### University of Nebraska - Lincoln

## DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

3rd World Congress on Genetics Applied to Livestock Production

**Animal Science Department** 

1986

# Comparison of Five Dam Breeds Under Two Nutritional Environments

C. E. Thompson *Clemson University* 

S. G. Woods *Clemson University* 

S. E. Meadows *Clemson University* 

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/wcgalp

Part of the Animal Sciences Commons

Thompson, C. E.; Woods, S. G.; and Meadows, S. E., "Comparison of Five Dam Breeds Under Two Nutritional Environments" (1986). *3rd World Congress on Genetics Applied to Livestock Production*. 10. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/wcgalp/10

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Animal Science Department at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in 3rd World Congress on Genetics Applied to Livestock Production by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

COMPARISON OF FIVE DAM BREEDS UNDER TWO NUTRITIONAL ENVIRONMENTS

C. E. THOMPSON\* S. G. WOODS\* S. E. MEADOWS\*

UNITED STATES

#### INTRODUCTION

crossbreeding has become an acccepted practice for beef cattle Hybrid vigor or heterosis of crosses among breeds of English such as Angus, Hereford and Shorthorn have been well documented. utilizing breeds of European and dairy breeding have not been well for beef production, particularly in the Southeastern part of the states. As most of the Southeastern U.S. is heavily involved in programs an evaluation of crossbreds involving the use of British, and dairy breeding is needed. This study is a portion of a the research project evaluating the performance of 5 dam breed rouss over their first five years of production under two nutritional levels.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data used in this study were generated from 141 Angus or  $F_1$  Angus massbred dams born during 1975. The F1 dams were initially generated by meeting straightbred Angus females to five sire breeds. The sire breeds tecluded Angus, Polled Hereford, Charolais, Holstein and Simmental. All femles produced from these matings were assembled in one location at mening time, overwintered as a group and assigned to one of two nutritional month as yearlings. All heifers were mated to a single sire breed and must the become pregnant as yearlings to be included in the study. Once ussigned to a nutritional level, the heifers remained with that level throughout the study.

Level one females were maintained on Coastal Bermudagrass pastures the grazing season and supplemented with Coastal Bermudagrass hay, and concentrates during the times when grazing was unavailable or inadequate due to weather conditions.

Level two females were grazed on Coastal Bermudagrass pastures Merseeded with Yuchi Arrowleaf clover and on winter and summer annuals, medifically rye and Pearl Millet. The intent of level two was to allow the is to have enough nutritional resources available for them to achieve mainum productivity.

Culling was not performed unless a female failed to raise two resecutive calves or developed a permanent anatomical injury. No culling was based upon performance.

During the five years of the study, all females were exposed to the

artment of Animal Science. Clemson University, Clemson, SC,

same sires through artificial insemination and natural service. Only one sire breed was used each year. In year one, all females were mated to Red Poll sires, year two to Santa Gertrudis sires, year three to Angus sires, year four to F<sub>1</sub> Simmental-Angus sires and year five to Simmental sires.

#### BIRTH TRAITS

TA

TAL

an

re

in

Da we we re fe

pr

đi

Birth data on 630 calvings were studied. Mean  $\pm$  S.E. birth weight for both nutrition levels was 34.8  $\pm$  .6 Kg with a 1.8 Kg difference (P<.05) observed for nutrition level. Differences were also observed for dam breed groups (Table 1). Calves from F<sub>1</sub> dams of Charolais-Angus, Holstein-Angus and Simmental-Angus breedings were heavier than those calves from Angus or Polled Hereford-Angus dams. These results are consistent with those reported by Bowden (1977) and Marshall et al. (1984). No differences at calving (7.5 and 7.7%, respectively for levels 1 and 2). Dystocia or calving difficulty scores were inconsistent for the various dam breeds and revealed no differences. Likewise, calf survival to weaning revealed no differences.

#### PREWEANING TRAITS

Level of nutrition and dam breed significantly influenced adjusted average daily gain (ADG). A difference of .09 Kg was observed between the nutrition levels (Table 2). All dam breeds except the Holstein-Angus showed an increase in ADG from Level I to Level II. In general, calves from dams of dairy and European breeding outgained calves from British breed dams. These findings were similar to those reported by Notter et al. (1978), Bowden (1977), Burns et al. (1973), Gross et al. (1966), Holloway et al. (1979), Halloway et al. (1982) and Holloway et al. (1983). Also, calves from the European and dairy crossbred dams graded higher (P<.05) than calves from British bred dams (Table 2) and Level II calves excelled by one-half of a grade.

Weaning weights were influenced (P<.01) by dam breed and level of nutrition. Except for the Holstein-Angus dams, the dam breeds showed an approximate nine percent increase from Level I to Level II. Mean adjusted 205-day weaning weights were 206.7 and 224. Kg for Levels I and II, respectively.

#### PREGNANCY AND CULLING

Pregnancy rates for rebreeding of the dam breeds revealed a significant genotype x environmental interaction for Charolais-Angus and Holstein-Angus dams (Table 3). Pregnancy rates were 20% higher during the first year for the Level II dams. This finding is consistent with that reported by Koger et al. (1961).

Overall percentages pregnant, open and culled did not vary significantly for dam breed (Table 4). A mean of 77% pregnant, 18% open

| ABUS               | Birth we<br>Leve | Birth weights (Kg)<br>Level <sup>a</sup> |      | Percent <sup>b</sup><br>Assisted |      | Percent <sup>b</sup><br>Dead |  |
|--------------------|------------------|--|------|----------------------------------|------|------------------------------|--|
|                    |                  | II                                       | I    | II                               | I    | II                           |  |
| ingus ingus        | 31.7             | 33.2                                     | 4.5  | 6.9                              | 9.1  | 3.4                          |  |
|                    | 32.0             | 35.2                                     | 7.3  | 2.5                              | 4.2  | 7.5                          |  |
| P. Hereford-Aligus | 36.0             | 37.1                                     | 13.8 | 9.4                              | 10.3 | 6.3                          |  |
| charolais-Angus    | 36.7             | 36.7                                     | 7.1  | 8.5                              | 4.7  | 5.6                          |  |
| Holstein-Angus     | 34.3             | 35.9                                     | 3.8  | 12.3                             | 5.7  | 6.2                          |  |
| simmental-Angus X  | 33.9             | 35.7                                     | 7.5  | 7.7                              | 6.5  | 5.9                          |  |

for five dam breeds from 630 calvings

bpifferences non-significant (P<.05).

Calf preweaning traits for dam breeds (Kg)

| portio losti                   | ADG <sup>a</sup><br>Level |                   | Grad                | Grade <sup>b</sup> , <sup>c</sup><br>Level |                | A 205 WW <sup>C</sup><br>Level |  |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--|----------------|--------------------------------|--|
|                                | I                         | II                | I                   | II   | I              | II                             |  |
| Angus<br>P. Hereford-Angus     | .81                       | .87<br>.88        | 11.3                | 11.7                                       | 197.5<br>190.9 | 211.0 216.3                    |  |
| Charolais-Angus                | .85                       | .94               | 11.8                | 12.3<br>12.4                               | 209.6          | 229.6                          |  |
| Simmental-Angus $\overline{X}$ | <u>.89</u><br>.84         | <u>.98</u><br>.92 | $\frac{12.0}{11.6}$ | $\frac{12.4}{12.1}$                        | 216.6<br>206.7 | $\frac{236.4}{224.6}$          |  |

affect of dam breed different (P<.05). b12 = low choice Caffect of dam breed nutrition level different (P<.05).

and 5% culled was observed for Level I, whereas Level II results revealed 85% pregnant, 12% open and 3% had been culled.

#### SUMMARY

Comparison of five dam breed groups indicated that level of nutriton influenced calf birth weight (P<.05) but not dystocia or percent death loss. Dam breed did significantly affect ADG, grade and adjusted 205-day weaning wight. Level of nutrition also influenced grade and adjusted 205-day seaning weight. A genotype x environmental interaction was reported for rebreeding rate of two-year-old lactating Charolais-Angus and Holstein-Angus females and increased overall pregnancy rates by 20 percent. Percentages pregnant, open and culled (1977-81) did not reveal any significant. difference due to dam breed or nutritional level.

| Di cea ana ici         | <u> </u> |          |
|------------------------|----------|----------|
| Dam breed <sup>a</sup> | Level I  | Level II |
| Angus                  | 69       | 75       |
| P. Hereford-Angus      | 75       | 88       |
| Charolais-Angus        | 53       | 92       |
| Holstein-Angus         | 56       | 92       |
| Simmental-Angus        | 67       | 92       |
| Mean                   | 65       | 85       |
|                        |          |          |

## TABLE 3. Rebreeding percentage of lactating 2-year-olds by dam breed and level

<sup>a</sup>Genotype by Environmental Interaction shown (P<.01) for Charolais-Angus and Holstein-Angus dams.

|                   | Level I  |      |        | Level IT |      |                |
|-------------------|----------|------|--------|----------|------|----------------|
|                   | Pregnant | Open | Culled | Pregnant | Open | Culled         |
| Angus             | 69       | 24   | 7      | 83       | 16   |                |
| P. Hereford-Angus | 85       | 11   | 4      | 82       | 12   | 6              |
| Charolais-Angus   | 74       | 20   | 6      | 82       | 16   | 0              |
| Holstein-Angus    | 74       | 19   | 2      | 88       | 9    | 2              |
| Simmental-Angus   | 74       | 21   | 5      | 89       | 8    | 2              |
| Mean              | 77       | 18   | 5      | 85       | 12   | 3              |
|                   |          |      |        |          |      | and the second |

TABLE 4. Percentages of dams pregnant, open and culled 1977-81a

<sup>a</sup>Differences non-significant (P<.05).

Burn.

Hollo

Hollo

Hollo

Koger

Marsh

Notte

#### LITERATURE CITED

Burns, J. C. 1974. Legumes in animal production systems for the upper south. Proceedings of the 30th and 31st Southern Pasture and Forage Crop Improvement Conference.

Holloway, J. W., W. T. Butts and T. L. Worley. 1982. Utilization of forage and milk energy by Angus calves grazing fescue or fescue-legume pastures. J. Anim. Sci. 55:1214.

Holloway, J. W., W. T. Butts, J. D. Beaty, J. T. Hopper and N. S. Hall. 1979. Forage intake and performance of lactation beef cows grazing high or low quality pastures. J. Anim. Sci. 48:692.

Bolloway, J. W. and W. T. Butts. 1983. Phenotype x nutritional environment interactions in forage intake and efficiency of Angus cows grazing fescue-legume or fescue pastures. J. Anim. Sci. 56:960.

Koger, M., W. G. Blue, G. B. Killinger, R. E. L. Greene, H. C. Harris, J. M. Myers, A. C. Warnick and N. Gammon. 1961. Beef production, soil and forage analyses, and economic returns from eight pasture programs in North Central Florida. University of Fla. Agric. Exp. Sta. Bull. 631. Gainesville, FL.

Marshall, D. M., R. R. Frahm and G. W. Horn. 1984. Nutrient intake and efficiency of calf production by two-breed cross cows. J. Anim. Sci. 59:317.

Notter, D. R., L. V. Cundiff, G. M. Smith, D. B. Laster and K. E. Gregory. 1978. Characterization of biological types of cattle. VI. Transmitted and maternal effects on birth and survival traits in progeny of young cows. J. Anim. Sci. 46:892.