#### **Community Diversity and Stability**

- 1. Biogeography: Observed patterns of community diversity
- 2. What processes promote community diversity?
  - Productivity
  - Disturbance (IDH)
  - Balance (PDB)
- 3. Definitions of stability (resistance vs. resilience, structure vs. function)
- 4. Does diversity increase stability?



#### **Community Diversity and Stability**

Geographical Ecology

**Conservation Biology** 





## North and Central America

**Bird Species Richness** 









Diversity gradient of gastropods along the eastern coast of the United States and Canada. Each line stands for ten species. (From Fischer, 1960, after Abbott.)

### Latitudinal gradients in species richness

Explanations for this pattern have guided hypotheses about the drivers of biodiversity



Species richness

### Hypothesis 1: Productivity drives diversity

High productivity allows specialization: *narrow niches* 

High productivity Reduces competition: *high niche overlap* 



Currie, D. J. (1991). Energy and large-scale patterns of animal-and plant-species richness. *The American Naturalist*, *137*(1), 27-49.

Productivity = rate of biomass production (g/m<sup>2</sup>/yr)

Dodson et al. 2000. Ecology.



FIG. 3. A regression analysis of log(species richness) as a function of log(PPR), with the fitted quadratic model assuming no effect of area on the richness-productivity relationship. Panels are as in Fig. 2.



Animals



Productivity–Diversity Patterns

Mittelbach, G. et al. (2001). What is the observed relationship between species richness and productivity?. *Ecology*, *82*(9), 2381-2396.

#### Hypothesis 2: Disturbance drives diversity

#### **Intermediate Disturbance Hypothesis**



Connell, J. H. (1978). Diversity in tropical rain forests and coral reefs. *Science*, *199*(4335), 1302-1310.

Fig. 1. The "intermediate disturbance" hypothesis. The patterns in species composition of adults and young proposed by Eggeling (8) for the different successional stages of the Budongo forest are shown diagrammatically at the bottom.

### Hypothesis 2: Disturbance drives diversity

#### **Intermediate Disturbance Hypothesis**



Connell, J. H. (1978). Diversity in tropical rain forests and coral reefs. *Science*, *199*(4335), 1302-1310.

Table 21.2 Seasonal patterns in bare space and species richness on boulders in each of three classes, categorized according to the force (in newtons) required to move them. (After Sousa, 1979b.)

Census date	Boulder class (N)	Percentage bare space	Species richness				
			Mean	Standard error	Range		
November 1975	< 49	78.0	1.7	0.18	1-4		
	50-294	26.5	3.7	0.28	2-7		
	> 294	11.4	2.5	0.25	1-6		
May 1976	< 49	66.5	1.9	0.19	1-5		
	50-294	35.9	4.3	0.34	2-6		
	> 294	4.7	3.5	0.26	1-6		
October 1976	<49	67.7	1.9	0.14	1-4		
	50-294	32.2	3.4	0.40	2-7		
	> 294	14.5	2.3	0.18	1-6		
May 1977	< 49	49.9	1.4	0.16	1-4		
	50-294	34.2	3.6	0.20	2-5		
	> 294	6.1	3.2	0.21	1-5		

Sousa, W. P. (1979). Disturbance in marine intertidal boulder fields: the nonequilibrium maintenance of species diversity. *Ecology*, *60*(6), 1225-1239.

#### **Hypothesis 3: Productivity Disturbance Balance**



Productivity



Huston, M. A. (2014). Disturbance, productivity, and species diversity: empiricism vs. logic in ecological theory. *Ecology*, *95*, 2382-2396.





(growth rate or productivity)

Huston, M. A. (2014). Disturbance, productivity, and species diversity: empiricism vs. logic in ecological theory. *Ecology*, *95*, 2382-2396.



(growth rate or productivity)

Huston, M. A. (2014). Disturbance, productivity, and species diversity: empiricism vs. logic in ecological theory. *Ecology*, *95*, 2382-2396.



(growth rate or productivity)

Huston, M. A. (2014). Disturbance, productivity, and species diversity: empiricism vs. logic in ecological theory. *Ecology*, *95*, 2382-2396.



Huston, M. A. (2014). Disturbance, productivity, and species diversity: empiricism vs. logic in ecological theory. *Ecology*, *95*, 2382-2396.



### **Community Diversity and Stability**

- 1. Diversity and stability of community STRUCTURE
- 2. Diversity and stability of community FUNCTION



### Stability of Community Structure Stability = Resistance + Resilience

**Resistance** measures the magnitude of disruption required to cause change **Resiliance** measures the tendency to return to original state if change does occur



High resistance, Low resilience

Low resistance, Low resilience

High resistance, High resilience

## Conventional View: High species richness INCREASES stability

**Functional redundancy** 



MacArthur, R. (1955). Fluctuations of animal populations and a measure of community stability. *Ecology*, *36*, 533-536.

## Challenging View: High species richness could DECREASE stability

Models with randomly assembled food webs, systematically varying:

**S** = **Species** richness

C = Connectance (links/species<sup>2</sup>) (links per possible link)

#### $\beta$ = Mean interaction strength

May, R. M. (2019). Stability and complexity in model ecosystems. Princeton University Press.









## Challenging View: High species richness could DECREASE stability

### $\beta \sqrt{SC} < 1$ Stable

### $\beta \sqrt{SC} > 1$ Unstable

May, R. M. (2019). Stability and complexity in model ecosystems. Princeton University Press.

## Resolution with empirical data: High species richness INCREASES stability

Fig. 2

Relationship between connectance and number of species

in African grassland samples.

1.0 0.5 -0.616 Interaction strength < 0.010.75 0.4 Connectance 0.3 0.50 0.2 p = -0.8310.25 < 0.001 0. 0 12 20 16 **Species richness** Species richness Fig. 1 relationship between average interaction strength among



MCNAUGHTON, S. Stability and diversity of ecological communities. Nature 274, 251–253

## Resolution with empirical data: High species richness INCREASES stability



Frank and McNaughton. 1991. Stability Increases with Diversity in Plant Communities: Empirical Evidence from the 1988 Yellowstone Drought. Oikos 62, 360 - 362.

# High species richness increases stability of ecosystem **FUNCTION**



McGrady-Steed, J., Harris, P. M., & Morin, P. J. (1997). Biodiversity regulates ecosystem predictability. *Nature*, *390*, 162-165.

				Initial species richness							
Trophic position	Organism	0	3	5	10	15	20	25	31		
Producers	Ankistrodesmus 1	(a)	с		a, c	а	а	а	а		
	Chlamydomonas	(a)	a, b	а-с	a-d	а	а	а	а		
	Diatom sp.			c, d	b, d						
	Euglena					а	а	а	a		
	Netrium					а	а		а		
	(Phacus)				а			а	a		
	(Peridinium)				а		а	а	a		
	Scenedesmus		d	a, d	b-d	а		а	a		
	Staurastrum			b	b-d		а	а	a		
Herbivores	Brachionus		с		с	а			а		
	Frontonia		d		a, d		а	а	a		
	Hypostome sp.		b	с	b		а	а	a		
	Stentor 1			b	b		а	а	a		
	Stylonychia			a, d	с		а	а	a		
Bacterivores	Aspidisca							а	a		
	(Amoeba)						а	•••••	a		
	(Coleps)						а		a		
	Colpidium			с	a, c	а	а	а	a		
	<i>Colpoda</i> sm.							а	a		
	<i>Colpoda</i> Ig.					••••••		а	a		
	Halteria		а		d	а	а	а	a		
	Gastrotrich sp.				a, d	а		•••••	a		
	Microflagellates	(a)	a-d	a-d	a-d	а	а	а	a		
	Monostyla			a	b		а	a	a		
	P. bursaria				b		а	а	a		
	Paramecium 2			d	a, d	а		а	a		
	Rotaria			b	с	а		а	a		
	Spirostomum				d	а		а	a		
Predators	Heliozoa sp.				b			а	а		
	(Oxytricha)				а	••••••	а	а	a		
	Stentor 2				с	а	а	a	a		
	(Urostyla)					а	а		a		

Letters a, b, c and d indicate the species composition of up to four different communities within each level of biodiversity. Taxa in parentheses failed to become established. Letters in parentheses in the 0 species treatment indicate organisms that contaminated microcosms originally containing only bacteria. Three other contaminants occurred sporadically in other treatments (2 amoebae and *Ankistrodesmus* 2).



Replicated microcosms – able to separate effects of species richness and the set of species present

