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Law of Interspersion Roadmap

• 1933 – *Law of Interspersion* described by Aldo Leopold in *Game Management*

• 1961 – *Edge Types and Abundance of Bobwhites in Southern Illinois* – Hanson and Miller

• 1972 – *The Interspersion Index as a Technique for Evaluation of Bobwhite Quail Habitat* – Baxter and Wolf

• 1992 – *On Leopold’s Principle of Edge* – Guthery and Bingham

• 1997 – *A Philosophy of Habitat Management for Northern Bobwhite* – Guthery
What did Leopold Actually Write?

• “The maximum population of any given piece of land depends, therefore, not only on its environmental types or composition but also on the **interspersion of these types** in relation to the cruising
What did Leopold Actually Write?

• “Composition and interspersion are thus the two principle determinants of potential abundance of game range.”
What did Leopold Actually Write?

“Abundance of non-mobile wild life requiring two or more types, appears, in short, to depend on the degree of interspersion of those types, because this determines the length of the edges of those types, and thus in turn their vegetative richness and simultaneous availability.”
What did Leopold Actually Write?

• ...as the law of dispersion: “The potential density of game of low radius requiring two or more habitat types is, within ordinary limits, proportional to the sum of the type peripheries.”
What Leopold Meant

• We can deduce a more modern definition of what Leopold meant by interspersion: the spatial intermixing of different patch types (McGarigal and Marks 1995)
What Leopold Did Not Write

• “Principle of Edge” – not used by Leopold
  – Leopold wrote “Game as an edge effect”

• “Principle of Edge” coined by Guthery and Bingham (1992)
Guthery’s Characterization

• “Principle of Edge”
  – High contrast edge
    • “..created by openings in mature woody plant communities.”
    • “Bobwhite abundance should be related positively and linearly to the density of woody edge if Leopold’s law of dispersion holds.”
  – Redundant edge = “within ordinary limits”
Guthery’s Characterization

• Based on....
  – Hanson and Miller 1961
  – Guthery and Bingham 1992
  – “Hanson and Miller (1961) observed this situation in Illinois, where creation of additional edge had no effect on northern bobwhite density.”

---

Hanson and Miller (1961) observed this situation in Illinois, where creation of additional edge had no effect on northern bobwhite density.
Guthery’s Characterization

Based on:

- Hanson and Miller 1961
  - “The amount of each kind of edge differed considerably on the two tracts.”
  - “Field work ended before the shrubs grew to optimum size.”
  - “The total of all kinds of edge could not be highly correlated with the number of bobwhites because the attractive edge types were in the minority.”
  - “When the data for edge between cultivated fields and sparsely brushy pastures and moderately brushy pastures were pooled, they were significantly correlated with the number of coveys present in the fall (r = 0.974)”
  - “The present research indicates that bobwhites require more than one hedge of multiflora rose and receive little value from isolated plantings containing a single row of plants.”
  - “Shrub plantings were made, but bobwhite populations did not increase, partly because the shrubs were planted in narrow strips, mainly near cultivated fields.”
Guthery’s Characterization

• Based on:
  – Baxter and Wolfe 1972
  • Guthery 1997
    – “On 3 areas in Nebraska, there was a weak association between edge density and bobwhite abundance (Baxter and Wolfe 1972).”
Guthery’s Characterization

• Based on:
  – Baxter and Wolfe 1972

Table 3. Comparisons of preseason inventories of bobwhite quail (4-year average number of calls per stop) and interspersion indices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Cass</th>
<th>Otoe</th>
<th>Pawnee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of calls per stop (1964-1967)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interspersion index</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guthery’s Characterization

Fig. 9

Interspersion of Types - Relation to Mobility & Density of Quail

A: Poor Interspersion (1 Covey)
B: Good Interspersion (6 Coveys)

Fig. 1. Graphic portrayal of the principle of edge as originally developed by Leopold (1933:132) and as modified.
Guthery’s Characterization

• Biologically Redundant Edge
  – Assumption regarding where a landscape falls on this curve?
  – Risk in assuming a landscape is already at a point of redundancy
Misconceptions

• “Linear mileage of type edges available in any block of range, is, as a matter of geometry, proportional to the degree of interspersion.”
  – ‘proportional to’...not equal to!
Misconceptions

• Leopold was referring to ‘high contrast’ edge
• Leopold was referring to just two ‘types’
Misconceptions

• Edge density and Interspersion are synonymous
Misconceptions

• Edge density and Interspersion are synonymous
  – Edge density is the amount of border between two patches
  • but for a given edge density there could be 2 or multiple patches in a variety of configurations (i.e., clustered or dispersed)
  – Edge density can increase without increasing interspersion
Misconceptions

- Edge density and Interspersion are synonymous
Misconceptions

• “...Leopold did not simplify this relationship into an assertion that more edge equals more game.”

Results from Mississippi and Texas

Distribution of CP-33 Monitoring Survey Points
Results from Mississippi and Texas

• Utilized a multiple-season occupancy modeling approach
• Following Dail and Madsen 2011:
  – Open population assumed
    • Temporary immigration/emigration
  – Allows for imperfect detection
  – Pollock’s Robust Design..
Results from Mississippi

Distribution of CP-33 Monitoring Survey Points

[Graph and map images]
Results from Texas

Distribution of CP-33 Monitoring Survey Points
Results from Mississippi and Texas Combined

![Graphs showing the relationship between edge density and expected superpopulation size. The left graph illustrates an upward trend with increasing edge density, while the right graph depicts a more complex relationship with a peak and trough.](image-url)
Results from Texas and Mississippi

• Different landscapes
• Differences in edge detectability and biological significance
Musings

• The Law of Interspersion is NOT the Principle of Edge
  – We contend that
    • Leopold was referring to interspersion
    • BUT, lacked the understanding of the potential disparity between the two terms
    • The field of Landscape Ecology had not yet been developed

• The Law of Interspersion and the Principle of Edge are two different ecological constructs
Musings

• Guthery and Bingham’s articulate argument has limited the application of the Law of Interspersion in the field of wildlife ecology.

• The time has come to reevaluate both Leopold’s central premise and Guthery and Bingham’s reformulation of the law of interspersion and the principle of edge.
Future Directions

• Guthery et al. 2001
  – “The law can be resurrected only if other scientists can demonstrate that the counter instances observed, both theoretical and empirical are invalid.”
Future Directions

  – “In short, edges are not created equal, and, hence their edge effects for wildlife should not be expected to be equal.”
Future Directions

• More theoretically supported research
  – Well designed
  – Manipulative
  – Long term
  – Examine the Edge Interface
    • Row crop-Grass Edge vs. Row crop-Hardwood Edge
  – Examining Edge and Interspersion separately when appropriate
Acknowledgments