



Applied Research Report

Effects on Chaperone in Cotton

Stephen Biles, Extension Agent - IPM for Calhoun, Refugio and Victoria Counties

Cooperator: Sam Nunley, Calhoun County

Summary

A simple test was conducted to determine the effects of applying 5 oz/A Chaperone to cotton in the second week of bloom. The only parameter measured was lint yield, which was not different between the treated and untreated plots. No benefit was observed as a result of application of 5 oz/A Chaperone.

Objective

The objective of this project was to determine the effect of Chaperone on cotton lint yield.

Materials and Methods

A large plot cotton test was initiated two weeks after first bloom in 2005 to evaluate the effect of chaperone on lint yield. Plot size was 36 field rows with a row length ranging from 2,600 to 3,500 feet long. Application of 5 oz/A Chaperone was made with the farmers spray coupe at 8 gallons per acre. The cotton variety was DP&L 444 BR. Plants were in the second week of bloom and had an average of 13.2 nodes. Harvest was done with the farmer's cotton pickers. Each plot was made into one module and ginned separately at Moreman Community Gin

Results and Discussion

The application of Chaperone did not have an effect on lint yields. Treated plots averaged 871.5 lbs./A and untreated plots averaged 867.0 lbs/A (Table 1). The treatment probability was 0.9520 signifying that 95.2% of the variation was due to chance or random effects; not treatment. No benefit was seen by the addition of Chaperone in this field trial.

Table 1. Lint yield (lbs./A) of untreated and Chaperone treated plots.

		LINT
		lbs/A
1	Untreated	871.5 a
2	Chaperone 5 OZ/A	867.0 a
LSD (P=.10)		376.05
Standard Deviation		72.94
CV		8.39
Replicate F		0.620
Replicate Prob(F)		0.6680
Treatment F		0.006
Treatment Prob(F)		0.9520

Means followed by same letter do not significantly differ (P=.10, LSD)

Trade names of commercial products used in this report are included only for better understanding and clarity. Reference to commercial products or trade names is made with the understanding that no discrimination is intended and no endorsement by the Texas A&M University System is implied. Readers should realize that results from one experiment do not represent conclusive evidence that the same response would occur where conditions vary.