



University of Kentucky
UKnowledge

International Grassland Congress Proceedings

XXI International Grassland Congress / VIII
International Rangeland Congress

Which Vegetation Sampling Approach Is More Efficient for a Rangeland Inventory?

Gh. Ghanbarian

University of Agricultural Sciences, Iran

M. Mesdaghi

University of Agricultural Sciences, Iran

H. Barani

University of Agricultural Sciences, Iran

M. Azimmohseni

University of Agricultural Sciences, Iran

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uknowledge.uky.edu/igc>



Part of the [Plant Sciences Commons](#), and the [Soil Science Commons](#)

This document is available at <https://uknowledge.uky.edu/igc/21/1-4/39>

The XXI International Grassland Congress / VIII International Rangeland Congress took place in Hohhot, China from June 29 through July 5, 2008.

Proceedings edited by Organizing Committee of 2008 IGC/IRC Conference

Published by Guangdong People's Publishing House

This Event is brought to you for free and open access by the Plant and Soil Sciences at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Grassland Congress Proceedings by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu.

Which vegetation sampling approach is more efficient for a rangeland inventory ?

G .Ghanbarian , M .Mesdaghi , H .Barani , and M .Azimmohseni

Department of Range Management , College of Natural Resources , University of Agricultural Sciences , Gorgan , Iran . E-mail sghanbarian@yahoo .com

Key words : sampling techniques , canopy cover , precision , accuracy , time/cost consumption , Zagros region

Introduction Iran's rangelands cover about 90 million hectares and provide a wide variety of products and services . Aims of a sampling plan would include maximum efficiency to provide the best statistical estimates with low cost and high precision . It is very important that sampling provides an unbiased estimate of the variance and the mean of the parameters being studied . Designing efficient sampling techniques is a critical process to all management decisions . On the other hand , the consequences of poor sampling design are loss of both time and money , reduced credibility , incorrect management decisions , and , eventually , rangeland deterioration . The objectives of our study were to compare three vegetation sampling techniques of (1) random (RNDM) , (2) systematic (SYSM) , and (3) random-systematic sampling (RND-SYSM) in terms of precision , accuracy , and time-cost consumption to characterize the vegetation of a mountainous region in Iran .

Material and methods The study area is located in southern part of Zagros mountain in Iran between 52°20' to 52°23' E and 29°52' to 29°54' N . The mean annual precipitation is 594 mm and mean annual temperature is 14 .9°C . The study area was stratified based on physical characteristics (slope , aspect , and elevation) by using GIS . In each homogenous unit , three sampling techniques were established to record canopy cover , production , and time/cost consumption .

Results Differences among sampling techniques were significant ($P < 0 .01$) for all criteria except for accuracy of production (Table 1) . The efficiency of different criteria was ranked and shown in Table 2 .

Table 1 Comparison of three sampling methods for different criteria .

| Sampling Method | Time/Cost Consumption (min .) | | Accuracy | | Precision (Variance) | |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | Production | Cover | Production | Cover | Production | Cover |
| RNDM | 3 .31 ^b | 3 .31 ^b | 57 .52 ^a | 33 .9 ^a | 525 .32 ^a | 219 .33 ^a |
| SYSM | 2 .33 ^a | 2 .33 ^a | 61 .64 ^a | 38 .36 ^b | 532 .16 ^a | 283 .24 ^b |
| RND-SYSM | 2 .13 ^a | 2 .13 ^a | 61 .73 ^a | 37 .15 ^b | 701 .19 ^b | 216 .67 ^a |

Table 2 The ranking of efficiency for three sampling methods .

| | Time/Cost * | | Accuracy | | Precision | |
|----------|-------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|
| | Production | Cover | Production | Cover | Production | Cover |
| RND-SYSM | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| SYSM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| RNDM | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |

* For time/cost , accuracy , and precision , 1 was the highest efficiency .

Conclusions The results showed that for cover estimation RND-SYSM had the highest precision and accuracy and the lowest time/cost consumption . On the other hand , the RNDM had the lowest accuracy and the highest time/cost consumption . The highest accuracy for production estimation was belonged to SYSM and the highest precision was belonged to RNDM . The highest time/cost efficiency for production and cover estimations was belonged to RND-SYSM .

References

- Elzinga , C .L . , D .W .Salzer . And J .W .Willoughby .(1998) .*Measuring and Monitoring Plant Population* ,BLM . Technical Reference-1730-1 .USA 496p .
 Krebs , C .J . (1999) .*Ecological Methodology* 2nd ed .Addison Wesley Longman .Menlo park ,California .USA .620p .
 Thompson , S .K .2002 .*Sampling* John Wiley and Sons , New York .USA 367p .
 Van der Maarel , E .(Editor) .(2005) .*Vegetation Ecology* .Malden Blachwell 395p .