# Soil arthropod biodiversity in plain and hilly olive orchard agroecosystems, in Crete, Greece

## V.D. GKISAKIS[1, 3, 4], D. KOLLAROS [2] AND E.M. KABOURAKIS[1*]

[1]*Ecological Production Systems, Institute of Viticulture and Horticulture, NAGREF-ELGO "Demeter", 71003, Heraklion, Crete, Greece*
[2]*Laboratory of Ecology, School of Agriculture, Technological Educational Institute (TEI) of Heraklion, Crete, Greece*
[3]*Institute of Life Sciences, Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna (SSSA), Piazza Martiri della Libertà 33, 56127 Pisa PI, Italy*
[4]*Departement of Sustainable Agriculture, Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Chania (MAICh), Crete, Greece*

## ABSTRACT

Soil arthropod biodiversity was monitored in 24 olive orchards located in eight different sites in Messara, Crete, covering the two main agroecological zones of olive oil production, hilly and plain. Monitoring was done weekly for five weeks per season, from autumn 2011 to summer 2012, using pitfall traps. Subgroups of functional taxa were defined with respect to services of biological pest control and of nutrient cycling. Comparison of the different agroecological zones in terms of abundance and diversity of soil arthropods and functional subgroups was performed. Coleoptera (39.52%), Formicidae (27.3%), Araneae (8.77%) and Collembola (5.32%) were the most abundant taxa found in the olive orchards. Hilly orchards presented higher total arthropod diversity, but lower abundance due to family Tenebrionidae. Arthropod richness did not differ between agroecological zones. Functional arthropods were a major part of total abundance (76.7%) and presented a trend of higher catches abundance in the hilly orchards arthropods with seasonally statistically significant differences. Shannon Index of Diversity showed higher arthropod diversity in the hilly orchards, being significantly higher in spring. The less intensive olive production in hilly areas appeared to favour soil arthropod diversity.
KEY WORDS: olive, soil arthropods, diversity, functional biodiversity, olive agroecosystem, agroecological zone.

## Introduction

Olive production in the Mediterranean is often a conventional agricultural protocol with high chemical inputs especially in intensive modern olive orchards. Such production often faces ecological problems (Kabourakis 1996, Kabourakis 1999, Volakakis et al. 2012). Biodiversity is particularly affected by intensive farming methods, forcing agroecosystems to impoverishment (Biaggini et al. 2007).

Olives are cultivated in different agroecological zones, predominately in plain

*Corresponding author: ekab@nagref-her.gr*

and hilly ones. These agroecological zones differ in terms of elevation, landscape structure, pedoclimatic conditions and biotic factors. These differences lead to different management practices in the olive orchards and different input use. Hilly agroecological zones are less suitable for intensification of farming practices and inputs due the limitations posed by the terrain and the pedoclimatic conditions (Kabourakis 1996, Metzidakis et al. 2008).

Enhanced agroecosystem biodiversity provides several services and supports soil fertility, crop protection and productivity, when correctly assembled (Altieri 1999). Soil biodiversity is especially regarded as offering stability against disturbance and stress in agroecosystems (Brussaard et al. 2007). The elements of agricultural biodiversity providing such desired services has been regarded as "functional" with several definitions emerged, depending on stakeholder's objectives and priorities (Moonen and Bàrberi 2008, Bàrberi 2013).

Nutrient cycling and decomposition is a major function that many soil arthropods deliver, by among others fragmentation of litter, grazing of microflora and improvement of soil structure (Reichle 1977). Main decomposers and detritivores among the soil arthropod community are Scarabaeidae, Tenebrionidae, mites (Acari), springtails (Collembolla), woodlice (Isopoda) and Thysanura (Petersen and Luxton 1982, Moore et al. 1988, Stork and Eggleton 1992, Wurst 2013).

Soil arthropod community of the olive agroecosystem can deliver as well substantial services in terms of biological control of olive fly (*Bactrocera oleae* (Rossi), Diptera: Tephritidae), the main olive pest worldwide (Daane and Johnson 2010). Several studies have showed that predatory soil arthropod community can inflict mortality on the Tephritidae pupae (Bateman 1972, Cavalloro and Delrio 1976, Bigler et al. 1986, Orsini et al. 2007). Typical potential predators of the Tephritidae pupae are taxa such as Araneae,

Carabidae, Staphylinidae, Formicidae and Opiliones (Bateman 1972, Cavalloro and Delrio 1976, Wong et al. 1984, Bigler et al. 1986, Allen and Hagley 1990, Thomas 1995, Hennessey 1997, Hodgson et al. 1998, Urbaneja et al. 2006, Gonçalves and Pereira 2012).

This investigation was designed to optimise the efficiency of soil arthropod diversity management in olive orchards taking into consideration the effect of agroecological zone. The diversity of soil arthropod fauna in twenty four olive orchards in southern Crete was monitored for a whole year period using a standard sampling method, as part of a wide-ranging investigation into a number of aspects of olive production. Soil arthropod fauna diversity and its functional counterpart were monitored among different agroecological zones. Low intensity management in olive orchards related to the hilly agroecological zone was assumed to favour soil arthropod diversity. In addition, the response of the functional part of the soil arthropods to the agroecoecological zone was investigated for drawing conclusions of the robustness of such an approach.

## Materials and Methods

### Orchard survey
The survey took place in twenty-four pilot orchards located in eight different sites in Messara valley southern Crete, Greece, a representative olive producing region of Crete. The area has a semi-arid Mediterranean climate with annual mean temperature of 17.5°C and precipitation of approximately 600 mm/year (Kabourakis 1996).

Landscape consists mostly of olive orchards, both plain and hilly, covering the main agroecological zones of olive production. These two agroecological zones, hilly and plain, were differentiated regarding the elevation, the terrain, the abiotic environment (soil type and fertility, rainfall,

temperature, humidity), the biotic environment (fauna and flora), the landscape and the intensity of management applied in the olive orchards. Plain orchards are regarded as more intensive compared to the hilly ones in terms of input and farming methods intensity.

Orchards were selected following discussions with stakeholders in the area of study, based on previous research carried out in the area (Kabourakis 1996, Kabourakis 1999, Vassiliou 2000, Volakakis 2010, Volakakis et al. 2012). All orchards were managed commercially and their management represented the diversity of practices occurred in the study area. Orchard size had an average of 0.53 ha, ranging from 0.17 to 1 ha. Four of the study sites were located on the plain agroecological zone, being orchards of intensive farming practices and high-input use and four on the surrounding hills, being less intensive. Soil management in the plain orchards was more intensive and included the use of the soil rotavator in all orchards with all orchard surface intensively cultivated. On the contrary, soil management in the hilly orchards was less intensive due to the terrain and the stoniness of the olive orchards. Soil management included an extensive use of the light soil cultivator while in two orchards there was no soil cultivation. Plain orchards were irrigated with higher amounts of water, also due to its availability in the plain. Hilly orchards were irrigated with lower amounts of irrigation water due to its scarcity and low quality in the hilly orchards.

The sampling period included five weekly measurements per each season, from autumn 2011 to summer 2012 (in total 20 weeks/year), covering a standard production year in terms of climatic conditions.

Six trap stations per hectare were defined in each orchard with a minimum of two traps per olive orchard.

**Soil arthropod fauna monitoring**
Pitfall traps were used for soil arthropods collection. The traps were plastic, colourless, of 7.5 cm diameter and 11.5 cm height, filled with propylene glycol and they were left in site for 7 days. Traps were randomly placed both under canopy and between olive trees.

The ground was carefully dug and the top of the trap was placed at the same level with soil surface, in order to achieve minimum terrain disturbance. Samples collected were transported in plastic bags to laboratory, filtered and cleaned of debris and inorganic material. The collected insects were placed in Petri dishes and identified by stereomicroscope (C-PS, Nikon).

The arthropods were identified down to order level of taxonomy and to the level of class for Chilopoda and Diplopoda. Such higher taxa level taxonomization is regarded as appropriate for rapid biodiversity surveys, saving time and resources (Biaggini et al. 2007). Coleoptera were further taxonomized for the families of Scarabaeidae, Carabidae, Staphylinidae and Tenebrionidae due to their functionality. Family Formicidae was counted independently from order Hymenoptera due to its abundance.

**Data analysis**
Agroecological zones were compared in terms of arthropods abundance, represented by number of total catches per orchard surface. Richness (S) and Shannon Index of diversity (H') were calculated. Catches of functional fauna were grouped regarding the important and prioritized agroecosystem services of biological pest control and soil nutrient cycling they deliver (Table 1).

SPSS 20.0 for MS Windows was used to carry out statistical analyses. Data normality was assessed by the Shapiro-Wilk test ($p < 0.05$) and were found to be not normally distributed, even after several transformations. A non-parametric Mann-Whitney test was run to test for differences in terms of total and functional abundance and Shannon Index between agroecological zones. Significance was reported at the level of $P < 0.05$.

Rank abundance curves (Whittaker plots) were formulated, to represent visually the species abundance distribution (SAD) for

management systems and agroecological zones. Such visualization is one of the best known and most informative methods (Magurran 2004), considered to be of intermediate complexity between univariate descriptors such as species richness and diversity indices and labeled lists of species abundances typically analyzed by multivariate statistics (McGill et al. 2007).

TABLE 1. Functional taxa delivering services in the olive agroecosystem.

| Olive agroecosystem service | Taxa |
|---|---|
| **Biological pest control** | Araneae |
| | Chilopoda |
| | Coleoptera |
| | 1. Carabidae |
| | 2. Staphylinidae |
| | Dermaptera |
| | Formicidae |
| | Opiliones |
| **Nutrient cycling** | Acari |
| | Coleoptera |
| | 1. Scarabaeidae |
| | 2. Tenebrionidae |
| | Collembola |
| | Diplopoda |
| | Isopoda |
| | Thysanrura |

## Results and Discussion

### Total arthropod's abundance

Total number of arthropods captured during the whole sampling period amounted to 118,035 individuals. In the plain orchards 59,250 individuals were collected, whereas 58,785 in the hilly ones. The arthropods were classified into 16 taxa, represented in all agroecological zones (Table 2).

Chilopoda, Dermaptera and Diplopoda are not presented in the tables due to their scarcity (less than 1%). Diptera, Lepidoptera, Mecoptera were not considered in the analysis, as not being true soil inhabitants.

The differences in total arthropod abundance were not statistically significant between agroecological zones in all seasons (Table 2). Nevertheless, the numbers of arthropods were higher in plain orchards in spring (30,479±249.49), winter (3,075 ±35.11) but not in summer (20,519 ±115.17) or autumn (5,177 ±24.35).

Main reason of such higher abundance in the plain orchards was the high presence of Coleoptera, especially Tenebrionidae (Tables 2, 3). When this taxon is excluded total catches appeared higher in the hilly orchards. Subsequently, this could be attributed to more favourable abiotic parameters for Coleoptera found in the plains of Messara, especially in the seasons of lower-mild temperature.

In the Whittaker plots visualizing taxa abundance distribution (Fig. 1), agroecological zones appear to have relatively steeper slopes in spring and in summer, indicating that plain and especially, hilly orchards presented higher dominance. Small seasonal differences appear in species richness (< 2 species) for all sampling periods, except in spring (see also S values in Tables 2, 3).

### Specific taxa abundance

The most abundant arthropods throughout the four sampling periods were Coleoptera with 45,556 catches (39.52% of total abundance), dominated by Tenebrionidae (21,965). Coleoptera were seasonally peaked in autumn and spring and presented significantly higher catches in the plain orchards (U=116, z=2.54, p<0.01), in spring (Tables 2, 3).

Coleoptera were among the most abundant taxa in olive agroecosystems. In Santos et al. (2007) were the third most abundant taxon,

after Formicidae and Collembola, from April to July. In Ruano et al. (2004) were the fifth and ninth most abundant in two-year study from March to October.

TABLE 2. Abundance of soil arthropod taxa per hectare, functional taxa and values of richness and biodiversity indices for hilly and plain agroecological zones in autumn and winter.

| Season Agroecological zone | Autumn | | | | Winter | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Hilly** | **SE** | **Plain** | **SE** | **Hilly** | **SE** | **Plain** | **SE** |
| Taxa | | | | | | | | |
| Acari | 108 | 2,56 | 93 | 1,65 | 62 | 1,30 | 42 | 0,89 |
| Araneae | 768 | 6,67 | 1004** | 6,68 | 527 | 6,81 | 1158** | 17,81 |
| Coleoptera | 1045 | 12,96 | 1452 | 19,03 | 453 | 4,73 | 410 | 5,25 |
| Scarabaeidae | 275* | 7,19 | 30 | 1,18 | 21 | 0,71 | 0 | 0,00 |
| Carabidae | 263 | 3,22 | 379* | 2,24 | 59 | 1,36 | 65 | 1,13 |
| Staphylinidae | 219 | 3,42 | 268 | 3,72 | 189 | 3,57 | 191 | 2,57 |
| Tenebrionidae | 20 | 0,62 | 57* | 1,10 | 6 | 0,34 | 49* | 1,86 |
| Other | 268 | 3,73 | 719 | 17,41 | 178 | 2,99 | 106* | 1,47 |
| Collembola | 673 | 16,47 | 897 | 14,61 | 790 | 10,87 | 709 | 11,55 |
| Dictyoptera | 0 | 0,00 | 4 | 0,23 | 13 | 0,84 | 13 | 1,11 |
| Formicidae | 1129 | 14,01 | 922 | 14,74 | 94 | 1,57 | 120 | 2,52 |
| Hemipt./Heteropt. | 16 | 0,43 | 5 | 0,34 | 2 | 0,17 | 0 | 0,00 |
| Hemipt./Homopt. | 48 | 1,22 | 31 | 0,56 | 97 | 1,19 | 75 | 2,00 |
| Hymenoptera | 56 | 1,13 | 59 | 1,08 | 10 | 0,40 | 13 | 0,49 |
| Isopoda | 231 | 4,24 | 281 | 5,47 | 31 | 0,72 | 31 | 1,10 |
| Opiliones | 1390** | 25,36 | 295 | 6,07 | 906** | 19,19 | 401 | 6,36 |
| Orthoptera | 31 | 1,12 | 45 | 1,00 | 7 | 0,29 | 27 | 0,94 |
| Thysanura | 29 | 1,46 | 22 | 0,56 | 8 | 0,33 | 14 | 0,37 |
| Other arthropods taxa counted: Chilopoda, Dermaptera, Diplopoda (<1%) | | | | | | | | |
| Total Abundance | 5543 | 41,37 | 5177 | 24,35 | 3061 | 28,66 | 3075 | 35,11 |
| Functional taxa | 5103 | 41,06 | 4247 | 25,36 | 2693 | 26,40 | 2780 | 33,05 |
| BPC | 3768 | 35,02 | 2868 | 16,32 | 1775 | 25,37 | 1935 | 22,09 |
| NC | 1335 | 18,34 | 1379 | 13,72 | 918 | 10,32 | 845 | 13,64 |
| S | 14 | | 16 | | 16 | | 14 | |
| H' | 1,468 | | 1,569 | | 1,388 | | 1,344 | |

BPC: Biological Pest Control, NC: Nutrient Cycling, S: Richness, H': Shannon Index,
* $P<0.05$
** $P<0.01$

TABLE 3. Abundance of soil arthropod taxa per hectare, functional taxa and values of richness and biodiversity indices for hilly and plain agroecological zones in spring and summer.

| Season | Spring | | | | Summer | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agroecological zone | Hilly | SE | Plain | SE | Hilly | SE | Plain | SE |
| Taxa | | | | | | | | |
| Acari | 2048* | 59,76 | 651 | 12,68 | 818 | 21,24 | 1125 | 40,3 |
| Araneae | 1784 | 23,30 | 1401 | 12,01 | 2055 | 18,78 | 1701 | 8,3 |
| Coleoptera | 11848 | 134,24 | 20038** | 232,44 | 4257 | 41,91 | 6053 | 62,8 |
| Scarabaeidae | 1072** | 59,18 | 57 | 2,60 | 15 | 0,50 | 3 | 0,2 |
| Carabidae | 267 | 4,11 | 749** | 8,62 | 35 | 1,48 | 73 | 1,4 |
| Staphylinidae | 874 | 11,26 | 1025 | 11,12 | 15 | 0,45 | 18 | 0,6 |
| Tenebrionidae | 5758 | 130,89 | 13043* | 182,15 | 1960* | 34,15 | 934 | 40,2 |
| Other | 3876 | 36,92 | 5164 | 72,06 | 2232** | 31,46 | 5024 | 62,9 |
| Collembola | 758 | 15,64 | 888 | 10,99 | 1185 | 31,80 | 254 | 9,8 |
| Dictyoptera | 39 | 1,23 | 57 | 1,80 | 996 | 23,92 | 2742* | 50,0 |
| Formicidae | 7133 | 98,23 | 5060 | 107,38 | 11032* | 146,37 | 6069 | 88,9 |
| Hemipt./Heteropt. | 194** | 4,68 | 46 | 0,74 | 628 | 34,45 | 47 | 1,4 |
| Hemipt./Homopt. | 658* | 7,97 | 325 | 3,88 | 178 | 4,09 | 127 | 2,2 |
| Hymenoptera | 177* | 4,37 | 49 | 0,86 | 188 | 3,10 | 434* | 7,5 |
| Isopoda | 869 | 29,49 | 1013 | 9,35 | 465 | 17,02 | 434 | 9,6 |
| Opiliones | 2358** | 26,66 | 656 | 10,09 | 3 | 0,24 | 4 | 0,3 |
| Orthoptera | 88 | 2,17 | 166 | 4,33 | 107 | 4,18 | 494 | 17,4 |
| Thysanura | 76** | 1,81 | 11 | 0,33 | 19 | 0,62 | 36 | 1,0 |
| Other arthropods taxa counted: Chilopoda, Dermaptera, Diplopoda (<1%) | | | | | | | | |
| Total Abundnce | 28217 | 255,30 | 30479 | 249,49 | 21964 | 197,88 | 20519 | 115,17 |
| Functional taxa | 22998 | 254,21 | 24555 | 238,84 | 17601* | 192,93 | 11723 | 140,37 |
| BPC | 12417 | 128,06 | 8891 | 118,25 | 13139* | 154,24 | 8453 | 91,84 |
| NC | 10581 | 162,27 | 15664 | 159,77 | 4462 | 75,79 | 3269 | 65,19 |
| S | 16 | | 16 | | 15 | | 16 | |
| H' | 1,510** | | 1,169 | | 1,380 | | 1,575 | |

BPC: Biological Pest Control, NC: Nutrient Cycling, S: Richness, H': Shannon Index,
 * $p<0.05$
 ** $p<0.01$

FIG. 1. Rank abundance curves of hilly (**X**) and plain agroecological zone (•).

Family Formicidae followed (31,190 catches and 27.3% of total abundance), with highest seasonal abundances found in summer and spring, as expected due to their tolerance to high temperatures and low humidity (Table 2). Significantly higher Formicidae catches were found in the hilly orchards (U=36, z=-2.08, *P*<0.05), in summer (Table 2). Formicidae are mentioned to be the most abundant taxon in the soil of olive orchards (Morris and Campos 1999, Santos et al. 2007, Cotes et al. 2010).

Araneae ranked third (10,348 catches and 8.77% of total abundance) among taxa, with the highest catches appearing in winter. Significantly higher abundances were found in the plain orchards, in autumn (U=108.3, z=2.109, *P*<0.01) and winter (U=188.5, z=2.108, *P*<0.05) (Table 2).

Araneae is also mentioned as being amongst the most abundant taxa in the olive agroecosystem (Morris et al. 1999).

Order Collembola followed in abundance (6,276 and 5.32% of total abundance), with the highest seasonal catches found in winter (1,499 individuals), ranking second after Araneae. This winter peak could be attributed to the high seasonal humidity, favouring the specific taxa. Gonçalves and Pereira (2012) found Collembola to be the most abundant in the soil of olive orchards, justifying accordingly their findings by seasonality of measurements and environmental conditions. No significant differences of Collembola catches appeared between agroecological zones.

In general, the comparison in each taxon abundance between agroecological zones showed hilly orchards as having

significantly higher catches in the cases of ten taxa, when plain orchards, had higher taxa abundances in seven cases (Table 2). The highest seasonal number of significant differences between agroecological zones was found in spring (seven taxa), followed by summer (three taxa) and then autumn and winter (two taxa each). Other surveys, comparing olive management systems, found highest numbers of different taxa in May and June (Cotes et al. 2010), as well as in July (Ruano et al. 2004), with most differences occurring in June.

**Functionally relevant taxa abundance**

Functional arthropods captured throughout the whole sampling periods numbered 90,627 individuals, representing 76.7% of total arthropod catches. 52,658 of them belonged to the biological pest control group (BPC) and 37,969 to the nutrient cycling group (NC).

In hilly orchards 48,396 functional arthropods were found (BPC: 31,100 and NC: 17,296), whereas 42,232 in the plain ones (BPC: 21,558 and NC: 20,674).

Agroecological zones comparison showed that total functional arthropods and BPC catches of the hilly orchards were statistically significantly higher in the summer (total: $U=31$, $z=-2.714$, $p<0.05$, BPC: $U=34.5$, $z=-2.166$, $p<0.01$) and the NC catches of the plain orchards in the spring measurements ($U=108$, $z=-2.078$) (Table 3). Main reason of higher values of NC in spring was the high number of Tenebrionidae catches.

**Biodiversity indices**

Shannon index (H') presented higher values in the hilly orchards except in autumn and summer. Differences between the agroecological zones were statistically significant in spring measurements (Table 3) where biodiversity appeared to be higher in the hilly orchards ($U=12$, $z=-3.464$).

## Conclusions

Hilly orchards presented the majority of significantly higher values of functional fauna abundance and Shannon Index, as well as in terms of specific taxa abundance. The most dominant taxa found were similar to the results of previous surveys, affecting the comparison of soil arthropods both in terms of total catches and functional subgroups.

Sub-grouping of total arthropods with regards to prioritised agroecosystem services proved to be an interesting approach for a biodiversity survey, providing significant results when agroecological zones were compared.

Orchard management encountered in hilly zones, attributed as less intensified and lower disturbance appeared to contribute to increasing soil arthropod diversity, but the effect of specific management practices should be further investigated. Therefore, future research may focus on the specific management practices effect, as well as their timing, that may result in greater overall and functional soil arthropod activity. Potential future changes in environmental factors (such as higher summer temperatures and irregular rain periods) and landscape aspects may also have to be taken into account when considering measures for increasing soil arthropod diversity.

## Acknowledgements

# References

Allen, W.R. and E.A.C. Hagley. 1990. Epigeal arthropods as predators of mature larvae and pupae of the apple maggot (Diptera, Tephritidae). Environ. Entomol. 19: 309-312.

Altieri, M. 1999. The ecological role of biodiversity in agroecosystems. Agric. Ecos. Environ. 74: 19–31.

Bàrberi, P. 2013. "Functional Agrobiodiversity: The Key to Sustainability?". In: Agricultural Sustainability-Progress and Prospects in Crop Research. Ed. by Bhullar S.G. and K.N. Bhullar. Elsevier, London, Waltham, San Diego, pp. 3-20.

Bateman, M.A. 1972. The ecology of fruit flies. Ann. Rev. Entomol. 17: 493–518.

Biaggini, M., R. Consorti, L. Dapporto, M. Dellacasa, E. Paggetti and C. Corti. 2007. The taxonomic level order as a possible tool for rapid assessment of Arthropod diversity in agricultural landscapes. Agric. Ecos. Environ. 122: 183–191.

Bigler, F., P. Neuenschwander V. Delucchi and S.E. Michelakis. 1986. Natural enemies of preimaginal stages of *Dacus oleae* Gmel. (Dipt., Tephritidae) inWestern Crete II: impact on olive fruit fly populations. Boll. Lab. Entomol. Agrar. Filippo Silvestri 43: 79–96.

Brussaard, L., de P. Ruiter and G. Brown. 2007. Soil biodiversity for agricultural sustainability. Agric. Ecos. Environ. 121: 233–244.

Cavalloro, R. and G. Delrio. 1976. Observation on the distribution and survival of *Dacus oleae* pupae in the soil. Redia 56: 167–76.

Cotes, B., M. Campos, F. Pascual, P.A. García and F. Ruano. 2010. Comparing taxonomic levels of epigeal insects under different farming systems in Andalusian olive agroecosystems. Appl. Soil Ecol. 44: 228-236.

Daane, K.M. and M.W. Johnson. 2010. Olive fruit fly: Managing an ancient pest in modern times. Ann. Rev. Entomol. 55: 151–169.

Fattorini, S. 2008. A multidimensional characterization of rarity applied to the Aegean tenebrionid beetles (Coleoptera Tenebrionidae). J. Insect Conserv. 12: 251–263.

Gonçalves, M.F. and J.A. Pereira. 2012. Abundance and diversity of soil arthropods in the olive grove ecosystem. J. Insect Sci. 12: 1–14.

Hennessey, M.K. 1997. Predation on wandering larvae and pupae of Caribbean fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) in guava and carambola grove soils. J. Agric. Entomol. 14: 129-138.

Hodgson, P.J., J. Sivinski, G. Quintero and M. Aluja. 1998. Depth of pupation and survival of fruit fly (*Anastrepha* spp.: Tephritidae) pupae in a range of agricultural habitats. Environ. Entomol. 27: 1310-1314.

Kabourakis, E. 1996. "Prototyping and dissemination of ecological olive production systems: A methodology for designing and a first step towards validation and dissemination of prototype ecological olive production systems (EOPS) in Crete". Published PhD thesis. Wageningen Agricultural University. The Netherlands.

Kabourakis, E. 1999. Code of practices for ecological olive production systems. Olivae 77: 46–55.

McGill, B.J., R.S. Etienne, J.S. Gray, D. Alonso, M.J. Anderson, H.K. Benecha, M. Dornelas, B.J. Enquist, J. Green, F. He, A. Hurlbert, A.E. Magurran, P.A. Marquet, B.A. Maurer, A. Ostling, C.U. Soykan, K. Ugland and E. White. 2007. Species abundance distributions: moving beyond single prediction theories to integration within an ecological framework. Ecol. Letters 10: 995–1015.

Magurran, A.E. 2004. Measuring Biological Diversity. Blackwell, Oxford.

Metzidakis, I., A. Martinez-Vilela, G. Castro Nieto and B. Basso. 2008. Intensive olive orchards on sloping land: Good water and pest management are essential. J. Environ. Manag. 89: 120–128.

Moonen, A., and P. Bàrberi. 2008. Functional Biodiversity: An Agroecosystem Approach. Agric. Ecos. Environ. 127: 7–21.

Moore, J.C., D.E. Walter and H.W. Hunt. 1988. Arthropod regulation of micro- and mesobiota in below-ground detrital food webs. Ann. Rev. Entomol. 33: 419-435.

Morris, T., and M. Campos. 1999. Predatory insects in olive-grove soil. *Zool. Baetica* 10: 149–160.

Morris, T., W. Symondson, N. Kidd and M. Campos. 1999. Las arañas y su incidencia sobre Prays oleae en el olivar. Boll. Sanid. Veg. Plagas 25: 475–489.

Orsini, M.M., K.M. Daane, K.R. Sime and E.H. Nelson. 2007. Mortality of olive fruit fly pupae in California. Bioc. Sci. Technol. 17: 797–807.

Petersen, H. and M. Luxton. 1982. A comparative analysis of soil fauna populations and their role in decomposition processes. Oikos 39: 288-388.

Reichle, D.E. 1977. The role of soil invertebrates in nutrient cycling. Ecol. Bull. 145-156.

Ruano, F., C. Lozano, P. Garcia, A. Peña, A. Tinaut, F. Pascual and M. Campos, 2004. Use of arthropods for the evaluation of the olive orchard management regimes. Agric. Forest Entomol. 6: 111-120.

Santos, S., J. Cabanas and J. Pereira. 2007. Abundance and diversity of soil arthropods in olive grove ecosystem (Portugal): Effect of pitfall trap type. Eur. J. Soil Biol. 43: 77–83.

Stork, N.E. and P. Eggleton. 1992. Invertebrates as determinants and indicators of soil quality. Am. J. Alternative Agric. 7: 38-47.

Thomas, D.B. 1995. Predation on the soil-inhabiting stages of the Mexican fruit-fly (Diptera, Tephritidae). Southwest. Entomol. 20: 61-71.

Urbaneja, A., F. García Marí, D. Tortosa, C. Navarro, P. Vanaclocha, L. Bargues and P. Castañera. 2006. Influence of ground predators on the survival of the Mediterranean fruit fly pupae, *Ceratitis capitata*, in Spanish citrus orchards. Biocontrol 51: 611-626.

Vassiliou, A. 2000. Farm structure optimisation of, and the impact of widespread conversion to ecological olive production systems. PhD Thesis, University of Wales.

Volakakis, N. 2010. Development of strategies to improve the quality and productivity of organic and "low input" olive production systems in semi-arid Mediterranean regions. PhD thesis, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne.

Volakakis, N.G., M.D. Eyre and E.M. Kabourakis. 2012. Olive Fly *Bactrocera oleae* (Diptera, Tephritidae) Activity and fruit infestation under mass trapping in an organic table olive orchard in Crete, Greece. J. Sustain. Agric. 36: 683–698.

Wong, T.T.Y., D.O. McInnis, J.I. Nashimotoa, A.K. Ota and V.C.S. Chang. 1984. Predation of the Mediterranean fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) by the Argentine ant (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) in Hawaii. J. Econ. Entomol. 77: 1454-1458.

Wurst, S. 2013. Plant-mediated links between detritivores and aboveground herbivores. Front Plant Sci. 4: 380.

# Βιοποικιλότητα εδαφόβιων αρθροπόδων σε αγροοικοσυστήματα πεδινών και λοφωδών ελαιώνων στην Κρήτη

## Β.Δ. ΓΚΙΣΑΚΗΣ [1, 3, 4], Δ. ΚΟΛΛΑΡΟΣ [2] ΚΑΙ Ε.Μ. ΚΑΜΠΟΥΡΑΚΗΣ[1]

[1]*Εργαστήριο Συστημάτων Οικολογικής Παραγωγής, Γενική Διεύθυνση Αγροτικής Έρευνας, Ελληνικός Γεωργικός Οργανισμός «Δήμητρα», Τ. Θ. 2229, 71003, Ηράκλειο, Κρήτη*
[2]*Εργαστήριο Οικολογίας, Σ.ΤΕ.Γ./ Τ.Ε.Ι. Κρήτης, Εσταυρωμένος 71004, Ηράκλειο, Κρήτη*
[3]*Institute of Life Sciences, Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna (SSSA), Piazza Martiri della Libertà 33, 56127 Pisa PI, Italy*
[4]*Department of Sustainable Agriculture, Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Chania (MAICh), Crete, Greece*

## ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Μελετήθηκε η βιοποικιλότητα της εδαφόβιας πανίδας αρθροπόδων σε 24 ελαιώνες, οι οποίοι βρίσκονται σε οκτώ διαφορετικές τοποθεσίες στην περιοχή της Μεσσαράς, Κρήτη, και καλύπτουν τις κύριες αγροοικολογικές ζώνες της ελαιοπαραγωγής, πεδινή και λοφώδη. Οι μετρήσεις της εδαφόβιας πανίδας περιλάμβαναν πέντε εβδομαδιαίες δειγματοληψίες σε κάθε εποχή του έτους, με χρήση παγίδων παρεμβολής εδάφους (pitfall traps). Επίσης, ορίστηκαν ομάδες λειτουργικής πανίδας, που αφορούν την βιολογική καταπολέμηση των εχθρών της ελιάς και την ανακύκλωση των θρεπτικών συστατικών του αγροοικοσυστήματος των ελαιώνων. Έγινε σύγκριση μεταξύ των διαφορετικών αγροοικολογικών ζωνών, όσον αφορά την αφθονία και την ποικιλότητα των εδαφόβιων αρθροπόδων και των λειτουργικών τους ομάδων. Στις ταξινομικές ομάδες με μεγάλη αφθονία απαντώνται τα Coleoptera (39.52%), η οικογένεια Formicidae (27.3%), τα Araneae (8.77%) και τα Collembola (5.32%). Η λοφώδης αγροοικολογική ζώνη παρουσίασε υψηλότερη ολική ποικιλότητα αρθροπόδων, ωστόσο χαμηλότερη αφθονία, λόγω της παρουσίας της οικογένειας Tenebrionidae. Ο πλούτος των ταξινομικών ομάδων δεν διέφερε μεταξύ των αγροοικολογικών ζωνών. Η ολική λειτουργική πανίδα αντιπροσώπευσε ένα μεγάλο ποσοστό της ολικής βιοποικιλότητας (76.7%) ενώ παρουσίασε μια τάση υψηλότερης σχετικής αφθονίας στους λοφώδεις ελαιώνες, με εποχικές στατιστικά σημαντικές διαφορές. Ο δείκτης βιοποικιλότητας Shannon υπέδειξε υψηλότερη βιοποικιλότητα στους λοφώδεις ελαιώνες, με στατιστικά σημαντικές διαφορές την άνοιξη. Γενικά, η λιγότερο εντατική ελαιοπαραγωγή των λοφωδών ελαιώνων φάνηκε να ευνοεί την βιοποικιλότητα της εδαφόβιας πανίδας αρθροπόδων.