

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

The Effects of Sward Height, Bulk Density and Tiller Structure on the Ingestive Behaviour of Red Deer and Romney Sheep

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in Plant Science at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Russell John Mitchell

1995

ABSTRACT

The ingestive behaviour of Red deer and/or Romney sheep was examined in relation to two major components of sward structure, height (HT) and bulk density (DEN), by measuring the depth, area and rate of biting on a series of artificial swards.

HT and DEN effects were examined in a series of four short-term indoor grazing experiments using two novel mini-sward techniques, developed to minimise confounding of HT with DEN and other differences in tiller structure. The first experiment used the deep, leafy horizon of tall vegetative sorghum swards, whereas the next three experiments used seedling wheat swards. A fifth experiment using both ryegrass and wheat swards built upon the previous four experiments (examining HT and DEN effects), by measuring the bite dimensions of sheep in relation to changes in tiller structure down the sward profile.

Wheat seedlings grew on seed reserves and achieved a high degree of separation of HT and DEN variation, enabling the description and conceptualisation of how bite parameters respond to independent HT and/or DEN variation. However, when compared to natural grass swards these seedling swards, with 100% green matter and low shear strength, resulted in large bite volumes and high bite rates.

Bite depth increased rapidly and linearly with increasing HT, and at a slightly greater rate the sparser the sward, although on very short swards (<3-4 cm) bite depth was insensitive to even large changes in DEN. High levels of dead matter had no influence upon the bite depth of sheep grazing ryegrass swards. Similarly, the tops of the pseudostems had little if any influence upon the bite depth of deer or sheep grazing wheat or ryegrass swards. However, sheep avoided penetrating the tough rigid pseudostem at the base of ryegrass swards when leaf-like immature pseudostem was available in the overlying strata. Bite depth averaged 70% of HT on the sorghum and seedling wheat swards, appreciably deeper than that typical for natural grass swards.

As the HT of wheat swards increased from minimum grazable levels, bite area increased rapidly as increasing tiller length enabled greater horizontal displacement of tillers. However, the rate of

increase soon declined and bite area plateaued as mouth dimensions rather than HT (tiller length) constrained the area of herbage which animals could efficiently prehend per bite. As DEN increased, animals reduced bite area so that HT became less of a constraint; consequently, bite area plateaued at lower maxima on shorter swards.

The rate of increase in bite area was low relative to the rate of decline in DEN (or tiller shear strength), probably in part reflecting the way mouth dimensions limit the ability of animals to adjust bite area upwards as DEN or tiller strength decline to low levels. Further, there was evidence that the forces required to sever a bite differed considerably across sward treatments.

The potential influences of bite depth, HT and mouth dimensions upon the efficiency of tiller capture per bite, were examined in simple models. These indicated that by penetrating to around 40-50% of HT, as is commonly the case, animals appear to optimise grazing efficiency in terms of the number, length and quality of tillers captured, per unit of grazing effort.

Bite weight increased linearly in relation to HT and DEN, but HT had the dominant influence, because bite volume increased with HT but declined with DEN. However, bite weight still increased rapidly with DEN, because the rate of reduction in bite volume was much lower than the rate of increase in DEN.

Bite rate declined linearly in relation to increasing HT and DEN, primarily because of their influence upon bite weight. However, bite rate was slightly more sensitive to increases in bite weight due to HT than DEN, evidently because bites of dense herbage required less gathering, while bites of long herbage required extra jaw movements to draw them into the mouth and/or reduce particle size.

Rate of intake increased at a declining rate with HT. The effects of HT and DEN were interactive on short swards but became largely independent and additive as HT increased.

Deer and sheep grazed the sorghum and wheat swards representing a very wide range of HT and DEN variation to a similar depth. However, sheep were able to graze 1 cm swards, whereas the minimum HT grazed by deer was 2 cm. Further, not only did sheep have larger mouths in

relation to body size, they also appeared to be superior at prehending short swards compared to deer. However, the bite area of deer increased more rapidly with HT, and to higher peak levels in line with their larger mouth dimensions. Reflecting these differences, bite weight per kg LW^{1.0} was much higher for sheep than deer on short swards, but the proportional difference declined with increasing HT. Practical implications are that deer would require more HT than sheep to obtain equivalent intakes.

The results are considered in relation to evidence on the foraging strategy of free grazing ruminants.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincere thanks to Professor John Hodgson for his most helpful and excellent supervision throughout the study. Similarly, my thanks to Dave Clark for his considerable help as assistant supervisor.

I am grateful to AgResearch Grasslands (formerly DSIR Grasslands) and the Grasslands Levy Research Fellowship Board for the provision of funding and to John Lancashire (Director, AgResearch Grasslands) for his part in organising funding. Similarly, I am most grateful to my Section and Group leaders Dr Dave Chapman and Dr Gerald Cosgrove for their patient and supportive attitude during my illness towards the latter stages of this study.

I am thankful to have had the thorough and generous help of the late Dr Siri Wewala with statistical analysis. Dr David Barker, Dr Gary Thomas and Robert Fletcher kindly advised me regarding some of the later analysis.

Dave Harwood (NZ Turf Culture Research Institute), Dr Martin McEwan, Dr Ian Brooking, Dr Ian Warrington (HortResearch) and Professor Rod Thomas (Massey University) gave me valuable technical advice regarding the manipulation of plant growth, while John Ford, Chris Mercer and John Grant (AgResearch Grasslands) helped with many practical aspects such as access to materials, glasshouses and other facilities. Similarly, Dr Peter Wilson, Dr Gary Waghorn and Dave Shelton gave useful advice and generous assistance with regards to animal welfare. Dr Geoff Asher, Keith Betteridge, Gong Yaoming (AgResearch Grasslands) and Dr Raymond Jones (CSIRO) provided useful discussion. Bill Thomas maintained animals for me in between experiments. I am grateful to them all.

Craig Anderson provided me with excellent technical assistance and helped with the production of figures. Similarly, Trevor Berquist gave helpful assistance during busy measurements periods. I am very grateful for their input and would also like to thank Grant Edwards, Bill Thomas, Jocelyn Van der Sar and Vanessa Pokaia for their technical assistance with some of the experiments.

I can only be deeply grateful to my wonderfully unselfish wife Kristina, for her tremendous patience and loving support over the period of the study, despite the very considerable difficulties our family faced in the latter stages, due to my ill health. Further, I would like to thank both Kristina and my very good friend Kevin Palfreyman for their generous help with proof reading.

ABBREVIATIONS

AHD	Actual horizontal displacement (cm)
BA	Bite area (cm ²)
BD	Bite depth (cm)
BR	Bite rate (bites min ⁻¹)
BV	Bite volume (cm ³)
BW	Bite weight (mg DM)
DEN	Herbage bulk density (mg DM cm ⁻³)
DHI	Daily herbage intake (mg DM day ⁻¹)
dwt	Dry weight (mg)
fw	Fresh weight (mg)
ha	Hectare (10 000 m ²)
HM	Herbage mass (mg DM cm ⁻²)
HT	Sward height (cm)
IAW	Incisor arcade width (cm)
IHT	Incisor height (cm)
LC	Tiller length captured (cm)
LL	Tiller length lost (cm)
LW	Liveweight (kg)
MLC	Mean tiller length captured (cm)
N	Newtons (kg x m sec ⁻²)
PBA	Maximum potential bite area for a given bite depth and height (cm ²)
PHD	Potential horizontal displacement of tiller (cm)
RHT	Height of grazed residual (cm)
RI	Rate of intake (mg DM min ⁻¹)
t	Tonne (1000 kg)
T	Treatment (eg. T1 = treatment one)
TPHD	Total potential horizontal displacement of tillers (cm)

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iv
Abbreviations	v
List of Figures	xii
List of Tables	xiii
 Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION.....	 1
 Chapter 2 THESIS OUTLINE AND STRUCTURE.....	 3
2.1 Thesis	3
2.2 The structure of the chapters describing the experiments (Chapters 5-8)	3
 Chapter 3 ILLUSTRATIONS OF EXPERIMENTAL CONDITIONS.....	 5
3.1 Experimental techniques.....	5
 Chapter 4 GENERAL LITERATURE REVIEW.....	 11
4.1 Introduction	11
4.2 Ingestive behaviour	14
4.2.1 The grazing process	14
4.2.2 The spatial dimensions of the bite.....	14
4.2.3 Bite weight.....	16
4.2.4 Bite rate.....	17
4.2.5 Rate of intake and daily herbage intake	19
4.3 Diet selection	21
4.4 Animal factors affecting herbage intake and ingestive behaviour	23
4.4.1 Red deer and sheep	25
4.5 Conclusion.....	27

Chapter 5	PAPER 1.....	28
	THE EFFECT OF VARYING LEAFY SWARD HEIGHT AND BULK DENSITY ON THE INGESTIVE BEHAVIOUR OF YOUNG RED DEER AND ROMNEY SHEEP	
5.1	Abstract	28
5.2	Introduction	29
5.3	Materials and Methods	30
5.3.1	Design.....	30
5.3.2	Animals	30
5.3.3	Swards	30
5.3.4	Measurement procedure.....	31
5.3.5	Ungrazed sward description.....	31
5.3.6	Calculation of bite parameters.....	31
5.3.7	Statistical analyses.....	32
5.4	Results.....	32
5.4.1	Ungrazed sward description.....	32
5.4.2	General relationships between bite parameters and sward height and bulk density	33
5.4.3	Bite weight corrected for confounded increases in bulk density with height.....	37
5.5	Discussion	38
5.5.1	Sward factors	38
5.5.2	Deer and sheep.....	39
5.5.3	Bite depth.....	39
5.5.4	Bite area	40
5.5.5	Bite weight.....	41
5.6	Conclusions	42
Chapter 6	PAPER 2.....	44
	THE INGESTIVE BEHAVIOUR OF RED DEER AND ROMNEY SHEEP. 1) IN RELATION TO HEIGHT AND HERBAGE BULK DENSITY IN ARTIFICIAL SWARDS	
6.1	Summary	44
6.2	Introduction	45
6.3	Methods.....	46
6.3.1	Design.....	46

6.3.2	Animals	47
6.3.3	Swards	48
6.3.4	Measurements.....	49
6.3.5	Sward description	50
6.3.6	Statistical analysis.....	50
6.4	Results.....	51
6.4.1	Sward structure.....	51
6.4.2	Sward height by density effects on bite parameters.....	52
6.4.3	Species differences in bite parameters	55
6.5	Discussion	60
6.5.1	Sward parameters	60
6.5.2	Bite depth.....	61
6.5.3	Bite area.....	62
6.5.4	Bite weight.....	64
6.5.5	Bite rate.....	65
6.5.6	Rate of intake.....	65
6.6	Conclusions	67
Chapter 7	PAPER 3.....	69
	THE INGESTIVE BEHAVIOUR OF RED DEER AND ROMNEY SHEEP. II. INFLUENCE OF HEIGHT AND BULK DENSITY IN ARTIFICIAL SWARDS MANAGED TO CONTROL PSEUDOSTEM HEIGHT	
7.1	Summary	69
7.2	Introduction	70
7.3	Methods.....	71
7.3.1	Design.....	71
7.3.2	Animals	71
7.3.3	Swards	72
7.3.4	Grazing measurements	72
7.3.5	Sward description	72
7.4	Results.....	73
7.4.1	Sward structure	73
7.4.2	Sward height by bulk density effects on bite parameters	73
7.4.3	Species differences in bite parameters	78

7.5	Discussion	78
7.5.1	Sward techniques	78
7.5.2	Sheep-deer differences	79
7.5.3	The spatial dimensions of the bite.....	81
7.5.3.1	Bite depth in relation to height	81
7.5.3.2	Bite area in relation to height and bite depth.....	82
7.5.4	Bite rate, bite weight and rate of intake.....	87
7.5.5	Generalised response.....	88
7.6	Conclusions	88
Chapter 8	PAPER 4.....	90
	THE BITE DIMENSIONS OF SHEEP ON SWARDS DIFFERING IN LEAF:PSEUDOSTEM RATIO, DEAD MATTER CONTENT AND/OR TILLER SHEAR STRENGTH	
8.1	Abstract	90
8.2	Introduction	91
8.3	Materials and Methods	91
8.3.1	Sward treatments and experimental design	91
8.3.1.1	Type 1 swards.....	92
8.3.1.2	Type 2 swards.....	93
8.3.1.3	Type 3 swards.....	93
8.3.1.4	Type 4 swards.....	93
8.3.1.5	Type 5 swards.....	94
8.3.2	Animals	94
8.3.3	Feeding and measurement procedure.....	94
8.3.4	Statistical analysis.....	95
8.4	Results and Discussion	96
8.4.1	Bite depth and leaf:pseudostem ratio	96
8.4.2	Bite area and leaf:pseudostem ratio.....	101
8.4.3	Bite depth and area in relation to dead matter content	102
8.5	Conclusions	103
Chapter 9	GENERAL DISCUSSION	105
9.1	Techniques	105
9.1.1	Mini-swards	105

9.1.2	The use of trimmed swards	107
9.1.2.1	Number of grazed horizons.....	108
9.1.3	Animal factors	108
9.1.3.1	Hunger and fasting effects on ingestive behaviour	109
9.1.3.2	Length of grazing period and background diet	109
9.1.3.3	Experience and learning.....	111
9.1.4	Conclusions	112
9.2	Bite depth	112
9.2.1	Bite depth on wheat and sorghum swards	112
9.2.2	Height and bulk density effects	114
9.2.2.1	Bite depth and bulk density	115
9.2.3	Bite depth on short swards.....	115
9.2.4	Bite depth as a proportion of height.....	116
9.2.5	Effects of pseudostem and dead matter content	119
9.2.6	Conclusions	121
9.3	Bite area.....	122
9.3.1	Bite area and height.....	122
9.3.1.1	Bite area in relation to bulk density on wheat swards.....	123
9.3.2	Deer-sheep differences	123
9.3.3	Bite depth and sward height constrain bite area	126
9.3.3.1	Gape restricts bite area responses to changes in bulk density	129
9.3.3.2	Body size and prehensive technique.....	129
9.3.4	Bulk density, tiller strength and biting effort	130
9.3.4.1	Height, bulk density and biting effort	131
9.3.5	The efficiency of tiller capture.....	132
9.3.6	Conclusions.....	138
9.4	Bite weight.....	139
9.4.1	Height and bulk density effects.....	139
9.4.2	Deer-sheep differences.....	142
9.4.3	Conclusions.....	144
9.5	Bite rate.....	144
9.5.1	Conclusions.....	147
9.6	Rate of intake, and practical implications	147
9.6.1	Height and bulk density effects on rate of intake.....	147
9.6.2	Sward type affects rate of intake	147
9.6.3	Overestimation of rate of intake.....	148
9.6.4	Scaling to metabolic requirements.....	151
9.6.5	Practical implications	151
9.6.5.1	Sward height requirements for deer and sheep.....	151
9.6.5.2	Mixed grazing	152
9.6.5.3	Implications for plant breeding and pasture management.....	153
9.6.5.4	Conclusions.....	155

9.7 Generalised response 155

9.8 Concluding summary 158

REFERENCES..... 161

APPENDICES 175

Appendix 1 Table showing the effects of bite depth, sward height and tiller density upon the lengths captured from tillers 175

Appendix 2 Aid to visualising the effects of bite depth and sward height on the efficiency of tiller capture..... 176

Appendix 3 Means and standard errors for Chapter 5 data 177

Appendix 4 Means and standard errors for Chapter 6 data 178

Appendix 5 Means and standard errors for Chapter 7 data 180

LIST OF TABLES

	<i>Page</i>
Table 5.1 Description of ungrazed sorghum swards	33
Table 5.2 Correlations between bite parameters of deer and sheep, and sorghum sward parameters	34
Table 5.3 Regression equations relating bite parameters of deer and sheep to sward height and bulk density	37
Table 6.1 Range and mean values for bite parameters of deer and sheep and, wheat sward parameters.....	53
Table 6.2 Correlations between bite parameters of deer and sheep and, wheat sward parameters.....	54
Table 6.3 Regression equations relating bite parameters of deer and/or sheep to sward height and bulk density	56
Table 6.4 The relative changes in sward height or bulk density required to alter bite parameters by a given amount.....	59
Table 7.1 Range and mean values for bite parameters of deer and sheep and, wheat sward parameters.....	74
Table 7.2 Correlations between bite parameters of deer and sheep and, wheat sward parameters.....	75
Table 7.3 Regression equation relating bite parameters of deer and/or sheep to sward height and bulk density.....	76
Table 8.1 Description of ungrazed ryegrass and wheat swards differing in leaf:pseudostem ratio and dead matter content and, the bite depth and bite area of sheep on those swards	98
Table 9.1 A comparison of the potential bite area which sheep should be able to achieve at a given height and bite depth with the actual bite areas they achieved, on 2-8 cm wheat swards.....	128

LIST OF FIGURES

	<i>Page</i>
Figure 5.1 Bite depths, bite areas, bite volumes and bite weights of deer and sheep in relation to leaf height (3-21 cm) and bulk density (0.18-0.75 mg DM cm ⁻³) on sorghum swards.....	35
Figure 5.2 Bite weight of sheep in relation to sward height and bulk density, on sorghum compared to hand-constructed ryegrass swards.....	36
Figure 6.1 Bite parameters of deer and/or sheep in relation to sward height (3-7 or 4-13 cm) and bulk density (0.33-4.00 or 0.63-3.25 mg DM cm ⁻³) on wheat swards.....	57-58
Figure 7.1 Bite parameters of deer and/or sheep in relation to sward height (1-8 cm) and bulk density (0.65-2.90 mg DM cm ⁻³) on wheat swards	77
Figure 7.2 The potential influence of bite depth and height upon bite area	84
Figure 8.1 The bite depth and bite area of sheep grazing swards differing in leaf:pseudostem ratio and dead matter content	97
Figure 9.1 The bite area (scaled to incisor arcade width) of deer and sheep when grazing 4-13 cm sparse through dense wheat swards.....	124
Figure 9.2 The effects of bite depth and sward height on the lengths captured from peripheral tillers	135
Figure 9.3 The effects of bite depth and sward height on the mean length of tillers captured per bite.....	136
Figure 9.4 The BW kg LW ^{1.0} of deer compared to sheep on sparse and dense wheat swards	143
Figure 9.5 The measured mean rates of intake of sheep in relation to sward height (4-13 cm) and bulk density (0.63-3.25 mg DM cm ⁻³)	150