

## 12.3 Field experiments

Field manipulative experiments include, for example, caging experiments to exclude or include predators, controlled pollution of experimental plots, and big-bag experiments with plankton. Their use was historically (unsurprisingly) predominantly for univariate *population* rather than *community* studies, although some early examples of multivariate analysis of manipulative field experiments include [Anderson & Underwood \(1997\)](#) , [Morrissey, Underwood & Howitt \(1996\)](#) , [Gee & Somerfield \(1997\)](#) and [Austen & Thrush \(2001\)](#) . The following example is one in which univariate, graphical and multivariate statistical analyses have been applied to meiobenthic communities.

### **Azoic sediment recolonisation experiment with predator exclusion {Z}**

[Olafsson & Moore \(1992\)](#) studied meiofaunal colonisation of azoic sediment in a variety of cages designed to exclude epibenthic macrofauna to varying degrees: A – 1 mm mesh cages designed to exclude all macrofauna; B – 1 mm control cages with two ends left open; C – 10 mm mesh cages to exclude only larger macro-fauna; D – 10 mm control cages with two ends left open; E – open unmeshed cages; F – uncaged background controls. Three replicates of each treatment were sampled after 1 month, 3 months and 8 months and analysed for nematode and harpacticoid copepod species composition.

*Univariate indices.* The presence of cages had a more pronounced impact on copepod diversity than nematode diversity. For example, after 8 months,  $H'_{\text{c}}$  and  $J'_{\text{c}}$  (but not  $S_{\text{c}}$ ) for copepods had significantly higher values inside the exclusion cages than in the control cages with the ends left open, but for the nematodes, differences in  $H'_{\text{c}}$  were of borderline significance ( $p = 5.3\%$ ).

*Graphical/distributional plots.* No significant treatment effect for either nematodes or copepods could be detected between  $k$ -dominance curves for all sampling dates, using the ANOSIM test for curves, referred towards the end of [Chapter 8 \(page 8.5\)](#).

*Multivariate analysis.* For the harpacticoid copepods there was a clear successional pattern of change in community composition over time (Fig. 12.4), but no such pattern was obvious for the nematodes. Fig. 12.4 uses data from Table 2 in Olafsson and Moore's paper, which are for the 15 most abundant harpacticoid species in all treatments and for the mean abundances of all replicates within a treatment on each sampling date. On the basis of these data, there is no significant treatment effect using the 2-way crossed ANOSIM test with no replication<sup>¶</sup> (see [page 6.8](#)), but the fuller replicated data may have been more revealing.




Fig. 12.4. Azoic sediment recolonisation experiment {Z}. MDS configuration for harpacticoid copepods (4th root transformed abundances) after 1, 3 and 8 months, with 6 different treatments (A–F), see text (stress = 0.07).

¶ Note, however, that this test (or the equivalent PERMANOVA test which exploits the interaction term as its residual) will be uninformative in the presence of large treatment  $\times$  time interactions, which is a likely possibility here.

Revision #12

Created 6 March 2022 13:45:10 by Arden

Updated 6 November 2024 04:59:00 by Abby Miller