



for the  
University  
of  
Edinburgh

H. M.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1962

University Library

Edinburgh EH8 9JT, Scotland, UK

Telephone: +44 131 650 5000

E-mail: [library@ed.ac.uk](mailto:library@ed.ac.uk)

http://www.ed.ac.uk/~library

and the number of species per genus. In addition, the number of individuals per species was used to calculate the mean species richness per genus. The mean species richness per genus was calculated by dividing the total number of individuals per genus by the number of species per genus. The mean species richness per genus was then multiplied by the number of species per genus to calculate the mean species richness per genus. The mean species richness per genus was then multiplied by the number of species per genus to calculate the mean species richness per genus. The mean species richness per genus was then multiplied by the number of species per genus to calculate the mean species richness per genus.

The mean species richness per genus was then multiplied by the number of species per genus to calculate the mean species richness per genus. The mean species richness per genus was then multiplied by the number of species per genus to calculate the mean species richness per genus. The mean species richness per genus was then multiplied by the number of species per genus to calculate the mean species richness per genus.

The mean species richness per genus was then multiplied by the number of species per genus to calculate the mean species richness per genus.

The mean species richness per genus was then multiplied by the number of species per genus to calculate the mean species richness per genus.

The mean species richness per genus was then multiplied by the number of species per genus to calculate the mean species richness per genus.

The mean species richness per genus was then multiplied by the number of species per genus to calculate the mean species richness per genus.

The mean species richness per genus was then multiplied by the number of species per genus to calculate the mean species richness per genus.

The mean species richness per genus was then multiplied by the number of species per genus to calculate the mean species richness per genus.

The mean species richness per genus was then multiplied by the number of species per genus to calculate the mean species richness per genus.

The mean species richness per genus was then multiplied by the number of species per genus to calculate the mean species richness per genus.

and capital flows, and the expansion of the market. But, the decline of the Brazilian oil and steel industry, which had been a major factor in the industrialization process, was also a consequence of the import-substitution industrialization model, which had concentrated on the production of intermediate goods for export, rather than on the production of final goods for domestic consumption. The import-substitution industrialization model was based on protectionism, which gave priority to the development of heavy industries, such as steel and oil, over light industries, such as food processing and textiles. This model was successful in creating a diversified industrial base, but it was also responsible for Brazil's dependence on foreign countries for its basic needs, such as oil and steel, and for the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few large companies.

The economic crisis of 1985, known as the "black dollar" crisis, exposed the weaknesses of the import-substitution industrialization model, as it led to a sharp increase in the price of oil, which caused a balance of payments crisis, and forced the government to devalue the real by 50% to combat inflation.

After the 1985 crisis, the government turned to a new model of development, known as the "structural adjustment model," which emphasized the need to reduce inflation and to open up the economy to foreign trade and investment. This model was based on the belief that the private sector could be more efficient than the state-owned enterprises, and that foreign investment could bring in new technologies and management practices.

Under this model, the government reduced state-owned enterprises and increased privatization, while the central bank focused on controlling inflation.

Under the new model, the government focused on reducing inflation and increasing privatization, while the central bank focused on controlling inflation.

Under the new model, the government focused on reducing inflation and increasing privatization, while the central bank focused on controlling inflation.

Under the new model, the government focused on reducing inflation and increasing privatization, while the central bank focused on controlling inflation.







1986. The difference in 1986 was that the government had to be more careful about its spending, and it had to be more careful about its borrowing.

Thus, in 1986, the government had to be more careful about its spending, and it had to be more careful about its borrowing.

The budget deficit has been reduced, and the government has been able to meet its spending needs without increasing its debt.

The budget deficit has been reduced, and the government has been able to meet its spending needs without increasing its debt.

The budget deficit has been reduced, and the government has been able to meet its spending needs without increasing its debt.

The budget deficit has been reduced, and the government has been able to meet its spending needs without increasing its debt.

The budget deficit has been reduced, and the government has been able to meet its spending needs without increasing its debt.

The budget deficit has been reduced, and the government has been able to meet its spending needs without increasing its debt.

The budget deficit has been reduced, and the government has been able to meet its spending needs without increasing its debt.

The budget deficit has been reduced, and the government has been able to meet its spending needs without increasing its debt.

The budget deficit has been reduced, and the government has been able to meet its spending needs without increasing its debt.

The budget deficit has been reduced, and the government has been able to meet its spending needs without increasing its debt.

The budget deficit has been reduced, and the government has been able to meet its spending needs without increasing its debt.

## REFERENCES

Anderson, C. L., 1972. A comparative study of seven higher plants  
and their pollen grains. *Bot. Gazette*, 143, 125-139.

Anderson, C. L., 1973. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Fraxinus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 144, 11-18.

Anderson, C. L., 1974. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 145, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1975. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Salix*. *Bot. Gazette*, 146, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1976. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 147, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1977. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 148, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1978. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 149, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1979. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 150, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1980. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 151, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1981. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 152, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1982. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 153, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1983. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 154, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1984. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 155, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1985. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 156, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1986. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 157, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1987. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 158, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1988. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 159, 1-10.

Anderson, C. L., 1989. A comparative study of the pollen grains of  
selected species of the genus *Populus*. *Bot. Gazette*, 160, 1-10.

Category	Number of individuals	Mean age (years)	SD	Range	Min	Max
Male	10	21.0	1.8	18-24	18	24
Female	10	21.0	1.8	18-24	18	24
Total	20	21.0	1.8	18-24	18	24
Mean age at first sexual intercourse	16.8	1.8	1.8	14-19	14	19
Mean age at first coitus	17.8	1.8	1.8	15-20	15	20
Mean age at first coitus with partner	18.8	1.8	1.8	16-21	16	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of same sex	19.8	1.8	1.8	17-22	17	22
Mean age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex	18.8	1.8	1.8	16-21	16	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of same sex and partner of opposite sex	19.0	1.8	1.8	17-21	17	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of same sex and partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex	19.0	1.8	1.8	17-21	17	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex	19.0	1.8	1.8	17-21	17	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex	19.0	1.8	1.8	17-21	17	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of same sex and partner of same sex	19.0	1.8	1.8	17-21	17	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of same sex and partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex	19.0	1.8	1.8	17-21	17	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex	19.0	1.8	1.8	17-21	17	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex	19.0	1.8	1.8	17-21	17	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex and partner of opposite sex	19.0	1.8	1.8	17-21	17	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of same sex and partner of same sex and partner of opposite sex	19.0	1.8	1.8	17-21	17	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex	19.0	1.8	1.8	17-21	17	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of same sex and partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex	19.0	1.8	1.8	17-21	17	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex and partner of opposite sex	19.0	1.8	1.8	17-21	17	21
Mean age at first coitus with partner of same sex and partner of same sex and partner of same sex	19.0	1.8	1.8	17-21	17	21

and 19.0 years respectively. The mean age at first coitus was 17.8 years, and the mean age at first coitus with partner was 18.8 years.

#### Other characteristics of respondents

There were no significant differences between males and females in terms of education, marital status, ethnicity or income. There were significant differences between males and females in terms of age, with females being significantly younger than males ( $p < 0.001$ ), and in terms of number of sexual partners ( $p = 0.001$ ).

There were significant differences between males and females in terms of age at first sexual intercourse, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ), and in terms of age at first coitus, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ).

There were significant differences between males and females in terms of age at first coitus with partner, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ), and in terms of age at first coitus with partner of same sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ).

There were significant differences between males and females in terms of age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ), and in terms of age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ).

There were significant differences between males and females in terms of age at first coitus with partner of same sex and partner of opposite sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ), and in terms of age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ).

There were significant differences between males and females in terms of age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex and partner of opposite sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ), and in terms of age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ).

There were significant differences between males and females in terms of age at first coitus with partner of same sex and partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ), and in terms of age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex and partner of opposite sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ).

There were significant differences between males and females in terms of age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ), and in terms of age at first coitus with partner of same sex and partner of same sex and partner of opposite sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ).

There were significant differences between males and females in terms of age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ), and in terms of age at first coitus with partner of same sex and partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ).

There were significant differences between males and females in terms of age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex and partner of opposite sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ), and in terms of age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ).

There were significant differences between males and females in terms of age at first coitus with partner of same sex and partner of same sex and partner of same sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ), and in terms of age at first coitus with partner of opposite sex and partner of opposite sex and partner of same sex, with females being significantly older than males ( $p = 0.001$ ).

of the population in one of the three main regions of the country. The results are shown in Table 1.

The sampling scheme used in the survey was a two-stage sampling procedure. In the first stage, 1000 households were selected from the total population of 100000 households in the three regions. In the second stage, 10 households were selected from each of the 1000 households.

The following sections describe the sampling procedure and the data analysis methods used in the survey.

### Sampling Procedure

The sampling procedure involved two stages. In the first stage, 1000 households were selected from the total population of 100000 households in the three regions.

In the second stage, 10 households were selected from each of the 1000 households.

The sampling procedure involved two stages. In the first stage, 1000 households were selected from the total population of 100000 households in the three regions.

In the second stage, 10 households were selected from each of the 1000 households.

The sampling procedure involved two stages. In the first stage, 1000 households were selected from the total population of 100000 households in the three regions.

In the second stage, 10 households were selected from each of the 1000 households.

The sampling procedure involved two stages. In the first stage, 1000 households were selected from the total population of 100000 households in the three regions.

In the second stage, 10 households were selected from each of the 1000 households.

The sampling procedure involved two stages. In the first stage, 1000 households were selected from the total population of 100000 households in the three regions.

In the second stage, 10 households were selected from each of the 1000 households.

The sampling procedure involved two stages. In the first stage, 1000 households were selected from the total population of 100000 households in the three regions.

In the second stage, 10 households were selected from each of the 1000 households.

The sampling procedure involved two stages. In the first stage, 1000 households were selected from the total population of 100000 households in the three regions.

In the second stage, 10 households were selected from each of the 1000 households.

The sampling procedure involved two stages. In the first stage, 1000 households were selected from the total population of 100000 households in the three regions.

In the second stage, 10 households were selected from each of the 1000 households.

The sampling procedure involved two stages. In the first stage, 1000 households were selected from the total population of 100000 households in the three regions.

In the second stage, 10 households were selected from each of the 1000 households.

the first time. In 1980, the U.S. Congress passed the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (EPCA), which established national energy efficiency standards for major appliances and equipment. This was followed by the Energy Conservation Policy Act of 1985, which imposed further restrictions on energy consumption. The EPCA has been instrumental in reducing energy waste and conserving resources.

The EPCA established minimum energy performance levels for a variety of products, including refrigerators, washing machines, dishwashers, clothes dryers, and water heaters. These standards have been updated periodically to reflect advances in technology and changing energy needs. For example, in 2010, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) issued new regulations for residential water heaters, setting a minimum energy factor of 0.75 for standard water heaters and 0.80 for tankless models. These changes are expected to save consumers billions of dollars over the long term.

In addition to setting minimum energy performance levels, the EPCA also provides incentives for manufacturers to develop more efficient products. For instance, the law includes provisions for research and development grants, tax credits, and other financial incentives to encourage innovation in energy efficiency technologies. These incentives have helped to drive down the cost of energy-efficient products and make them more accessible to consumers.

Overall, the EPCA has been a significant success in promoting energy efficiency and conservation. By setting clear performance standards and providing incentives for innovation, the law has helped to reduce energy waste and conserve resources while also saving consumers money on their utility bills. As energy prices continue to rise, it is likely that the EPCA will play an even more important role in ensuring a sustainable future for all Americans.







записей в приватных и публичных жертвенниках Иерусалима и  
Храма Гроба Господня в Иерусалиме и Иерусалимской епархии УПЦ КП

и других христианских святынь для изучения истории и культуры

Христианства и православия в Иерусалиме и Израиле. В  
рамках этого проекта в Иерусалиме и Израиле  
планируется создание Центра изучения Христианства и  
Православия в Иерусалиме и Израиле.

