An analytical solution for correcting palaeomagnetic inclination error
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SUMMARY
With increasing evidence showing significant inclination shallowing in red beds, it is important to develop useful tools to detecting and correcting inclination errors for haematite-bearing sedimentary rocks. Theoretically, any deviation of magnetization from the ambient magnetic field can be described by a preferred orientation distribution (OD) of unique axes of the anisotropic magnetic particles. Based on Stephenson’s continuous particle OD function, magnetic anisotropy parameters of a bulk sample and inclination-correction equations were derived considering all the magnetic particles in a sample. In addition to our new equations for correcting red bed inclination error, the results also confirm the inclination correction of Jackson et al. for magnetite-bearing samples, which is based on a simple, discrete-particle OD model used by Stephenson et al. to show their derivations, suggesting that the inclination correction is probably independent of the particle OD models.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Significant inclination shallowing (>15°) of haematite-bearing sediments has been observed in laboratory redeposition experiments (Lovlie & Torsvik 1984; Tauxe & Kent 1984; Tan et al. 2002a), in compaction experiments (Tan et al. 2002a), and in modern fluvial haematite-bearing deposits (Tauxe & Kent 1984; Rosler & Appel 1998). It has also been observed in the Neogene Siwalik Formation red beds deposited in the Himalayan foreland fluvial and alluvial environments (e.g. Butler 1992; Gautam & Fujiwara 2000; Ojha et al. 2000), in Miocene red beds from the extensional Catalan Neo-gene basins of Spain (Garces et al. 1996), in Tertiary and Cretaceous red beds from central Asia (especially, NW China) (e.g. Gilder et al. 1996, 2001; Fang et al. 1997; Kodama & Tan 1997; Tan et al. 2002b), and in Palaeozoic red beds from North America (e.g. van der Pluijm et al. 1993; Potts et al. 1994; Stamatakis et al. 1995; Tan & Kodama 2002). Red beds are one of the major targets of palaeomagnetic studies aimed at constructing major continental apparent polar wander paths and delineating the kinematic histories of major and minor continental blocks. Therefore, it is of great interest to develop useful approaches to detecting and correcting inclination errors in red beds.

Deviation of the magnetization of a sample from the applied magnetic field direction can be theoretically described by an anisotropy in the ability of the sample being magnetized (either by magnetic susceptibility, \( k \), or remanence susceptibility, \( q \)) assuming there are no magnetic interactions between magnetic particles. The anisotropy of magnetic susceptibility (AMS) and remanence susceptibility (ARS) of a bulk sample results from an anisotropic orientation distribution (OD) of the anisotropic individual particles. ARS may include the anisotropies of anhysteretic remanence (ARM), isothermal remanence (IRM) and thermal remanence (TRM). Stephenson et al. (1986) have derived mathematical relationships between the individual particle anisotropy and bulk sample anisotropy parameters. To avoid mathematical complexities, they used a simple particle OD model in which the magnetically prolate particles are aligned with their maximum anisotropy axes parallel to each of the three principal axes of the bulk sample anisotropy ellipsoid. They stated that the results are the same as if the mathematical relationships are derived using a more realistic, continuous particle OD function, i.e. that proposed by Stephenson (1981).

Jackson et al. (1991) developed a quantitative model for correcting inclination shallowing carried by magnetite-bearing samples by assuming that the remanence-acquisition tensor of sediments is consistent with the long-axis OD model. In both of these derivations, only those particles with easy axes aligned parallel to the principal axes of the bulk sample anisotropy ellipsoids were considered. Since the contributions of magnetic susceptibility or remanent magnetization from particles not aligned with their easy axes parallel to the three principal axes do not cancel out, this simplification is not sound physically. The anisotropy of haematite particles is most probably oblate, different from the prolate magnetite anisotropy. Therefore, the equation of Jackson et al. (1991) is not applicable for haematite-bearing samples. We will use a continuous particle OD function to derive a complete relationship between individual particle anisotropy and bulk sample anisotropy parameters for magnetite-bearing and haematite-bearing samples, respectively, and, in particular, to develop new formulae to detect and correct red bed inclination errors.
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2 ASSUMPTIONS

The AMS and ARS of bulk rock samples and their influence on the fidelity of the palaeomagnetic record to the magnetic field direction can be understood based on three essential assumptions concerning the magnetic anisotropy of the individual magnetic particles and the particle OD pattern. First, the magnetic interaction between individual particles is negligible. If this assumption does not hold, the situation is more complicated, and it will not be considered in this study. Secondly, the magnetic anisotropy of individual particles can be expressed by an ellipsoid of revolution. This means that the individual particle anisotropy is either prolate with equal susceptibility in the minimum plane or oblate with isotropic susceptibility in the maximum plane. It can be expressed as

\[
q_{1} > q_{2} = q_{3} \quad \text{for prolate particle AMS fabric,} \\
q_{1} = q_{2} > q_{3} \quad \text{for oblate particle AMS fabric,} \\
q_{1} > q_{2} = q_{3} \quad \text{for prolate particle ARS fabric,} \\
q_{1} = q_{2} > q_{3} \quad \text{for oblate particle ARS fabric,}
\]

where \(q_{i}(i = 1, 2, 3)\) are the principal axes of the AMS and ARS ellipsoids of the individual particle, respectively.

Then, the individual particle anisotropy factor, \(a\) is defined as

\[
a_{1} = k_{1}/k_{3} \quad \text{(or } k_{2}/k_{3} \text{)} \quad \text{for magnetic susceptibility of prolate (or oblate) particles, and} \\
a_{2} = q_{1}/q_{3} \quad \text{(or } q_{2}/q_{3} \text{)} \quad \text{for remanence susceptibility of prolate (or oblate) particles.}
\]

The third assumption is that the intrinsic (individual particle) remanent magnetization is along the easy axis for prolate particles and within the easy plane for oblate particles. Specifically, the natural remanent magnetization (NRM) of a sample is the vector sum, exclusively, of the magnetizations along the easy axes of individual magnetite particles or the magnetizations within the easy planes of haematite particles. In reality, the latter two assumptions can be met by single-domain or elongated pseudo-single-domain magnetite particles and rhombohedral and hexagonal haematite crystal particles because the easy magnetization axis of a magnetite mineral is controlled by particle shape and a haematite mineral is controlled by magnetocrystalline anisotropy (e.g. Dunlop & Özdemir 1997). The magnetic susceptibility of haematite is \(\sim 6000 \mu\)SI (e.g. Borradaile & Henry 1997). The magnetic susceptibility of common red beds is \(<300 \mu\)SI. Therefore, the concentration of haematite in red beds is probably \(<5\) per cent. Magnetic interaction between particles is in many cases negligible because of the relatively low concentration of magnetic minerals, except for chemically precipitated magnetic minerals. Magnetic interaction is important between precipitates of magnetite or haematite particles that carry a chemical remanent magnetization (CRM). CRM carried by multiple generations of haematite particles may be parallel or antiparallel to the applied field direction, or without any relation to the field direction (Stokking & Tauxe 1990), suggesting that magnetic interaction of chemical precipitates of haematite can exist. On the other hand, if a complicated remanent magnetization is not observed in real red beds, which is probably a common situation, magnetic interaction is probably not important. Therefore, the three assumptions for inclination-shallowing correction of red beds are generally met.

3 CONTRIBUTION OF A SINGLE PARTICLE

The existence of anisotropic particles is essential, while a preferential OD of anisotropic particles is necessary to cause a deflection of the remanent magnetization from the magnetic field direction. A uniform OD of anisotropic particles will not cause a bulk sample anisotropy or inclination error for the sample. Stephenson (1981) derived a particle OD function from the inversion of an anisotropy expression for bulk rock samples; therefore, it was assumed to be a realistic OD function for the anisotropic particles in a sample (Stephenson et al. 1986). Derivation of the analytical solution is based on Stephenson’s OD function:

\[
n(\theta, \phi) = \frac{3N_{0}}{2\pi} \left[ k_{0} + (k_{x} - k_{z}) \sin^{2} \phi \right] \cos^{2} \phi \sin^{2} \theta \cos^{2} \theta 
\]

where \(n(\theta, \phi)\) is the angular number density of particles with their unique principal axes of the individual particle aligned in and around the direction defined by unit spherical polar coordinates \((\theta, \phi)\) (Fig. 1); \(N_{0}\) is the total number of particles in the distribution; \(k_{0}, k_{x}, k_{z}\) are the number densities of particles with their unique principal axes of the individual particle aligned in the three principal axes \(X, Y\) and \(Z\) of the bulk sample anisotropy ellipsoid divided by \(3N_{0}/2\pi\), respectively. \(k_{x}, k_{z}\) and \(k_{z}\) have been normalized such that \(k_{x} + k_{z} + k_{z} = 1\). The unique principal axis of the individual particle is either the easy axis of a prolate magnetite particle or the hard axis of an oblate haematite particle.

Assuming that the susceptibility values of the unique principal axis of the individual particle and the equal axes are \(L\) and \(S\), respectively, the eigenvalues of the anisotropy tensor of the particle are

\[
D = \begin{bmatrix} L & S \\ S & S \end{bmatrix}.
\]

The anisotropy tensor of a particle aligned in the direction defined by \((\theta, \phi)\) shown in Fig. 1 is

\[
T = PDP^{T},
\]

where \(P\) is the eigenvector (unit vectors along \(L\) and \(S\)) matrix of the particle, and \(P^{T}\) is the transposed matrix of \(P\):
By extension of eq. (3), it can be shown that the contributions of either magnetic susceptibility or remanence from a single particle with its unique axis aligned in the direction defined by $(\theta, \varphi)$ to the principal axes, $X$, $Y$, $Z$, of the anisotropy ellipsoid of the bulk sample are $T_{11}$, $T_{22}$, $T_{33}$, respectively:

$$T_{11} = S + (L - S) \cos^2 \varphi \sin^2 \theta,$$

$$T_{22} = S + (L - S) \sin^2 \varphi \sin^2 \theta,$$

$$T_{33} = S + (L - S) \cos^2 \theta.$$  

(5)

The results of the integration in eq. (6) are:

$$X = (N_0/5)[(L + 4S) + 2(L - S)k_x],$$

$$Y = (N_0/5)[(L + 4S) + 2(L - S)k_y],$$

$$Z = (N_0/5)[(L + 4S) + 2(L - S)k_z].$$  

(7)

Normalization of $X$, $Y$ and $Z$ by $(X + Y + Z)$ yields the final normalized principal axes for the bulk sample:

$$X_0 = \frac{2(L - S)k_x + (L + 4S)}{5(L + 2S)},$$

$$Y_0 = \frac{2(L - S)k_y + (L + 4S)}{5(L + 2S)},$$

$$Z_0 = \frac{2(L - S)k_z + (L + 4S)}{5(L + 2S)}. $$  

(8)

By solving eq. (8), the three constants, $k_x$, $k_y$ and $k_z$, can be expressed as functions of the three measurable parameters $X_0$, $Y_0$ and $Z_0$:

$$k_x = \frac{5(L + 2S)X_0 - (L + 4S)}{2(L - S)},$$

$$k_y = \frac{5(L + 2S)Y_0 - (L + 4S)}{2(L - S)},$$

$$k_z = \frac{5(L + 2S)Z_0 - (L + 4S)}{2(L - S)}. $$  

(9)

For elongated magnetite-bearing samples, the $a$ factor is defined by $L/S$, and eqs (8) and (9) become

$$X_0 = \frac{2(a - 1)k_x + (a + 4)}{5(a + 2)},$$

$$Y_0 = \frac{2(a - 1)k_y + (a + 4)}{5(a + 2)},$$

$$Z_0 = \frac{2(a - 1)k_z + (a + 4)}{5(a + 2)}.$$  

and

$$k_x = \frac{5(a + 2)X_0 - (a + 4)}{2(a - 1)},$$

$$k_y = \frac{5(a + 2)Y_0 - (a + 4)}{2(a - 1)},$$

$$k_z = \frac{5(a + 2)Z_0 - (a + 4)}{2(a - 1)}. $$  

Eqs (10) and (11) are different from those used by Stephenson et al. (1986). For example, the difference between $k_x$ and $k_x'$ of Stephenson et al. (1986) (eq. 5) is $(a + 2)(3X_0 - 1)/(2a - 1)$. Furthermore, similar equations are derived for haematite-bearing samples. For flaky oblate haematite particles, the $a$ factor is defined by $S/L$, and eqs (8) and (9) become

$$X_0 = \frac{2(1 - a)k_x + (1 + 4a)}{5(1 + 2a)},$$

$$Y_0 = \frac{2(1 - a)k_y + (1 + 4a)}{5(1 + 2a)},$$

$$Z_0 = \frac{2(1 - a)k_z + (1 + 4a)}{5(1 + 2a)}.$$  

and

$$k_x = \frac{5(1 + 2a)X_0 - (1 + 4a)}{2(1 - a)},$$

$$k_y = \frac{5(1 + 2a)Y_0 - (1 + 4a)}{2(1 - a)},$$

$$k_z = \frac{5(1 + 2a)Z_0 - (1 + 4a)}{2(1 - a)}. $$  

5 INCLINATION CORRECTIONS

Assuming $a$ is infinite for the intrinsic remanent magnetization of individual particles that contribute to the NRM, a tensor for the acquisition of NRM can be derived from eq. (10) for magnetite-bearing samples and from eq. (12) for haematite-bearing samples, respectively:

$$k_{NRM} = \begin{pmatrix} X_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Y_0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Z_0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$k_{NRM} = \begin{pmatrix} (2 - k_x) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (2 - k_y) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (2 - k_z) \end{pmatrix}$$ (α-Fe₂O₃).  

(14)

(15)
The relationship between remanent components \( M_t = (N_t, E_t, V_t) \) and palaeomagnetic field components \( H_t = (N_t, E_t, V_t) \) can be expressed as

\[
M_t = k_{\text{NRM}} H_t. \tag{16}
\]

Assuming the palaeomagnetic field is within the \( XZ \) plane of the anisotropy ellipsoid, or the anisotropy ellipsoid is oblate with almost equal magnitudes for the maximum and intermediate axes, the remanent inclination of magnetite-bearing samples can be derived from eqs (14) and (16):

\[
\tan(I_o) = \frac{2k_x + 1}{2k_z + 1} \tan(I_n). \tag{17}
\]

The two constants \( k_x \) and \( k_z \) can be replaced by bulk sample anisotropy and individual particle anisotropy parameters, eq. (11), using either ARS or AMS measurement results. Inserting eq. (11) into eq. (17), we then have the inclination-correction equation for magnetite-bearing samples:

\[
\tan(I_o) = \frac{(a + 2)X_0 - 1}{(a + 2)Z_0 - 1} \tan(I_n), \tag{18}
\]

where \( I_o \) is the real magnetic field inclination; \( I_n \) is the remanent inclination; \( X_0 \) and \( Z_0 \) are the normalized principal anisotropy axes of the bulk rock samples and \( a \) is the individual particle anisotropy factor. Eq. (18) is the same as that derived by Jackson et al. (1991).

Similarly, the remanent inclination of haematite-bearing samples can be derived from eqs (15) and (16):

\[
\tan(I_o) = \frac{2 - k_x}{2 - k_z} \tan(I_n). \tag{19}
\]

Inserting eq. (13) into eq. (19), we then have the inclination correction equation for haematite samples:

\[
\tan(I_o) = \frac{(2a + 1)X_0 - 1}{(2a + 1)Z_0 - 1} \tan(I_n). \tag{20}
\]

A correction for inclination error may use either the AMS or ARS parameters for bulk samples and individual particles. Measurement of the individual particle anisotropy is difficult, although it is not impossible. Approaches for determining the \( a \) factor include compaction experiments and extraction of magnetite particles (e.g. Kodama 1997; Tan & Kodama 1998). Laboratory compaction experiments of disaggregated sediments may provide a more accurate estimate of the \( a \) factor, yet disaggregation and compaction experiments are not easily applied to well-cemented and/or coarse-grained sediments. Direct measurement of the \( a \) factor involves disaggregation of sediments, extraction of magnetic particles and alignment of the easy axes of the particles parallel to a magnetic field. This approach is less accurate and more difficult, because extracting only those particles that carry the characteristic remanent magnetization (ChRM) is difficult, and magnetic interaction between the extracted particles is almost inevitable. Separation of fine haematite particles from red beds is even more difficult. Alternatively, Stephenson et al. (1986) suggested that the \( a \) factor may be constrained using the relationship between the normalized bulk sample AMS and the ARS principal axis values (\( \chi, R_i \)).

6 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN AMS AND ARS

Rewrite eq. (11) for magnetic susceptibility and remanence, respectively; by equating these two equations (because of the same particle distribution) and rearranging, we then have a relationship between normalized AMS and ARS principal axes for magnetite-bearing samples:

\[
R_i = \frac{(a_x + 2)(a_y - 1)}{(a_x + 2)(a_y - 1)} a_y - a_x \tag{21}
\]

where \( a_x \) and \( a_y \) are the magnetic susceptibility and remanence anisotropy factors of the individual particle, respectively; \( R_i = R_1, R_2, R_3 \), are the normalized \((R_1 + R_2 + R_3 = 1)\) maximum, intermediate and minimum axes of AMS, and \( \chi_x = \chi_1, \chi_2, \chi_3 \), are the normalized \((\chi_1 + \chi_2 + \chi_3 = 1)\) maximum, intermediate and minimum axes of AMS.

We find a similar relationship for haematite-bearing samples:

\[
R_i = \frac{(2a_y + 1)(a_x - 1)}{(2a_y + 1)(a_x - 1)} a_x - a_y \tag{22}
\]

Following Stephenson et al. (1986), by defining the normalized particle \( a \) factor as

\[
a_y = \frac{a_y}{2 + a_y}, \quad \bar{a}_x = \frac{a_x}{2 + a_x} \quad \text{(for Fe}_3\text{O}_4) \tag{23}
\]

\[
\bar{a}_y = \frac{a_y}{1 + 2a_y}, \quad \bar{a}_x = \frac{a_x}{1 + 2a_x} \quad \text{(for a-Fe}_2\text{O}_3) \tag{24}
\]

it can be shown that the normalized \( a \) factors for remanence and magnetic susceptibility have the same linear relationship as eq. (21) for magnetite or eq. (22) for haematite. Although the values of the normalized \( a \) factors are between 1/3 and 1 for magnetite particles, and between 1/3 and 1/2 for haematite particles, corresponding to the range of the \( a \) factor values between 1 and infinity, a much smaller range of either the normalized remanence \( a \) factor or the normalized \( a \) factor of magnetic susceptibility may be achieved when the slope defined in eq. (21) or (22) is either flat or steep. A few inconsistent data values concerning haematite particle anisotropy have been reported. For example, Neel (1953) measured magnetic susceptibility and saturation remanence as a function of temperature in the direction parallel and perpendicular to the basal plane of the haematite particle, yielding \( a \) factor values of less than 1.1 for magnetic susceptibility and approximately 2 for remanence at room temperature. In contrast, Uyeda et al. (1963) reported a factor values greater than 100 for magnetic susceptibility. The linear relationship between the remanence and magnetic susceptibility anisotropy-parameters of the bulk sample can be very helpful in determining the \( a \) factor of the haematite (e.g. Tan & Kodama 2002; Tan et al. 2002b).

The linear relationship between the normalized principal axes of AMS and ARS is for pseudo-single-domain and multidomain magnetite and single-domain and pseudo-single-domain haematite particles. For single domain magnetite particles, the ARS ellipsoid is consistent with the individual particle shape, while the AMS ellipsoid is inverted such that the maximum and minimum axes are along the short and long axes of the particle, respectively (e.g. Potter & Stephenson 1988). The inclination correction equation (eq. 18) may not be applicable for multidomain magnetite, since its intrinsic remanence may not be parallel to the long axis of the particle. In addition, the linear relationship may not apply for bulk rock samples, because AMS measurements often include contributions from ferromagnetic, (super) paramagnetic and diamagnetic particles. Nevertheless, the linear relationship provides an independent way for estimating the \( a \) factor value. When ferromagnetic grains dominate the AMS, the easily measured AMS and ARS parameters may be analysed by linear regression. The values of the slope and the intercept point on the \( R_i \) axis (eqs 21 or 22), can be used to constrain the \( a \) factors of the individual particles in the bulk samples.
When the $\alpha$ factor is known, an accurate palaeomagnetic inclination can be determined by eq. (18) for magnetite-bearing or eq. (20) for haematite-bearing samples, respectively.

7 DISCUSSION

Jackson et al. (1991) derived an inclination-correction expression for magnetite-bearing samples, which is the same as eq. (18). They used the simple relationship between remanence anisotropy and individual particle anisotropy of Stephenson et al. (1986) and their supposition that the acquisition tensor of the detrital remanent magnetization (DRM) is consistent with the long-axis OD function:

$$k_D = \begin{pmatrix} k_D \text{max} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & k_D \text{int} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & k_D \text{min} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} k_x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & k_y & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & k_z \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

The basic assumptions we used are essentially the same as those implicit in their derivations, but we consider the contributions from all the magnetic particles. Eqs (20) and (22) can be derived following their reasoning. However, by considering all magnetic particles, we have derived new relationships between individual particle and bulk sample anisotropies (eqs 8–15), which indicate that the contribution of individual particles not aligned with their ellipsoid axes parallel to the principal axes of the bulk sample cannot be neglected. If these new relationships are used in the DRM tensor of Jackson et al. (1991) (eq. 25), we will have a different inclination correction equation. For example, the equation for magnetite-bearing samples will be

$$\tan(I_0) = \frac{(a + 2)X_0 - (a + 4)/5}{(a + 2)Z_0 - (a + 4)/5} \tan(I_m). \quad (26)$$

Eq. (26) yields a significantly greater inclination correction than eq. (18) (Fig. 2). Therefore, Jackson et al.’s (1991) DRM tensor is a model-dependent expression for inclination shallowing, which is true for the simplified particle distribution model Stephenson et al. (1986) used to show the derivations. In fact, the DRM or NRM tensor depends on detailed OD models. If a truncated Fisher (1953) function (Hrouda 1980) is used as a continuous OD model, it will yield different NRM tensors (see the Appendix). However, eqs (14) and (15) are probably the more realistic tensors of a natural remanent magnetization for magnetite-bearing and haematite-bearing samples, respectively, because they are based on a more realistic OD model (Stephenson 1981).

Three continuous functions have been used to describe OD models, and to derive the relationship between bulk sample anisotropy and individual particle anisotropy. They are the Bingham distribution function (Bingham 1964), the truncated Fisher distribution function (Hrouda 1980) and the Stephenson (1981) distribution function. Both Bingham’s and Stephenson’s functions describe triaxial OD models, while the Fisher function is a uniaxial OD model. Owens (1974) used numerical approaches to solve the integrations using the Bingham function. We have difficulty in deriving an analytical solution for correcting inclination shallowing using the Bingham function. Stephenson (1981) derived the triaxial OD function by inverting the ellipsoid equation of bulk sample anisotropy; therefore, the function has a physical basis, i.e. the triaxial bulk sample anisotropy. One drawback of the Stephenson (1981) OD model is that it cannot describe the extreme case when particles are perfectly aligned with their unique axis in one direction, because the inversion of the ellipsoid equation for the bulk sample anisotropy does not exist. For the Stephenson OD model, when $k_x = k_y = 0$ and $k_z = 1$ for magnetite-bearing samples or $k_x = k_z = 0$ and $k_y = 1$ for haematite-bearing samples, the model-dependent eqs (10), (17), (12), (19) predict limits for the maximum anisotropy and inclination correction factors, which are 3 and 2 for magnetite-bearing and haematite-bearing samples, respectively. These are the largest anisotropies the model can describe, owing to the small decrease of the OD function near the $Y$ and $Z$ axes (Fig. 3). Although greater values of anisotropy may occasionally be observed in highly deformed metamorphic rocks, the observed bulk sample anisotropy of sedimentary rocks is well below the limit (e.g. Tarling & Hrouda 1993), suggesting that the Stephenson OD model is valid for studying magnetic anisotropy and inclination corrections of sedimentary rocks. The inclination correction factors calculated using the model-independent eqs (18) and (20) can be greater than these limits (e.g. Fig. 2). This probably indicates that when $k_y$ and $k_x$ ($k_x$ and $k_y$) are taken as virtual numbers, eqs (10), (12), (17), (19) might predict greater anisotropy and inclination correction factor values. In contrast, the truncated Fisher OD function (Hrouda 1980) can describe the extremely high anisotropies because the OD of particles in the model can be distributed within a very narrow solid angle (Fig. 3). When $k$ approaches infinity, $F(k) = -1$, $X_0 = a/(a + 2)$, $Y_0 = Z_0 = 1/(a + 2)$ and $I_m = 0^\circ$, eqs (A3), (A5), (A7) (see the Appendix); these parameters are consistent with the extreme model in which the OD is perfectly restricted parallel to the $X$-axis. The truncated Fisher function (Hrouda 1980) can only describe oblate bulk sample ellipsoids if individual particles are oblate, or prolate bulk sample ellipsoids if individual particles are prolate. In contrast, the Stephenson OD function can describe prolate, oblate and triaxial bulk sample anisotropies, independently of whether the anisotropy of the individual particle is prolate or oblate. Choosing the Stephenson OD function in our analytical solution is not only a result of its physical basis but also owing to its ability to describe various anisotropy ellipsoids.
Stephenson (1981) OD function, so that the distribution becomes uniaxial, as the ratio between the maximum and the minimum principal axes (eqs 21 or 22): the degrees of ARS and AMS (de
determined as the ratio between the density of particles with their unique axes aligned in the direction with ω (=arccos (cos ϕ + sin θ)) degree to the X-axis. The curves are calculated by the truncated Fisher distribution function (Hrouda 1980) (see the Appendix), \( f/f_{\text{max}} = e^{\chi^2/2} \). For comparison, \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) are set to zero in Stephenson (1981) OD function, so that the distribution becomes uniaxial, and \( f/f_{\text{max}} = \cos^2 \chi \). It shows that the truncated Fisher distribution function is able to describe the extreme cases when OD of particles is restricted in a very narrow solid angle, while the Stephenson’s OD model describes a rather smooth OD.

Despite the difference in detailed OD functions, and the model-dependent expressions for the principal axes of bulk sample anisotropy and the remanence tensors, using the truncated Fisher OD function yields the same inclination-correction equations and the same linear relationships between the ARS and AMS principal axes as those derived using the Stephenson OD function and the discrete OD model of Stephenson et al. (1986) and Jackson et al. (1991) (see the Appendix).

Cogne (1987) derived a theoretical relationship between the ratio of ARS principal axes and the ratio of AMS principal axes for multidomain magnetite, in which the former is the square of the latter, i.e., \( P_y = P_x^2 \). A Peruvian gabbro and granites of Flamanville from NW France yielded exponent values of 1.94 and 1.81, respectively. These results were thought to be in good agreement with the theoretical analysis (Cogne 1987). Recently, Gattacceca & Rochette (2002) observed significantly greater exponent values (3.9) from volcanic flows from Monte Minerva, Italy. The relationship between the degree of ARS and the degree of AMS (defined as the ratio between the maximum and the minimum principal axes) can also be derived from the linear relationship between the ARS and AMS principal axes (eqs 21 or 22):

\[
P_y = \frac{s P_x + i(1 + 2 P_x)}{s + i(1 + 2 P_x)} \quad \text{for oblate bulk sample anisotropy (27)}
\]

\[
P_y = \frac{s P_x + i(2 + P_x)}{s + i(2 + P_x)} \quad \text{for prolate bulk sample anisotropy (28)}
\]

where \( s \) and \( i \) are the slope and intercept of the line defined by eqs (21) or (22), and \( s = 1 - 3i \). \( P_x \) and \( P_y \) do not have a square relationship. The relationship depends on the anisotropy of the individual particle and the bulk sample anisotropy, which can vary quite significantly. The curves derived from real data also deviate significantly from Cogne’s theoretical results (Fig. 4), indicating that the square relationship between the degrees of anisotropy of ARS and AMS is probably not universal.

Another critical point for the comparison of ARS and AMS parameters, and for the inclination correction is that the ARS, AMS and ChRM should be carried by the same populations of magnetic particles. Because the highest coercivity of haematite is far greater than 100 mT (the highest alternating field (AF) available to most ARM experiments), the anisotropy of high-field IRM or TRM must be measured to study the anisotropy of remanence-carrying particles and its effect on the palaeomagnetic directions in red beds. When working with AMS, it is important to isolate various sources contributing to AMS. For magnetite-bearing samples, the magnetic susceptibility of bulk samples may be dominated by magnetite. However, when the magnetite is a mixture of single-domain, pseudo-single domain and multidomain particles, separating their contributions to AMS becomes critical. For haematite-bearing samples, owing to its low magnetic susceptibility, it is essential to isolate them from other non-remanence-carrying particles. We have used AF demagnetization to target the anisotropy of ARM of ChRM-carrying haematite particles (Tan & Kodama 1998), thermal demagnetization to target the anisotropy of IRM of ChRM-carrying haematite particles (Tan & Kodama 2002), and chemical demagnetization to target AMS of ChRM-carrying haematite particles (Tan et al. 2002b). Successful inclination corrections rely on a direct relationship between the magnetic anisotropy and the ChRM-carrying particles.

Various processes ranging from syn-depositional, post-depositional to compactional alignment of magnetic particles may have affected the particle distribution pattern. Detailed mechanisms may include interaction between hydraulic, magnetic and mechanical forcing factors during settling of magnetic particles (e.g. Verosub 1977; Tauxe & Kent 1984), attachment of magnetic particles to clay minerals during deposition (Lu et al. 1990; Deamer & Kodama 1990) and post-deposition mechanical compaction (Sun & Kodama 1992), and a possible pressure solution (chemical) compaction (Tan & Kodama 2002). Yet, the magnetic anisotropy tensors measured represent the final state of the particle distribution; it may be produced by one or a combination of several mechanisms. The inclination correction developed by Jackson et al. (1991) has accurately corrected synthetic magnetite-bearing depositional and compaction-caused inclination shallowing, respectively (e.g. Jackson et al. 1991; Kodama & Sun 1992). The new equations developed in this study have also been successfully applied to correct red bed palaeomagnetic inclination shallowing of possible depositional and compactional origins (Tan & Kodama 2002; Tan et al. 2002b). Therefore, as suggested by Jackson et al. (1991), the inclination correction is not complicated by detailed physical paths of inclination shallowing.

Tectonic strain can also distort the particle distribution pattern and palaeomagnetic directions (e.g. Cogne et al. 1986; van der Pluijm 1987; Kodama 1988; Borradaile 1993; Jackson et al. 1993). The inclination correction techniques may be applicable to tectonic-strain-deflected remanence. However, since stress and strain may also alter the domain states and magnetic properties of magnetic particles (see, e.g., Jackson et al. 1993), the case of strained remanence and magnetic anisotropy is more complicated than the situation we considered here for depositional and burial compaction-caused inclination shallowing. We have not tried to use the techniques developed by Jackson et al. (1991) and this study to correct the tectonically distorted palaeomagnetic direction.
8 CONCLUSIONS

Based on three assumptions for individual particle anisotropy, a bulk sample anisotropy is derived from all particles that can be described by a continuous-particle OD function proposed by Stephenson (1981). The expression for a bulk sample anisotropy is different by those derived from only considering particles with their unique axes parallel to the principal axes of the bulk sample, indicating that the other particles also contribute to the bulk sample anisotropy. However, the linear relationship between the ARS and AMS principal axes of the normalized bulk sample and inclination corrections are probably independent of the particle OD models, and independent of detailed mechanisms that may have caused the observed, depositional and/or burial compaction-caused magnetic anisotropy and inclination shallowing.
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APPENDIX A: DERIVATION OF INCLINATION CORRECTION USING THE TRUNCATED FISHER DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION

Hrouda (1980) adopted a truncated Fisher (1953) distribution function to describe the frequency density of the c-axis distribution of haematite particles, and to derive the relationship between bulk sample and individual particle anisotropies. We will use this distribution function to derive the inclination correction expressions.

Based on Hrouda (1980), the frequency density of haematite particles with their c-axis distributed in the direction defined by the polar angle \( \theta \) (Fig. 1) is

\[
f = \frac{k}{2\pi(c^2 - 1)} e^{-k \cos \theta} \]

where \( k \) is a measure of concentration of the c-axis distribution. This function can also be used to describe the easy-axis distribution of prolate magnetite particles, but with some modifications of the orientation of the principal axes of the bulk sample anisotropy, i.e. the maximum axis will align in the Z-axis direction (Fig. 1).

For haematite-bearing samples, the principal axes of the bulk sample anisotropy can be described by

\[
X = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\pi/2} T_{11} f \sin \theta \, d\theta \, d\psi, \\
Y = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\pi/2} T_{22} f \sin \theta \, d\theta \, d\psi, \\
Z = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\pi/2} T_{33} f \sin \theta \, d\theta \, d\psi.
\]
The results of the integration in (A2) are
\[ X = Y = \frac{L + S}{2} + \frac{L - S}{2} F(k), \]
\[ Z = S - (L - S) F(k), \]  
(A3)

From eq. (A4), we have
\[ F(k) = \frac{k}{c^2 - 1} \left[ 2 - c^2 \left( \frac{1}{k} - \frac{2}{k^2} + \frac{2}{k^3} \right) \right]. \]

Eq. (A3) is consistent with Hrouda (1980) eq. (5). The normalized principal axes are
\[ X_0 = Y_0 = \frac{(L + S) + (L - S) F(k)}{2(L + 2S)}, \]  
(A4)
\[ Z_0 = \frac{S - (L - S) F(k)}{L + 2S}. \]

Inserting the individual particle anisotropy factor, \( a = S/L \) into eq. (A4), we have
\[ X_0 = Y_0 = \frac{(1 + a) + (1 - a) F(k)}{2(1 + 2a)}, \]  
(A5)
\[ Z_0 = \frac{a - (1 - a) F(k)}{1 + 2a}. \]

By arranging eq. (A5) for \( F(k) \), we have
\[ F(k) = \frac{(1 + a) - 2(1 + 2a) X_0}{a - 1}, \]  
(A6)
\[ F(k) = \frac{(1 + 2a) Z_0 - a}{a - 1}. \]

Assuming an infinite \( a \) factor for the intrinsic remanence of the particle, we have the NRM tensor:
\[ k_{\text{NRM}} = \begin{bmatrix} [1 - F(k)]/4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & [1 - F(k)]/4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & [1 + F(k)]/2 \end{bmatrix}. \]  
(A7)

From eq. (16), we have
\[ \tan(I_0) = \frac{1 - F(k)}{2 + 2 F(k)} \tan(I_n). \]  
(A8)

Inserting eq. (A6) using either AMS or ARS parameters into eq. (A8), we then have the inclination correction for haematite-bearing samples:
\[ \tan(I_0) = \frac{(2a + 1) X_0 - 1}{(2a + 1) Z_0 - 1} \tan(I_n). \]  
(A9)

By writing eq. (A6) for ARS and AMS parameters, respectively, and equating them, we have
\[ R_i = \frac{(1 + 2a_L)(a_L - 1)}{(1 + 2a_M)(a_M - 1)} X_i + \frac{a_L - a_M}{(1 + 2a_M)(a_M - 1)}. \]  
(A10)

Note that eqs (A9) and (A10) are exactly the same as eqs (20) and (22). This may imply that the linear relationship between the normalized principal axes of remanence anisotropy and magnetic susceptibility anisotropy, and the inclination correction are probably independent from detailed OD models.

For magnetite-bearing samples, since the easy-axis distribution of the prolate magnetite particles is around the Z-axis, the maximum principal axis \( (X_0) \) of the bulk sample is along the Z-axis direction, while the intermediate and minimum axes \( (Y_0 \) and \( Z_0 \) (which are equal) are within the XY plane. From (A4), we have
\[ Y_0 = Z_0 = \frac{(L + S) + (L - S) F(k)}{2(L + 2S)}, \]  
(A11)
\[ X_0 = \frac{S - (L - S) F(k)}{L + 2S}. \]

By inserting \( a = L/S \) into eq. (A11), we have
\[ Y_0 = Z_0 = \frac{1 + a + (a - 1) F(k)}{2(a + 1)}. \]  
(A12)
\[ X_0 = \frac{1 - (a - 1) F(k)}{a + 2}. \]

Similarly, it can be shown that the linear relationship between the normalized principal axes of ARS and AMS, and the inclination correction for magnetite-bearing samples derived using the truncated Fisher distribution function are exactly the same as eqs (21) and (18), respectively.