## PROVENANCE x ENVIRONMENT INTERACTIONS IN WHITE ASH

Fan H. Kung and Knud E. Clausen 1/

Abstract. Height growth of 19 white ash provenances at ages 4 and 6 were measured in plantations in Louisiana, Illinois, Ohio and Wisconsin. Both the provenance by plantation interaction and the plantation by year interaction were significant. One-fifth of the variation in height growth could be accounted for by these interactions. The interaction of provenances and plantations is due to the reversal of growth trends among provenances in different plantations, while the interaction of plantations and years is due to the scale of measurement. No significant interaction was found between provenances and years. Practical implications for white ash tree improvement programs are discussed.

Additional Keywords: age-age correlation, logarithmic transformation, site selection, <u>Fraxinus americana</u> L.

The genotype-environment (GE) interaction is the failure of genetic entries to maintain the same relative ranks and level of differences when tested in different environments (Snyder 1972). Unless the magnitude of the GE interaction is known, the tree breeder can neither make a realistic estimate of the rate of improvement nor determine the range of environment to which his results will apply (King 1965). Once the source of interaction is known, one can make a logical choice in seed source recommendations and evaluate selections with greater confidence. If there is no interaction, a few superior genotypes may be selected for the average environment. If there are no changes in ranking but there are changes in levels of difference, common genotypes can still be selected but the predicted genetic gain may not be valid. Finally, if there are changes in both ranking and in levels of difference, one should discard the pooled analysis and look at each plantation separately.

This study examines provenance x environment interactions in white ash <u>(Fraxinus americana</u> L). The objectives of this paper are to quantify and classify interactions among provenances, seedling ages and plantations.

1/

The authors are respectively Professor, Department of Forestry, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Carbondale, Illinois 62901 and Principal Plant Geneticist, North Central Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Carbondale, Illinois 62901.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank Drs. John R. Toliver, Daniel B. Houston, and Hans Nienstaedt for plantation maintenance and data collection.

228

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Seeds were collected from up to 10 native parent trees per stand throughout the natural range of white ash during 1973-1974. The seeds were sown in the Illinois Division of Forestry Nursery at Jonesboro, Illinois and plantations established in 1976 as randomized complete blocks with 5-tree and 5 replications. Plantations in Louisiana (LA), Illinois (IL), Ohio (OH) and Wisconsin (WI), which had 45 wind pollinated families from 19 provenances in common, were used in this study.

Total height after 3 and 5 years in the field (ages 4 and 6 from seed) were recorded for each tree. Because families within provenance variance was small (Clausen, et. al. 1981), provenance means were used as observations in the data analysis (Table 1).

In order to test whether or not any GE interaction was due to scaling, natural logarithmic transformation of height data was also used in the analysis of variance. A fixed effects model was assumed for testing interactions while a random effects model was assumed for variance component (VC) analysis. Data analysis was processed through the Statistical Analysis System (SAS 1982).

# RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There was no provenance by year interaction (Table 2). There may be two reasons for the lack of this interaction. The first one is that ages 4 and 6 are so close in time that, unless some drastic events have altered the growth trends, there is only a small probability that changes in rank or changes in levels of difference would occur in such a short interval. The second reason is that both ages are within the same stage of growth development, and the age-age correlations are high and positive (Clausen 1982). Namkoong and Conkle (1976) found that age-age correlations are high only when juvenile age classes (age 8 and younger) are compared among themselves or when more mature age classes (age 20 and older) are compared among themselves. Correlations between performance at age 3 and that after 8 years are low and often negative (Namkoong and Conkle 1976). Therefore the provenance by year interaction probably would remain absent until comparison can be made between juvenile and mature ages.

The plantation x year interaction is highly significant when height is measured in the actual units (cm) but is non-significant when height data are transformed to the natural logarithmic scale (Table 2). The discrepancy is due to the multiplicative plantation effect. From age 4 to age 6 the relative growth rate in LA, IL, OH and WI plantations were, respectively, 76, 74, 82 and 59 percent, so the differences are small. But since the Ohio plantation is about 5 times the height of the Wisconsin plantation the difference in actual units becomes significant.

The ranking from high to low for the four plantations remains unchanged from age 4 to age 6. This further strengthens the argument that the plantation by year interaction was due to the change in the levels of difference. Once a proper transformation is used, the interaction vanishes.

prance					S-17704-01	10.50 ARC 10	urtest. a	0.1 70/04	59.310m
Source	Height		at are 4		Distantio	Height at age 6			
No.		LA	IL	OH	WI	LA	IL	OH	WI
		out rows t		- Harris	2010-10	nan saraw		0/	100 T
				cm			c	m	
6768		82	184	151	24	157		208	40
								and the second second	42
									34
									43
									38
									40
									38
									35
									32
									44
									44
									65
									52
									64
									83
									70
									55
									80
6736		43	70	141	37	54	146	261	67
		50	127	156	32	88	221	284	51
					67	1129	3304	2154	254
-		13	45	25	8	34	57	46	16
Analy	sis of	f varian	ce fo	r 5-yea	ar heigh	t in white	ash		1
Source df			Height in cm			Ln (Height in cm)			
		MSQ		F	VC	MSQ	F		VC
-	-					Charles and the	1.002.0	1 100.000	-
rces, S	18	2293	- tital	8.7ª/	0.23	0.101	2.6		b/
ons, P	3	272414	10	34.5-	58.41	23.332	598.9	71	.75
	1	185920	7	06.14/	19.18	11.290	289 8	- 17	.44
	54			8.2ª/	8.49	0.143	3.7-	6	.11
	18	204		0.8 ,	b/				b/
			e mit	91.7ª/					.01
									.69
	151								
	11 F . T				merces.			200	
	Source No. 6768 6738 6737 6740 6733 6728 6871 6734 6792 6721 6795 6778 6771 6794 6795 6778 6771 6794 6723 6736	Source No. 6768 6738 6737 6740 6733 6728 6871 6734 6792 6721 6795 6778 6771 6794 6782 6775 6778 6771 6794 6782 6785 6779 6723 6736	Source No.         H LA           6768         82           6738         76           6737         57           6740         63           6733         51           6728         48           6871         50           6734         38           6792         34           6795         35           6778         42           6771         52           6794         46           6782         50           6785         43           6779         40           6723         51           6736         43           50         158           13         50           158         13           7         57           6736         43           50         158           13         50           158         13           7         72414           1         185920           54         2145           18         204           3         24120           54         263	Source No.         Height LA         IL           6768         82         184           6738         76         153           6737         57         173           6740         63         196           6733         51         135           6734         63         196           6733         51         135           6728         48         153           6792         34         145           6721         47         155           6795         35         144           6778         42         67           6771         52         126           6794         46         88           6782         50         73           6736         43         70           6779         40         70           6723         51         75           6736         43         70           6736         43         70           6736         43         70           6736         43         70           13         45           6736         43         70	Source No.         Height at age LA         at age ILA $$ cm            6768         82         184         151           6738         76         153         117           6737         57         173         130           6740         63         196         131           6733         51         135         134           6728         48         153         157           6871         50         168         143           6734         38         167         162           6792         34         145         183           6721         47         155         182           6795         35         144         180           6778         42         67         157           6771         52         126         214           6794         46         88         155           6785         43         70         125           6779         40         70         141           50         127         156           158         2039         621         13           13         <	Source No.         Height at age 4 LA         age 4 ILA         OH         WI           6768         82         184         151         24           6738         76         153         117         13           6737         57         173         130         30           6740         63         196         131         37           6733         51         135         134         33           6728         48         153         157         30           6871         50         168         143         29           6734         38         167         162         29           6792         34         145         183         32           6721         47         155         182         34           6795         35         144         180         37           6778         42         67         157         34           6782         50         73         187         38           6783         51         75         164         45           6784         50         127         156         32           158         2039	Source No.         Height at age 4 LA         IL         OH         WI         ILA	Source No.         Height at age 4 LA         A         Height U         MI         Height LA         IL	Source No.         Height at age 4 LA         Height at age 4 IL         Height at age LA         IL         OH         WI         LA         IL         OH

Table 1.--Average height of white ash provenances at ages 4 and 6 in four plantations

a/Significant at .01 level Negative variance component

The provenance by plantation interaction was highly significant. Use of natural logarithmic transformation did not remove this interaction. Thus the nature of this interaction is not due to a change in the levels of difference. Using a "mean polish procedure" to remove the population mean from the provenance effect and plantation effect, Kung (1981a) found that in the Illinois plantation the positive interaction terms were common for the southern provenances while in the Louisiana and the Wisconsin plantations, the trend was reversed. Furthermore, using a quadratic curve to fit the height data to latitude, the regression for the Ohio plantation was shown to be convex while the Wisconsin was concave (Kung 1981b). Significant negative correlations among provenance means were found between the northern plantation (WI) and the southern plantations (LA and IL). All these statistical inferences indicated that the provenance by plantation interaction was due to changes in rankings rather than changes in levels of differences.

The combination of provenance by plantation interaction and provenance by year interaction together accounted for about 20 percent of the variance in the original units but only 6 percent of the variance in the transformed units. Furthermore, the largest of the three interaction terms in the original unit was plantation by year, but in the transformed data set it was the provenance by plantation interaction. In contrast to the interaction terms, the ranking by size of variance components for the three primary factors (plantation, year, and provenance) did not change after logarithmic transformation. Thus, logarithmic transformation may or may not change our interpretation. The important thing to remember is that the relationship between variables is strongly influenced by the scales with which these variables are measured. Interpretations of data are valid only with respect to the particular scale adopted in a given instance (Li 1964, p. 445).

Because the standard deviation of height among the four plantations seems to change with the mean height (Table 1), the logarithmic transformation would stabilize the variance and let us meet the assumption requirement. Interpretation of the transformed data would, therefore, be more robust than that without transformation.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Because there was no provenance by age correlation, the ranking of provenance would remain stable. Selection for fast juvenile growth at age 4 from seed appears feasible. Should such interaction still be lacking at the mature age, early selection for mature height would also be possible. The absence of provenance by age correlation indicates that the levels of difference has been maintained. In other words, the annual increment of the periodic growth between age 4 and age 6 were similar for all provenances. The study of genetic difference in annual increment or periodic growth would not be recommended.

The plantation by year interaction is not due to changes in rank. Therefore, site evaluation can be conducted at an earlier age. Since the relative growth rates (growth percentages) are similar, the internal rate of return for white ash plantations would also be similar. In contrast, the absolute increments are different. Thus, planting white ash on good sites and on poor sites would yield the same interest rate but different monetary return. A forest manager needs to consider both relative and absolute growth potential of the planting site. Planting white ash on a poor site may be justified on the grounds of interest rate but may not be justified on the actual return.

The provenance by plantation interaction is due to changing of ranks, therefore, a tree improvement worker should match seed sources and planting sites very carefully and no common provenances should be recommended for the whole range.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Clausen, K. E. 1982. Age-age correlations in black walnut and white ash. North Amer. For. Biol. Workshop Proc. 7:113-117.
- Clausen, K. E., Kung, F. H., Bey, C. F. and Daniels, R. A. 1981. Variation in white ash. Silvae Genet. 30:93-97.
- King, J. P. 1965. Seed source x environment interaction in Scotch pine. I. Height growth. Silvae Genet. 14:105-115.
- Kung, F. H. 1981a. Exploratory data analysis for a multiple plantation forest genetics study through a simple mean polish procedure. Proceedings North Cent. Tree Improv. Conf. Proc. 2:159-167.
- Kung, F. H. 1981b. Delineating seed collection zone based on multi-plantation provenance tests. South For. Tree Improv. Conf. Proc. 16:336-342.
- Li, C. C. 1964. Introduction to experimental statistics. McGraw-Hill Co., New York, New York. 460 pp.
- Namkoong, G., and Conkle, M. T. 1976. Time trend in genetic control of height growth in ponderosa pine. Forest Sci. 22:2-12.
- SAS. 1982. SAS User's Guide: Statistics 1982 Edition. SAS. Cary, North Carolina. 584 pp.
- Snyder, E. B. 1972. Glossary for forest tree improvement workers. •South
  For. Exp. Sta., For. Ser. USDA., 22 pp.