

TOLERANCE OF TRITICALE, WHEAT AND RYE TO COPPER
AND ZINC DEFICIENCY IN SOILS OF LOW AND HIGH pH

by

SUSAN PAULA HARRY, B.Ag.Sci.

A thesis submitted for the degree of

MASTER OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF AGRONOMY

Waite Agricultural Research Institute

The University of Adelaide

South Australia

September, 1982

CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF FIGURES	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF PLATES	viii
LIST OF APPENDICES	ix
ABSTRACT	xvi
DECLARATION	xviii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xix
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1 Copper and Zinc in Soils	7
2.1.1 Content and Distribution of Copper and Zinc in Soils	7
2.1.2 Copper and Zinc Minerals in Soils	8
2.1.3 Adsorption of Copper and Zinc in Soils	10
2.1.4 Solubility and Mobility of Copper and Zinc in Soils	12
2.2 Availability of Copper and Zinc to Plants	14
2.2.1 Patterns of Copper and Zinc Deficiency	14
2.2.2 Factors Affecting Availability of Copper and Zinc	15
2.2.2.1 Restricted Root Zones	15
2.2.2.2 Soil pH	16
2.2.2.3 Soil Organic Matter	20
2.2.2.4 Micro-organisms	22
2.2.2.5 Soil Temperature	23
2.2.3 Movement of Trace Elements to Plant Roots	24
2.2.4 Absorption and Translocation of Copper and Zinc by Plants	25
2.3 Copper and Zinc in Plants	29
2.3.1 Copper Deficiency	30
2.3.1.1 Sensitivity to Copper Deficiency	31
2.3.1.2 Copper Requirement of Crops	32
2.3.2 Zinc Deficiency	33
2.3.2.1 Sensitivity to Zinc Deficiency	34
2.3.2.2 Zinc Requirement of Crops	35
2.4 Genotypic Differences: Triticale, Wheat, Rye	36
2.5 Role of Copper and Zinc in Plants	38
2.5.1 Role of Copper in Plants	38
2.5.1.1 Enzymatic	38
2.5.1.2 Photosynthesis	39
2.5.1.3 Pollen	40
2.5.1.4 Cytological	40

2.5.2	Role of Zinc in Plants	41
2.5.2.1	Enzymatic	41
2.5.2.2	RNA and Ribosomes	42
2.5.2.3	Auxin	43
2.5.2.4	Pollen	43
2.5.2.5	Cytological	44
2.6	Interactions	44
2.6.1	Copper-phosphorus	45
2.6.2	Zinc-phosphorus	45
2.6.3	Copper-nitrogen	46
2.6.4	Zinc-nitrogen	47
2.6.5	Copper-iron	47
2.6.6	Zinc-iron	48
2.6.7	Copper-molybdenum	48
2.6.8	Copper-zinc	48
2.7	Copper and Zinc Fertilizers	49
3.0	EXPERIMENTAL MATERIALS AND METHODS	53
3.1	Program of Investigation	54
3.2	Pot Experiments	55
3.2.1	Pot Experiment 1	55
3.2.1.1	Soil Treatment	55
3.2.1.2	Sand Culture Technique	56
3.2.1.3	Genotypes	56
3.2.1.4	Treatments and Experimental Design	56
3.2.1.5	Water Use	58
3.2.1.6	Plant Measurements	59
3.2.1.7	Harvesting and Measurements	59
3.2.1.8	Plant Copper Determinations	60
3.2.2	Pot Experiment 2	60
3.2.2.1	Sand Culture Technique	60
3.2.2.2	Treatments and Experimental Design	60
3.2.2.3	Water Use	61
3.2.2.4	Plant Measurements	61
3.2.2.5	Harvesting and Measurements	61
3.2.2.6	Plant Zinc and Manganese Determination	62
3.2.3	Pot Experiment 3	62
3.2.3.1	Soil Preparation	62
3.2.3.2	Sand Culture Technique	63
3.2.3.3	Genotypes	63
3.2.3.4	Treatments and Experimental Design	63
3.2.3.5	Water Use	64
3.2.3.6	Plant Measurements	66
3.2.3.7	Harvesting and Measurements	66
3.2.3.8	Plant Copper, Zinc and Manganese Determination	66
3.3	Analytical Methods	67
3.3.1	Copper Analysis	67
3.3.2	Zinc and Manganese Analysis	68
3.3.3	Soil pH Measurement	68
4.0	RESULTS	69
4.1	Pot Experiment 1	70
4.1.1	Growth and Visual Symptoms	70
4.1.2	Water Use	70
4.1.2.1	Weekly Water Use	70
4.1.2.2	Total Water Use	75

4.1.3	Plant Height	75
4.1.4	Tillering	78
4.1.5	Delay in Maturity	78
4.1.6	Dry Matter Production	81
4.1.7	Grain Yield and its Components	83
4.1.8	Dry Weight of Roots	85
4.1.9	Copper in the Plant	88
4.2	Pot Experiment 2	93
4.2.1	Growth and Visual Symptoms	93
4.2.2	Water Use	93
	4.2.2.1 Weekly Water Use	93
	4.2.2.2 Total Water Use	98
4.2.3	Plant Height	98
4.2.4	Tillering	101
4.2.5	Delay in Maturity	101
4.2.6	Dry Matter Production	101
4.2.7	Grain Yield and Its Components	107
4.2.8	Dry Weight of Roots	108
4.2.9	Zinc and Manganese in the Plant	108
4.3	Pot Experiment 3	117
4.3.1	Growth and Visual Symptoms	117
4.3.2	Water Use	118
	4.3.2.1 Weekly Water Use	118
	4.3.2.2 Total Water Use	125
4.3.3	Plant Height	127
4.3.4	Tillering	127
4.3.5	Pollen Viability	130
4.3.6	Delay in Maturity	132
4.3.7	Dry Matter Production	132
4.3.8	Grain Yield and Its Components	144
4.3.9	Dry Weight of Roots	148
4.3.10	Copper and Manganese in the Plant	150
5.0	DISCUSSION	155
5.1	Pot Experiment 1	156
5.2	Pot Experiment 2	160
5.3	Pot Experiment 3	165
5.4	General Discussion	172
6.0	CONCLUSION	179
7.0	APPENDICES	182
8.0	BIBLIOGRAPHY	286

LIST OF FIGURES

Number		Page
3.2.1	Diagram showing the arrangement of pots in the glasshouse for Pot Experiment 1.	57
3.2.2	Diagram showing the arrangement of pots in the glasshouse for Pot Experiment 3.	65
4.1.1	Effect of level of copper supply on the weekly water use (ml plant ⁻¹) throughout the season of wheat at pH 5.0.	74
4.1.2	Effect of level of copper supply on the weekly water use (ml plant ⁻¹) throughout the season of wheat at pH 7.0.	74
4.1.3	Effect of level of copper supply on the weekly water use (ml plant ⁻¹) throughout the season of wheat at pH 8.4.	74
4.1.4	Effect of soil pH, level of copper supply and genotype on A. total shoot dry matter (g plant ⁻¹) and B. total grain yield (g plant ⁻¹).	82
4.1.5	Effect of soil pH and level of copper supply on A. total shoot dry matter (g plant ⁻¹) and B. copper content (µg plant ⁻¹) for plant components of wheat, triticale and rye.	91
4.2.1	Effect of level of zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant ⁻¹) throughout the season of wheat at pH 8.4.	97
4.2.2	Effect of level of zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant ⁻¹) throughout the season of triticale at pH 8.4.	97
4.2.3	Effect of level of zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant ⁻¹) throughout the season of rye at pH 8.4.	97
4.2.4	Effect of soil pH, level of zinc supply and genotype on A. total shoot dry matter (g plant ⁻¹) and B. total grain yield (g plant ⁻¹)	104
4.2.5	Effect of soil pH and level of zinc supply on A. total shoot dry matter (g plant ⁻¹), B. zinc content (µg plant ⁻¹) and C. manganese content (µg plant ⁻¹) for plant components of wheat, triticale and rye.	116
4.3.1	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant ⁻¹) throughout the season of wheat cv. Halberd at pH 5.0.	122
4.3.2	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant ⁻¹) throughout the season of wheat cv. Gatcher at pH 5.0.	122

Number		Page
4.3.3	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of triticale at pH 5.0.	124
4.3.4	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of rye at pH 5.0.	124
4.3.5	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply, soil pH and genotype on total shoot dry matter (g plant^{-1}).	135
4.3.6	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply, soil pH and genotype of total grain yield (g plant^{-1}).	146
5.3.1	Response to application of copper and/or zinc on grain yield (g plant^{-1}) as a function of soil pH. A. Grain yield (g plant^{-1}) independent of genotype (average for all genotypes). B. Grain yield (g plant^{-1}) for each genotype.	171

LIST OF TABLES

Number		Page
4.1.1	Effect of level of copper, soil pH and genotype on the total water use (ml plant^{-1}) over the whole season.	76
4.1.2	Effect of copper supply, soil pH and genotype on plant height (cm).	77
4.1.3	Tiller production and ear production per plant at maturity.	79
4.1.4	Number of days to ear emergence, anthesis and maturity of the genotypes as affected by soil pH and level of applied copper.	80
4.1.5	Effect of level of copper and soil pH on the harvest index.	84
4.1.6	Yield and components of grain yield at maturity.	86
4.1.7	Effect of level of copper and soil pH on the dry weight of roots per plant (g).	87
4.1.8	Concentration of copper in straw, main culm grain, primary tiller grain and secondary tiller grain.	89
4.2.1	Effect of level of zinc, soil pH and genotype on the total water use (ml plant^{-1}) over the whole season.	99
4.2.2	Effect of zinc supply, soil pH and genotype on plant height (cm).	100
4.2.3	Tiller production and ear production at maturity.	102
4.2.4	Number of days to ear emergence, anthesis and maturity of the genotypes as affected by soil pH and level of applied zinc.	103
4.2.5	Yield and components of yield at maturity.	109
4.2.6	Effect of level of zinc and soil pH on the dry weight of roots per plant (g).	110
4.2.7	Concentration of zinc in straw, main culm grain, primary tiller grain and secondary tiller grain.	111
4.2.8	Concentration of manganese in straw, main culm grain, primary tiller grain and secondary tiller grain.	113
4.3.1	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply, soil pH and genotype on the total water usage (ml plant^{-1}) over the whole season.	126
4.3.2	Effect of copper and zinc supply, soil pH and genotype on plant height (cm).	128

Number		Page
4.3.3	Tiller production and ear production per plant at maturity.	129
4.3.4	Effect of level of copper and zinc on the pollen viability of four genotypes grown in three soils of different pH.	131
4.3.5	Mean number of days to emergence, anthesis and maturity of the four genotypes as affected by soil pH and level of applied copper and zinc.	133
4.3.6	Dry weight of straw (stem, leaf and chaff), grain and total dry weight at maturity.	143
4.3.7	Yield and components of grain yield at maturity.	147
4.3.8	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply on the dry weight of roots per plant (g) of four genotypes grown in three soils of different pH.	149
4.3.9	Concentration of copper ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$) in straw and grain of plants grown in the acid soil and calcareous soil.	151
4.3.10	Concentration of manganese ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$) in straw and grain of plants grown in the acid soil and calcareous soil.	152
4.3.11	Copper content per plant (μg) in straw and grain of plants grown in the acid soil and calcareous soil.	154
5.2.1	Effect of adjusted soil pH on relative yield of grain from -Zn treatments (as a percentage of that in +Zn treatments).	161
5.3.1	Effect of level of copper and zinc on the relative grain yield (percentage) of four genotypes grown in three soils of different pH.	166

LIST OF PLATES

Number		Page
1	Close-up of a copper-deficient wheat plant showing the typical "wither-tip" symptom associated with copper deficiency.	72
2	Close-up of a zinc-deficient wheat plant showing typical zinc-deficiency symptoms: chlorotic and necrotic areas on the leaves.	95
3	The difference between genotypes in sensitivity to deficiency of zinc at pH 8.4. Wheat, triticale and rye, from left to right in pairs (without zinc added, with zinc added).	106
4	Close-up of a wheat plant showing symptoms of both copper and zinc-deficiency: "wither-tip" of copper deficiency, and chlorotic and necrotic areas characteristic of zinc deficiency.	120
5	Close-up of a wheat plant with added copper and added zinc (complete treatment) at pH 5.0 showing "stripes" of light and dark green.	120
6	Four pots of wheat cv. Halberd grown in the Mt. Burr soil (pH 5.0) showing the influence of copper and zinc on growth.	138
7	Four pots of wheat cv. Halberd grown in the Woods Well soil (pH 7.1) showing the influence of copper and zinc on growth.	138
8	Four pots of wheat cv. Halberd grown in the Robe soil (pH 8.8) showing the influence of copper and zinc on growth.	138
9	Four pots of triticale cv. T22 grown in the Mt. Burr soil (pH 5.0) showing the influence of copper and zinc on growth.	140
10	Four pots of triticale cv. T22 grown in the Woods Well soil (pH 7.1) showing the influence of copper and zinc on growth.	140
11	Four pots of triticale cv. T22 grown in the Robe soil (pH 8.8) showing the influence of copper and zinc on growth.	140
12	Four pots of rye cv. S.A. Commercial grown in the Mt. Burr soil (pH 5.0) showing the influence of copper and zinc on growth.	142
13	Four pots of rye cv. S.A. Commercial grown in the Woods Well soil (pH 7.1) showing the influence of copper and zinc on growth.	142
14	Four pots of rye cv. S.A. Commercial grown in the Robe soil (pH 8.8) showing the influence of copper and zinc on growth.	142

LIST OF APPENDICES

Number		Page
1	Detail of soils used in Pot Experiments 1, 2 and 3.	183
EXPERIMENT 1		
2, Figure 1	Effect of level of copper supply on the weekly water use (ml plant ⁻¹) throughout the season of triticale grown at pH 5.0.	185
Figure 2	Effect of level of copper supply on the weekly water use (ml plant ⁻¹) throughout the season of triticale grown at pH 7.0.	185
Figure 3	Effect of level of copper supply on the weekly water use (ml plant ⁻¹) throughout the season of triticale grown at pH 8.4.	185
Figure 4	Effect of level of copper supply on the weekly water use (ml plant ⁻¹) throughout the season of rye grown at pH 5.0.	187
Figure 5	Effect of level of copper supply on the weekly water use (ml plant ⁻¹) throughout the season of rye grown at pH 7.0.	187
Figure 6	Effect of level of copper supply on the weekly water use (ml plant ⁻¹) throughout the season of rye grown at pH 8.4.	187
3	Statistical analysis: Total water use over the whole season (ml plant ⁻¹).	188
4	Statistical analysis: Height of main culms to top of ears (cm).	189
5	Statistical analysis: Number of culms produced per plant.	190
6	Statistical analysis: Number of ears produced per plant.	191
7	Statistical analysis: Number of days to ear emergence of main culms.	192
8	Statistical analysis: Number of days to anthesis of main culms.	193
9	Statistical analysis: Number of days to maturity of main culms.	194
10	Statistical analysis: Total dry matter production per plant (g).	195
11	Statistical analysis: Dry weight of straw per plant (g).	196

Number		Page
12	Statistical analysis: Grain yield per plant (g).	197
13	Statistical analysis: Harvest index of the plant.	198
14	Statistical analysis: Number of grains per plant.	199
15	Statistical analysis: Number of spikelets per ear.	200
16	Statistical analysis: Number of grains per ear.	201
17	Statistical analysis: Weight per grain (mg).	202
18	Statistical analysis: Dry weight of roots per plant (g).	203
19	Statistical analysis: Concentration of copper in the straw ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	204
20	Statistical analysis: Concentration of copper in main culm grain ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	205
21	Statistical analysis: Concentration of copper in primary tiller grain ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	206
22	Statistical analysis: Concentration of copper in secondary tiller grain ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	207
23	Statistical analysis: Copper content of the straw per plant (μg).	208
24	Copper content ($\mu\text{g plant}^{-1}$) in grain of wheat, triticale and rye grown at two levels of copper supply at three soil pHs.	209
25	Statistical analysis: Total copper uptake by grain ($\mu\text{g plant}^{-1}$).	210
26	Statistical analysis: Copper content of main culm grain per plant (μg^{-1}).	211
27	Statistical analysis: Copper content of primary tiller grain per plant (μg).	212
28	Statistical analysis: Copper content of secondary tiller grain per plant (μg).	213
29	Statistical analysis: Weight of main culm grain per plant (g).	214
30	Statistical analysis: Weight of primary tiller grain per plant (g).	215

Number		Page
31	Statistical analysis: Weight of secondary tiller grain per plant (g).	216
EXPERIMENT 2		
32, Figure 1	Effect of level of zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of wheat grown at pH 5.0.	218
Figure 2	Effect of level of zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of triticale grown at pH 5.0.	218
Figure 3	Effect of level of zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of rye grown at pH 5.0.	218
Figure 4	Effect of level of zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of wheat grown at pH 7.0.	220
Figure 5	Effect of level of zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of triticale grown at pH 7.0.	220
Figure 6	Effect of level of zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of rye grown at pH 7.0.	220
33	Statistical analysis: Total water use over the whole season (ml plant^{-1}).	221
34	Statistical analysis: Weight of main culms to top of ears (cm).	222
35	Statistical analysis: Number of culms produced per plant.	223
36	Statistical analysis: Number of ears produced per plant.	224
37	Statistical analysis: Number of days to ear emergence of main culms.	225
38	Statistical analysis: Number of days to anthesis of main culms.	226
39	Statistical analysis: Number of days to maturity of main culms.	227
40	Dry weight of straw (stem, leaf and chaff), grain and total dry weight at maturity.	228
41	Statistical analysis: Total dry matter production per plant (g).	229

Number		Page
42	Statistical analysis: Dry weight of straw per plant (g).	230
43	Statistical analysis: Grain yield per plant (g).	231
44	Statistical analysis: Number of grains per plant.	232
45	Statistical analysis: Number of spikelets per ear.	233
46	Statistical analysis: Number of grains per ear.	234
47	Statistical analysis: Weight per grain (mg).	235
48	Statistical analysis: Dry weight of roots per plant (g).	236
49	Statistical analysis: Concentration of zinc in the straw ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	237
50	Statistical analysis: Concentration of zinc in main culm grain ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	238
51	Statistical analysis: Concentration of zinc in primary tiller grain ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	239
52	Statistical analysis: Concentration of zinc in secondary tiller grain ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	240
53	Statistical analysis: Concentration of manganese in the straw ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	241
54	Statistical analysis: Concentration of manganese in main culm grain ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	242
55	Statistical analysis: Concentration of manganese in primary tiller grain ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	243
56	Statistical analysis: Concentration of manganese in secondary tiller grain ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	244
57	Statistical analysis: Weight of main culm grain per plant (g).	245
58	Statistical analysis: Weight of primary tiller grain per plant (g).	246
59	Statistical analysis: Weight of secondary tiller grain per plant (g).	247
60	Statistical analysis: Zinc content of straw per plant (μg).	248

Number		Page
61	Zinc content ($\mu\text{g plant}^{-1}$) in grain of wheat, triticale and rye grown at two levels of zinc supply at three soil pHs.	249
62	Statistical analysis: Total zinc uptake by grain ($\mu\text{g plant}^{-1}$).	250
63	Statistical analysis: Zinc content of main culm per plant (μg).	251
64	Statistical analysis: Zinc content of primary tiller grain per plant (μg).	252
65	Statistical analysis: Zinc content of secondary tiller grain per plant (μg).	253
66	Statistical analysis: Manganese content of straw per plant (μg).	254
67	Manganese content ($\mu\text{g plant}^{-1}$) in grain of wheat, triticale and rye grown at two levels of zinc supply at three soil pHs.	255
68	Statistical analysis: Manganese content of main culm grain per plant (μg).	256
69	Statistical analysis: Manganese content of primary tiller grain per plant (μg).	257
70	Statistical analysis: Manganese content of secondary tiller grain per plant (μg).	258
EXPERIMENT 3		
71, Figure 1	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of wheat cv. Halberd grown at pH 7.1.	260
Figure 2	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of wheat cv. Gatcher grown at pH 7.1.	260
Figure 3	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of triticale grown at pH 7.1.	262
Figure 4	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of rye grown at pH 7.1.	262
Figure 5	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of wheat cv. Halberd grown at pH 8.8.	264

Number		Page
71, Figure 6	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of wheat cv. Gatcher grown at pH 8.8.	264
Figure 7	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of triticale grown at pH 8.8.	266
Figure 8	Effect of level of copper and zinc supply on the weekly water use (ml plant^{-1}) throughout the season of rye grown at pH 8.8.	266
72	Statistical analysis: Total water use over the whole season (ml plant^{-1}).	267
73	Statistical analysis: Height of main culms to top of ears (cm).	268
74	Statistical analysis: Number of culms produced per plant.	269
75	Statistical analysis: Number of ears produced per plant.	270
76	Statistical analysis: Pollen viability expressed as percentage of grains staining with iodine.	271
77	Statistical analysis: Number of days to ear emergence of main culms.	272
78	Statistical analysis: Number of days to anthesis of main culms.	273
79	Statistical analysis: Number of days to maturity of main culms.	274
80	Statistical analysis: Total dry matter production per plant (g).	275
81	Statistical analysis: Dry weight of straw per plant (g).	276
82	Statistical analysis: Grain yield per plant (g).	277
83	Statistical analysis: Number of grains per plant.	278
84	Statistical analysis: Dry weight of roots per plant (g).	279
85	Statistical analysis: Concentration of copper in the straw ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	280
86	Statistical analysis: Concentration of copper in the grain ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	281

Number		Page
87	Statistical analysis: Concentration of manganese in the straw ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	282
88	Statistical analysis: Concentration of manganese in the grain ($\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$).	283
89	Statistical analysis: Copper content of the straw per plant (μg).	284
90	Statistical analysis: Copper content of the grain per plant (μg).	285

ABSTRACT

The tolerance of triticale to soils of low copper status and low zinc status over a range of pH, both natural and artificially induced, was determined in three glasshouse experiments and compared with its parent species, wheat and rye.

In the first experiment, the tolerance of triticale to low copper status was determined in a neutral soil adjusted to both acid and alkaline pH. Intermediate tolerance of triticale was demonstrated, in that triticale was tolerant like rye at pH 5.0, but sensitive at pH 8.4 like wheat. Rye maintained the highest concentrations of copper and wheat the lowest, and concentration decreased with increasing pH. Uptake of copper showed the same pH dependence as concentration, and again rye had highest uptake of copper and wheat the least.

The second experiment was identical in design to the first experiment, but examined the tolerance of triticale to soil of low zinc status. Again, intermediate tolerance of triticale was demonstrated. At the alkaline pH in this experiment, where zinc was limiting, triticale was sensitive like wheat, although maintaining both a total shoot yield and grain yield intermediate between wheat (least) and rye (highest). Rye was tolerant of zinc deficiency. The concentration and absolute content of zinc in all plant parts of rye and triticale were higher than those of wheat at maturity, irrespective of the zinc status of the soil and in all pH environments.

Three natural soils (pH 5.0, 7.1, and 8.8) deficient in copper and zinc, were chosen for the third experiment in which growth responses of triticale, wheat and rye were compared at low and high levels of the limiting trace elements. Results further established the tolerance of rye to extremes of pH, and to both copper and zinc deficiency whether separately

or together, the relatively greater sensitivity of wheat, and the intermediate performance of triticale. Typically positive interactions between zinc and copper were observed in vegetative yield and grain yield and most strikingly in pollen viability on which the patterns of grain yield were based. A basic difference in the physiological effects of copper and zinc deficiency was on pollen viability: adding zinc alone aggravated copper deficiency and decreased pollen viability and yield, whilst adding copper alone generally increased pollen viability and yield. Genotypic differences in the copper-zinc interaction showed up strongly at higher pH where grain was produced only by rye and triticale in the unfertilised treatment.

Although there were marked differences among genotypes in their sensitivity to a single deficiency of copper or zinc, the copper-zinc interaction was physiologically similar for all genotypes in each soil.

Results of all three experiments were consistent in that rye was most tolerant of copper and zinc deficiency in all soils and that wheat was most sensitive. It was also evident that effects of copper were more on grain yield, whilst effects of zinc were mediated more through effects on general vigour and vegetative yield. Thus, artificial pH adjustment led to the same conclusion as natural extremes of pH.

This study showed conclusively that pH did indeed effect the uptake of copper and zinc, however, pH had a larger influence on the availability of zinc than of copper. This was contrary to the findings of Piper and Beckwith (1949), who found that pH had no effect on the availability of copper.

DECLARATION

This thesis contains no material that has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any University and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person, except when due reference is made in the text.

S. P. HARRY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

These studies were carried out in the Department of Agronomy at the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, University of Adelaide. I would like to thank Professor C.J. Driscoll, Chairman of the Department of Agronomy for permission to undertake the study (part time) within the Department.

I wish to express my sincere thanks to my main supervisor, Dr. R.D. Graham, Department of Agronomy, Waite Agricultural Research Institute for his invaluable advice and encouragement throughout the course of my studies and on preparation of this thesis. I also thank Dr. D. Puckridge, Department of Agronomy, Waite Agricultural Research Institute and Dr. B. Cartwright, Soils Division, CSIRO for supervising my studies while Dr. R.D. Graham was on study leave interstate.

I would like also to express sincere thanks to:

- Emeritus Professor C.M. Donald, Waite Agricultural Research Institute, for his encouragement, understanding and useful discussions throughout these studies.
- Dr. A.M. Alston, Department of Soil Science, Waite Agricultural Research Institute for contributions to discussions throughout the course of my studies.
- Miss J. Ascher, Department of Agronomy for expert technical assistance in all facets of the study and for being such a good friend.
- Mr. T.W. Hancock, Biometry Section, Waite Agricultural Research Institute for assistance in statistical analysis.
- Mr. B.A. Palk for photographic work in this thesis and throughout these studies.
- Mrs. J. Howe for typing the text.
- Mr. J.D. Rump and Mr. R. Dawson from whose properties the soil for these studies was collected.

I am greatly indebted to:

My family for encouraging my studies.

My husband John for being so understanding, and helping and encouraging me throughout my studies, particularly during difficult moments.