

# Measuring the Angular Correlation Function for Faint Galaxies in High Galactic Latitude Fields

David Woods<sup>1</sup> and Gregory G. Fahlman<sup>1</sup>

Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, 2219 Main Mall, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1Z4

## ABSTRACT

A photometric survey of faint galaxies in three high Galactic latitude fields (each  $\sim 49$  arcmin<sup>2</sup>) with sub-arcsecond seeing is used to study the clustering properties of the faint galaxy population. Multi-color photometry of the galaxies has been obtained to magnitude limits of  $V \sim 25$ ,  $R \sim 25$  and  $I \sim 24$ . Angular correlation analysis is applied to magnitude-limited and color-selected samples of galaxies from the three fields for angular separations ranging from  $10 - 126''$ . General agreement is obtained with other recent studies which show that the amplitude of the angular correlation function,  $\omega(\theta)$ , is smoothly decreasing as a function of limiting magnitude. The observed decline of  $\omega(\theta)$  rules out the viability of “maximal merger” galaxy evolution models.

Using redshift distributions extrapolated to faint magnitude limits, models of galaxy clustering evolution are calculated and compared to the observed  $I$ -band  $\omega(\theta)$ . Faint galaxies are determined to have correlation lengths and clustering evolution parameters of either  $r_0 \sim 4 h^{-1}$  Mpc and  $\epsilon \sim 0 - 1$ ;  $r_0 \sim 5 - 6 h^{-1}$  Mpc and  $\epsilon > 1$ ; or  $r_0 \sim 2 - 3 h^{-1}$  Mpc and  $\epsilon \sim -1.2$ , assuming  $q_0 = 0.5$  and with  $h = H_0/100$  km s<sup>-1</sup> Mpc<sup>-1</sup>. The latter case is for clustering fixed in co-moving coordinates and is probably unrealistic since most local galaxies are observed to be more strongly clustered. Even though the first of the three cases has the most reasonable rate of clustering evolution, distinguishing the correct  $r_0$  for the faint galaxies is not possible with the current data. No significant variations in the clustering amplitude as a function of color are detected, for all the color-selected galaxy samples considered. The validity of this result is discussed in relation to other determinations of  $\omega(\theta)$  for galaxies selected by color.

*Subject headings:* cosmology: large-scale structure of universe — cosmology: observations — galaxies: evolution — galaxies: general — galaxies: photometry

---

<sup>1</sup>Visiting Astronomer, Canada–France–Hawai’i Telescope (CFHT), operated by the National Research Council of Canada, le Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique de France, and the University of Hawai’i.

## 1. Introduction

Angular correlation function analysis of large photometric samples of galaxies is a popular tool for quantifying the large-scale structure of the local universe. Its power as a diagnostic of the galaxy distribution lies in the simplicity of its application, essentially requiring only a counting of pairs of galaxies at given angular separations and normalizing these results with respect to the number of pairs expected for a random distribution. The angular correlation function,  $\omega(\theta)$ , is a two-dimensional analogue of the spatial two-point correlation function,  $\xi(r)$ , where the latter quantity has the important property of being the Fourier transform of the power spectrum,  $P(k)$ , of the galaxy distribution. Measurements of either  $\xi(r)$  or  $P(k)$  are important tests of structure formation models, such as Cold Dark Matter (CDM) scenarios (Davis *et al.* 1985), and are also necessary for understanding the relationship between nearby, bright galaxies and their faint, distant counterparts, along with the evolutionary processes that link the two populations.

The angular and spatial two-point correlation functions for bright magnitude-limited samples of nearby galaxies have been determined, in various forms, by several authors over the last few decades (see Peebles 1980, 1993, and references therein). Numerous studies have measured  $\xi(r)$  to be a power-law,  $(r/r_0)^{-\gamma}$ , with  $\gamma \sim 1.7 - 1.8$  and the correlation length,  $r_0(z = 0)$ , is estimated to be  $\sim 5 h^{-1}$  Mpc for local galaxy populations (Davis & Peebles 1983, Loveday *et al.* 1992). There is still considerable uncertainty concerning the exact normalization and slope due to possible systematic errors from morphological mixing, redshift distortions from clusters of galaxies and differing approaches to the correlation analysis (Bernstein *et al.* 1994, Loveday *et al.* 1995). Another potential problem for studies of nearby galaxies may be that a significant population of low surface brightness galaxies is being systematically ignored, due to high surface brightness selection effects, in contrast to faint galaxy surveys where this is not a problem (McGaugh 1994).

Pioneering photographic studies of faint galaxies done by Phillipps *et al.* (1978), Koo & Szalay (1984), Stevenson *et al.* (1985) and Pritchet & Infante (1986) determined  $\omega(\theta)$  down to magnitude limits of  $B < 23 - 24$ . Only in the last decade has it been possible to measure  $\omega(\theta)$  for fainter galaxy samples because of the emergence of CCD imaging cameras, in particular the large-format devices. Efstathiou *et al.* (1991, hereafter EBKTG) found the faint blue galaxy population in their CCD images (for  $24 < B_J < 26$ ) to be weakly clustered at  $30''$  separations relative to local galaxy populations. They concluded that either (1) most of the faint galaxies were members of an hitherto unobserved population which had faded away by the current epoch, (2) galaxy clustering was insufficiently described by basic models of gravitational instability or (3) that space-time geometry departed significantly from an Einstein-de Sitter universe. However, as Koo & Kron (1992) point out, the EBKTG result implicitly assumes that galaxies with different morphologies have similar intrinsic clustering properties. This is not the case locally (Loveday *et al.* 1995, Giovanelli *et al.* 1986, Davis & Geller 1976) and clearly this is an effect which needs to be addressed by using various sample selection criteria for faint galaxies such as morphologies and colors, in addition to magnitude limits.

Neuschaefer *et al.* (1991, hereafter NWD) measured  $\omega(\theta)$  down to  $g \sim 25$  and found a similar amplitude as EBKTG at  $g \sim 24.8$ . The monotonic decrease of the amplitude of  $\omega(\theta)$  for a given angular separation as a function of survey magnitude limit demonstrated by NWD has been observed in a number of other studies (Pritchett & Infante 1992, Couch *et al.* 1993, Roche *et al.* 1993, Roukema & Peterson 1994, Brainerd *et al.* 1995, hereafter BSM, and Metcalfe *et al.* 1995, hereafter MSFR, to name a few). This decrease of clustering with survey depth shows some indication of beginning to flatten out at the faintest limits in some studies (Roche *et al.* 1993 and MSFR) but the errors involved in these measurements preclude any firm conclusions from being made.

Studying the clustering of galaxies with color-selected samples is a technique which has only recently been applied to discriminate faint galaxies of differing morphologies (Bernstein *et al.* (1994), hereafter BTBJ; Landy, Szalay & Koo 1996, hereafter LSK; Roche *et al.* 1996). Using  $U - R_F$  as the color discriminant, LSK found a factor of  $\gtrsim 10$  increase in the amplitude of the angular correlation function for the extremely blue *and* red subsets of galaxies with  $20 < B_J < 23.5$  in their sample of 5900 galaxies. LSK claim the  $\omega(\theta)$  excess for the reddest galaxies is due to intrinsic clustering of the sample (morphology-density relation) since most of these objects are probably E/S0 galaxies and both fields contain known clusters. The increase of the clustering amplitude for the bluest objects in the sample is explained as being caused by a faint population of galaxies with  $z < 0.3$ . Roche *et al.* (1996) calculated  $\omega(\theta)$  for color-selected samples to significantly fainter magnitude limits ( $B \simeq 25.5$  and  $R \simeq 24.5$ ) than LSK. For  $\sim 7000$  galaxies, they determined the amplitude of  $\omega(\theta)$  for the red ( $(B - R) > 1.5$ ) sample to be higher than that calculated for the blue ( $(B - R) < 1.5$ ) galaxies. This result led Roche *et al.* to suggest that the decrease in the amplitude of  $\omega(\theta)$  for all galaxies with  $B > 23$  is caused by the same blue galaxies that are responsible for the number counts excess around this magnitude range. Using a pure luminosity evolution model they explain the correlation function color dependence at  $B \sim 25$  as being due to red galaxies with  $z < 1$ , in addition to the blue galaxy sample consisting of both late-type dwarfs at low/moderate redshifts and evolving  $L^*$  galaxies having redshifts from  $z \sim 0.5 - 3$ .

In this paper,  $\omega(\theta)$  is calculated for a sample of galaxies imaged in  $V$ ,  $R$  and  $I$  to respective magnitude limits of 25, 25 and 24, combining data from three different high Galactic latitude fields. Woods *et al.* (1995) determined the close pair fraction for one of the fields (NF1) studied here. This nearest neighbour approach is complementary to the correlation analysis since it measures clustering behaviour at the smallest possible angular separations while the greater numbers of galaxies analysed in this paper can be used to estimate the angular correlation function over a range of larger angular separations (as an aside, note that equations 1 and 2 in Woods *et al.* 1995 are both missing a factor of  $\rho$  in the integrand). Galaxy samples presented here are among the deepest yet used for measurements of  $\omega(\theta)$ . Also, the multi-bandpass data allows the clustering variations with color to be measured for these faint galaxies. Observations and preliminary data reduction and analysis techniques are outlined in §§2 and 3, respectively. The adopted approach for estimating the angular correlation function, along with a summary of the galaxy clustering

model used, is presented in §4. Clustering results for magnitude-limited and color-selected samples of galaxies are given in §5. This section also contains a comparison of the clustering detected in the *I*-band to models of the *spatial* correlation function, which are calculated with extrapolated redshift distributions provided by the CFRS (Lilly *et al.* 1995a). Finally, possible interpretations of the results are discussed and summarized in §§6 and 7.

## 2. Observations

The *V*, *R* and *I* images used in this study were obtained at the prime focus of the Canada-France-Hawai’i telescope using FOCAM and the LICK1 and LICK2 large-format,  $2k \times 2k$  CCDs between 1991 April and 1993 March. The image scale for both LICK devices is  $0''.207$  per pixel so the full field-of-view of the CCD is  $\sim 7'$  on a side. These images of high Galactic latitude “blank” fields were originally obtained for a survey of Population II halo stars (see Richer & Fahlman 1992) but are also useful for studying properties of the faint galaxy population. Three fields with *north* Galactic latitudes were observed and are dubbed NF1, NF2 and NF3. The right ascension and declination, and the corresponding Galactic coordinates, of the centers of these three blank fields are given in Table 1, along with the time of the observing runs. Fields were specifically chosen to have no observable objects on the Palomar Sky Survey photographs and a lack of any Zwicky clusters. Seeing for the frames used in the final summed images is uniformly excellent, ranging from  $0''.5$  to  $1''$ . Good seeing is essential for acquiring deep images in a reasonable amount of exposure time. The filter bandpasses used, and the total exposure times and average seeing for the summed frames in each color and field, are summarized in Table 2. *V* + *R* + *I* frames which demonstrate the total multi-band exposure for each field are shown in Figs. 1, 2 and 3.

## 3. Data Reduction and Analysis

### 3.1. Image Pre-processing and Summation

Exposures of the fields were obtained typically for 900-1200s, in between which the telescope would be dithered by  $\simeq 10''$  in the cardinal directions such that program frames could be used to generate a sky-flat in each bandpass, for flat-fielding purposes. Various programs from the *IRAF*<sup>2</sup> package were used to do the pre-processing of the CCD images. All frames had the instrumental dc level, as determined from the CCD bias region, removed with the *linebias* routine and a median bias frame was then subtracted from each program frame to remove the pixel-to-pixel pattern. The pixel response function for each bandpass was determined by constructing a sky-flat from the median of the corresponding dithered program frames. This “superflat” was generated using

---

<sup>2</sup>Image Reduction and Analysis Facility, a software system distributed by the National Optical Astronomy Observatories (NOAO).

anywhere from 7 – 10 program frames, with this set including the data frames used for the final combined frame. Any artifacts caused by the use of a data frame in the making of its own flatfield were dealt with by masking brighter objects, where these effects were most significant.

After the flat-fielding step, the individual frames were registered with the *IRAF* routine *imalign*. The alignment interpolation was performed to the nearest pixel. There is a slight rotation ( $\sim 1^\circ$ ) between the images obtained of NF2 in 1992 and 1993 and the *IRAF* routines *geomap* and *geotran* were used to align these data. Finally, an exposure weighted average of the aligned program frames in each field and for each bandpass was obtained with the *IRAF* routine *imcombine*. CCD frames with poor seeing were not included in the average to avoid resolution degradation. The final combined frames were always found to be flat to within  $\lesssim 1\%$ . Image flatness is an important feature of our processed images in that it allows accurate faint galaxy photometry to be determined. Cosmic rays were also removed, as a final step, using the *IRAF* routine *cosmicrays*. No obvious differences in the final images were found when the cosmic rays were removed before or after the combination of the individual data frames. Careful selection of the detection threshold and other parameters for the *cosmicrays* routine resulted in the removal of most of the cosmic rays from the final combined frames.

### 3.2. Calibrations

Standard star fields were observed on every night of each observing run. The fields used are summarized in Table 3, with the pertinent references. The zero points in the calibration equations were very stable, not varying more than  $\sim 0.2$  mag between observing runs. Color terms found in the calibration solutions for the three runs were accounted for by small offsets ( $\leq 0.05$ ) based on a mean color for the faint galaxies or were disregarded due to the calculated coefficient being negligible. Stetson’s (1987, 1990) DAOGROW and DAOPHOT programs were used to determine accurate aperture corrections for the standard star frames. The only departure from standard calibration techniques necessary was in the case of the NF2 *V* and *I* final frames, which were comprised of images from two different observing runs. A set of  $\sim 20$  stars in the NF2 field were chosen to be secondary standards. Magnitude offsets between these secondary standards photometered on a single frame from the 1992 June run, and the final, averaged frames were determined. These small offsets ( $\leq 0.05$  mag) were found to be color independent and therefore could be applied directly to the magnitudes obtained from the final averaged *V* and *I* frames for NF2, to correct for the variations between the two observing runs. For more details of the calibrations the reader is referred to Woods (1996).

### 3.3. Generating FOCAS Catalogs

The objects in our final CCD frames were detected and analysed using FOCAS (Jarvis & Tyson 1981) routines with slight modifications to the standard analysis procedures, some of which are outlined in Valdes (1983, 1993). The two key input parameters for FOCAS are the detection threshold, given as a multiple of the sky variance ( $\sigma_{sky}$ ), and the minimum area for the objects detected, in numbers of pixels. After experimenting with these parameters and ensuring that spurious detections were minimized, we adopted a threshold of  $2.5\sigma_{sky}$  and a minimum area which corresponded to the seeing disk for the poorest resolved frame from the three bandpasses taken of a given field (also see Steidel & Hamilton 1993). Since we use conservative magnitude limits in this study (see §3.4) where galaxy incompleteness is negligible and the success of the galaxy detection is checked thoroughly by eye, we are confident that the threshold and minimum area parameters chosen are appropriate.

Two approaches were used for the initial detection of the objects in our fields. The first technique was to use a “master” frame ( $V + R + I$ ), where the average frames from each bandpass were normalized to a common sky level in counts (Smail *et al.* 1994). An object list was generated from the master frame detections, then the galaxy magnitudes were measured off of the average images in each respective filter. This works quite well for fields where data have been obtained with comparable magnitude limits in the three filters (NF1). Note that  $V \sim R + 0.5$  and  $R \sim I + 0.75$  (see galaxy color histograms in Fig. 7) for galaxies with late-type morphologies within the redshift regime that approximately corresponds to our magnitude limits (Frei & Gunn 1994). Exceptions to this are ellipticals which become harder to detect since the  $4000\text{\AA}$  break has been redshifted beyond the V filter at  $z \geq 0.5$ . In fields where the faint limits were not roughly equivalent from filter-to-filter (NF2 and NF3), the second approach was to have the initial detection of the objects done in each individual bandpass. The objects found in each filter were then matched in master catalogs in order to provide color information. In particular, the  $R$ -band data taken for NF2 and NF3 were found to be deeper than the  $V$  and  $I$  data.

FOCAS programs are applied to either the master frame of a field or the averaged frame in each filter (i.e., the “detection” frame) to determine an initial catalog of objects, with a slight modification. The detection algorithm for FOCAS will find different numbers of objects, varying by a few percent, depending on the orientation of the frame. This variation in numbers is due to the line-by-line nature of the detection algorithm and the fact that the threshold for a particular line depends on the sky history from the previous lines. We work around this problem by rotating the detection frame through 90 degree increments and matching the resultant four catalogs to produce a final catalog. An object is included in the final catalog if it is detected in all the catalogs from the four orientations. We used the “builtin” FOCAS filter (1 2 3 2 1) for convolution with the image under consideration during the detection process to reduce the number of spurious objects in the final catalogs. The final catalog is also filtered to remove detections of objects which lie within “masked” areas of the frame. Masked regions include saturated stars, very bright galaxies, bad columns, vignetted corners and other artifacts which generate spurious detections.

The masked area of each field is typically only a few percent of the total number of pixels in the final frame.

Following the application of the detection algorithm, the sky values are determined for each frame using the standard *sky* and *skycorrect* routines in FOCAS. No significant dependence of the measured sky values on the orientation of the frame was found. Detections listed in the final catalogs were split into individual objects and the magnitudes were evaluated using the default FOCAS programs. Splitting of multi-component groups into individual galaxies (and stars) was easily accomplished for the separations over which the angular correlation function is calculated, mostly due to the uniformly excellent seeing of the data set. All objects were split with confidence down to separations of  $\sim 1''$ , as in Woods *et al.* (1995). Measurement of galaxy magnitudes is discussed further in the following section. A point spread function (PSF) was determined from  $\sim 15 - 20$  bright stars found in each field for each bandpass. The PSF is used in the FOCAS object classification algorithm *resolution*, to separate galaxies and stars from spurious objects in the final master catalog. Separation of stars from galaxies in the final samples was *not* done with the FOCAS classification routine but with an approach outlined in §4.3. Objects listed in the final catalogs were all checked by eye to confirm their detection. A few spurious objects remained at this juncture, and were removed from further analysis, but their numbers were small relative to the final galaxy sample.

### 3.4. Final Photometry

Total exposures for the three bandpasses, in a given field, were obtained so as to be comparable in depth to maximize the color information for the greatest number of objects. In practice this is difficult to do at the telescope due to varying seeing, along with weather and observing time constraints. However, we obtained fairly uniform sampling of the objects allowing us to determine *V*, *R* and *I* magnitudes for  $\sim 1000$  galaxies in each field, with the exceptions of the *V* and *I* data for NF2. Slightly lower numbers of faint objects for the NF2 data were detected due to the data sets being collected during two observing runs which created a small loss in area from slightly mismatched fields. Only the field area which is coincident on all the data frames is included in the final detection frames, so that uniform magnitude-limited samples are generated.

Magnitudes were evaluated for each bandpass and field yielding final lists of isophotal and aperture magnitudes, and colors for all the objects. Aperture magnitudes were found to be a more reliable measure of the total brightness of the faint galaxies than isophotal magnitudes. Also, the isophotal magnitude limit was found to be unrealistically faint. However, the use of a small fixed aperture is not appropriate for the galaxies in the sample which have a significant angular extent. Hence “hybrid” magnitudes are adopted: an aperture of  $3''$  in diameter was used for the galaxies with an average diameter  $\leq 3''$  and isophotal magnitudes were used for galaxies with characteristic sizes larger than this. Isophotal and aperture magnitudes are in good agreement at the magnitude range where the transition between the two measures occurs, typically having differences  $\lesssim 0.1$

mag.

Isophotal magnitudes are usually used for galaxies which are up to three magnitudes below the bright magnitude limit ( $V \sim 20 - 23$ ,  $R \sim 20 - 23$  and  $I \sim 19 - 22$ ) where galaxies are  $> 3''$  in mean diameter. Since the majority of the galaxies in any of our samples is within two magnitudes of the faint magnitude limit ( $V > 23$ ,  $R > 23$  and  $I > 22$ ) the galaxies measured with isophotal magnitudes are a small contribution to the final sample size. The isophotal magnitudes used are *not* the “total” magnitudes which FOCAS generates (Valdes 1983) since we prefer to avoid doubling the isophotal area, from the initially determined isophote, for the flux measurements. Considering the small numbers of galaxy magnitudes measured with isophotes this choice does not have a significant effect on the final magnitude-limited galaxy samples. Apertures of  $3''$  were chosen since they were determined to be large enough to contain most of the flux from the majority of the faint galaxies. The adopted aperture size of  $3''$  corresponds to a physical scale of  $\sim 11 h^{-1}$  kpc and  $\sim 13 h^{-1}$  kpc for redshifts of  $z = 0.5$  and  $1.0$ , respectively, using  $h = H_0/100 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$  and  $q_0 = 0.5$ . See §2.3 of Lilly *et al.* (1991) for some further discussion of the benefits of aperture photometry for faint galaxies, as opposed to using isophotal photometry.

Number counts, in  $V$ ,  $R$  and  $I$ , are given for the three fields in Figs. 4, 5 and 6, respectively. Bright stars have been removed from these counts in the manner outlined in §4.3 and hybrid magnitudes are used to calculate these counts. The slopes of the galaxy counts are listed in Table 4. There is good agreement between the slopes determined in different fields for a given bandpass. These are encouraging results since we want to calculate  $\omega(\theta)$  by averaging the galaxy clustering behaviour in NF1-3, thus requiring field-to-field uniformity. To avoid crowding the plots in Figs. 4-6 with a plethora of data points from other studies we have compared our  $R$  number counts normalization and slope to the compilation of Metcalfe *et al.* (1991) and the counts of Hudon & Lilly (1996, hereafter HL) both plotted in the latter study’s Fig. 1. We find excellent agreement with the  $R$  counts of HL and Metcalfe *et al.* Checking our  $V$  and  $I$  data is more problematic due to a scarcity of published number counts in these bandpasses. Our  $V$  counts are in good agreement with the observations shown in Fig. 2 of Smail *et al.* (1995) except we observe no break at  $V \sim 24.25$ , but this is not surprising considering our magnitude limit is  $V \sim 25$ . The  $I$  counts from the current study have a slightly steeper slope and different normalization than the Smail *et al.* data but are consistent with the Lilly *et al.* (1991) number counts. The source of the difference with Smail *et al.* is not clear, however, they suggest that the discrepancy could be due to other workers choosing fields which are devoid of bright galaxies therefore biasing the count slope to be steeper. Nevertheless, we find our number counts to be in generally good agreement with other groups’ observations.

From the number counts it is easily seen that conservative magnitude limits for the data are  $V \sim 25$ ,  $R \sim 25$  and  $I \sim 24$ , except the NF1  $R$  data which has a limit of  $\sim 24.5$ . This latter limit is more comparable to the  $V$  and  $I$  limits for galaxies at intermediate redshifts ( $z \sim 0.5 - 0.7$ ). To test the completeness levels of galaxy detection at these magnitude limits we checked the number of “dark” galaxies detected by FOCAS (or negative fluctuations on the CCD) in each field and

bandpass. The excess of above-sky objects to the number of below-sky objects detected can be used as an unbiased estimate of the number of faint objects at that magnitude (Valdes 1983). All of our samples were found to be essentially  $\sim 100\%$  complete at the magnitude limits that are listed above, confirming the conservative nature of our faintness limits. Photometric errors were calculated to be typically  $\lesssim 0.1$  mag. for galaxies with  $V < 24$ ,  $R < 24$  and  $I < 23$ , increasing to as much as  $\sim 0.3$  mag. for fainter galaxies. In Table 5, the number of objects found within the given magnitude limits are tabulated, along with the effective field areas. All of these objects comprise the magnitude limited samples which are used for angular correlation analysis in §5.

Color-selected samples were obtained by matching the catalogs generated for a given field for the two bandpasses in the required color. The magnitude limit for each color-selected sample was chosen to be the limit of the bandpass (either  $V \sim 25$ ,  $R \sim 25$  or  $I \sim 24$ , except NF1 where it’s  $R \sim 24.5$ ) with the largest number of galaxies, thereby maximizing the accuracy of the clustering measurements. This approach introduces some galaxies into the sample which are beyond the magnitude limit for the bandpass with the smaller sample size, in order to maintain a high level of matching. Colors are calculated using “hybrid” magnitudes but the number of galaxies measured with isophotal magnitudes is small enough such that there is little effect on our final results. This was checked by calculating the results using galaxy samples which contained only aperture magnitudes. No attempts were made to convolve the two bandpass images to the poorest seeing before the colors were determined since the majority of galaxies easily fit into the  $3''$  apertures adopted and the seeing values in different bandpasses for the same field are comparable (Table 2). High percentages (typically  $\geq 90\%$ ) of the galaxies matched between filters, particularly for the NF1 field where the magnitude limits in  $V$ ,  $R$  and  $I$  were of similar depth. A 5 – 10% decrease in the match success rate was observed for the faintest magnitude bins. These faint galaxies are not detected in all three filters partly because of color effects and because the counts are beginning to become incomplete due to fluctuations in the background. Histograms of the colors of the galaxies found in the three fields are shown in Fig. 7.  $(V - R)$ ,  $(R - I)$  and  $(V - I)$  galaxy colors are shown in the plot panels from top to bottom for NF1 (solid line), NF2 (dashed line) and NF3 (dotted line). The shapes and modes of the histograms for a given color are very similar from field-to-field, with the differences in the normalization due to the variations in the effective area of detection and in the galaxy numbers. The median colors of galaxies as a function of  $R$  magnitude were found to be roughly consistent with those measured by Smail et al. (1995), in their Fig. 3. These samples are used to measure the color-selected angular correlation function of galaxies.

## 4. Measuring the Angular Correlation Function

### 4.1. Estimator

If one considers two differential elements of solid angle on the sky,  $d\Omega_1$  and  $d\Omega_2$ , then the joint probability,  $dP$ , that galaxies will occupy the two elements with an angular separation of  $\theta$

can be written as:

$$dP = n^2(1 + \omega(\theta))d\Omega_1d\Omega_2, \quad (1)$$

where  $\omega(\theta)$  is the angular correlation function and  $n$  is the mean surface density of galaxies. A random (Poisson) distribution of galaxies yields  $\omega(\theta) = 0$  for all  $\theta$ . Therefore,  $\omega(\theta)$  is simply a measure of the number of galaxy pairs observed at a given separation projected on the sky, normalized by the number of galaxy pairs expected if the galaxies are randomly distributed. The traditional estimator for  $\omega(\theta)$  (Peebles 1980), where equal numbers of galaxies and random points are considered, is of the form:

$$\hat{\omega}(\theta) = \frac{DD(\theta)}{RR(\theta)} - 1 \quad (2)$$

where  $DD(\theta)$  and  $RR(\theta)$  represent the number of data-data and random-random pairs at the angular separation  $\theta$  (hereafter pair symbols will implicitly be assumed to be functions of  $\theta$  and the hat symbol is used to denote an *estimate* of a function). Another estimator includes a cross-correlation of the data and random objects:

$$\hat{\omega}(\theta) = \frac{2DD}{DR} \frac{(N_R)}{(N_D - 1)} - 1 \quad (3)$$

(see EBKTG, Infante & Pritchett 1995, and references therein), where  $N_D$  and  $N_R$  are the number of galaxies and random objects, respectively. The estimators in equations (2) and (3) have greater than Poissonian variance, so, to minimize the noise we adopt the estimator suggested by Landy & Szalay (1993, hereafter LS; also see Hamilton 1993):

$$\hat{\omega}(\theta) = \frac{(DD - 2DR + RR)}{RR}. \quad (4)$$

For a given galaxy sample, 100 files of random positions, each containing the same number of “galaxies” as those observed, were generated, yielding  $\sim 0.5 - 1.0 \times 10^5$  random objects. An increase in the number of random position files from 100 to 1000 did not significantly improve the accuracy of the final  $\omega(\theta)$  estimation but substantially increased the computing time. The random position files were created using the same detection mask which was used for the galaxy image (in all three bandpasses for a given field) to block out saturated objects and areas of the CCD with defects and vignetting. A mean of the 100 random files cross correlated with the particular galaxy sample yielded DR in the estimator. In addition, by averaging the files, one can calculate the probabilities of obtaining a pair and triplet at a separation  $\theta$  (LS refers to these probabilities as  $G_p(\theta)$  and  $G_t(\theta)$ , respectively), which are quantities required to calculate  $\omega(\theta)$  and the errors associated with the estimator.

To check the clustering estimator in equation (4), we also determined counts in cells using:

$$\hat{\omega}(\theta) = \frac{\langle N_i N_j \rangle}{\langle N_i \rangle \langle N_j \rangle} - 1, \quad (5)$$

with the number of galaxies in cells  $i$  and  $j$  denoted by  $N_i$  and  $N_j$ , and the angular brackets representing an average of all the cells with an angular separation within the bin  $\theta \pm \delta\theta$ . Images

were divided into square cells,  $5''$  on a side. Excellent agreement was obtained between the data pairs (eq. [4]) and cell counts estimators, so, in the remainder we only refer to the data pairs approach.

## 4.2. The Clustering Model

The standard model for the angular correlation function is:

$$\omega(\theta) = A_\omega \theta^{-\delta}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\delta$  has been found to range from  $\sim 0.6 - 0.8$  for faint samples. The value of  $\delta$  could be dependent on the angular scales ( $\theta$ ) probed or the magnitude limit of the galaxy sample (Maddox *et al.* 1990, BTBJ and Neuschaefer & Windhorst 1995). If we want to use the estimated  $\omega(\theta)$  projected on the sky to determine the *spatial* two-point correlation function, we must adopt a model which includes possible clustering evolution with redshift ( $z$ ). The conventional model for the spatial correlation function is:

$$\xi(r, z) = \left(\frac{r}{r_0}\right)^{-\gamma} (1+z)^{-(3+\epsilon)}, \quad (7)$$

where evolution with redshift is parameterized by  $\epsilon$ ,  $r$  is the proper length, and  $r_0$  is the correlation length for  $z = 0$  (see Phillipps *et al.* 1978, Peebles 1980, Efsthathiou *et al.* 1991, Infante & Pritchett 1995 and Hudon 1995). If the redshift distribution ( $dN/dz$ ) is known for the magnitude limits for which the angular correlation function has been measured, the relationship between  $\omega(\theta)$  and  $\xi(r, z)$  is determined by an integral known as Limber's equation (see, for example, Peebles 1980 and HL):

$$\omega(\theta) = Cr_0^\gamma \theta^{1-\gamma} \int_0^\infty D(z)^{1-\gamma} g(z)^{-1} (1+z)^{-(3+\epsilon)} \left(\frac{dN}{dz}\right)^2 dz \left[ \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{dN}{dz}\right) dz \right]^{-2}. \quad (8)$$

$D(z)$  is the angular diameter distance defined as:

$$D(z) = \frac{c}{H_0} \frac{q_0 z + (q_0 - 1)(\sqrt{1 + 2q_0 z} - 1)}{q_0^2 (1+z)^2}, \quad (9)$$

with  $g(z)$  and  $C$  given by:

$$g(z) = \frac{c}{H_0} ((1+z)^2 (1+2q_0 z)^{\frac{1}{2}})^{-1}, \quad (10)$$

and

$$C = \sqrt{\pi} \frac{\Gamma((\gamma - 1)/2)}{\Gamma(\gamma/2)}, \quad (11)$$

with  $q_0$ ,  $H_0$  and  $\Gamma$  being the deceleration parameter, Hubble constant and Gamma function, respectively. Note that equation (7) and Limber's equation (eq. [8]) gives  $\delta = \gamma - 1$ . If  $\gamma \simeq 1.8$ , the value derived from surveys of bright, nearby galaxies (Davis & Peebles 1983), in the case of

clustering which is fixed in comoving coordinates then  $\epsilon = \gamma - 3 = -1.2$ . “Stable clustering”, where the clustering is fixed in proper coordinates, is the result when  $\epsilon = 0$ . If  $\epsilon > 0$ , then there is a growth in the clustering with redshift in proper coordinates. Using an extrapolated redshift distribution ( $dN/dz$ ) from the CFRS (Lilly *et al.* 1995a), with the same faint magnitude limit as our galaxy sample ( $I \leq 24$ ), we can solve Limber’s equation for assumed values of  $q_0$ ,  $H_0$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $\epsilon$ . The growth of clustering ( $\epsilon$ ) can then be estimated by comparing the models with the observations of  $\omega(\theta)$  (see §5.3).

### 4.3. Star Removal

The number counts of objects at faint magnitudes are dominated by galaxies but at bright limits the stellar component makes a significant contribution. To correct for this stellar contamination we plot a shape parameter vs. the aperture magnitudes for all the detected objects. This shape parameter is simply the difference between the “core” and aperture magnitude of an object, where the former is the magnitude corresponding to the flux incident on the inner 3x3 pixels. The core and aperture magnitude difference is a measure of the object’s light concentration and is analogous to Kron’s (1980)  $r_{-2}$  statistic which is proportional to the half-light radius.

A plot of the core–aperture vs. aperture ( $3''$ ) magnitudes for  $V$ ,  $R$  and  $I$  in NF2 and  $I$  in NF3, is given in Fig. 8 (see also Fig. 1 in Woods *et al.* 1995, for NF1 in  $I$ ). The stellar sequences are demarcated with a solid-lined rectangular box and at the brightest magnitudes they sometimes exhibit increasing values for the shape parameter due to saturation. Magnitude limits for each galaxy sample are shown by dashed vertical lines. Stars brighter than  $V$ ,  $R$  or  $I = 22$  are removed from the final galaxy samples for all three fields, except in NF1 where stars are removed down to  $R$  or  $I = 21$ . With these limits the star/galaxy separation is unambiguous. For fainter objects no attempt is made to further eliminate stars from the sample since compact galaxies could be mistakenly removed and stellar numbers are very small relative to the galaxies at these faint limits. Objects identified as stars in one bandpass, for a given field, are removed from all the galaxy samples determined with the three filters. In NF1 and NF2, the vast majority of stars found in one filter are also identified in the remaining two filters. The stars in NF3 are identified only with the  $I$  data because the  $V$  and  $R$  PSFs were noticeably variable across the field. This isn’t a concern in view of the overlap between bandpasses for the stellar samples found in NF1 and NF2. At brighter magnitudes where the stars are removed from the initial object lists, there is reasonable agreement between the Bahcall & Soneira (1980) model and the observed star counts in the three fields.

#### 4.4. Integral Constraint

A correction must be made for the integral constraint, which is due to the estimation of the density of galaxies, at a given magnitude limit, with a bounded, finite sample (Peebles 1980). This bias has the effect of reducing the amplitude of  $\omega(\theta)$ . Following BSM and LS we calculate the integral constraint ( $\omega_\Omega$ ) using:

$$\omega_\Omega = \frac{1}{\Omega^2} \int \int \omega(\theta) d\Omega_1 d\Omega_2 \quad (12)$$

with  $\Omega$  representing the solid angle of the masked field. We also assume the angular correlation function has the functional form given in equation (6). Integral constraints are calculated for each field and for power laws with  $\delta$  ranging from 0.5 – 0.9, resulting in  $\omega_\Omega \sim 0.08A_\omega - 0.01A_\omega$ . For  $\delta = 0.8$ , the integral constraints are determined to be  $\omega_\Omega \simeq 0.0195A_\omega$ ,  $0.0199A_\omega$ ,  $0.0193A_\omega$  for NF1, NF2 and NF3, respectively. The values are comparable since the field sizes and geometries are similar. This correction is significant compared to the small amplitudes of  $\omega(\theta)$  measured from the faint galaxy samples (see §5).

#### 4.5. Star Dilution Correction

Since stars have not been removed from the photometric samples fainter than  $V$ ,  $R$  or  $I \sim 22$ , a correction must be made to the amplitude of  $\omega(\theta)$  to account for the stellar component present down to the magnitude limit. The number of stars expected at faint magnitude limits is taken from the model of Bahcall & Soneira (1980). The three fields in this study were chosen to be at high Galactic latitudes where stars are relatively scarce and therefore the stellar dilution corrections are small. The amplitude of  $\omega(\theta)$  after the correction for stellar dilution is made is given by:

$$A_\omega^{sc} = \left( \frac{N_{obj}}{N_{obj} - N_s} \right)^2 A_\omega \quad (13)$$

where  $N_{obj}$  is the number of objects used to calculate  $\omega(\theta)$ ,  $N_s$  is the number of stars predicted by the Bahcall & Soneira model and  $A_\omega$  is the “raw” amplitude of  $\omega(\theta)$  before any corrections or weighting have been applied. Stellar dilution correction terms calculated for the various magnitude limited samples are listed in Table 7.

#### 4.6. Combining Fields, Error Analysis and Fitting

Since the use of just one of the three observed deep fields leads to a determination of  $\omega(\theta)$  which is of low accuracy, a strategy must be adopted to combine the data sets and to calculate the average or “final”  $\omega(\theta)$  and the appropriate errors. We follow a similar approach to that of Neuschaefer *et al.* (1995, hereafter NRGCI), where the average  $\omega(\theta)$  for a given bin ( $\theta$ ) is

calculated using:

$$\widehat{\omega}_{fin}(\theta) = \frac{\sum_i \eta_i \widehat{\omega}_i^{IC}(\theta)}{\sum_i \eta_i}, \quad (14)$$

where the summations extend over fields  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , and where the  $\eta_i$  are the weights for each field and include the stellar dilution correction and the galaxy number densities. We use the number densities of objects as weights since the total areas of the three fields are slightly different. The *IC* superscript on the  $\omega(\theta)$  estimates for each field denotes that corrections have been made for the integral constraint. Corrections for higher order correlations (e.g., three-point correlation function) are disregarded since they are negligible relative to the values of the  $\widehat{\omega}_i^{IC}(\theta)$  calculated in the individual fields.

Although the estimator for  $\omega(\theta)$  which we use has been shown to give Poissonian variance for uncorrelated data by LS, it does not necessarily follow that it behaves this way for *correlated* data. This was first pointed out by Bernstein (1994) who also emphasized that most authors do not properly account for the interdependence between the various bins when estimating the uncertainty in their results. We calculate errors using a scheme outlined by Fisher *et al.* (1994) where the covariance matrix for a particular estimate of  $\omega(\theta)$  is determined with bootstrap resampling (Barrow, Bhavsar & Sonoda 1984). Alternatively, Bernstein (1994) derives an approximate analytical expression for the covariance matrix, but the model fitting procedures in either study are essentially equivalent. As in NRGCI, for a given field and magnitude-limited sample, resampled estimates of the  $\widehat{\omega}_i^{IC}(\theta)$  are calculated by applying the estimator of equation (4) to a resampled list of galaxies with the same number of objects as the original, real sample. The resampled list is generated by randomly selecting galaxies from the original list *with* replacement, such that a galaxy can be chosen anywhere from zero up to several times. For each magnitude-limited sample, 50 bootstrap-resampled estimates of  $\widehat{\omega}_{fin}(\theta)$  are made by averaging resampled estimates of  $\widehat{\omega}_i^{IC}(\theta)$  calculated for the three fields. The final bootstrap errors for the different angular separation bins are simply given by the variance of the resampled estimates of  $\widehat{\omega}_{fin}(\theta)$ . Finally, a covariance matrix is generated so that the power-law model (eq. [6]) can be properly fit to the clustering observations for each magnitude-limited sample, following the technique described by Fisher *et al.* (1994, Appendix A).

Since the galaxy samples are fairly small (see Table 5), we choose to fix the power-law exponent ( $\delta$ ) and only let the amplitude ( $A_\omega$ ) vary when fitting the model (eq. [6]) to the data. The  $\chi^2$  minimization is analytic with one linear parameter in the model. The power-law exponent,  $\delta$ , has been measured to range from  $\sim 0.6$  to  $\sim 0.9$  (Neuschaefer & Windhorst 1995, and references therein) for galaxies at faint magnitude limits. Accordingly, each  $\widehat{\omega}(\theta)$  calculated for a magnitude-limited sample is fit with power laws between  $\delta = 0.5$  to  $\delta = 0.9$ , in 0.1 increments. The  $\chi^2$  statistic calculated for each fit gives an idea of what the most appropriate value for  $\delta$  is, although the measurement is not well constrained. Our data favour larger values of  $\delta$  ( $\delta \sim 0.8 - 0.9$ ), so we fix  $\delta = 0.8$  to ease comparison with other studies. Table 6 illustrates the relative insensitivity of the final amplitudes to fits with power laws having different values for  $\delta$ , in this case for the faintest magnitude-limited samples in *V*, *R* and *I*. The  $\chi^2$  values, which are

for *five* degrees of freedom, decrease as the power law approaches  $\delta = 0.8 - 0.9$  but for  $\delta > 1.0$  the errors in the amplitude fit increase dramatically. For decreasing values of  $\delta$  the integral constraint increases (§4.4) and this is the primary reason the  $\chi^2$  statistic increases dramatically, as listed in Table 6. Given the limited statistics of our sample, fixing  $\delta = 0.8$  seems to be the best approach but it should be emphasized that the errors given for the fitted amplitudes using this technique are probably underestimates. Further details of the results of the model fitting are discussed in §5.1 below.

For each magnitude-limited sample in a particular field,  $\hat{\omega}(\theta)$  is calculated for angular separations ranging from  $10 - 126''$ , within 6 equally spaced logarithmic bins. The binning and angular separation range were carefully chosen to optimize the measurement of  $\omega(\theta)$  given the available imaging data. The upper limit for  $\theta$  was chosen to be roughly one-third of the angular extent of the smallest field, thereby avoiding border effects. A lower limit of  $10''$  yielded error bars for the smallest angular separation bin which were roughly comparable to those obtained for bins with a larger  $\theta$ . A discussion of close galaxy pairs with smaller angular separations ( $\leq 10''$ ) is given in Woods *et al.* (1995).

## 5. Angular Correlation Function Results

### 5.1. Magnitude-Limited Samples

Measurements of the angular correlation function for the magnitude-limited samples defined in §3.4, for  $V$ ,  $R$  and  $I$ , are presented in Figs. 9, 10 and 11 respectively. The correlation amplitudes generally decrease over the small range of magnitudes probed, most obviously with the  $R$  data. The solid lines in Figs. 9-11 are *fits* of the model,  $\omega(\theta) = A_\omega \theta^{-0.8}$ , to the data and the errors are calculated using bootstrap resampling, as described in the previous section. Amplitudes,  $A_\omega^{fin}$ , measured from the fits to  $\hat{\omega}_{fin}(\theta)$  for the various magnitude ranges are listed in Table 7, and are scaled for angular separations ( $\theta$ ) given in arcseconds. The stellar dilution corrections used for the galaxy samples are also listed in Table 7. To demonstrate the scatter of the uncorrected estimates of  $\omega(\theta)$  between the three fields, the “raw” angular correlation functions are plotted for the  $I$ -band data in Fig. 12. The circles, triangles and squares are data points measured from the NF1, NF2 and NF3 fields, respectively. NF1 data points have been offset 0.01 dex to the left, with NF3 data moved the same amount to the right, to improve the clarity of this plot. These data have not yet been corrected for either the integral constraint or for dilution due to stars. The improvement of the agreement of the  $\omega(\theta)$  estimates in the three fields towards fainter magnitude ranges is typical for the three bandpasses and is due to the larger numbers of galaxies in the faint samples. Note that the ordinate range of Fig. 12 is smaller than Fig. 11 to better illustrate the similarities between the three fields. In Figs. 9-11 it can be seen that the faintest sample for each bandpass appears to have a slightly flatter distribution than the assumed  $\theta^{-0.8}$  power law. Since there is good agreement between the clustering measurements made in the three fields at

faint limits this effect could be real and possibly connected with the flattening of the power law slope of  $\omega(\theta)$  observed by Neuschaefer & Windhorst 1995). As discussed in the previous section, our galaxy samples are of insufficient size to accurately determine both the amplitude ( $A_\omega$ ) of  $\omega(\theta)$  and the power law slope ( $\delta$ ) simultaneously. Assuming  $\delta < 0.8$  introduces a larger integral constraint correction for the data plotted in Figs. 9-11 and thereby increases the  $\chi^2$  value for the fit. The adoption of  $\delta = 0.8$  is to ease the comparison with other studies but it is still typically the best fit when all the corrections to the data are made. However, it should be noted that there is some evidence for a decrease in the value of  $\delta$  at fainter limits and this should be investigated with larger samples of faint galaxy photometry.

The values of the angular correlation functions measured in  $V$ ,  $R$  and  $I$  at the separation of  $\theta = 1'$  are plotted in Fig. 13. The  $R$ -band data gives the strongest clustering signal but the variations are roughly comparable to the errors. Lilly *et al.* (1995a) have measured the redshift distribution of faint galaxies selected to a magnitude limit of  $I \simeq 22$  and also make extrapolations for  $N(z)$  to limits as faint as those obtained for the photometry in this work. With these redshift distributions and the  $I$ -band angular correlation analysis by Lidman & Peterson (1996, hereafter LP) at brighter magnitude limits, we use our  $\omega(\theta)$  measurements in  $I$  to constrain model parameters for the *spatial* correlation function in §5.3. Finally, since there have been many recent correlation studies of faint galaxies in  $R$ -bandpasses, these provide a comparison for the clustering detected with  $R$ -filter data in this study.

In Fig. 14, the angular correlation function normalized to  $\theta = 1^\circ$ , using the standard power law model with  $\delta = 0.8$ , is plotted as a function of the  $R$  magnitude limit. The measurements by different groups are denoted by the various symbols which are keyed to the authors' initials and year of the particular paper. The  $\omega(\theta)$  amplitudes determined in this work are given by the solid circles for  $R = 20 - 24$ ,  $20 - 24.5$ ,  $20 - 25$ . Magnitude transformations for BSM were made using their assumption of  $R \sim r - 0.55$ . For Couch *et al.* (1993) and others the conversions given by Yoshii *et al.* (1993) and Roche *et al.* (1993) yield  $R$  magnitudes from the original  $VR$  and  $r_F$  values. The only observation plotted in Fig. 14 which was not taken with a red filter is that of MSFR. Since the MSFR result is the  $\omega(\theta)$  amplitude with the faintest magnitude limit yet measured from the ground, it is interesting to include it for comparison using the approximate relationship  $B_{CCD} \simeq R + 1$ .

It is notable that the  $\omega(\theta)$  values presented in this work form a smooth continuation of the previous observations made by Infante & Pritchett (1995) and HL for  $R = 21 - 23.5$ , where the latter study used the same  $R$  filter as the current observations. Our data agrees reasonably well with the Efstathiou *et al.* (1991) data point and very well with the overlapping observations of Roche *et al.* (1996). The largest discrepancy with this study is seen with BSM's  $\omega(\theta)$  measurements where our clustering amplitudes are observed to be factors of  $\sim 2 - 3$  larger. A possible explanation for part of this difference is that the BSM field is at low Galactic latitude ( $b \simeq 35^\circ$ ) typically requiring larger stellar contamination corrections than our three high Galactic latitude fields. Another possibility is that our clustering amplitude errors are underestimates since

they are the fitting errors for a  $\theta^{-0.8}$  power law. Nevertheless, the clustering measurements in this study are in agreement with Roche *et al.* (1996), who in turn agree with the BSM results, so there is a reasonable level of consistency between studies in the  $R \sim 24 - 25$  magnitude range. With three fields the current work is less susceptible to variations in general clustering behaviour induced by large scale structure.

The fact that our  $V$  and  $I$ -band estimates of  $\omega(\theta)$  (Fig. 13) do not show well defined decreases with magnitude, as the  $R$ -filter data does, is not surprising due to the poorer statistics of the  $V$  and  $I$  filters for the two brightest magnitude bins (see Table 5). Therefore, the apparent flatness of the clustering amplitudes with magnitude for the  $V$  and  $I$  galaxy samples should not be interpreted as a strong trend but merely a clustering measure over a small range of magnitudes (note the galaxy samples are cumulative towards fainter magnitudes, not differential). Since clustering over a significant magnitude range cannot be tracked with just the data from this study, other studies must be included for a proper analysis of galaxy clustering evolution. This is done for the  $I$ -band data in §5.3.

Our Fig. 14 follows the format of Fig. 2 presented in BSM. Even with the additional results included from recent studies, there still isn't general agreement on the precise slope of the monotonic decrease in clustering amplitude with limiting magnitude. No clear indication that the amplitude is starting to level off at faint magnitudes is observed, as would be expected in some merger models of galaxy evolution (Carlberg & Charlot 1992) or if there was a magnification bias from weak gravitational lensing (Villumsen 1995). Roche *et al.* (1993) and Roukema & Yoshii (1993, hereafter RY) have also found merging-model clustering behaviour to be inconsistent with current measurements of  $\omega(\theta)$ . MSFR claim that the amplitude of  $\omega(\theta)$  flattens for  $B$  data at about the same magnitude where the slope of the number counts flattens ( $B \sim 25$  or  $R \sim 24$ ), which they attribute to an effective redshift cutoff for the galaxies. The data from various groups plotted in Fig. 14 shows that any flattening in the clustering amplitude with magnitude is not that well constrained as yet, especially considering the inherently large random and systematic errors which plague the measurement of  $\omega(\theta)$  at faint limits.

One cannot rule out the viability of *all* merger models of galaxy evolution with current observations but models with extreme amounts of merging or “maximal merging” as in RY can be shown to be inconsistent with measurements of  $\omega(\theta)$ . (Note that merging is considered “maximal” with the assumption that every galaxy merges when its dark halo merges.) See RY for more details on the nature of their galaxy merging models. The clustering measurements for the increasingly faint magnitude-limited samples in the  $V$  bandpass which are listed in Table 7 and shown in Fig. 13 (with respective median magnitudes of  $V_{median} = 23.33, 23.84, 24.30$ ) have corresponding predictions from the RY merger models which are  $\log(\omega(\theta = 1', \delta = 0.8)) \simeq -1.06, -1.14$  and  $-1.25$ . Thus, a discrepancy of at least a factor of  $\sim 3$  is evident between our  $V$ -band  $\omega(\theta)$  measurements plotted in Fig. 13 and the models plotted in RY's Fig. 3. Other observations which seem to rule out the most extreme merger galaxy evolution models (Carlberg 1995) are a collection of redshifts for very faint galaxies obtained with the Keck telescope (Koo *et al.* 1996).

This spectroscopic sample is still sparse, so the results should be treated as preliminary, but the median redshifts obtained for  $I > 22$  are contrary to what is expected for Carlberg’s “maximal merging model”. The extent of the role of galaxy merging is still not clear but we can conclude that a *maximal* merger model is no longer a viable mechanism for galaxy evolution at intermediate redshifts.

## 5.2. Color-Selected Samples

With the *multi-color* deep imaging in each field, the angular correlation function can be measured with color-selected samples down to faint magnitude limits. A few approaches for obtaining color-selected samples were attempted to maximize the number of galaxies and thereby improve the accuracy of the  $\omega(\theta)$  measurements over a significant range in color. However, it should be noted that having just  $V$ ,  $R$  and  $I$  images to work with, and no bluer bandpasses, unfortunately leads to a limited baseline of observed colors for the faint galaxies. In Fig. 15, the angular correlation functions selected by  $(V - R)$ ,  $(R - I)$  and  $(V - I)$  colors are presented in a plot which is analogous to Fig. 1 of LSK. Amplitudes measured for the full range of angular separations,  $10 - 126''$  (yielding an effective separation of  $\sim 35''$ ), are plotted as a function of the colors which the galaxies observed are either *less* than (top row of plots), or *greater* than (bottom row). Poisson error bars are shown but should be considered to be underestimates of the true errors. The final amplitudes have been corrected for the integral constraints and stellar dilution factors calculated for each field. Also, the plotted values are obtained with weighted averaging, where the weights are determined from the number of galaxies detected in both bandpasses for a given color.

LSK used  $(U - R_F)$  colors to find that the  $\omega(\theta)$  amplitude increased by over a factor of ten for the reddest *and* bluest galaxies taken from a bright magnitude limited sample ( $B_J \leq 23.5$ ). Fig. 15 shows no indication of this behaviour for the current, fainter galaxy sample with  $(V - R)$ ,  $(R - I)$  and  $(V - I)$  colors. Within the errors, the angular correlation amplitude integrated over the full range of separations is relatively constant regardless of the colors of the galaxies being analysed. This is consistent with what BSM ( $R \lesssim 25.5$ ) and Infante & Pritchett (1995,  $b_J \leq 24$  and  $R_F \leq 23$ ) have found although one should note that these previous studies made only one division in color (blue/red) and did not look at the extremely blue or red galaxies, as did LSK. It is possible the lack of an increase in the clustering amplitude in Fig. 15 is due to the  $V$ ,  $R$  and  $I$  colors not discriminating the reddest and bluest galaxies well enough with our coarser colour bins. In other words, the numbers of galaxies available for this study may be simply insufficient for providing an accurate measure of  $\omega(\theta)$  with color. There also could be physical reasons for the non-detection of a clustering increase with extreme color, and these are discussed below.

To do a more direct comparison of the clustering observed with color-selected samples the correlation amplitudes for  $(V - I)$ -selected galaxy samples are plotted in Fig. 16, for a fixed angular separation of  $1'$ . Results from NRGCI are given as open symbols for the 50% blue, 50%

red and entire samples while the filled symbols are measurements for objects in the current work with  $(V - I) < 1.3$ ,  $(V - I) > 1.3$  and for the full sample, with the *median*  $I$  magnitude plotted on the abscissa. The value  $(V - I) = 1.3$  was chosen as the dividing line such that the entire sample could be cut into roughly 50% blue and red galaxies. In this case, the  $\omega(\theta)$  amplitudes calculated from our sample assume that  $\delta = 0.7$  in order to ease the comparison with NRGCI and our error bars are calculated using bootstrap resampling. Galaxies with the 50% reddest  $(V - I)$  colors in NRGCI were observed to have clustering which is  $\sim 4 - 8$  times stronger than the blue half of the sample, but with substantial errors. NRGCI also argue that there is an increase in amplitude for the 20% color marginals (bluest and reddest 1/5 of the galaxies) from the 50% samples, although these two samples for either blue or red objects are consistent within the errors. The  $(V - I)$ -selected sample in this study, which is one magnitude deeper than that of NRGCI, shows no sign of color segregation of the clustering amplitudes beyond  $I \sim 22$ , albeit with large error bars for the measurements. Also, there is no significant difference observed between the clustering of the galaxies in the full,  $I$ -selected sample and the blue and red samples. The amplitudes from our red and blue galaxy samples do not bracket those calculated for the full sample due to not all the galaxies being detected in both the  $V$  and  $I$  images. Clustering amplitudes for the red and blue 20% marginals in our sample were not determined since large errors would result from the small sample size.

LP also determined  $\omega(\theta)$  for  $(V - I)$ -selected samples of galaxies, in the magnitude range  $I = 18 - 20$ . They used  $(V - I) = 1.5$  as the blue/red boundary and found a marginally significant difference between the samples with red galaxies exhibiting stronger clustering, similar to the NRGCI results at brighter magnitudes. This comparison of LP, NRGCI and the current work suggests that a difference in the clustering amplitudes for blue and red galaxies (using  $(V - I)$  selection) exists at bright magnitudes ( $I \sim 18 - 21.5$ ) and either disappears or has not been detected at fainter magnitude limits ( $I \sim 21.5 - 24$ ). Interpreting these color-selected clustering results is complicated in that, for  $I$ -selected samples (for e.g., the CFRS with  $I \leq 22$ ), red galaxies tend to be confined to a fairly narrow range of intermediate redshifts while blue galaxies are observed to have more broadly distributed redshifts ( $z \sim 0 - 1$ ), with a lower mean  $z$ . The results summarized in Fig. 16 may be showing that significant galaxy evolution is occurring at faint magnitudes relative to brighter magnitudes (lower redshift). Red and blue galaxies are observed to cluster differently at lower  $z$ , which is simply a reflection of the morphology-density relation. Another possibility is that the blue sample is more diluted with lower luminosity galaxies which have stronger clustering properties, making the clustering measurements for the blue and red faint galaxy samples indistinguishable. A more accurate approach for tracing clustering evolution of “typical”  $L^*$  galaxies may be to select out red galaxies and measure their clustering variations with magnitude, since the luminosity function of these objects shows very little change over  $0 < z < 1$  (Lilly *et al.* 1995a). Obviously, larger multi-color imaging surveys of faint galaxies are required to more accurately measure the color-selected angular correlation function and further check the viability of various galaxy evolution scenarios.

### 5.3. Comparison with Models of the Spatial Correlation Function

To determine a viable model for the evolution of  $\xi(r)$  with redshift (eq. [7]) from measurements of  $\omega(\theta)$ , one requires the redshift distribution ( $dN/dz$ ) of the galaxies within the magnitude interval being considered. With a realistic redshift distribution, Limber's equation (8) can be solved and relationships between the observed  $\omega(\theta)$  and inferred  $\xi(r)$  can be determined for different cosmologies ( $q_0, H_0$ ) and clustering evolution ( $\epsilon$ ), with the power law index for  $\xi(r)$  constrained from the angular clustering results ( $\gamma = \delta + 1$ ). Unless otherwise noted we assume that  $q_0 = 0.5$  and  $H_0 = 100 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ . Since the correlation length at  $z = 0$ ,  $r_0$ , corresponds to the amplitude of the locally observed  $\xi(r)$ , a range of reasonable values for  $r_0$  and  $\epsilon$  are assumed in order to generate models of the clustering evolution. These models are then compared to the observed values of  $\omega(\theta)$ .

The  $I$  photometric data in this study have a magnitude limit ( $I \sim 24$ ) which is a full two magnitudes fainter than the currently largest deep redshift survey (Lilly *et al.* 1995b). For an estimate of the redshift distribution at the limits of the photometry, the  $dN/dz$  measured to  $I \sim 22$  can be extrapolated to fainter magnitude limits with a no-evolution assumption for the galaxies. Evolution is obviously occurring for the galaxies at some level towards fainter magnitudes but the discrepancy between the observed galaxy counts and extrapolated- $dN/dz$  number counts is fairly small for the two magnitude interval beyond  $I \sim 22$  (see Figs. 8 and 9 in Lilly *et al.* 1995a). Using the Lilly *et al.* extrapolations to  $I \sim 24$  and the observed redshift distributions for brighter magnitude limits, we have calculated the variation of  $\omega(\theta)$  with  $I$  magnitude for given values of  $r_0$ ,  $\epsilon$  and  $\gamma$ .

Errors are almost certainly present in the extrapolated redshift distributions used to calculate the clustering evolution models. Since the amplitude of  $\omega(\theta)$  calculated using Limber's equation (eq. [8]) has a strong dependence on the shape (essentially the width) of  $dN/dz$ , errors will occur if this shape is poorly estimated with the extrapolation, while the effect of an inaccurate normalization will be small. Preliminary observational support for the extrapolated Lilly *et al.* (1995a) redshift distributions has been provided by the DEEP survey (Koo *et al.* 1996) where the median redshifts *measured* at faint limits are found to be consistent, albeit within large error bounds. Hudon (1995) and HL have shown that if the redshift distribution, with slightly brighter magnitude limits than ours, has 15% more galaxies added to it which are similarly distributed in redshift there is little change in the estimate of the spatial correlation function, as expected. In the more extreme scenario where this 15% is added at median redshifts of  $z_{med} = 1.5$  or 2.1 as a gaussian distribution the resulting correlation length  $r_0$  is increased by  $\sim 15\%$  or  $\sim 30\%$ , respectively. This is probably a reasonable upper bound for the uncertainty in this study due to our still sparse knowledge of the redshift distribution of galaxies with  $22 < I < 24$ . Also, the shape of  $dN/dz$  at these faint magnitudes will be incorrect if a particular galaxy population dominates at these limits but is not detected at brighter magnitudes. The calculations using Limber's equation are presented keeping these caveats in mind.

LP have measured  $\omega(\theta)$  for a wide range of brighter magnitudes in  $I$  and we use these results as a comparison to this study, as well as to the models. In Fig. 17 the logarithm of  $\omega(\theta)$  at an angular separation of  $1'$  is plotted with the *median*  $I$  magnitude given on the abscissa. All of the samples obtained from the two fields (CL and FBS) in LP are included, in addition to the Efstathiou *et al.* (1991) point for the  $I$ -band. Models calculated using the aforementioned redshift distributions from Lilly *et al.* (1995a) are plotted as a series of lines for different values of  $r_0(z=0)$  ( $5.4 h^{-1}$  Mpc solid lines,  $4 h^{-1}$  Mpc dashed lines and  $2 h^{-1}$  Mpc dotted lines) and  $\epsilon$  ( $-1.2, 0, 1, 2$  from top to bottom for each set of lines with a given  $r_0$ ). The value of  $\gamma$  is fixed at 1.8 following the discussions in §§4.2 and 4.6, but the effects of varying it are shown below. The LP results are amplitudes obtained from galaxies within narrow luminosity bins (1 or 2 magnitudes wide) spanning  $I = 16 - 23$  while the points determined in the current study are for galaxies with  $I = 19 - 23, 23.5, 24$ . Our magnitude limits were chosen to minimize the error in the  $\omega(\theta)$  measurements since there are a limited number of galaxies available (2697 with  $I = 19 - 24$ ). As noted earlier, the majority of the galaxies in our  $I$ -selected samples are within a narrow magnitude range so no claim is made for a detection of flattening in  $\omega(\theta)$ . When combined with the LP clustering study, a generally smooth decline in the amplitude of  $\omega(\theta)$  with  $I$  magnitude is observed. For the slightly better statistics of the  $R$  observations (Fig. 14), a decrease in the clustering amplitudes with magnitude limit is unambiguously seen to the faintest limits, in conjunction with other studies. There is fairly good agreement between the correlation function amplitudes from the three  $I$ -band studies at the faintest magnitudes in Fig. 17. At  $I_{med} \sim 22$  the LP data are consistent with our measurement of the clustering. For the LP point at  $I_{med} \sim 22.5$  and the Efstathiou *et al.* result at  $I_{med} \sim 23$  there is agreement within  $2\sigma$  of the amplitudes obtained from this study but with a substantial error for the LP measurement at their magnitude limit.

A comparison of the observations to the models in Fig. 17 leads to some general conclusions. Clustering evolution which is fixed in co-moving coordinates ( $\epsilon = -1.2$ ) is a viable scenario only if  $r_0(z=0) \sim 2 - 3 h^{-1}$  Mpc. Values for  $r_0$  are typically not observed to be this small for the entire galaxy population. The correlation length usually ranges from  $\sim 4 h^{-1}$  Mpc, calculated using IRAS-selected redshift surveys (Saunders *et al.* 1992, Fisher *et al.* 1994), to the canonical optical survey correlation length of  $r_0(z=0) = 5.4 h^{-1}$  Mpc from Davis & Peebles (1983). BSM show that, with a correlation length of  $r_0 \sim 2 h^{-1}$  Mpc, and a rate of clustering growth predicted by linear theory ( $\epsilon \sim 0.8$ ), they can match their clustering observations and models at faint limits. From this result, BSM claim that low surface brightness (LSB) and/or dwarf galaxies are dominating the faint galaxy population since some local measurements of the correlation lengths for these objects yield  $r_0 \sim 2.3 - 2.7 h^{-1}$  Mpc (Santiago & da Costa 1990). However, the values for the LSB/dwarf galaxy local correlation lengths are still controversial and may be larger (Thuan *et al.* 1991). As noted earlier (§5.1), the amplitudes of the BSM observations in the  $R$ -band are significantly lower than what is observed in this study at similar magnitude limits. Given that most studies to date have found local correlation lengths with  $r_0 \gtrsim 4 h^{-1}$  Mpc along with the assumption that faint galaxy populations evolve into locally observed galaxies, our  $I$ -filter observations then suggest that  $\epsilon \geq 0$ , in agreement with HL, Le Fèvre *et al.* (1996) and Shepherd

*et al.* (1997).

For a non-negative value of  $\epsilon$ , two general possibilities remain for the evolution of the faint galaxy population. The first scenario is that  $\epsilon \simeq 0 - 1$  and  $r_0(z = 0) \sim 4 h^{-1}$  Mpc, where the excess of faint blue galaxies is due to objects which are analogous to IRAS-selected galaxies with respect to star formation, morphology and clustering, as suggested by BTBJ. The second possibility is that  $\epsilon > 1$ , implying significant evolution in the clustering from faint limits to locally observed galaxies such that a value of  $\sim 5 - 6 h^{-1}$  Mpc is found for  $r_0$ . This correlation length is in agreement with most optically-selected, local redshift survey measurements of  $\xi(r)$ . We note that Efstathiou *et al.* (1991) only considered clustering models with  $-1.2 \lesssim \epsilon \lesssim 0$  in order to obey the standard gravitational instability picture. However, more recent N-body studies (Melott 1992, Yoshii, Peterson & Takahara 1993) have found that models with  $\epsilon \sim 0 - 3$  are indeed possible due to the continual merging of groups as the universe expands.

To illustrate the sensitivity of the models for  $\omega(\theta)$  in  $I$  to the assumed  $q_0$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $\epsilon$ , for a given  $r_0$ , the observed clustering amplitudes are plotted again in Fig. 18 versus the  $I$  magnitude limit along with three different families of models. Note that each ordinate of the three panels covers a different range of clustering amplitudes but has a total range of 1 dex. For each  $r_0$  listed (5.4, 4, 2  $h^{-1}$  Mpc from top to bottom) in the lower left corner, the solid line corresponds to the model calculated for  $q_0 = 0.5$ ,  $\gamma = 1.8$  and  $\epsilon = 0$ . Assuming a small- $\Omega_0$  universe with  $q_0 = 0.1$  yields the dotted line model for each  $r_0$ . Changing just the power-law index for the correlation function to the two extremes of what is observed,  $\gamma = 1.9$  and  $\gamma = 1.6$ , gives the short-long dashed lines above and below the solid line, respectively. Finally, the long dashed lines are associated with changing just the value of  $\epsilon$ , as in Fig. 17. The long-dashed line above the solid line is for  $\epsilon = -1.2$  while the two dashed lines below correspond to  $\epsilon = 1, 2$  for decreasing amplitude. Clearly the comparison between the observations and models does not have a strong dependence on the assumed value of  $q_0$ . The clustering evolution parameter  $\epsilon$  provides the greatest leverage in parameter space for matching the observations to clustering models, in addition to being poorly constrained. If the inherent degeneracy of fitting clustering models to measurements of  $\omega(\theta)$  is to be broken, better determinations of  $r_0$  and  $\gamma$  for local samples of galaxies selected by morphology, luminosity and surface brightness are required.

## 6. Discussion

Lilly (1993) summarized the three standard scenarios which were suggested to explain the obvious evolution in the galaxy number counts (Tyson 1988, Lilly *et al.* (1991)) and the lack thereof in the measured redshift distributions (Broadhurst *et al.* 1988, Colless *et al.* 1990, 1993). First, the faint blue galaxies are explained to be proto-dwarf galaxies undergoing bursts of star formation at intermediate redshifts ( $z \sim 0.4$ ) and then evolving into galaxies at the faint end of the luminosity function ( $L < 0.01L^*$ ) by the current epoch (Broadhurst *et al.* 1988). The second model has faint galaxies being very shortlived, star-bursting objects which are subsequently disrupted or

fade away in such a fashion that they aren't observed in large numbers at small redshift (Babul & Rees 1992). The final conventional model invokes merging of sub-galactic units at intermediate redshifts where current  $L^*$  galaxies are the products of this process (Broadhurst *et al.* 1992). We refer to these three frameworks as the “bursting dwarfs”, “fading dwarfs” and “merger” models. By looking for increases in the clustering of faint galaxies using various selection criteria (e.g., magnitude-limited samples, small angular separations, colors), we can test the viability of the merger galaxy evolution model, as in §5.1. Dwarf models can be checked by comparing the clustering behaviour of the various local and faint galaxy populations (§§5.2 and 5.3). A more unconventional explanation for the number counts and redshift distributions evolution discrepancy is the proposal by McGaugh (1994, also see Ferguson & McGaugh 1995) of the existence of a significant population of low surface brightness galaxies which are not typically detected locally, due to observational selection effects, but which can be detected in faint, photometric surveys.

As shown in the previous section, neither a sustained flattening in the amplitude of the angular correlation function over a significant range of magnitude, nor a well defined change in the slope of the decreasing  $\omega(\theta)$  with magnitude, is seen with current data, which suggests that merger models (Guiderdoni & Rocca-Volmerange 1990, Broadhurst *et al.* 1992, Carlberg & Charlot 1992) may not be viable descriptions of faint galaxy evolution. It is still possible to incorporate some merging into galaxy evolution models without being inconsistent with the observed clustering and redshift distributions, but models with “maximal merging” are certainly ruled out (§5.1 and Koo *et al.* 1996). A lack of a significant amount of merging of galaxies at faint limits is in agreement with our results from Woods *et al.* (1995), where no substantial excess of close pairs of galaxies in NF1 were found down to  $I \leq 24$ . Obviously the clustering measurements displayed in Fig. 14 are still too inaccurate to reasonably constrain any detailed galaxy evolution model.

Assessing whether the faint galaxy population are predominantly bursting dwarfs or fading dwarfs is very difficult (if not impossible) to distinguish at this juncture using only estimates of the clustering. These two scenarios can be respectively described as follows (see Fig. 17 and Table 8): (1) the majority of faint galaxies are evolving into a local population which is similar to IRAS-selected galaxies ( $r_0 \sim 4 h^{-1}$  Mpc) with moderate clustering evolution ( $\epsilon \sim 0 - 1$ ) and (2) the clustering is fixed in comoving coordinates with  $\epsilon \sim -1.2$  requiring the local counterparts of faint galaxies to be either low surface brightness galaxies which are weakly clustered ( $r_0 \sim 2 - 3 h^{-1}$  Mpc) or galaxies which have been disrupted and are therefore undetectable. Additional local surveys for low surface brightness galaxies are required to better constrain the purported weak clustering behaviour of this population. The third model, previously discussed, where merging of galaxies plays some role is given by: (3) clustering of the faint population evolving at a significant rate ( $\epsilon > 1$ ) yielding local galaxies with similar clustering properties to what is observed in optical surveys ( $r_0 \sim 5 - 6 h^{-1}$  Mpc). The three approximate pairs of  $r_0$  and  $\epsilon$  which match the clustering model to our  $I$ -band  $\omega(\theta)$  measurements, are also in broad agreement with those found by HL in the  $R$  bandpass. We summarize these three galaxy evolution scenarios in Table 8 and comment on the models' strengths and drawbacks.

Clustering evolution processes (1) and (3) could both be occurring but recent HST observations suggest that late-type and irregular galaxies dominate the number counts at faint limits (Driver *et al.* 1995, Glazebrook *et al.* 1995). Loveday *et al.* (1995) have measured the local correlation lengths for early and late-type galaxy morphologies to be  $5.9 \pm 0.7 h^{-1}$  Mpc (E and S0) and  $4.4 \pm 0.1 h^{-1}$  Mpc (Sp and Irr), respectively. If spirals and irregulars are the dominant population comprising the faint counts it is possible that the primary path for faint galaxy evolution is scenario (1) above, with a moderate change in the clustering ( $\epsilon \sim 0 - 1$ ). This value of  $\epsilon$  is consistent with what is predicted by linear theory and is easier to account for than larger values of  $\epsilon$ .

Another point which should be made is that some of the large fraction of irregular galaxies found at faint magnitude limits with HST data (Driver *et al.* 1995, Glazebrook *et al.* 1995) could be galaxies at high redshift with  $2.3 \leq z \leq 3.5$  (Abraham *et al.* 1996), where the lower redshift limit corresponds to the Lyman discontinuity entering the  $U$  filter. This possibility is supported by 19 of the 83 “irregular/peculiar/merger” objects found by Abraham *et al.* in the Hubble Deep Field to have  $(U - B) > -0.2$ . A red UV-optical,  $(U_n - \mathcal{G})$ , color criterion has also been recently used by Steidel *et al.* (1996) to find “normal”, star-forming galaxies (with  $\mathfrak{R} \leq 25$ ) at redshifts of  $3 \leq z \leq 3.5$ , confirmed with Keck spectroscopy. However, Steidel *et al.* have found the surface density of the galaxies in this redshift range to be quite low ( $0.4 \pm 0.07$  galaxies arcmin $^{-2}$ ). This suggests that if the Abraham *et al.* irregular objects are at high redshift then the bulk of these galaxies will have redshifts with  $2.3 \leq z \leq 3$ . Galaxy morphologies at large redshifts are subject to K-corrections, evolutionary effects of stellar populations and a strong dependence on surface brightness (Giavalisco *et al.* 1996). Considering these effects, it is not clear whether the significant fraction of faint galaxies with apparent irregular/peculiar morphology are *all* the result of dynamical evolution at intermediate redshifts or the galaxies are at high redshift ( $z > 2.3$ ) and are observed to be irregular due to these “morphological K-corrections”. Morphology studies of local galaxies at UV wavelengths and further faint galaxy spectroscopy (e.g., Koo *et al.* 1996) should address this concern.

No evidence was found in this study for a dependence of clustering on galaxy color (Figs. 15 and 16), such as what LSK found using  $U - R_F$  colors at brighter magnitude limits. Nevertheless, Roche *et al.* (1996) find a difference in the clustering of red and blue galaxies at  $B \sim 25.5$ . They suggest that the observed clustering is consistent with the LSK result at  $B \leq 23.5$ . No significant differences in the clustering measured for red and blue samples of galaxies were found by Efstathiou *et al.* (1991) and BSM. NRGCI, as mentioned earlier, find only marginal differences in the clustering for  $(V - I)$ -selected samples of red and blue galaxies at faint limits ( $I > 21.5$ ) while larger discrepancies are observed for brighter magnitudes ( $I < 21.5$ ). This roughly consistent clustering of red and blue galaxies at faint magnitudes is in agreement with what is observed for the  $(V - I)$ -selected samples of this work (Fig. 16). It remains to be seen if the difference (or consistency) of the clustering between red and blue galaxies is a function of the sample magnitude limit. The accuracy of the measurements of the color-selected  $\omega(\theta)$  in the current work does not

warrant further analysis. Larger photometric surveys of faint galaxies will be essential towards achieving more precise determinations of  $\omega(\theta)$  for magnitude limited and color-selected galaxy samples.

## 7. Summary

The amplitude of  $\omega(\theta)$  is found to decrease with magnitude limit when our  $R$  and  $I$ -band results are combined with clustering determined by other authors. This observed monotonic decrease with magnitude rules out “maximal merger” galaxy evolution models. Angular correlation function estimates (in  $I$ ) in the current study and LP were compared to galaxy clustering evolution models, generated with CFRS redshift distributions which were extrapolated to the faint limits of the photometry. The observed clustering of the faint galaxies can be explained with local correlation lengths for this population of  $\sim 4 h^{-1}$  Mpc or  $\sim 5 - 6 h^{-1}$  Mpc for moderate ( $\epsilon \sim 0 - 1$ ) or strong ( $\epsilon > 1$ ) clustering evolution, respectively. Clustering evolution which is fixed in co-moving coordinates ( $\epsilon = -1.2$ ) is possible but requires smaller correlation lengths ( $\sim 2 - 3 h^{-1}$  Mpc) than what is usually observed for local galaxies. No evidence is found for variations in clustering which are dependent on galaxy color in this study. Larger photometric surveys are required to confirm the stronger clustering amplitudes for faint, red galaxies found by Roche *et al.* (1996) and to improve upon the accuracy of angular correlation function measurements at faint magnitude limits.

We thank the CFHT TAC for generous allocations of observing time. Kudos to Harvey Richer for helping collect the NF1 data and for contributing part of the initial (and ongoing) impetus for the high Galactic latitude fields project. Simon Lilly and Dan Hudon are thanked for providing some of their images so that NF2 could be flat-fielded, and for sending the CFRS extrapolated redshift distributions in machine readable form. David Schade is thanked for promptly transferring the Lilly/Hudon data when it was needed. DW thanks Bob Abraham, Brad Gibson, Dan Hudon, Ted Kennelly and Frank Valdes for stimulating and helpful conversations. Finally, we would like to thank the referee, Ian Smail, for a detailed report which improved the clarity of this paper. Support for this research was provided by grants to GGF and Harvey Richer from the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

## REFERENCES

- Abraham, R.A. et al. 1996, MNRAS, 279, L47
- Babul, A., & Rees, M.J. 1992, MNRAS, 255, 346
- Bahcall, J.N., & Soneira, R.M. 1980, ApJS, 44, 73
- Barrow, J.D., Bhavsar, S.P., & Sonoda, D.H. 1984, MNRAS, 210, 19
- Bernstein, G.M. 1994, ApJ, 424, 569
- Bernstein, G.M., Tyson, J.A., Brown, W.R., & Jarvis, J.F. 1994, ApJ, 426, 516 (BTBJ)
- Brainerd, T.G., Smail, I., & Mould, J. 1995, MNRAS, 275, 781 (BSM)
- Broadhurst, T.J., Ellis, R.S., & Shanks, T. 1988, MNRAS, 235, 827
- Broadhurst, T.J., Ellis, R.S., & Glazebrook, K. 1992, Nature, 355, 55
- Carlberg, R.G. 1995, in Galaxies in the Young Universe, ed. H. Hippelein, K. Meisenheimer, & H.-J. Roser (Springer-Verlag:Berlin), p.206
- Carlberg, R.G., & Charlot, S. 1992, ApJ, 397, 5
- Christian, C.A. et al. 1985, PASP, 97, 363
- Colless, M.M., Ellis, R.S., Taylor, K., & Hook, R.N. 1990, MNRAS, 244, 408
- Colless, M.M., Ellis, R.S., Broadhurst, T.J., Taylor, K., & Peterson, B.A. 1993, MNRAS, 261, 19
- Couch, W.J., Jurcevic, J.S., & Boyle, B.J. 1993, MNRAS, 260, 241 (CJB)
- Davis, M., & Geller, M.J. 1976, ApJ, 208, 13
- Davis, M., & Peebles, P.J.E. 1983, ApJ, 267, 465
- Davis, M., Efstathiou, G., Frenk, C.S., & White, S.D.M. 1985, ApJ, 292, 371
- Driver, S.P. et al. 1995, ApJ, 449, L23
- Efstathiou, G., Bernstein, G., Katz, N., Tyson, J.A., & Guhathakurta, P. 1991, ApJ, 380, L47 (EBKTG)
- Ferguson, H.C., & McGaugh, S.S. 1995, ApJ, 440, 470
- Fisher, K.B. et al. 1994, MNRAS, 266, 50
- Frei, Z., & Gunn, J.E. 1994, AJ, 108, 1476
- Giavalisco, M. et al. 1996, AJ, 112, 369
- Giovanelli, R., Haynes, M.P., & Chincarini, G.L. 1986, ApJ, 300, 77
- Glazebrook, K., Ellis, R., Santiago, B., & Griffiths, R. 1995, MNRAS, 275, L19
- Guiderdoni, B., & Rocca-Volmerange, B. 1990, A&A, 227, 362
- Hamilton, A.J.S. 1993, ApJ, 417, 19
- Hudon, J.D. 1995, Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto

- Hudon, J.D., & Lilly, S.J. 1996, ApJ, 469, 519 (HL)
- Infante, L., & Pritchett, C.J. 1995, ApJ, 439, 565 (IP)
- Jarvis, J.F., & Tyson, J.A. 1981, AJ, 86, 476
- Koo, D.C., & Szalay, A.S. 1984, ApJ, 282, 390
- Koo, D.C., & Kron, R.G. 1992, ARA&A, 30, 613
- Koo, D.C. et al. 1996, ApJ, 469, 535
- Kron, R.G. 1980, ApJS, 43, 305
- Landolt, A. 1992, AJ, 104, 340
- Landy, S.D., & Szalay, A.S. 1993, ApJ, 412, 64 (LS)
- Landy, S.D., Szalay, A.S., & Koo, D.C. 1996, ApJ, 460, 94 (LSK)
- Le Fèvre, O. et al. 1996, ApJ, 461, 534 (CFRS VIII)
- Lidman, C.E., & Peterson, B.A. 1996, MNRAS, 279, 1357 (LP)
- Lilly, S.J., Cowie, L.L., & Gardner, J.P. 1991, ApJ, 369, 79
- Lilly, S.J. 1993, ApJ, 411, 501
- Lilly, S.J. et al. 1995a, ApJ, 455, 108 (CFRS VI)
- Lilly, S.J. et al. 1995b, ApJ, 455, 50 (CFRS I)
- Loveday, J., Efstathiou, G., Peterson, B.A., & Maddox, S.J. 1992, ApJ, 400, L43
- Loveday, J., Maddox, S.J., Efstathiou, G., & Peterson, B.A. 1995, ApJ, 442, 457
- Maddox, S.J. et al. 1990, MNRAS, 247, 1P
- McGaugh, S.S. 1994, Nature, 367, 538
- Melott, A.L. 1992, ApJ, 393, L45
- Metcalf, N., Shanks, T., Fong, R., & Jones, L.R. 1991, MNRAS, 249, 498
- Metcalf, N., Shanks, T., Fong, R., & Roche, N. 1995, MNRAS, 273, 257 (MSFR)
- Montgomery, K.A., Marschall, L.A., & Janes, K.A. 1993, AJ, 106, 181
- Neuschaefer, L.W., Windhorst, R.A., & Dressler, A. 1991, ApJ, 382, 32 (NWD)
- Neuschaefer, L.W., & Windhorst, R.A. 1995, ApJ, 439, 14
- Neuschaefer, L.W. et al. 1995, ApJ, 453, 559 (NRGCI)
- Peebles, P.J.E. 1980, “The Large-Scale Structure of the Universe”, (Princeton : Princeton University Press).
- Peebles, P.J.E. 1993, “Principles of Physical Cosmology”, (Princeton : Princeton University Press).
- Phillipps, S. et al. 1978, MNRAS, 182, 673

- Pritchett, C.J., & Infante, L. 1986, *AJ*, 91, 1
- Pritchett, C.J., & Infante, L. 1992, *ApJ*, 399, L35
- Richer, H. B., Fahlman, G. G. 1992, *Nature*, 358, 383
- Roche, N., Shanks, T., Metcalfe, N., & Fong, R. 1993, *MNRAS*, 263, 360 (RSMF)
- Roche, N., Shanks, T., Metcalfe, N., & Fong, R. 1996, *MNRAS*, 280, 397
- Roukema, B.F., & Yoshii, Y. 1993, *ApJ*, 418, L1 (RY)
- Roukema, B.F., & Peterson, B.A. 1994, *A&A*, 285, 361
- Santiago, B.X., & da Costa, L.N. 1990, *ApJ*, 362, 386
- Saunders, W., Rowan-Robinson, M., & Lawrence, A. 1992, *MNRAS*, 258, 134
- Schild, R.E. 1983, *PASP*, 95, 1021
- Shepherd, C.W. et al. 1997, *ApJ*, 479, 82
- Smail, I., Ellis, R.S., & Fitchett, M.J. 1994, *MNRAS*, 270, 245
- Smail, I. et al. 1995, *ApJ*, 449, L105
- Steidel, C.C., & Hamilton, D. 1993, *AJ*, 105, 2017
- Steidel, C.C. et al. 1996, *ApJ*, 462, L17
- Stetson, P.B. 1987, *PASP*, 99, 191
- Stetson, P.B. 1990, *PASP*, 102, 932
- Stevenson, P.R.F., Shanks, T., Fong, R., & McGillivray, H.T. 1985, *MNRAS*, 213, 953 (SSFm)
- Thuan, T.X. et al. 1991, *ApJ*, 370, 25
- Tyson, J.A. 1988, *AJ*, 96, 1
- Valdes, F. 1983, *FOCAS User's Manual*
- Valdes, F. 1993, *FOCAS User's Guide*
- Villumsen, J.V. 1995, preprint astro-ph/9512001
- Woods, D., Fahlman, G.G., & Richer, H.B. 1995, *ApJ*, 454, 32
- Woods, D. 1996, Ph.D. thesis, University of British Columbia
- Yoshii, Y., Peterson, B.A., & Takahara, F. 1993, *ApJ*, 414, 431

Fig. 1.—  $V + R + I$  image of the NF1 field with each bandpass normalized to an equivalent sky level. The areas of the CCD frame with cosmetic defects, saturated stars and very bright galaxies are masked out and not considered in the image analysis. Note the cosmetic differences between the LICK1 CCD (NF1) and the LICK2 device (NF2 and NF3; Figs. 2 and 3).

Fig. 2.—  $V + R + I$  image of the NF2 field with each bandpass normalized to an equivalent sky level, as in Fig. 1.

Fig. 3.—  $V + R + I$  image of the NF3 field with each bandpass normalized to an equivalent sky level, as in Fig. 1.

Fig. 4.—  $V$  number counts for NF1, NF2 and NF3. The plotted lines are least squares fits to all the points above the  $V \sim 25$  magnitude limits. Slopes are listed in Table 4. NF3 counts have been shifted to the right and NF1 counts to the left, by 2 magnitudes, for purposes of clarity. NF1, NF2 and NF3 counts are denoted by circular, triangular and square points, respectively. The coordinate on the abscissa corresponds to “hybrid” magnitudes, as discussed in the text.

Fig. 5.—  $R$  number counts for NF1, NF2 and NF3. The plotted lines are least squares fits to all the points above the  $R \sim 25$  magnitude limits, except for NF1 which has a magnitude limit of  $R \sim 24.5$ . Slopes are listed in Table 4 and the format of the plot is the same as in Fig. 4.

Fig. 6.—  $I$  number counts for NF1, NF2 and NF3. The plotted lines are least squares fits to all the points above the  $I \sim 24$  magnitude limits. Slopes are listed in Table 4 and the format of the plot is the same as in Fig. 4.

Fig. 7.— Histograms of galaxy colors for NF1, NF2 and NF3 with the number of galaxies observed as a function of  $(V - R)$ ,  $(R - I)$  and  $(V - I)$  plotted in the top, middle and bottom panels, respectively. The NF1, NF2 and NF3 fields are indicated by solid-line, dashed-line and dotted-line histograms.

Fig. 8.— Star-galaxy separation diagrams for NF2 and NF3 with the difference between the “core” and aperture magnitudes plotted on the ordinate and just the latter on the abscissa. The field and bandpass are shown in the upper left corner of each panel. Magnitude limits are marked with dashed lines and the stellar sequences are demarcated by solid line rectangular boxes. Note the “plume” of galaxies seen in the NF3- $I$  panel, at the upper right of the data near the magnitude limit, is caused by spurious noise objects yet to be removed from the galaxy catalog.

Fig. 9.— Measurements of the angular correlation function using  $V$ -band data from NF1, NF2 and NF3, for the listed magnitude ranges. Error bars are calculated using bootstrap resampling. The solid lines represent the standard model fit to the data assuming  $\delta = 0.8$ . See text for details.

Fig. 10.— As in Fig.9, but for the  $R$  data.

Fig. 11.— As in Fig.9, but for the  $I$  data.

Fig. 12.— Comparison of “raw” angular correlation functions measured for the listed magnitude ranges in each field, in the  $I$ -bandpass. The circles, triangles and squares denote the NF1, NF2 and NF3 data points, respectively. NF1 data are offset 0.01 dex to the left while the NF3 data points have been shifted the same amount to the right, for the purpose of clarity. These measurements have *not* been corrected for the integral constraint or for stellar dilution (see Table 7). Better agreement is observed between the three fields at fainter magnitude limits, where the samples of galaxies are the largest. Note the ordinate scale covers a smaller range than in Fig. 11.

Fig. 13.— The amplitudes of the angular correlation function calculated for a separation of one arcminute for  $V$ ,  $R$  and  $I$ , assuming a power law with  $\delta = 0.8$ . Measurements for the  $V$ ,  $R$  and  $I$ -band data are shown in the left, center and right panels, respectively.

Fig. 14.— Amplitudes of the angular correlation function normalized to 1 degree assuming  $\delta = 0.8$  for this work and other studies from the literature, in the  $R$  band. Details of the magnitude transformations used for the different observations are given in the text. Each symbol is listed with the initials of the authors’ names and the year of the study it denotes.

Fig. 15.— Measurements of  $\omega(\theta)$  for the full range of angular separations ( $10 - 126''$ ; giving an effective separation of  $\sim 35''$ ) as a function of  $(V - R)$ ,  $(R - I)$  and  $(V - I)$  colors. The top panels show the clustering amplitudes as a function of colors the galaxies are *less* than. Similarly, the bottom panels show clustering with the abscissa giving the colors the galaxies are *greater* than. Note the limited range of color the  $V$ ,  $R$  and  $I$  filters provide. The Poisson error bars plotted are determined from the combination of the three fields, and are probably underestimates of the true errors (see text).

Fig. 16.— Amplitudes of the angular correlation function calculated for separations of 1 arcminute assuming  $\delta = 0.7$ , following Fig.3 of Neuschaefer *et al.* (1995, NRGCI) to ease the comparison with this work. The abscissa is the *median I* magnitude for each galaxy sample plotted. Open symbols show the “50% Blue”, “50% Red” and full samples of NRGCI. Filled symbols show the red, blue and entire galaxy samples for this study, with  $(V - I) = 1.3$  used as the blue/red dividing line.

Fig. 17.— The angular correlation function determined for separations of 1 arcminute plotted as a function of the *median I* magnitude. Results for the  $I$ -selected samples of LP, Efstathiou *et al.* (1991, EBKTG) and this work are shown. Four different subsamples of LP are listed with the corresponding symbols, along with the EBKTG observation and the filled squares which denote the  $I$ -filter measurements of this work. Each family of lines correspond to evolutionary models calculated for a given correlation length (solid lines:  $r_0 = 5.4 h^{-1}$  Mpc, dashed lines:  $r_0 = 4.0 h^{-1}$  Mpc and dotted lines:  $r_0 = 2.0 h^{-1}$  Mpc) and  $\epsilon = -1.2, 0, 1, 2$  (from top to bottom, respectively).

Fig. 18.— A further comparison of the  $I$ -band observations of  $\omega(\theta)$  with  $\theta = 1'$  to a suite of evolutionary models calculated using the extrapolated CFRS redshift distributions (Lilly *et al.* 1995a). Note the abscissa is the  $I$  magnitude limit *not* the median magnitude. The correlation

length ( $r_0$ ) used is shown in the lower left corner of each panel. For each panel, the solid line corresponds to the model with  $q_0 = 0.5$ ,  $\gamma = 1.8$  and  $\epsilon = 0$ . Just a change of  $q_0 = 0.1$  yields the dotted line. Setting  $\gamma = 1.9, 1.6$  moves the solid line to the short-long dashed lines above and below, respectively. Changing just  $\epsilon$ , to  $-1.2$ , gives the long dashed line above the solid line, while the dashed lines in decreasing amplitude below are for  $\epsilon = 1, 2$ .

Field	$\alpha_{1950}$	$\delta_{1950}$	$l$	$b$	Dates Observed
NF1	$13^h 10^m 10^s.80$	$+43^\circ 01' 06''.0$	$109.0^\circ$	$+73.8^\circ$	1991 April 7-11
NF2	$15^h 39^m 01^s.50$	$+24^\circ 47' 36''.0$	$39.0^\circ$	$+51.9^\circ$	1992 June 4-6, 1993 March 25
NF3	$12^h 29^m 11^s.70$	$+02^\circ 07' 42''.0$	$291.5^\circ$	$+64.3^\circ$	1993 March 23-25

Table 1: Coordinates and Observing Runs of “Blank Fields”

	Filters		NF1		NF2		NF3	
	$\lambda_{eff}(\text{\AA})$	$\Delta\lambda(\text{\AA})$	Exp. (s)	Seeing	Exp. (s)	Seeing	Exp. (s)	Seeing
<i>V</i>	5430	900	9600	0'.94	9000	0'.82	4800	0'.72
<i>R</i>	6485	1280	9600	0'.89	6300	0'.84	6000	0'.66
<i>I</i>	8320	1950	12000	0'.83	6000	0'.76	8400	0'.73

Table 2: Filters, Total Exposure Times and Average Seeing

Observing Run	Standards
1991 April	M67 (Montgomery <i>et al.</i> 1993, Schild 1983), NGC 4147 (Christian <i>et al.</i> 1985 [C85])
1992 June	NGC 4147 (C85), SA 110 (Landolt 1992 [L92]), SA 113 (L92), M92 (L. Davis, priv. comm. [D])
1993 March	SA 98 (L92), M92 (D), G12-43 (L92), RU 149 (L92)

Table 3: Standard Star Fields

Field	$V$	$R$	$I$
NF1	$0.41 \pm 0.01$	$0.36 \pm 0.01$	$0.32 \pm 0.01$
NF2	$0.42 \pm 0.02$	$0.35 \pm 0.01$	$0.34 \pm 0.02$
NF3	$0.46 \pm 0.02$	$0.39 \pm 0.02$	$0.33 \pm 0.02$

Table 4: Slopes of Number Counts

NF1 ( <i>Effective Area</i> : $\sim 0.01064 \text{ deg}^2$ )			
Filter	Number of Objects (Magnitude Range)		
<i>V</i>	355 (20-24)	590 (20-24.5)	935 (20-25)
<i>R</i>	574 (20-24)	878 (20-24.5)	...
<i>I</i>	486 (19-23)	706 (19-23.5)	996 (19-24)
NF2 ( <i>Effective Area</i> : $\sim 0.01026 \text{ deg}^2$ )			
Filter	Number of Objects (Magnitude Range)		
<i>V</i>	253 (20-24)	425 (20-24.5)	699 (20-25)
<i>R</i>	407 (20-24)	610 (20-24.5)	913 (20-25)
<i>I</i>	319 (19-23)	496 (19-23.5)	709 (19-24)
NF3 ( <i>Effective Area</i> : $\sim 0.01111 \text{ deg}^2$ )			
Filter	Number of Objects (Magnitude Range)		
<i>V</i>	312 (20-24)	543 (20-24.5)	908 (20-25)
<i>R</i>	588 (20-24)	930 (20-24.5)	1482 (20-25)
<i>I</i>	439 (19-23)	658 (19-23.5)	992 (19-24)

Table 5: Number of Objects Detected

	$20 \leq V \leq 25$		$20 \leq R \leq 25$		$19 \leq I \leq 24$	
	$A_{\omega}^{fin}$	$\chi^2$	$A_{\omega}^{fin}$	$\chi^2$	$A_{\omega}^{fin}$	$\chi^2$
$\delta = 0.5$	$0.653 \pm 0.024$	49.3	$0.686 \pm 0.022$	62.6	$0.689 \pm 0.020$	67.5
$\delta = 0.6$	$0.596 \pm 0.036$	26.9	$0.640 \pm 0.033$	36.7	$0.641 \pm 0.031$	37.9
$\delta = 0.7$	$0.546 \pm 0.053$	13.7	$0.605 \pm 0.049$	20.9	$0.603 \pm 0.045$	20.2
$\delta = 0.8$	$0.508 \pm 0.077$	6.6	$0.583 \pm 0.072$	11.9	$0.578 \pm 0.067$	10.5
$\delta = 0.9$	$0.485 \pm 0.110$	3.1	$0.581 \pm 0.104$	7.1	$0.570 \pm 0.097$	5.4

Table 6: Angular Correlation Function Fits and  $\chi^2$  Statistic (five degrees of freedom)

<b>V</b>	$20 \leq V \leq 24$	$20 \leq V \leq 24.5$	$20 \leq V \leq 25$
$A_{\omega}^{fin}$	$0.550 \pm 0.233$	$0.527 \pm 0.141$	$0.508 \pm 0.077$
$\left(\frac{N_{obj}}{N_{obj}-N_s}\right)^2$ (NF1)	1.116	1.087	1.067
" (NF2)	1.494	1.356	1.255
" (NF3)	1.198	1.147	1.104
<b>R</b>	$20 \leq R \leq 24$	$20 \leq R \leq 24.5$	$20 \leq R \leq 25$
$A_{\omega}^{fin}$	$0.804 \pm 0.120$	$0.676 \pm 0.079$	$0.583 \pm 0.072$
$\left(\frac{N_{obj}}{N_{obj}-N_s}\right)^2$ (NF1)	1.105	1.082	...
" (NF2)	1.300	1.253	1.204
" (NF3)	1.156	1.117	1.085
<b>I</b>	$19 \leq I \leq 23$	$19 \leq I \leq 23.5$	$19 \leq I \leq 24$
$A_{\omega}^{fin}$	$0.545 \pm 0.176$	$0.627 \pm 0.116$	$0.578 \pm 0.067$
$\left(\frac{N_{obj}}{N_{obj}-N_s}\right)^2$ (NF1)	1.083	1.075	1.065
" (NF2)	1.185	1.183	1.179
" (NF3)	1.072	1.077	1.070

Table 7: Angular Correlation Function Amplitudes and Stellar Dilution Corrections

Model	$r_0$ ( $h^{-1}$ Mpc)	$\epsilon$	Comments
(1) Bursting Dwarfs	$\sim 4$	$\sim 0 - 1$	acceptable at all limits; only moderate clustering evolution required
(2) Fading Dwarfs	$\sim 2$	$\sim -1.2$	untestable locally (?)
(3) Merging	$\sim 5$	$\sim 1 - 2$	excessive (unobserved) clustering evolution may be required

Table 8: Summary of Galaxy Evolution Models





























