

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.

Sward structural characteristics and selective foraging behaviour in dairy cows

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in Pastures and Crops, Institute of Natural Resources
at Massey University, New Zealand.

WENDY MAREE GRIFFITHS

1999

We know what we are, but know not what we may be

Shakespeare – Hamlet, Act IV. Sc. 5

ABSTRACT

This thesis sought to further the understanding of foraging behaviour in the context of the manner in which dairy cattle graze in a complex dietary environment, and incorporated an evaluation of the trade-offs cattle make between criteria for selection between alternative patches of vegetation. A series of five experiments at the patch scale were carried out with four trained dairy cows, using a novel methodology of patches arranged in linear sequence. Observations of preferential behaviour (grazing bites, residence time and the mass of herbage removed) were related to choices involving combinations of sward physical, structural and morphological characteristics, and where possible were related to phenomena defining the components of ingestive behaviour, primarily bite depth and bite mass.

Swards in a vegetative phase of growth were offered to animals in Experiment 1, with sward height a stronger patch cue than bulk density, although the relative importance of density within the selection criteria could not be ascertained. Green leaf mass, however, was strongly associated with sward height (Experiments 1 and 2). When sward maturity was added to the heterogeneity of the offered choices, increasing the complexity of decisions the cattle faced, patch reward was no longer always associated with sward height as a cue (Experiments 3 and 4). Cattle then sampled all sward choices in the appraisal phase of foraging to gain information about their potential value. The preferential grazing of the short immature swards in Experiment 3 indicated that the initial approach cue of sward height was strongly conditioned by the information gathered about sward maturity upon patch appraisal. The selective response for short immature swards could not be accounted for by variations in leaf mass or the depth of regrowth, which suggested that the distribution of leaf mass within the canopy, and the intermingling of leaf and stem within the grazed stratum strongly modified patch residence time. The results from Experiment 3 suggested clearly the need to separate out the effects of sward height and maturity on foraging decisions. In Experiment 4, cattle strongly used the handling cue of depth of regrowth rather than sward height as a basis for patch appraisal, and because of the decline in the depth of regrowth with increasing

sward height, sward height was negatively associated with patch preference. The strength of the effect of maturity over that of sward height as a selection cue was a particularly significant finding from the programme. The final experiment (Experiment 5) investigated the role of the spatial distribution of patches relative to patch area and sward height on foraging behaviour. When foraging responses were adjusted for per unit area effects, the current patch distance strongly influenced patch selection as measured by the preferential indices of grazing bites and residence time. In this study preference was greater for the short sward treatment but, within sward height treatments, preference was linearly related to sward height. Animals showed strong evidence for the monitoring of patch area.

Analysis of the patch grazing cycle showed an asymptotic relationship between bite depth and bite number (Experiment 4) which indicated a clear adjustment phase where animals increased the depth of penetration as they gained information and appreciated the opportunity value of the patch. The structure and composition of sward strata were found to be important regulators of bite penetration. When the contrast between the stubble and regrowth strata reflecting variations in biting resistance were small (Experiment 2) cattle readily penetrated into the stubble stratum comprising leaf and pseudostem (Experiment 2). At the opposite end of the continuum, when the contrast between the two strata was greater (Experiment 4), the depth of bite penetration was strongly influenced by the vertical position of the regrowth:stubble interface. The response in terms of deeper penetration into the stubble stratum with increasing sward height (Experiment 4) led to the conclusion that the interface was only a partial regulator of bite penetration, although it strongly influenced patch residence time, indicating the relative importance of this structural feature on patch ingestion. The sward combinations used throughout this thesis covered a wide range of sward heights. There was, however, a lack of consistency for the significance of the proportionality concept, a result strongly emphasised when choices comprised controlled variations in the proportions of regrowth and stubble (Experiment 4). This generalised finding raises concerns over the theoretical assumption that bite depth can be modelled as a constant proportion of sward height.

The absence of any consistent relationship for within and between patch behaviour across Experiments 1 to 5, and the absence for evidence of rate of intake control with increasing inter-patch distance (Experiment 5), and increasing number of bites removed per patch (Experiments 4 and 5) calls into question the underlying

assumptions and constraints that characterise linear style foraging models such as the marginal value theorem.

The novel methodology used throughout this thesis demonstrated its potential to examine trade-off decisions, but greater effort will need to be focussed on separating many of the naturally confounding sward characteristics and their effects on foraging behaviour.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of the thesis presented here marks the end of a challenging tertiary education. For the last six years (Masters-Ph.D.), I have been fortunate to have the opportunity to study under the guidance of Professor John Hodgson, and it is to him that I am greatly indebted. His role as a mentor, to say the least, is unrivalled and unsurpassed. His willingness to take under his wing one quite as raw and under-prepared for a career in research as I was, with little knowledge of ingestive or foraging behaviour; to shoulder largely the full responsibility of the programme; and his head-on approach attitude to the communication barrier he faced says much for his seemingly endless patience as well as his character.

I am also particularly grateful to my co-supervisor Professor Colin Holmes for his constructive feedback on manuscripts and for the input to the programme by statistician, Greg Arnold with the development of a statistical model that enabled the programme objectives to be met.

My thanks and gratitude are extended to Professor Robert Anderson (Pro Vice-Chancellor, College of Sciences). It was he, who through a chance meeting in 1989 while I was still at College, set the cogs and wheels turning in the direction for an agricultural science career. I am very appreciative of the background support role he has played throughout the nine year period of study within his faculty/college, and shall remember those words of his from our early introductions: “anything is possible, after all why not?”

I’d also like to acknowledge the words of wisdom and encouragement from Associate Professor Alan Wright (former chairman of the Bachelor of Agriculture Degree, now retired) and Dr Peter Kemp (Senior Lecturer in Pastures and Crops) for it was largely due to the combination of their support during the Bachelor’s degree programme that I even dared think of returning for a post-graduate diploma let alone a Ph.D.

The personal financial assistance provided through the AGMARDT Masterate scholarship, Mike Hansen Educational scholarship, Massey University Doctoral

scholarship, Robert Gibson Trust scholarship, Helen E Akers Ph.D scholarship and Pastoral Sciences scholarship are acknowledged in making the study programme possible. Financial assistance with research costs from the Leonard Condell Farming scholarship and the Massey University Graduate Research Fund were also appreciated.

I am grateful for the on-ground field assistance, particularly that from the late Terry Lynch, former head of the technician group, whose experience with equipment and procedures, and general co-operation was invaluable in getting the programme up and running smoothly. Martin Chesterfield's (Dairy Cattle Research Unit) co-operation with the handling of the cows during the experimental work was also appreciated. For Experiments 1 to 3, I had fabulous support in the field from former technician, Douglas Stewart, who coped with a true 'sports junkie' in addition to my numerous peculiarities, and survived, from the initial training of the cows through to the completion of field measurements. These were truly some of the most memorable and treasured days of the Ph.D. I am also appreciative of the assistance in the field during Experiment 2 by fellow doctoral student, Dr Fabio Montossi, and to be granted the assistance of a summer student for Experiment 4. I thank my Dad, who travelled to assist me in the field during Experiment 5 and over the Christmas/New Year breaks during Experiments 3 and 4. My thanks also to fellow doctoral students Dr Greg Bishop-Hurley and Mark Hyslop (Ph.D in pending) for their voluntary time and assistance with the grazing observations on the morning of experimental grazing sessions. Further, Greg's computer knowledge, however annoying was indispensable. His ability to solve, with ease, what appeared as the most awkward of problems was a great asset to have access to.

I utilised both expertise and equipment outside of the groups' resources and for this I acknowledge the assistance of Tony Bishop (Computer Services) with programming the Psion Organiser; AgResearch (Grasslands) for the loan of the Warner Bratzler meat shear-test apparatus, the Telix downloading programme and NIRS analysis, and Food Technology for use of the Instron instrument and Garry Radford for technical assistance with the herbage strength measurements for Experiment 4.

To my friends, the fellow sports enthusiasts and fitness guru's, outside of the walls of Massey; a number of you I have met over the last 18 months, which to say the least really has been a sensational period of life, together you have demonstrated that life can be fun, again, and it need not be so serious, all the time. My thanks for the encouragement and support.

Finally, the acknowledgements would be incomplete without thanking my parents; you have walked the tightest rope of anyone. Not only do all good things come to an end, they also come to those who wait, and being patient you have had to be. No words could possibly express my thanks for the respect of my wishes that a university education was initially a greater priority than the cochlear implant. Twelve years in a silent world passed before I gave the golden word, but the implant's success has, in part, driven the wheel for the completion of this thesis, finally I hear you say! In the end, the potential of one was no good without the other. My heartfelt thanks to you both for your unwavering support, for the lecture/discussion transcriptions, the encouragement to never quit, even in light of the difficulties I faced, and above all for your patience and your understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xvi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xxv
LIST OF PLATES.....	xxviii
TERMINOLOGY.....	xxix

ONE

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION.....	1
-------------------	---

TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 OVERVIEW	3
2.2 ANIMAL MINDS	4
2.3 FORAGING STRATEGY.....	6
2.3.1 The Grazing Process	6
2.3.2 Harvesting apparatus and body size influences	6
2.3.3 Scales in ecology.....	7
2.5 DISCRIMINATION	9
2.5.1 Terminology.....	9
2.5.2 Assessment.....	9
2.5.2.1 Quantity ingested.....	10
2.5.2.2 Bite number and grazing time	11
2.5.2.3 Animal presence and frequency	12
2.5.2.4 Summary.....	12

2.5.3	Methodology	12
2.5.3.1	Laboratory based methodologies.....	12
2.5.3.2	Field methodologies	13
2.5.3.3	Summary.....	14
2.6	SENSORY WORLD	15
2.6.1	Vision.....	15
2.6.2	Olfaction	18
2.6.3	Taste	19
2.6.4	Touch	20
2.6.5	Summary.....	20
2.7	FORAGING MOVEMENTS	21
2.7.1	Introduction.....	21
2.7.2	Patch use – dwell time and departure rules.....	21
2.7.3	Information retention - partial preference and sampling for reinforcement.....	23
2.7.2	Summary.....	26
2.8	PATCH CHARACTERISTICS.....	27
2.8.1	Introduction.....	27
2.8.2	Sward height and density	28
2.8.3	Sward structure and morphology	30
2.8.3.1	Lamina length, pseudostem height and senescent material.....	30
2.8.3.2	Sward maturity	32
2.8.5	Nutritive value	33
2.8.6	Summary.....	36
2.9	CONCLUSION	37

THREE

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

3.1	INTRODUCTION	38
3.2	EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN	38
3.2.1	Establishment.....	38
3.2.2	Sequence layout	39

3.2.3	Animals	42
3.2.4	Grazing bites and residence time per patch	43
3.3	GENERAL SWARD MEASUREMENTS	43
3.3.1	Sward height and Pseudostem height	43
3.3.2	Herbage mass	43
3.3.3	Botanical composition	44
3.3.4	Nutritive value	44
3.3.5	Strength properties.....	45
3.4	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	45

FOUR

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

Experiment 1 An assessment of the use of sward height and bulk density as cues on patch selection behaviour using a linear structured field design

4.1	INTRODUCTION.....	48
4.2	PATCH TREATMENTS and MANIPULATION	49
4.3	SUMMARISED SWARD MEASUREMENTS	50
4.4	RESULTS.....	50
4.4.1	Treatment contrasts.....	50
4.4.2	Bite number, residence time and herbage removed	56
4.4.3	Bite rate.....	60
4.4.4	Bite depth.....	60
4.4.5	Adjacent patch effects.....	62
4.5	DISCUSSION.....	62
4.5.1	Sward height and bulk density effects on preferential grazing behaviour.....	63
4.5.2	Bite depth.....	66
4.5.3	Bite rate.....	67
4.5.4	Measures of preference	68
4.5.5	Sampling behaviour and adjacent patch effects.....	69
4.6	CONCLUSION	71

FIVE

SWARD STRUCTURE and MORPHOLOGY

Experiment 2	Foraging behaviour responses to choices that differ in structural composition	
5.1	INTRODUCTION	72
5.2	PATCH TREATMENTS and MANIPULATION	74
5.3	SUMMARISED SWARD MEASUREMENTS	75
5.3.1	Shear strength.....	75
5.4	RESULTS	77
5.4.1	Treatment contrasts.....	77
5.4.2	Bite number and residence time.....	84
5.4.3	Bite rate	87
5.4.4	Bite depth.....	91
5.4.5	Adjacent patch effects.....	94
Experiment 3	Selective responses to differences in sward maturity and the role of leaf mass in the decision hierarchy	
5.5	PATCH TREATMENTS and MANIPULATION	96
5.6	SUMMARISED SWARD MEASUREMENTS	98
5.6.1	Shear strength.....	99
5.7	RESULTS	100
5.7.1	First grazing session.....	100
5.7.1.1	Treatment contrasts	100
5.7.1.2	Bite number, residence time and herbage removed.....	105
5.7.1.3	Bite rate	106
5.7.1.4	Bite depth.....	108
5.7.1.5	Adjacent patch effects	109
5.7.2	Second grazing session	111
5.7.2.1	Treatment contrasts	111
5.7.2.2	Bite number and residence time	111
5.7.2.3	Bite rate	112

Experiment 4 Separation of the effects of structural parameters, sward height and maturity, on foraging decisions

5.8	PATCH TREATMENTS and MANIPULATION	113
5.9	SUMMARISED SWARD MEASUREMENTS	115
5.9.1	Herbage mass	115
5.9.2	Botanical composition	116
5.9.3	Force to fracture	117
5.10	RESULTS	120
5.10.1	Treatment contrasts	120
5.10.2	Bite number and residence time	124
5.10.3	Herbage removed	129
5.10.4	Between cow variation	131
5.10.5	Bite mass	131
5.10.6	Bite rate	137
5.10.7	Bite depth	137
5.10.8	Adjacent patch effects	145
5.11	DISCUSSION	146
5.11.1	Sward structure and morphology effects on preferential grazing behaviour	147
5.11.2	Can lower-order variables assist with the explanation of preferential foraging behaviour?	155
5.11.2.1	Is bite penetration regulated by the separate effects of leaf, pseudostem and stem strata?	155
5.11.2.2	Relationship between bite depth and bite number	165
5.11.2.3	Relationship between bite mass, regrowth depth and patch depletion	167
5.11.2.3	Do animals maintain, increase or decrease rate of biting in face of structural constraints on grazing behaviour?	171
5.11.3	Nutritive value	173
5.11.4	Adjacent patch effects	176
5.11.5	Sampling behaviour	177
5.12	CONCLUSION	181

SIX

SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION

Experiment 5 An evaluation of the influence of inter-patch distance in relation to sward height and patch area on the foraging behaviour of dairy cattle

6.1	INTRODUCTION	183
6.2	PATCH TREATMENTS and MANIPULATION	184
6.3	SUMMARISED SWARD MEASUREMENTS	186
6.3.1	Herbage mass	187
6.4	RESULTS	187
6.4.1	Treatment contrasts	187
6.4.2	Bite number, residence time and herbage removed	191
6.4.2.1	Bite number and residence time	191
6.4.2.2	Herbage removed.....	195
6.4.3	Bite Mass	200
6.4.4	Bite rate	203
6.4.5	Intake rate.....	203
6.4.6	Bite depth.....	204
6.4.7	Adjacent patch effects.....	209
6.5	DISCUSSION.....	210
6.5.1	Herbage mass	211
6.5.2	Bite mass	212
6.5.3	Bite depth.....	213
6.5.4	Animals preferentially grazed and achieved larger bites and greater rates of intake from the patches assigned to the short sward height. Why did this occur?	215
6.5.5	What effects do sward height, patch area and patch distance have on selective behaviour?.....	219
6.5.6	Can a common patch departure rule be defined?.....	220
6.5.7	Is patch behaviour determined by the characteristics of adjacent patches in sequence?	223
6.5.8	Is the current interpretation of sampling correct?	225
6.6	CONCLUSION	226

SEVEN

INTEGRATING DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

7.1	INTRODUCTION.....	228
7.2	EVALUATION OF EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES	229
7.2.1	Methodologies.....	229
7.2.1.1	Linear patch sequence	229
7.2.1.2	Strength properties.....	230
7.2.1.3	Spatial distribution of herbage.....	232
7.2.1.4	Nutritive value	233
7.2.2	Patch characteristics.....	236
7.2.2.1	Manipulation of sward characteristics.....	236
7.2.3	Monitoring preferential behaviour.....	237
7.2.4	Bite rate	239
7.2.5	Animal state	239
7.3	CUES and CHOICES	242
7.3.1	Approach and Appraisal	242
7.3.2	Ingestion and Defoliation.....	245
7.3.2.1	Leaf mass.....	246
7.3.2.2	Nutritive value	247
7.3.2.3	Bite penetration	247
7.3.2.3.1	The constant proportionality concept	249
7.3.2.4	Patterns of behaviour with increasing number of bites removed	251
7.4	FORAGING THEORY	253
7.5	CONCLUDING COMMENTS	256

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1	Experimental treatments for Experiment 1.....	49
Table 4.2	Summarised sward measurements for Experiment 1.....	50
Table 4.3	Mean values for sward height, bulk density and pregraze mass for the 9 treatments in Experiment 1.	52
Table 4.4	Mean values for botanical composition (% DM) for the 9 treatments in Experiment 1.....	53
Table 4.5	Mean values for botanical composition (% DM) for the 9 treatments in Experiment 1.....	54
Table 4.6	Mean values for bite number, residence time and herbage removed for the 9 treatments in Experiment 1.	55
Table 4.7	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite number using Model 1.....	56
Table 4.8	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite number using Model 2.....	56
Table 4.9	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite number using Model 3.....	57
Table 4.10	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite number using Model 4.....	57
Table 4.11	Mean values for bite rate, bite depth and bite depth/sward height for the 9 treatments in Experiment 1.	59
Table 4.12	Extract from the analysis of variance output for rate of biting using Model 2.	60
Table 4.13	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth using Model 3.....	60
Table 4.14	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth using Model 4.....	61
Table 4.15	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth/sward height using Model 3.	61

Table 4.16	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth/sward height using Model 4.	62
Table 4.17	Extract from the analysis of variance output for the influence of succeeding patch height on bites removed from the current patch.....	62
Table 5.1	Treatment structure for Experiment 2.....	74
Table 5.2	Summarised sward measurements for Experiment 2.....	75
Table 5.3	Mean values for stubble height, regrowth depth, sward height, pregraze mass and bulk density for the 9 treatments in Experiment 2.	78
Table 5.4	Mean values for botanical composition (% DM) for the 9 treatments in Experiment 2.	80
Table 5.5	Mean values for the force (Newtons) required to sever herbage samples at specified positions within the sward profile for the 9 treatments in Experiment 2. Values given in parenthesis represent the sampling height above ground level, refer to Figure 5.1.	81
Table 5.6	Mean values for the content (% DM) of crude protein (CP), lipid, acid detergent fibre (ADF), neutral detergent fibre (NDF), carbohydrates-soluble sugars and starch (CHO), ash, organic matter digestibility (OMD), and metabolisable energy (ME) (MJ ME/kg DM), as determined by Near Infrared Reflectance Spectroscopy (NIRS) for the three sward height groups in Experiment 2.....	82
Table 5.7	Mean values for bite number, residence time and bite rate for the 9 treatments in Experiment 2.	83
Table 5.8	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite number using Model 1.	84
Table 5.9	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite number using Model 2.	85
Table 5.10	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite number using Model 3.	85
Table 5.11	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite number using Model 4.	87
Table 5.12	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite rate using Model 1.	88
Table 5.13	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite rate using Model 3.	88

Table 5.14	Extract from the analysis of variance output, excluding T1, for bite rate using Model 1.	88
Table 5.15	Extract from the analysis of variance output, excluding T1, for bite rate using Model 2.	89
Table 5.16	Extract from the analysis of variance output, excluding T1, for bite rate using Model 5.	89
Table 5.17	Mean values for bite depth and bite depth/sward height for the 9 treatments in Experiment 2.	90
Table 5.18	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth using Model 1.	91
Table 5.19	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth using Model 2.	91
Table 5.20	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth using Model 3.	91
Table 5.21	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth using Model 5.	92
Table 5.22	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth using Model 6.	93
Table 5.23	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth/sward height using Model 2.	94
Table 5.24	Extract from the analysis of variance output for the influence of the sward height of the succeeding patch in sequence on bites removed using Model 4 in Experiment 2.	95
Table 5.25	Treatment structure for Experiment 3.	96
Table 5.26	Summarised sward measurements for Experiment 3.	98
Table 5.27	Mean values for patch area, sward height, pregraze mass and bulk density for the 3 treatments in the first grazing session in Experiment 3.	101
Table 5.28	Mean values for botanical composition (% DM) for the two sward height groups in Experiment 3.	102

Table 5.29	Mean values for the shear strength (Newtons) required to sever herbage samples at specified positions within the sward profile for the two sward height groups in Experiment 3. Values determined using the Warner Bratzler meat shear-test apparatus. Values given in parenthesis represent the sampling height above ground level, refer to Figure 5.5.	102
Table 5.30	Mean values for the content (% DM) of crude protein (CP) lipid, acid detergent fibre (ADF), neutral detergent fibre (NDF), carbohydrate – soluble sugars and starch (CHO), ash, organic matter digestibility (OMD), and metabolisable energy (ME) (MJ ME/kg DM), as determined by Near Infrared Reflectance Spectroscopy (NIRS) and on the content (% DM) of crude protein (CP) as determined by the Kjeldahl method and ash and organic matter digestibility (OMD), as determined using <i>in vitro</i> standards for the two sward height groups in Experiment 3.....	103
Table 5.31	Mean values for bite number and residence time for the 3 treatments in the first grazing session in Experiment 3.....	104
Table 5.32	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite number per patch in the first grazing session using Model 1.....	105
Table 5.33	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite rate in the first grazing session using Model 1.	106
Table 5.34	Mean values for bite rate, bite depth and bite depth/sward height for the 3 treatments in the first grazing session in Experiment 3.	107
Table 5.35	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth in the first grazing session using Model 1.	108
Table 5.36	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth in the first grazing session using Model 2.	109
Table 5.37	Extract from the analysis of variance output for the influence of the sward height of the succeeding patch in sequence on bites removed per patch in the first grazing session using Model 1.....	109
Table 5.38	Mean values for patch area, sward height, bite number, residence time and bite rate for the 3 treatments in the second grazing session in Experiment 3.	110
Table 5.39	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite number per patch in the second grazing session using Model 1.....	111
Table 5.40	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite rate in the second grazing session using Model 1.....	112
Table 5.41	Treatment structure for Experiment 4.....	113

Table 5.42	Pairing combinations for comparison across levels of sward height, stubble height and regrowth depth.....	114
Table 5.43	Summarised sward measurements for Experiment 4.....	115
Table 5.44	Clamp positions for estimates of force to fracture (Newtons), as determined using the Instron testing instrument. Measurements given are from the tip of the lamina.....	118
Table 5.45	Mean values for stubble height, regrowth depth, sward height, whole sward pregraze mass and upper stratum pregraze mass (stratum height given in parenthesis) for the 9 treatments in Experiment 4.....	121
Table 5.46	Mean values for botanical composition (% DM) for the regrowth stratum of T2, T5, T8 and T3, T6, T9 in Experiment 4.....	122
Table 5.47	Mean values for botanical composition (% DM) for the stubble stratum for the 9 treatments in Experiment 4.	122
Table 5.48	Mean values for the force (Newtons) required to sever herbage samples at the interface between regrowth depth and stubble height, based on nominal regrowth depth and stubble height values, for the 6 regrowth treatments (T2, T3, T5, T6, T8 and T9) in Experiment 4. Comparative values from the stubble strata for T1, T4 and T7 are provided. All values determined using an Instron testing instrument.	123
Table 5.49	Mean values for the force (Newtons) required to sever herbage samples for the stubble stratum, based on nominal stubble height values, for T1, T4 and T7 in Experiment 4. All values determined using an Instron testing instrument.	123
Table 5.50	Mean values for the content (% DM) of crude protein (CP), lipid, acid detergent fibre (ADF), neutral detergent fibre (NDF), carbohydrates-soluble sugars and starch (CHO), ash, organic matter digestibility (OMD), and metabolisable energy (ME) (MJ ME/kg DM), for the upper stratum for the 9 treatments in Experiment 4. Values determined by Near Infrared Reflectance Spectroscopy (NIRS).....	125
Table 5.51	Mean values for the content (% DM) of crude protein (CP), lipid, acid detergent fibre (ADF), neutral detergent fibre (NDF), carbohydrates-soluble sugars and starch (CHO), ash, organic matter digestibility (OMD), and metabolisable energy (ME) (MJ ME/kg DM), for the middle stratum for the 9 treatments in Experiment 4. Values determined by Near Infrared Reflectance Spectroscopy (NIRS).	126

Table 5.52	Mean values for the content (% DM) of crude protein (CP), lipid, acid detergent fibre (ADF), neutral detergent fibre (NDF), carbohydrates-soluble sugars and starch (CHO), ash, organic matter digestibility (OMD), and metabolisable energy (ME) (MJ ME/kg DM), for the lower stratum for T4 and T7 in Experiment 4. Values determined by Near Infrared Reflectance Spectroscopy (NIRS).....	127
Table 5.53	Mean values for bite number, residence time and herbage removed for the 9 treatments in Experiment 4.	128
Table 5.54	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite number using Model 1.	129
Table 5.55	Extract from the analysis of cow by treatment interaction, between patches using mean square error as the error term, and within patches using treatment(sequence x block) as the error term.	131
Table 5.56	Mean values for bite mass and bite rate for the 9 treatments in Experiment 4. Values are calculated from patches where 4 or more bites were removed.	132
Table 5.57	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite mass using Model 1.	133
Table 5.58	Extract from the analysis of variance for the interactions between bite mass and log bite number.	134
Table 5.59	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite rate using Model 1.	137
Table 5.60	Mean values for bite depth and bite depth/sward height for the 9 treatments in Experiment 4. Values are calculated from patches where 4 or more bites were removed.	138
Table 5.61	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth using Model 1.	139
Table 5.62	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth using Model 2.	139
Table 5.63	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth using Model 3.	140
Table 5.64	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth/sward height using Model 3.	141
Table 5.65	Extract from the analysis of variance for the interactions between bite depth and log bite number.	142

Table 5.66	Extract from the analysis of variance table for the influence of the regrowth depth and sward height of the adjacent patch in sequence on bites removed from the current patch in Experiment 4.	145
Table 5.67	Extract from the analysis of variance table for the influence of the regrowth depth and sward height of the adjacent patch in sequence on herbage removed from the current patch in Experiment 4.	146
Table 5.68	The proximity of grazed height to estimated pseudostem height in Experiment 2.	158
Table 5.69	Comparison between measured and predicted bite depth calculated on the maximum bite depth concept for Treatments 1 to 9 in Experiment 2.	160
Table 6.1	Treatment structure for Experiment 5.	184
Table 6.2	Summarised sward measurements for Experiment 5.	186
Table 6.3	Mean values for patch distance, patch area, sward height, pseudostem height, pregraze mass and bulk density for the 8 treatments in Experiment 5.	189
Table 6.4	Mean values for botanical composition (% DM) for the 2 sward height groups in Experiment 5.	190
Table 6.5	Mean values for the content (% DM) of crude protein (CP), lipid, acid detergent fibre (ADF), neutral detergent fibre (NDF), carbohydrates-soluble sugars and starch (CHO), ash, organic matter digestibility (OMD), and metabolisable energy (ME) (MJ ME/kg DM), as determined by Near Infrared Reflectance Spectroscopy (NIRS) for the 2 sward height groups in Experiment 5.	190
Table 6.6	Mean values for bite number, residence time and herbage removed for the 8 treatments in Experiment 5.	192
Table 6.7	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite number per patch using Model 2.	193
Table 6.8	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite number per patch using Model 3.	193
Table 6.9	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite number per unit area using Model 3.	194

Table 6.10	Mean values for the mass of herbage removed for the 8 treatments in Experiment 5 using the four methods described in section 6.4.2.2. The sum of squares estimate used as the error term for calculating probability values is given as a comparative assessment of methods.....	198
Table 6.11	Extract from the analysis of variance output for herbage removed per patch using Model 3.....	199
Table 6.12	Extract from the analysis of variance output for herbage removed per unit area using Model 3.	199
Table 6.13	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite mass using Model 3.....	200
Table 6.14	Mean values for bite mass, bite rate and intake rate for the 8 treatments in Experiment 5.....	201
Table 6.15	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite rate using Model 3.....	203
Table 6.16	Extract from the analysis of variance output for intake rate using Model 3.....	204
Table 6.17	Mean values for bite depth and bite depth/sward height for the 8 treatments in Experiment 5.....	205
Table 6.18	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth using Model 3.....	206
Table 6.19	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth using Model 4.....	207
Table 6.20	Extract from the analysis of variance output for bite depth/sward height using Model 3.	208
Table 6.21	Extract from the analysis of variance table for the influence of the sward height, patch area and patch distance of the preceding patch in sequence on bites removed per unit area from the current patch in Experiment 5.....	209
Table 6.22	Extract from the analysis of variance table for the influence of the sward height, patch area and patch distance of the succeeding patch in sequence on bites removed per unit area from the current patch in Experiment 5.....	210
Table 6.23	A summary of the bite mass estimates of cattle from a selection of short term studies.....	213

Table 6.24	Comparison between bite depth at two pseudostem:sward height ratios, at a common sward height, in Experiment 5 with the data of Flores <i>et al.</i> (1993).	217
Table 7.1	The minimum number of samples required for accurate estimation of nutritive value within a dairy pasture as defined by Cosgrove <i>et al.</i> (1998).....	235
Table 7.2	A summary of the number of samples, for each treatment effect, used to determine the significance of nutritive value within each experiment for Experiments 2 to 5.	235
Table 7.3	Comparison of correlations between grazing bites and residence time, and grazing bites and herbage removed, for Experiments 1 to 5.	238
Table 7.4	Summary of the variation in bite depth/sward height for Experiments 1, 2, 4 and 5. Data from Tables 4.16, 5.23, 5.64 and 6.20.	250

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1	(a) Illustration of strip layout and (b) sequence structure for strip 1 in Experiment 1.....	40
Figure 4.1	Relationship between bite number per patch and sward height for the 9 treatments in Experiment 1. A curvilinear, quadratic function is fitted for T1-T9 (—). Plotted data includes patches where there were no prehended bites and matches the output from the analysis of variance.....	58
Figure 4.2	Estimates of bite mass for the 9 treatments in Experiment 1 using the equations for bite volume and bulk density given by McGilloway <i>et al.</i> (1997).....	65
Figure 5.1	Division of strata for estimates of shear strength for Experiment 2. Measurements based on actual heights (white lines represent measurement height).....	76
Figure 5.2	Actual regrowth depths (cm), stubble heights (cm) and sward heights (cm) for the 9 treatments in Experiment 2.	77
Figure 5.3	Relationship between bite number and sward height for T1-T3 (•), T4-T6 (+) and T7-T9 (O) and linear fits for T1-T3 (— — —), T4-T6 (.....), T7-T9 (....) and a curvilinear, quadratic, fit for T1-T9 (—). Plotted data includes patches where there were no prehended bites and matches the output from the analysis of variance.....	86
Figure 5.4	Grazed height relative to the interface between the regrowth and stubble strata (vertical bars represent sem).....	93
Figure 5.5	Division of strata for estimates of shear strength for Experiment 3 (white lines represent measurement height).	99
Figure 5.6	Stratified sampling of pregraze herbage mass from the centre section (white lines represent measurement height).	116
Figure 5.7	Division of strata for estimates of force to fracture for Experiment 4 (white lines represent the position of the bottom clamp).....	118

- Figure 5.8 Relationship between sward height and bite number (—) or herbage removed (g DM m⁻²) (-----) for 1.7 (●), 6.4 (+) and 9.6 (O) cm regrowth depths respectively.130
- Figure 5.9 Relationship between bite mass and bite number for the three regrowth depths. Pooled relationship Bite mass=24.76 (±0.71) - 14.33 (±0.57)Log Bite number, 1.7 cm regrowth depth Bite mass=31.11 (±2.09) -22.67 (±2.36)Log Bite number, 6.4 cm regrowth depth Bite mass=23.47 (±1.41) -13.77 (±1.13)Log Bite number, 9.6 cm regrowth depth Bite mass=19.16 (±1.15) -9.82 (±0.78)Log Bite number.135
- Figure 5.10 Relationship between bite mass and bite number for the three sward heights. Pooled relationship Bite mass=24.76 (±0.71) - 14.33 (± 0.57)Log Bite number, 16.1 cm sward height Bite mass=20.41 (±1.42) -11.04 (±1.06)Log Bite number, 19.5 cm sward height Bite mass=31.63 (±2.03) -19.41 (± 1.62)Log Bite number, 22.1 cm height Bite mass=27.02 (±1.48) -16.50 (±1.32)Log Bite number.136
- Figure 5.11 Grazed height relative to the interface between stubble height and regrowth depth (vertical bars represent sem).....141
- Figure 5.12 Relationship between bite depth and bite number for the three regrowth depths. Pooled relationship Bite depth=1.50 (±0.41) + 3.74 (±0.32)Log Bite number, 1.7 cm regrowth depth Bite depth=2.26 (±0.71) + 1.89 (±0.72)Log Bite number, 6.4 cm regrowth depth Bite depth=4.58 (±0.67) + 1.49 (±0.53)Log Bite number, 9.6 cm regrowth depth Bite depth=5.63 (±1.16) + 1.32 (± 0.76)Log Bite number.143
- Figure 5.13 Relationship between bite depth and bite number for the three sward heights. Pooled relationship Bite depth=1.50 (±0.41) + 3.74 (±0.32)Log Bite number, 16.1 cm sward height Bite depth=1.00 (±0.71) + 3.76 (±0.51)Log Bite number, 19.5 cm sward height Bite depth=0.75 (±0.75) + 4.54 (±0.58)Log Bite number, 22.1 cm sward height Bite depth=1.89 (±0.76) + 3.64 (±0.63)Log Bite number.144
- Figure 6.1 Illustration of sequence structure for strip 1 in Experiment 5. Patch distance effects are illustrated for the grazing of patch 7.185
- Figure 6.2 Relationship between sward height and bite number per unit area for short (●) and tall (O) treatments. Linear relationships are fitted for short (-----) treatments, tall (.....) treatments and a pooled (—) relationship.194

Figure 6.3	Relationship between sward height and bite mass for short (●) and tall (○) treatments. Linear relationships are fitted for short (-----) treatments, tall (.....) treatments and a pooled (—) relationship.....	202
Figure 6.4	Relationship between sward height and intake rate for short (●) and tall (○) treatments. Linear relationships are fitted for short (--- --) treatments, tall (.....) treatments and a pooled (—) relationship.....	202
Figure 6.5	Relationship between sward height and bite depth for short (●) and tall (○) treatments. Linear relationships are fitted for short (--- --) treatments, tall (.....) treatments and a pooled (—) relationship.....	204
Figure 6.6	Depth of penetration relative to pregraze height and pseudostem height (vertical bars represent sem).	206
Figure 6.7	Relationship between sward height and bite depth/sward height for short (●) and tall (○) treatments. Linear relationships are fitted for short (-----) treatments, tall (.....) treatments and a pooled (—) relationship.	208
Figure 6.8	Relationship between sward height and pseudostem height for short (●) and tall (○) treatments. Linear relationships are fitted for short (-----) treatments, tall (.....) treatments and a pooled (—) relationship.....	216
Figure 7.1	The patch grazing cycle.	241

LIST OF PLATES

- Plate 3.1 Linear patch sequence (a) patch manipulation, (b) sequence layout
with one grazing run either side of the centre section and (c) study
cow working her way down the choices41
- Plate 5.1 Instron testing instrument used to assess force to fracture (a)
pneumatic clamp set-up (b) tiller test sample. 119

TERMINOLOGY

There is a potential source of confusion in the description of sward state characteristics, particularly with reference to the tendency to use the terms horizon and stratum interchangeably. Throughout this thesis the terminology as defined below has been adhered to. Accordingly when quoting from published material, the terminology has been changed to maintain this consistency.

Stratum/strata	A depth of sward canopy confined between two distinct lines.
Horizon	A distinct line separating two strata.
Sward height	The average height of the uppermost surface of leaves in an undisturbed sward canopy.
Stubble height	The mean height from ground level of the cut surfaces of tillers following a defoliation or series of defoliations.
Regrowth depth	Depth of a stratum of regrowth. The difference between sward height and stubble height.
Pseudostem height	The height from the base of a tiller to the ligule of the youngest mature leaf.