

TABLE 35. Comparison of herbaceous and woody plants in cleared understorey *L. japonica* weeded (treated) and unweeded (control) 1 × 1-m plots by paired plot design experiments on square root ($\sqrt{x + 0.5}$) transformed data (no./m²)

Experiments	Results							Significance
	m ² plot replications	Standard deviation 1971	Standard deviation 1972	Mean no./m ² 1971	Mean no./m ² 1972	Corrected mean 1971	Corrected mean 1972	
Herbs								
controls								$t_{9\text{ df}} = 2.636$ and modified $t_{9\text{ df}} = 2.719$; significant at 0.05 and 0.025 respectively
treated	10	12.0	34.7	17.9	41.9	15.7	34.2	
	10	15.9	82.5	22.5	110.9	19.7	96.7	
<i>Allium vineale</i>								$t_{9\text{ df}} = 0.897$; not significant at 0.1
controls	10	8.3	32.7	13.6	36.3	12.0	27.9	
treated	10	12.7	50.8	16.8	35.1	14.9	21.5	
<i>Oxalis stricta</i>								modified $t_{9\text{ df}} = 4.764$; significant at 0.005
controls	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
treated	10	0.0	18.2	0.0	17.7	0.0	13.9	
Woody								$t_{9\text{ df}} = 0.0003$; not significant at 0.1
controls	10	0.4	35.4	0.2	51.4	0.2	46.4	
treated	10	1.3	42.0	1.1	58.2	0.9	51.4	
Herbs vs. woody	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	$t_{9\text{ df}} = 1.941$; significant at 0.1
	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Trees								modified $t_{9\text{ df}} = 5.363$; significant beyond 0.001
controls	10	0.4	1.3	0.2	0.7	0.2	0.5	
treated	10	1.1	8.5	0.7	13.5	0.5	12.4	
<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>								modified $t_{9\text{ df}} = 7.105$; significant beyond 0.001
controls	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
treated	10	0.0	3.4	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.6	
<i>Ulmus americana</i>								modified $t_{9\text{ df}} = 4.491$; significant at 0.005
controls	10	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.3	
treated	10	0.0	5.2	0.0	6.0	0.0	5.1	
Other woody								$t_{9\text{ df}} = 0.824$; not significant at 0.1
controls	10	0.0	35.4	0.0	50.5	0.0	45.3	
treated	10	0.0	40.2	0.0	43.8	0.0	33.3	
<i>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</i>								modified $t_{9\text{ df}} = 0.939$; not significant at 0.1
controls	10	0.0	13.5	0.0	12.6	0.0	8.6	
treated	10	0.0	5.5	0.0	6.0	0.0	4.8	
<i>Rhus radicans</i>								$t_{9\text{ df}} = 0.610$; not significant at 0.1
controls	10	0.0	16.3	0.0	7.9	0.0	4.0	
treated	10	0.0	9.3	0.0	4.3	0.0	2.2	
<i>Vitis rupestris</i>								$t_{9\text{ df}} = 0.126$; not significant at 0.1
controls	10	0.0	29.6	0.0	26.5	0.0	19.7	
treated	10	0.0	33.8	0.0	31.3	0.0	21.0	