



AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Rise of the generalists: evidence for climate driven homogenization in avian communities

This is the author's manuscript				
Original Citation:				
Availability:				
This version is available http://hdl.handle.net/2318/133368 since				
Published version:				
DOI:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2011.00693.x				
Terms of use:				
Open Access				
Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.				

(Article begins on next page)



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	This is an author version of the contribution published on:
6	Questa è la versione dell'autore dell'opera:
7	Global Ecology and Biogeography, 21, 2012, 10.1111/j.1466-8238.2011.00693.x
8	
9	The definitive version is available at:
10	La versione definitiva è disponibile alla URL:
11	http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2011.00693.x/pdf
12	
13	

14	Rise of the generalists: evidence for climate driven homogenization in avian communities
15	
16	
17	Catherine M. Davey, Dan E. Chamberlain^, Stuart E. Newson, David G. Noble, Alison
18	Johnston
19	
20	
21	British Trust for Ornithology, The Nunnery, Thetford, IP24 2PU
22	cathdavey@yahoo.com
23	^Current address: Dipartemento di Biologia Animale e dell'Uomo, Universita di Torino, Via
24	Accademia Albertina 13, 10123 Torino, Italy.
25	

27 ABSTRACT

Aims Biogeographical evidence suggests a strong link between climate and patterns of species diversity, and climate change is known to cause range shifts. However, there is little understanding of how these relate to community composition and we lack empirical evidence of recent climate change impacts on the diversity of vertebrates. Using a long-term comprehensive dataset on bird abundance, we explore recent patterns of change in different components of species diversity and avian communities, and postulate a process to explain the observed changes in diversity and specialization.

35 **Location** Britain

Methods We used Breeding Bird Survey data for Britain from 1994 - 2006 to calculate sitespecific diversity and community specialization indices. We modeled these indices using Generalized Additive Models to examine the relationship between local climate and spatial and temporal trends in community metrics and the relationship between changes in diversity and specialization.

Results Local temperature was positively associated with alpha diversity, which increased over the study period, supporting empirical and theoretical predictions of the effect of climate warming. Diversity increased in all habitats, but the rate of increase was greatest in upland areas. However, temperature was negatively associated with community specialization indices, which declined over the same period. Our modeling revealed a non-linear relationship between community specialization and species diversity.

47 **Main conclusions** Our models of diversity and specialization provide stark empirical evidence 48 for a link between warming climate and community homogenization. Over a thirteen-year 49 period of warming temperatures, diversity indices increased while average community 50 specialization decreased. We suggest that the observed diversity increases were most likely 51 driven by range expansion of generalist species and that future warming is likely to increase 52 homogenization of community structure. When assessed in combination, diversity and 53 specialization measures provide a powerful index for monitoring climate change impacts.

54

- 55 Keywords: climate change, birds, species diversity, richness, homogenization, specialization
- 56

57 **INTRODUCTION**

58 Global changes in climate have had significant impacts not just on individual species but on 59 the fundamental composition of ecological communities (Sax & Gaines, 2003). In Britain 60 observed responses of bird species to warming climate include: northward expansion of 61 ranges (Thomas & Lennon, 1999); changes in migrant (Sparks et al., 2007) and resident 62 phenology (Crick & Sparks, 1999) and the establishment of introduced species outside of their 63 endemic climatic ranges (Dudley et al., 2006). Many studies have linked the specificity of 64 these climate impacts to species traits such as mobility and niche space (e.g. Warren et al. 65 2001, Pöyry et al. 2001). However, despite a multitude of studies documenting climate impacts 66 on individual avian species, there is a paucity of information available on the impact these 67 species' specific responses have had on the greater community as measured by changes in 68 local (alpha) diversity, beta diversity and regional (gamma) diversity.

69 Several macroecological studies have demonstrated a relationship between climate 70 and observed variation in taxonomic richness (Hawkins et al., 2003; Currie et al., 2004). 71 Avifaunal species richness has been shown to decrease with increasing latitude and lower 72 temperatures (Turner et al., 1988; Lennon et al., 2000) and in northern-temperate regions 73 energy is expected to be the limiting factor for species (Hawkins et al., 2003). Cool to 74 temperate regions, such as Britain, that experience warming are therefore expected to show 75 increases in species richness (Lennon et al., 2000; Hawkins et al., 2003). Despite evidence of 76 these biogeographical patterns, the mechanism linking climate and species diversity remains 77 elusive (Clarke & Gaston, 2006). In particular, there is a paucity of empirical evidence showing 78 a link between changing climate and species richness of terrestrial vertebrates. One recent 79 North American study found that species richness of winter bird communities was positively 80 correlated with annual temperatures that increased during the study period of 1975 - 2001 (La 81 Sorte et al., 2009). Within other taxonomic groups there is greater evidence of the relationship 82 between climate change and community metrics. A number of studies have now shown links

83 between warming temperatures and localised increases in species richness in plant, butterfly 84 and fish communities (Klanderund & Birks, 2003; Menéndez et al., 2006; Wilson et al., 2007; 85 Hiddink & ter Hofstede, 2008; Britton et al., 2009). However, these increases were often 86 localised and associated with range expansion in generalists and range contractions in 87 specialists (Warren et al., 2001; Wilson et al., 2007; Britton et al., 2009). Specialist species 88 with small range-restricted populations are thought to be particularly vulnerable to extinction 89 as a result of environmental change (McKinney, 1997; McKinney & Lockwood, 1999; Gaston & 90 Blackburn 2002; Julliard et al. 2003). In contrast, generalists are expected to be less 91 susceptible to, and may even benefit from, environmental disturbance (McKinney & Lockwood, 92 1999). Increases in the prevalence of generalists under climate change have already been 93 documented (Menéndez et al., 2006; Britton et al., 2009) and warming temperatures have 94 been shown to increase species turnover in communities (Hillebrand et al., 2010).

95 Although high alpha diversity is often used as a measure of ecosystem health and 96 functioning (Balvanera et al., 2006), increases due to colonisation by common generalist 97 species are likely to reduce beta diversity and eventually gamma diversity as widespread 98 species dominate and communities become homogenized (Van Turnhout et al., 2007). 99 Several recent studies have highlighted the importance of monitoring homogenization in 100 conjunction with other diversity metrics (Devictor et al., 2008; Devictor & Robert, 2009; Filippi-101 Codaccioni et al., 2010a,b). These studies all demonstrated that increases in alpha diversity in 102 disturbed habitats were directly associated with a loss of community specialization. Therefore, 103 to obtain a more comprehensive overview of community dynamics, functional diversity should 104 be monitored in conjunction with alpha diversity. As no reference state exists for 'ideal' 105 diversity and specialization, to assess the impacts of environmental change on communities 106 we need to use datasets that allow us to monitor how indices have changed through space 107 and time.

108 The BTO/JNCC/RSPB Breeding Bird Survey (BBS), is an annual extensive monitoring 109 scheme that began in 1994 and covers around 3000 1km squares in Britain each year. One of 110 the strengths of the BBS dataset is that it allows geographical and temporal trends in bird

populations to be examined. The BBS has shown that British bird populations continue to show long-term declines for several species groups, with climate and land-use change the likely drivers (Newton, 2004; Hewson & Noble 2009; Baillie *et al.*, 2010). Here we use BBS data to investigate how climate has affected measures of community diversity and specialization over a 13 year time period throughout Britain.

116

117 METHODS

118 Survey data

119 In this study we use BBS data from Britain only, for the period 1994-2006 during which about 120 3,000 1-km squares were surveyed annually. This period matches the public availability of 121 British climate data. This survey employs a stratified random sampling design, based on 122 randomly-selected 1-km squares within regional strata that differ slightly in survey intensity. 123 Surveys are conducted annually, usually by the same observer, and require two visits, one 124 from April to mid-May and a second from mid-May to the end of June. During the survey, each 125 observer records birds along two 1 km transect routes through each 1-km square. All birds 126 seen and heard are recorded in three distance bands (0-25m, 25-100m, >100m) (Risely, et al. 127 2009). Birds recorded in flight were discarded from the dataset as they were less likely to be 128 associated with the square for breeding. Observers also record habitat for each 200m transect 129 section using a hierarchical coding system (Crick, 1992).

130

131 Bird detectability

To correct for differences in detectability between species, we used a distance-sampling approach (Buckland *et al.*, 2001). For each species, we fitted half-normal distributions to data from the first two distance bands only (see Newson *et al.*, 2008) using the Mark-Recapture Distance Sampling (MRDS) package (Thomas *et al.*, 2010) for R (R Development Core Team, 2009). A global model using data from across the BBS dataset (1994-2008), was used to maximise the number of observations available for each species. An estimate of species-

138 specific detection probability (\hat{p}), was calculated for all species for which there were 10 or 139 more observations, 209 species in total. 51 species with fewer than 10 observations, were 140 excluded from the analyses here. The excluded records comprised less than 0.003% of the 141 total bird observations, and were mainly rare vagrants or escapees from captivity. Distance 142 models failed to produce estimates for 16 species, for which the detection probability from a 143 similar surrogate species was used, chosen on the basis of expert opinion. A full list of 144 species, along with sample sizes, and surrogates where applicable, is provided online in 145 Appendix S1.

146

147 Measures of community diversity

148 The density of each bird species was calculated as the maximum count per surveyed square, 149 summed over the first two distance bands and divided by the detection probability. For each 150 square/year combination, the reciprocal Simpson's index (1/D) and Simpson's measure of 151 evenness (E_{1/D}) were calculated using the detectability-adjusted abundance data, while 152 species richness (S) was calculated as the number of species. We used Simpson's index, and 153 the associated evenness measure, as it is considered to be robust and easy to interpret (see 154 Magurran 2004 for review). While Simpson's index is correlated with both species richness 155 and Simpson's measure of evenness we included both these measures, so as to help 156 determine the mechanism by which climate affects diversity. Simpson's measure of evenness 157 is not sensitive to species richness (Magurran, 2004).

158

159 Community specialization index (CSI)

To obtain a measure of community specialization we followed the methods of Julliard *et al.* (2006) and Devictor *et al.* (2008). We first calculated species specialization indices (SSI) for species with greater than ten observations, using the coefficient of variation (standard deviation/mean) of the species' density across habitats. SSI values are provided online in Appendix S1. We calculated species' habitat-specific density using data from the first two

distance bands from all years of the BBS (1994-2008). We defined habitat using the primary habitat category from the BBS data using the classification system of Newson *et al.* (2009) which identified 12 broad habitat classes. The community specialization index (CSI) was calculated for each square/year combination as the average SSI weighted for species abundance (Julliard *et al.* 2006; Devictor *et al.* 2008). We used abundance data corrected for detectability in the weighting to account for differences in detection probability across species.

171

172 Land cover and climate data

173 For estimating changes in the diversity metrics across habitat types, habitat classification per BBS square was based on CEH Land Cover Map 2000 (LCM2000) Aggregate Classes (AC), 174 175 which are classified at 25m resolution and summarized at the 1km scale (Jackson, 2000). 176 Habitat categories were defined as follows: Woodland (AC 1.2): Sea (AC 10): Coastal (AC 9) : 177 Improved Grassland (AC 4); Natural Grassland (AC 5); Arable (AC 3); Urban (AC 7); Upland 178 (AC 6). Squares were categorized using the dominant class (>50% cover) within the 1km 179 square. Squares containing a mixture of grassland and arable classes but no dominant class 180 were defined as 'Mixed Farmland'. Squares with no dominant aggregate class were defined as 181 'Mixed'. Those squares categorized as 'Sea' and 'Coastal' were removed from the analyses as 182 they were unlikely to contain terrestrial breeding birds. Climate variables were obtained from 183 the UKCIP02 dataset at 5km square resolution for the period of publically available data 1994 184 - 2006, a full description of the methods used to create the weather variable surface is 185 provided in Perry & Hollis (2005). BBS survey squares and UKCIP data are both based on the 186 GB National Grid and therefore BBS squares fell wholly within the boundary of each 5km 187 climate square. To examine the associations with climate we calculated mean breeding 188 season temperature (°C) and rainfall (mm) measures for each 1km square. The 'breeding 189 season' was defined as April to the end of July. We also examined the influence of winter 190 climate variables, measured from December to February.

191

192 Statistical analysis

193 Diversity and CSI

194 Generalized additive models (GAMs) were used to examine the effects of year, location, 195 habitat, temperature and rainfall on bird diversity, evenness, richness and CSI at the 1km 196 scale. The GAMs were constructed using version 1.6-1 of the mgcv package (Wood, 2006) in 197 the statistical package R (R Core Development Team 2009). We used generalized cross 198 validation (GCV) optimization to select the degrees of freedom for each term automatically and 199 included a gamma penalty of 1.4 to reduce the likelihood of over fitting the data (Wood, 2006). 200 All indices were normally distributed, so the identity link function was used. The model took 201 the form:

202

203 $g(\text{diversity}) = \beta_0 + s(\text{lat, long, year}) + \text{habitat} + \text{mean temperature} + \text{mean rainfall}.$

204

205 Where $g(\mu)$ is the link function, β_0 is the intercept and s is a thin plate spline. We used a three 206 way interaction of latitude, longitude and year to allow us to model all the spatial and temporal 207 variation in our dataset without constraints Habitat was a categorical variable based on 208 LCM2000 classification. We also included a weighting to account for the original square 209 stratification, which was the reciprocal of the survey density in different regions. The GAM fits 210 a smooth two-dimensional surface to the data which optimizes a fit to peaks and troughs in the 211 response variable, which have no support from the environmental data, thus controlling for 212 unmeasured variables which may be affecting the response variable. This surface also 213 implicitly fits spatial autocorrelation in the data, because it optimizes the degrees of freedom 214 used in the surface to describe the patterns of the response variable. In doing so, it controls 215 for similarities in the response variable at nearby points, and thus the climate variables 216 describe relationships which are not described by the smooth GAM surface. In this way, 217 spatial autocorrelation is partially controlled for by the two-dimensional smooth. The model 218 parameters were determined a priori as potentially important determinants of species diversity so no model selection was undertaken (e.g. Habitat: Devictor et al., 2008; Filippi-Codaccioni et 219 220 al., 2010; Temperature: Lennon et al., 2000; La Sorte et al., 2009; Rainfall: Allbright et al.,

2010). Our observed diversity and CSI values were used to fit the model and then national habitat and climate data were used to predict modeled values for each 1-km square in Britain over the same period as our sample. To test our model validity we also examined the fit of the final model to a random selection of 50% of our observed data, which showed a good fit to the unmodeled section of the data (Appendix S2).

226

227 Relationship between CSI and other community metrics

To examine the relationship between CSI and species diversity, richness and evenness we first plotted the data. These plots indicated that a non-linear, unimodal relationship existed between CSI and species diversity and also between CSI and richness (Fig. 4). There was less evidence of a clear relationship between CSI and evenness (Fig. 4). We modeled these relationships by fitting GAMs with a smooth of CSI and parametric year and habitat variables. We used GCV optimization and an identity link function for diversity and evenness and a log link for richness. We constrained the degrees of freedom to 5 to prevent overfitting.

235

236 **RESULTS**

Between 1994-2006, 4,782 1km squares were surveyed at least once; within the first two distance bands a total of 6,897,246 individuals of 260 species were counted. Over the study period, mean breeding season temperatures were variable but showed a general upward trend with a mean increase between 1994-2006 of 1.39 °C \pm s.e 0.004 (Fig. 1). There was no consistent trend in rainfall patterns. The GAMs of species diversity, species richness, species evenness and community specialization accounted for 45.9%, 55.1%, 12.7% and 64.2% of the total deviance respectively (Table 1).

Upland followed by urban habitats were the least diverse while the three agricultural habitats (arable, improved grassland and mixed farming) were the most diverse (Table 1). Modeled values showed that increases in diversity between 1994-2006 were almost ubiquitous (Fig. 2(a-c)). There was a clear latitudinal gradient in diversity, which decreased with latitude (Fig. 2 (a,b)). Patterns in species richness were similar to diversity, with the

249 lowest numbers of species found in upland habitats and the highest in agricultural habitats 250 (arable, improved grassland and mixed farmland) (Table 1). The habitat coefficients for the 251 evenness measure showed a different pattern to richness and diversity with the lowest values 252 seen in urban habitats and the highest in arable and woodland habitats, although the model 253 predictors explained the variance in the evenness measure poorly (Table 1). Modeled values 254 of CSI showed a decline in all regions of Britain (Fig. 2 (d-f)) with a decreasing trend across 255 years (Fig. 1(b)). Habitat-specific patterns in CSI were generally opposite to those for diversity, 256 with upland having the highest CSI, and agricultural habitats the lowest. Again a latitudinal 257 gradient was clear, with CSI higher in northern areas, likely reflecting the distribution of upland 258 habitat (Table 1, Fig. 2 (d,e)).

259 Mean breeding season temperature had a significant (P < 0.05) positive association with 260 species diversity and species richness, but a significant negative association with CSI and 261 evenness (Table 1, Fig 1(a-d)). Mean breeding season rainfall had a significant negative 262 association with species diversity and richness, but a small positive association with species 263 evenness and CSI (Table 1). Because the trend in diversity and richness remained positive, 264 we can assume that temperature had a greater influence on these variables than rainfall. 265 These results also suggest that temperature-related increases in species diversity are driven 266 by changes in the number of species present, rather than the evenness component of the 267 index. Winter climate variables had a similar influence on our dependent variables, although 268 explained less overall variance (Appendix S2).

Mean modeled diversity increased across all habitats from 1994-2006, with upland showing the greatest mean percentage gain in diversity ($36.85 \pm s.e \ 0.18$), richness (23.05 ± 271 s.e 0.21), evenness ($6.66 \pm s.e \ 0.01$) and temperature ($15.57 \pm s.e \ 0.03$) (Fig. 3). Mean modeled CSI decreased across all habitats from 1994-2006, with agricultural habitats showing the greatest mean percentage loss in CSI (Fig. 3b).

The above results imply that increasing alpha diversity and decreasing specialization are related processes. Plots of the relationship between CSI and the three diversity metrics suggest a non-linear relationship (Fig. 4). GAMs using a smooth of CSI appeared to confirm

277 this and explained 42.5% of the deviance of species diversity and 39.0% of the deviance of 278 species richness. The smooth CSI term was significant (P<0.0001). Evenness was not well 279 explained by the model with only 14.2% of the deviance accounted for (Appendix S2). The full 280 GAM results are provided in Appendix S2. Both diversity and richness exhibited a unimodal 281 relationship with CSI. The models suggest that at very low values of richness and diversity 282 further increases in species will increase CSI, after the turning point this relationship is 283 reversed (Fig. 4). Upland habitats were represented towards the right hand side of the curve 284 (Appendix S2), showing that they typically had higher CSI values, but also that further 285 increases in species richness in these habitats tend to decrease CSI.

286

287 **DISCUSSION**

288 This is the first study to examine trends in diversity and homogenization of British bird 289 assemblages utilising extensive national monitoring data from 1994-2006. Against the 290 backdrop of variable population trends (Baillie et al., 2010), the alpha diversity of British bird 291 assemblages, as measured using Simpson's index and species richness, has shown a 292 positive trend over thirteen years of climate warming (Fig. 1,2). However, increases in diversity 293 and richness have been concurrent with declines in community specialization (Fig. 1,2) 294 suggesting that, although local diversity and species richness are increasing, these gains are 295 likely to be at the expense of specialists in the community. Therefore, although our results 296 show increases in alpha diversity, the increasing levels of homogenization suggest that a loss 297 of beta and gamma diversity is likely to occur due to the localized distribution of our highly 298 specialized communities (Fig. 1 d,e). Filippi-Codaccioni et al. (2010b) quantified a significant 299 negative linear relationship between species richness and CSI. However, with our extensive 300 dataset we found a non-linear relationship between CSI and richness (Fig 4). Our model 301 demonstrated that there is a short increase period during which richness and CSI are 302 positively correlated, but that a turning point exists after which this relationship reverses. By 303 looking at where particular habitats fall on this curve, we can see that the most 'specialized' 304 habitats such as upland and urban fall to the right of the turning point (Appendix S2), indicating

that any further increases in species in these habitats are likely to decrease community specialization. These results suggest that climate change has already had a significant impact on the composition of British bird communities and that some habitats are more vulnerable than others.

309 Our findings contribute to the growing number of empirical studies that have 310 demonstrated climate impacts on diversity indices (e.g. Klanderund & Birks, 2003; Menéndez 311 et al., 2006; Wilson et al., 2007; Hiddink & ter Hofstede, 2008; Britton et al., 2009) and add to 312 the relatively sparse literature documenting impacts on terrestrial vertebrates (e.g. Lemoine & 313 Böhning-Gaese, 2003; La Sorte et al., 2009). Our results support the predictions of Lennon et 314 al. (2000) who hypothesised that warmer summers would increase bird diversity, and the 315 magnitude would vary geographically dependent on the sensitivity of the resident avifauna. 316 Previous studies indicate changes in species richness often reflect an increased prevalence of 317 generalists (e.g. Menéndez et al., 2006; Britton et al., 2009). Our analysis indicates that 318 increases in generalists have concurrent, negative implications for community specialists. This 319 suggests a detrimental impact of climate change on specialist species, corroborating recent 320 studies that demonstrate decreases in community specialization due to environmental 321 disturbance (Devictor et al., 2007, 2008; Devictor & Robert, 2009; Filippi-Codaccioni et al., 322 2010a,b).

323 As a result of future climate change, European resident species are predicted to 324 advance by 550 km north-east on average by the end of the 21st century (Huntley et al., 2007). 325 Within Britain, we would expect elevational and latitudinal shifts in species' distributions to 326 have the greatest impact on communities in northern and upland habitats. Some of the 327 observed increases in alpha diversity may be due to recent colonists. For example, Black 328 Redstart (Phoenicurus ochruros), Cetti's Warbler (Cettia cetti) and Little Egret (Egretta 329 garzetta) are thought to have colonized Britain from the continent during this period, 330 movements likely to have been facilitated by warming temperatures (Robinson et al., 2005). 331 Species introduced outside of their endemic climate range have also become established, for 332 example the Ring-necked Parakeet (Psittacula krameri) has seen a 600% increase in

population size between 1995 and 2007 (Risely *et al.*, 2009). However, the ubiquitous nature
 of diversity increases suggest that range expansion of resident species is the most likely factor
 driving the observed variation in our indices.

336 Common British birds and those with broader niches exhibit stronger species-energy 337 relationships than rare ones (Evans et al., 2005a,b) and are therefore more likely to show 338 positive population responses to warming temperature. We found that upland communities 339 were the most specialized (Table 1) and as predicted, these habitats incurred losses of 340 specialization concurrently with the greatest increases in alpha diversity and temperature. We 341 hypothesize that diversity gains in upland habitats are likely to have been driven by altitudinal 342 and latitudinal shifts by generalists. Range-restricted and specialist species are unlikely to 343 have the phenotypic plasticity required to adapt rapidly to novel climatic conditions and 344 habitats (Crick, 2004) and will come under increasing pressure from loss of habitat and the 345 shifting ranges of more generalist species. Extinctions of some species and distribution 346 expansion of others will likely lead to a homogenization of assemblages (McKinney & 347 Lockwood 1999) as demonstrated for birds in the Netherlands and France (Van Turnhout et 348 al., 2007; Devictor et al. 2008). Our results support the hypothesis that widespread 349 homogenization is also occurring in British bird communities. We saw a significant national 350 decrease in CSI during our study period, suggesting that the prevalence of generalists within 351 assemblages is on the increase (Fig 1f). Further work is needed to quantify the impact of 352 generalist expansion on specialists at the species level.

While temperature appears to be the predominant driver of these processes, rainfall had a significant negative association with species diversity and richness and a positive association with CSI (Table 1). Lemoine & Böhning-Gaese (2003) found that changes in rainfall had different impacts on long and short distance migrants suggesting that future shifts in precipitation would also have implications for the composition of communities.

We must consider that our results could reflect a spurious correlation between two increasing variables (alpha diversity and temperature). For example, whilst climate appears to have an important role in the homogenization process, a number of factors such as

361 land-use change have also been associated with profound changes in UK bird populations 362 (e.g. Chamberlain et al. 2000), and specialist bird species have been shown to be more 363 susceptible to farming intensification than generalists in France (Filippi-Codaccioni et al. 364 2010a,b). However, habitat changes and climate are intrinsically linked; several studies have 365 highlighted the importance of habitat as a factor affecting distribution changes in response to 366 climate change (Pöyry et al., 2001; Warren et al., 2001; Menéndez et al., 2007), although 367 separating cause and effect between climate and habitat induced changes in vertebrates is 368 complex. While this study did not examine the contribution of land-use or habitat change to 369 patterns in diversity, what we have shown is that changes in climate explain almost half of the 370 observed variation in diversity trends over this 13 year period (Table 1). Furthermore, the size 371 of our dataset and the fine spatial scale at which the bird and climate data were collected 372 would have greatly reduced the likelihood of spurious correlations arising. Our analysis also 373 accounted for differences in detection probability between species, reducing much of the 374 potential bias from creating indices using multiple species. Ultimately, most local extinctions 375 result from multiple factors (Thomas et al., 2006). Asides from competition, the climate-376 mediated spread of generalists could have secondary effects on avian communities though 377 alteration of predator-prey interactions and the introduction of novel diseases and parasites. 378 Future work should attempt to synthesize the relative contributions of these different factors to 379 diversity change.

380 Quantifying the impact of environmental change on communities by measuring 381 declines in species diversity has been common practice for some time. However, as 382 demonstrated here, levels of alpha diversity often remain stable or increase as a result of 383 environmental change (Sax & Gaines, 2003). Studies that have used measures of both alpha 384 diversity and specialization have found these indices tend to have contrasting trends as a 385 result of environmental disturbance (Devictor & Robert, 2009; Calvero & Brotons, 2010; Filippi-386 Codaccioni et al., 2010b). However, all community metrics have strengths and limitations and 387 we must be careful not to consider the presence of specialists as a de facto measure of 388 ecosystem quality. It is rarely feasible to assess diversity and specialization values against

those of a pristine system (Devictor *et al.*, 2008). The strength of extensive long-term datasets such as the BBS, is that we can use temporal and spatial changes in metrics to inform our interpretation.

392

393 Conclusions

394 As long as species have differential abilities to adapt, disperse and compete, the 395 impact of climate change will vary on a species-specific basis. There is now excellent evidence 396 in place to describe climate impacts based on species traits but the implications for 397 communities are less certain. Using an extensive long-term dataset we provide stark evidence 398 for a link between warming climate and perturbation of British bird assemblages. Although 399 species diversity and richness were shown to increase with rising temperatures, these gains 400 were concurrent with increased homogenization and were likely the result of generalists' range 401 expansion. As such, our observed increase in diversity over a period of recent warming is 402 likely to be transient (Walther et al., 2002; Devictor & Robert, 2009). Future climate change is 403 likely to expedite further assemblage perturbation, with the UK likely to suffer permanent 404 losses of specialist and range-restricted species. These results highlight the importance of 405 considering measures of specialization in conjunction with more common diversity metrics.

407 Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all those professional and amateur ornithologists who contributed to the collection of field data. The BBS is funded funded jointly by the British Trust for Ornithology, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee. Sarah Eglington, Andy Musgrove and Gavin Siriwardena all helped with aspects of this paper.

413

414 **REFERENCES**

- Allbright, T.P., Pidgeon, A.M., Rittenhouse, C.D., Clayton, M.K., Flather, C.H., Culbert, P.D.,
 Wardlows, B.D. & Radeloff, V.C. (2010) Effects of drought on avian community
 structure. *Global Change Biology*, **16**, 2158-2170.
- Baillie, S.R., Marchant, J.H., Leech, D.I., Joys, A.C., Noble, D.G., Barimore, C., Downie, I.S.,
 Grantham, M.J., Risely, K. & Robinson, R.A. (2010) *Breeding Birds in the Wider Countryside: their conservation status 2009.* BTO Research Report No. 541. British
 Trust for Ornithology, Thetford. (http://www.bto.org/birdtrends)
- Balvanera, P., Pfisterer, A.B., Buchmann, N., He, J.S., Nakashizuka, T., Raffaelli, D. &
 Schmid, B. (2006) Quantifying the evidence for biodiversity effects on ecosystem
 functioning and services. *Ecology Letters*, 9, 1146–1156.
- Britton, A. J., Beale, C. M., Towers, W. & Hewison, R. L. (2009). Biodiversity gains and losses:
 evidence for homogenization of Scottish alpine vegetation. *Biological Conservation*,
 142, 1728-1739.
- Buckland, S.T., Anderson, D.R., Burnham, K.P., Laake, J.L., Borchers, D.L. & Thomas, L.
 (2001) Introduction to distance sampling: estimating abundance of biological
 populations. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Chamberlain, D.E., Fuller, R.J., Bunce, R.G.H., Duckworth, J.C. & Shrubb, M. (2000) Changes
 in the abundance of farmland birds in relation to the timing of agricultural intensification
 in England and Wales. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **37**, 771–788.

434

- 435 Clarke, A., & Gaston, K.J. (2006) Climate, energy and diversity. *Proceedings of the Royal*436 Society B, 273, 2257-2266.
- Clavero, M. & Brotons, L. (2010) Functional homogenization of bird communities along habitat
 gradients: accounting for niche multidimensionality. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **19**, 684-696.
- 440 Crick, H.Q.P. (1992) A bird-habitat coding system for use in Britain and Ireland incorporating
 441 aspects of land-management and human activity. *Bird Study*, **39**, 1-12.
- 442 Crick, H.Q.P. & Sparks, T.H. (1999) Climate change explains bird egg-laying trends. *Nature*,
 443 **399**, 423–424.
- 444 Crick, H.Q. (2004) The impact of climate change on birds. *Ibis*, **146**, 48–56.
- Currie, D.J., Mittelbach, G.G., Cornell, H.V., Field, R., Guégan, J., Hawkins, B.A., Kaufman,
 D.M., Kerr, J.T., Oberdorff, T., O'Brien, E. & Turner, J.R.G. (2004) Predictions and
 tests of climate-based hypotheses of broad-scale variation in taxonomic richness. *Ecology Letters*, 7, 1121–1131.
- 449 Devictor, V., Julliard, R., Couvet, D., Lee, A& Jiguet, F. (2007) Functional homogenization
 450 effect of urbanization on bird communities. *Conservation Biology*. 21, 741-751.
- 451 Devictor, V., Julliard, R., Clavel, J., Jiguet, F., Lee, A., & Couvet, D. (2008) Functional biotic
 452 homogenization of bird communities in disturbed landscapes. *Global Ecology and*453 *Biogeography*, **17**, 252-261.
- 454 Devictor, V. & Robert, A. (2009) Measuring community responses to large-scale disturbance in
 455 conservation biogeography. *Diversity and Distributions*, **15**, 122-130.
- 456 Dudley, S.P., Gee, M., Kehoe, C. & Melling, T.M. (2006) The British list: a checklist of birds of
 457 Britain. *Ibis*, **148**, 526–563.
- Evans, K. L., Greenwood, J. J. D. & Gaston, K. J. (2005a) Dissecting the species–energy
 relationship. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, **272**, 2155–2163.
- 460 Evans, K. L., Greenwood, J. J. D. & Gaston, K. J. (2005b) Relative contribution of abundant
 461 and rare species to species–energy relationships. *Biology Letters*, **1**, 87–90.

- Filippi-Codaccioni, O., Devictor, V., Bas, Y., Clobert, J., & Julliard, R. (2010b) Specialist
 response to proportion of arable land and pesticide input in agricultural landscapes. *Biological Conservation*, **143**, 883-890.
- Filippi-Codaccioni, O., Devictor, V., Bas, Y. & Julliard, R. (2010b) Toward more concern for
 specialization and less for species diversity in conserving farmland biodiversity. *Biological Conservation*, **143**, 1493-1500.
- Gaston, K.J. & Blackburn, T.M. (2002) Large-scale dynamics in colonization and extinction for
 breeding birds in Britain. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **71**, 390-399.
- Hawkins, B.A., Field, R., Cornell, H.V., Currie, D.J., Guégan, J.F., Kaufman, D.M., Kerr, J.T.,
 Mittelbach, G.G., Oberdorff, T., O'Brien, E.M, Porter E.E, Turner R.G. (2003) Energy,
 water, and broad-scale geographic patterns of species richness. *Ecology*, **84**, 3105–3117.)
- Hewson, C.M. & Noble, D.G. (2009) Population trends of breeding birds in British woodlands
 over a 32-year period: relationships with food, habitat use and migratory behaviour. *Ibis*,
 151, 464-486.
- Hiddink, J.G. & ter Hofstede, R. (2008) Climate induced increases in species richness of
 marine fishes. *Global Change Biology*, **14**, 453-460.
- Hillebrand, H., Soininen, J. & Snoeijs, P. (2010) Warming leads to higher species turnover in a
 coastal ecosystem. *Global Change Biology*, **16**, 1181-1193.
- 481 Huntley, B., Green, R.E., Collingham, Y.C. & Willis, S.G. (2007) A climatic atlas of European
 482 breeding birds. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona.

Jackson, D.L. (2000) Guidance on the interpretation of the Biodiversity Broad Habitat
 Classification (terrestrial and freshwater types): definitions and the relationships with

- 485 other habitat classifications. JNCC Report No. 307. Joint Nature Conservation
 486 Committee, Peterborough.
- Julliard, R., Jiguet, J. & Couvet, D. (2003) Common birds facing global changes: what makes a
 species at risk? *Global Change Biology*, **10**, 148-154.
- 489 Julliard, R., Clavel, J., Devictor, V., Jiguet, J. & Couvet, D. (2006) Spatial segregation of

- 490 specialists and generalists in bird communities. *Ecology Letters*, **9**, 1237-1244.
- Klanderud, K. & Birks, H. J. B. (2003). Recent increases in species richness and shifts in
 altitudinal distributions of Norwegian mountain plants. *Holocene*, **13**, 1-6.
- La Sorte, F. A., Lee, T. M., Wilman, H. & Jetz, W. (2009). Disparities between observed and
 predicted impacts of climate change on winter bird assemblages. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, **276**, 3167-3174.
- Lennon, J.J., Greenwood, J.J.D. & Turner, J.R.G. (2000) Bird diversity and environmental
 gradients in Britain: a test of the species-energy hypothesis. *Journal of Animal Ecology*,
 69, 581–598.
- Lemoine, N. & Böhning-Gaese, K. (2003) Potential impact of global climate change on species
 richness of long-distance migrants. *Conservation Biology*, **17**, 577-586.
- 501 Magurran, A.E. (2004) *Measuring biological diversity*. Blackwell Publishing, Malden.
- 502 McKinney, M. L. (1997). Extinction vulnerability and selectivity: Combining ecological and 503 paleontological views. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, **28**, 495-516
- 504 McKinney, M.L. & Lockwood, J.L. (1999) Biotic homogenization: a few winners replacing many 505 losers in the next mass extinction. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **14**, 450–453.

506 Menéndez R, Megías A.G, Hill J.K, Braschler B, Willis S.G, Collingham Y, Fox R, Roy D.B,

- 507 Thomas C.D. (2006) Species richness changes lag behind climate change. *Proceedings* 508 of the Royal Society B, **273**, 1465–1470.
- 509 Menéndez, R., González-Megías, A., Collingham, Y., Fox, R., Roy, D.B., Ohlemüller, R. &
- 510 Thomas, C.D. (2007) Direct and indirect effects of climate and habitat factors on 511 butterfly diversity. *Ecology*, **88**, 605-611.
- Newson, S.E., Evans, K.L., Noble, D.G., Greenwood, J.J. & Gaston, K.J. (2008) Use of
 distance sampling to improve estimates of national population sizes for common and
 widespread breeding birds in the UK. *Journal of Ecology*, **45**, 1330–1338.
- 515 Newton, I. (2004) The recent declines of farmland bird populations in Britain: an appraisal of 516 causal factors and conservation actions. *Ibis*, **146**, 579-600.

- 517 Perry, M. & Hollis, D. (2005) The generation of monthly gridded datasets for a range of climatic 518 variables over the UK. *International Journal of Climatology*, **25**, 1041-1054.
- 519 Pöyry, J., Luoto, M., Heikkinen, R. K., Kuussaari, M. & Saarinen, K. (2009). Species
 520 traits explain recent range shifts of Finnish butterflies. *Global Change Biology*, **15**,
- 521 **732-743**.
- R Development Core Team (2009) *R: A language and environment for statistical computing.* R
 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <u>http://www.R-project.org</u>
- Risely, K., Noble, D.G. & Baillie, S.R (2009) *The Breeding Bird Survey 2008*. BTO Research
 Report, 537. British Trust for Ornithology, Thetford.
- Robinson, R.A., Learmonth, J.A., Hutson, A.M., Macleod, C.D., Sparks, T.H., Leech, D.I.,
 Pierce, G.J., Rehfisch, M.M. & Crick, H.Q.P. (2005) *Climate change and migratory species.* BTO Research Report, 414, 85–88. British Trust for Ornithology, Thetford.
- Sax, D.F. & Gaines, S.D. (2003) Species diversity: from global decreases to local increases.
 Trends in Ecology and Evolution, **18**, 561–566.
- Sparks, T.H., Huber, K., Bland, R.L., Crick, H.Q., Croxton, P.J., Flood, J., Loxton, R.G.,
 Mason, C.F., Newnham, J.A. & Tryjanowski, P. (2007) How consistent are trends in
 arrival (and departure) dates of migrant birds in the UK? *Journal of Ornithology*, **148**,
 503–511.
- 535 Thomas, C.D. & Lennon, J.J. (1999) Birds extend their ranges northwards. *Nature*, **399**, 213.
- 536 Thomas, C.D., Franco, A.M.A. & Hill, J.K. (2006) Range retractions and extinction in the face 537 of climate warming. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **21**, 415-416.
- Thomas, L., Buckland, S.T., Rexstad, E.A., Laake, J.L., Strindberg, S., Hedley, S.L., Bishop,
 J.R., Marques, T.A. & Burnham, K.P. (2010) Distance software: design and analysis of
 distance sampling surveys for estimating population size. *Journal of Applied Ecology*,
 47, 5-14.
- 542 Turner, J.R., Lennon, J.J. & Lawrenson, J.A. (1988) British bird species distributions and the 543 energy theory. *Nature*, **335**, 539-541.

Avian diversity, homogenization and warming climate

- Van Turnhout, C.A., Foppen, R.P., Leuven, R.S., Siepel, H. & Esselink, H. (2007) Scaledependent homogenization: Changes in breeding bird diversity in the Netherlands over
 a 25-year period. *Biological Conservation*, **134**, 505–516.
- Walther, G.R., Post, E., Convey, P., Menzel, A., Parmesan, C., Beebee, T.J., Fromentin, J.M.,
 Hoegh-Guldberg, O. & Bairlein, F. (2002) Ecological responses to recent climate
 change. *Nature*, **416**, 389–395.
- Warren, M. S., Hill, J. K., Thomas, J. A., Asher, J., Fox, R., Huntley, B., Roy, D. B., Telfer, M.
 G., Jeffcoate, S., Harding, P. *et al.* (2001). Rapid responses of British butterflies to
 opposing forces of climate and habitat change. Nature, **414**, 65-69.
- Wilson, R. J., Gutiérrez, D., Gutiérrez, J. and Monserrat, V. J. (2007). An elevational shift in
 butterfly species richness and composition accompanying recent climate change.
 Global Change Biology, **13**, 1873-1887.
- Wood, S.N. (2006) Generalized Additive Models: an introduction with R. Chapman & Hall /
 CRC, Boca Raton.
- 558
- Appendix S1 File containing species sample sizes and species specialization index (SSI)
 values.
- 561 **Appendix S2** Additional modeling results and graphs.

562

563

564

565 **BIOSKETCH**

566 **Catherine Davey** has recently completed a postdoctoral position at the British Trust for 567 Ornithology where she worked on a variety of applied conservation issues. Prior to her work 568 on patterns in avian diversity she completed an evaluation of the efficacy of environmental 569 schemes for reversing farmland bird declines in England. She will soon take up a position at 570 Lund University to study Swedish bird populations and climate change.

571

Alison Johnston is the Ecological Statistician at the British Trust for Ornithology where she is responsible for statistical advice across the organization and contributes to a wide variety of scientific projects. She is interested in the dynamics of wild bird populations, and the demographic processes which contribute to changing populations and how statistical techniques can reduce the bias in surveys.

578

580

579 **TABLE AND FIGURE CAPTIONS**

Table 1 Results of the Generalized additive models (GAMs) used to examine the association of year, location, habitat, breeding season temperature and rainfall with bird diversity, the community specialization index (CSI), richness (S) and evenness ($E_{1/D}$) of British bird assemblages as measured at the 1km scale. Parameter estimates, standard errors and *P*values are shown for the parametric terms along with the *P*-values for the smoothed terms. Habitat coefficients are in reference to 'upland' habitat (UP), which had the lowest overall diversity and highest CSI.

588

Figure 1 Mean modeled Simpson diversity values (1/D) (a); mean modeled community specialization indices (CSI) (b); mean modeled species richness (S) (c); and mean modeled species evenness ($E_{1/D}$) (d); all shown using a solid line and plotted with mean breeding season temperatures (°C) plotted with a dotted line. Standard error bars are shown but are small in relation to the means.

594

595 Figure 2 (a-c) Map of the modeled Simpson diversity values (1/D) for Britain in (a) 1994 and 596 (b) 2006; darker squares represent greater diversity. The absolute change in diversity 597 between 1994 and 2006 is shown in (c) with colours tending towards orange representing a 598 greater increase in diversity across the study period. (d-f) Map of the modeled community 599 specialization indices (CSI) for Britain in (d) 1994 and (e) 2006; darker squares represent 600 greater community specialization. The absolute change in CSI between 1994 and 2006 is 601 shown in (f) with lighter values representing a greater decrease in CSI across the study 602 period.

603

Figure 3 Mean modeled percentage change over the study period of 1994 – 2006 for each habitat type in Simpson diversity (1/D) (a); community specialization index (CSI) (b); species richness (S) (c); and species evenness ($E_{1/D}$) (d), all plotted with open circles, shown with

percentage change in mean breeding season temperatures (°C) plotted with solid circles.
Habitats are abbreviated as follows: Arable (AR), Improved Grassland (IG), Mixed Farmland
(MF), Mixed (MI), Natural Grassland (NG), Urban (UR), Woodland (WO). Standard error bars
are shown but are small in relation to the means.

611

Figure 4 Plots showing the relationships between the Community Specialization Index (CSI) and species diversity (1/D), species richness (S) and evenness ($E_{1/D}$). The top row contains the plots of observed values using data from all years. The bottom row shows the modeled relationship created using a Generalized Additive Model (GAM) with a smooth CSI term (solid line); 95% confidence intervals are shown using broken lines.

	Species Diversity (1/D)		Community Specialization Index (CSI)			
n = 26105	deviance explained = 45.9%			deviance explained = 64.2%		
Model term	Coefficient	S.E	Р	Coefficient	S.E	Р
(Intercept)	-0.441	0.469	0.347	1.494	0.020	< 0.001
Arable (AR)	5.565	0.136	< 0.001	-0.337	0.006	< 0.001
Improved Grassland (IG)	5.676	0.134	< 0.001	-0.337	0.006	< 0.001
Mixed Farmland (MF)	5.980	0.123	< 0.001	-0.306	0.005	< 0.001
Mixed (MI)	4.548	0.133	< 0.001	-0.231	0.006	< 0.001
Natural Grassland (NG)	1.826	0.135	< 0.001	-0.108	0.006	< 0.001
Urban (UR)	0.842	0.172	< 0.001	-0.097	0.007	< 0.001
Woodland (WO)	3.606	0.141	< 0.001	-0.322	0.006	< 0.001
Mean temperature (°C)	0.617	0.035	< 0.001	-0.026	0.001	< 0.001
Mean rainfall (mm)	-0.008	0.001	< 0.001	$3.02E^{-04}$	5.55E ⁻⁰⁵	< 0.001
Model term	edf		Р	edf		Р
s(lat,long,year)	187		< 0.001	192		< 0.001
	Specie	es Richn	less	Spec	ies Evenne	SS
	Specie	es Richn (S)	less	Spec	ies Evenne (E 1/D)	SS
n = 26105	Specie deviance ex	es Richn (S) xplained	ess = 55.1%	Spec deviance e	ies Evenne (E $_{1/D}$) explained =	ss = 12.7%
n = 26105 Model term	Specie deviance ex Coefficient	es Richn (S) xplained S.E	ess = 55.1% P	Spec deviance e Coefficient	ies Evenne (E _{1/D}) explained = S.E	ss = 12.7%
n = 26105 Model term (Intercept)	Specie deviance ex Coefficient 1.897	es Richn (S) splained S.E 0.788	ess = 55.1% <u>P</u> 0.016	Spec deviance e Coefficient 0.497	ies Evenne (E $_{1/D}$) explained = S.E 0.019	ss = 12.7% <u>P</u> <0.001
n = 26105 Model term (Intercept) Arable (AR)	Specie deviance ex Coefficient 1.897 8.675	es Richn (S) splained S.E 0.788 0.228	ess = 55.1% P 0.016 <0.001	Spec deviance e Coefficient 0.497 0.049	ies Evenne (E $_{1/D}$) explained = S.E 0.019 0.005	ss = 12.7% P <0.001 <0.001
n = 26105 Model term (Intercept) Arable (AR) Improved Grassland (IG)	Specie deviance ex Coefficient 1.897 8.675 10.082	es Richn (S) splained S.E 0.788 0.228 0.225	ess = 55.1% <u>P</u> 0.016 <0.001 <0.001	Spec deviance e Coefficient 0.497 0.049 0.027	ies Evenne (E $_{1/D}$) explained = S.E 0.019 0.005 0.005	ss 12.7% P <0.001 <0.001 <0.001
n = 26105 Model term (Intercept) Arable (AR) Improved Grassland (IG) Mixed Farmland (MF)	Specie deviance ex Coefficient 1.897 8.675 10.082 10.561	es Richn (S) plained S.E 0.788 0.228 0.225 0.206	ess = 55.1% P 0.016 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001	Spec deviance e Coefficient 0.497 0.049 0.027 0.025	ies Evenne (E $_{1/D}$) explained = S.E 0.019 0.005 0.005 0.005	ss 12.7% P <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001
n = 26105 Model term (Intercept) Arable (AR) Improved Grassland (IG) Mixed Farmland (MF) Mixed (MI)	Specie deviance ex Coefficient 1.897 8.675 10.082 10.561 8.731	es Richn (S) splained S.E 0.788 0.228 0.225 0.206 0.223	ess = 55.1% P 0.016 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001	Spec deviance e Coefficient 0.497 0.049 0.027 0.025 -0.004	ies Evenne (E $_{1/D}$) explained = S.E 0.019 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005	ss 12.7% P <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.451
n = 26105 Model term (Intercept) Arable (AR) Improved Grassland (IG) Mixed Farmland (MF) Mixed (MI) Natural Grassland (NG)	Specie deviance ex Coefficient 1.897 8.675 10.082 10.561 8.731 2.820	es Richn (S) plained S.E 0.788 0.228 0.225 0.206 0.223 0.227	= 55.1% P 0.016 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0	Spec deviance e Coefficient 0.497 0.049 0.027 0.025 -0.004 0.008	ies Evenne (E $_{1/D}$) explained = S.E 0.019 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005	ss 12.7% P <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.451 0.160
n = 26105 Model term (Intercept) Arable (AR) Improved Grassland (IG) Mixed Farmland (MF) Mixed (MI) Natural Grassland (NG) Urban (UR)	Specie deviance ex Coefficient 1.897 8.675 10.082 10.561 8.731 2.820 4.421	es Richn (S) splained S.E 0.788 0.228 0.225 0.206 0.223 0.227 0.290	= 55.1% P 0.016 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0	Spec deviance e Coefficient 0.497 0.049 0.027 0.025 -0.004 0.008 -0.085	ies Evenne (E $_{1/D}$) explained = S.E 0.019 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005	ss 12.7% P <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.451 0.160 <0.001
n = 26105 Model term (Intercept) Arable (AR) Improved Grassland (IG) Mixed Farmland (MF) Mixed (MI) Natural Grassland (NG) Urban (UR) Woodland (WO)	Specie deviance ex Coefficient 1.897 8.675 10.082 10.561 8.731 2.820 4.421 5.299	es Richn (S) splained S.E 0.788 0.228 0.225 0.206 0.223 0.227 0.227 0.290 0.238	= 55.1% P 0.016 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0	Spec deviance e Coefficient 0.497 0.049 0.027 0.025 -0.004 0.008 -0.085 0.048	ies Evenne (E $_{1/D}$) explained = S.E 0.019 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.007 0.006	ss 12.7% P <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.451 0.160 <0.001 <0.001
n = 26105 Model term (Intercept) Arable (AR) Improved Grassland (IG) Mixed Farmland (MF) Mixed (MI) Natural Grassland (NG) Urban (UR) Woodland (WO) Mean temperature (°C)	Specie deviance ex Coefficient 1.897 8.675 10.082 10.561 8.731 2.820 4.421 5.299 1.213	es Richn (S) plained S.E 0.788 0.228 0.225 0.206 0.223 0.227 0.290 0.238 0.059	ess = 55.1% P 0.016 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001	Spec deviance e Coefficient 0.497 0.049 0.027 0.025 -0.004 0.008 -0.085 0.048 -0.003	ies Evenne (E $_{1/D}$) explained = S.E 0.019 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.007 0.006 0.001	ss 12.7% P <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.451 0.160 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.044
n = 26105 Model term (Intercept) Arable (AR) Improved Grassland (IG) Mixed Farmland (MF) Mixed (MI) Natural Grassland (NG) Urban (UR) Woodland (WO) Mean temperature (°C) Mean rainfall (mm)	Specie deviance ex Coefficient 1.897 8.675 10.082 10.561 8.731 2.820 4.421 5.299 1.213 -0.021	es Richn (S) splained S.E 0.788 0.228 0.225 0.206 0.223 0.227 0.290 0.238 0.059 0.002	ess = 55.1% P 0.016 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001	Spec deviance e Coefficient 0.497 0.049 0.027 0.025 -0.004 0.008 -0.085 0.048 -0.003 1.37E ⁻⁰⁴	ies Evenne $(E_{1/D})$ explained = S.E 0.019 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.007 0.006 0.001 5.31E ⁻⁰⁵	ss 12.7% P <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.451 0.160 <0.001 <0.001 0.044 0.010
n = 26105 Model term (Intercept) Arable (AR) Improved Grassland (IG) Mixed Farmland (MF) Mixed (MI) Natural Grassland (NG) Urban (UR) Woodland (WO) Mean temperature (°C) Mean rainfall (mm)	Specie deviance ex Coefficient 1.897 8.675 10.082 10.561 8.731 2.820 4.421 5.299 1.213 -0.021	es Richn (S) plained S.E 0.788 0.228 0.225 0.206 0.223 0.227 0.290 0.238 0.059 0.002	= 55.1% P 0.016 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0	Spec deviance e Coefficient 0.497 0.049 0.027 0.025 -0.004 0.008 -0.085 0.048 -0.003 1.37E ⁻⁰⁴	ies Evenne (E $_{1/D}$) explained = S.E 0.019 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.007 0.006 0.001 5.31E ⁻⁰⁵	ss 12.7% P <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.451 0.160 <0.001 <0.001 0.044 0.010
n = 26105 Model term (Intercept) Arable (AR) Improved Grassland (IG) Mixed Farmland (MF) Mixed (MI) Natural Grassland (NG) Urban (UR) Woodland (WO) Mean temperature (°C) Mean rainfall (mm) Model term	Specie deviance ex Coefficient 1.897 8.675 10.082 10.561 8.731 2.820 4.421 5.299 1.213 -0.021 edf	es Richn (S) splained S.E 0.788 0.228 0.225 0.206 0.223 0.227 0.290 0.238 0.059 0.002	= 55.1% P 0.016 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 <p< td=""><td>Spec deviance e Coefficient 0.497 0.049 0.027 0.025 -0.004 0.008 -0.085 0.048 -0.003 1.37E⁻⁰⁴ edf</td><td>ies Evenne $(E_{1/D})$ explained = S.E 0.019 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.007 0.006 0.001 5.31E⁻⁰⁵</td><td>ss 12.7% P <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.451 0.160 <0.001 <0.001 0.044 0.010 P</td></p<>	Spec deviance e Coefficient 0.497 0.049 0.027 0.025 -0.004 0.008 -0.085 0.048 -0.003 1.37E ⁻⁰⁴ edf	ies Evenne $(E_{1/D})$ explained = S.E 0.019 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.005 0.007 0.006 0.001 5.31E ⁻⁰⁵	ss 12.7% P <0.001 <0.001 <0.001 0.451 0.160 <0.001 <0.001 0.044 0.010 P



Figure 1.



Figure 2.



Figure 3.



168×126mm (600 × 600 DPI)

623

Figure 4.