

**THE ROLE OF INSECT LEAF HERBIVORY
ON THE MANGROVES *AVICENNIA MARINA*
AND *RHIZOPHORA STYLOSA***

Thesis submitted by

Damien Wayne BURROWS

2003

**for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Zoology and Tropical Ecology
within the School of Tropical Biology,
James Cook University**

ELECTRONIC COPY

I, the undersigned, the author of this work, declare that the electronic copy of this thesis provided to the James Cook University Library, is an accurate copy of the print thesis submitted, within the limits of the technology available.

Signature

Date

STATEMENT OF ACCESS

I, the undersigned, the author of this thesis, understand that James Cook University will make it available for use within the University Library and, by microfilm or other means, allow access to users in other approved libraries. All users consulting this thesis will have to sign the following statement:

In consulting this thesis I agree not to copy or closely paraphrase it in whole or in part without the written consent of the author; and to make proper public written acknowledgment for any assistance which I have obtained from it.

Beyond this, I do not wish to place any restriction on access to this thesis.

.....
Damien Wayne Burrows

.....

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines insect leaf herbivory and the insect herbivore community on two common mangrove species – *Avicennia marina* and *Rhizophora stylosa*, at two sites near Townsville, northern Queensland. Despite its widely recognised importance in other forested ecosystems, the role of insect herbivory in mangrove ecosystems is often downplayed and remains relatively unexplored. It is generally considered that mangroves lack a diverse and specialised insect herbivore fauna, and are populated with insects from adjoining habitats. It is also commonly believed that mangrove leaves are less palatable and nutritious than leaves of other tree species, and that herbivory levels are less than those found in other forest ecosystems.

Sixty-one insect species were confirmed feeding upon *A. marina* and *R. stylosa* at the study sites, more than doubling the number of published host records for Australian mangroves. Herbivore diversity on the two mangrove species was similar, but only four of the 61 herbivore species were in common between them and the composition of the two faunas was substantially different. The two faunas show a high degree of host-specificity and adaptation to their mangrove hosts and there were substantial similarities between the faunas found in this study and those of other *Avicennia* and *Rhizophora* species elsewhere in the world. The diversity of folivores on these two mangrove species was similar to that of other nearby non-mangrove trees and to that reported for other trees elsewhere in the tropics.

Nearly all mangrove herbivory studies have measured damage on discrete leaf samples collected at one point in time. This approach fails to detect entirely consumed leaves, or partly damaged leaves that have been abscised. These leaves can be accounted for by an alternative long-term method that makes repeated herbivory estimates on tagged leaves. Application of the long-term method in this study found herbivory to be 3-6 times higher than estimated by discrete measurements. *R. stylosa* had only 2-3% loss of leaf area in discrete samples but 7-13% loss in the long-term study. *A. marina* had 6-7% loss of leaf area in discrete samples but 28-36% loss in the long-term study. For both species, most herbivory occurred whilst the leaves were young. Once past the juvenile phase, *R. stylosa* leaves were rarely attacked. In contrast, mature *A. marina* leaves suffered significant insect damage and leaf loss. Herbivory reduced average leaf longevity of all leaves by 4-5% for *R. stylosa* and 12-13% for *A. marina*.

In mangroves, loss of entire leaves is reported to be rare, but in *R. stylosa* and *A. marina* in this study, 4-5% and 19-29% of leaves, respectively, were either entirely consumed, or aborted due to insect damage. For both species, loss of leaf material through premature abscission of damaged leaves was as great as that actually consumed by insects, indicating a role for herbivory in promoting leaf fall.

Destruction of developing leaf buds by insects resulted in greater leaf losses than that suffered by emerged leaves. This was especially important for *R. stylosa*, which can only produce leaves from the apical bud. Damage to *R. stylosa* apical buds was common, frequently resulting in the loss of leaves before they emerged or, where damage resulted in the destruction of the apical bud, cessation of leaf production and death of that shoot. In some cases, new apical buds regenerated from suppressed lateral buds immediately below the destroyed apical bud. Death of existing shoots and regeneration from suppressed laterals are potentially major sources of architectural change to tree growth form. Damage to apical buds also resulted in the loss of developing inflorescences and lateral branches.

The chemical and physical nature of leaves changed significantly as they aged. Young leaves had a higher nutrient and chlorophyll concentration, but lower leaf thickness and leaf mass per unit area. Thus they were more nutritious and less tough for herbivores. These young leaves were especially prone to premature leaf fall because of insect damage. Leaves retranslocated over half of their nutrients prior to senescence but consumption or premature abscission of leaves before this process is complete may increase nutrient loss from the trees to microbial and detrital food chains on the forest floor. Thus herbivore-mediated leaf fall may also impact upon nutrient dynamics in mangrove forests.

This thesis demonstrates that: mangroves support a diverse and distinctive insect herbivore community; leaf herbivory is much higher than previously reported; there are additional mechanisms (eg, apical bud damage) by which herbivores affect leaf loss and other aspects of tree performance; and insects significantly affect leaf longevity, the timing of leaf fall and the quality of leaf litter. These results indicate that the role of herbivorous insects in mangrove ecosystems is more important than previously thought and that its evaluation needs to go well beyond simple static measures of leaf area missing from mature leaves.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my original supervisor, Dr. Chris Hill and my subsequent supervisors Professors Rhondda Jones and Richard Pearson for all their assistance over several years.

I am very grateful to the Cooperative Research Centre for Coastal Zone, Estuary and Waterway Management for funding much of this work and Theresa Leijten from that organisation for her assistance. I also thank Jan Tilden (Coastal CRC) and Dr. Norm Duke (University of Queensland) for reviewing the final draft of this thesis.

I thank my parents who have always wholeheartedly supported all my educational and environmental pursuits.

Special thanks to my girlfriend (now wife) Sandra, who trudged through the mud, sandflies and humidity of tropical mangroves nearly every weekend for 18 months during the peak period of my fieldwork and then waited innumerable nights whilst this thesis was written.

Finally, to my wonderful kiddies, Caitlin and Matthew – both born during this process (as if I wasn't busy enough) – I hope you are proud.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Introduction.....	1
1.2	Mangrove Ecosystems	1
1.3	Importance of Herbivory in Forest Ecosystems	2
1.4	Status of Herbivory in Mangrove Ecosystems	3
1.5	Studies of Herbivory Level in Mangroves.....	5
1.6	Measuring Herbivory	6
1.7	Types of Herbivore Damage.....	7
1.8	Aims and Organisation of This Thesis	8
2.0	STUDY SITES AND SPECIES	10
2.1	Mangrove Habitat	10
2.2	General Study Location	12
2.2.2	Study Sites.....	13
2.2.3	Plant Species Studied	19
3.0	FOLIVOROUS INSECT DIVERSITY AND DISTINCTIVENESS ...	22
3.1	Introduction.....	22
3.1.1	Status of Insect Herbivores in Mangroves	22
3.1.2	Diversity of Mangrove Insect Fauna.....	23
3.2	Methods	28
3.2.2	Sampling the Insect Herbivore Community.....	28
3.2.3	Comparison to Folivore Diversity Studies in the Literature	30
3.3	Results.....	31
3.3.1	Diversity of Folivorous Insects Collected in This Study	31
3.3.2	Comparison of Folivore Diversity Between Mangroves.....	35
3.3.3	Comparison to Folivore Diversity Studies in the Literature	37
3.3.4	Comparison of Folivore Species Richness With That of Adjoining Plant Species	39
3.4	Discussion.....	40
3.4.1	Diversity and Composition of the Insect Folivore Community	40
3.4.2	Specialisation and Host-Specificity of the Folivore Fauna.....	45
3.4.3	Comparison With Other Mangrove Studies	48
3.4.4	Comparison With Non-Mangrove Trees.....	49
3.4.5	Potential Worldwide Similarities in Mangrove Folivore Faunas.....	50
3.4.6	Potential Diversity of Insect Herbivores in Australian Mangroves	52
3.5	Conclusions.....	53
4.0	HERBIVORY LEVEL	55
4.1	Introduction.....	55
4.2	Methods	56
4.2.1	Discrete Sampling	56
4.2.2	Long-Term Sampling	57
4.2.3	Accuracy of Field Damage Estimates	58
4.2.4	Loss of Entire Leaves	59

4.2.5	Change in Area of Leaf Damage With Leaf Growth	61
4.3	Results.....	61
4.3.1	Discrete Study	61
4.3.2	Accuracy of Estimation.....	64
4.3.3	Comparison of Discrete and Long-Term Methods	66
4.3.4	Attribution of Causes of Mortality	69
4.3.5	Proportion of Damage by Category Between the Discrete and Long-Term Studies.....	69
4.3.6	Frequency and Types of Leaf Damage	70
4.3.7	Accumulation of Herbivore Damage With Increasing Leaf Age.....	73
4.3.8	Change in Area of Leaf Damage With Leaf Growth	73
4.4	Discussion.....	76
4.4.1	Review of Mangrove Herbivory Results.....	76
4.4.2	Discrete Study	80
4.4.3	Comparison of Discrete and Long-Term Methods	81
4.4.4	Direct Herbivory Versus Leaf Loss	84
4.4.5	Patterns of Herbivory by Type, Frequency and Age-Based Distribution of Leaf Damage.....	85
4.4.6	Use of Discrete Studies as a Relative Measure of Herbivory	87
4.4.7	Comparison of Herbivory in Mangroves With Herbivory in Other Forest Types	88
4.4.8	Herbivory on <i>Avicennia</i> Versus Herbivory on <i>Rhizophora</i>	90
4.4.9	The Influence of Leaf Hole Expansion in Herbivory Estimates	91
4.5	Conclusions.....	93
5.0	EFFECT OF INSECT HERBIVORY ON LEAF LONGEVITY AND PREMATURE LEAF LOSS.....	95
5.1	Introduction.....	95
5.1.1	Ecological Significance of Leaf Longevity	95
5.1.2	Leaf Longevity and Insect Herbivory	96
5.1.3	Leaf Longevity in Mangroves	97
5.2	Methods	98
5.3	Results.....	99
5.3.1	Leaf Longevity	99
5.3.2	Between-Tree Variation in Leaf Longevity and Frequency of Insect-Killed Leaves.....	100
5.3.3	Patterns of Leaf Fall	103
5.3.4	Premature Abscission.....	107
5.3.5	Causes of Premature Leaf Death.....	110
5.4	Discussion.....	111
5.4.1	Leaf Longevity in Mangroves	111
5.4.2	Reductions in Leaf Longevity Caused by Insect Damage	116
5.4.3	Variation Between Trees in Leaf Longevity and Premature Abscission	117
5.4.4	Pattern of Leaf Fall.....	118
5.4.5	Premature Leaf Loss.....	121
5.4.6	The Role of Premature Leaf Loss in Mangrove Herbivory Estimates	123
5.5	Conclusions.....	125

6.0	DEATH OF APICAL TIPS AND DEVELOPING LEAF BUDS....	126
6.1	Introduction.....	126
6.2	Methods	135
6.2.1	Discrete Study – Developing <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> Leaves.....	135
6.2.2	Damage to, and Loss of, Developing <i>A. marina</i> Leaves and Buds...	135
6.2.3	Long-Term Study – <i>R. stylosa</i> Developing Leaves.....	135
6.2.4	Gladstone Study	136
6.2.5	Panama Study	138
6.3	Results.....	140
6.3.1	<i>A. marina</i> Developing Leaves	140
6.3.2	Discrete Study – <i>R. stylosa</i>	141
6.3.3	Long-Term Study – <i>R. stylosa</i>	142
6.3.4	Gladstone Study	149
6.3.5	Panama Study	150
6.3.6	Comparison of Tip Damage and Loss of Developing Leaves Between Townsville, Gladstone and Panama	150
6.4	Discussion.....	151
6.4.1	<i>A. marina</i> Developing Leaves	151
6.4.2	Apical Tip Damage and Leaf Loss in <i>R. stylosa</i> and <i>R. mangle</i>	152
6.4.3	Other Aspects of Apical Tip Damage	153
6.4.4	Architectural Effects	155
6.4.5	Significance of Tip Damage for Leaf Herbivory Estimates.....	157
6.5	Conclusions.....	160
7.0	ONTOGENIC CHANGES IN SELECTED CHEMICAL AND PHYSICAL LEAF COMPONENTS	161
7.1	Introduction.....	161
7.2	Methods	164
7.2.1	Leaf Developmental Studies	164
7.2.2	Water Content and Nutrient Analysis	167
7.2.3	Leaf Size and Physical Attributes	167
7.2.4	Chlorophyll Content.....	168
7.2.5	Role of Insect Herbivores in Nutrient and Biomass Loss	169
7.2.6	Statistical Analysis	169
7.3	Results.....	170
7.3.1	Leaf Area and Weight	171
7.3.2	Leaf Thickness	171
7.3.3	Leaf Mass per Unit Area (LMA).....	174
7.3.4	Water Content	174
7.3.5	Chlorophyll Content.....	176
7.3.6	Nutrient Concentration.....	177
7.3.7	Total Nutrient Content	181
7.3.8	Role of Insect Herbivores in Nutrient and Biomass Loss	184
7.4	Discussion.....	187
7.4.1	LMA and Leaf Physical Characteristics.....	187
7.4.2	Water Content	189
7.4.3	Chlorophyll Content.....	192

7.4.4	Nutrient Content.....	194
7.4.5	Nutrient Resorption.....	201
7.4.6	Relationship of Leaf Ontogeny to Herbivory Patterns.....	204
7.4.7	Nutrient Cycling and Retention.....	205
7.5	Conclusions.....	207
8.0	GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	209
8.1	Herbivore Fauna and Herbivory Level.....	209
8.2	Implications for Herbivory Studies	211
REFERENCES		214

APPENDIX A – Natural History and Miscellaneous Observations of the
Mangrove Insect Folivore Fauna

APPENDIX B – Three-Way ANOVA’s from Chapter Seven

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Mangrove species occurring around Townsville	13
Table 3.1	Literature records for folivorous insects from mangroves in Australia... 26	26
Table 3.2	Folivorous insect species collected from <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i>	32
Table 3.3	Number of folivorous insect species found on <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> at Gordon Creek and Saunders Beach, near Townsville.....	34
Table 3.4	Comparison of numbers of folivorous insect species in each insect order found on <i>Rhizophora</i> and <i>Avicennia</i> species in three studies.....	35
Table 3.5	Proportional representation of folivorous insect taxa in three mangrove studies.....	36
Table 3.6	Number of folivore species reported in the literature from tropical or sub-tropical shrubs and trees.	38
Table 3.7	Comparison of the number of folivorous insects collected in laboratory sorted field collections from mangrove and adjoining coastal tree species in northern Queensland.	40
Table 4.1	Percent leaf area damaged by folivores in the upper and lower canopies of <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> at two sites in the discrete study.	62
Table 4.2	Proportion of herbivore damage by damage category type in the discrete study.....	63
Table 4.3	Frequency of damaged leaves and damage categories in the discrete study.....	63
Table 4.4	Comparison of estimates for percent leaf area damaged on <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves obtained by discrete and long-term methods at two sites.....	66
Table 4.5	Loss of leaf material attributable to direct consumption by insects of leaf loss related to insect damage	67
Table 4.6	Number of leaves lost due to various mortality factors	69
Table 4.7	Proportion of leaf damage by damage category.....	70
Table 4.8	Frequency of damaged leaves and damage types in the discrete and long-term studies	71
Table 4.9	Insect folivory studies in mangrove ecosystems.....	77
Table 4.10	Literature values for leaf area damaged by insect herbivores on <i>Avicennia</i> and <i>Rhizophora</i> species worldwide.....	79
Table 4.11	Summary of leaf herbivory results from studies that utilised long-term assessment techniques	82
Table 5.1	Mean longevity of <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves and the effects of insect-induced leaf mortality.....	99
Table 5.2	Results of one-way ANOVA's for between-tree variation in leaf longevity.....	100
Table 5.3	Results of one-way ANOVA's testing the effect of herbivore damage on leaf longevity	109
Table 5.4	Proportion of leaves killed by insects that were part of a leaf pair.....	110
Table 5.5	Numbers of insect-killed leaves and the type of herbivore damage they suffered.....	110
Table 5.6	Summary of literature values for mean leaf longevity of various mangrove species	112
Table 5.7	Comparison of mean longevity data from published literature for various forest types	115

Table 6.1	Sampling regime for Gladstone study.....	138
Table 6.2	Sampling regime for the Panama study	139
Table 6.3	Proportion of developing <i>A. marina</i> leaves damaged by insects in the discrete survey.....	140
Table 6.4	Proportion of developing leaves damaged by insects on tagged <i>A. marina</i> branches	140
Table 6.5	Proportion of tips damaged by insects on <i>R. stylosa</i>	141
Table 6.6	Proportion of leaf damage and retention on damaged <i>R. stylosa</i> buds	142
Table 6.7	Tip damage, and leaf loss due to tip damage, on <i>R. stylosa</i> at Gordon Creek and Saunders Beach	143
Table 6.8	Frequency of tip damage and leaf loss on <i>R. stylosa</i> in Gladstone.....	149
Table 6.9	Frequency of tip damage and leaf loss on <i>R. mangle</i> in Panama.....	150
Table 6.10	Frequency of tip damage and leaf loss on <i>R. mangle</i> in Panama and <i>R. stylosa</i> in Townsville and Gladstone	151
Table 6.11	Comparison of folivory estimates (% leaf area lost) on developing and emerged leaves.	158
Table 7.1	Summary of three-way ANOVA's comparing leaf area, leaf dry weight, LMA, leaf thickness and % water content for two species (<i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i>) at two sites (Gordon Creek and Saunders Beach) across five leaf developmental stages.	171
Table 7.2	Summary of three-way ANOVA's for nutrient and chlorophyll content for two species (<i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i>) at two sites (Gordon Creek and Saunders Beach).....	177
Table 7.3	Percentage decline in nutrient concentration between each successive leaf developmental stage and overall decline from youngest to oldest leaves	181
Table 7.4	Percent change in nutrient content compared to the maximum amount, between each successive leaf developmental stage and decline between maximum value and senescent leaves.....	183
Table 7.6	Summary of literature values for % water content in Avicenniaceae and Rhizophoraceae mangrove leaves	189
Table 7.7	Summary of literature values for nitrogen concentration in leaves of Rhizophoraceae and Avicenniaceae mangroves	197
Table 7.8	Summary of literature values for phosphorus concentration in leaves of Rhizophoraceae and Avicenniaceae mangroves.....	199
Table 7.9	Summary of published data on proportional decline in nutrient concentration between mature and senescent leaves of Rhizophoraceae and Avicenniaceae mangroves.....	203

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	Map of Australia showing locations mentioned in the text	11
Figure 2.2	Map of Townsville and Ross River Estuary showing location of Gordon Creek study site	14
Figure 2.3	Map showing location of Saunders Beach study site	15
Figure 2.4	Images of mangroves at the Gordon Creek study site	17
Figure 2.5	Images of mangroves at the Saunders Beach study site	18
Figure 2.6	<i>Avicennia marina</i> var. <i>eucalyptifolia</i> tree among salt grass at Gordon Creek	20
Figure 2.7	Typical image of <i>Rhizophora stylosa</i> trees	20
Figure 4.1	Comparison between estimated and actual measures of leaf area damaged	65
Figure 4.2	Differences between discrete and long-term estimates of leaf area missing and the contribution of consumptive damage versus premature leaf loss to long-term estimates.	68
Figure 4.3	Frequency distribution of leaf area damage on mangrove leaves	72
Figure 4.4	Cumulative herbivore damage on <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves	74
Figure 4.5	Regression slopes for change in leaf area and hole area for <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i>	75
Figure 5.1	Frequency of insect-induced leaf loss and its effect on leaf longevity for all <i>A. marina</i> trees at Saunders Beach	101
Figure 5.2	Frequency of insect-induced leaf loss and its effect on leaf longevity for all <i>A. marina</i> trees at Gordon Creek	102
Figure 5.3	Frequency of insect-induced leaf loss and its effect on leaf longevity for all <i>R. stylosa</i> trees at Saunders Beach	104
Figure 5.4	Frequency of insect-induced leaf loss and its effect on leaf longevity for all <i>R. stylosa</i> trees at Gordon Creek	105
Figure 5.5	Longevity distribution of <i>A. marina</i> leaves	106
Figure 5.6	Longevity distribution of <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves	106
Figure 5.7	Effect of insect herbivore damage on longevity of <i>A. marina</i> leaves	108
Figure 5.8	Effect of insect herbivore damage on longevity of <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves	108
Figure 5.9	Effect of insect-induced leaf loss on longevity distribution of <i>A. marina</i> leaves at Saunders Beach	120
Figure 5.10	Effect of insect-induced leaf loss on longevity distribution of <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves at Saunders Beach	120
Figure 6.1	Sequence of new leaves emerging from an apical tip of <i>R. stylosa</i> .	127
Figure 6.2	Leaf death and damage resulting from insect attack on apical tips of <i>R. stylosa</i>	127
Figure 6.3	Two inflorescences emerging with two developing leaves of <i>R. stylosa</i>	129
Figure 6.4	Comparison of undamaged, damaged and entirely destroyed bud of <i>R. stylosa</i>	129
Figure 6.5	<i>Rhizophora stylosa</i> shoot with destroyed apical bud attempting to compensate by initiating suppressed reserve lateral buds	130
Figure 6.6	<i>Rhizophora stylosa</i> reserve lateral buds soon to unfurl new leaves	130
Figure 6.7	Numerous branches regenerating (coppice growth) from sawn trunk of <i>A. marina</i> along a boardwalk	131
Figure 6.8	Developing leaf buds of <i>A. marina</i> .	134
Figure 6.9	Damage and loss of new <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves and tips affected by insect	

damage at Gordon Creek	145
Figure 6.10 Damage and loss of new <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves and tips affected by insect damage at Saunders Beach	146
Figure 6.11 Relationship between the number of new leaves produced and the number that successfully emerged from each of 10 <i>R. stylosa</i> trees	147
Figure 7.1 The five developmental stages of <i>A. marina</i> leaves defined in this study	165
Figure 7.2 The five developmental stages of <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves defined in this study	165
Figure 7.3 Surface area of fresh <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves at each developmental stage	172
Figure 7.4 Dry weight of fresh <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves at each developmental stage	172
Figure 7.5 Lamina thickness of fresh <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves at each developmental stage	173
Figure 7.6 Leaf mass per unit area of fresh <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves at each developmental stage	173
Figure 7.7 Percent water content of fresh <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves at each developmental stage	175
Figure 7.8 Total chlorophyll concentration of fresh <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves at each developmental stage	178
Figure 7.9 Total chlorophyll content of fresh <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves at each developmental stage	178
Figure 7.10 Percent nitrogen content of fresh <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves at each developmental stage	180
Figure 7.11 Percent phosphorus content of fresh <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves at each developmental stage	180
Figure 7.12 Total nitrogen content of fresh <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves at each developmental stage	182
Figure 7.13 Total phosphorus content of fresh <i>A. marina</i> and <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves at each developmental stage	182
Figure 7.14 Effect of insect caused leaf drop on nutrient return to the forest floor and leaf biomass loss of <i>A. marina</i> leaves	185
Figure 7.15 Effect of insect caused leaf drop on nutrient return to the forest floor and leaf biomass loss of <i>R. stylosa</i> leaves	186

STATEMENT ON SOURCES

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education. Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.

.....
Damien Wayne Burrows

.....