

What makes species vulnerable to extinction  
following habitat fragmentation and  
degradation? A test using the insect fauna in  
native temperate grasslands in South-eastern  
Australia

Anett Richter

A thesis submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements for the degree  
of Doctor of Philosophy

Institute for Applied Ecology  
University of Canberra

February 2010



“I have an old belief that a good observer really means a good theorist”

C. Darwin to Bates in 1860 as cited by I.R. Ball (1975)

Charles Robert Darwin (1809-1882) painted by John Maler Collier (1850- 1934)

# Abstract

---

Landscape fragmentation and modification are the main factors believed to be responsible for the current high rates of species declines and extinctions. Native temperate grassland is one of the most threatened ecosystems in Australia having undergone extensive loss and degradation, to the extent that only less than five percent of the original community remains in reasonable conditions. Effective conservation of temperate grassland is hampered by our inability to predict the responses of the biota to further loss and fragmentation, and to changes in the way the grasslands are managed.

In this thesis, I report on a three year study of the conservation ecology of terrestrial insects in highly fragmented native temperate grassland in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT). I examine the vulnerability of carabid beetles (Carabidae, Coleoptera) and scarab beetles (Scarabaeidae, Coleoptera) to modifications in landscape structure and habitat quality following native grassland fragmentation. To complement that study, I also conducted an autecological study of the golden sun moth (*Synemon plana*, Castiniidae, Lepidoptera), a flagship species in the ACT grasslands which is classified as critically endangered at both the state and national levels.

Below, I outline the contents of each chapter that together comprise my PhD thesis.

To begin, **Chapter 1** provides an introduction to the thesis and an overview of our current understanding of the consequences of fragmentation on terrestrial biological diversity. The chapter introduces the reader to insect conservation in Australia with an emphasis on previous insect research conducted in native temperate grassland in the ACT and identifies the gaps in our understanding of how the Australian insect fauna has been affected by large scale natural habitat loss and fragmentation. The general methods of site selection and the rationale for the selection of insect taxa that were investigated are described. Furthermore, I present a summary of the climatic

conditions characterised by above average monthly temperatures and significant deficiencies in precipitation that occurred at the time of investigation.

In **Chapter 2** I review the influence of land use change and predicted climate change on temperate grasslands – an overlooked ecological community at the global scale - and identify future research strategies to halt the further loss of biodiversity in these grasslands. I discuss previous research that has contributed to our understanding of grassland ecology and describe how two major threats to temperate native grasslands (land use change and climate change) might affect the ecological integrity of these grasslands. Based on a consideration of research conducted in three native temperate grassland regions - North America, South Asia and South-eastern Australia - it is concluded that increasing legal protection, a wider public appreciation and more research is required to reverse the current trend of biodiversity loss and to improve the current lack of appreciation of temperate grasslands. In particular, there is a need for more detailed inventory surveys of the temperate grasslands biota and increased autecological research on the invertebrate fauna. The establishment of long term monitoring is required to provide a measurement of the success of conservation action and to relate the effects of historical and current threats to native grassland and component biodiversity.

In **Chapter 3** I modelled the response of carabid and scarab beetles to the effects of fragmentation in highly fragmented native temperate grassland. Zero- inflated models and ordination techniques were applied to relate beetle diversity to fragments size at the level of three basic characteristics of community structure: 1) the number of species (species richness), 2) the identity of those species (species composition) and, 3) the relative abundance of those species. My analysis revealed a clear relationship between the size of native temperate grassland remnants and beetle diversity at the community level and with respect to community composition. Specifically, fragments larger than seven hectares hosted higher numbers of species and individuals of carabid and scarab beetles. Similar trends of increasing diversity with increasing fragment size were observed in the composition of the scarab beetle community. Smaller fragments contained less diverse communities than larger fragments. Overall,

these results indicate that carabid and scarab beetles are sensitive to the reduction of native grassland.

In **Chapter 4** I applied multiple hypotheses testing of single and combined ecological models using Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) analysis to test for: 1) the relationship between habitat heterogeneity and the diversity of carabid and scarab beetles, 2) the relationship between landscape structure and the richness of carabid and scarab beetles, and 3) the influence of kangaroo and livestock grazing and mowing on the richness and abundance of carabid and scarab beetles and arthropods in fragmented native temperate grassland. The analysis revealed that native grassland quality, specifically a rich diverse flora, best described the occurrence pattern of carabid and scarab beetles in the fragmented native grassland. The importance of the type of management was also evident at very high taxonomic resolution (species level). The analysis showed that while management that included mowing positively affected the richness and abundance of ground dwelling arthropods, kangaroo grazing was a factor positively associated with the diversity of carabid and scarab beetles. The intensity of management seemed not to have any significant influence on the distribution of the insect diversity.

In **Chapter 5** the hypothesis that life history traits of grassland beetles can be used as predictors for species sensitivity to fragmentation was tested using carabid beetles (Carabidae, Coleoptera). My aim in this chapter was to assess the relationship between environmental variables and life history traits in ground beetles and to test for the sensitivity of species and associated traits to the consequences of fragmentation. Ordination techniques and three table analysis (RLQ - Analysis) revealed that there was no overall significant effect of environmental variables on life history traits in ground beetles. However, I found significant relationships between the spatial patch characteristics of isolation and floristic diversity and life history traits that are shared among ground beetles found in fragmented native temperate grassland. Species of carabid beetles characterized by larger body size, lower dispersal abilities and restricted biogeographical distribution were most sensitive to the consequences of fragmentation. In **Chapter 6** I examined a range of quantitative characteristic of the biology and ecology of the critically endangered golden sun moth

(*Synemon plana*), a native grassland specialist and a flagship species for these grasslands. I tested the species vulnerability to fragmentation and grassland modification. My data provide clear evidence that *S. plana* at all its life stages (egg, larvae, pupae and adult stage) occupies habitats dominated by native grasses, particularly mixed wallaby grass (*Austrodanthonia* spp.) and spear grass (*Austrostipa bigeniculata*), but can also occur at sites comprised almost entirely of the exotic Chilean needle grass (*Nassella neessiana*). The size of grassland fragments proved to be of less importance. Based on field work conducted over two years I detected the species at 32 grasslands in the ACT with an overall characteristic of very low densities among most *S. plana* populations. The examination of empty *S. plana* pupae cases to identify the species sex ratio revealed a male biased sex ratio in the species. These findings about the species adult and larval biology and ecology fill important gaps in our understanding for one of the critically endangered insect species in Australia.

In **Chapter 7** – the final chapter I provide a synthesis of my results on the sensitivity of carabid beetles and scarab beetles to the effects of fragmentation and highlight the importance of maintaining a rich floristic diversity and the presence of kangaroo grazing (as opposed to livestock grazing and mowing) for a diverse ground dwelling beetle fauna in temperate grassland fragments. I highlight the significance of considering multiple taxa and taxonomic resolutions to predict the vulnerability of insects following fragmentation and provide suggestions for future insect conservation in native temperate grassland in Australia. Follow up research should a) address the spatial distribution of the terrestrial insect fauna in temperate grassland; focussing particularly on a range of types of grasslands, including identification of suitable and unsuitable habitat in the surrounding matrix and, b) should include the studies of the autecology of temperate grassland insects species to better link species ecology with native temperate grassland fragmentation and modification.

The research chapters in this thesis have been written as stand - alone manuscripts for later publication (except Chapter 1). As a result, there is some repetition between chapters, particularly in the Introduction and Method sections, although I have attempted to minimise this where ever possible by referring back to earlier chapters.

# Table of Contents

<i>Form B</i> -----	3
<i>Certificate of Authorship of Thesis</i> -----	3
<i>Signature of candidate</i> -----	3
<i>Signature of chair of the supervisory panel</i> -----	3
<i>Date</i> -----	3
<i>Copyright</i> -----	3
<i>Abstract</i> -----	4
<i>Table of Contents</i> -----	8
<i>List of Tables</i> -----	12
<i>List of Figures</i> -----	15
<i>Acknowledgments</i> -----	20
<i>Chapter 1</i> -----	24
<i>General Introduction</i> -----	24
Biodiversity conservation in fragmented landscapes-----	25
Responses of insects to fragmentation -----	26
The highly fragmented natural temperate grasslands in south eastern Australia ----	27
The Australian terrestrial insect fauna in native temperate grassland -----	29
<i>Aims of this study</i> -----	33
<i>Material and methods</i> -----	34
Area selection-----	34
Selection of study sites -----	34
Selection of insect groups-----	35
Weather conditions during this research – ongoing drought-----	41
<i>Chapter 2</i> -----	44
<i>Temperate grasslands- out of sight, out of mind? Introduction to the conservation and future research for one of the world most threatened ecological communities</i> -----	44
<i>Introduction</i> -----	45
Setting the scene-----	47

Historical distribution of temperate grasslands-----	49
Threats to native temperate grassland- an international perspective-----	51
Native temperate grassland: ecosystem services, monitoring and research-----	57
Consequences of climate change for native temperate grassland-----	58
Identifying the gaps in native temperate grassland conservation research -----	62
Conservation research for native temperate grassland- Where to go from here? ----	68
<b>Chapter 3 -----</b>	<b>71</b>
<i>Importance of fragment size for ground and dung beetle diversity in highly fragmented native temperate grassland in south-eastern Australia-----</i>	<i>71</i>
<i>Introduction-----</i>	<i>72</i>
<i>Methods-----</i>	<i>76</i>
Study region and study sites -----	76
Beetle sampling-----	78
Data analysis-----	78
<i>Results -----</i>	<i>80</i>
Sampling intensity and description of beetle community -----	80
Beetle richness and abundance responses to fragment size -----	87
Beetle community composition responses to fragment size -----	91
<i>Discussion-----</i>	<i>94</i>
<i>Research limitations and implications for beetle conservation and further research -----</i>	<i>98</i>
<b>Chapter 4 -----</b>	<b>101</b>
<i>Conservation of epigeic beetles in native temperate grasslands in South-Eastern Australia: importance of floristic composition and kangaroo grazing for carabid and scarab beetles-----</i>	<i>101</i>
<i>Introduction-----</i>	<i>102</i>
<i>Methods-----</i>	<i>106</i>
Study area and study sites-----	106
Invertebrate sampling-----	107
Explanatory variables-----	108
Data analysis-----	111
<i>Results -----</i>	<i>114</i>
Overall results -----	114



Factors determining the occurrence of ground dwelling arthropods at different hierarchical taxonomic levels over two sampling periods -----	114
Effects of floristic richness and isolation among fragment size classes -----	120
Effects of management type on ground dwelling arthropods-----	125
<b><i>Discussion</i></b> -----	<b>128</b>
Habitat heterogeneity and the distribution of ground and dung beetles -----	128
Management and the responses of ground dwelling arthropods-----	129
<b><i>Conclusions and management implications</i></b> -----	<b>131</b>
<b>Chapter 5</b> -----	<b>134</b>
<b><i>Identification of life history traits in ground beetles as predictors for the vulnerability of species to fragmentation and degradation in natural temperate grassland in South-eastern Australia</i></b> -----	<b>134</b>
<b><i>Introduction</i></b> -----	<b>135</b>
<b><i>Methods</i></b> -----	<b>137</b>
Study area -----	137
Species data collection-----	137
Life history traits-----	138
Rarity and patch occupancy-----	138
Body size-----	139
Dispersal (mobility) -----	139
Adult activity pattern (phenological information)-----	139
Environmental variables-----	140
Statistical framework and analysis -----	142
<b><i>Results</i></b> -----	<b>145</b>
<b><i>Discussion</i></b> -----	<b>154</b>
Rarity and site occupancy -----	154
Body size, dispersal and phenology -----	156
<b><i>Summary</i></b> -----	<b>158</b>
<b>Chapter 6</b> -----	<b>159</b>
<b><i>Moths in fragments - distribution, population biology and habitat use of the endangered Golden sun moth (<i>Synemon plana</i>) in native temperate grassland remnants in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT)</i></b> -----	<b>159</b>
<b><i>Introduction</i></b> -----	<b>160</b>
<b><i>Methods</i></b> -----	<b>162</b>
Study Area -----	162
The population ecology of adults-----	163

Relative and absolute estimates of population size -----	163
Mark Release Recapture study -----	165
Habitat specificity and habitat use, species reproduction and sex ratio-----	166
<b>Larval biology and habitat specificity-----</b>	<b>168</b>
<b>Statistical Analysis-----</b>	<b>168</b>
<b><i>Results</i> -----</b>	<b><i>170</i></b>
<b>Relative and absolute population estimates of adult moths and their daily flight activity -----</b>	<b>170</b>
<b>Adult habitat use-----</b>	<b>171</b>
<b>Female reproduction and sex ratio -----</b>	<b>176</b>
<b>“Survival” of <i>S. plana</i> pupae cases -----</b>	<b>179</b>
<b>Larval biology and habitat usage -----</b>	<b>180</b>
<b><i>Discussion</i>-----</b>	<b><i>181</i></b>
<b><i>Implications for future research and monitoring</i>-----</b>	<b><i>184</i></b>
<b><i>Chapter 7</i> -----</b>	<b><i>187</i></b>
<b><i>Synopsis</i> -----</b>	<b><i>188</i></b>
<b>Future research-----</b>	<b>194</b>
<b><i>References</i>-----</b>	<b><i>196</i></b>

## List of Tables

- Table 1** Identification of potential research and conservation priorities for native temperate grasslands. Symbol X indicates existing information and attempts to address these issues; O indicates areas that are important to improve in future and are currently not sufficiently addressed, "minus" indicates that not sufficient information were found. All information presented in this table obtained from contributions of invited authors at the World Temperate Grassland Conservation Initiative Workshop 2008 report (TGCI 2008). ..... 67
- Table 2** Species of carabids (Carabidae) and their abundance (%) collected between November 2006 and March 2008 at twenty four native temperate grassland sites in the Australian Capital Territory. .... 81
- Table 3** Species of scarab beetles (Scarabaeoidea) and their abundance (%) collected between November 2006 and March 2008 at twenty four native temperate grassland sites in the Australian Capital Territory. .... 82
- Table 4** Results of the SIMPER analysis to identify the species that primary accounts for the observed differences in the beetle assemblages and size classes. The table shows the cumulative contribution (%) of *Heteronyx piceus* (Scarabidae) within and between size classes (large, medium, small, very small) studied. .... 86
- Table 5** Results of model selection for ground beetle abundance (a) and richness (b). The final model, based on likelihood ratio test, is highlighted in bold. .... 88
- Table 6** Results of model selection for dung beetle abundance (a) and richness (b). The final model, based on likelihood ratio test, is highlighted in bold. .... 89
- Table 7** Results of ANOSIM tests of scarab beetle community composition between site classes within 24 native temperate grassland sites in the ACT after the removal of *Heteronyx piceus*; values listed are the ANOSIM test statistic (R) and probability values (P). Values in bold indicate significant differences. .... 91
- Table 8** SIMPER analysis of differences of species composition (average dissimilarity =85.73%) of dung beetle assemblages after removal of *Heteronyx piceus* between the two most dissimilar size classes (large versus small). .... 92
- Table 9** Explanatory factors and their minimum and maximum values across 24 sampling sites of natural temperate grassland in the ACT used to perform multiple regression analysis to explain extrinsic factors determining ground dwelling arthropod diversity. .... 109
- Table 10** Correlation coefficients between explanatory (habitat composition, habitat configuration, habitat management) and response variables (number of beetle species and number of beetle individuals). Highest correlations are indicated in bold. .... 115

<b>Table 11</b> Result of the test for intercorrelation between the final habitat and landscape variables (explanatory variables). Values indicate correlation coefficients. Bold values show high correlations between the variable ‘area size’ and composition (floristic richness), management type and intensity (kangaroo pellets) (top table). Lower correlation coefficients are reported when the explanatory variables ‘isolation’ is applied as the variable describing the spatial features of the habitat (bottom table). .....	116
<b>Table 12</b> Total number of specimens of most abundant arthropods groups collected with wet pitfall traps between November 2006 and March 2008. Hymenoptera abundance classes and Aracanae (spiders) information excluded. ....	118
<b>Table 13</b> Summary of Akaike’s information criterion (AICc) analysis in comparison of regressions models describing the variance in ground, dung beetles and insect order richness and abundance complete (I+II) and per session (I, II). Only the best model (with delta AIC lower than 2 and lowest AIC) are presented. Model description: Conf: configuration=isolation, Comp: composition=floristic richness, Type: management type (grazing versus mowing). ....	119
<b>Table 14</b> Summary table of the GLM analysis for each fragment size class (very small, small, medium and large) to test for significances in responses of ground beetle richness and abundance to floristic richness and the distance to nearest patch within each size class (Very small: <0.2 ha, Small: >0.2-1 ha, Medium: >1-10 ha, Large: >10-100 ha). R <sup>2</sup> represents the coefficient of variation and the p value presents the level of significance.....	121
<b>Table 15</b> Categories / values and sources for life history traits information for ground beetles used for RLQ analysis.....	141
<b>Table 16</b> Overview of number of species and individuals of ground beetles collected in native temperate grassland in the ACT. For each species, the mean species size and weight, its distributional classification, flight ability and period of adult activity is reported.....	146
<b>Table 17</b> Correlation coefficients between environmental variables P_rich (Floristic richness), G_rich (Grass species richness), Veg_h (Vegetation height), Man (Type of management), Pel_sum (Summe of pellets), Area_ha (Fragment size (ha)), Peri (Fragment perimeter), RatioP_A (Ratio Perimeter Area), Ph_value, Bare_g (Average percentage of bare ground). ....	147
<b>Table 18</b> Correlation coefficient after removal of highly correlated environmental variables. ....	148
<b>Table 19</b> Results of RLQ analysis and comparison with separate analysis. The R-RLQ, L-RLQ and Q-RLQ values represent the percentage of variance of each of the separated analysis (R- for environmental variables, L- for species composition, Q- for species traits) accounted by each of the first two ordination axes (RS1 + RS2) of the RLQ analysis. The values are calculated as the ratio of the axis eigenvalue on the equivalent axis of eigenvalue of separate analysis. ....	149
<b>Table 20</b> Correlations between environmental variables of plant richness, vegetation height, pH value and isolation and RLQ axes (RS1 and RS2) for ground beetles. Bold values indicate the highest positive and negative correlation at each axis. ....	150

<b>Table 21</b> Statistical link between environmental variables for sites and ground beetles traits after fourth-corner permutations with $\alpha = \sqrt{0.05/N}$ with $N = \text{number of environmental variables}$ . Permutations are based on model 2 (permutes values of sites (i.e., permute entire rows of table L) and model 4 (permutes values of species (i.e., permute entire column of table L) .....	153
<b>Table 22</b> Survival probability ( $\phi$ ) and recapture probability ( $p$ ) of <i>S. plana</i> during the MRR study at York Park in 2006.....	172
<b>Table 23</b> Sex ratio variations in <i>S. plana</i> populations between Chilean needle grass sites (A-C) and native grassland sites (1-8). .....	177

# List of Figures

**Figure 1** Distribution of major climate zones (indicated in various grey shades) and major treeless biomes (desert and grassland) in Australia. Prior to European settlement, native temperate grassland occupied large parts of the temperate climate zone in the south-east of the continent. Modified from: Bureau of Meteorology, Australia (BOM) <http://www.bom.gov.au>..... 30

**Figure 2** Historical (light grey) and current (dark grey) distribution of native temperate grassland in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT). Source: ACT Government 2005..... 36

**Figure 3** One of the largest (>100 ha) native temperate grassland study sites (former Naval Transmitting station in Belconnen, Canberra) located in Northern Canberra during the summer drought in 2006/2007. .... 37

**Figure 4** One of the smallest (<0.2 ha) native grassland study sites (York Park, Barton) located in Central Canberra (flag post of the Australian Parliament house in the distance) surrounded by government buildings (Department of Foreign Affairs in the back) and planted non native shrubs and trees. In the centre of the figure is the location of one of the wet pitfall traps covered with metal shelter. .... 37

**Figure 5** Rainfall deficiencies during the sampling periods from November 2006 – April 2008. Bars per month indicate the deviation (positive or negative) of the monthly rainfall from the historical average rainfall (1939-2009). Data from Bureau of Meteorology, Canberra..... 42

**Figure 6** Temperature deviations in grad Celsius from the long term average during the sampling periods from November 2006 – April 2008. Graphs indicate the deviation (positive or negative) of the monthly mean maximal temperatures (C) from the historical average rainfall (1939-2009). Data from Bureau of Meteorology, Canberra. .... 43

**Figure 7** Extent of natural temperate grasslands (black areas) in the temperate zone between 30–40° latitude in both the northern and southern hemispheres prior to large scale anthropogenic modifications. Modified after Coupland (1992) and Bailey (1998). Note that these areas are indicative of occurrence in a general region, which may support a variety of vegetation types..... 50

**Figure 8** Schematic diagram modified from TGCI (2008) showing interactions between the major threats of land use changes and global climate change to temperate grasslands ecosystem services. Global climate change acts as a singular factor and with its additive power. .... 52

**Figure 9** The extent of prairie declines in North America based on information provided by Samson and Knopf (1994). The figure summarise the estimated current areas and historic area of the tallgrass, mixed grass, and short grass prairies. For full details see Sampson and Knopf (1994)..... 55

**Figure 10** Extent of losses and fragmentation of native temperate grassland within the vicinity of the two Australian cities: Canberra and Melbourne. Light grey areas indicate extent of pre-European settlement native grassland distribution. Locations in Melbourne indicated as white (no fill) and in Canberra as dark grey fill show remaining native grassland fragments. Sources: ACT Government (2005) and modelled native vegetation data from the Department of Sustainability and Environment (DSE) Corporate Spatial Data Library (2005). 56

**Figure 11** Representation of taxa (a) and research topics (b) in temperate grassland conservation. Results obtained from a search of 78 publications that were published in international journals. Publication list retrieved from the Web of Science and individually searched for the presence of each category. Studies that addressed organic matter and chemical cycles are excluded from the top graph. .... 65

**Figure 12** Proportion of literature that addressed conservation research topics (e.g. Ecology/Conservation, management, restoration) in native temperate grassland classified according to the continent where the study was conducted. The information is based on published literature found under the keyword search “temperate grassland conservation” at the Web of Science. .... 66

**Figure 13** Current (dark grey) and historical (light grey) distribution of native temperate grassland in the surroundings of Canberra (northern parts of the Australian Capital Territory- ACT). Numbers indicate approximate distribution of all 24 study sites. .... 77

**Figure 14** Annual activity pattern of ten of the most abundant carabids in native temperate grassland. J-D indicates months and highlighted grey area indicates months during which the species was collected. Total captures for each species are indicated in parentheses. .... 83

**Figure 15** Annual activity pattern of scarab beetle in native temperate grassland. J-D indicates months and highlighted grey area indicates months during which the species was collected. Total captures for each species are indicated in parentheses. .... 84

**Figure 16** Species rarefaction curves with 999 randomisations for carabids (line) and scarab beetles (dashed line) collected over 14 sampling sessions from November 2006 to February 2008. Shaded areas indicate 95% confidence intervals. .... 85

**Figure 17** Response of scarab beetle and carabid beetle richness and abundance to increasing native temperate grassland fragment size (ln fragment size). Data plotted for each season: line with triangle: winter, dashed line with squares: spring, dotted line with circle: autumn, dashed and dotted line with diamond: summer. Dung beetles were not present in autumn. .... 90

**Figure 18** MDS ordination plots of sampling sites in native temperate grassland, generated for a) carabid beetle assemblages and b) scarab beetle assemblages, arranged according to the size classes shown below the figure. .... 93

- Figure 19** Top line: linear relationship (GLM) between number of species of ground beetles and dung beetles and number of other insect taxa and floristic richness. Bottom line: linear relationship between number of individuals of species of ground beetles and dung beetles and other insect taxa and floristic richness. Lines are fitted regression lines..... 122
- Figure 20** Top line: linear relationship (GLM) between number of species of ground beetles and dung beetles and number of other insect taxa and isolation. Bottom line: linear relationship between number of individuals of species of ground beetles and dung beetles and other insect taxa and isolation. Lines are fitted regression lines..... 123
- Figure 21** Linear relationships between the number of ground beetles (ground beetle richness) and number of individuals (ground beetle abundance) and floristic richness and distance to nearest patch within each size class (very small, small, medium and large)..... 124
- Figure 22** Box-Whisker plots illustrating the effect of kangaroo and livestock grazing and mowing on species of carabid beetles, scarab beetles and other insect taxa. The boxes show median and 1st and 3rd quartile values. Small open squares indicate means, handle show minimum and maximum values and circles data outliers. Stars indicate significant differences between the management types after multiple comparisons after Kruscal Wallace test. .... 126
- Figure 23** Box-Whisker plots illustrating the effect of kangaroo and livestock grazing and mowing on the number of individuals of carabid beetles, scarab beetles and other insect taxa. The boxes show median and 1st and 3rd quartile values. Small open squares indicate means, handle show minimum and maximum values and circles data outliers. Stars indicate significant differences between the management types after multiple comparisons after Kruscal Wallace test..... 127
- Figure 24** Triangular relationships for three tables (1,2,3) of information (species on sites (L), life history traits (Q), environmental variables(R)) and ordination techniques applied to the analysis of relationships. CA= Correspondence Analysis, PCA= Principle Component Analysis, Co-inertia=analysis for interactions between CA and PCA. Circle indicates the RLQ analysis of the triangular relationship. .... 144
- Figure 25** Overview showing the link between species on site (bottom), life history trait classifications (top) and the environmental variables (arrows): isolation and plant species richness. The figure assists with the interpretation of the three table analysis. For example, the species *C. masteri masteri* is characterised by scarce distribution, high dispersal abilities, medium body size and active in summer. With respect to the link between the species and environmental variables, *C. masteri masteri* occurs at grassland fragments that are high in plant richness and low in isolation..... 151



<b>Figure 26</b> Significant relationships and the lack of relationships (indicated by the black square and empty boxes) between environmental data on site and life history traits of ground beetles present on site based on fourth corner statistic ( $\alpha = \sqrt{0.05/N}$ with $N = \text{number of environmental variables}$ ). Permutations are based on model 2 (permutes values of sites (i.e., permute entire rows of table L) and model 4 (permutes values of species (i.e., permute entire column of table L).....	152
<b>Figure 27</b> Map of the northern parts of the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) with the outline of the city of Canberra. Dark grey areas indicate current distribution and size of native temperate grassland remnants. Light grey areas indicate distribution of pre 1750 native grassland. Circles show the locations where <i>S. plana</i> (GSM) populations were surveyed. ....	164
<b>Figure 28</b> Shape, colour and size of <i>S. plana</i> eggs, dissected from captured females. Single grid size is 1 x 1 mm.....	166
<b>Figure 29</b> Female (left) and male (right) <i>S. plana</i> empty pupae cases after removal from silk tunnel and cleaning. Sizes are not scaled. ....	167
<b>Figure 30</b> Absolute numbers of sites by relative abundance classes of <i>S. plana</i> adults at all sites surveyed in the ACT between 2006 and 2009. Abundance estimates are based on surveys of moths for a minimum of 20 minutes per grassland sites (n=47) either by transect or circular point counts. Abundance classes are classified as follows: I: no sightings, II (very low-low): 2-50 individuals, III (medium-high): >50-100, IV (very high) :>100 individuals.....	172
<b>Figure 31</b> Estimated daily (18.11.-16.12. 2006) population sizes (N) for the <i>S. plana</i> population at York Park, Canberra, ACT. Bars indicate standard error. ....	173
<b>Figure 32</b> Flight activity of adult <i>S. plana</i> between 10 am and 2 pm at three grassland monitoring sites (A: Former Transmitting Belconnen Naval Base, B: Dudley Street Canberra, C: Crace Nature Park) in the ACT. The relative abundance of moths was estimated using circular point count. ....	174
<b>Figure 33</b> Proportion of presence and absence of <i>S. plana</i> in a) grassland communities (exotic pasture, native pasture and natural temperate grassland) and b) in climax vegetation classifications. Bars indicate standard error. Sample size for grasslands dominated by wallaby grass n=24, spear grass n=7, Chilean needle grass n=4, wet and dry kangaroo grass n=4 (each) and Canary grass n=4. ....	175
<b>Figure 34</b> Linear relationship between <i>S. plana</i> female abdomen lengths and numbers of eggs. ....	176
<b>Figure 35</b> Sex ratio in <i>S. plana</i> populations based on pupae case identification from samples (n=650) obtained in 2007 and 2008 in native temperate grassland and exotic grassland dominated by Chilean needle grass ( <i>Nassella neessiana</i> ). Males are indicated by shaded bars, females by open bars. The number of specimens examined in each year is listed within the bars.....	178

<b>Figure 36</b> Pupae case intactness probability ( $\phi(t.)$ ) under natural conditions between 07.11.2008 – 12.01.2009 at one of the largest natural temperate grasslands in the ACT (former Belconnen Naval Transmitting Station). Bars indicate standard error.....	179
<b>Figure 37</b> Total number of <i>S. plana</i> larvae with associated grass species found in native and exotic grasslands in the ACT.....	180

## Acknowledgments

---

Throughout the last few years I (we) have been living and working in two continents and have met many people, of which some have become very good friends and others hopefully lifetime lasting colleagues. Every single one of you had great positive impact on my personal and academic life for which I would like to thank you. Your unfailing faith in my ability to become an ecologist, your enduring help in getting me to this stage and your encouragement to take this path till the end will be always kept in my heart and mind. This thesis could not have been done without ...

### ....my supervisory panel,

I am enormously thankful to my primary supervisor and mentor **Dr Will Osborne** and co - supervisors **Prof Stephen Sarre** and **Dr Klaus Henle**. Your support, dedication and assistance in all stages of this PhD thesis is greatly appreciated. Will Osborne has been a fantastic supervisor, sharing his enormous knowledge about Australian flora and fauna and his great expertise in applied ecology during field trips and at Uni. He always believed in my personal growth and academic future even in times when I had my doubts about it. In Germany, a PhD student's supervisor is referred as being a "Doktorvater" (doctor dad). I refer to Will Osborne as my "Doktorvater" because he cared for and looked after me and my family like a father in a professional and personal manner. Such moments, conducting grasslands surveys, while Will was playing his banjo or harmonica, will be always remembered. I thank Stephen Sarre for reminding me to stay focused and to keep the big picture in mind and acknowledge Klaus Henle's great help in conceptualising the study and providing critical comments on chapters. All supervisors helped improve the thesis by proving constructive critics and comments as well as helping with expression and grammar. Will Osborne's editing effort was outstanding and I think he will not take on board another international student in a long time.

**...the funding bodies and agencies that provided permissions and site access,**

My study was funded by the ACT government and by the University of Canberra Vice Chancellor scholarship. The community based golden sun moth monitoring program that I initiated through the Friends of Grassland Group (FOG) received financial support from WWF Australia. Overseas travel to international conferences and research visits were supported by the University of Canberra, the Institute for Applied Ecology and by the Early Research Network. I kindly received permission to access the native temperate grasslands from the Department of Defence, the International Airport Canberra, ACT Parks, Conservation, and Lands, Canberra Nature Park and private landholders. Permission to handle *Synemon plana* individuals and to collect ground dwelling insects in native temperate grasslands was provided by the Commonwealth Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.

**...the volunteers that conducted laborious hours in the field and in the laboratory and the general technical support,**

I was fortunate to receive voluntary assistance with pitfall sampling, sorting insects and recording golden sun moth sightings and pupal case collections. In particular, Emma Cook, Sian Jeung, Dana Weinhold, Sylvio Teubert, Carolin Kugel, Steffen Ehmen, Matt Young, Wendy Dimond, Nadav Pezaro, David Wong (GIS mapping) and all members of the Friends of Grassland community which were part of the golden sun moth monitoring, in particular Sarah Hnatiuk and Geoff Robertson, contributed to the data collection and made my time in the hot dry grasslands bearable but also the huge job easier and more fun. Technical support was provided by staff members of the Faculty of Applied Science at the University of Canberra, namely Peter Ogilvie, Anthony Senior, Janet Palmer and Brian Marsh. The administrative crew of the Institute for Applied Ecology made my Uni life much easier by always helping in the most appropriate way. Thank you to Karen Mow and Richard Norris, who manage the Institute for Applied Ecology and always supported my study. Special thank you to Kerrie Aust for kind help in many professional matters and for one personal matter in particular.

**... the Australian scientists,**

Without the support and assistance of several Australian scientists, including botanists and entomologists, I would not have been able to identify the temperate grassland biodiversity. I am thankful to **Isobel Crawford** who taught me in a wonderful way how to identify plant species in native grasslands. I will always bear in mind that the *Austrodanthonia* species found in native grasslands are like the eucalypts in the woodlands (citation I. Crawford). Thank you to the Australian National Herbarium for assisting with some plant identification. **Dr Tom Weir** and **Kim Pullen** from CSIRO Entomology and the Australian Insect Collection (ANIC) introduced me to the amazing diverse Australian beetle fauna and assisted greatly with the confirmation of species identification. Also, from CSIRO Entomology, I like to express my thank you to **Ted Edwards** for his insights about golden sun moth biology and for his taxonomic advice in pupae case sexing. Mark Dunford, Dr Murray Evans, Sarah Sharp, Greg Baines, Dr Don Fletcher and Sharon Lane from ACT Parks, Conservation, and Lands provided advice and ongoing support for my research. Thank you also to Alison Rowell for sharing the data on the MRR study on the golden sun moth.

**... my statistical heroes,**

I am enormously grateful for the statistical assistance and advice that I have received by the time I faced the challenge of analysis small data sets. **Dr Bernd Gruber**'s knowledge about the application of modern statistic and his patience to explain statistical methods to me were outstanding and are highly appreciated. Dr Bernd Gruber provided contributions to Chapter 3 and 4. **Michael Gerisch** assisted greatly and overlooked the statistical analysis in Chapter 5. My thanks to both of them for never giving up answering my aarrggR- error messages. **Dr David Peterson** (statistical consultant within the University of Canberra) assisted greatly with the analysis for Chapter 5. The stats sessions, that we shared, helped me to better understand the statistical aspects of my work.

**.... my friends and colleagues at the Institute for Applied Ecology and at the UFZ- Centre of Environmental Research Leipzig (Germany)**

I will always treasure the care and support that I received from graduate and postgraduate students at the Institute for Applied Ecology and fellows at the UFZ. To all of you had who had or still have a desk in 3C51 and at the Department of Conservation Biology - thank you for the laughter and the tears we shared, the cans of tuna we ate, the chitchat I enjoyed and the motivating words in times when there was no light at the end of the tunnel.

**...and without you- my closest non-scientist friends and family!**

I am grateful for the days when we had homemade cakes and German BBQ's together, went playing with the kids in the lake or in the garden, riding our bikes in the floodplain forest or running in the woods which always brought me back from planet science that helped to put things back into perspective. My deepest thank you to my friends for being the best friends and family ever: Evi, Dirk, and Tim Stark, Uta, Philipp, Johann, Justus, Jannick Glinka, Anett, Kay, Sophie and Jonas Schirmer, Sarah, Gatot and Maya Gwilym-Margianto, Sabine, Uli, Fritzi, Jan and Dotty Dajka, Kristina, Sven, Maha and Merle Friedemann and Jochen and Peter Ehmen. I wish to thank my parent's Sabine and Frank Dieter Richter for preparing me to face the challenges of life as well as to appreciate the sunny days that always follow after a rainy day. Thanks goes to my sister Conny Walkowik with husband Sirko for their different views about the importance of applied science and to my grandma Brigitte Winkler and Ursula Richter for not giving up trying to understand what I am actually doing. Finally, there are two people in my life that made all this possible. My husband and in the last years *housebound* **Steffen Ehmen** and my daughter **Julika Marie Richter**- this thesis is our achievement. Thank you for your understanding and patience, for filling my life with emotions and for your love. Other exciting times are soon to come. This thesis is dedicated to **Peter Winkler** and **Monika Ehmen** who would have loved to have seen this thesis being finally finalised and finished. Ich vermisse Euch sehr.