

Overplaying the role of honey bees as pollinators: A comment on Aebi and Neumann (2011)

Jeff Ollerton¹, Victoria Price¹, W. Scott Armbruster², Jane Memmott³, Stella Watts^{1,4}, Nickolas M. Waser^{5,6}, Ørjan Totland⁷, Dave Goulson⁸, Ruben Alarcón⁹, Jane C. Stout¹⁰ and Sam Tarrant¹

¹ Department of Environmental and Geographical Sciences, University of Northampton, Avenue Campus, Northampton, NN2 6JD, UK

²School of Biological Sciences, University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, PO1 2DY, UK

³School of Biological Sciences, University of Bristol, Woodland Road, Bristol, BS8 1UG, UK

⁴Laboratory of Pollination Ecology, Institute of Evolution, University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel

⁵ Department of Biology, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521, USA

⁶School of Natural Resources and the Environment, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

⁷ Department of Ecology and Natural Resource Management, The Norwegian University of Life Sciences, PO Box 5003, NO-1432, Ås, Norway

⁸School of Biological & Environmental Sciences, University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA, UK

⁹Biology Program, California State University Channel Islands, Camarillo, CA 93022, USA

¹⁰ School of Natural Sciences, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Republic of Ireland

In a recent letter to *TREE* [1], Alexandre Aebi and Peter Neumann propose a novel approach to researching the wide-scale losses of honey bee (*Apis mellifera*) colonies in the Northern hemisphere. We recognise the importance of understanding the causes of colony collapse for honey production and for a subset of the agricultural industry. However, we fundamentally question the authors' starting assertion that honey bees 'are essential pollinators for the maintenance of natural biodiversity and agriculture' [1]. This assertion has a substantial history (e.g. [2]), and appears to be lodged in both the academic (e.g. [3]) and the public consciousness, but in fact lacks empirical support.

Studies by Tom Breeze, Simon Potts and colleagues at the University of Reading [4], demonstrate that honey bees are not nearly as important for agricultural pollination as is usually assumed and that, in the UK, most insect pollination of crops is carried out by wild bees, hoverflies (family Syrphidae) and other native pollinators. Likewise, in California, where over one million honey bee colonies are trucked in from across the USA to pollinate almonds, yields (and acreage under cultivation) have continued to increase from 1840 lb per acre (610 000 acres) in 2006 when Colony Collapse Disorder (CCD) first appeared, to 2600 lb per acre (750 000 acres) by 2011 [5], suggesting that the importance of honey bee pollination services is also overestimated for crops in North America.

In natural plant communities, honey bees are even less important as pollinators than they are in agricultural systems, which is as expected, given that honeybees are not a native species in most regions. Surveys conducted in the UK during the late 19th century (e.g. [6]), long before the collapse in honey bee numbers, indicate that honey bees were not a significant part of the pollinating fauna, as does a critical examination of more recent literature. Unpublished surveys by two of us (JO and VP) show that honey bees on average typically comprise only approximately 3.3% (range 0.0–21.1%) of total pollinator abundance in British wild plant communities, compared with native bees (mean = 22.1%, range = 5.3-77.5%) and hoverflies (mean = 45.8%, range = 3.1-76.0%). Similar surveys in Ireland (JCS, unpublished data) demonstrate that honey bees comprise 2.1% (range 0.22-3.8%) of total flower visitors, compared with other wild bees (mean = 35.6%, range = 17.3-59.8%) and hoverflies (mean = 53.0%, range = 33.5-70.1%). Honey bee abundances at the top end of the range probably reflect proximity to unusually high densities of managed hives.

Generally low abundance, along with a limited ability of each individual to transfer pollen among flowers (e.g. [7]) together combine to indicate a low value of honey bees as pollinators in wild plant communities, and thus as contributors to the maintenance of biodiversity. Domesticated honey bees can in fact harm biodiversity through competition with wild pollinators for floral resources [8], via pollination (and thus facilitation) of invasive plants [9], and via host switching of pathogens from honey bees to wild bees [10]. In California, a region of high biodiversity, honey bee abundances in natural plant communities exceed the values given above (mean 22.8%, range 0.9-49.6%) but are negatively correlated with native bee abundances (r = -0.96, P = 0.044; RA, unpublished data). Indeed, one can argue that recent 'Save the Honey Bee' campaigns by a wide range of commercial and non-governmental organisations might do more harm than good with respect to the maintenance of biodiversity and ecosystem services provided by other pollinators.

The unsupported biodiversity-conservation argument for the value of honey bee research is widely promoted in the published and broadcast media. Based on a survey of online national newspaper and broadcast media websites, we estimate that between June 2010 and April 2011, almost 40% of UK media references to pollinators mentioned honey bees, compared with approximately 10% that referred to native bumblebees (*Bombus* spp.), despite the latter being far more important as pollinators of both crops

and native plants in the UK, and under much greater threat of extinction. We are concerned that this cycle of scientists advancing questionable arguments for the importance of their work and the media accepting these arguments without scrutiny could result in a skewing of public attention and research funding in favour of honey bee diseases to the detriment of awareness and research on native pollinator declines and extinctions that would have a much greater effect on plant biodiversity. Twenty-three species of bees and 18 species of butterfly have been lost from England during the past 200 years and a reduction in numbers of wild bees and hoverflies in parts of Europe has been mirrored by declines in the plants they pollinate [11]. Maintenance of the terrestrial flora of the world is indeed critically dependent on animal pollinators [12]. By conflating problems in the honey bee industry with the much more

acute conservation issue of losses of native pollinators, honey bee researchers do damage to the whole community of researchers working on bee biology and pollination more generally.

References

- 1 Aebi, A. and Neumann, P. (2011) Endosymbionts and honey bee colony losses? *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 26, 10
- 2 Morse, R.A. (1991) Honey bees forever. Trends Ecol. Evol. 6, 337–338

- 3 Genersch, E. et al. (2010) The German bee monitoring project: a long term study to understand periodically high winter losses of honey bee colonies. Apidologie 41, 332–352
- 4 Breeze, T.D. et al. (2011) Pollination services in the UK: how important are honey bees? Agric. Ecosys. Environ. 142, 137–143
- 5 United States Department of Agriculture (2011) California Almond Objective Measurement Report, National Agricultural Statistical Services
- 6 Burkill, I.H. (1897) Fertilization of some spring flowers on the Yorkshire coast. J. Bot. 35, 92–189
- 7 Wilson, P. and Thomson, J.D. (1991) Heterogeneity among floral visitors leads to discordance between removal and deposition of pollen. *Ecology* 72, 1503–1507
- 8 Goulson, D. and Sparrow, K. (2009) Evidence for competition between honeybees and bumblebees; effects on bumblebee worker size. J. Insect Conserv. 13, 177–181
- 9 Goulson, D. and Derwent, L.C. (2004) Synergistic interactions between an exotic honeybee and an exotic weed: pollination of *Lantana camara* in Australia. Weed Res. 44, 195–202
- 10 Meeuse, I. et al. (2011) Effects of invasive parasites on bumble bee declines. Conserv. Bio. 25, 662–671
- 11 Biesmeijer, J.C. *et al.* (2006) Parallel declines in pollinators and insect-pollinated plants in Britain and the Netherlands. *Science* 313, 351–354
- 12 Ollerton, J. et al. (2011) How many flowering plants are pollinated by animals? Oikos 120, 321–326

0169-5347/\$ - see front matter © 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

doi:10.1016/j.tree.2011.12.001 Trends in Ecology and Evolution xx (2011) 1-2