

### **CONTENTS**

INTRO	ODUCTION	1
	Acreage, yield, and total production of spring oats in Kansas, 1975-1994, Table 1	1
1994	PERFORMANCE TESTS	
	Spring oat varieties grown in 1994 Kansas tests, Table 2	1
	Oat Performance Test site descriptions, management, and conditions in 1994, Table 3	2
	Yield (bushels per acre and % of test average), Table 4	3
	Test weight (lbs per bushel) and moisture (%), Table 5	3
	Period-of-years yield averages (bushels per acre), Table 6	4
	Maturity (days earlier or later than a standard) and plant height (inches), Table 7	5
	Lodging (%) and shattering (%), Table 8	5
	Contributors back cover	er

# 1994 KANSAS PERFORMANCE TESTS WITH SPRING OAT VARIETIES

### INTRODUCTION

The number of acres utilized for spring oats production is small in comparison to the acreage used for the major crops in Kansas. However, this does not limit the potential importance of spring oats on individual producer's farms. Spring oats often are used in crop rotations or when winter wheat acreage is restricted or winter-damaged. Either grain or forage production from spring oats can make a significant contribution to a crop or livestock enterprise.

Spring oat production figures for 1994 and preceding years are given in Table 1. Oat production for 1994 was substantially higher than the very low 1993 production which was limited by adverse weather conditions. Only 43% of the planted acreage was harvested in 1993, and yields were 13 bushels below the long-term average. In 1994, many more acres were sown and harvested, and yields were slightly higher than the long-term average.

Table 1. Acreage, yield, and total production of spring oats in Kansas, 1975-1994 (Crops Report; Kansas Agricultural Statistics, August 11, 1994).

	Tota	Acres	•	Total
	(1,0	000's)	Yield	Production
Year	Sown	Harvested	bu/acre	1,000 bu
1994	160	120	48	5,760
1993	70	30	34	1,020
1992	200	140	56	7,840
1991	160	110	53	5,830
1990	160	120	55	6,600
1975-89	213	153	46	7,040
1975-94	197	141	47	6,633

### 1994 PERFORMANCE TESTS

The Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station conducts trials of various crops at several locations throughout the state to provide agronomic information on new and established varieties and hybrids under current growing conditions. Table 2 lists the oat varieties included in 1994 Kansas tests. Because very few oat varieties are developed by private companies, most of the varieties in the tests have been developed and

released by public universities or agricultural experiment stations.

Table 2. Spring oat varieties grown in 1994 Kansas performance tests.

	State/	Year			Year
Variety	Company	Released	Variety	State	Released
Armor	ОН	1991	Horicon	WI	1990
Bates*	MO	1977	Larry*	IL	1980
Brawn	IL	1993	Ogle*	IL	1980
Dane	WI	1990	Prairie	WI	1992
Don*	IL	1985	Premier*	MN	1990
Eli	Paramoun		Settler*	SD	1989
	t				
Hazel	IL	1985	Starter*	MN	1986

<sup>\*</sup> Certified seed produced in Kansas in 1994.

Spring oat tests have been conducted at various locations for several years. Locations of 1994 spring oat test sites are shown on the map on the front cover. The Greeley County test near Tribune had to be discarded because of freeze damage in late April. Site descriptions, management practices, and growing conditions for the remaining eight test sites are summarized in Table 3. The location codes listed in parentheses after each location name are used as column headers in the data tables.

Performance of specific varieties can best be determined by examining Tables 4 through 8. The information in these tables is derived from replicated varietal comparisons at the sites listed in Table 3. Yields are reported in Table 4 as bushels per acre (32 pounds per bushel) adjusted to a moisture content of 12.5 percent and as percentages of the test averages to speed recognition of highest yielding entries (more than 100%, the test average).

Table 6 provides yield performance of most entries over several years at the different testing locations. Measurements of characteristics often contributing to yield performance are shown in Table 5 (test weights and harvest moisture), Table 7 (maturity differences), and Table 8 (lodging and shattering for locations where varietal differences in these characters were noted).

Table 3. Oat Performance Test site descriptions, management, and conditions in 1994.

County and	Site, nearest town,	Dates of planting &	Soil type and	Fertilizers applied, Ibs/a	
BROWN Brian Marsh Conditions:	Cornbelt Expt Field Powhattan (BR) good soil moisture a	3/17 7/12 t planting, hot	Grundy silty clay loam Soybean, 1993 and dry during grain fill	40	90 lb/a 8" row spacing
RILEY K. Roozeboom Conditions:	Agronomy North Far Manhattan (RL) good seedbed with a	7/1	Smolan silt loam Soybeans, 1993 sture, little disease, hot just b	50 25 pefore harvest	64 lb/a 10" row spacing
FRANKLIN Keith Janssen Conditions:	EC KS Expt Field Ottawa (FR) very wet early in the	3/16 7/1 season, some	Woodson silt loam Soybean, 1993 e barley yellow dwarf	60	60 lb/a 7" row spacing
LABETTE Jim Long Conditions:	SE KS Ag. Res. Ctr. Parsons (LB) first planted on Febru	3/17 6/29 uary 17, repla	Parsons silt loam Soybeans, 1993 nted in March because of he	60 eavy rains	80 lb/a 7" row spacing
HARVEY Mark Claassen Conditions:		3/4 6/30 low temperate	Ladysmith silty clay loam Oats, 1993 ures in April, good rains in A		60 lb/a (approx.) 7" row spacing te May and June
RENO William Heer Conditions:	SC KS Expt Field Hutchinson (RN) dry in early spring, c	2/17 6/27 ool in March a	Ost silt loam Wheat, 1993 and April, good rains in April	100 40 	64 lb/a 8" row spacing
THOMAS Pat Evans Conditions:	NW KS Res-Ext Ctr Colby (TH) adequate moisture re	3/4 7/11 esulted in goo	Keith silt loam Barley, 1992 d stands, but dry until just b	35 efore harvest, which	65 lb/a 12" row spacing was delayed by rain
FINNEY Irr Merle Witt Conditions:	SW KS Res-Ext Ctr Garden City Unit (FN dry during most of se insects or diseases	•	Keith silt loam Wheat, 1993 ed in mid-May, hot during Ju	45 ine grain fill period, lit	70 lb/a 10" row spacing tle or no damage from

At the bottom of each column of replicated data in the various tables is the L.S.D. (Least Significant Difference). Unless two varieties differ by more than the L.S.D. given, little confidence can be placed in one being superior to the other. The use of the L.S.D. is intended to reduce the chance of overemphasizing small differences in yield or other characteristics. in soil Small variations structure. fertility. water-holding characteristics, and other test-site characteristics can cause considerable yield variation among plots of the same variety grown only a short distance apart.

Another statistical parameter is the coefficient of variation (C.V.) shown at the bottom of most columns. This figure, if properly interpreted, can be used to estimate the degree of confidence one may have in the data presented. In this testing program, C.V.'s below 10% generally indicate reliable, uniform data, whereas C.V.'s from 11 to 15% usually indicate less

desirable but generally useful data for the rough performance comparisons desired from these tests.

## Excerpts from the UNIVERSITY RESEARCH POLICY AGREEMENT WITH COOPERATING SEED COMPANIES\*

Permission is hereby given to Kansas State University to test our varieties and/or hybrids designated on the attached entry forms in the manner indicated on the test announcement. I understand that all results from Kansas crop performance tests belong to the University and to the public and shall be controlled by the University so as to produce the greatest benefit to the public. It is further agreed that the name of the University shall not be used by the company in any commercial advertising either in regard to this agreement or any other related matter.

\* This agreement must be signed by an authorized individual before results involving the company's entries can be published by the Experiment Station. Except for the limitation that the name "KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY" cannot be used in advertising (you may use something like "official state tests" or "state yield trials"), this does not preclude the use of data for advertising, if done in a fair manner.

Table 4. Yield from 1994 Kansas Spring Oat Performance Tests.

			T	est Lo	ocatio	on						T	est L	ocati	on			
Cultivar	BR	RL	FR	LB	HV	RN	TH	FN	Avg.	BR	RL	FR	LB	HV	RN	TH	FN	Avg.
		bus	shels	pera	cre at	12%	moist	ure				per	cent	of tes	t aver	age		
Armor	53	65	41	49	58	53	57	75	57	92	103	86	106	94	96	107	88	97
Bates	53	62	45	49	73	64	56	91	62	92	99	95	106	119	115	104	107	105
Brawn	54	67	52	38	54	69	57	72	58	93	106	108	81	88	124	107	84	99
Dane	66	70	48	48	58	45	51	90	59	114	111	100	105	94	80	95	106	101
Don	74	77	62	45	71	69	55	100	69	127	123	129	96	115	124	103	118	117
Eli			32				32		32			67				60		63
Hazel	55	52	42	44	55	61	57	82	56	94	83	88	94	90	110	107	96	95
Horicon	55	55	43	38	56	50	50	82	54	96	87	90	82	90	89	94	97	91
Larry	52	65	50	59	74	48	60	89	62	89	103	104	128	121	86	112	105	106
Ogle	48	58	52	37	65	58	62	81	58	82	92	109	79	105	104	116	95	98
Prairie	59	62	53	47	58	67	65	78	61	102	98	111	101	94	121	122	92	105
Premier	60	63	51	52	62	53	53	94	61	103	100	106	113	101	95	100	110	103
Settler	59	57	44	49	63	55	46	75	56	103	90	92	106	102	99	85	88	96
Starter	65	66	55	48	55	33	48	96	58	113	105	114	103	89	58	89	113	98
Test Avg	58	63	48	46	62	56	54	85	57	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
CV (%)	8	5	12	11	5	10	8	8	8	8	5	12	11	5	10	8	8	8
LSD (.05)**	5	4	8	7	4	7	5	8	3	9	6	16	15	6	12	9	10	5

<sup>\*\*</sup> Unless two varieties differ by more than the L.S.D., little confidence can be placed in one being superior to the other.

Table 5. Test weight and moisture from 1994 Kansas Spring Oat Performance Tests.

			T	est Lo	ocatio	on						T	est L	ocati	on			
Cultivar	BR	RL	FR	LB	HV	RN	TH	FN	Avg	BR	RL	FR	LB	HV	RN	TH	FN	Avg.
		te	est we	ight,	pound	ls per	bush	el					%	moist	ture			
Armor	30	31	32	27	30	31	34	29	31	11	13	15	11	9	11	10	12	12
Bates	34	32	36	28	33	35	36	34	33	10	12	13	10	9	9	10	9	10
Brawn	29	29	33	26	28	31	32	28	29	10	14	13	9	9	10	10	10	11
Dane	28	29	33	25	28	31	32	30	30	10	13	12	10	9	10	9	9	10
Don	33	34	36	28	33	35	36	33	34	11	12	12	9	9	9	9	9	10
Eli			36				36		36			13				10		12
Hazel	30	32	34	28	31	33	34	32	32	10	14	12	10	9	10	9	10	11
Horicon	31	29	35	25	30	30	33	31	30	11	13	13	10	9	11	10	10	11
Larry	30	32	34	28	31	33	34	32	32	10	12	11	10	9	12	10	9	10
Ogle	29	30	34	26	30	31	34	30	31	10	13	12	10	9	11	10	10	10
Prairie	29	31	33	28	30	31	34	28	31	11	13	12	10	10	11	10	12	11
Premier	34	32	37	27	31	34	37	35	34	11	14	13	10	9	11	10	10	11
Settler	32	32	35	28	33	33	34	32	32	11	14	12	11	9	10	10	10	11
Starter	35	34	36	29	33	30	36	35	33	10	13	11	10	9	13	10	9	11
Test Avg	31	31	35	27	31	32	34	32	32	10	13	12	10	9	11	10	10	11
CV (%)	2	3	2	8	5	3	3	2	4	1	3	5	6	3	15	2	6	7
LSD (.05)**	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	1	0

<sup>\*\*</sup> Unless two varieties differ by more than the L.S.D., little confidence can be placed in one being superior to the other.

Table 6. Period-of-years yield averages (bushels per acre) from 1994 Kansas Spring Oat Performance Tests.

3yr. 4yr avg. avg  66 78 78 87	avg.  61 64	2yr. avg. 69 61 68	3yr. avg.  63 70	4yr. avg.  63	2yr. avg. 45 60	3yr. avg. 48 58	4yr avg
 66 78 78 87	 61 64	69 61	 63		45	48	
66 78 78 87	61 64	61		 63			
66 78 78 87	61 64	61		 63			
78 87	64			63	60	50	
		68	70			56	60
02 00			70		55	64	67
83 90	75	71	71	65	44	47	46
66 73	53	66	65	59	27	36	40
68 75	49	67	65		40	53	50
66 70	65	63	67	63	45	53	53
69 78	62	76	76	72	44	53	54
67 75	54	64	63		46	52	52
68 74	55	68	66	62	36	44	48
	60	67	60	64	4.4	F 4	52
(	67 75 68 74	67 75 54	67     75     54     64       68     74     55     68	67     75     54     64     63       68     74     55     68     66	67     75     54     64     63        68     74     55     68     66     62	67     75     54     64     63      46       68     74     55     68     66     62     36	67     75     54     64     63      46     52       68     74     55     68     66     62     36     44

Table 6. (continued).

		Harvey	,1		Ren	o <sup>4</sup>		-	Thoma	s <sup>1</sup>			Finney	4
	2yr.	3yr.	4yr	2y	r. 3yr	4yr	_	2yr	3yr.	4yr.	_	2yr.	3 yr.	4yr.
Cultivar	avg.	avg.	avg.	av	g. avg	ı a∨g		avg.	avg.	avg.		avg.	avg.	avg.
Armor	71			5:	2			60				77	90	
Bates	79	69	69	58	3 62	61		69	80	78		82	89	89
Dane	45	46	50	5	3 56	60		57	64			86	81	87
Don	65	59	60	6:	2 61	60		58	73	74		91	98	96
Hazel	54	50	51	50	61	61						76	81	82
Horicon	59	54	53	50	57	58		57	72	72		77	82	82
Larry	66	59	56	50	53	53		66	74	76		80	84	82
Ogle	64	57	57	60	61	62		66	81	81		73	84	80
Premier	71	63	59	48	3 52	52		57	67	68		83	94	90
Starter	56	54	50	3.	4 39	42						80	81	80
Test Avg	63	57	56	5:	2 56	56		61	73	75		80	86	85

<sup>1</sup> Includes data from 1990, 1991, 1992, and 1994.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Includes data from 1991 and 1994.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Includes data from 1989, 1991, 1992, and 1994.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Includes data from 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994.

Table 7. Maturity and height from 1994 Kansas Spring Oat Performance Tests.

			T	est L	ocatio	on						Test	t Loc	ation			
Cultivar	BR	RL	FR	LB	HV	RN	TH	FN	Avg.	BR	FR	LB	HV	RN	TH	FN	Avg.
	matu	irity, c	lays e	arlier	or lat	er hea	ading	than	Bates			h	eight,	inche	es		
Armor	4	7	4	4	5	7	5	7	5	34	31	33	29	34	29	34	32
Bates	5/30	5/23	5/29	5/28	5/23	5/22	5/29	5/26	5/26	33	30	32	31	38	24	32	31
Brawn	4	6	4	5	5	4	4	6	5	32	27	28	24	32	24	29	28
Dane	-1	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	33	29	34	30	35	25	33	31
Don	0	-1	0	1	1	1	-1	1	0	33	29	30	30	37	23	33	31
Eli			1				2		2		32				29		31
Hazel	2	4	2	3	3	3	1	3	3	33	28	28	27	32	23	30	29
Horicon	2	6	2	4	2	3	4	3	3	34	30	32	29	34	27	33	31
Larry	0	1	0	1	-1	1	0	1	0	31	28	30	29	33	25	30	29
Ogle	3	5	2	4	4	4	3	5	4	36	30	30	28	33	27	32	31
Prairie	4	7	3	5	7	5	5	7	5	33	31	32	28	33	27	34	31
Premier	3	5	3	3	3	5	1	2	3	34	31	32	31	35	26	34	32
Settler	3	7	3	4	2	5	4	3	4	34	33	34	31	39	29	34	33
Starter	-2	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	33	30	33	31	33	26	33	31
Test Avg	2	4	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	33	30	31	29	34	26	32	31
CV (%)	2	2	2	3	2	5	2	3	3	6	4	6	3	3	4	5	5
LSD (.05)**	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	3	1	1	1	2	1

<sup>\*\*</sup> Unless two varieties differ by more than the L.S.D., little confidence can be placed in one being superior to the other.

Table 8. Lodging and shattering from 1994 Kansas Spring Oat Performance Tests.

		T	est Locati	on			Test L	ocation	
Cultivar	BR	LB	HV	RN	TH	Avg.	HV	TH	Avg.
			lodgi	ng, %			Ş	hattering, <sup>c</sup>	%
Armor	2	2	2	6	3	3	0	2	1
Bates	8	7	16	30	8	14	1	2	2
Brawn	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Dane	3	1	12	0	0	3	2	2	2
Don	11	3	3	8	10	7	1	2	2
Eli					5	5	0	3	2
Hazel	5	1	0	0	5	2	0	2	1
Horicon	3	1	6	5	0	3	1	1	1
Larry	18	1	3	1	0	5	3	1	2
Ogle	2	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	1
Prairie	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	1
Premier	4	4	14	4	13	8	1	4	3
Settler	55	3	5	3	13	16	1	2	2
Starter	25	2	4	0	8	8	1	2	2
Test Avg	11	2	5	4	4	5	1	2	2
CV (%)	86	101	64	311	73	144	83	50	64
LSD ( 05)**	11	3	4	16	4	5	1	1	1

<sup>\*\*</sup> Unless two varieties differ by more than the L.S.D., little confidence can be placed in one being superior to the other.

This publication from the Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service has been archived. Current information is available from http://www.ksre.ksu.edu.

### **CONTRIBUTORS**

### MAIN STATION, MANHATTAN

Kraig Roozeboom, Assistant Agronomist (Senior Author)

### **RESEARCH CENTERS**

Patrick Evans, Colby James Long, Parsons Merle Witt, Garden City

#### **EXPERIMENT FIELDS**

Mark Claassen, Hesston William Heer, Hutchinson Keith Janssen, Ottawa Brian Marsh, Powhattan

NOTE: Trade names are used to identify products. No endorsement is intended, nor is any criticism implied of similar products not named.

Agricultural Experiment Station, Kansas State University, Manhattan 66506-4008