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#### Abstract

Rice is a cereal plant and staple food for most Indonesian people. One of the causes of the problem is decrease of wetland and lowland area which have impact on national level production. One of the efforts to increase rice production is selection to get desired trait. Regression and correlation analysis to determined the relationship among characters that can be used as a consideration for selection criterion. The purpose of this study is to know the relationships between morphological and agronomic characters in rice plant of F2 generation. This study was conducted at the Experimental Faculty of Agriculture, University of Brawijaya, Jatimulyo Village, Malang, between June and August 2018. Planting materials were population of F2 generation (SBCH, SBCB, TWCH dan TWCB). All of the populations planted in area $25 \mathrm{~m} \times 3 \mathrm{~m}$ with spacing $60 \mathrm{~cm} \times 60 \mathrm{~cm}$. Based on the result, all of the populations showed that there was positif linear relationship between plant height and panicle length, number of tiller, and number of productif tiller. TWCH population showed strong and significant positive correlation in leaf length and number of tiller. Very strong and significant positive correlation showed by all of F2 generation in plant height with panicle length and number of productive tillers with number of tillers.
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## INTRODUCTION

Rice is a cereal plants and staple food that consumed by more than $95 \%$ of Indonesian people. However, rice production in 2012 to 2018 does not stable. One of the causes is the decrease of wetland area function which has an impact on national level of rice production. The area of paddy fields in 2014 was $8,111,593$ ha and decreased in 2015 to $8,092,906$ ha (Ministry of Agriculture of Republic Indonesia, 2017).

Efforts to increase production can be done by selection to get the desired superior varieties. To obtain desirable traits, it is necessary to select the segregated generation and then proceed with selfpollination of 6-10 generations to obtain pure homozygous strains (Safitri et al., 2011). This causes the assembly of rice varieties to take a long time so that the selection efficiency is needed.

Selection will be more effective if the appropriate character is used. Morphological and agronomic characters are characteristics that can affect plant productivity. Aryana (2009) states that a character can be used as a selection criterion if there is a real relationship between these characters and the intended character. In this study, the value of regression and correlation is important to know the relationship between characters which can later be used as a consideration in making a selection.

## Material and Methods

This research was conducted at the Experimental Garden of the Faculty of Agriculture, Brawijaya University, Jatimulyo Village, Lowokwaru District, Malang. In April to August 2018. The material used in this study is rice seed from the results of research by Yanuar (2017) and Hazmy et al., 2018, namely 4 generations of rice generation F 2 ( $\mathrm{SBCH}, \mathrm{SBCB}, \mathrm{TWCH}$ and TWCB), compost, urea, $\mathrm{SP36}, \mathrm{KCl}$ and insecticides. In this study all populations were planted in an area of $25 \mathrm{~m} \times 3 \mathrm{~m}$ with a spacing of 60 cm x 60 cm . Total number of plants is 140 and total sample is 100 plants. Variables observed included plant height, leaf length, leaf width, panicle length, number of tillers, number of productive tillers and day to flowering. Data analysis used regression and correlation analysis. As follows:

$$
\mathrm{Y}=a+\mathrm{bX}
$$

Where Y is dependent variable, a is intercept, b is linear regression coefficient and x is independent variable.

Correlation formula:

$$
r=\frac{\sum x y-\left\{\left(\sum x\right)\left(\sum y\right)\right\} / n}{\sqrt{ }\left[\sum x^{2}-\left(\sum x\right)^{2} / n\right]\left[\sum y^{2}-\left(\sum y\right)^{2} / n\right]}
$$

Where N is Number of data pairs X and $\mathrm{Y}, \Sigma \mathrm{x}$ is Total number of variables $\mathrm{X}, \Sigma \mathrm{y}$ is Total number of variables $\mathrm{Y}, \Sigma \mathrm{x}^{2}$ is Total number of squares of variable $\mathrm{X}, \Sigma \mathrm{y}^{2}$ is The total number of squared variables Y, $\Sigma x y$ is Total number of multiplications of XY variables.

Correlation categories are:

| Coefficient Interval | Relationship Level |
| :--- | :--- |
| $0.00-0.19$ | Very Weak |
| $0.20-0.39$ | Weak |
| $0.40-0.59$ | Moderate |
| $0.60-0.79$ | Strong |
| $0.80-1.00$ | Very Strong |

## Results and Discussion

Based on the results of regression analysis, in the fourth generation F2 rice population has a different regression function. The regression function in F2 generation rice plants is shown in Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Table 1. Linear regression function of SBCH population

| No | Independent variable $(\mathbf{X})$ | Dependent variable (Y) | Function | $\mathbf{R}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Plant Height | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=8.103+0.375 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.334 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.322+0.011 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.282 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=2.604+0.276 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.693 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=59.222+0.077 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.001 |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=35.660+0.254 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.007 |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=92.224-0.098 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.055 |
| 2 | Leaf Length | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=38.796+0.891 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.334 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.456+0.018 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.330 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=13.998+0.225 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.195 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=73.594-0.266 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.003 |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=68.173-0.439 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.009 |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=90.473-0.147 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.052 |
| 3 | Leaf Width | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=41.167+26.116 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.282 |
|  |  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=14.414+18.325 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.330 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=14.869+6.358 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.152 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=125.122-56.664 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.115 |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=111.054-54.093 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.133 |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=80.477-4.681 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.052 |
| 4 | Panicle Length | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=14.649+2.513 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.693 |
|  |  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=15.278+0.864 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.195 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.549+0.024 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.152 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=29.167+1.634 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.025$ |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=23.228+1.385 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.023 |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=95.160-0.447 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.162 |
| 5 | Number of Tillers | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=68.650+0.007 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.127 |
|  |  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=34.622-0.010 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.003 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=1.199-0.002 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.115 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=20.666+0.015 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.025 |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=-0.979+0.840 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.896$ |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=88.435-0.046 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.140 |
| 6 | Number of Productive | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=67.597+0.028 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.007 |
|  | Tillers | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=35.077-0.020 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.009 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=1.199-0.002 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.133 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=20.778+0.017 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.023 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=7.784+1.066 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.896 |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=88.191-0.051 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.137 |
| 7 | Days to Flowering | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=117.269-0.564 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.055 |
|  |  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=64.508-0.357 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.052 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.112-0.011 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.052 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=45.883-0.283 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.127 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=326.676-3.066 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.140 |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=282.946-2.687 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.137 |

Table 2. Linear regression function of SBCB population

| No | Independent variable ( $\mathbf{X}$ ) | Dependent variable (Y) | Function | $\mathbf{R}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Plant Height | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=9.151+0.365 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.128 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.941+0.004 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.009 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=0.092+0.310 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.491 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=249.170-2.766 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.266 |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=193.379-2.104 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.235 |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=77.575+0.142 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.026 |
| 2 | Leaf Length | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=56.508+0.350 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.128 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.830+0.010 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.077 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=19.044+0.066 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.023 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=119.371-1.747 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.110$ |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=102.762-1.566 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.135$ |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=80.803+0.190 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.049 |
| 3 | Leaf Width | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=65.542+2.452 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.009 |
|  |  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=25.255+7.469 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.077 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=19.136+1.834 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.025 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=-23.701+70.677 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.249 |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=-12.995+52.788 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.212 |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=96.542-7.836 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.116 |
| 4 | Panicle Length | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=34.667+1.585 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.491 |
|  |  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=26.564+0.353 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.023$ |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.895+0.013 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.025$ |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=106.017-2.168 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.032$ |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=87.672-1.796 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.033$ |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=89.321+0.145 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.018 |
| 5 | Number of Tillers | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=74.189-0.096 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.266 |
|  |  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=37.861-0.063 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.110 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.971-0.004 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.249 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=22.185-0.015 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.032 |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=1.570+0.799 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.976$ |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=91.020-0.063 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.148 |
| 6 | Number of Productive | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=73.951-0.112 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.235 |
|  | Tillers | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=38.352-0.086 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.135 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.983+0.004 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.212 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=22.224-0.019 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.033 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=0.456+1.221 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.976 |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=91.001-0.075 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.140 |
| 7 | Days to Flowering | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=52.211+0.186 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.026 |
|  |  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=11.450+0.259 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.049 |


| Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=2.471-0.015 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.116 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=15.353+0.068 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.018 |
| Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=265.853-2.360 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.148 |
| Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=211.990-0.961 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.140 |

Table 3. Linear regression function of TWCH population

| No | Independent variable (X) | Dependent variable (Y) | Function | $\mathbf{R}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Plant Height | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=27.558+0.095 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.009 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=-0.003+0.016 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.177 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=-15.065+0.527 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.711 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=16.695+0.956 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.100 |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=-8.818+1.117 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.136$ |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=56.211+0.380 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.164 |
| 2 | Leaf Length | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=64.169+0.093 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.009 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=1.008+0.003 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.005$ |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=17.234+0.094 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.023 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=108.547-0.809 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.073 |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=94.592-0.830 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.077 |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=72.811+0.264 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.081 |
| 3 | Leaf Width | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=55.414+10.778 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.177 |
|  |  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=31.857+1.902 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.005 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=11.596+7.999 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.249 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=43.599+33.962 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.193 |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=24.444+38.017 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.241 |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=80.816+0.855 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.001$ |
| 4 | Panicle Length | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=39.786+1.348 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.711 |
|  |  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=28.931+0.246 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.023 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.467+0.031 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.249 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=41.430+1.1941 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.162 |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=26.448+1.956 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.164 |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=89.720+0.590 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.155 |
| 5 | Number of Tillers | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=58.818+0.105 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.100 |
|  |  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=41.320-0.091 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.033 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.644+0.006 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.193 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=13.676+0.083 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.162 |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=-2.208+0.846 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.714 |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=86.638-0.060 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.038 |
| 6 | Number of Productive | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=59.231+0.122 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.136 |
|  | Tillers | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=40.126-0.093 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.077 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.683+0.006 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.241 |


|  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=14.874+0.084 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.164 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7 | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=25.077+0.843 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.714 |
|  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=84.697-0.041 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.018 |
|  | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=32.017+0.432 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.164 |
|  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=8.849+0.307 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.081 |
|  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.982+0.001 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.001 |
|  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=-1.019+0.262 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.155 |
|  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=132.127-0.624 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.038 |
|  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=101.490-0.429 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.018 |

Table 4. Linear regression function of TWCB population

| No | Independent <br> Variable (X) | Dependent Variable (Y) | Function | $\mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Plant Height | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=26.532-0.065 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.008 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.549+0.008 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.239$ |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=12.291+0.128 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.438$ |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=36.885+0.628 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.103$ |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $Y=17.556+0.685 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.123$ |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=99.877-0.206 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.075$ |
| 2 | Leaf Length | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=67.433+0.127 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.008 |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=1.043+0002 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.007 |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=20.002+0.047 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.029 |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=73.979-0.247 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.008$ |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=44.706+0.699 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.065$ |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=71.940+0.426 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.152$ |
| 3 | Leaf Width | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=37.284+31.060 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.239$ |
|  |  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=27.12+3.651 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.007$ |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=14.220+6.588 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.286$ |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=-0.090+74.444 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.360$ |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=-13.662+72.962 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.345$ |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=102.984-16.228 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.115$ |
| 4 | Panicle Length | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=-1.744+3.409 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.438 |
|  |  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=17.662+0.628 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.029$ |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.168+0.043 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.286$ |
|  |  | Number of Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=-23.885+4.920 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.239$ |
|  |  | Number of Productive Tillers | $\mathrm{Y}=-42.704+5.089 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.255$ |
|  |  | Days to Flowering | $\mathrm{Y}=98.405-0.617 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.025$ |
| 5 | Number of Tillers | Plant Height | $\mathrm{Y}=57.961+0.165 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.103$ |
|  |  | Leaf Length | $\mathrm{Y}=28.458+0.033 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.008$ |
|  |  | Leaf Width | $\mathrm{Y}=0.703+0.005 \mathrm{X}$ | $0.360$ |
|  |  | Panicle Length | $\mathrm{Y}=17.490+0.049 \mathrm{X}$ | 0.239 |



Table 5. Correlation coefficient of SBCH population

(PH) Plant Height. (LL) Leaf Length. (LW) Leaf Width. (PL) Panicle Length. (NT) Number of Tillers. (NPT) Number of Productive Tillers). DF (Days to Flowering ) (ns) Not Significant. (*) Significant at p<5\%. (**) Significant at p<1\%

Table 6. Correlation coefficient of SBCB Population

(PH) Plant Height. (LL) Leaf Length. (LW) Leaf Width. (PL) Panicle Length. (NT) Number of Tillers. (NPT) Number of Productive Tillers). DF (Days to Flowering ) (ns) Not Significant. (*) Significant at p<5\%. (**) Significant at p<1\%

Table 7. Correlation coefficient of TWCH population

|  | PH | LL | LW | PL | NT | NPT | DF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LL | $0.094^{\mathrm{ns}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LW | $0.421^{*}$ | $0.073^{\mathrm{ns}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| PL | $0.843^{* *}$ | $0.152^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $0.499^{*}$ |  |  |  |  |
| NT | $0.317^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $-0.271^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $0.439^{*}$ | $0.402^{*}$ |  |  |  |
| NPT | $0.369^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $-0.278^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $0.490^{*}$ | $0.404^{*}$ | $0.845^{* *}$ |  |  |
| DF | $0.405^{*}$ | $0.284^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $0.036^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $0.393^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $-0.194^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $-0.133^{\mathrm{ns}}$ |  |

(PH) Plant Height. (LL) Leaf Length. (LW) Leaf Width. (PL) Panicle Length. (NT) Number of Tillers. (NPT) Number of Productive Tillers). DF (Days to Flowering ) (ns) Not Significant. (*) Significant at p<5\%. (**) Significant at p $<1 \%$
Table 8. Correlation coefficient of TWCB population

|  | PH | $\mathbf{L L}$ | LW | PL | NT | NPT | DF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{P H}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{L L}$ | $0.074^{\mathrm{ns}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{L W}$ | $0.489^{*}$ | $0.081^{\mathrm{ns}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| PL | $0.662^{* *}$ | $0.171^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $0.534^{* *}$ |  |  |  |  |
| NT | $0.321^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $0.090^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $0.600^{* *}$ | $0.489^{*}$ |  |  |  |
| NPT | $0.350^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $0.254^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $0.587^{* *}$ | $0.505^{*}$ | $0.888^{* *}$ |  |  |
| DF | $-0.273^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $0.390^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $-0.339^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $-0.159^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $-0.266^{\mathrm{ns}}$ | $-0.150^{\mathrm{ns}}$ |  |

(PH) Plant Height. (LL) Leaf Length. (LW) Leaf Width. (PL) Panicle Length. (NT) Number of Tillers. (NPT) Number of Productive Tillers). DF (Days to Flowering ) (ns) Not Significant. (*) Significant at p<5\%. (**) Significant at p $<1 \%$

Based on Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 shows that character of plant height has a positive and significant correlation with the character of leaf length, leaf width, panicle length and days to flowering. The degree of closeness of the relationship between plant height and leaf length. leaf width and days to flowering is classified as moderate. While with the panicle length is classified as strong and very strong. Regression analysis (Table 1) showed linear line between plant height and panicle length with the equation $\mathrm{Y}=$ $2.604+0.276 \mathrm{X}$ and $\mathrm{R}^{2}=0.693$. It's mean, each addition of plant height then panicle length will increase by 0.276 cm .

Donggulo et al. (2017) states that plants height will use asymylate more for stem and leaf formation than the formation of number of tillers. This is indicated by the character of plant height which has a real negative correlation with the character of the number of tillers and the number of productive tillers. Regression analysis showed that the SBCB population (Table 2) has a regression function $\mathrm{Y}=$ 193.379-2.104X. The same results were also obtained from the research of Babu et al. (2012) and Venkanna et al. (2014) that there is a real negative relationship between plant height and the number of productive tillers.

The population of SBCH showed the character of leaf length has a positive and significant correlation with plant height. leaf width and panicle length. The character of leaf length with the character of plant height, leaf width and panicle length are classified as having a moderate relationship. Guru et al. (2017) states the character length. width and angle determine the shape and size of leaves. Long leaves are associated with droopy leaves, while short and small leaves tend to be associated with erect leaves.

Based on observations of leaf morphology, the four $\mathrm{F}_{2}$ populations have leaf characters in the short to medium category and erect leaf angles. Whereas in leaf width characters are in the medium category. Putri (2017) states that short and upright leaves cause the leaf surface to get more sunlight so photosynthesis will be more optimal. This results in the photosynthate produced being used for the growth process such as elongation of the stem. The lengthening of the stem will determine the height of the plant. The same results were also obtained by the study of Francis et al. (2018) showed that leaf length was significantly positively correlated with the character of leaf width, plant height, panicle length and maturation.

Leaf width showed positive and significant correlation with number of tillers and the number of productive tillers. This is shown in the populations of SBCH. TWCH and TWCB. Leaves are the main source of assimilate-producing plants. The assimilation results are then spread throughout the plant parts for the process of growth and development. The shape of the leaves greatly affects the interception of sunlight radiation and its spread in the canopy. The wider the leaf. the greater the absorption of the sun's intensity will be indicated by the increase in the number of tillers and the number of productive tillers (Saidah et al., 2015).

The panicle length has positive and significant correlation with the number of tillers and the number of productive tillers. This is indicated by the population of TWCH and TWCB which has a moderate level of relationship. The same thing is also showed by the research of Rajeswari and Nadarajan (2004) that there is a positive and real relationship to the number of productive tillers and panicle length.

The number of tillers showed a positive and significant correlation value with the character of leaf width and number of productive tillers. This is shown in the TWCB population with a degree of closeness between the number of tillers and the leaves width classified as moderate. The number of productive tillers has positive and significant correlation with the number of tillers. This is shown in all $\mathrm{F}_{2}$ populations having a very strong closeness between the number of productive tillers and the number of tillers.

This shows that the increasing number of tillers will be followed by an increase in leaf area so that the increase in sun absorption will also be greater as indicated by an increase in the number of
productive tillers (Saidah et al., 2015). The same results were also showed by the study of Muthuvijayaragavan and Murugan (2017) stating the number of tillers had a real positive correlation value with the character of the number of productive tillers.

Days to Flowering have positive and significant correlation with plant height. this is shown in the SBCH population. That is, the longer of days to flowering, the plant height will have a higher tendency. The same results were also shown by Riyanto et al. (2012) that plant height has positive and significant correlation with the percentage of grain content per panicles, days to flowering and age of harvest.

All of $\mathrm{F}_{2}$ generations showed different results. This is presumably because each population has different genetic, morphological and physiological properties. This causes differences in the appearance of plants. In accordance with Alavan et al. (2015) which states that the high and low growth and yield of plants, besides being influenced by the environment are also influenced by genetic factors such as plant age, plant morphology, food reserve capacity and disease resistance.

## Conclusion

The fourth generation of F2 rice population showed a positive linear relationship between plant height with panicle length and character of the number of tillers with the number of productive tillers. The SBCB population showed negative and significant correlation with moderate closeness, namely the character of plant height with the number of tillers and the number of productive tillers. The population of TWCH has a positive and significant correlation with strong closeness which is the character of leaf width with the number of tillers. The positive correlation with closeness is very strong shown by the four populations, namely the character of plant height with panicle length and the character of the number of productive tillers with the number of tillers.
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