17	10/16 •	34	6	1.5	1
	Davis	26.9	8/22	10/20	31	۷,	1.9	1

Fable 17.	Two-Year Average Yield,	First Bloom	and Maturity	Dates, Pl	ant and	First Pod	Heights,	Lodging, and
•	Shattering of Soybean V	arieties when	Planted June	e 20, 1975	5-76, at	Upper Coa	stal Plain	Substation

•

 $\frac{1}{Y}$ ields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.  $\frac{2}{A}$ n explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report. 

Variatu	Viold1/	lst	Maturity2/	Plant	Ht. let $pod^2/$	Lodging2/	Shattoring <sup>2</sup> /
variety	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	<u>IIL.='</u> In	ISC POUL	Rating	Rating
•	Du/It	Dates	Dates	111.	±+++•	Racing	Nating
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Three-year averag	e early plant	ing date May	13	
Hutton	48.4	7/25	10/22	38	7	3.3	1
Lee 74	48.0	7/17	10/12	32	5	2.2	1
Davis	47.7	7/27	10/08	40	7	2.2	1
McNair 600	47.7	7/17	10/09	36	5	1.6	1
Ransom	47.2	7/19	10/14	38	7	1.6	1
Tracy	47.0	7/15	10/10	36	6	2.3	1
Bragg	46.5	7/22	10/16	43	8	2.6	1
Essex	45.8	7/13	9/27	28	4	1.2	1
Forrest	44.0	7/13	10/01	34	5	2.0	1
Coker 136	43.1	7/17	10/02	37	6	1.2	1
Lee 68	40.9	7/18	10/08	34	5	1.9	1
Dare	40.1	7/15	10/01	33	6	1.7	1
FFR 666	39.8	7/17	10/08	30	5	1.5	1
	•		Three-wear avera	ce late plant	ing data luna	18	
•	· · ·		inice year avera	ge face prant	ing date Julie	10	
Lee 74	36.6	8/15	10/17	32	5	2.5	1
Forrest	35.3	8/10	10/11	32	5	1.6	1
Coker 338	34.5	8/18	10/29	39	6	2.4	1
Сорр	34.4	8/24	11/01	42	6	2.3	1 1
Ransom	34.2	8/17	10/23	34	5	1.8	1
Tracy	33.8	8/15	10/17	33	4	2.2	1
Dare	33.5	8/10	10/10	33	5	1.5	1
Essex	33.4	8/10	10/07	24	3	1.1	1
McNair 600	32.8	8/14	10/14	34	4	1.5	1
Coker 136	32.8	8/14	10/13	34	6	1.6	1
Bragg	32.8	8/17	10/22	39	6	2.7	1
Hutton	31.8	8/18	10/24	34	6	2.5	1
Davis	29.0	8/20	10/20	34	4	2.1	1

Table 18. Three Year Average Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties at Upper Coastal Plain Substation, 1974 through 1976

25

 $\frac{1}{Y}$ ields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.  $\frac{2}{An}$  explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

		lst		~~			•
Variety	Vield1/	bloom <sup>2</sup> /	Matumity2/	Plant	Ht. $\frac{1}{2}$	1-1-1-2/	Chattering 2/
	$\frac{11010}{Bu/\Delta}$	Dates		<u></u>	IST podz'	Lodging <sup>2</sup>	Snattering_/
• • • • • • • • •	bu) n	Dates	Dates	111.	111.	Kating	Kating
	· · · · ·		Four-year ave	rage early nl	lanting data Ma	w 16	
· · · ·	· · · · ·		four year ave	rage earry pi	anting date ha	y 10	
McNair 600	46.7	7/19	10/07	36	5	1.5	· 1
Lee 74	46.3	7/18	10/11	32	6	2.3	Ĩ
Davis	46.0	7/26	10/06	39	6	1.9	1
Tracy	45.8	7/17	10/07	35	5	2.0	1
Ransom	45.0	7/20	10/11	37	7	1.5	1
Hutton	44.4	7/24	10/18	38	8	2.9	1
Forrest	44.0	7/14	9/29	34	5	1.8	1
Bragg	43.2	7/23	10/14	43	8	2.2	1
Essex	43.1	7/14	9/25	28	4	1.1	1
Coker 136	42.9	7/19	10/01	36	7	1.2	1
Lee 68	40.9	7/19	10/06	33	5	1.8	1
FFR 666	39.8	7/19	10/05	29	5	1.4	1
Dare	38.4	7/15	9/30	32	5	1.5	1
				•			
			Four-year av	erage late pl	anting date Jun	ne 18	
100 7/	26 1	0/10	10/11	0.0	_		
Eerrogt	26.1	8/13	10/16	32	5	2.2	1
Cokor 338	24.7	8/08	10/09	32	5	1.5	1
Forey	34.4	0/10	10/2/	39	6.	2.2	1
Dancom	34.1	8/08	10/06	25	4	1.1	1
Troov	24.0	0/15	10/21	34	6	1.6	1
MaNair 600	22.4	8/14	10/15	33 y	5	2.1	1
Dara	22.4	8/13	10/12	34	4	1.4	1
Cokor 136	32.J 22.L	δ/1U 0/10	10/09	33	5	1.4	1
Bragg	32.4	8/13	10/11	34	6	1.5	1
Unttop	JI.4 20.7	0/14	10/20	38	.6	2.3	1
Dovia	20.7	8/10	10/22	35		2.2	1
	29.0	8/19	10/1/	34	4	1.9	1

# Table 19. Four-Year Average Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties at Upper Coastal Plain Substation, 1974 though 1976

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

 $\overline{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

## Central Alabama

The test locations in Central Alabama were on Sumter clay at Marion Junction, Lucedale sandy loam at Prattville, and Forkland sandy loam at Camden. Soybeans of Maturity Group VII are full season varieties in this area. Varieties of maturity groups V and VI are very early and early, respectively. Maturity Group V varieties are approximately 10 inches shorter in central than morthern Alabama locations.

Coker 136 and Forrest are the tallest group V varieties planted in the central tests. Their yields are not as good as the full season varieties, but could be used for early harvest varieties as they mature between September 22 and 30. Essex has produced slightly better yields at Prattville than either Coker 136 or Forrest, but its maturity tends to be very erratic in central and southern locations.

The maximum yielding varieties at central Alabama locations for the past 3 to 4 years are: Group V varieties Essex, Forrest, and Coker 136; Group VI varieties McNair 600, Davis, Lee 74, and FFR 666 for mid-May plantings and Davis and Tracy at later plantings at Marion Junction; Group VII varieties Bragg, McNair 800, and Ransom, particularly at the late May and early June plantings; Group VIII varieties Coker 338, Hutton, and Cobb looked good at later planting at Marion Junction and Prattville.

This is the first year a variety test was planted at Camden and the six highest yielding varieties were the full season (Group VII) and late maturity (Group VIII) varieties.

New lines that looked good were Coker 842 and E-X-C-E-L 200 at Marion Junction and McNair 3129 at Camden on Prattville in 1976.

	Variety	$y_{i,j,l,l}$	lst_bloom <sup>2</sup> /	2/ Maturity	Plant ht.2/	llt. 1st $pod^{2/2}$	Lodging2/	Shattering <sup>2</sup> /	
		Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating	
				•			1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1		
	FFR 666	46.2 a	7/14	10/07	26	4	1.1	1.3	
	E-X-C-E-L 200	44.2 ab	7/14	10/06	26	3	1.5	1.3	
	Coker 842	44.1 ab	7/16	10/11	31	4	1.0	1.0	
	McNair 800	43.4 abc	7/27	10/11	. 32	4	1.3	1.0	
	McNair 3131	40.7 abcd	7/25	10/12	33	5	1.6	1.0	
	McNair 600	40.4 abcd	7/16	10/08	31	3	1.5	1.0	•
	Centennial	39.7 abcde	7/15	10/09	32	3	1.5	1.5	
	Essex	38.9 abcdef	7/06	9/17	22	2	1.3	1.5	
• •	Lee 74	38.4 bcdefg	7/17	10/09	29	4	1.9	1.3	
8	McNair 500	37.7 bcdefg	7/15	9/25	27	2	1.4	1.0	
	Coker 136	37.3 bcdefgh	7/13	9/25	31	۷,	1.5	1.0	
	Lee 63	37.0 bcdefgh	7/19	10/08	30	5	1.9	1.5	
	Coker 277	37.0 bcdefgh	7/18	10/13	32	3	1.5	1.3	
	Tracy	35.9 cdefgh	7/14	10/08	31	5	2.0	1.8	
	Coker 338	35.6 cdefgh	7/22	10/17	36	4	1.8	1.3	
	Forrest	34.8 defgh	7/12	9/22	23	3	1.1	1.0	
	McNair 3129	33.6 defgh	7/20	10/14	33	4	1.8	1.0	
	Mack	32.9 defgh	7/12	9/20	28	2	2.0	1.3	·
	Dare	32.0 efgh	7/12	9/22	25	2	1.0	1.3	
	Lancer	32.0 efgh	7/17	10/01	30	3	1.3	1.5	
	Ransom	31.7 fgh	7/19	10/14	31	4	1.0	1.0	
	Hutton	31.6 fgh	7/23	10/16	34	4	2.4	1.0	
	Davis	31.5 fgh	7/21	10/01	27	2	1.1	1.5	
	Bragg	30.5 gh	7/21	10/13	34	5 -	1.9	1.3	
	Cobb	29.6 h	7/21	10/21	41	4	1.5	2.0	
				1	•			· ·	

Table 20. Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties when Planted May 13, 1976, at Black Belt Substation

C.V.% 12.9

.

 $\frac{1}{\text{Adjusted to 13\%}}$  moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P = .05)  $\frac{2}{\text{An explanation of data and ratings is given on page3 of this report.}$ 

Vorietu	viold <sup>1</sup> /	lst $hloom^2/$	Maturity <sup>2</sup> /	Plant $ht \frac{2}{}$	Ht. 1st $pod^2/$	Lodging2/	Shattering $\frac{2}{}$
variety	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
		2					•
Coker 842	41.1 a	7/23	10/15	39	4	1.8	1.0
Ransom	40.8 a	7/25	10/16	38	4	1.9	1.0
McNair 3131	37.7 ab	7/27	10/08	36	5	1.9	1.5
Lee 74	37.2 ab	7/26	10/12	35	3	2.5	1.3
Forrest	36.7 ab	7/19	9/28	35	4	1.9	1.0
McNair 800	36.2 ab	8/04	10/13	35	5	1.5	1.3
Green Sov 74-85	35.8 ab	7/22	10/15	33	6	1.6	1.0
Tracy	35.2 ab	7/22	10/17	36	3	2.4	1.8
. Essex	35.2 ab	7/18	9/30	26	4	1.3	1.0
<sup>9</sup> Lancer	34.9 ab	7/27	10/07	37	4	2.0	1.8
Davis	34.6 ab	7/30	10/12	35	4	1.5	1.3
Hutton	34.6 ab	7/29	10/17	37	4	3.1	1.0
Centennial	33.5 bc	7/23	10/14	37	3.	1.6	1.0
McNair 600	33.4 bc	7/22	10/13	37	3	2.3	1.3
Coker 338	33.3 bc	7/30	10/21	42	4	3.1	1.3
Coker 136	33.1 bc	7/23	10/03	38	5	2.0	1.0
Bragg	33.1 bc	7/28	10/14	42	4	2.6	1.0
Dare	32.7 bc	7/21	9/27	33	4	2.3	1.0
Cobb	32.6 bc	8/01	10/25	44	5	2.3	2.0
Mack	27.6 c	7/21	10/02	33	3	3.4	1.0

Table 21. Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties when Planted May 31, 1976, at Black Belt Substation

C.V.% 11.6  $\frac{1}{\text{Adjusted to 13\%}}$  moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P = .05).  $\frac{2}{\text{An explanation of data and ratings}}$  is given on page 3 of this report.

	•					1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -	•	
Variety	Yield1/	lst bloom2/	2/ Maturity	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod2/	Lodging <sup>2/</sup>	Shattering <u>2</u> /	
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating	
Green Soy 74-64	39.1 a	8/06	10/20	30	3	1.0	1.0	
Forrest	37.5 ab	8/04	10/08	29	3	1.1	1.0	
Hutton	37.1 ab	8/14	10/23	32	4	1.5	1.0	
Green Soy 74-35	36.8 ab	8/05	10/27	27	2	1.0		
Davis	36.5 abc	8/11	10/25	29	2	1.0	1.0	
Tracy	36.3 abc	8/06	10/24	33	2	1.5	1.5	
Coker 338	34.4 abcd	8/15	10/25	35	3	1.3		
Coker 842	33.9 abcd	8/06	10/21	29	3	1.0	1.3	
Bragg	33.0 abcde	8/08	10/21	33	4	1.3	1.0	
Essex	32.3 abcde	8/02	10/23	20	2	1.0	1.0	
o Centennial	31.8 abcde	8/07	10/19	32	2	1.1	1.3	
Lee 74	31.1 abcde	8/08	10/20	30	2	1.3	1.0	
Mack	30.8 abcde	8/05	9/21	27	2	1.5	1.0	
McNair 800	29.8 bcde	8/16	10/22	24	2	1.0	1.0	
Dare	29.6 bcde	8/06	10/07	26	2	1.0	1.3	
McNair 600	27.8 cde	8/07	10/17	31	2	1.3	1.8	
Cobb	27.7 cde	8/11	11/01	38	6	1.0		
Lancer	27.2 de	8/11	10/16	29	4	1.0	1.3	
Ransom	26.6 de	8/08	10/24	27	3	1.0	1.0	
Coker 136	24.8 e	8/07	10/12	26	2	1.0	1.5	
	16 /							

Table 22. Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties when Planted June 21, 1976, at Black Belt Substation

C.V.% 16.4  $\frac{1}{\text{Yields}}$  adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P = 0.5)

 $\frac{2}{An}$  explanation of data and ratings is given on page3 of this report

			Р	l'anting da	tes				
	May	13, 1976		Ma	y 31, 1976		Jui	ne 21, 1976	I
	Seed*	Purple**	Seed	Seed	Purple**	Seed	Seed*	Purple**	Seed
Variety	quality	stain	size	quality	stain	size	quality	stain	size
	Rating	Rating	g/100 seed	Rating	Rating	g/100 seed	Rating	Rating	g/100 seed
Essex	2.0	2.0	12.6	2.0	2.0	13.9	2.0	2.0	15.8
Dare	1.3	1.0	. 12.0	1.0	2.0	12.6	1.5	1.5	14.1
Mack	1.5	1.0	13.2	1.0	1.5	13.6	2.0	2.0	14.5
Forrest	1.5	1.5	11.3	1.5	2.0	12.8	2.0	1.0	12.7
Coker 136	1.0	2.0	14.7	1.5	1.5	14.8	2.0	1.5	13.8
McNair 500	1.5	1.5	12.3	***	***	***	***	***	***
E-X-C-E-L 200	1.5	2.0	12.3	***	***	***	***	***	***
McNair 600	1.0	2.0	13.2	1.5	2.0	14.0	1.5	1.0	12.7
Tracy	2.0	1.0	16.4	2.0	2.0	16.2	1.5	1.0	16.1
Coker 842	1.0	1.0	12.9	1.5	1.0	14.9	1.0	1.0	12.6
Lee 68	1.5	1.0	13.0	***	***	***	***	***	***
FFR 666	2.0	1.5	11.8	***	***	***	***	***	***
Davis	1.5	2.0	14.2	1.5	2.0	14.9	1.5	1.0	13.5
Lancer	2.0	2.0	15.3	1.5	2.0	15.7	1.5	1.0	14.5
Lee 74	2.0	1.5	12.7	1.5	1.0	13.5	2.0	1.0	13.2
Centennial	1.5	1.0	13.6	1.5	1.0	12.6	1.5	1.0	11.7
McNair 800	1.5	1.0	12.0	1.0	2.0	12.2	1.0	1.5	10.7
Ransom	2.0	1.5	14.4	1.5	1.0	15.3	1.0	1.0	14.0
Bragg	2.0	1.0	13.2	1.5	1.0	14.8	1.0	1.0	13.6
Coker 277	2.0	1.0	13.0	***	***	***	***	***	***
McNair 3129	1.5	1.5	15.3	***	***	***	***	***	***
Hutton	1.5	1.5	14.5	1.5	2.0	15.0	1.0	1.0	13.7
Coker 338	1.5	1.0	13.7	2.0	1.0	14.7	1.5	1.0	13.0
McNair 3131	1.5	1.0	13.8	1.5	1.0	15.7	***	***	**
Cobb	1.0	1.0	12.5	1.5	1.0	12.5	1.5	1.0	11.7
Green Soy 74-85	***	***	***	1.0	2.0	14.1	***	***	***
Green Soy 74-35	***	***	***	***	***	***	2.0	1.0	14.3
Green Soy 74-64	***	***	***	***	***	***	1.0	1.0	14.1
*Seed quality is	rated from	n 1 to 5 ac	cording to th	ne followin	ng scale:	l=very good; 2	2 = good;	3 = fair: 4	= poor:

Table 23. Soybean Seed Quality and Size by Variety When Grown at Black Belt Substation, 1976

5 = very poor.

ωĻ

\*\*Purple stain ratings ar given to seed samples on a scale of 1 to 5 as follows: 1 = no purple staining; 2 = 1-3% purple staining; 3 = 4-8% purple staining; 4 = 9-19% purple staining; 5 = over 20% purple staining. \*\*\*Variety not in test.

Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom <sup>2</sup> /	Maturity $\frac{2}{}$	Plant ht.2/	Ht. lst pod <u>2</u> /	Lodging <sup>2/</sup>	
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Coker 842	40 3	7/14	10/07	31	3	1.1	1.0
FFR 666	39.9	7/12	10/06	24	3	1.1	1.1
Centennial	37.3	7/13	10/09	34	۷.	1.6	1.3
Lee 74	36.3	7/16	10/03	28	4	1.6	1.1
Tracy	35.8	7/14	10/06	32	5	2.3	1.4
McNair 600	35.8	7/15	10/05	31	4	1.5	1.0
Lee 68	35.2	7/16	10/07	28	4	1.6	1.3
McNair 800	34.9	7/28	10/11	32	4	1.4	1.0
Essex	34.1	7/04	9/13	22	2	1.1	1.3
Ransom	33.0	7/17	10/15	31	5	1.3	1.0
Coker 136	32.6	7/13	9/23	30	<b>4</b> • • • • • •	1.4	1.1
$\infty$ Davis	32.0	7/20	10/01	30	3	1.4	1.3
Hutton	31.5	7/22	10/18	34	4.	2.3	1.0
Bragg	31.4	7/21	10/17	35	6	1.9	1.1
Lancer	31.4	7/17	10/09	32	3	1.4	1.4
Forrest	30.9	7/09	9/19	29	4	1.1	1.0
Mack	29.5	7/10	9/15	28	3	1.6	1.1
Dare	28.8	7/09	9/18	28	3	1.0	1.1

3

4

Table 24. Two-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties Planted May 17 on Black Belt Substation During 1975 and 1976

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

-

. •

 $\overline{2}/An$  explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

-	Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom <u>2</u> /	Maturity $\frac{2}{}$	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod <sup>2/</sup>	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	$\frac{2}{5hatteriv^{2/2}}$
		Bu/A	Dates	Dates ,	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
	Coker 842	33.6	7/22	10/11	33	4	1.4	1.0
	Ransom	32.6	7/24	10/16	34	5	1.6	1.0
	Lee 74	31.7	7/24	10/12	32	4	2.0	1.1
	Tracy	31.1	7/23	10/13	35	4	2.2	1.5
	Centennial	30.7	7/22	10/13	· ' 36	4	1.8	1.0
	Davis	30.0	7/29	10/09	3.5	4	1.3	1.1
	llutton	28.3	7/29	10/20	35	6	2.6	1.0
	McNair 800	28.2	8/04	10/13	31	- 5	1.4	1.1
	Forrest	28.2	7/18	9/27	31	· Z <sub>i</sub>	1.6	1.0
	Coker 338	28.0	7/30	10/22	38	5	2.8	1.1
	McNair 600	27.9	7/23	10/12	33	4	1.6	1.1
ů.	Bragg	27.9	7/28	10/17	37	5	1.9	1.1
ΰ.	Coker 136	26.6	7/22	10/02	34	5	1.8	1.0
	Essex	26.6	7/16	9/22	24	Ζι	1.1	1.0
	Dare	24.5	7/20	9/25	32	4	1.6	1.0
	Mack	23.6	7/20	9/25	31	3	2.6	1.0

Table 25. Two-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates Plant and First Pod Heights, and Lodging of Soybean Varieties Planted June 1 on Black Belt Substation During 1975 and 1976

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

 $\frac{1}{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom2/	Maturity $\frac{2}{}$	Plant ht.2/	Ht. 1st pod <u>2</u> /	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	Shattering $\frac{2}{}$
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Hutton	33 1	8/12	10/23	31	5	2.3	1.0
Davis	32.5	8/11	10/13	31	3	1.9	1.0
Tracy	32.2	8/05	10/18	31	3	1.6	1.3
Centennial	31.5	8/05	10/18	' 33	4	1.0	1.1
Forrest	29.6	8/03	10/08	29	3	1.2	1.0
Coker 338	29.6	8/11	10/26	34	5	1.4	1 0
Lee 74	29.1	8/05	10/16	29	3	1.3	1.0
Coker 842	28.8	8/05	10/16	28	3	1.0	1.3
McNair 800	27.5	8/15	10/21	24	3	1.1	1.0
Mack	27.4	8/03	9/25	29	3	1.8	1.0
. Cobb	27.3	8/12	11/01	38	6	1.8	
<sup>+</sup> McNair 600	27.2	8/05	10/14	30	3	1.3	1.4
Bragg	26.4	8/08	10/20	31	5	1.4	1.0
Essex	26.2	7/29	10/09	23	3	1.0	1.0
Dare	25.0	8/04	10/05	28	3	1.1	1.1
Coker 136	24.8	8/06	10/09	28	4	1.3	1.3
Ransom	24.5	8/07	10/23	27	4	1.0	1.0

ć

Table 26. Two-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, and Lodging of Soybean Varieties Planted June 20 on Black Belt Substation During 1975 and 1976

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

 $\frac{\overline{2}}{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Table 27. Three-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties when Planted May 16 on Black Belt Substation During 1974 through 1976.

						· · ·	
Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom <u>2</u> /	Maturity $\frac{2}{}$	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod <u>2</u> /	$Lodging^2/$	Shattering $\frac{2}{}$
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
FFR 666	40.6	7/11	10/04	22	2	1.0	1.1
Tracy	39.9	7/11	10/05	31	4	2.0	1.3
McNair 600	37.2	7/12	10/04	30	4	1.3	1.0
Lee 74	37.1	7/13	10/07	26	3	1.4	1.2
Ransom	36.9	7/15	10/14	30	5	1.3	1.1
McNair 800	36.6	7/26	10/11	33	4	1.5	1.0
Coker 136	36.5	7/12	9/23	31	4	1.4	1.1
Forrest	35.8	7/08	9/18	29	4	1.0	1.0
Essex	35.4	7/05	9/11	20	2	1.1	1.2
Davis	35.3	7/19	9/28	33	3	1.6	1.3
Lee 68	34.8	7/14	10/08	25	3	1.4	1.3
Hutton	34.4	7/21	10/18	35	5	2.2	1.0
Dare	34.0	7/09	9/18	27	3	1.0	1.1
Bragg	33.2	7/18	10/15	36	6	1.6	1.1
							and the second

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

 $\frac{2}{An}$  explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Table 28. Three Year Avearges for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties When Planted June 2, 1973, 1975, and 1976<sup>2</sup>/ at Black Belt Substation

Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom	Maturity $\frac{3}{}$	Plant ht. <u>3</u> /	Ht. 1st pod <sup>3_/</sup>	Lodging <sup>1</sup> /	Shattering <sup>3</sup> /
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Ransom	31.6	7/25	10/12	35	5	1.9	1
Davis	29.8	7/29	10/06	36	5	2.2	1
McNair 600	28.4	7/23	10/03	34	4	1.9	1
Forrest	28.2	7/20	9/25	31	4	1.9	1
Coker 136	27.3	7/22	9/29	36	6	1.7	1
Essex	27.1	7/16	9/22	26	4	1.2	1
McNair 800	26.8	8/05	10/09	33	5	1.9	1
Hutton	25.6	7/30	10/19	35	6	2.9	1
Bragg	25.4	7/29	10/13	38	6	2.3	1
Dare	25.3	7/21	9/25	32	5	2.0	1
ώ 							

 $\frac{1}{A}$ Adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.  $\frac{2}{N}$ No planting made in 1974 due to wet soil conditions during planting period.  $\frac{3}{A}$ An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Table 29. Three-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties when Planted June 19 on Black Belt Substation During 1974 through 1976

Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom <sup>2</sup> /	Maturity <sup>2</sup> /	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st $\frac{1}{\text{pod}^2}$	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	Shattering $\frac{2}{}$
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Davis `	33.6	8/11	10/19	32	3	1.7	1.0
Tracy	33.5	8/06	10/17	32	3	1.6	1.2
Coker 338	32.2	8/12	10/27	35	5	1.7	
Hutton	31.5	8/13	10/23	31	5	1.9	1.0
Lee 74	31.1	8/07	10/16	30	3	1.5	1.0
Forrest	29.3	8/04	10/09	29	3	1.3	1.0
McNair 600	29.0	8/07	10/15	32	3	1.4	1.3
McNair 800	29.0	8/15	10/19	26	3	1.2	1.0
Essex	28.6	7/31	10/07	24	3	1.0	1.0
Bragg	27.9	8/09	10/21	34	5	1.4	1.0
Сорр	27.8	8/14	11/02	40	5	1.8	
Ransom	27.1	8/08	10/24	29	4	1.1	1.0
Coker 136	26.9	8/07	10/10	30	4	1.4	1.2
Dare	25.5	8/04	10/06	28	3	1.1	1.1

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

 $\overline{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Variety	Yield1/	lst bloom 2/	Maturity <u>2</u> /	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod <u>2</u> /	Lodging2/	Shattering2/
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
			Average	planting da	te May 16		
Coker 136	38.0	7/12	9/22	32	4	1.4	1.1
McNair 600	37.9	7/12	10/03	30	4	1.3	1.0
Essex	37.6	7/07	9/13	21	2	1.2	1.2
Davis	37.1	7/18	9/28	34	3	1.8	1.3
Lee 74	36.9	7/13	10/05	28	4	1.6	1.2
Lee 68	36.4	7/13	10/05	27	3 4 4	1.5	1.3
Forrest	36.4	7/09	9/18	29	4	1.2	1.0
Ransom	35.0	7/14	10/12	31	5	1.5	1.1
McNair 800	34.9	7/26	10/08	34	5	1.9	1.0
🕉 Dare	34.1	7/10	9/18	28	3	1.2	1.1
Bragg	32.9	7/16	10/11	37	6	1.7	1.1
			Average	e planting da	ate June 23	•	
Davis	31.0	8/12	10/18	29	3	1.5	1.0
Hutton	28.9	8/14	10/23	29	5	1.9	1.0
Forrest	26.8	8/05	10/08	27	3	1.4	1.0
Bragg	26.6	8/10	10/20	31 -	4	1.5	1.0
McNair 800	26.3	8/16	10/18	24	4	1.2	1.0
McNair 600	26.2	8/08	10/13	29	2	1.4	1.3
Essex	25.6	8/02	10/07	22	3	1.1	1.0
Ransom	25.2	8/09	10/24	27	- 4	1.1	1.0
Coker 136	24.4	8/08	10/09	28	4	1.3	1.2
Dare	22.0	8/06	10/06	25	3	1.1	1.1

Table 30. Four-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties Planted at Two Dates on Black Belt Substation During 1973 through 1976

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

 $\frac{2}{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Table 31. Four-Year Averages for Yield, Date of Maturity, Plant and First Pod Heights, and Lodging of Soybean Varieties Planted June 2 on Black Belt Substation During 1972, 1973, 1975, and 1976<sup>2/</sup>

Variety	Yield <u>1</u> /	Maturity <sup>3/</sup>	Plant ht.3	/ Ht. 1st poo	$\frac{3}{100000000000000000000000000000000000$
	Bu/A	date	In.	In.	rating
· · · · ·					
Ransom	34.6	10/14	36	5.6	2.0
Davis	31.9	10/06	37	4.5	2.1
McNair 600	30.8	10/08	35	4.1	2.0
Forrest	30.7	9/25	34	4.7	1.9
McNair 800	29.1	10/10	32	4.9	2.1
Dare	27.2	9/24	34	4.4	2.0
Bragg	28.7	10/13	39	5.7	2.5
Hutton	28.7	10/22	36	5.5	2.9

 $\frac{1}{2}$ /Yield adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.  $\frac{2}{2}$ /No planting made in 1974 due to wet conditions during planting period.  $\frac{3}{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Variety	Yield1/	lst bloom <u>2</u> /	Maturity2/	Plant ht.2		Ht. 1st pod <u>2</u> 7	Lodging <u>2</u> /	Seed quality	Purple stain	Se si	ed` ze
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.		In.	Rating	Rating	Rating	g/100	seed
						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · ·		· .	2	•
Bragg	41.2 a	7/24	10/16	32		5	2 0	10	1.0	14 0	
McNair 3129	41.0 a	7/19	10/12	27		6	2 3	1.0	1.0	14.9	
McNair 800	40.6 ab	8/01	10/11	26 .		5	1.8	1.0	1.0	14.5	
Coker 338	40.4 ab	7/26	10/22	. 30		5	2.0	1.0	1.0	12.1	· .
Сорр	39.8 abc	8/02	10/18	33		4	2.5	1.0	1.0	15.6	
McNair 3131	39.6 abc	7/28	10/09	26	:	6	2.5	1.0	1.0	13.8	
FFR 667	39.6 abc	7/18	10/17	30		6	1.5	1.0	1.0	15.4	
Lancer	37.9 abc	7/22	9/29	25		0	2.0	1.0	1.5	14.5	
Coker 842	37.9 abcd	7/20	10/05	23			1.3	1.5	1.5	13.5	
Ransom	37.6 abcd	7/23	10/17	2 J 7 J		4	. 1.3	1.0	1.0	12.3	
McNair 3130	37.5 abcd	7/23	10/11	27		5	1.3	1.0	1.0	14.9	
McNair 600	36.8 abcd	7/17	10/01	27		5	1.5	1.0	1.0	13.5	
FFR 666	36.6 abode	7/15	10/04	- 27		4 ·	2.3	1.0	1.5	12.9	1 - C
Hutton	36.5 abode	7/31	10/05	22		3	2.3	1.0	1.0	11.9	
Centennial	35 0 abcdef	7/18	10/14	29		3	1.8	1.5	1.0	17.2	
Tracy	34.9 abcdef	7/15	10/00	28		3	1.5	1.0	1.0	13.4	
Coker 277	34.9 abcdef	7/10	10/02	25	•	3	2.0	1.5	1.0	16.2	•
Lee 68	34.0 abcdef	7/19	10/16	26		3	1.8	1.0	1.0	13.7	
Davis	34.1 abodof	7/10	10/06	23		4	1.8	1.5	1.0	12.6	
McNair 500	32.6 Ladefa	7/20	10/02	25		4	1.8	1.0	1.5	13.4	
Lee 74	32.0 Dederg	7/19	9/26	21		3	2.0	1.5	1.5	11.2	
Ecc 74 Forrect	32.2 cderg	7/21	10/05	22		.4	2.0	1.0	1.0	12.6	
$F_{-}Y_{-}C = I 200$	32.1 cdefg	7/14	9/22	24		5	1.8	1.0	1.5	12.3	
E=A=C=E=L 200	31.4 defg	//19	10/04	22		2	1.8	1.0	1.0	12.1	
Cohem 126	30.3 defg	//15	10/04	22		3	2.3	1.0	1.0	12.5	
LOKET 136	30.2 defg	7/1.9	9/22	26		6	1.5	1.0	1.7	12.5	
Dare	28.9 efg	7/15	9/18	23		3	1.3	1.0	1.0	12.5	
LSSEX	28.2 fg	7/13	9/18	19		5	1.0	1.0	1.0	14 6	
Маск	26.2 g	7/15	9/15	23		3	3.3	1.5	1.0	- 13 9	

Table 32. Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, Shattering, and Seed Size and Quality of Soybean Varieties when Planted May 20, 1976, at Lower Coastal Plain Substation

· C.V.% 13.4

1/Yield adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P = .05).  $\frac{1}{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	Plar Maturity <sup>2</sup> / ht.	$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{ht} & \text{Ht. 1st} \\ \frac{2}{2} & \text{pod} \end{array}$	Lodging2/	Shattering <sup>2</sup> /	Seed <sup>_2/</sup> quality	Purple stain	Seed size
	Bu/A	Dates In.	. In.	Rating	Rating	Rating	Rating	g/100 seed
McNair 800	46.3 a	10/14	35 5	2,5	1	1.0	1.0	14.0
McNair 3129	45.7 ab	10/15	37 4	3.0	1	1.5	1.5	16.0
Ransom	45.6 abc	10/16	33 5	2.4	1	1.0	1.0	16.4
Coker 277	45.1 abcd	10/13	33 2	2.4	1	1.0	1.0	15.9
Coker 338	44.4 abcd	10/15	37 4	2.4	1	1.0	1.0	15.4
Сорр	43.5 abcde	10/15	39 5	2.8	1	1.0	1.0	13.7
Coker 842	43.2 abcde	10/14	30 3	1.4	1	1.0	1.0	13.0
McNair 600	43.0 abcdef	10/11	34 2	2.5	1	1.0	1.0	13.0
Davis'	42.6 abcdefg	10/04	28 2	1.9	1	1.5	1.5	15.9
McNair 3131	42.6 abcdefgh	10/16	35 6	2.5	1	1.0	1.0	16.8
£FFR 667	42.4 abcdefgh	10/15	33 5	1.9	1	1.0	1.0	14.0
Bragg	42.0 abcdefgh	10/16	39 5	3.1	1	1.0	1.0	15.0
Lancer	41.7 abcdefgh	10/02	29 3	1.0	1	1.0	1.0	15.5
Lee 74	40.9 abcdefgh	10/13	29 2	2.0	.1	1.0	1.0	13.3
E-X-C-E-L 200	40.9 abcdefgh	10/08	27 3	2.1	1	. 1.0	1.0	14.0
FFR 666	40.2 bcdefgh	10/11 2	26 2	1.9	1	1.0	1.0	12.8
Hutton	39.6 cdefgh	10/15	36 3	3.9	1	1.0	1.0	16.8
McNair 3130	39.3 defgh	10/04	33 4	1.8	1.	1.0	1.0	15.3
Dare	38.3 i efgh	9/27 2	26 4	1.4	1	1.0	1.0	16.6
Centennial	38.2 i efgh	10/11 3	33 3	1.9	1	1.0	1.0	13.6
FFR 6024	37.7 i efgh	10/11 2	27 . 4	2.0	1	1.0	1.0	17.7
Lee 68	37.1 i fgh	10/11 2	27 2	2.0	1	1.0	1.0	14.3
Essex	37.1 i fgh	9/23 2	21 4	1.0	2	1.0	1.5	16.7
Coker 136	37.0 i fgh	9/24 3	6	1.5	1	1.0	1.0	16.8
McNair 500	36.8 i gh	10/04 2	29 3	1.6	1	1.0	1.0	16.1
Mack	36.7 i gh	9/27 2	24 4	2.1	1	1.0	1.5	16.6
Forrest	36.5 i h	10/04 2	29 5	1.9	1	1.5	1.5	15.1
Tracy	33.3 i	10/08	31 2	1.9	1	2.0	1.0	15.9
C.V.%	8.9			•				

Table 33. Yield, Date of Maturity, Plant Height, Lodging, Shattering, and Seed Size and Quality of Soybean Varieties when Planted May 17, 1976, at Prattville experiment Field

 $\frac{1}{Y}$ ield adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P = .05).  $\frac{2}{A}$  explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

.

Table 34.	Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, Shattering, and Seed Size and	
	Quality3/ of Soybean Varieties when Planted June 22, 1976, at Prattville Experiment Field	

Variety	lield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom <u>2</u> /	Maturity $\frac{2}{}$	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. lst $pod^{2}$	Lodging2/	Shattering <sup>2</sup> /	Seed size
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating	g/100 seed
	•							
Green Soy 74-64	39.4 a	8/04	10/15	31	7	2.0	1	15.4
Essex	38.3 ab	8/01	10/08	20	2	1.0	- 1	14.0
Forrest	37.9 abc	8/01	10/04	29 ,	4	1.6	1	11.7
Ransom	37.5 abc	8/09	10/19	30	6	2.4	1	15.4
Tracy	37.3 abcd	8/05	10/12	30	- 4	2.3	1	15.4
Coker 338	37.2 abcd	8/13	10/20	34	3	2.8	1	15.4
Coker 842	36.8 abcd	8/16	10/15	26	4	1.1	1	13.0
Cobb	36.7 bcd	8/13	10/25	34	4	2.4	1	13.0
AcNair 800	36.5 bcd	8/13	10/16	29	6	1.9	1	11.5
McNair 600	36.4 bcd	8/05	10/12	31	4	2.1	1	11.7
Green Soy 74-35	36.4 bcd	7/30	10/04	25	2	1.1	1	13.0
Coker 136	36.1 bcd	8/04	10/08	29	5	1.3	1	16.2
lack	36.1 bcd	8/02	10/01	27	4	2.0	1	13.6
Bragg	35.6 bcd	8/09	10/19	35	5	3.3	1	14.1
lutton	35.4 cde	8/13	10/20	33	3	3.1	1	14.7
Centennial	34.7 def	8/05	10/15	31	4	1.9	1	12.4
Lancer	34.6 def	8/08	10/12	29	5	1.3	1	14.0
Dare	33.0 ef	8/03	10/01	23	3	1.1	1	13.1
ee 74	32.8 f	8/07	10/14	27	4	2.3	1	12.5
Davie	30.2	∝ 8/11	10/14	26	3	1 8	- 1	12.0

C.V.%

1/Y ield adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P = .05)  $\frac{2}{An}$  explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.  $\frac{3}{Seed}$  quality and purple stain ratings were very good for all varieties in this test.

Variety	Yield1/	1st bloom <u>2/3</u> /	Maturity <sup>2/</sup>	Plant ht.2/	Ht. 1st $pod^{2/2}$	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	Shattering $\frac{2}{}$
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Essex	42.4	7/04	9/19	25	4	1 3	. 1 5
Coker 338	42.4	7/23	10/22	38	5	2 5	1.5
Ransom	41.1	7/18	10/17	36	6	2.5	1.0
Dare	40.2	7/07	9/22	4 31	6	2.4	1.0
Coker 842	39.3	7/17	10/10	34	5	1.9	1.5
Hutton	38.7	7/23	10/21	37	4	4.0	1.0
Davis	38.5	7/21	10/02	33	5	2.6	1.0
Coker 136	38.5	7/15	9/22	35	6	2.0	1.0
McNair 600	38.1	7/13	10/10	34	5	2.4	1.0
McNair 800	38.1	7/28	10/14	36	6	2.0	1.0
Mack	38.1	7/07	9/21	29	5	2 9	1.0
S FFR 666	37.9	7/13	10/09	29	3	2.0	1.0
FFR 6024	37.1	7/11	10/11	30	5	2.0	1.0
Forrest	37.0	7/07	9/26	31	6	2.1	1.0
Lee 74	36.8	7/14	10/12	32	4	2.5	1.0
Bragg	36.8	7/21	10/16	40	7	2.4	1.0
Lee 68	36.5	7/15	10/09	30	4	J.J	1.0
Centennial	35.4	7/12	10/11	38	++ 5	2.3	1.0
Lancer	35.1	7/18	10/02	35	5	2.J	1.0
l'racy	35.0	7/14	10/07	35	8	1./	1.0

Table 35. Two-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, and Lodging of Soybean Varieties Planted May 19 at Prattville Experiment Field, 1975 and 1976

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

•

 $\frac{2}{An}$  explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report. First bloom not taken 1976.  $\frac{3}{First}$  bloom data for 1975 only. 

	1/	lst 2/		Plant 27	11- l-t		Todoino <sup>2</sup> /	Shottoring <sup>2</sup> /
Variety	Yield-'	bloom=/	Maturity='	<u>nt.='</u>	Ht. Ist	pou-	Louging-	
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	ln.	ln.		Kating	Rating
Сорр	35.6	8/13	10/29	36	4		2.6	1
Tracy	34.0	8/05	10/15	31	- 4		2.4	1
Coker 338	34.0	8/11	10/23	, 34	3	÷	2.7	1 .
Hutton	33.2	8/12	10/23	33	. 4		3.3	1
Bragg	32.6	8/07	10/20	35	4		3.1	. 1
McNair 600	31.6	8/04	10/13	32	5.		2.7	1
Ransom	31.6	8/08	10/22	30	5		2.4	. 1
Coker 136	31.5	8/05.	10/07	31	5		1.9	1
Forrest	30.7	8/01	10/04	29	4		2.7	1
Centennial	30.6	8/05	10/15	34	5	•	2.6	1
£McNair 800	30.4	8/13	10/18	29	- 6		2.4	1
Coker 842	30.2	8/05	10/15	27	4		1.6	· 1
Essex	30.1	7/31	10/04	21	3		1.1	1
Lee 74	29.8	8/01	10/17	23	. 3	•	3.0	1
Dare	29.5	8/04	10/03	27	- 4		2.1	<b>1</b>
Lancer	29.2	8/09	10/13	32	5		1.8	1
Davis	28.3	8/10	10/14	30	3	•	2.6	1
Mack	27.9	8/02	9/29	29	3		2.6	1

Table 36. Two-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Shattering, and Lodging of Soybean Varieties Planted June 23 at Prattville Experiment Field, 1975-76

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

.

 $\overline{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Variety	Viold1/	lst bloom 2/3/	Maturity2/	Plant bt 2/	Ht. lst.pod <sup>2</sup> /	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	Shattering <sup>2</sup> /
variety	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	Tn.	Ist pour	Rating	Rating
	,						
			Three-year ave:	rage planting	date May 17		
Essex	43.2	7/10	9/20	25	4	1.2	1
Ransom	43.1	7/22	10/18	37	6	2.4	1
Coker 338	42.3	7/25	10/22	40	5	2.6	1
Davis	40.8	7/24	10/03	35	5	2.8	1
Hutton	40.3	7/27	10/21	38	5	4.0	1
Coker 136	40.1	7/19	9/28	37	7	2.1	1
Dare	40.1	7/14	9/22	32	6	1.9	1
Tracy	40.0	7/17	10/08	37	7	2.7	1
Lee 74	39.7	7/20	10/13	33	5	2.5	1
Forrest	39.7	7/12	9/25	33	6	2.2	1
McNair 600	39.6	7/17	10/09	36	5	3.0	1
FFR 666	39.4	7/16	10/09	29	4	1.9	1
McNair 800	38.9	8/01	10/14	36	6	3.0	1
Bragg	38.6	7/24	10/17	41	7	3.8	1
Lee 68	38.2	7/18	10/11	31	4	2.2	1
			Three-Vear ave	cage planting	date June 21	1976	
			inice year uver	age planting	date built 21,	1770	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Сорр	36.8	8/13	11/01	36	4	2.7	1
Coker 338	33.6	8/10	10/25	35	4	2.8	1
Hutton	32.8	8/12	10/26	33	4	2.9	1
Bragg ,	32.7	8/07	10/23	. 34	4	3.2	1
Tracy	32.6	8/05	10/22	32	4	2.5	2
Forrest	32.3	8/02	10/08	28	4	2.9	1
McNair 600	31.9	8/05	10/17	32	4	2.5	1
McNair 800	31.2	8/13	10/18	29	5	2.3	1
Coker 136	31.0	8/05	10/10	31	4	2.1	1
Davis	30.3	8/09	10/15	31	a <b>3</b> a	2.6	1
Essex	30.3	8/01	10/04	21	3	1.2	1
Dare	29.9	8/03	10/03	26	4	1.9	1
Ransom	29.1	8/08	10/25	31	5	2.1	1
Lee 74	28.6	8/03	10/23	28	3	2.5	1
1/Yields ad	justed to 13% mc	isture and 60 p	ounds per bushel	. 3/First	bloom dates fo	r 1974-75 only.	

Table 37. Three-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties Planted at Prattville Experiment Field 1974 through 1976

 $\frac{2}{An}$  explanation of data and ratings is given on page3 of this report. First bloom not taken 1976 on first planting.

Variaty	Vield1/	lst bloom $2/3/$	Maturity	Plant $ht \frac{2}{}$	Ht. lst Pod <sup>2/</sup>	Lodging2/	Shattering <u>2</u> /
variety		Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
			Four-year	average plant:	ing date May 18		
							1 0
Essex	38.9	7/10	9/19	24	4	1.1	1.3
Ransom	37.2	7/22	10/14	36	6	2.1	1.0
Davis	36.6	7/24	10/01	36	5	2.4	1.0
Coker 136	35.8	7/19	9/22	35	6	1.9	1.0
Coker 338	35.6	7/25	10/21	40	5	2.3	1.0
Forrest	35.5	7/12	9/23	31	5	1.9	1.0
Tracy	35.1	7/17	10/05	36	6	2.4	1.4
Dare	35.1	7/14	9/22	30	5	1.7	1.2
Lee 74	34.5	7/20	10/11	32	4	2.1	1.0
Hutton	34.5	7/27	10/19	38	5	3.3	1.0
FFR 666	34.3	7/16	10/07	27	3	1.7	1.0
McNair 600	33.7	7/17	10/06	35	· 5	2.5	1.0
Lee 68	33.4	7/18	10/10	30	4	1.9	1.0
McNair 800	33.3	8/01	10/12	36	6	2.7	1.0
Bragg	33.1	7/24	10/14	40	7	3.2	1.0
			Four-year av	erage plantin	g date June19		
Forrect	29 /	8/01	10/04	28	4	2.4	1
Cokor 338	29.4	8/09	10/26	36	5	2.3	1
Tracer JJ0	29.0	8/0/	10/10	33	4	2.2	2
Prage	29.0	8/06	10/21	35	5	2.6	1
MaNain 600	20.7	8/05	10/1/	32 /	4	2.1	1
Hutton	20.0	8/11	10/23	34	5	2.4	1
Facey	20.4	7/30	10/01	21.	3	1.1	1
Colton 126	20.0	8/0/	10/01	31	5	1.8	1
Domo	21.7	8/02	10/03	26	4	1.7	1
Dare	21.0 07.1	0/02	10/02	20	3	±•/ 2 2	- 1
Davis	2/.1	0/00	10/12	20	5	2.0	1
MCNair 800	20.0	0/12 0/07	10/10	27	5	1.0	1
Kansom	26.0	8/0/	10/22	20 21	2 2		1
Lee /4	25.9	8/03	10/20	20	<u> </u>	2.2	1

Table 38. Four-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Shattering, and Lodging of Soybean Varieties Planted at Prattville Experiment Field, 1973 through 1976

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. 2/An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

3/First bloom date for 1974 through 1975.

## Southern Alabama

The tests in southern Alabama were on a Benndale sandy loam at Brewton, Malbis fine sandy loam at Fairhope, Lucedale sandy loam at Monroeville, and Dothan sandy loam at Headland. Soybean of Maturity Group VIII are full season varieties in the south Alabama locations. For a full season variety to yield well it must have good rainfall during podfill period. As can be seen by Table 1, there has been excellent rainfall at all southern locations for the past 4 years at Brewton, Fairhope, and Headland and this past year at Monroeville. Because of this excellent rainfall during pod fill the leading three or four varieties at each location are Maturity Group VII or VIII varieties.

Hutton has been the most consistent yielder at both Brewton and Fairhope. Other Group VIII varieties that yield well are Coker 338 and Cobb.

Ransom, Bragg, and McNair 800 were frequently in the top five or six yielding varieties in the southern locations for the past 4 years.

McNair 600, Davis, and Tracy have been the best yielding Group VI in southern locations.

New lines that have looked good for the past 2 years were Coker 842 at Fairhope and Headland and for the past year McNair 3131 was the highest yielding variety at Brewton early planting and Monroeville.

Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom <sup>2</sup> /	Maturity <sup>2</sup> /	$\frac{\text{Plant}}{\text{ht} \cdot \frac{2}{2}}$	Ht. lst	pod <sup>2/</sup> Lodging	$\frac{2}{}$ Shattering $\frac{2}{}$
McNair 3131	50.3 a	8/05	10/20	31	2	1.0	1.0
Cobb	49.5 a	8/09	11/03	40	3	1.5	1.0
Hutton	49.4 a	8/06	10/21	36	4	1.3	1.0
Ransom	46.7 ab	8/02	10/19	32	- 3	1.0	1.0
Coker 338	46.7 ab	8/05	10/22	35	3	1.0	1.0
Bragg	46.3 ab	8/03	10/16	39	4	1.0	1.0
McNair 3129	45.6 ab	8/03	10/14	37	3	1.0	1.0
McNair 800	44.6 ab	8/03	10/15	31	3	1.0	1.0
Coker 277	44.1 abc	7/30	10/18	34	3	1.0	1.0
Coker 842	42.5 bcd	7/28	10/10	26	. 2	1.0	1.0
McNair 600	41.0 bcd	7/30	10/12	28	· 1	1.0	1.0
Lancer	41.0 cde	8/03	10/02	33	4	1.0	1.3
₽ Lee 74	38.0 cdef	8/01	10/15	26	. 2	1.0	1.0
∞ Tracy	37.1 def	7/28	10/15	33	1	1.0	2.5
Davis	36.3 ef	8/03	10/09	32	3	1.0	1.0
Forrest	36.3 ef	7/27	9/23	27	3	1.0	1.0
Centennial	35.9 ef	7/30	10/13	31	2	1.0	1.0
Lee 68	35.9 ef	7/31	10/08	26	2	1.0	1.0
Coker 136	35.0 ef	7/30	9/24	31	4	1.0	1.0
Dare	34.6 ef	7/29	9/22	23	3	1.0	1.0
Essex	33.8 f	7/28	9/28	21	1	1.0	1.0
Mack	33.3 f	7/27	9/25	22	- 2	1.0	1.0
FFR 666	32.7 f	7/30	10/10	22	1	1.0	1.0
$\overline{C. \sqrt{.\%}} = 10.1$		.,			•		

Table 39. Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties When Planted June 9, 1976, at Brewton Experiment Field

1/Yield adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P=.05). 2/An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

					÷ .		
Variety	Yield1/	lst bloom2/	Maturity <u>2</u> /	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod2/	Lodging2/	Shattering2/
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Davis	60.3 a	8/10	10/20	-38	4	1.3	1.0
McNair 600	58.6 ab	8/04	10/18	37	3	1.3	1.0
McNair 800	56.0 abc	8/11	10/21	31	<u> </u>	1.0	1.0
Lee 74	55.0 abcd	. 8/06	10/18	32	4	1.8	1.0
Coker 338	55.0 abcd	8/08	10/30	38	6	1.3	1.0
Ransom	54.5 abcd	8/06	10/28	33	4	1.5	1.0
Hutton	54,1 abcd	8/08	10/31	35	5	2.8	1.0
Lancer	53.9 abcd	8/06	10/17	38	5	1.5	1.0
Bragg	53.3 bcd	8/08	10/24	40	Z1	2.0	1.0
Green Soy 74-85	53.3 bcd	8/04	10/20	32	5	2.0	1.0
+ Centennial	52.4 bcd	8/05	10/15	38	4	1.8	1.0
Forrest	49.7 cde	7/31	9/29	33	5	2.8	1.0
Essex	49.4 cde	7/30	9/27	24	5	1.0	1.0
Tracy	49.0 de	8/03	10/19	37	2	1.8	2.3
Сорр	48.6 de	8/14	11/03	40	5	2.3	1.0
Coker 136	44.2 ef	8/05	9/06	35	8	2.3	1.0
Mack	41.8 f	8/02	10/01	34	5	2.8	1.3
Dare	41.0 f	8/04	9/28	31	4	2.5	1.0
C U	7 % 7 0						

Table 40. Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties when Planted June 18, 1976, at Brewton Experiment Field

C.V.% 7.9

1/Yield adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P = .05)  $\overline{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Variety	Yield <u>1</u> /	lst bloom <u>2</u> /	Maturity <u>2</u> /	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod <u>2</u> /	Lodging <u>2</u> /	Shattering <sup>2</sup> /
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Hutton	50.2	8/01	10/24	28	4	1.9	1.0
Coker 338	47.0	8/01	10/25	29	4	1.4	1.0
Ransom	45.4	7/27	10/21	28	4	1.0	1.0
Cobb	44.5	8/05	11/01	35	4	1.5	1.0
Bragg	42.4	7/28	10/18	33	5	1.3	1.0
McNair 800	42.3	8/01	10/16	27	4	1.0	1.0
McNair 600	41.5	7/24	10/14	24	3	1.0	1.0
Centennial	41.5	7/24	10/14	30	3	1.4	1.0
Tracy	41.4	7/23	10/13	28	2	1.4	1.8
Lee 74	40.1	7/27	10/16	22	2	1.0	1.0
Coker 136	39.8	7/24	10/01	29	5	1.1	1.0
Lancer	39.3	7/29	10/05	30	4	1.0	1.1
Coker 842	39.0	7/23	10/13	21	2	1.0	1.0
Davis	38.3	7/28	10/11	28	4	1.9	1.0
Forrest	38.2	7/19	9/29	24	4	1.0	1.0
Mack	38.0	7/21	10/01	25	3	1.0	1.0
Essex	37.5	7/19	10/05	19	2	1.0	1.0
Lee 68	37.2	7/23	10/12	23	3	1.0	1.0
FFR 666	35.1	7/24	10/13	18	2	1.0	1.0
Dare	35.0	7/22	9/28	25	4	1.1	1.0

Table 41. Two-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties when Planted June 3 at Brewton Field, 1975-76

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

 $\overline{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Variety	Yield1/	lst bloom <sup>2</sup> /	Maturity <sup>2/</sup>	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st $pod\frac{2}{}$	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	Shattering $\frac{2}{}$
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Davie	17 8	9/10	10/21	27	<b>F</b>	1 0	1.0
	47.0	0/12	10/21	34	5	1.3	1.0
MCNair 600	4/.0	8/05	10/20	32	3	1.1	1.0
Coker 338	47.0	8/10	10/29	34	6	1.3	1.0 .
Ransom	46.1	8/07	10/27	32	5	1.3	1.0
Hutton	45.6	8/10	10/29	31	5	2.0	1.0
Bragg	44.9	8/09	10/25	35	5	1.5	1.0
McNair 800	44.2	8/13	10/21	26	5	1.0	1.0
Сорр	43.0	8/17	11/04	35	6	1.8	1.0
Tracy	42.9	8/04	10/18	32	3	1.4	1.6
Lee 74	42.7	8/05	10/22	27	3	1.4	1.0
Forrest	40.2	8/02	10/06	30	5	2.1	1.0
Essex	38.3	8/01	10/07	23	4	1.0	1.0
Mack	38.0	8/04	10/07	30	6	2.4	1.1
Coker 136	36.3	8/05	10/09	28	5	1.8	1.0
Dare	34.4	8/06	10/06	28	5	1.8	1.0

Table 42. Two-year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties When Planted June 22 at Brewton Field, 1975-76

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

2/An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom_/	Maturity $\frac{2}{}$	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. 1st pod <u>2</u> /	Lodging <sup>2/</sup>	Shattering $\frac{2}{}$
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Hutton	50.5	7/31	10/21	30	4.5	1.6	1.0
Coker 338	48.1	7/30	10/22	31	3.8	1.3	1.0
Ransom	44.8	7/25	10/18	28	4.1	1.0	1.0
McNair 800	44.0	7/31	10/14	29	3.9	1.0	1.0
Tracy	42.3	7/21	10/10	30	2.3	1.3	1.8
McNair 600	41.7	7/22	10/11	25	2.4	1.0	1.0
Bragg	41.2	7/27	10/16	33	4.7	1.2	1.0
Davis	40.8	7/28	10/09	30	3.8	1.6	1.0
Forrest	39.0	7/18	9/27	26	3.8	1.0	1.0
Lee 74	38.8	7/24	10/14	21	2.2	1.0	1.0
Essex	38.8	7/16	10/02	20	2.5	1.0	1.0
Coker 136	37.7	7/23	9/29	29	5.1	1.1	1.0
Dare	35.4	7/21	9/26	25	3.7	1.1	1.0
Lee 68	34.2	7/22	10/10	. 22	2.3	1.0	1.0
FFR 666	33.4	7/22	10/11	17	1.5	1.0	1.0

Table 43. Three-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties Planted June 1 on Brewton Experiment Field During 1974 through 1976

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

 $\frac{2}{An}$  explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

			· ·		
Table 44.	Three-Year Averages for Yi	eld, First Bl	loom and Maturity Date	es, Plant and First Pod H	leights, Lodging,
	and Shattering of Soybean	Varieties Pla	anted June 27 on Brewt	ton Experiment Field Duri	ing 1974 through 1976

Variety	Yield $\frac{1}{}$	lst bloom <u>2</u> /	Maturity $\frac{2}{}$	Plant ht.2/	Ht. 1st $pod^{2/2}$	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	Shattering $\frac{2}{}$
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Davis	41.7	8/15	10/20	29	4.1	1.2	1.0
СоЪЬ	40.5	8/20	10/31	32	5.2	1.5	1.0
Coker 338	39.8	8/13	10/25	29	5.0	1.2	1.0
McNair 600	38.7	8/09	10/18	27	2.8	1.1	1.0
Ransom	37.2	8/12	10/24	27	4.1	1.2	1.0
Bragg	36.7	8/13	10/21	29	3.8	1.3	1.0
Hutton	36.5	8/14	10/25	26	4.1	1.7	1.0
McNair 800	36.2	8/16	10/18	21	3.6	1.0	1.0
Lee 74	35.6	8/09	10/19	23	2.9	1.3	1.0
Tracy	35.2	8/07	10/17	27	2.8	1.3	1.4
Forrest	34.6	8/07	10/07	26	4.6	1.8	1.0
Essex	33.0	8/04	10/07	20	3.4	1.0	1.0
Coker 136	28.4	8/10	10/09	23	4.3	1.5	1.0
Dare	27.9	8/10	10/06	24	4.1	1.5	1.0

 $\frac{1}{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

L	nrough 1970						
Variety	Yield <u>l</u> /	lst Bloom <u>2</u> /	Maturity <u>2</u> /	Plant ht. <u>2</u> /	Ht. lst pod <u>2</u> /	Lodging2/	Shattering2/
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
		A	verage planting da	te June l		1 /	1.0
Hutton	48.1	7/30	10/25	31	5.1	1.4	1.0
Coker 338	46.3	7/29	10/25	30	4.2	1.2	1.0
Ransom	43.2	7/24	10/21	27	4.2	1.0	1.0
McNair 800	41.6	8/01	10/13	29	4.3	1.0	1.0
Tracy	40.7	7/21	10/14	29	2.8	1.2	1.8
Bragg	40.0	7/25	10/18	33	5.0	1.1	1.0
McNair 600	39.6	7/22	10/13	25	2.9	1.0	1.0
Lee 74	38.0	7/23	10/15	22	2.5	1.0	1.0
Davis	37.4	7/27	10/12	30	4.1	1.4	1.0
Forrest	35.8	7/18	9/29	25	3.6	1.0	1.0
Essex	35.0	7/17	10/03	20	3.0	1.0	1.0
Coker 136	34.5	7/23	9/30	28	5.5	1.1	1.0
Lee 68	32.7	7/21	10/14	22	2.5	1.0	1.0
FFR 666	31.4	7/21	10/14	19	2.0	1.0	1.0
			Average planting	date June 27			
Coker 338	39.0	8/13	10/27	30	5.5	1.1	1.0
Davis	37.5	8/15	10/19	. 30	4.8	1.1	1.0
McNair 600	36.9	8/08	10/18	28	3.5	1.1	1.0
Hutton	36.1	8/14	10/26	27	4.6	1.5	1.0
Bragg	34.7	8/13	10/21	29	4.3	1.3	1.0
Lee 74	33.7	8/09	10/21	24	3.3	1.2	1.0
McNair 800	33.5	8/15	10/20	22	3.9	1.0	1.0
Ranson	33 4	8/11	10/27	26	4.1	1.1	1.0
Tracy	32 7	8/07	10/20	27	3.4 ,	1.2	1.4
Forrest	32.1	8/07	10/07	26	4.8	1.6	1.0
Essex	29 3	8/04	10/08	20	3.3	1.0	1.0
Coker 136	27.5	8/10	10/09	24	5.1	1.4	1.0
Dare	25.7	8/10	10/06	24	4.3	1.4	1.0

Table 45. Four-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties Planted at Two Dates on Brewton Experiment Field During 1973 through 1976

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. 2/An explanation of data and ratings is given on page3 of this report.

			r				
				Dlost	Ut lat		
Variety	Yield $\frac{1}{}$	lst bloom <sup>2/</sup>	Maturity $\frac{2}{}$	$\frac{12}{ht} \frac{2}{2}$	$\frac{121}{\text{pod}^2}$	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	Shattering $\frac{2}{}$
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Cobb	51.1 a	8/02	10/26	43	9	2.0	1.0
Bragg	50.2 ab	7/26	10/17	39	8	2.0	1.0
Hutton	50.2 ab	7/29	10/21	39	8	2.3	1.0
Coker 842	49.7 abc	7/26	10/17	33	5	1.0	1.0
Coker 338	47.8 abcd	7/30	10/24	41	8	2.0	1.0
Green Soy 74-85	46.6 abcde	7/26	10/15	34	6	1.5	1.0
Ransom	46.4 abcde	7/27	10/17	35	7	1.3	1.0
Coker 277	45.9 abcdef	7/26	10/19	39	7	2.0	1.0
Lee 74	44.5 abcdefg	7/26	10/16	34	7	1.3	1.0
McNair 600	44.3 abcdefg	7/26	10/15	38	5	2.3	1.0
FFR 666	43.4 abcdefg	7/26	10/15	27	5	1.0	1.0
Lee 68	42.9 abcdefgh	7/23	10/14	34	5	1.3	1.0
Forrest	42.6 ibcdefgh	7/19	9/29	34	6	1.8	1.0
Essex	41.8 i cdefgh	7/19	10/02	26	6	1.0	1.0
Tracy	41.4 i defgh	7/26	10/14	<b>`</b> 35	6	2.3	1.8
Centennial	40.3 i defgh	7/26	10/13	36	6	1.3	1.0
Davis	39.6 i defgh	8/01	10/06	36	7	1.5	1.0
McNair 3130	38.9 i efgh	7/27	10/03	37	8	2.3	1.0
Coker 136	37.9 i fgh	7/26	9/30	39	9	2.0	1.0
McNair 800	37.3 i gh	8/01	10/06	35	6	1.5	1.0
Mack	34.8 i h	7/26	10/01	36	ό	2.0	1.0
Lancer	34.8 i	7/29	10/06	39	7	1.5	1.0
Dare	34.4 i	7/26	10/01	35	7	1.3	1.0
C.V.%	11.6	•					

Table 46. Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties when Planted June 5, 1976, at Gulf Coast Substation

 $\frac{1}{Y}$  Yield adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different (P = .05).  $\frac{2}{An}$  explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

с С

Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom2/	Maturity $\frac{2}{}$	Plant $ht.\frac{2}{}$	Ht. lst $pod^{2/2}$	$Lodging^{2/}$	Shattering $\frac{2}{}$
	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
Coker 842	52.0	7/21	10/15	33	5	1.0	1.0
Hutton	51.4	7/28	10/21	38	7	2.1	1.0
Bragg	51.3	7/24	10/17	37	7	1.4	1.0
Ransom	51.1	7/24	10/16	35	6	1.5	1.0
Tracy	48.2	7/21	10/12	33	5	2.4	1.4
Lee 74	48.0	7/23	10/15	33	7	1.3	1.0
Forrest	47.9	7/17	10/02	33	6	1.4	1.0
Cobb	47.7	7/29	10/28	41	8	2.3	1.0
Lee 68	47.6	7/21	10/13	32	5	1.3	1.0
Essex	47.5	7/16	9/28	25	6	1.0	1.0
McNair 600	47.2	7/22	10/14	35	6	1.9	1.0
Coker 338	46.9	7/28	10/23	37	7	2.0	1.0
FFR 666	46.5	7/22	10/12	28	5	1.0	1.0
Davis	45.4	7/29	10/08	36	6	1.6	1.0
Coker 136	45.4	7/22	10/01	37	7	1.6	1.0
Centennial	44.9	7/23	10/13	37	6	1.4	1.0
Dare	43.3	7/21	9/29	33	6	1 1	1.0
Mack	41.8	7/21	10/03	35	6	1.8	1.0
McNair 800	40.9	7/31	10/10	34	6	1.9	1.0
Lancer	40.5	7/26	10/07	38	7	13	1.0

Table 47. Two-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties Planted June 6 at Gulf Coast Substation, 1975 and 1976

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

 $\overline{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Variety	Viold	$1_{st}$	Maturity2/	Plant ht 2/	Ht. $1st \text{ pod}^2/$	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	Shattering <sup>2</sup> /
variety	Bu/A	Dates	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
				-			
			Three-year av	verage pLanting	date June 3		
Hutton	54.8	7/26	10/21	37	6	2.0	1.0
Ransom	53.2	7/21	10/15	33	6	1.5	1.0
Bragg	52.6	7/21	10/16	39	7	1.8	1.0
Tracy	51.4	7/19	10/09	35	8	2.6	1.3
Lee 74	50.9	7/20	10/13	31	6	1.2	1.0
Coker 338	50.5	7/24	10/23	38	7	2.3	1.0
McNair 600	49.6	7/20	10/12	36	5	2.0	1.0
Forrest	49.5	7/15	9/29	32	5	1.3	1.0
Cobb	49.0	7/28	10/27	41	7	2.9	1.0
Lee 68	48.6	7/19	10/12	30	4	1.3	1.0
Davis	48.1	7/27	10/08	36	6	2.1	1.0
Coker 136	47.1	7/20	9/29	37	6	1.5	1.0
Dare	45.2	7/17	9/27	32	5	1.1	1.0
McNair 800	44.9	7/31	10/11	35	6	2.3	1.0
Essex	41.0	7/13	9/29	24	5	1.0	1.2
			Four-year a	verage planting	g date June 5	5	
Hutton	53.4	7/27	10/23	39	7	2.0	1.0
Ransom	50.5	7/22	10/19	33	6	1.4	1.0
Bragg	50.0	7/22	10/18	38	7	1.6	1.0
Coker 338	49.0	7/26	10/24	39	7	1.9	1.0
Lee 74	48.9	7/23	10/15	32	6	1.1	1.0
Davis	47.7	7/27	10/08	37	5	1.8	1.0
McNair 600	46.9	7/21	10/14	36	5	1.8	1.0
Lee 68	46.8	7/20	10/12	29	5	1.3	1.0
Forrest	45.9	7/19	10/01	32	5	1.3	1.0
Coker 136	45.8	7/22	10/01	36	6	1.4	1.0
McNair 800	44.5	7/30	10/13	35	5	2.3	1.0
Dare	43.5	7/19	9/29	30	5	1.1	1.0
Essex	41 3	7/15	10/01	24	4	1.0	1 2

Table 48. Three and Four-Year Averages for Yield, First Bloom and Maturity Dates, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties Planted June at Gulf Coast Substation, 1973 through 1976

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

 $\frac{1}{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	Maturity $\frac{2}{3}$	$/ \frac{Plant}{ht.2}$	Ht. 1st $pod^{2/2}$	$Lodging^2/$	Shattering $\frac{2}{}$
	Bu/A	Dates	In.	In.	Rating	Rating
McNair 3131	48.0 a	10/18	29	2	1.5	1
Coker 338	44.1 ab	10/21	32	3	1.8	1
McNair 800	43.1 bc	10/13	26 ,	2	1.5	1
Bragg	42.7 bc	10/17	34	3	1.8	1
McNair 3129	41.6 bcd	10/13	30	2	1.3	1
llutton	41.4 bcde	10/21	31	2	2.3	1
Davis	40.3 bcdef	10/13	27	2	1.0	1
Coker 842	40.3 bcdef	10/14	25	1	1.3	1
Cobb	40.1 bcdef	11/01	37	3	2.0	1
Lancer	39.9 bcdef	10/11	30	3	1.0	1
ப Coker 277	39.9 bcdef	10/12	30	2	1.8	1
<sup>∞</sup> McNair 600	39.5 bcdef	10/11	28	2	1.0	1
Ransom	38.2 cdefg	10/16	28	3	1.3	1
Centennial	37.1 h defg	10/12	33	2	1.5	1
Forrest	36.3 hij efg	10/04	26	3	1.0	1
Lee 68	35.4 hif fg	10/12	25	1	1.3	1
Coker 136	33.3 hij g	9/27	32	4	2.0	1
Tracy	32.1 hij	10/11	32	1	1.8	1
Lee 74	31.6 ij	10/12	23 .	1	1.0	1
FFR 666	31.4 ij	10/11	18	1	1.0	1
Dare	31.4 j	10/01	26	· 2	1.0	1
Mack	31.0 ј	10/01	27 ·	2	1.8	1
Essex	25.9 k	10/08	20	2	1.0	1

Table 49. Yield, Date of Maturity, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, and Shattering of Soybean Varieties When Planted May 25, 1976, at Monroeville Experiment Field

C.V.% 8.6  $\frac{1}{Y}$ ield adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel. Yields with a common letter are not different(P = .05).  $\frac{2}{A}$ n explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup> /	lst bloom <u>2</u> /		Plant ht.2	Ht. 1st pod <sup>2</sup> /	Lodging2/	Shattering <sup>2</sup> /	Seed <u>2</u> / quality	Purple stain	Seed size
	Bu/A	Dates		In.	In.	Rating	Rating	Rating	Rating	g/100 seed
MaNa : 000	(01.	7/27		30	4	1 4	1 0	15	1 0	17.6
Bragg	40.1 a 44 7 ab	7/27		36	5	1.8	1.0	1.0	1.5	19.7
Ransom	44.7 ab	7/22		29	4	1.0	1.0	2 0	2 0	20.9
Coker 8/2	43.7 abc	7/21		28	2	1.0	1.0	1 0	2.0	18 2
McNair 3120	4 <b>3.</b> 0 abc	7/23		30	2	1.0	1.0	2 0	2.0	20 3
Lee 68	41,4 Ded	7/18		29	2	1 3	1.0	2.0	2.0	16.8
EEE 666	40.9 bed	7/21		26	2	1.5	1.0	1 5	2.0	16.3
Davie	40.7 bcd	7/18	~	31	4	1 1	1.0	1 0	2.0	19.2
	40.7 Ded	7/20		29		1 4	1.0	1.5	1 5	17 0
McNair 3131	39.7 cde	7/10	•	31	5	1 2	1.0	2.0	1.0	19 4
Coker 277	39.6 cde	7/22		29	2	1.0	1.0	1 5	1 5	17.8
Centennial	38 9 cde	7/20		31	2	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.5	18 5
Cobb	38.2 do	7/28		30	4	2.8	1.0	<b>1.</b> 5	-	-
Tracy	37.6 de	7/20		27	7	1 1	1.0	15	2 0	18 5
Cokor 338	37.6 do	7/20		32	2	1 5	1.0	<b>-</b>	- · · ·	
Hutton	37.0 de	7/24	•	32	5	1.5	1.0			_
McNair 600	363 do	7/12		20	. <del>.</del>	1 3	1.0	2 0	3 0	17 1
Langer	35.3 de	7/22		29	5	1.0	1.0	1 5	3.0	10 1
Eancer	22.5 UE	7/22		30 26		1.0	1.0	25	1.5	12.6
Porrest	27.0	7/21		20		1.5	1.0	2.5	1.0	14.0
Dare	27.0	g //22		24	2	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	14.0
Essex	23.0 1	g //11		20	2	1.0	J.0	2.5	1.0	12.7
COKET 136	22.8	gn //20		30 •	2	1.0	1.U	2.3	2.0	13./
маск	10.9	n //16		20	3	1.3	1.0	1.0	2.0	13.0

Table 50. Yield, Date of First Bloom, Plant and First Pod Heights, Lodging, Shattering, and Seed Size and Quality of Soybean Varieties when Planted May 18, 1976, at Wiregrass Substation

C.V.% 8.5

 $\frac{1}{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

Variety		Vield <sup>1</sup> /	Plant bt 2/	Ht	lst pod <sup>2</sup> /	Lodging <sup>2</sup> /	Shattering 2/
		Bu/A	In.		In.	Rating	Rating
Coker 842	1997 - 19	41.4	28		2	1.1	1.0
McNair 800		40.8	32		4	1.9	1.0
Kansom		39.9	31		3	1.7	1.0
Tracy		38.9	29		2	1.4	1.0
Davis	· . ·	37.7	33		4	2.4	1.0
Bragg		37.5	37		5 .	2.8	1.0
Centennial		36.8	33		2	1.8	1.3
McNair 600		36.4	30		3	1.6	1.0
Lee 74		35.9	25		. 2	1.3	1.0
Lee 68		35.4	25		1	1.2	1.0
Hutton		34.7	35		3	2.7	1.0
FFR 666		34.2	21		2	1.1	1.0
Lancer		34.0	32		4	1.3	1.3
Cobb		32.9	35		3	3.5	1.0
Coker 338		31.9	34		2	2.4	1.0
Forrest		30.9	26		3	1.1	2.0
Dare		29.6	27		2	1.3	2.3
Coker 136	100 T.	27.4	31		5	1.1	. 1.8
Mack		23.2	26		2	1.9	1.9

2

2

Table 51. Two-Year Averages for Yield, Plant and First Pod Heights, Shattering, and Lodging of Soybean Varieties Planted May 20 at Wiregrass Substation, 1975-76

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

 $\overline{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.

	1/	Plant	2/	2/
Variety	Yield <sup>1</sup>	ht. <u></u>	Ht. 1st pod <sup>27</sup>	Lodging-
	Bu/A	In.	In.	Rating
	Three-year	r average planting o	late May 18,1974-76	
McNair 800	41.9	33	4 .	1.8
Davis	40.7	35	3	2.4
Ransom	40.6	30	3	1.5
Tracy	40.5	29	2	1.6
McNair 600	38.3	30	2	1.4
Bragg	37.9	35	4	2.3
Lee 74	37.2	24	· 1	1.2
Hutton	36.9	35	4	2.5
Lee 68	35.7	22	1	1.1
Coker 338	35.5	34	3	2.3
Forrest	34.5	.27	3	1.2
Dare	34.2	27	3	1.2
Сорр	34.0	37	3	, 3.4
Coker 136	31.5	32	5	1.2
	Four-year	average planting da	te May 17,1973-76	
McNair 800	38.4	30	4 -	1.6
Ransom	35.6	27	3	1.3
Davis	35.3	31	4	2.0
Bragg	35.2	33	4	2.0
McNair 600	34.4	27	3	1.3
Hutton	33.8	32	4	2.2
Lee 74	32.8	23	2	1.2
Lee 68	32.0	21	2	1.1
Dare	31.5	25	3	1.1
Coker 338	31.1	31	3	2.0
Forrest	30.5	24	3	1.1

Table 52. Three and Four-Year Averages for Yield, Plant and First Pod Heights, and Lodging of Soybean Varieties Planted 1973 through 1976 at Wiregrass Substation

1/Yields adjusted to 13% moisture and 60 pounds per bushel.

 $\overline{2}$ /An explanation of data and ratings is given on page 3 of this report.