

**NUTRITIONAL FACTORS INFLUENCING THE
YIELD OF BUCKWHEAT IN THE NEW ENGLAND
TABLELANDS**

BY

MUZAMMIL SHAH
M.Sc. (Hons) Soil Science

**A THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND
JULY 1999**

PREFACE

I certify that the substance of this thesis has not already been submitted for any degree and is not currently being submitted for any other degree.

I certify that to the best of my knowledge any help received in preparing this thesis, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in this thesis.



Muzammil Shah

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I take this opportunity to express my deepest sense of gratitude to Almighty Allah, who enabled me to complete this study.

This study was sponsored by a World Bank funded project (ARP-II) to the NWFP Agricultural University, Peshawar (Pakistan). This support is gratefully acknowledged. Furthermore I express my very sincere thanks to Dr. Professor Syed Basit Ali Shah, Vice Chancellor, NWFP Agricultural University, Peshawar (Pakistan) for his big support in the award of this fellowship. My very sincere thanks are extended to Dr. Prof. Naseer Hussain, Dr. Professor Said Khan Khalil and Noorul Hadi (Secretary to Vice Chancellor) NWFP AU, for their extreme encouragement and continuous support throughout the process of this study.

I would like to express my profound appreciation and sincere thanks to my supervisor Dr. Errol Hoult, Senior Lecturer, for his invaluable guidance, inestimable help and support throughout the period of this study and in the preparation of this thesis. I am particularly obliged for the very kind attitude and respect received from him during my stay here in this department.

My sincere thanks are extended to Assoc. Professor Robin Jessop, for his technical guidance and extreme help and support throughout my studies.

I wish to sincerely acknowledge the technical help, provision of facilities and encouragement received from Assoc. Professor Graeme Blair and Assoc. Professor Acram Taji during the whole period of my stay in this department. The help received from Graeme Blair in the use of isotope experiment is highly acknowledged.

I sincerely acknowledge the technical help received from Michael Faint, Allan Mitchell, Michael Fittler, David Edmonds, Gary Cluley, Nell Blair, George Henderson, Leanne Lisle, Judy Kenny and Dan Alter. The general assistance from Shirley Fraser and Ildi Hall is highly appreciated.

The help received from Priscilla Connor in the editing and preparation of this thesis is highly acknowledged. Map No. 3.1, 3.6, and 3.7 were prepared by Alan Jones, Department of Geography & Planning, UNE. This help is sincerely acknowledged and appreciated.

I would like to extend my acknowledgment to all postgraduates of the Division of Agronomy and Science and all my friends particularly Riaz Ahmad and Navida Yasmin for their technical help and continuous encouragement throughout this study. The technical help received from Dr. Riaz A. Khattak and Dr. M. Jamal Khattak during the correction process of this thesis is sincerely acknowledged and highly appreciated.

Last but not least, I am highly indebted to my affectionate parents and uncle Haji Abdul Hanan, for their guidance and support. I would humbly admit that without the support and encouragement of my beloved uncle Haji Abdul Hanan, I would not have had the chance to reach this high level of my studies.

My love and thanks to my wife and lovely children (Afzal Shah, Atif Shah, Parkha Shah) for their continuous encouragement during the most difficult times during my study and giving me the patience to persevere through 4 years of study.

ABSTRACT

Buckwheat (*Fagopyrum esculentum* Moench) belongs to the family *Polygonaceae*. Although it is not a member of the grass family *Poaceae*, (Hughes and Metcalfe, 1972; Martin *et al.*, 1976; Taylor, 1996), it is considered as a pseudocereal (Hughes and Metcalfe, 1972) and as a nutraceutical (DeFelice, 1994). The most appealing quality of this crop is its high nutritional value, which contains protein of very high biological value (Eggum, 1980; Javornik, 1980). Buckwheat grain is used in many ways for human use throughout the world. Buckwheat, native to temperate east Asia, where it was grown in China before 1000 AD (Robinson, 1980), has proven itself to be widely adopted around the world. It is of economic importance in many countries including Nepal, India, Iran, Pakistan, Afghanistan, China, Japan, Korea, Russia, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Canada, United States, and Brazil (Mazza, 1986). Research demonstrating the many health benefits of buckwheat consumption is impressively large while research related to the nutritional requirements of buckwheat as related to soil type is lacking in many parts of the world.

A series of experiments were conducted in the field and glasshouse to investigate the nutritional requirements of buckwheat as related to soil types. The potentially suitable areas for the cultivation of buckwheat in the New England Tablelands were identified and mapped (Map 3.7) during the current research program. These areas were classified as climatically and topographically suitable for the successful cultivation of buckwheat.

An experiment was conducted to visually identify the deficiency symptoms of buckwheat as no published or unpublished data were available. The omission of nutrients in the triple-pot technique as described by Bouma (1966), Janssen (1974, 1990) and Muller *et al.*, (1979) was used. Distinctive deficiency symptoms due to omission of nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), potassium (K), and sulfur (S) were identified, which were mostly similar to the deficiency symptoms of other plants recorded and described by Thompson and Troeh (1975), Tisdale *et al.*, (1993), Grundon (1987), and Bergmann (1992). The same technique of the nutrient omission was used for evaluating the nutrient status of five agriculturally important soils of this region using buckwheat as a test crop. This investigation revealed that the omission of N, P, and S from the nutrient solution decreased the dry matter yields significantly. The omission of K from the nutrient solution did not show any significant effect on the dry matter yields except the grey brown podsollic, Uralla soil, which contained only 0.1 meq/100g of K. The available levels of calcium (Ca), magnesium (Mg) are currently sufficient in all soils.

The micronutrients response indicated that almost all the soils were sufficient in these nutrients for the yield of buckwheat.

A study was conducted to determine the effectiveness of various fertiliser sources of the major elements including urea, $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$ and NH_4NO_3 for N, PARP, RP, SSP, and TSP for P, K_2SO_4 and KCl, for K, and K_2SO_4 , ES, CaSO_4 , $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$ for S were used. On the average, straw yield increased by 49, 50, 59, 45% and grain yield by 25, 26, 22, and 30% over control with the sources of N, P, K, and S, respectively in nutrient rich, chocolate soils. However, in the nutrient deficient grey brown podsolc soils these increases were 271, 218, 262, and 271% for straw and 191, 149, 217, and 195% for grain, with the respective sources of N, P, K, and S fertilisers. Nitrogen and K sources were similar in efficiency on both the soils tested. For the sources of P and S on the light clay soil, triple-super phosphate, partially acidulated rock phosphate and rock phosphate showed similar efficiencies and elemental sulfur (ES) proved the best source for the satisfactory grain yield of buckwheat. Single-super phosphate and gypsum gave the best results for the grain yield for a sandy loam, grey brown podsolc soil.

The effects of micronutrients zinc (Zn), copper (Cu), boron (B), and molybdenum (Mo) applied at the rate of 5 kg/ha each in a pot experiment on a chocolate and grey brown podsolc soils showed no beneficial effects indicating that adequate levels of all these nutrients are currently present. Boron application showed depressing effects on most of the plant parameters measured while other nutrients did not cause any significant increase in the plant parameters in most cases when compared with the control. Addition of Cu as Cu x Zn and Cu x B tended to stimulate the straw and grain yields. Similarly, Mo x Zn showed additive effect on yield.

Major nutrients (N, P, K, and S) were applied at the rate of 50, 40, 50, and 50 kg/ha, respectively to buckwheat on a yellow podsolc and a chocolate soil under field conditions. The results from the yellow podsolc soil indicated that it was deficient in N, P, and S. Addition of 50 kg/ha N produced significant increases of 121 and 136% in straw and grain yield over control in the grey brown podsolc soil. The straw yield increased by 155, 155, 180 and 197% with NP, SKN, SN, and KNP, respectively. Similar effect was observed for grain yield. This suggested that combined application of SN and that of NPK were more beneficial in terms of buckwheat production on yellow podsolc soil. The application of K was not beneficial except when applied in combination with N and P. The nutrient rich chocolate soil showed no response to the

application of any nutrient applied except N which caused non-significant increases of 26 and 21% in straw and grain yield respectively. The combined application of NP did not improve the straw and grain yield as compared to N alone but the combine application of KNP and SNP improved the yield enhancement by 37% as compared to control. This indicated that chocolate soil was currently adequate in the major nutrients. These results are in agreement with Murayama *et al.*, (1998), and Goos *et al.*, (1998).

Buckwheat is reported as a heavy user of phosphorus (P) and had given consistent increases in yield with P applications. Three sources of P i.e. partially acidulated rock phosphate (PARP), phosphate rock (PR), and triple-super phosphate (TSP) were applied at the rate of 0, 10, 40, and 80 kg P/ha to two P-deficient soils with an initial P availability of 9 and 6 mg/kg Colwell P. A reverse dilution technique was used (Shedley *et al.*, 1979) and the soil was labelled with radioactive phosphorus ^{32}P (half-life of 14.7 days) as KH_2PO_4 . Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium were applied at the rate of 61, 50, and 50 kg/ha, respectively. The results indicated that the dry matter yield at maturity for Coventry soil as affected by the sources was ranked as TSP > PARP = PR and the P contribution in the plant was in the order of TSP > PARP > PR. In Kirby soil, the dry matter yield affected by sources was ranked as TSP > PARP > PR, while P contribution from these sources was in the order of TSP > PARP = PR.

It can be concluded from these studies that chocolate soil, containing adequate nutrients, offers great promise for buckwheat cultivation. All other soils tested (grey brown podsollic, yellow podsollic, and black earth) will need addition of N, P, and S for obtaining optimum yield. Further research is needed to establish appropriate levels of these nutrients for cultivation of buckwheat on these soils.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xvi
LIST OF MAPS.....	xix
CHAPTER 1	
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2	
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	6
2.1. Buckwheat in Australia.....	6
2.2. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PLANT	7
2.1.1. Origin, History and Classification	7
2.3. PLANT MORPHOLOGY.....	8
2.3.1. Stem.....	8
2.3.2. Leaves.....	9
2.3.3. Flowers.....	9
2.3.4. Seed.....	10
2.3.5. Roots.....	10
2.4. GROWING HABIT.....	12
2.5. VARIETIES.....	12
2.6. USES.....	14
2.7. PLANT REQUIREMENTS	17
2.7.1. Climatic.....	17
2.7.1.1. Temperature.....	17
2.7.1.2. Moisture.....	21
2.7.2. Soil	25
2.7.2.1. Soil reaction.....	26
2.7.3. Fertiliser responses	26

CHAPTER 3

3.1. INTRODUCTION.....	35
3.2. CLIMATE	36
3.2.1. Mean daily maximum temperature (°C)	36
3.2.2. Mean number of days maximum temperature equal or exceeding 30°C	37
3.2.3. Mean number of days maximum temperature equal or exceeding 35°C	37
3.2.4. Daily minimum temperature (°C).....	38
3.2.5. Frost	39
3.2.5.1. Light frost (temperature < 2.0°C)	39
3.2.5.2. Heavy frost (temperature <0.0°C).....	40
3.2.6. Rainfall	41
3.2.7. Altitude	42
3.2.8. Evaporation and moisture index.....	42
3.2.9. Soils	43
3.2.10. Slope.....	49
3.2.11. Soil erosion	49
3.3. SUMMARY.....	52

CHAPTER 4

NUTRIENT DEFICIENCY SYMPTOMS OF BUCKWHEAT.....	56
4.1. INTRODUCTION.....	56
4.2. MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	56
4.2.1. Experimental design and treatments.....	58
4.3. DEFICIENCY SYMPTOMS	61
4.4. DISCUSSION	63

CHAPTER 5

SOIL NUTRIENT DEFICIENCIES.....	65
5.1. INTRODUCTION.....	65
5.2. MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	65
5.2.1. Experimental design and treatments.....	66
5.2.2. Soil analysis.....	66

5.3. RESULTS	69
5.3.1. Chocolate soil	69
a) Plant height	69
b) Dry matter yield	69
c) Root dry weights.....	70
5.3.2. Grey brown podsolic soil (Kirby-17)	70
a) Plant height	71
b) Dry matter yield	71
c) Roots dry weight.....	72
5.3.3. Black earth soil (Clark's)	73
a) Plant height	73
b) Dry matter yield	73
c) Root dry weights.....	73
5.3.4. Grey brown podsolic soil (Uralla)	74
a) Plant height	74
b) Dry matter yield	75
c) Root dry weights.....	75
5.3.5. Grey brown podsolic soil (Clark's).....	76
a) Plant height	76
b) Dry matter yield	77
c) Root dry weight.....	77
5.4. DISCUSSION	78

CHAPTER 6

PLANT PARAMETERS OF BUCKWHEAT AFFECTED BY THE SOURCES OF NPKS FERTILISERS	81
6.1 INTRODUCTION	81
6.2 MATERIALS AND METHODS	82
6.2.1. Description of Treatments	82
6.2.2. Fertiliser Calculations.....	82
6.2.3. Experimental Design and data recording	84
6.2.4. Soil analysis	85
6.2.5. Data presentation and statistical analysis	85
6.3. RESULTS	86
6.3.1. Chocolate soil	86
i) Plant height	86

ii) Straw yield	87
iii) Grain yield.....	87
6.3.2. Grey brown podsollic soil	87
i) Plant height	87
ii) Straw yield	88
iii) Grain yield.....	88
6.4. DISCUSSION	89

CHAPTER 7

EFFECTS OF NITROGEN, PHOSPHORUS, POTASSIUM AND SULFUR ON THE YIELD OF BUCKWHEAT ON DIFFERENT SOILS OF NEW ENGLAND TABLELANDS.....

93

7.1. INTRODUCTION.....

93

7.2. MATERIALS AND METHODS.....

93

7.2.1. Data analysis

94

7.2.2. Soil analysis.....

94

7.3. RESULTS

95

7.3.1. Coventry site

95

 i) Straw yield.....

95

 ii) Grain yield

98

7.3.2. Laureldale site.....

102

 i) Straw yield.....

102

 ii) Grain yield

104

7.4. DISCUSSION

105

CHAPTER 8

RESPONSE OF BUCKWHEAT TO APPLICATION OF MICRONUTRIENTS (Zn, Cu, B, AND Mo).....

109

8.1. INTRODUCTION.....

109

8.2. MATERIALS AND METHODS.....

109

8.2.1. Experimental design and treatments.....

110

8.2.2. Data presentation and statistical analysis

111

8.2.3. Soil analysis

111

8.3. RESULTS

112

8.3.1. Chocolate soil	112
a) Plant height	113
b) Straw yield.....	113
c) Grain yield	114
8.3.2. Grey brown podsollic soil.....	116
a) Plant height	116
b) Straw yield.....	117
c) Grain yield	117
8.4. DISCUSSION	118

CHAPTER 9

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF P-SOURCES FOR THE OPTIMUM YIELD OF BUCKWHEAT UNDER PHOSPHORUS DEFICIENT SOILS.....	120
9.1. INTRODUCTION.....	120
9.2. MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	121
9.2.1. Specific Activity Ratio.....	122
9.2.2. Statistical analysis.....	122
9.2.3. Soil analysis	122
9.3. RESULTS	123
9.3.1. First harvest (Coventry soil)	123
1) Dry matter yield	123
2) P-uptake.....	124
3) Specific activity ratio (SAR).....	125
9.3.2. Kirby soil	126
1) Dry matter yield	126
2) P-uptake	127
3) Specific activity ratio (SAR).....	128
9.3.3. Final harvest (Coventry soil)	128
1) Dry matter yield	128
2) P-uptake.....	129
3) Specific activity ratio (SAR).....	130
9.3.4. Kirby soil	131
1) Dry matter yield	131
2) P-uptake.....	132
3) Specific activity ratio.....	132

9.4. DISCUSSION	133
------------------------------	------------

CHAPTER 10

GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	136
10.1. Buckwheat in the New England Tablelands.....	136
10.2. Visual deficiency symptoms of buckwheat and soils nutrient evaluation.....	137
10.3. Micronutrients.....	139
10.4. Buckwheat yield as affected by sources of fertilisers.....	140
10.5. Buckwheat (Mancan cv.) production in soils of New England Tablelands as influenced by N, P, K, and S.....	142
10.6. Achievements.....	143
10.7. Limitations and difficulties.....	144
10.8. Future research.....	144

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Average nutritional composition of buckwheat seed and groats compared with some commercial buckwheat and wheat flour.....	11
Table 2.2. Average amino acid concentration in buckwheat.....	13
Table 2.3. Some of the common varieties of buckwheat grown in different parts of the world. ...	15
Table 2.4. Top weight and grain yield affected by the application of major nutrients.....	28
Table 3.1. Mean daily maximum temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) during buckwheat growing period.....	34
Table 3.2. Mean number of days maximum temperature equal or exceeding 30°C during buckwheat growing period.....	36
Table 3.3. Mean number of days, maximum temperature equal or exceeding 35°C during the buckwheat growing period.....	36
Table 3.4. Mean daily minimum temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) during the buckwheat growing season.	37
Table 3.5. Median (decile 5) rainfall (mm) during the buckwheat growing season.	39
Table 4.1. Nutrient solutions used in triple-pot experiments.....	58
Table 4.2. Final concentration of the nutrients in the solutions.....	60
Table 5.1. Chemical and physical properties of soils used in various experiments.....	69
Table 5.2. Plant height as affected by the omission of nutrients.....	73
Table 6.1. Soil analysis of the chocolate and grey brown podsolic soils.....	85
Table 6.2. Plant height, straw and grain yields of buckwheat affected by sources of N, P, K, & S in chocolate soil.....	86
Table 6.3. Plant height, straw and grain yield as affected by the sources of N, P, K, and S on the	89
Table 7.1. Experimental Layout for the field trials.....	94
Table 7.2. Soil analysis of Laureldale and Coventry sites.	95
Table 7.3. Average (n=32) straw yield (t/ha) as affected by the application of N, P, K, and S at Coventry.....	96
Table 7.4. Straw yield (t/ha) affected by N, P, K, and S and their interactions at Coventry.	97
Table 7.5. Average (n=32) grain yield (t/ha) as affected by the application of N, P, K, and S at 99	99
Table 7.6. Grain yield (t/ha) affected by N, P, K, S, and their interactions at Coventry.....	100
Table 7.7. Average (n= 32) straw yield (t/ha) affected by the application of N, P, K, and S at Laureldale.....	103
Table 7.8. Straw yield (t/ha) affected by N, P, K, S, and their interactions at Laureldale.....	103
Table 7.9. Average (n=32) grain yield (t/ha) affected by the application of N, P, K, and S at ...	104
Table 7.10. Grain yield (t/ha) affected by N, P, K, S, and their interactions at Laureldale.....	105
Table 8.1. Treatments description.....	110
Table 8.2. Fertiliser calculations for the treatments (micronutrients) and basal rates (g/pot)....	111
Table 8.3. Soil analysis of the chocolate and grey brown podsolic soils.....	112

Table 8.4. Average (n=32) plant height (cm) as affected by the application of micronutrients on	113
Table 8.5. Average (n=32) straw (g/pot) as affected by the application of micronutrients on the	113
Table 8.6. Average (n=32) grain yield (g/pot) as affected by the application of micronutrients on the chocolate soil.....	114
Table 8.7. Average (n=32) plant height (cm) as affected by the application of micronutrients on the grey brown podsolic soil.....	116
Table 8.8. Average (n=32) straw yield as affected by the application of micronutrients on grey brown podsolic soil.....	117
Table 8.9. Average (n=32) grain yield (g/pot) as affected by the application of micronutrients on the grey brown podsolic soil.....	117
Table 9.1. Soil analysis of Coventry and Kirby.....	123

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1. Grain yield of wheat with and without fertiliser.....	3
Figure 1.2. Global trends in population growth, grain yield, and origin of plant nutrients.....	3
Figure 2.1. Current buckwheat growing areas in Australia.....	7
Figure 2.2. The effects of planting date effect on the yield of buckwheat (Mancan) during three growing seasons at Langdon, North Dakota. (Source: Berglund, 1995).....	19
Figure 2.3. The effects of planting date effect on the yield of buckwheat (Manor) during three growing seasons at Langdon, North Dakota. (Source: Berglund, 1995).....	19
Figure 3.1. January mean daily maximum isotherms ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) during buckwheat growing season (Lea, <i>et al.</i> , 1977).....	35
Figure 3.2. January mean daily minimum isotherms ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) during buckwheat growing season (Lea <i>et al.</i> , 1977).....	37
Figure 3.3. Median rainfall and percentiles for various places in the New England during the month of January (Source: Lea <i>et al.</i> , 1977).....	41
Figure 3.4. Average Monthly Evaporation (mm) (Australian Sunken Tank Values) (Source: Lea <i>et al.</i> , 1977).....	44
Figure 3.5. Average seasonal moisture index of New England (Source: Lea <i>et al.</i> , 1977).....	45
Figure 4.1. Schematic representation of triple-pot technique.....	57
Figure 5.1. Plant height as affected by the omission of nutrients on the chocolate soil (Laureldale).....	69
Figure 5.2. Dry matter yields as affected by the omission of nutrients on the chocolate soil (Laureldale).....	70
Figure 5.3. Root dry weights as affected by the omission of nutrients on the chocolate soil (Laureldale).....	70
Figure 5.4. Plant height as affected by the omission of nutrients on the grey brown podsolic (Kirby-17).....	71
Figure 5.5. Dry matter yield as affected by the omission of nutrients on the grey brown podsolic (Kirby17) soil.....	72
Figure 5.6. Root dry weights as affected by the omission of nutrients on the grey brown podsolic (Kirby-17) soil.....	72
Figure 5.7. Dry matter yield as affected by the omission of nutrients on the black earth soil (Clark's).....	73
Figure 5.8. The omission of nutrients affecting the root dry weights on the black earth soil (Clark's).....	74
Figure 5.9. The omission of nutrients affecting the plant height on the grey brown podsolic soil (Uralla).....	74

Figure 5.10. The omission of nutrients affecting the dry matter yield on the grey brown podsolic soil (Uralla).....	75
Figure 5.11. Root dry weights as affected by the omission of nutrients on the grey brown podsolic soil (Uralla).....	76
Figure 5.12. The omission of nutrients affecting the plant height on the grey brown podsolic soil (Clark's).....	76
Figure 5.13. Dry matter yield as affected by the omission of nutrients on the grey brown podsolic soil (Clark's).....	77
Figure 5.14. Root dry weights as affected by the omission of nutrients on the grey brown podsolic soil (Clark's).....	78
Figure 7.1. Effects of N, P, K, and S on the straw yield in comparison with NIL at Coventry.....	96
Figure 7.2. Straw yield as affected by the interactions of S x K at Coventry.....	97
Figure 7.3. Straw yield as affected by the interaction of S x P x N at Coventry.	98
Figure 7.4. Grain yield as affected by the application of N, P, K, and S in comparison with NIL at Coventry.	99
Figure 7.5. Grain yield as affected by the interaction of N x P at Coventry.....	100
Figure 7.6. Grain yield as affected by the interaction of S x K x N at Coventry.	101
Figure 7.7. Grain yield as affected by the interaction of S x P x N at Coventry.	102
Figure 7.8. Effects of N, P, K, and S on the straw yield in comparison with NIL at Laureldale.	102
Figure 7.9. Effects of N, P, K, and S on the grain yield in comparison with NIL at Laureldale.	104
Figure 8.1. Straw yield (g/pot) as affected by the interaction of Mo x B x Cu on the chocolate soil.	114
Figure 8.2. Grain yield (g/pot) affected by the interaction of Mo x Cu x Zn on the chocolate soil.	115
Figure 8.3. Grain yield as affected by the application of micronutrients on the chocolate soil.	116
Figure 8.4. Grain yield as affected by the interaction of Zn x Cu x Mo on the grey brown podsolic soil.....	118
Figure 9.1. Dry matter yield in the first harvest as influenced by the sources of P for Coventry soil.....	124
Figure 9.2. Dry matter yield in the first harvest as affected by P rates for Coventry soil.....	124
Figure 9.3. Phosphorus uptake in the first harvest as affected by P-sources and rates for Coventry soil.....	125
Figure 9.4. Specific activity in the first harvest as affected by P-sources and rates for Coventry soil.....	126
Figure 9.5. Dry matter yield in the first harvest as affected by P sources and rates for Kirby soil.	127

Figure 9.6. Phosphorus uptake in the first harvest as affected by P-sources and rates for Kirby soil.	127
Figure 9.7. Specific activity in the first harvest as affected by P-sources and rates for Kirby soil.	128
Figure 9.8. Dry matter yield at maturity as affected by P-sources and rates for Coventry soil..	129
Figure 9.9. Phosphorus uptake at maturity as affected by P-sources for Coventry soil.....	130
Figure 9.10. Specific activity ratio at maturity as affected by P sources for Coventry soil.	130
Figure 9.11. Specific activity ratio at maturity as affected by P rates for Coventry soil.	131
Figure 9.12. Dry matter yield at maturity as affected by P-sources and rates for Kirby soil.....	131
Figure 9.13. P-uptake at maturity as affected by the P-sources and rates for Kirby soil.....	132
Figure 9.14. Specific activity ratio at maturity as affected by P sources for Kirby soil.....	133

LIST OF MAPS

Map 3.1. New England Tablelands of New South Wales, Australia where the research was conducted.....	35
Map 3.2. Relief of the New England Tablelands (Source: Lea <i>et al.</i> , 1977).	44
Map 3.3. Soils of the New England Tablelands (Source: Lea <i>et al.</i> , 1977).....	46
Map 3.4. Slope classification of the New England Tablelands (Source: Lea <i>et al.</i> , 1977).	50
Map 3.5. Soil erosion in the New England Tablelands (Source: Lea <i>et al.</i> , 1977).	51
Map 3.6. Suitable areas of the New England Tablelands for the cultivation of buckwheat.	54
Map 3.7. Climatically suitable areas of the New England Tablelands for the cultivation of buckwheat.	55