



***COMPARING SOCIAL BEE AND WASP DIVERSITY IN DIFFERENT  
AGRICULTURAL LANDSCAPES USING PAN TRAPS***

**FATIN AFIQAH BINTI ROSLAN**

**FH 2018 123**

**Comparing Social Bee and Wasp Diversity in Different Agricultural  
Landscapes Using Pan Traps**



**A Project Report Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Bachelor of Forestry Science in the  
Faculty of Forestry  
Universiti Putra Malaysia**

**2018**

## DEDICATION

### **For my beloved family:**

Roslan bin Sentol.

Rozita binti Ramli.

Also my siblings.

To all my friends,

Villages people in Kampung Sungai Lalah, Negeri Sembilan.

Thank you for your encouragements supports

And the sacrifices that you have given.

Thank you for everything. May Allah Bless All of us.

## ABSTRACT

Forest conversion into agricultural lands has become a global concern due to habitat degradation that reduces overall biodiversity specifically insects. Insects responded to agricultural land use, however, may vary between different management such as monoculture and polyculture systems. In this study, social bees and wasps (Insecta: Hymenoptera) were compared between different agricultural landscapes namely; polyculture orchard, monoculture rubber and monoculture oil palm plantations. The study was carried out in Kampung Sungai Lalah, Pedas, Negeri Sembilan for 28 days from January to February 2018. Social bees and wasps were sampled using yellow pan trap at all agricultural sites (total sampling point = 45). From the results, a total of 1045 individuals social bees and wasps belonging to eight families were recorded. Polyculture orchard showed the greatest abundance of social bees and wasps followed by monoculture oil palm and monoculture rubber plantations. Surprisingly, all agricultural sites recorded similar number of social bees and wasps family. However, family composition differed between polyculture and monoculture landscapes where Apidae was only recorded in orchard while Braconidae was only recorded in rubber and oil palm plantations. Polyculture orchard also showed significantly greater vegetation cover and relative humidity that may provide suitable habitat conditions for social bees and wasps. The findings proved that habitat heterogeneity in polyculture systems may support greater abundance of social bees and wasps compared to monoculture plantations. Social bee and wasp abundance and diversity of in agricultural landscape may indicate enhance local diversity as this particular insect group providing important ecosystem services such as pollination and biological control. Thus, polyculture systems should be established in agricultural landscape for improved insect conservation and ecosystem services.

## ABSTRAK

Penukaran hutan ke tanah pertanian menjadi kebimbangan global disebabkan oleh degradasi habitat yang mengurangkan serangga biodiversiti secara keseluruhannya. Walau bagaimanapun, reaksi serangga terhadap penggunaan tanah pertanian mungkin berbeza antara pengurusan yang berbeza seperti sistem monokultur dan polikultur. Dalam kajian ini, lebah dan penyengat (Insecta: Hymenoptera) dibandingkan antara landskap pertanian yang berbeza iaitu; dusun polikultur, getah monokultur dan ladang kelapa sawit monokultur. Kajian ini dijalankan di Kampung Sungai Lalah, Pedas, Negeri Sembilan selama 28 hari dari Januari hingga Februari 2018. Sampel lebah dan penyengat diambil menggunakan perangkap dulang kuning di semua kawasan pertanian (jumlah titik pensampelan = 45). Dari hasilnya, sebanyak 1045 individu lebah dan penyengat yang terdiri daripada lapan famili telah direkodkan. Kebun polikultur menunjukkan bilangan lebah dan penyengat yang paling banyak diikuti oleh ladang getah kelapa sawit dan monokultur monokultur. Hasil kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa semua tapak pertanian mencatatkan bilangan famili lebah dan penyengat yang sama. Walau bagaimanapun, komposisi famili yang berbeza di antara landskap polikultur dan monokultur di mana Apidae hanya direkodkan dalam kebun sementara Braconidae hanya direkodkan di ladang getah dan kelapa sawit. Dusun polikultur juga menunjukkan perlindungan tumbuhan yang ketara dan kelembapan relatif yang dapat memberikan kondisi habitat yang sesuai untuk lebah dan penyengat. Penemuan ini membuktikan bahawa habitat kompleks dalam sistem polikultur dapat menyokong bilangan lebah dan penyengat yang lebih banyak berbanding ladang monokultur. Kelebihan lebah dan penyengat serta kepelbagaian landskap pertanian mungkin menunjukkan peningkatan kepelbagaian kumpulan serangga kerana ianya menyediakan perkhidmatan ekosistem yang penting seperti pendebungaan dan kawalan biologi. Oleh itu, sistem polikultur perlu diwujudkan dalam landskap pertanian untuk pemuliharaan serangga dan perkhidmatan ekosistem yang lebih baik.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Alhamdulillah and thank to Allah S.W.T with all His Gracious and His Merciful for giving me strength and the ability to accomplish this project successfully. I would like to take the utmost opportunity to express my sincere and gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Norhisham bin Razi, who is always giving me supports and guidance.



## APPROVAL SHEET

I certify that this research project report entitled “Comparing Social Bee and Wasp Diversity In Different Agricultural Landscapes Using Pan Traps” by Fatin Afiqah binti Roslan has been examined and approved as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Forestry Science in the Faculty of Forestry, Univeristi Putra Malaysia.

---

Dr. Norhisham bin Razi  
Faculty of Forestry  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Supervisor)

---

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Zakaria Bin Hussin  
Dean  
Faculty of Forestry  
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: June 2018

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | <b>Page</b> |
|---|-------------|
| DEDICATION  | ii          |
| ABSTRACT  | iii         |
| ABSTRAK   | iv          |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS  | v           |
| APPROVAL SHEET  | vi          |
| LIST OF TABLES  | ix          |
| LIST OF FIGURES   | xi          |
| <br><b>CHAPTER</b>  |             |
| <b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>   |             |
| 1.1 Background of Study   | 1           |
| 1.2 Problem Statement and Justification   | 3           |
| 1.3 Research Objectives and Questions   | 5           |
| 1.4 Research Questions  | 5           |
| <b>2 LITERATURE REVIEW</b>  |             |
| 2.1 Understanding Agricultural Intensification and Their Characteristics.                 | 6           |
| 2.2 The Ecological Importance of Social Bees and Wasps.                                   | 7           |
| 2.3 Morphological Characteristics of Social Bees and Wasps.                               | 8           |
| 2.4 The Effects of Agricultural Intensification on Social Bees and Wasp.                  | 9           |
| 2.5 The Developmental Stages of Social Bees and Wasps.                                    | 10          |
| <b>3 METHODOLOGY</b>  |             |
| 3.1 Study Sites   | 12          |
| 3.2 Sampling Design.  | 15          |
| 3.2.1 Sampling size and design.   | 16          |
| 3.3 Environmental Variables Measurements.   | 17          |
| 3.4 Data Analysis   | 18          |
| <b>4 RESULTS</b>  |             |
| 4.1 Summary   | 19          |
| 4.2 Social Bees and Wasps Abundance between Different Agricultural Landscapes.            | 21          |
| 4.3 The Relationship between Social Bees and Wasps Abundance and Environmental Variables. | 24          |
| 4.4 The number of Social Bees and Wasps Families Between Agricultural Landscapes.         | 30          |
| 4.4.1 The Relationship Between Social Bees and Wasps Families and Environment Variables.  | 32          |



|       |  |    |
|-------|--|----|
| 4.5   | Habitat Quality Between Different Agricultural Landscapes.   | 38 |
| 4.5.1 | Post Hoc Tukey Test of Vegetation Cover Between Different Agricultural Landscapes.                                 | 42 |
| 4.5.2 | Post Hoc Tukey Test of Relative Humidity and Three Different Agricultural Landscapes.                              | 44 |
| 4.5.3 | Post Hoc Tukey Test of Temperatures Between Agricultural Landscapes.   | 46 |
| 4.6   | Vespidae, Sphecidae, Pompilidae, Braconidae and Ichneumonidae Abundance Between Different Agricultural Landscapes. | 48 |
| 4.6.1 | Post Hoc Tukey Test on Abundance of Vespidae Family and Three Different Agricultural Landscapes.                   | 51 |
| 4.6.2 | Post Hoc Tukey Test on Abundance of Sphecidae Family and Three Different Agricultural Landscapes.                  | 53 |
| 4.6.3 | Post Hoc Tukey Test on Abundance of Ichneumonidae Family and Three Different Agricultural Landscapes.              | 57 |
| 4.6.4 | Post Hoc Tukey Test on Abundance of Braconidae Family and Three Different Agricultural Landscapes.                 | 59 |
| 5     | DISCUSSION   |    |
| 5.1   | Introduction   |    |
| 5.2   | The Relationship Between Social Bees and Wasps Abundance with Habitat Quality.                                     | 61 |
| 5.3   | Social Bees and Wasps Family Diversity between Agricultural Landscapes.  | 62 |
| 6     | CONCLUSION, LIMITATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS   |    |
| 6.1   | Conclusion   |    |
| 6.2   | Limitations and Recommendations  | 65 |
|       |  | 65 |
|       | REFERENCES   | 67 |
|       | APPENDICES   |    |
|       | Appendix A   | 72 |
|       | Appendix B   | 78 |



## LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| 4.1 Total of abundance and number of families for bees and wasps.   | 20   |
| 4.2 The mean number of social bees and wasps individuals based on families between different agricultural landscapes.     |      |
| 4.3 Analysis of variance for social bees and wasps abundance between agricultural landscapes.                             | 22   |
| 4.4 Analysis of variance for number of social bees and wasps families between agricultural landscapes.                    | 30   |
| 4.5 Mean, Standard Error, Minimum and Maximum Value of Environmental Variables between Different Agricultural Landscapes. | 38   |
| 4.6 Analysis of Variance for Vegetation Cover between Different Agricultural Landscapes.                                  | 39   |
| 4.7 Analysis of variance for relative humidity between different agricultural landscapes.                                 |      |
| 4.8 Analysis of Variance for Temperature between Different Agricultural Landscapes.                                       | 40   |
| 4.9 Analysis of Variance for Canopy Openness between Different Agricultural Landscapes.                                   |      |
| 4.10 Analysis of variance for canopy closure between different agricultural landscapes.                                   | 41   |
| 4.11 Analysis of variance for vegetation height between different agricultural landscapes.                                |      |
| 4.12 Post Hoc Tukey Test of Vegetation Cover Between Different Agricultural Landscapes.                                   | 42   |
| 4.13 Post Hoc Tukey Test of Relative Humidity Between Different Agricultural Landscape                                    | 44   |
| 4.14 Post Hoc Tukey-Test of Temperature Between Different Agricultural Landscapes.  | 46   |
| 4.15 Analysis of Variance for Vespidae Abundance Between Different Agricultural Landscapes.                               | 48   |
| 4.16 Analysis of Variance for Sphecidae Abundance Between Different Agricultural Landscapes.                              | 49   |
| 4.17 Analysis of Variance for Pompilidae Abundance Between Different Agricultural Landscapes.                             |      |

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| 4.18 | Analysis of Variance for Braconidae Abundance Between Different Agricultural Landscapes.    | 50 |
| 4.19 | Analysis of Variance for Ichneumonidae Abundance Between Different Agricultural Landscapes. |    |
| 4.20 | Post Hoc Tukey Test on Vespidae Abundance Between Agricultural Landscapes.                  | 51 |
| 4.21 | Post Hoc Tukey Test of Sphecidae Abundance Between Agricultural Landscapes.                 | 53 |
| 4.22 | Post Hoc Tukey Test of Pompilidae Abundance Between Agricultural Landscapes.                | 55 |
| 4.23 | Post Hoc Tukey Test of Ichneumonidae Abundance Between Agricultural Landscapes.             | 57 |
| 4.24 | Post Hoc Tukey Test of Braconidae Abundance Between Agricultural Landscapes.                | 59 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

| <b>FIGURE</b> |  | <b>PAGE</b> |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| 3.1           | Location of study site, Kampung Sungai Lalah   | 12          |
| 3.2           | Location of study site, Kampung Sungai Lalah showing the location of orchard, oil palm and rubber plantations. | 13          |
| 3.3           | Location of the points in orchard area.  |             |
| 3.4           | Location of the points in rubber area plantation.  | 14          |
| 3.5           | Location of the points in oil palm plantation area.  |             |
| 3.6           | Sampling design for each agricultural landscapes using systematic sampling with randomized start point.        | 16          |
| 3.7           | Study sites showed three of yellow pan trap was located at each sampling point.                                | 17          |
| 3.8           | List of equipments for collecting data.  | 18          |
| 4.1           | Boxplot of social bees and wasps abundance between different agricultural landscapes.                          | 23          |
| 4.2           | The relationship between social bees and wasps abundance and canopy openness.                                  | 24          |
| 4.3           | The relationship between social bees and wasps abundance and canopy cover.                                     | 25          |
| 4.4           | The relationship between social bees and wasps abundance and vegetation cover.                                 | 26          |
| 4.5           | The relationship between social bees and wasps abundance and vegetation height.                                | 27          |
| 4.6           | The relationship between social bees and wasps abundance and relative humidity.                                | 28          |
| 4.7           | The relationship between social bees and wasps abundance and temperature.                                      | 29          |
| 4.8           | Boxplot of number of social bees and wasps families between different agricultural landscapes.                 | 31          |
| 4.9           | The relationship between number of social bees and wasps families with canopy openness.                        | 32          |
| 4.10          | The relationship between number of social bees and wasps families with canopy cover.                           | 33          |
| 4.11          | The relationship between number of social bees and wasps families with vegetation cover.                       | 34          |

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| 4.12 | The relationship between number of social bees and wasps families with vegetation height. | 35 |
| 4.13 | The relationship between number of social bees and wasps families with relative humidity. | 36 |
| 4.14 | The relationship between number of social bees and wasps families with temperature.       | 37 |
| 4.15 | Boxplot of vegetation cover between different agricultural landscapes.                    | 43 |
| 4.16 | Boxplot of relative humidity between different agricultural landscapes.                   | 45 |
| 4.17 | Boxplot of temperature between different agricultural landscapes.                         | 47 |
| 4.18 | Boxplot of Vespidae abundance between different agricultural landscapes.                  | 52 |
| 4.19 | Boxplot of Sphecidae abundance between different agricultural landscapes.                 | 54 |
| 4.20 | Boxplot of Pompilidae abundance between different agricultural landscapes.                | 56 |
| 4.21 | Boxplot of Ichneumonidae abundance between different agricultural landscapes.             | 58 |
| 4.22 | Boxplot of Braconidae abundance between different agricultural landscapes.                | 60 |

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background of Study

Forest degradation has become a major concern worldwide due to its negative impact on overall biodiversity (Wilcove & Koh, 2010). Tropical forests provide refuge for diverse insect communities and the impacts of human activity such as illegal logging and agricultural expansion has led to population declines in many tropical insect species (Cunha & Juen, 2017). Bees and solitary wasp (Insecta: Hymenoptera) are considered as an important component in ecosystem functioning (Matos et al., 2016). Bees provide important function for pollination while solitary wasp is an efficient predator for crop pest (Kevan, 1999; Urbini et al., 2006). In addition, these hymenopterans are also ideal biological indicators for ecosystem disturbance as they are sensitive to changes in environmental conditions (Hirsch & Wolters, 2003). Forest degradation has caused the loss of natural habitat leading to population decline in bees and wasps community. Changes in environmental biotic and abiotic factor may affect the distribution and abundance of bees and wasp due to loss in nesting and floral resources (Tylianakis et al., 2004)

Pollination is a biotic interaction between plant and its pollinators where pollen from anther is transferred to stigma in the same or to different flower.

Many insects are useful pollinators as observed in butterfly (Lepidoptera) but bees are the most important and effective pollinator (Kevan, 1999). Bees contribute to the overall reproductive fitness of diverse plant community (Rianti et al., 2010) and population decline can have negative impact on crop yields (Ricketts et al., 2008). In addition, social bees and wasps are also sensitive to environmental disturbance through changes in microclimatic conditions, plant community structure and topography (Loyola & Martins, 2008). Forest expansion into agricultural lands such as oil palm has become a major concern worldwide due to habitat degradation that contributes to decline in insects biodiversity (Turner & Foster, 2008). Changes in landscape heterogeneity may change bees and wasp species composition that influence the biotic pollination for many crops and wild plant species (Hirsch & Wolters, 2003).

Biodiversity conservation is important to maintain bees and wasps community in agroecosystems. The intensification of agricultural practices such as monoculture systems can have negative impacts on bees and wasp species composition due to lower habitat complexity compared to polyculture systems (Ghazali et al., 2016). Complex vegetation structure that consists of crops and wild plants may support bees and wasp community due to higher food resources and nesting sites. Thus, diverse plant community as seen in agroforestry systems may support different bees and wasps community. Moreover, crop production such as seeds and fruits in agroforestry or agricultural landscapes are highly dependent on bee's pollination. Meanwhile, wasps can become a useful predator to control crop pest

population such as Lepidoptera larvae (Krewenka et al., 2011). Even though bees and wasp are known to play important role for agroecosystem functioning, information regarding species composition between different agricultural landscapes are still poor.

## 1.2 Problem Statement and Justification

In Malaysia, agricultural landscapes are mostly represented by monoculture and polyculture systems which are majorly consist of oil palm plantation, rubber plantation and fruit orchard. Landscape heterogeneity between agricultural landscapes may differ and influence the abundance of bees and wasps due to variation in floristic composition and nesting sites. Therefore, different agricultural management can have different impact on bees and wasp survival. Even though, pollination of some crops is not affected by bees such as oil palm that depends on weevil, *Elaeidobius kamerunicus* (Curculionidae), their presence in agricultural plantations is essential for wild plant pollination and also to assess the effects of pesticide and herbicides in agricultural landscapes. Meanwhile, the presence of wasps may indicate the degree of physical habitat complexity as their nesting sites can be found in tree trunks or branches of semi-natural habitats. Thus, the presence of bees and wasp can elucidate the effects of modification and intensification in different agricultural practices (Wang et al., 2017).



Apart from pollination, bees also support human wellbeing by honey productions. By maintaining diverse plant community in agricultural landscape, provide the opportunity for beekeeping as a value added product in food security other than crop production. Furthermore, in agricultural landscape, the pollination and pest control service provided by bees and wasps can significantly increase crop yields and reduced the application of agrochemicals. However, to fully utilized ecosystem functions provided by these hymenopterans, assessment on the effects of different agricultural systems is essential. Different vegetation structure and microclimatic conditions between monoculture and polyculture system can influence bees and wasps assemblages within an area (Klein et al., 2002). By understanding the important factors that support bees and wasps persistence within an agricultural landscape will help to improve conservation effort for a better agroecosystem services (Kremen, 2005). Thus, more information is required to understand the effects of agricultural intensification on the abundance of bees and wasps populations (Matos et al., 2016).

Bee and wasp diversity in agricultural landscapes is closely associated with plant community structure (Loyola & Martins, 2008). Increased in agricultural intensification by using a single crop species with frequent application of agrochemicals will significantly reduce bees and wasps diversity. Therefore, study comparing different agricultural practices will illustrate the effects of agricultural intensification on bees and wasps community. The diversity of bees and wasps is one of the important key for successful a successful agro ecosystem functioning (Liow et al., 2001). Therefore, the present study is set

out to compare bees and wasps diversity in different agricultural practices between monoculture and polyculture systems.

### **1.3 Research Objectives and Questions**

The present study aimed to evaluate the effects of different agricultural landscapes between monoculture and polyculture systems on bees and wasps communities. The specific objective was to compare the number of families and abundance of bees and wasps influence by vegetation structure and environmental variables under different agricultural landscapes.

### **1.4 Research Questions**

In order to understand bees and wasps diversity and abundance in agricultural landscape, the present study asked the following question; (i) how changes in agricultural intensification affect bees and wasps diversity? And (ii) what are the important environmental variables that influence bees and wasps distribution?

## REFERENCES

- Amdam, G. V., & Page Jr, R. E. (2010). The developmental genetics and physiology of honeybee societies. *Animal Behaviour*, 79(5), 973-980.
- Al Naggat, Y., Codling, G., Vogt, A., Naiem, E., Mona, M., Seif, A., & Giesy, J. P. (2015). Organophosphorus insecticides in honey, pollen and bees (*Apis mellifera* L.) and their potential hazard to bee colonies in Egypt. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety*, 114, 1-8.
- Allinne, C., Savary, S., & Avelino, J. (2016). Delicate balance between pest and disease injuries, yield performance, and other ecosystem services in the complex coffee-based systems of Costa Rica. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 222, 1–12.
- Ashraf, M., Zulki, R., Sanusi, R., Tohiran, K. A., & Terhem, R. (2018). Alley-cropping system can boost arthropod biodiversity and ecosystem functions in oil palm plantations. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 260(November 2017), 19–26.
- Buschini, M.L.T., Woiski, T.D., 2008. Alpha–beta diversity in trap-nesting wasps (Hymenoptera: Aculeata) in Southern Brazil. *Acta Zoologica*. 89, 351–358.
- Batáry, P., Dicks, L. V., Kleijn, D., & Sutherland, W. J. (2015). The role of agri-environment schemes in conservation and environmental management. *Conservation Biology*, 29(4), 1006-1016.
- Biodiversity of land-use systems in coastal Ecuador and bioindication using trap- nesting bees, wasps, and their natural enemies. *Lyonia* 6, 7–15.
- Cane, J. H. (2002). Pollinating bees (Hymenoptera: Apiformes) of US alfalfa compared for rates of pod and seed set. *Journal of Economic Entomology*, 95(1), 22-27.
- Cardinal, S., & Packer, L. (2007). Phylogenetic analysis of the corbiculate Apinae based on morphology of the sting apparatus (Hymenoptera: Apidae). *Cladistics*, 23(2), 99-118.
- Cunha, E. J., & Juen, L. (2017). Impacts of oil palm plantations on changes in environmental heterogeneity and Heteroptera (Gerromorpha and Nepomorpha) diversity. *Journal of Insect Conservation*, 21(1), 111–119.
- Fetridge, E. D., Ascher, J. S., & Langellotto, G. A. (2008). The bee fauna of residential gardens in a suburb of New York City (Hymenoptera: Apoidea). *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, 101(6), 1067-1077.
- Gilbert, F., & Jervis, M. A. (1998). Functional, evolutionary and ecological aspects of feeding-related mouthpart specializations in parasitoid flies. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 63, 495–535.

Gadagkar, R. (2010). Sociobiology in turmoil again. *Current Science*, 99(8), 1036-1041.

Giannini, T.C., Boff, S., Cordeiro, G.D., Cartolano Jr., E.A., Veiga, A.K., Imperatriz-Fonseca, V.L., Saraiva, A.M., 2015. Crop pollinators in Brazil: a review of reported interactions. *Apidologie* 46, 209–223.

Ghazali, A., Asmah, S., Syafiq, M., Yahya, M. S., Aziz, N., Tan, L. P., Azhar, B. (2016). Effects of monoculture and polyculture farming in oil palm smallholdings on terrestrial arthropod diversity. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Entomology*, 19(2), 415–421.

Hirsch, M., & Wolters, V. (2003). Response of aculeate Hymenoptera to spatial features of an agricultural landscape. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 11(3), 179–185.

Kevan, P. G. (1999). Pollinators as bioindicators of the state of the environment: Species, activity and diversity. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 74(1–3), 373–393.

Kremen, C. (2005). Managing ecosystem services: what do we need to know about their ecology?. *Ecology Letters*, 8(5), 468-479.

Koh, L. P. (2007). Impacts of land use change on South-east Asian forest butterflies: A review. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 44(4), 703–713.

Klein, A. M., Vaissiere, B. E., Cane, J. H., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham, S. A., Kremen, C., & Tscharntke, T. (2007). Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world crops. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 274(1608), 303-313.

Krewenka, K. M., Holzschuh, A., Tscharntke, T., & Dormann, C. F. (2011). Landscape elements as potential barriers and corridors for bees, wasps and parasitoids. *Biological Conservation*, 144(6), 1816-1825.

Kennedy, C. M., Lonsdorf, E., Neel, M. C., Williams, N. M., Ricketts, T. H., Winfree, R., & Carvalheiro, L. G. (2013). A global quantitative synthesis of local and landscape effects on wild bee pollinators in agroecosystems. *Ecology Letters*, 16(5), 584-599.

Liow, L. H., Sodhi, N. S., & Elmqvist, T. (2001). Bee diversity along a disturbance gradient in tropical lowland forests of south-east Asia. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 38(1), 180-192.

Loyola, R. D., & Martins, R. P. (2008). Habitat structure components are effective predictors of trap-nesting Hymenoptera diversity. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 9(6), 735–742.

Noll, F. B., & Zucchi, R. (2000). Increasing caste differences related to life cycle progression in some neotropical swarm-founding polygynic polistine wasps (Hymenoptera Vespidae Epiponini). *Ethology Ecology and Evolution*, 12(1), 43-65.

Mates, S. G., Perfecto, I., & Badgley, C. (2012). Parasitoid wasp diversity in apple orchards along a pest-management gradient. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 156, 82–88.

Macfadyen, S., Davies, A. P., & Zalucki, M. P. (2015). Assessing the impact of arthropod natural enemies on crop pests at the field scale. *Insect Science*, 22(1), 20-34.

Milbrath, M. O., van Tran, T., Huang, W. F., Solter, L. F., Tarpy, D. R., Lawrence, F., & Huang, Z. Y. (2015). Comparative virulence and competition between *Nosema apis* and *Nosema ceranae* in honey bees (*Apis mellifera*). *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology*, 125, 9-15.

Matos, M. C. B., Silva, S. S., & Teodoro, A. V. (2016). Seasonal population abundance of the assembly of solitary wasps and bees (Hymenoptera) according to land-use in Maranhão state, Brazil. *Revista Brasileira de Entomologia*, 60(2), 171–176.

Mody, K., Collatz, J., Bucharova, A., & Dorn, S. (2017). Crop cultivar affects performance of herbivore enemies and may trigger enhanced pest control by coaction of different parasitoid species. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 245, 74–82.

O'Donnell, S., & Bulova, S. (2017). Development and evolution of brain allometry in wasps (Vespidae): size, ecology and sociality. *Current Opinion in Insect Science*, 22, 54-61.

Owens, B. E., Allain, L., Gorder, E. C. V., Bossart, J. L., & Carlton, C. E. (2018). The Bees (Hymenoptera: Apoidea) of Louisiana: An Updated, Annotated Checklist. *Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Washington*, 120(2), 272-307.

Packer, L. (2003). Comparative morphology of the skeletal parts of the sting apparatus of bees (Hymenoptera: Apoidea). *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 138(1), 1-38.

Quicke, D. L. (2012). We know too little about parasitoid wasp distributions to draw any conclusions about latitudinal trends in species richness, body size and biology. *PLoS One*, 7(2), e32101.

Ricketts, T.H., Regetz, J., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham, S.A., Kremen, C., Bogdanski, A., Gemmill-Herren, B., Greenleaf, S.S., Klein, A.M., Mayfield, M.M., & Morandin, L.A., Ochieng, A., Viana, B.F., 2008. Landscape effects on crop pollination services: are there general patterns? *Ecology letters*, 11(5), 499–515.



Rianti, P., Suryobroto, B., & Atmowidi, T. (2010). Diversity and effectiveness of insect pollinators of *Jatropha curcas* L.(Euphorbiaceae). *HAYATI Journal of Biosciences*, 17(1), 38-42.

Roitberg, B. D., & Gillespie, D. R. (2014). Natural enemies on the landscape – Integrating life-history theory and landscapes. *Biological Control*, 75, 39–47.

Rubene, D., Schroeder, M., & Ranius, T. (2015). Diversity patterns of wild bees and wasps in managed boreal forests: Effects of spatial structure, local habitat and surrounding landscape. *Biological Conservation*, 184, 201–208.

Richardson, L. L., Adler, L. S., Leonard, A. S., Andicoechea, J., Regan, K. H., Anthony, W. E., ... & Irwin, R. E. (2015). Secondary metabolites in floral nectar reduce parasite infections in bumblebees. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282(1803), 20142471.

Shuttleworth, A., & Johnson, S. D. (2012). The Hemipepsis wasp-pollination system in South Africa: a comparative analysis of trait convergence in a highly specialized plant guild. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society*, 168(3), 278-299.

Soto, V. C., Maldonado, I. B., Gil, R. A., Peralta, I. E., Silva, M. F., & Galmarini, C. R. (2013). Nectar and flower traits of different onion male sterile lines related to pollination efficiency and seed yield of F1 hybrids. *Journal of Economic Entomology*, 106(3), 1386-1394.

Steckel, J., Westphal, C., Peters, M. K., Bellach, M., Rothenwoehrer, C., Erasmi, S., & Steffan-Dewenter, I. (2014). Landscape composition and configuration differently affect trap-nesting bees, wasps and their antagonists. *Biological Conservation*, 172, 56-64.

Sabino, W. D. O., & Antonini, Y. (2017). Nest architecture, life cycle, and natural enemies of the neotropical leafcutting bee *Megachile (Moureapis) maculata* (Hymenoptera: Megachilidae) in a montane forest. *Apidologie*, 48(4), 450-460.

Tylianakis, J., Veddeler, D., Lozada, T., Lopez, R. M., Benítez, P., Klein, A. M., & Onore, G. (2004). Biodiversity of land-use systems in coastal Ecuador and bioindication using trap-nesting bees, wasps, and their natural enemies. *Lyonia*, 6(2), 7-15.

Turner, E. C., & Foster, W. a. (2008). The impact of forest conversion to oil palm on arthropod abundance and biomass in Sabah, Malaysia. *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, 25(1), 23.

Tuck, S. L., Winqvist, C., Mota, F., Ahnström, J., Turnbull, L. A., & Bengtsson, J. (2014). Land-use intensity and the effects of organic farming on biodiversity: a hierarchical meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 51(3), 746-755.

Urbini, A., Sparvoli, E., & Turillazzi, S. (2006). Social paper wasps as bioindicators: a preliminary research with *Polistes dominulus* (Hymenoptera Vespidae) as a trace metal accumulator. *Chemosphere*, 64(5), 697–703.

Wilcove, D. S., & Koh, L. P. (2010). Addressing the threats to biodiversity from oil-palm agriculture. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 19(4), 999-1007.

Wood, T. J., Holland, J. M., & Goulson, D. (2015). Pollinator-friendly management does not increase the diversity of farmland bees and wasps. *Biological Conservation*, 187, 120–126.

Wang, M., Lu, X., Ding, S., Ren, J., Bian, Z., & Xu, Z. (2017). Pollinator diversity in different habitats of the agricultural landscape in the middle and lower reaches of the Yellow River based on the three-color pan trap method. *Acta Ecologica Sinica*, 37(3), 148-155.