

**Community-level Convergence
and Community Structure of
temperate *Nothofagus* forests**

Benjamin Smith

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
at the University of Otago,
Dunedin, New Zealand

March 1996

Abstract

Assembly rules represent the integrated action of species interactions leading to non-random patterns in the distributions of species niches in the combined niche space for a community or guild, i.e. to community structure. The most likely effect of assembly rules would be to limit the degree of overlap between niches that is possible.

In the present study, assembly rules were sought by looking for two types of non-random pattern that might be expected: convergence between disjunct communities in similar environments, and character overdispersion among the species within a community or guild. Convergence was sought both in species richness and in texture – assemblage-wide spectra of species functional characters. These patterns were sought within tall, evergreen temperate rainforest dominated by *Nothofagus* species.

Species occurrence, abundance and texture data were obtained for vascular plant species occurring at 17 environmentally-matched study sites in Tasmania (3 sites), mainland Australia (2 sites), New Zealand (8 sites) and South America (Chile and Argentina, 4 sites). Texture was evaluated in terms of 13 species characters, primarily concerning the structure and function of photosynthetic units (PSUs, i.e. leaves or their functional equivalents in certain species). All questions were addressed at local, regional and landmass scales. Texture convergence and character overdispersion were sought both within whole communities and within guilds, each comprising the species present within a vertical stratum.

Evidence for possible species richness convergence was sought using a bootstrap-based method to test the null hypothesis that communities were no more dissimilar in species richness than expected on a random basis. There were cases at all scales where the null hypothesis could not be rejected, providing preliminary evidence for assembly rules.

Evidence for texture convergence was sought by comparing the observed variation in texture between communities to the variation expected under a null model in which species characters could assort randomly among communities. In separate tests, texture was expressed as the community mean, distribution or mean-adjusted distribution (in which texture distributions from different communities were adjusted arithmetically to a common overall mean). Little convergence of texture means or distributions was detected. However, when the effects of environmental differences between sites were minimised by comparing mean-adjusted distributions, convergence was detected at all spatial scales, both within and among landmasses. This provides strong evidence for similar assembly rules in the convergent communities.

Character overdispersion was sought by comparing the variance of the spacing of species values along character axes to the variance expected under a null model drawing characters at random from a kernel density distribution. Significantly low observed variances, representing

overdispersion, were detected for a number of texture variates at all scales. There were also trends, non-significant in individual tests, but significant among communities according to binomial tests, in several variates. This provides strong evidence for the operation of assembly rules.

Both convergence and overdispersion were most pronounced in the characters PSU area, succulence, specific weight, phosphorus content, total chlorophyll content and chlorophyll *a/b* ratio. Each of these characters would be expected to be associated with the light regime. This suggests that an important mechanism underlying the assembly rules observed may be competitive niche differentiation leading to partitioning of the vertical light gradient among species.

Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks are due to my supervisors, Assoc. Prof. Bastow Wilson and Dr. Bill Lee, both of whom inspired me with their enthusiasm, pragmatism and unfailing readiness (and ability) to provide help and good advice. Dr. Anni Watkins consented to represent my interests whilst Dr. Wilson was absent on sabbatical, and I am grateful for her support and for the office.

For supporting the overseas and North Island components of this research both logistically and financially I am indebted to Assoc. Prof. Bob Hill and staff of the Departments of Plant Science and Agricultural Science, University of Tasmania; Dr. Ian Noble and staff of the Research School of Biological Sciences and the Department of Forestry, Australian National University; Dr. Gill Rapson and staff of the Ecology Department, Massey University; Dr. Gonzalo Paredes and staff of the Instituto de Manejo Forestal, Universidad Austral de Chile; Prof. Claudio Donoso, Dr. Antonio Lara and Dr. Renato Grez of the Instituto de Silvicultura, Universidad Austral de Chile; Dr. Chris Lusk of the Departamento de Ciencias Biológicas, Universidad de Talca; and Dr. Luis Sancholuz, Dr. E.H. Rapoport and staff of the Centro Regional Universitario Bariloche, Universidad Nacional del Comahue.

I thank the Hutton Fund Grants Committee, Royal Society of New Zealand and the J.S. Tennant Fund for generously contributing to the funding of this project. Significant financial assistance was also provided by Ecosystem Dynamics Group, RSBS, Australian National University (Dr. I.R. Noble); and by the Department of Plant Science, University of Tasmania (Assoc. Prof. R.S. Hill).

I thank the following organisations who consented to my sampling on land under their jurisdiction: Forestry Commission Tasmania; Tasmanian Department of Parks, Wildlife and Heritage; State Forests of New South Wales; National Parks and Wildlife Service of New South Wales; New Zealand Department of Conservation; Corporación Nacional Forestal, Chile; and Administración de Parques Nacionales, Argentina.

The Department of Conservation (Colin O'Donnell) and Landcare Research New Zealand (Dr. David Hollinger and Dr. Glenn Stewart) kindly allowed me to make use of their field accommodation facilities.

Forestry Commission Tasmania (Dr. M.J. Brown), Prof. Henry Nix (Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies, Australian National University) and Dr. Neil Mitchell, University of Auckland, supplied the BIOCLIM climate estimates, for which I am most grateful.

For capable and enthusiastic assistance in the field I thank Beatrice Lee, Kathleen Potter and Andrea Wallace.

For extended hospitality and good company I am sincerely grateful to Dr. Mike Ayress, Dr. Oscar and Hosly Garcia and Dr. Gill Rapson.

Staff and fellow students of the Botany Department contributed to my work in many ways, and I would like particularly to thank Prof. Peter Bannister, Prof. Alan Mark, Ute Drobner, Trish Fleming, Philip Grove, Richard Gypfel, Neil Harris, Warren King, Jan Littleton, Shaun O'Brien, Ken Phipps, Liz Rodriguez, Dr. Stephen Roxburgh, and John Steel.

Many individuals provided advice, logistic support or helped in ways that made my work easier or more enjoyable. I am especially grateful to those, not all of whom I am able to list below, who indulged me with their hospitality and good company when I was far from home. In this category I would like to thank Larry Burrows; Alejandro Dezzotti; Dr. Katherine Dickinson; Dr. Pablo Donoso, Patricio and staff of Instituto Forestal, Valdivia; Phil Dunne; Caroline Fenton; Maria Eugenia Fenton; Dr. Habiba Gitay; Dr. David Hollinger; Dr. Geoff Hope; Dr. Greg Jordan; staff of the Laboratorio de Nutrición y Suelos Forestales, Universidad Austral de Chile; Lucy, Patricia and Francis of the Departamento de Química, Universidad Nacional del Comahue; Alan and Joyce Mayley; Monica Mermoz and Juan Salgurero of Delegación Técnica Regional Patagonica, Administración de Parques Nacionales; John Nicholls; Dr. John Ogden; staff of the Ohakune Mountain View Motel; Carlos Poveda and Nicolas, Guardaparques of Parque Nacional Puyehue; Dr. Javier Puntieri; Prof. Carlos Ramirez; Andrea Relva; Jane Sedgeley; Ricardo Serrano; Dr. Mark Smale; Dr. Glenn Stewart; Martin Stolle, Dr. Jill Packham and staff of the Smithton District Office of Forestry Commission Tasmania; Dr. Peter Wardle; Raleigh Wells; John Williams of the Botany Department, University of New England; and Prof. Ian Woodward.

Finally, I thank my fellow musos in the Pioneer Pog 'n' Scroggin Bush Band, because they insisted.

Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter 1. General introduction	1
1.1 Community texture	1
1.2 Functional groups and guilds	2
1.3 Relation between guilds and texture	4
1.4 Community structure	5
1.5 Community-level convergence	10
1.6 <i>Nothofagus</i> -dominated forests	20
1.7 Null models for hypothesis-testing in community ecology	22
1.8 Aims and approach of this study	24
 Chapter 2. Methodology for data collection	 29
2.1 Introduction	29
2.2 Rationale	29
2.2.1 Site criteria	29
2.2.2 Sampling data	30
2.2.3 Study site design	38
2.2.4 Seasonality considerations	39
2.3 Methods	40
2.3.1 Selection of sites	40
2.3.2 Field sampling	40
2.3.3 Climate parameters	44
2.3.4 Laboratory measurement	44
2.3.5 Calculation of texture variates	49
2.3.6 Nomenclature	53
2.3.7 Analyses	53
 Chapter 3. Study sites and their environments	 54
3.1 Introduction	54
3.2 Site descriptions	54
3.3 Comparison of site environments	67

Chapter 4.	Interrelationships and vertical trends for species characters	79
4.1	Introduction	79
4.2	Methods	80
4.3	Results	81
4.4	Discussion	83
 Chapter 5.	 Convergence and divergence in species richness among <i>Nothofagus</i>-dominated communities	 88
5.1	Introduction	88
5.2	Methods	89
5.3	Results	93
5.4	Discussion	96
 Chapter 6.	 Convergence among <i>Nothofagus</i>-dominated communities: community texture means	 103
6.1	Introduction	103
6.2	Methods	104
6.4	Results	116
6.5	Discussion	140
 Chapter 7.	 Convergence among <i>Nothofagus</i>-dominated communities: community texture distributions	 149
7.1	Introduction	149
7.2	Methods	152
7.3	Results	154
7.4	Discussion	184
 Chapter 8.	 Convergence among <i>Nothofagus</i>-dominated communities: mean-adjusted texture distributions	 187
8.1	Introduction	187
8.2	Methods	190
8.3	Results	194
8.4	Discussion	221

Chapter 9.	Convergence among <i>Nothofagus</i>-dominated communities: derived texture factors	226
9.1	Introduction	226
9.2	Methods	228
9.3	Results	229
9.4	Discussion	241
Chapter 10.	Convergence among <i>Nothofagus</i>-dominated communities: focusing on height guilds	247
10.1	Introduction	247
10.2	Methods	248
10.3	Results	250
10.4	Discussion	283
Chapter 11.	Character overdispersion as evidence for assembly rules in <i>Nothofagus</i>-dominated communities	288
11.1	Introduction	288
11.2	Methods	289
11.3	Results	296
11.4	Discussion	328
Chapter 12.	General discussion	337
12.1	Introduction	337
12.2	The null model approach	337
12.3	Species richness convergence	340
12.4	Texture convergence	342
12.5	Character overdispersion	354
12.6	Integration of results	357
References		362
Appendix A	Species character data	389
Appendix B	Smith, B., Moore, S.H., Grove, P.B., Harris, N.S., Mann, S. & Wilson, J.B. 1994. Vegetation texture as an approach to community structure: community-level convergence in a New Zealand temperate rainforest. <i>New Zealand Journal of Ecology</i> 18: 41-50.	
Appendix C	Smith, B., Mark, A.F. & Wilson, J.B. 1995. A functional analysis of New Zealand alpine vegetation: variation in canopy roughness and functional diversity in response to an experimental wind barrier. <i>Functional Ecology</i> 9: 904-912.	