NEST ASSOCIATES OF CLUBIONA ROBUSTA L. KOCH (ARANEAE: CLUBIONIDAE) IN AUSTRALIA

A.D. AUSTIN

Austin, A.D. 1993 11 11: Nest associates of Clubiona robusta L. Koch (Araneae: Clubionidae) in Australia. Memoirs of the Queensland Museum 33(2): 441-446. Brisbane. ISSN 0079-8835.

The nests of *Clubiona robusta*, whether or not they contain a resident female spider, are usually inhabited by other invertebrates, here termed nest associates. The abundance and diversity of nest associates for *C. robusta* are described from sampled nests. Associates recorded were: other spiders, Acarina, Mollusca and insects of the orders Collembola, Coleoptera, Heteroptera, Hymenoptera, Lepidoptera, Neuroptera, Psocoptera and Thysanoptera. The presence of a resident female was a factor which affects the abundance and diversity of associates. Biological notes on each group of nest associates are given. Results for *C. robusta* are compared with data on other spiders in the same habitat, and other categories of nest associates used in other studies. *Araneae, Clubionidae, parasitoid, predator, eggs, spider nest*.

A.D. Austin, Department of Crop Protection, Waite Campus, University of Adelaide, P.O. Glen Osmond, South Australia 5064, Australia; 18 August, 1992.

Most vagabond spiders build a silken retreat in which they moult, mate, lay eggs and protect themselves and their eggs from predators and extreme environmental conditions (Jackson, 1979; Jackson and Griswold, 1979; Pollard and Jackson, 1982; Austin, 1984a, 1988; Wolf, 1990). Different species construct a great variety of retreats which vary in size, structural complexity and the location in which they are placed. For Clubiona robusta L. Koch, a moderate-sized clubionid (body length about 15 mm) which inhabits the corticating (shedding) bark of eucalypt trees in south-eastern Australia, two types of retreats have been recognized: flimsy, thin, silkwalled moulting chambers constructed by juveniles, and thicker walled nests constructed by mature females for egg laying (Austin, 1984a).

Whatever the structure of spider retreats, they often attract an array of other invertebrates (termed 'nest associates') which utilize them in a variety of ways (Auten, 1925; Jackson and Griswold, 1979; Griswold, 1986). This aspect of spider retreats has been examined only rarely. A study of the nest associates of the salticid Phidippus johnsoni Peckham and Peckham in the U.S.A. by Jackson and Griswold (1979) is the only known detailed work. Jackson and Griswold (1979) divided nest associates into eight categories, following the three described by Auten (1925), based on their biological relationship with the resident spider, its eggs or the nest itself (see Table 1). Most of these biological categories have also been recognized for two eresid species in South Africa (Griswold, 1986).

During a study of the biology of *C. robusta* in South Australia (Austin, 1984a, 1988), incidental observations showed that 1) most nests contained at least some associates, 2) associates inhabited both vacant and occupied nests, and 3) the size range of associates appeared to differ between vacant and occupied nests. This study then sets out to detail the diversity and abundance of nest associates found in *C. robusta* nests, and the factors that might determine their number and size.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Nests of C. robusta were collected from under the bark of eucalypt trees with large plates of corticating bark at their bases (i.e. Eucalyptus camaldulensis, E. cladocalyx, E. leucoxylon and E. viminalis) in the Mylor area of the Adelaide Hills, South Australia (see Austin, 1984a). Nests were collected at random in the summer (December-February) over three years (1979-1981). Nests constructed only in that summer were included in samples. The whiter, fresher colour of the silk was used to distinguish them from nests built in previous seasons. Samples included vacant nests, nests containing a resident spider, and nests containing a resident spider and eggmass or hatched juveniles. In the field, after bark plates were removed from trees, nests were gently teased away and placed in screw-top plastic vials (40 mm dia.). A large white dish prevented accidental loss of any associates or resident spiders. In the laboratory, when nest associates were en-

Category	Description			
1a	Endoparasitoids of spiders that seek out and/or emerge from their hosts inside nests			
1b	Ectoparasites and ectoparasitoids of spiders that seek out and/or emerge from their hosts inside nests			
2	Endoparasitoids of eggs in nests			
3a	Predators of eggs in nests (including 'ectoparasitoids')			
3b	Predators of spiders in nests			
4	Scavengers feeding on dead spiders or other material in nests			
5	Predatory spiders that adopt nests as a predatory device			
6	Spiders that adopt the nests of other spiders as a refuge or substitute for constructing their own nests			
7	Organisms (other than spiders) that adopt nests as a refuge or pupation site			
8	Accidental inhabitants			
9	Conspecific males			

TABLE 1. Categories of nest associates, modified after Jackson and Griswold (1979) (see text for further information).

countered, details of the nest were recorded along with any relevant biological information for the associate, and they were then preserved in 70% alcohol for identification. Parasitized spider eggs and the larvae and pupae of mantispids, pompilids, Diptera and Lepidoptera were left to emerge prior to preservation. As in Jackson and Griswold (1979), nest associates only within the nest, within the silk matrix of the nest wall, or under the nest were collected, not those completely outside or near the nest. To compare differences in the diversity, size and abundance of associates between vacant nests and those occupied by a resident female, 30 nests of each type were collected at random in the field during January 1980 and examined.

Voucher specimens of each nest associate were lodged in the Department of Crop Protection insect collection, Waite Campus, University of Adelaide, South Australia.

RESULTS

Over 400 nests sampled during the summers of 1979 to 1981, yielded over 40 species of nest associates including Acarina, Araneae, Collembola, Coleoptera, Diptera, Heteroptera, Hymenoptera, Lepidoptera, Neuroptera, Psocoptera, Thysanoptera and Mollusca (Table 2). The biological association of each associate with *C. robusta* (categories listed in Table 1), whether determined by direct observation or only assumed, is also given for each species in Table 2. The exact category of individual associates could be assigned only for those species whose biology

was observed directly (e.g., parasitoids or predators of eggs or adult C. robusta-?Ogcodes sp., Ceratobaeus masneri Austin), or for those species whose biology was well enough known to rule out all categories except one (e.g., Lepidoptera pupating in nests or Hymenoptera which specifically parasitize other spiders). For other associates, multiple categories are listed to indicate the range of biological associations that might exist. For many species it was impossible to determine whether nests were being used as a specific refuge or the species was there by accident (categories 7/8). For others, their association with C. robusta appeared to vary. Gnaphosid and segestriid spiders were observed in the field preying on subadult C. robusta (category 3b, see below), as well as constructing their own nests inside those of the host spider (category 6).

Nest associates seemed to occur both in vacant nests and those occupied by a female spider, there appearing to be fewer and smaller associates in the latter. To test these hypotheses, i.e. that occupied nests had fewer and smaller associates, the fauna from 30 occupied nests and 30 vacant nests were compared (Table 3). Of the 40 recognized taxa that were collected during the 1979-81 survey, 28 were found in the 60 sampled nests, with Diptera and Neuroptera being the ordinal taxa not recorded. The 30 occupied nests had substantially fewer nest associates (total 147) compared with vacant nests (227) (see Table 3). Using a Wilcoxin test (Zar, 1984) occupied nests contained significantly fewer associates per nest than vacant nests (Z = 2.36, P < 0.02), and significantly fewer associates larger than 2.5 mm in length (Z = -4.38, P <0.0001). The two major groups of associates that seemed to differ most notably between vacant and occupied nests were other species of spiders and Coleoptera, which were both mostly represented by individuals much greater than 2.5 mm long. This specific size was chosen to test for differences in size of nest associates because previous work on C. robusta has shown that this is about the minimum size for potential prey that females spiders can physically handle (Austin, 1988). Hence, one suggested cause for fewer large associates in occupied nests is that they would be killed or driven away by the resident spider.

BIOLOGY OF NEST ASSOCIATES

Assigning nest associates to one or more biological categories first required that those used by Jackson and Griswold (1979) be modified. In particular, endo- and ectoparasitoids have been

Taxonomy of nest associate	Associate	C. robusta		
axonomy of nest associate	Category	I	11	III
Acarina: Mesostigmata				
Phytoseiidae Seiulus sp.	4/7/8	+	5	2
Acarina: Prostigmata				
Bdellidae Bdellodes harpax (Atyeo)	4/7/8	+	2	2
Cyta latirostris (Hermann)	4/7/8	+	1	1
Anystidae genus & sp. indet.	4/7/8	+	6	7
?Eupalopsellidae genus & sp. indet	4/7/8	+	1	2
Erythraeidae genus & sp. indet	4/7/8	+	3	2
Araneae				
Clubionidae Clubiona cycladata Simon	3a/6/8	+	3	2
C.robusta L.Koch ð	9	+	8	2
Clubiona spp. juveniles*	6/8	+	16	11
Gnaphosidae Intruda sp.	3a/3b/6/8	+	2	0
Hahniidae Scotospilus sp.	3a/6/8	+	0	0
Lamponidae Lampona sp.	3a/3b/6/8	+	1	0
Salticidae Myrmarachne sp.	3a/6/8	+	3	0
Servaea sp.	3a/6/8	+	1	0
Segestriidae Ariadna sp.	3a/3b/6/8	+	2	0
Collembola				
Entomobryidae Drepanura sp. 1 & 2*	4/7/8	+	11	7
Neanuridae Setanodosa sp.	4/7/8	+	5	3
Coleoptera				
Coccinellidae Scymus parallelus Blackburn	4/7/8	+	5	2
Dermestidae Anthrenus sp.	4/7/8	+	2	1
Trogoderma antipodum Blackburn	4/7/8	+	1	0
Tenebrionidae genus & spp. indet.*	4/7/8	+	11	6
Diptera				
Acroceridae ? Ogcodes sp.	la	+	0	0

Toxonomy of past according	Associate Category	C. robusta		
Taxonomy of nest associate		Ι	II	III
Chloropidae Pseudogaurax sp.	3a	+	0	0
Heteroptera				
Reduviidae Empicoris rubromaculatus (Blackburn)	3a/7/8	+	4	2
Pentatomidae Nezara viridula L.	7/8	+	0	0
Poecilometis sp.	7/8	+	0	0
Hymenoptera				
Eulophidae Tetrastichus sp.	3a	+	0	0
Formicidae Iridomyrmex sp.	3a	+	3	0
Scelionidae Ceratobaeus clubionus Austin	7/8	+	2	2
C. lamponae (Hickman)	7/8	+	0	0
C. masneri Austin	2	+	4	7
Gryon sp.	7/8	-	1	0
Trissolcus sp.	7/8	-	0	1
Pompilidae Epipompilus sp.	3a	+	0	0
Lepidoptera				
Limacodidae Doratifera sp. (pupa)	7	-	1	0
genus & spp. indet, (larvae)*	7/8	+	0	0
Neuroptera	_			
Mantispidae Austromantispa sp.	1b/3a	+	0	0
genus & sp. indet. (larva)	1b/3a	+	0	0
Psocoptera				
Lepidopsocidae genus & spp. indet.*	4/7/8	+	2	5
Liposcelidae Liposcelis sp.	4/7/8	+	6	8
Thysanoptera Thripidae genus & spp. indet.*	4/7/8	+	6	7
Mollusca: Gastropoda Helicidae Cochlicella ventrosa (Ferussac)	4/7/8	+	1	0

TABLE 2. Nest associates in nests of *Clubiona robusta* and category of associate to which they belong (see Table 1 and text). I = associates found at least once (+) in occupied or vacant nests over three-year period (1979-81); II = no. of nests in which each associate occurred in sample of 30 vacant nests (Jan 1980); III = no. of nests in which each associate occurred in sample of 30 nests occupied by \Im spiders (Jan 1980); * = nest associate represented by more than one species.

distinguished (categories 1a and 1b), and predators of spiders and their eggs divided into separate categories (3a and 3b). The term 'parasitoid' (Askew, 1971) is used for species that kill their host (e.g., scelionid egg parasitoids), and 'parasite' for species that feed from but normally do not kill their host (e.g., mantispid larvae feeding on adult spiders, see below). 'Ectoparasitoids' of eggs, a term used by some authors, are not distinguished from egg predators (Austin, 1985; La-Salle, 1990). Also, a new category has been added; that of conspecific males (category 9, see below).

Notes on the biology of nest associates were made both in the field and on nests and associates kept for short periods in the laboratory, during the three-year survey of nests.

Scavengers, refuge seekers and accidental inhabitants. Most nest associates belong to one of these categories (25/40 taxa), but without detailed biological studies on individual species, it was impossible to determine in which specific category they belonged. The major groups are Acarina, Collembola, Coleoptera, Pentatomidae (Heteroptera), Lepidoptera, Psocoptera (New, 1974), Thysanoptera and Mollusca. In addition, three parasitic wasps can be categorized as either refuge seekers or accidental inhabitants; Ceratobaeus clubionus Austin, an egg parasitoid of other clubionid spiders (not C. robusta -Austin, 1984b), Ceratobaeus lamponae (Hickman), an egg parasitoid of Lampona spp. (Hickman, 1967a), and Trissolcus sp. and Gryon sp., egg

Statistics	Nest residents			
Stausnes	no Q	resident §		
No. of nests sampled	30	30		
Total no. of associates	227	1.47		
Mean no. of associates/nest	7.63	4.90		
Total no. of associates >2.5mm	72	13		
% of associates>2.5 mm	31.7	8.9		
Mean no. of associates/nest> 2.5mm	2.33	0.47		

TABLE 3. No. of nest associates for vacant nests and nests occupied by resident 9 spider.

parasitoids of pentatomid bug eggs (Masner, 1976).

Other spiders that use C. robusta nests. More than 50% of vacated nests were occupied by other spiders, including conspecifics, many of which had constructed moulting retreats or their own nests inside that of C. robusta (category 6), Sixteen of 30 vacant nests contained juvenile Clubiona which, in most cases, could not be identified to species. Some of these may have come from previously hatched eggmasses in the same nest. However, 11 of 30 occupied nests also contained Clubiona juveniles, 8 of which contained gravid female C. robusta and no previously hatched eggmasses, indicating that these juveniles had migrated from other nests. Ten out of 60 nests sampled in January 1980 contained conspecific adult males, two cobabitating with mature females and eight found in older, vacated nests. Other spiders were encountered more rarely in the survey and only in vacant nests. All species, except for the hahniid Scotospilus sp. and the segestriid Ariadna sp., at least once constructed retreats or nests inside nests of C. robusta.

Parasitoids and parasites of adult C, robusta. Only on two occasions were such organisms recorded. One acrocerid fly (?Ogcodes sp.) was reared from a female C. robusta (category 1a) (Schlinger, 1987) and a single mantispid larva (possibly Austromantispa sp.) was found attached to the pedicel of a gravid female inside a nest (category 1b). Some mantispids are now known to act as ectoparasites of female spiders as small larvae and then as predators of the eggs as larger larvae (Redborg, 1982; Redborg and Macleod, 1983).

Predators of adult C. robusta. The only potential predators of adult C. robusta collected during the study were other large spiders, but no such predation was noted (category 3b). Four cases of predation on subadult C. robusta outside of retreats were recorded, two each by Intruda sp. and Ariadna sp. Also, no spider were noted using C. robusta nests as a predatory device (category 5, see Jackson, 1976; Jackson and Griswold, 1979).

Parasitoids and predators of C. robusta eggs. An endoparasitic wasp, Ce, masneri, was the most commonly noted species (category 2) and was associated with vacant nests, occupied nests without eggmasses, and occupied nests with eggmasses. This wasp caused the highest level of egg mortality (22-25%, Austin, 1984b, 1988) of all species found feeding on eggs. Four species thought to be specific predators ('ectoparasites' of other authors) were seen feeding on C. robusta eggmasses only rarely (category 3a). These included a chloropid fly, Pseudogaurax sp., on three occasions (Austin, 1985), a eulophid wasp, Tetrastichus sp. (LaSalle, 1990), a pompilid wasp, Epipompilus sp. (Pollard, 1982), cach on one occasion, and a mantispid, Austromantispa sp., on two occasions. The only generalist predator of eggs recorded was the ant Iridomyrmex sp. which was observed feeding on eggmasses and hatched eggs several times, but only in vacant nests (Austin, 1988). Other possible predators of eggs include a reduviid, Empicoris rubromaculatus Blackburn, and other spiders.

NEST ASSOCIATES OF OTHER SPIDERS ON EUCALYPT BARK

During the 1979-81 survey, while collecting nests of C. robusta, nests of three relatively common spiders were also collected and their nest associates examined. Observations on these three species are presented here. Other species were either too rarely encountered to report on here or were not found associated with their nests.

Servaea sp. (Salticidae). This same species (or one very similar) was figured as Plexippus validus Urquhart by Hickman (1967b), who described some aspects of its biology in Tasmania. The spider constructs a flattened, circular nest (30-40 mm dia.) of dense, white silk, similar in appearance and density to cotton wool. Twenty-five nests were collected: 20 occupied by female spiders, and 10 contained eggmasses or hatched juveniles. Only six associates were identified from these nests: Austromantispasp. 2 (two nests), Ogcodes sp. (one nest), Pseudogaurax sp. 2 (seven nests), Iridomyrmex sp. (one nest), Anthrenus sp. (one nest) and an unidentified carabid beetle (one nest). Iridomyrmex sp. was feeding on eggs inside a vacant nest. The Austromantispa sp., Ogcodes sp. and Pseudogaurax sp. in these nests were different from those in C. robusta nests. Mites, Collembola and

Psocoptera were seen in some nests but were not extracted and identified. No scelionid wasps were reared from eggmasses.

Breda jovialis (L. Koch) (Salticidae). This easily recognized salticid builds a disc-shaped nest (about 30 mm dia.) with two prominent tubular entrances opposite each other (Hickman, 1967b). The surface of the nest is hardened and parchment-like, but the inside is lined with dense, flocculent, white silk. Seventeen nests were collected: six had resident, gravid females, and five had females with eggmasses. Only two associates were identified, and both were feeding on eggs. These were Idris sp. (Scelionidae) and Pseudogaurax sp. Another scelionid is known to parasitize *B. jovialis* eggs elsewhere in Australia (Hickman, 1967a; Austin, 1981), but this species was not found in South Australia. As for Servaea sp., mites, Collembola and Psocoptera were seen in a few nests but were not extracted and identified.

Ariadna sp. (Segestriidae). This species builds a flattened oval or tubular nest with walls of similar construction and silk density to that of *B. jovialis*. Only nine nests were collected, all contained resident females, and four contained eggmasses. The only nest associates recorded were the larvae of a hymenopteran egg predator in one nest. These failed to develop and thus could not be identified. No mites, Collembola and Psocoptera were seen in the nests of this species.

DISCUSSION

The number of species of nest associates collected from C. robusta nests and the major taxa represented were similar to that found in nests of a salticid, P. johnsoni (Jackson and Griswold, 1979). However, C. robusta differed in that many more contained associates: of the 60 sampled nests 55 (92%) contained at least one associate, whereas only 1.2 % of P. johnsoni nests were occupied by associates. No nests of P. johnsoni occupied by a resident female spider contained associates, whereas most occupied C. robusta nests did (87%). P. johnsoni nests also differed in that a much greater proportion of recorded associates were spiders (66%), whereas for C. robusta, even excluding Acarina and Collembola, only 26% of associates were spiders. The reason for these differences is unclear, but is probably due to differences between the habitats of the two spiders and the size and nature of potential invertebrate faunas that exist at the two locations. Certainly, the bark of eucalypt trees

examined in this study harbour a large and diverse invertebrate fauna that acts as a reservoir for *C. robusta* nests. Also, the apparent high and consistent abundance of this fauna means that there is probably a much greater chance of nests being inhabited, compared with the places *P. johnsoni* constructs nests, i.e., under rocks, pieces of wood, and in hollow reeds (Jackson, 1979).

Occupied nests of *C. robusta* have smaller nest associates compared with vacant nests presumably because resident spiders are known to kill and feed on intruders larger than 2.5mm. Also, females are known to guard their eggmasses and kill even distasteful intruders in nests (Austin, 1988). However, the aggressiveness of resident spiders does not explain why there are fewer small associates (<2.5 mm) in occupied nests (see Table 2). One possible reason for this is that the activity of female spiders in building, repairing and tidying nests, disturbs many small invertebrates and they move away.

The notes on nest associates of other spiders given here pose some questions. Generally the nests of the three species examined have structurally more complex nests than does *C. robusta*, and this is associated with them having far fewer nest associates. In the light of this association, further research on nest associates could profitably examine the structure of nests as a factor regulating the number and types of nest associates, as could differences in the behaviour of resident spiders inside their nests.

Finally, the biological categories proposed by Jackson and Griswold (1979) for the nest associates of *P. johnsoni* were directly applicable to the associates recorded here for *C. robusta* and the other three spiders examined and, thus, probably can be applied to the associates of any nest-building vagabond spider. We have modified their scheme in two points: 1) to distinguish between endo- and ectoparasitoids, because these two types of parasitoids have basically different biologies (Austin, 1985; La-Salle, 1990), and 2) to include conspecific males as a new category, which were found in both occupied and vacant nests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the following people for identification of specimens: Val Davies, Mike Gray, Penny Greenslade, Gordon Gross, Mark Harvey, David Lee, Eric Matthews and Tim New. I also thank Mike Keller for assistance with statistical analyses, Sally Collins for assistance with field work and comments on the manuscript, and Paul Dangerfield for comments on the manuscript and proof-reading.

LITERATURE CITED

- ASKEW, R.R. 1971. 'Parasitic Insects'. (Heinemann: London). 316pp.
- AUSTIN, A.D. 1981. *Hickmanella*, a new genus of Scelionidae from Australia (Hymenoptera: Proctotrupoidea). Journal of the Australian Entomological Society 20: 303-308.
 - 1984a. Life history of Clubiona robusta L. Koch and related species (Araneae, Clubionidae) in South Australia. Journal of Arachnology 12: 87-104.
 - 1984b. The fecundity, development and host relationships of *Ceratobaeus* spp. (Hymenoptera: Scelionidae), parasites of spider eggs. Ecological Entomology 9: 125-138.
 - 1985. The function of spider egg sacs in relation to parasitoids and predators, with special reference to the Australian fauna. Journal of Natural History 19: 359-376.
 - 1988. Guarding behaviour, eggmass shape and the eggsac in *Clubiona robusta* L. Koch (Araneae: Clubionidae). Pp.87-95. In A.D. Austin and N.W. Heather (eds). 'Australian Arachnology'. (The Australian Entomological Society: Brisbane).
- AUTEN, M. 1925. Insects associated with spider nests. Annals of the Entomological Society of America 18: 240-250.
- GRISWOLD, T.M. 1986. Nest associates of two species of group-living Eresidae in South Africa. Actas X Congress Internationale Arachnologie Jaca/Espana 1: 275.
- HICKMAN, V.V. 1967a. New Scelionidae (Hymenoptera) which lay their eggs in those of spiders. Journal of the Entomological Society of Australia (N.S.W.) 4: 15-39.
 - 1967b. 'Some Common Spiders of Tasmania', (Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery: Hobart). 112pp.
- JACKSON, R.R. 1976. Predation as a selection factor in the mating strategy of the jumping spider

Phidippus johnsoni (Salticidae, Araneae). Psyche 83: 243-255.

- 1979. Nests of *Phidippus johnsoni* (Araneae, Salticidae): characteristics, pattern of occupation, and function. Journal of Arachnology 7: 47-58.
- JACKSON, R.R. & GRISWOLD, C.E. 1979. Nest associates of *Phidippus johnsoni* (Araneae, Salticidae). Journal of Arachnology 7: 59-67.
- LASALLE, J. 1990. Tetrastichinae (Hymenoptera: Eulophidae) associated with spider egg sacs. Journal of Natural History 24: 1377-1389.
- MASNER, L. 1976. Revisionary notes and keys to world genera of Scelionidae (Hymenoptera: Proctotrupoidea), Memoirs of the Entomological Society of Canada 97: 1-87.
- NEW, T.R. 1974. Psocoptera from nests of the colonial spider *Lxeuticus candidus* (Koch) (Dictynidae) in Western Victoria. Australian Entomological Magazine 2: 2-6.
- POLLARD, S.D. 1982. Epipompilus insularis (Hymenoptera: Pompilidae), a parasitoid of hunting spiders. New Zealand Journal of Zoology 9: 37-40.
- POLLARD, S.D. & JACKSON, R.R. 1982. The biology of *Clubiona cambridgei* (Aranea, Clubionidae): intraspecific interactions. New Zealand Journal of Ecology 5: 44-50.
- REDBORG, K.E. 1982. Interference by the mantispid Mantispa uhleri with the development of the spider Lycosa rabida. Ecological Entomology 7: 187-196.
- REDBORG, K.E. & MACLEOD, E.G. 1983. Climaciella brunnea (Neuroptera: Mantispidae): a mantispid that obligately boards spiders. Journal of Natural History 17: 63-73.
- SCHLINGER, E.I. 1987. The biology of Acroceridae (Diptera): true endoparasitoids of spiders. 319-327. In W. Nentwig (ed.), 'Ecophysiology of Spiders'. (Springer-Verlag: Berlin).
- WOLF, A. 1990. The silken nests of the clubionid spider Cheiracanthium pennyi and Cheiracanthium punctorium (Araneae, Clubionidae). Acta Zoologica Fennica 190: 397-404.
- ZAR, J.H. 1984. 'Biostatistical Analysis'. (Prentice-Hall: New Jersey). 718pp.



Austin, A. D. 1993. "Nest associates of Clubiona robusta L. Koch (Araneae: Clubionidae) in Australia." *Memoirs of the Queensland Museum* 33, 441–446.

View This Item Online: <u>https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/125180</u> **Permalink:** <u>https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/74870</u>

Holding Institution Queensland Museum

Sponsored by Atlas of Living Australia

Copyright & Reuse Copyright Status: Permissions to digitize granted by rights holder.

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org.