碩士學位論文

파종기와 栽植密度가 青刈콩의 收量 및 飼料價値에 미치는 영향

濟州大學校 大學院

農學科

金 炫 兌

2000年 12月

A Thesis
for the Degree of Master of Science

Yield and Feed Value of Soybean Forage as Affected by Planting Date and Plant Density

by
Hyun-Tae Kim

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
GRADUATE SCHOOL
CHEJU NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

December 2000

파종기와 栽植密度가 青제콩의 收量 및 飼料價値에 미치는 영향

指導教授 姜 榮 吉

金 炫 兌

이 論文을 農學碩士學位 論文으로 提出함

2000年 12月

金炫兌의 農學碩士學位 論文을 認准함

審査委員長 ____________________ **印**

委　　員 ____________________ **印**

委　　員 ____________________ **印**

濟州大學校 大學院

2000年 12月

Yield and Feed Value of Soybean Forage as Affected by Planting Date and Plant Density

Hyun-Tae Kim

(Supervised by Professor Young-Kil Kang)

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF AGRICULTURE

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

GRADUATE SCHOOL

CHEJU NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

December 2000

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

Soybean [*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.] is known to produce the highest TDN yield among summer grain legumes in Cheju area but little is known about the effects of cultural practices on forage yield and quality. A determinate soybean cv. 'Baegunkong' was planted on 5 June, 20 June and 3 July and grown at four plant densities (30, 50, 70 and 90 plants m^{-2}) in 1998 at Cheju to evaluate the effects of planting date and plant density on the yield and quality of soybean forage. Days to flowering decreased from about 47 to 38 days, average plant height 61 to 51 cm and main stem diameter from 6.31 to 5.00 mm as planting was delayed from 5 June to 3 July. Average plant height quadratically increased from 45 to 62 cm as plant density increased from 30 to 90 plants m^{-2}. Planting date did not affect the average Dry matter, crude protein, and total digestible nutrient (TDN) yields. The average dry matter and TDN yields displayed a quadratic response to an increasing plant density and the optimum plant density for both dry matter and TDN yields was estimated about 60 plants m^{-2}. Plant density had no effect on crude protein yield. Planting date did not significantly influenced forage quality. The crude protein content was not significantly influenced by plant density. Increasing plant density slightly increased acid detergent fiber content but slightly decreased TDN content.

Ⅰ. INTRODUCTION

Although presently grown almost entirely as a grain legume, soybean was a popular main summer annual green manure and forage legume in Cheju Island until N fertilizers were readily available and cheap. Sorghum [*Sorghum bicolar* (L.) Monench] has been recommended for a summer forage crop in the Island because of their high productivity. Comparing with sorghum, soybean produces much higher quality forage although forage yield of soybean is much less. Kang et al. (1998a) reported that crude protein (CP), crude fiber and total digestible nutrient (TDN) content of soybean forage harvested at stage R6 was about 20, 65 and 25%, respectively while those of sorghum forage harvested at 30% heading about 8, 52 and 38% respectively. Because of increasing proportion of seed with high protein and digestibility, soybean forage quality does not decrease with aging (Munoz et al., 1983). Kang et al. (1998a) also reported that among grain legumes [soybean, mungbean, cowpea (*Vigna sinsensis* L.) and adzuki bean], the dry matter (DM), CP, and TDN yields of soybean forage averaged across two planting dates and three cultivars were greatest with about 5,650, 1,060, and 3,640 kg ha^{-1}, respectively, at Cheju and could be the best forage legume for grass-legume forage rotation in this region and good CP supplementary forage to sorghum with low CP content because of higher CP content of soybean forage. Lee (1989) has shown that corn-soybean intercropping can increase CP yield without a decrease in DM yield in comparison with corn monocropping for silage. However, Redfearn et al. (1999) found that intercropping tall-statured forage-type soybean with another tall-growing forage does not appear to be practical because of the decrease in dry matter accumulation of soybean.

Compared with sorghum for which the recommended N rate is 250 kg ha^{-1}, soybean requires only about 16% of N fertilizer required for sorghum because of N_2 fixation and thus soybean cropping will reduce the NO_3-N contamination of ground waters. Some of fixed N by soybean become available for the next crop. Cropping soybean usually increase the yield of the next crop (Bagayoko et al., 1992).

In the USA, soybean was primarily a forage crop and grown for hay and silage with cowpea, millet (*Panicum* spp.) or sorghum (Smith & Huyser, 1987). Soybean was frequently grown with corn (*Zea mays* L.) to increase soil N and to improve the quality of silage. Perennial legumes have now largely replaced soybean for forage production but soybean is still considered a viable alternative forage during periods of decreased productivity of perennial forage species (Hintz et al., 1992; Munoz et al., 1983). Hintz et al. (1992) evaluated management practices for soybean forage such as plant density, row spacing, cultivar, and harvest maturity and found that harvest maturity had the greatest effect on forage yield and quality. The study indicated that soybean could produce forage similar in quality to alfalfa and that management practices typically used for grain production are suitable for forage production. In Korea, cultivar and harvest maturity effects also has been reported (Lee et al., 1995; Shin, 1987) but there is little information on forage yield and quality of soybean grown at different planting date and plant densities. The objective of this study was to evaluate forage yield and quality of soybean in order to determine the optimum plant density at various planting date in Cheju area.

Ⅱ. LITERATURE REVIEW

Although presently grown almost entirely as an oil-seed crop, soybean was previously a popular summer annual forage legume in Cheju Island and USA (Hintz et al., 1992). Soybean was also a popular green manure crop in Cheju region until N fertilizers were readily available and cheap. Sorghum has been recommended for a summer forage crop in the region because of their high productivity. Perennial legumes have now largely replaced soybean for forage production in the USA; however, soybean is still considered a viable alternate forage during periods of decreased productivity of perennial forage species.

There is cultivar difference in soybean forage yields (Hintz et al., 1992; Lee et al., 1995). Lee et al. (1995) reported that 'Togukong' produced the highest forage yield at 80 and 90 days after planting among 10 cultivars evaluated at Chungju in 1989 to 1991. According to Hintz et al. (1992), late maturing cultivars produced greater forage yields but lower quality forage when harvested at the same stage of development. Kang et al. (1998a) also reported that two late maturing cultivars, Baegunkong and Namhaekong, tended to have higher DM yield than a early maturing cultivar, Sobaeknamulkong .

Munoz et al. (1983) evaluated that soybean forage yield at plant densities ranging from 97,000 to 291,300 plants and observed an increase in forage yields with increased plant densities. Hintz et al. (1992) found that increasing planting rate from 280,000 to 890,000 seeds ha^{-1} did not affect soybean forage yield.

Soybean hay yield increases with maturity. Shin (1987) reported that the dry matter yield of a soybean cultivar at Taegu, Korea in 1984 was 2,870, 7,000, 8,930, and 12,440 ㎏ ha^{-1} at bloom, mid-formation of pod development, complete formation of pod development, and just before dough stage, respectively. Lee et al. (1995) found that dry matter yield of 10 cultivars averaged across 3 years ranged from 3,408 to 5,653, 4,679 to 7,048, 6,020 to 10,603 kg ha^{-1} at 70, 80 and 90 days after planting, respectively. Hintz et al. (1992) reported that in Wisconsin, USA, soybean forage yield increased from 2.4 Mg ha^{-1} when harvested at R1 to 7.4 Mg ha^{-1} when harvested at R7. Munoz et al. (1983) also found that the forage yield of soybean markedly increased with maturity and obtained a total dry matter yield of 12.4 Mg ha^{-1} when the pods were filled and leaves were beginning to turn yellow.

Shin (1987) reported that crude protein of soybean forage declined from 19.1 to 13.6 but crude fiber content increased from 23.8 to 30.1% as harvesting delayed from bloom to just before dough stages. Munoz et al. (1983) found that percentage of crude protein of soybean shoots was maximized at R6. According to Hintz et al. (1992), crude protein concentration of soybean forage declined from R1 (20.1%) to R3 (18.1%), remained constant between R3 to R5 (18.2%) but increased R5 to R7 (19.2%). They also reported that NDF, ADF, acid detergent lignin concentrations increased from R1 to R3 and then decreased form R5 to R7.

According to Munoz et al. (1983), digestibility of soybean shoots slightly decreased with increased planting densities and was nearly constant from R1 to R7. The leaves and pods were much more digestible than the stems. Digestibility of stem decreased substantially beginning with pod development, but the increasing amount of highly digestible pods counteracted this effect of stems on shoot digestibility. Hintz and Albrecht (1994) found that harvest maturity had the greatest effect on dry matter partitioning and nutritive value of soybean parts while row spacing, planting rate, and cultivar had little effect. As plant matured, NDF and ADF concentrations increased but CP concentration decreased for leaf and stem components. The pod component showed an opposite trend, with NDF and ADF concentrations decreasing and CP concentration increasing between Stages R5 and R7.

Recently three forage soybean cultivars have been developed in the USA (Devine and Hatley, 1998; Devine et al., 1998a; Devine et al., 1998b). They are exceptionally tall, late maturing soybean with high forage yield potential. 'Derry', 'Donegal', and 'Tyrone' forage soybean cultivars produced an average of 23, 66, and 8% more total dry matter per hectare than the adapted grain-type soybean cultivars, Sherman, DKCX121, and Hutcheson, respectively. Redfearn et al. (1999) evaluated the yield and quality responses of morphological components of tall-statured forage soybean intercropped with forage sorghum compared with monocrop forage soybean. They found that intercropping forage-type soybean with another tall-growing forage does not appear to be practical because of the decrease in dry matter accumulation.

Ⅲ. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field study was conducted in 1998 at the Research Farm of College of Agriculture, Cheju National University (33°27″ 20′ N latitude, 277 m altitude) on a volcanic soil with low nutrient status. Mean soil test values for surface soil (0 to 10 cm) were shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The initial chemical properties of surface soil (0～10 cm) at the experimental site.

pH	O.M.	Av. P_2O_5	Ex. cations ($cmol^{+}$ kg^{-1})				EC
(1:5)	(g kg^{-1})	(mg kg^{-1})	Ca	Mg	K	Na	(mS m^{-1})
4.38	58.1	188	1.97	0.78	0.61	0.16	8.42

A soybean cultivar, 'Baegunkong' was hand planted on 5 June, 20 June and 3 July on 50-cm rows with plant spaces of 13.3, 8.0, 5.7 and 4.4 cm within a row. Three seeds were planted per hill and later thinned to 2 plant per hill to obtain plant densities of 30, 50, 70, 90 plants per ㎡. Fertilizer was applied prior to planting at a rate of 40, 60, and 50 ㎏ ha^{-1} of N, P_2O_5, and K_2O, respectively. Recommended pesticides were used to control weeds, diseases and insects.

Each experimental plots contained four rows with 4 m long (8 m^2 per plot). The experimental design was a split-plot arrangement in a randomized complete block with four blocks. The main-plots consisted of three planting dates, and subplots four plant densities.

Flowering date (R2 stage) was recorded. Lodging was not recorded because considerable lodging was not observed until harvest. At stage R6 (Fehr & Carviness, 1971), plant height and stem diameter of ten representative plants in the center two rows of each plot were measured and forage was hand harvested from 2 m of two center rows (2 m^2) at about 2 cm cutting height. A subsamples was collected for each plot and dried at 80℃ in a forced oven to a constant weight, and then weighed to determine dry matter yield. Dried samples were ground through 1 mm-sieve and were analyzed for NDF and ADF (Goering & Van Soest, 1970) and total N (Leco dry combustion method, Reco Corp., 1998), which was reported as CP (N × 6.25). Total digestible nutrient content was calculated according to the equation given by Lee et al. (1997). Analysis of variance was performed with SAS General Linear Models procedure and planting date means were separated according to least significant difference (LSD) and trend comparisons were used for plant density.

Air temperature and precipitation were obtained from the Cheju Agricultural Experiment Station (4.1 km from the experimental site) and shown in Table 2. Comparing the 11 year mean (1987-1997), mean air temperatures of 1998 growing season were slightly cooler in early June and late August, and warmer in early July and early to mid-August. Plants somewhat were exposed to drought from August to September.

Table 2. Ten day average of normal mean air temperature and precipitation, and departures from normal from 1998 growing season at Cheju.

Month	Ten days	Mean air temperature (℃)		Precipitation (㎜)	
		Normal†	Departure‡	Normal	Departure
June	Early	19.6	−1.7	28.6	+6.7
	Middle	20.9	−0.7	77.0	−8.8
	Late	22.1	+0.7	87.1	+23.2
July	Early	23.7	+3.3	76.0	−65.8
	Middle	26.0	+0.2	36.0	−18.2
	Late	26.3	−4.0	62.4	+54.3
Aug.	Early	26.7	+1.4	60.3	−8.8
	Middle	25.7	+1.7	98.1	−96.4
	Late	24.8	−3.5	82.8	−15.6
Sept.	Early	24.0	−1.3	56.0	−56.0
	Middle	21.9	+0.5	27.1	+69.5
	Late	20.2	+0.6	65.8	+193.6

† 11-year (1987-1997) mean.

‡ Departure from normal.

Ⅳ. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Days to flowering, Plant height and Stem diameter

Because the number of days from planting to flowering was not affected by plant density, only planting date effect on this trait was shown in Table 3. Days to flowering decreased from about 47 to 38 days as planting was delayed from 5 June to 3 July probably due to higher temperatures for the latter plantings.

Table 3. Effect of planting date on flowering (50% of plants) and harvest dates of soybean grown as forage in 1998.

Planting date	Flowering date	Harvest date
5 June	22 July (47)	2 Sept. (89)
20 June	30 July (40)	9 Sept. (81)
3 July	10 Aug. (38)	23 Sept. (82)

† Numbers in parenthesis are days after planting

Mean square values and significance of analysis of variance for the traits measured as affected by planting date and plant density are shown in Table 4. Planting date × plant density interaction was not significant even at 10% level except for main stem diameter. Therefore, only the main effects of the treatments on the traits are shown in Table 5 and 6. Regression equations relating plant density to various traits that showed significant trend were presented in Table 7. Planting date significantly affected plant height and main stem diameter at 5% probability level and CP yield and CP content at 10% probability level. Plant density significantly affected plant height, main stem diameter, and forage quality except CP content. There was a significant quadratic trend between plant density and DM yield ($p<0.05$) and TDN yield ($p<0.10$).

Table 4. Mean square values and significance of analysis of variance for agronomic characteristics of soybean forage as affected by planting date and four plant density in 1998.

Source of variation	df	Plant height	Stem diameter	DM† yield	CP yield	TDN yield	CP content	NDF content	ADF content	TDN content
				······×1000‡······						
Block	3	50.97^{NS}	1.31^{NS}	9193$^{(*)}$	473.1$^{(*)}$	3607^{NS}	8.07^{NS}	0.91^{NS}	1.80^{NS}	1.12^{NS}
Planting date (P)	2	436.31*	7.10**	2937^{NS}	487.0$^{(*)}$	1331^{NS}	63.04$^{(*)}$	1.96^{NS}	4.01^{NS}	2.51^{NS}
Error a	6	43.32	0.53	2543	125.6	1153	14.10	2.61	4.91	3.07
Plant density (D)	3	670.40***	6.32***	1338^{NS}	4.5^{NS}	445^{NS}	6.53^{NS}	4.26*	7.63**	4.76**
Linear	1	1886.46***	17.97***	224^{NS}	8.4^{NS}	8^{NS}	7.83^{NS}	2.28^{NS}	19.34***	12.07***
Quadratic	1	118.44*	0.85*	3261*	5.1^{NS}	1126$^{(*)}$	8.38^{NS}	0.00^{NS}	3.53$^{(*)}$	2.21$^{(*)}$
Cubic	1	5.83^{NS}	0.18^{NS}	528^{NS}	0.1^{NS}	202^{NS}	3.38^{NS}	10.50**	0.00^{NS}	0.00^{NS}
P×D	6	4.75^{NS}	0.30*	109^{NS}	2.2^{NS}	37^{NS}	1.23^{NS}	1.41^{NS}	0.21^{NS}	0.13^{NS}
Error b	27	16.24	0.09	777	35.0	290	3.00	1.18	1.16	0.72

$^{(*)}$, *, **, *** Significant at 10, 5, 1 and 0.1% probability levels, respectively; NS Not significant.

† DM, dry matter; CP, crude protein; TDN, total digestible nutrient; NDF, neutral detergent fiber; ADF, acid detergent fiber.

‡ To obtain the actual mean squares, the reported values must be multiplied by the factor.

As planting was delayed from 5 June to 3 July, mean plant height decreased from 61 to 51 cm and main stem diameter from 6.31 to 5.00 cm when averaged across four plant densities. As plant density was increased from 30 to 90 plants m^{-2}, mean plant height across three planting dates quadratically increased from 45 to 62 cm and the stem diameter linearly decreased for 5 June planting but quadratically for 20 June and 7 July plantings, causing the significant planting date × plant density interaction for the stem diameter. Kang et al. (1998b) also reported that both the plant height stem diameter of two soybean cultivars tended to decrease as planting was delay from 8 June to 8 July, in 1996 at Cheju. According to Johnson (1987), soybean plants are generally taller when planted between mid-May and early June and decrease with either very early or late plantings. Parker et al. (1981) also reported that plant height increased with succeeding planting until early June and then decreased with a further delayed planting. Plant height of soybean usually increases but the stem diameter decreases with increasing plant density (Kang et al., 1998b; Kim et al., 1993).

Table 5. Plant height, stem diameter, and yield of dry matter (DM), crude protein (CP) and total digestible nutrition (TDN) of soybean forage as affected by planting date and plant density in 1998.

Treatment	Plant height	Stem diameter	DM yield	CP yield	TDN yield
	㎝	㎜	....	kg ha^{-1}	....
Planting date					
5 June	61.3	6.31	6008	848	3740
20 June	53.3	5.60	6857	1153	4315
3 July	51.5	5.00	6332	1146	3991
LSD(5%)	5.7	0.63	NS	NS	NS
Plant density, plants m^{-2}					
30	45.2	6.61	6093	1057	3879
50	54.6	5.69	6488	1063	4058
70	59.3	5.30	6831	1056	4261
90	62.4	4.91	6183	1020	3850
Response†	Q‡	Q	Q	NS	Q

† Regression equations relating plant density are presented in Table 7.

‡ Q, quadratic; NS, not significant at 10% probability level.

Table 6. Forage quality of soybean forage as affected by planting date and plant density in 1998.

Treatment	CP†	NDF	ADF	TDN
	....	.... %	....	....
Planting date				
5 June	14.2	59.8	33.7	62.3
20 June	16.7	60.2	32.8	63.0
3 July	18.1	60.5	32.8	63.0
LSD(5%)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Plant density, plants m^{-2}				
30	17.2	60.1	32.0	63.6
50	16.4	59.4	33.1	62.5
70	16.3	60.9	33.7	62.3
90	15.4	60.3	33.7	62.3
Response‡	NS§	C	Q	Q

† CP, crude protein; TDN, total digestible nutrient; NDF, neutral detergent fiber; ADF, acid detergent fiber.

‡ Regression equations relating plant density are presented in Table 7.

§ Q, quadratic; C, cubic; NS, not significant at 10% probability level.

Table 7. Regression equations with coefficients of determination relating plant density and various traits and the calculated optimum plant density (plants m^{-2}) for DM and TDN yields.

Variable	Regression equation	r^2 or R^2	Opti. plant density
Plant hight	$Y = 26.37 + 0.751X - 0.0039X^2$	0.997	
Stem diameter			
5 June planting	$Y = 8.15 - 0.0305X$	1.000	
20 June planting	$Y = 9.56 - 0.111X + 0.00066X^2$	0.954	
3 July planting	$Y = 7.56 - 0.074X + 0.00045X^2$	0.999	
DM† yield	$Y = 4195.2 + 81.25X - 0.6516X^2$	0.868	62
TDN yield	$Y = 2794.0 + 46.52X - 0.3829X^2$	0.849	61
NDF content	$Y = 74.1-0.861X+0.016X^2-0.0000871X^3$	1.000	
ADF content	$Y = 29.29 + 0.11X - 0.00068X^2$	1.000	
TDN content	$Y = 65.75 - 0.087X + 0.00054X^2$	1.000	

† DM, dry matter; TDN, total digestible nutrient; NDF, neutral detergent fiber; ADF, acid detergent fiber.

2. DM, CP, and TDN yields

Although 20 June and 3 July plantings produced 849 and 324 kg ha^{-1} more DM than 5 June planting when averaged across four plant densities, the DM yield differences between plant dates were not statistically significant at 10% probability level because of the larger error mean square value (Tables 4 and 5). The DM yield exhibited a significant quadratic response to plant density, with maximum DM yield (6,728 kg ha^{-1}) at 62 plants ha^{-1} (Table 7). Crude protein yield for 20 June and 3 July plantings tended to be greater (significant at 10% probability level) comparing with 5 June planting because of greater DM yield and higher CP content for the later plantings but was not influenced by plant density. Total digestible nutrient yield was not affected by planting date but quadratically increased with increasing planting density, with maximum TDN yield (4,207 kg ha^{-1}) at 61 plants ha^{-1} (Table 7). Kang et al. (1998) observed greater soybean seed yield for 23 June planting than for 8 June and 8 July plantings at Cheju and also reported that soybean seed yield increased up to 53 plants m^{-2}. Kang (1971) reported that the soybean seed yield of Hill and a Korean local cultivar was greater for 10 and 25 June plantings than for 10 and 25 May, and 10 July plantings. Hintz et al. (1992) reported that the higher planting rate (740, 000 plants ha^{-1}) produced 0.1 Mg ha^{-1} more soybean forage than lower planting rate (247, 000 plants ha^{-1}) averaged over all main effects (two row spacings, three cultivars and four harvest stages).

3. Forage quality

Planting date did not significantly influence CP, NDF, ADF, and TDN contents. However, mean CP content across four plant densities tended to increase with delayed plantings (significant at 10% probability level, Tables 5 and 6). The CP content was not significantly influenced by plant density. The relationship between plant density and NDF content was cubic, but the magnitude of the difference is small and of little practical importance. Increasing plant density slightly increased ADF content but slightly decreased TDN content. Hintz et al. (1992) also found that the soybean forage produced under the higher planting rate was slightly lower in CP and higher in NDF and ADF concentrations than that produced under the lower planting rate.

In conclusion, the optimum planting date seems to be mid-June for both soybean seed and forage productions in Cheju area. Our data also indicates forage yield of grain-type soybean grown as double crop on the volcanic soils with low nutrient status is like to be more stable at about 60 plants m^{-2} regardless of planting date.

Ⅴ. 適 要

濟州 地域에 適應하는 種實用 콩 品種을 靑刈用으로 栽培할 경우 適定 栽植密度를 究明하기 위하여 백운콩을 6月 5日, 6月 20日, 7月 3日에 播種하여 m^2當 30, 50, 70, 90 本이 되도록 솎아 管理하다가 粒肥大盛期(R6)에 收穫하여 乾物 收量, 品質 등을 조사한 結果를 要約하면 다음과 같다.

播種이 遲延됨에 따라 開花 日數는 47日에서 38日로 短縮되었고 莖長은 61cm에서 51cm로, 莖直徑은 6.31mm에서 5.00mm로 줄어들었다. 莖長은 栽植密度가 增加함에 따라 2次曲線的으로 45cm에서 62cm로 增加되었다. 播種期는 乾物 收量, 粗蛋白質 收量, 可消化養分(TDN) 收量에 影響을 주지 않았다. 栽植密度와 乾物 收量 및 TDN 收量과의 關係는 2次曲線的이었으며 乾物 收量 및 TDN 收量을 위한 適定 栽植密度는 播種期와는 相關없이 m^2當 60 本으로 算出되었다. 粗蛋白質 收量은 栽植密度에 影響을 받지 않았다. 栽植密度가 增加됨에 따라 ADF 含量은 약간 增加되었으나 TDN 含量은 약간 減少되었다.

REFERENCES

Bagayoko, M., S. C. Mason, and R. J. Sabata. 1992. Effects of previous cropping systems on soil nitrogen and grain sorghum yield. Agron. J. 84:862-868.

Devine, T. E. and E. O. Hatley. 1998. Registration of 'Donegal' forage soybean. Crop Sci. 38:1719-1720.

Devine, T. E., E. O. Hatley, and D. E. Starner. 1998. Registration of 'Derry' forage soybean. Crop Sci. 38:1719.

Devine, T. E., E. O. Hatley, and D. E. Starner. 1998. Registration of 'Tyrone' forage soybean. Crop Sci. 38:1720.

Fehr, W. R. Fehe, C. E. Caviness, D. T. Burmood, and J. S. Pennington. 1971. Stage of development descriptions for soybeans, *Glycine max* (L.) Merrill. Crop Sci. 11:929-931.

Goering, H. K. and P. J. Van Soest. 1970. Forage fiber analyses. Agric. Handb. 379, U. S. Gov. Print. Office, Washington DC.

Hintz, R. W. and K. A. Albrecht. 1994. Dry matter partitioning and forage nutritive value of soybean plant components. Agron. J. 86:59-62.

Hintz, R. W., K. A. Albrecht, and E. S. Oplinger. 1992. Yield and quality of soybean forage as affected by cultivar and management practices. Agron. J. 84:795-798.

Johnson, R. R. 1987. Crop management. p. 355-390. In J. R. Wilcox (ed.) Soybeans: Improvement, production and uses. 2nd ed. Agron. Monogr. 16. ASA, CSSA, and SSSA, Madison, WI.

Kang, C. S. 1971. Experiment on planting date and plant density for recommending soybean cultivars. Cheju Provincial Rural Development Administration Annual Research Report for 1970. p. 59-62.

Kang, Y. K., N. K. Cho, W. B. Yook, and M. S. Kang. 1998a. Forage yield and quality of summer grain legumes and forage grasses in the Cheju Island. Korean J. Crop Sci. 43(4):245-249.

Kang, Y. K., M. R. Ko, N. K. Cho, and Y. M. Park. 1998b. Effect of planting date and planting density on growth and yield of soybean in Cheju Island. Korean J. Crop Sci. 43(1):44-48.

Kim, H. S., E. H. Hong, S. I. Park, and Y. K. Park. 1993. Responses of growth and yield characters on planting density in determinate and indeterminate soybeans. Korean J. Crop Sci. 38(2):189-195.

Lee, J. S., I. H. Jo, and J. H. Ahn. 1997. Harvest management and nitrogen fertilization level to maximize nutrient yield of reed Canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea* L.) in uncultivated rice paddy. Korean J. Grassl. Sci. 17(2):123-134.

Lee, S. K. 1989. Studies on Corn-Legume intercropping system. Ⅳ. Effects of Corn-soybean intercropping on chemical composition and TDN yield. Korean J. Grassl. Sci. 9(2):113-118.

Lee, S. M., J. Y. Koo, and B. T. Jeon. 1995. The effect of cultivation period on growth characteristics, palatability and forage yield of soybean cultivars. Korean J. Grassl. Sci. 15(2):132-139.

Munoz, A. E., E. C. Holt, and R. W. Weaver. 1983. Yield and quality of soybean hay as influenced by stage of growth and plant density. Agron. J. 75:147-148.

Parker, M. B., W. H. Marchant, and B. J. Mullinix Jr. 1981. Date of planting and row spacing effects on four soybean cultivars. Agron. J. 73:759-762.

Reco Corp. 1998. FP-528 protein/nitrogen analyzer instruction manual. Reco Corp., St. Joseph, MI.

Redfearn, D. D., D. R. Buxton, and T. E. Devine. 1999. Sorghum intercropping effects on Yield, Morphology, and Quality of forage soybean. Crop Sci. 39:1380-1384.

Shin, C. N. 1987. Effect of various growth stages on the dry matter yield and nutritive value of soybean. Korean J. Anim. Sci. 29(5):235-239.

Smith, K. J. and W. Huyser. 1987. World distribution and significance of soybean. p. 1-22. In J. R. Wilcox (ed.) Soybeans: Improvement, production and uses. 2nd ed. Agron. Monogr. 16. ASA, CSSA, and SSSA, Madison, WI.

ADKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to deeply thank to you for your unceasing guidance and profound advice in conducting this research.

I wish to express my most sincere appreciation to Dr. Young-Kil Kang, my major professor, for his teaching throughout the course of my graduate studies.

And I don't forget to Dr. Kang for his diligence and constant researchful images in everything.

I wish to express my thanks to Dr. Nam-Ki Cho and Dr. Young-Woo Ko for their judgement on my thesis.

I wish to also like to deeply thank to Dr. Yang-Mun Park, Dr. Oh-Kyoon Kwon, Dr. Hyun-Do Oh and Dr. Hal-Lim Kim for their helpful advice and encouragement.

I wish to thank to Dr. Chang-Kil Song who showed his forgiveness and mercy on me.

I wish to return my thanks to senior · junior, associates of the graduate course of Agriculture and junior · Kwang-Ho Kim.