



HAL
open science

Foraging patterns of soil springtails are impacted by food resources

Matthieu Chauvat, Gabriel Perez, Jean-François Ponge

► **To cite this version:**

Matthieu Chauvat, Gabriel Perez, Jean-François Ponge. Foraging patterns of soil springtails are impacted by food resources. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 2014, 82, pp.72-77. 10.1016/j.apsoil.2014.05.012 . hal-01009691

HAL Id: hal-01009691

<https://hal.science/hal-01009691>

Submitted on 18 Jun 2014

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Public Domain

1 **Foraging patterns of soil springtails are impacted by food resources**

2

3

4 Matthieu CHAUVAT^{1*}, Gabriel PEREZ¹, Jean-François PONGE²

5 ¹ Normandie Univ, EA 1293 ECODIV-Rouen, SFR SCALE, UFR Sciences et Techniques, 76821

6 Mont Saint Aignan Cedex, France

7 ² Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, CNRS UMR 7179, 4 avenue du Petit-Château, 91800

8 Brunoy, France

9

10

11 *Corresponding author at Normandie Univ, EA 1293 ECODIV-Rouen, SFR SCALE, UFR

12 Sciences et Techniques, 76821 Mont Saint Aignan Cedex, France Phone: +33 2 32769441;

13 Email: matthieu.chauvat@univ-rouen.fr

14

15

16

17

18

19 **ABSTRACT**

20 Movement of soil microarthropods associated to searching or foraging behaviour has
21 received scanty attention and remained largely unexplored. However, rare studies on soil
22 Collembola suggested that their exploratory behaviour is an important feature of population
23 dynamics. In the current study based on a microcosm experiment we tested the influence of
24 food sources tied to a distant patch on the foraging behaviour of springtails. The microcosms
25 consisted of five separate 5 cm sections bound together. Only the last part of the
26 microcosms (section 5) differentiated the 3 treatments with no food (C), microflora (M) or
27 microflora + plant (M+P). Collembola were introduced into the first section. The mean
28 covered distance of total collembolan differed between all the treatments. It continuously
29 increased from 0.9 (\pm 0.3) cm in C through 4.7 (\pm 1.0) cm in M to 7.4 (\pm 1.2) cm within M+P.
30 Concomitantly, the mean covered distance was also influenced by the factor "life-form" with
31 on average 7.3 cm covered by the epedaphic species which was 73.8% more than
32 hemiedaphic and 82.5% more than euedaphic. Even if differences between life-forms were
33 detected, our results also revealed differences of exploratory pattern between species
34 belonging to the same life-form. Our study clearly shows that springtails are reactive to the
35 quality of their environment, in particular food sources.

36

37 Keywords : Movement, Life-forms, Collembola, Microcosm

38

39 1. INTRODUCTION

40 Studying the movement *sensu lato* of organisms is a key topic in ecology (Dieckmann et
41 al., 1999; Levin et al., 2003). Processes like migration, dispersal or foraging influence the
42 dynamics of populations, the distribution and abundance of species and therefore the
43 community structure. Migration is furthermore known to be involved in speciation processes
44 and in the evolution of life-history traits (Winker, 2000). Consequently movements of
45 organisms affect ecosystem functioning by modifying living assemblages and the nature and
46 strength of biotic relationships. One main reason that forces organisms to move, explore or
47 disperse is foraging. For example, animals can be attracted by the odour of their food
48 (Auclerc et al., 2010; Salmon and Ponge, 2001). They may also be forced to move owing to
49 overcrowding or antagonism from competing species (Ronce, 2007).

50 Many data and models of foraging, dispersal or migration are now available for many
51 organisms (Nathan, 2001). However, with the exception of a few groups like ants (Lenoir,
52 2003) or soil living-herbivores (Schallhart et al., 2011), movement associated to searching or
53 foraging behaviour within the soil has received scanty attention and remained largely
54 unexplored (Hassall et al., 2006; Mathieu et al., 2010). However, rare studies on soil animals
55 suggested that their searching and foraging behaviour is an important feature of population
56 dynamics (Bengtsson et al., 1994a; Bengtsson et al., 2002b; MacMillan et al., 2009).

57 Collembola constitute a dominant, well investigated and diverse soil microarthropod
58 group. Many studies have proven the direct or indirect contribution of Collembola to
59 belowground functioning such as N mineralisation, soil respiration or leaching of dissolved
60 organic carbon (Filser, 2002). Many indirect effects of Collembola on soil processes operate
61 through interactions with the microflora. Several studies highlighted that Collembola critically
62 depend on food sources provided by the soil microflora (Hopkin, 1997).

63 Gisin (1943) described three typical soil collembolan life-forms based on morphology and
64 habitat. Briefly, epedaphic species are usually large bodied species, have a high metabolic
65 activity, consume a food substrate of a high quality and are surface-dwellers. Conversely,
66 euedaphic species are deep-living species that consume low-quality food and have a low
67 metabolic activity. Euedaphic species are small-sized, colorless with reduced appendices
68 (e.g. furca, antennae, leg). Finally, the hemiedaphic group includes species sharing
69 intermediate attributes (Petersen, 2002; Rusek, 1989). Collembolan assemblages are thus
70 well-structured on a vertical spatial scale matching the resources dispatched by plants either
71 above- (litterfall) or belowground (roots and root exudates).

72 While several studies focused on the dispersal of springtails (Auclerc et al., 2009;
73 Bengtsson et al., 2002a; Ojala and Huhta, 2001), few focused on foraging (Bengtsson and
74 Rundgren, 1988; Bengtsson et al., 1994b; Hagvar, 2000). According to the fact that dispersal
75 capacity relates beside other factors to locomotor activity, comparatively large epedaphic
76 springtails with good jumping skills and well-developed legs should be more efficient
77 foragers than euedaphic species. However, species with directional sense perception may
78 also have a high probability to forage successfully (Mitchell, 1970).

79 In the current study based on a microcosm experiment we thus wanted to test the
80 influence of two food sources tied to a distant patch on the foraging behaviour of springtails.

81

82 2. MATERIAL & METHODS

83

84 2.1 Microcosm setup

85 2.1.1 Substrate

86 The substrate used was sourced from a deciduous forest (*Fagus sylvatica*) located within
87 the Campus of the University of Rouen. The soil was an endogleyic dystric Luvisol (FAO)
88 developed on more than 80 cm of loess (lamellated siltloam) lying on clay with flints. The
89 humus form is a dysmoder. The C:N ratio of the A horizon was of about 15.3 and the pH H₂O
90 3.9. We collected on a square meter the F and H organic horizons of the topsoil. Once in the
91 laboratory, one part of the organic substrate collected was used in the microcosms and
92 another part served to collect the Collembola to be introduced within them as explained
93 below.

94 The microcosms, adapted from a previous experiment on nematodes (MacMillan et al.,
95 2009), were made of 5 plastic tubes arranged in a row-like configuration (total length 25 cm,
96 diameter 5 cm). Each plastic tube corresponds to a section (numbered 1 to 5) bound
97 together with adhesive tape, and sealed at each end with a plastic cap to prevent escape of
98 animals (Fig. 1). For all tests, the organic substrate filling the compartments 1 to 5 of the
99 microcosms was first sterilized by autoclaving at 105°C with two successive cycles of 1h
100 separated by 24h, then was sieved at 5 mm and carefully mixed before filling the different
101 sections.

102 Only the last part of the microcosms (section 5) differentiated the treatments:

- 103 - In the “microflora bio-assay”, abbreviated M in the following text, the sterilised
104 organic substrate dedicated to section 5 was reinoculated with soil microflora. A
105 suspension of soil microflora was obtained after shaking 500 g of fresh organic

106 substrate with 2.5 L of distilled water during 1h. The suspension was then filtered in
107 two successive steps: first at 250 µm and then using filters for qualitative microbial
108 analysis (DURIEUX n°149). Ten millilitres of this suspension were transferred into
109 each section 5. This was repeated three times waiting 12h between each inoculate.
110 The same amount of distilled water was added to the other sections.

111 - In the “microflora+plant bio-assay”, abbreviated M+P in the following text, one week
112 after reinoculation of microflora, a plant (*Hyacinthoides non-scripta* (L.) Chouard ex
113 Rothm., 1944) was added to section 5. Plants of the same morphology, around 10 cm
114 tall, were collected in the forest, their roots were washed with distilled water and
115 slightly cut to homogenise their morphology.

116 - In the “control bio-assay”, abbreviated C in the following text, no further treatment
117 was applied to the substrate of the section 5 compared to compartments 1 to 4. In
118 each section of the control bio-essay, ten millimetres of distilled water was added
119 three times as it was done in the two previous bio-assays.

120 The tubes used for the sections 5 were also pierced (1.5 cm in diameter) on top to allow
121 introduction of the microflora suspension and the plants. Whatever the treatments, the
122 section 5 was separated from section 4 with a fine-mesh (20 µm) plastic gauze to minimize
123 or exclude propagation of soil biota (microflora and roots) to adjacent compartments. In
124 each microcosm one centimetre was left empty between the substrate and the top of the
125 tubes to allow movement of surface dwelling collembolans. Four replicate microcosms were
126 used per treatment.

127

128 2.1.2 Introduction of Collembola

129 From the non-sterilised part of the organic substrate collected, Collembola were
130 extracted alive using the dry funnel method above trays filled with moist clay as collectors
131 and then were transferred using a pooter to sections 1 through a hole (1.2 cm diameter)
132 pierced on top of the tubes. After springtails were introduced, the hole was closed with a
133 plastic plug caps. The amount of substrate used for extracting Collembola corresponded to
134 the amount of substrate used to fill in the sections 1 plus 50% to obviate for mortality during
135 the transfer into the microcosms. Because it is known that death odour is repellent for
136 Collembola (Nilsson and Bengtsson, 2004), a two-week period was left before introducing
137 them into the microcosms.

138 The microcosms were incubated at room temperature for 12 days. We selected this time
139 lapse because to the light of preliminary experiments 12-day was judged enough to allow
140 migration but not reproduction to occur. However, we cannot rule out that some deposition
141 and hatching of eggs deposited in the meantime by fertile females probably occurred,
142 thereby increasing the error but not the treatment effect. The sections were then carefully
143 separated and the collembolans were recovered from them by the dry-funnel method,
144 counted and determined at species level following several keys (Gisin, 1960; Hopkin, 2007).
145 The soil water content in the different microcosms was determined by drying 5 g of soil at
146 105 °C for 48 h (Alef and Nannipieri, 1995). Furthermore, at the end of the experiment, the
147 microbial C biomass (C_{mic}) of sections 5 was determined by means of the fumigation-
148 extraction method (Jenkinson and Powlson, 1976). Before and after fumigation, 20 g of fresh
149 soil was shaken for 1 h in a solution of K₂SO₄ at 0.05 M then filtered at 0.45 µm and
150 analysed for dissolved organic C on a Shimadzu-TOC-L series.

151

152 **2.2 Data Analysis**

153 For each treatment, we determined the exploratory behaviour of each species, then of
154 each life-form and finally of the whole assemblage, using the following calculation:

$$155 \text{ Exploratory behaviour} = (n_2 + n_3 + n_4) / N * 100$$

156 Where n_i = number of individuals recovered in section i , and N = total number of individuals
157 within the microcosm.

158 In parallel we also evaluated the Collembola movement according to the following formula:

$$159 \text{ Mean covered distance} = p_1*d_1 + p_2*d_2 + p_3*d_3 + p_4*d_4$$

160 Where p_i = proportion of individuals in section i from the total recovered in sections 1-4, and
161 d_i = distance from the application point to the centre of section i .

162 For each level of observation (assemblage, life-form and species of Collembola) the
163 impact of the factor "Treatment" upon the exploratory behaviour and the mean covered
164 distance was tested by means of General Linear Models (GLM). GLM with single categorical
165 predictor can be called a one-way Anova design. The same test was applied for the microbial
166 C biomass and the soil water content.

167 For each treatment, differences between the percentages of Collembola recovered within
168 each section were tested by GLM with Section as fixed factor. Prior to analyses, percentage
169 data were arcsin transformed. In all cases, significant differences between means were
170 tested at the 5% level using the Tukey HSD test. All statistical analyses were performed with
171 the STATISTICA® software package (version 7.0, Statsoft®, Tulsa, OK).

172

173 3. RESULTS

174 The microbial C biomass differed between the treatments ($F = 38.1$, $p < 0.0001$) with on
175 average almost 18 times more C_{mic} in the M+P treatment than in the Control and twice
176 more than in the M treatment (Fig. 2). In opposite, no difference of soil water content could
177 be established between the treatments ($F = 0.907$, $p = 0.44$) with an overall mean (\pm SD) of
178 $53.2 (\pm 2.6)$ % of dry weight.

179 There were no significant differences between the treatments regarding the total amount
180 of springtails recovered from the microcosms ($F = 2.25$, $p = 0.16$) with an overall mean (\pm SD)
181 of $76.1 (\pm 15.4)$ individuals per microcosm.

182

183 3.1 Collembolan Assemblages

184 The mean (\pm SD) exploratory behaviour in the control bio-assay (C) was of $15.3\% (\pm 5.3)$
185 and increased to $62.0\% (\pm 11.5)$ in the microflora treatment (M) and to $78.7\% (\pm 5.6)$ in the
186 microflora+plant treatment (M+P).

187 The mean covered distance of total collembolan differed between all the treatments ($F =$
188 50.37 , $p < 0.001$). It continuously increased from $0.9 (\pm 0.3)$ cm in C through $4.7 (\pm 1.0)$ cm in
189 M to $7.4 (\pm 1.2)$ cm within M+P.

190 The amount of collembolan found in the different sections differed in the C and the M
191 treatment ($F = 302.6$, $p < 0.001$ and $F = 11.8$, $p < 0.001$, respectively). In C, only less than 3%
192 of the springtails moved beyond the section 2 (Fig. 3A). When adding microflora in the fifth
193 separated section, a maximum of individuals was found in section 2 (about 40% of the total
194 amount). Still in M, the percentage of collembolans recovered in sections 1 and 2 did not
195 differ but both were significantly higher than in sections 3 and 4. A total of 25% of the

196 collembolans were found in these two last sections (Fig. 3B). In M+P, a similar percentage of
197 individuals was recovered in all sections ($F = 3.1$, $p > 0.05$; Fig. 3C).

198

199 **3.2 Life-forms**

200 The factor “life-form” had a significant effect on the exploratory behaviour ($F = 13.83$; $p <$
201 0.001). Epedaphic collembolans had an overall exploratory behaviour of 76.2% significantly
202 higher than both hemiedaphic and euedaphic, with similar values of 56.5% and 48.4%,
203 respectively.

204 The different life-forms showed a similar pattern of exploratory behaviour across the
205 treatments. Each life-form had similar values in both M and M+P, being twice higher for
206 epedaphic and 5 to 6 times higher for hemiedaphic and euedaphic than in C (Table 1).
207 Concomitantly, the mean covered distance was also influenced by the factor “life-form” ($F =$
208 22.2 , $p < 0.001$) with on average 7.3 cm covered by the epedaphic which was 73.8% more
209 than for hemiedaphic and 82.5% more than euedaphic. The mean distance covered by the
210 epedaphic was almost twice higher in M and M+P than in C (Fig. 4). The same pattern was
211 obtained for the euedaphic springtails with 7.1 (± 0.8) cm covered in M+P and only 0.6 (\pm
212 0.2) cm covered in C. Finally the distance covered by the hemiedaphic was different for each
213 bio-assay ranging from 0.9 (± 0.3) cm in C to 7.6 (± 1.7) cm in M+P. While strong differences
214 existed in the mean distance covered between the life-forms in the C and M treatments,
215 these differences disappeared in M+P (Fig. 4).

216

217 **3.3 Species-level**

218 Four different groups of species could be distinguished according to their exploratory
219 response to the treatments (Table 2). Group 1 was made of species showing a foraging

220 pattern (mean covered distance) that did not differ between the treatments: *Mesaphorura*
221 *macrochaeta* and *Friesea truncata*. On average (\pm SD), species of this group covered a
222 distance of 4.2 (\pm 2.7) cm. *Lepidocyrtus lanuginosus*, *Entomobrya multifasciata*, *Sminthurinus*
223 *signatus*, and *Folsomia quadrioculata* belong to a second group with a mean distance
224 covered significantly modified by the addition of food resources but without differences
225 between M and M+P treatments. In the control treatment, members of this group covered
226 on average (\pm SD) a distance of 2.3 (\pm 1.0) cm, while in M and M+P considered together they
227 covered a mean (\pm SD) distance of 7.8 (\pm 1.1) cm. The group 3 was only made of
228 *Protaphorura armata* which was only affected by the M+P treatment. While in C and M
229 considered together, *P. armata* covered a mean (\pm SD) distance of 0.9 (\pm 1.8) cm, the
230 addition of a plant (M+P) increased its movement to reach an average (\pm SD) distance of 7.9
231 (\pm 3.2) cm. Finally the fourth group was made of species showing significantly different mean
232 distances covered for each treatment: *Isotomiella minor* and *Parisotoma notabilis*.

233

234 **4. DISCUSSION**

235 Movements of animals can be considered over a wide range of spatial and temporal
236 scales. In large-scale movements they migrate in response to a deteriorating habitat,
237 optimum breeding conditions or physiological signals, basically independent of resource
238 limitation. Passive dispersal has been also advocated to explain large-scale dispersal of
239 collembolans (Hawes, 2008). Small-scale movements, covering only a small part of a
240 population, are often due to local resource limitations (e.g. space or food) and may be
241 triggered by feeding activities or by intraspecific antagonisms (Bowler and Benton, 2005;
242 Bullock et al., 2002; Clobert et al., 2001). Our study clearly demonstrates the importance of
243 foraging behaviour, based on distant patch quality recognition, for the movement of

244 collembolans. The absence of food at a distant point leads to almost no exploratory
245 behaviour of springtails. However, enriching the last part of our devices with a food item had
246 a significant effect on the distribution of Collembola. Collembolans are known to move
247 towards sources of CO₂, which they locate in a similar way as plant parasitic nematodes find
248 CO₂-emitting roots in soil (Klinger, 1965). This may explain the higher dispersal distance
249 covered by Collembola when a plant was introduced in the distant section. Furthermore, the
250 higher microbial C biomass in the M+P treatment may also, through a higher amount of
251 volatile compounds, be responsible for the higher attraction of springtails. The highest mean
252 dispersal distance estimated in our study (4.3 cm/week) is in the range of values reported
253 previously in forest soil (Ojala and Huhta, 2001). This may indicate that our design did not
254 cause a strong bias in springtails behaviour, at least at the community level.

255 According to morphological traits of collembolan life-forms, a positive gradient of
256 efficient dispersal is often observed from euedaphic to epedaphic species (Ojala and Huhta,
257 2001). This is only partly supported by our data. Epedaphic species had the highest mean
258 dispersal distance whatever the treatment, but no difference was found between the mean
259 dispersal distance of euedaphic and hemiedaphic species in the different treatments.
260 Apparently, as stated by Sjögren (1997), jumping abilities of springtails species do not fully
261 correlate to their dispersal rates. Interestingly, however, the exploratory behaviour of
262 epedaphic species was weakly impacted by the different treatments while the addition of
263 different food resources strongly modified the patterns of both hemi- and euedaphic
264 species. Mechanisms responsible for migration of epedaphic species might differ from those
265 in play for the two other life-forms. Epedaphic species, living in a fluctuating environment in
266 opposite to hemi or euedaphic, are rather considered as r species. Such strategists are often
267 good dispersers and pioneer species with therefore an exploratory behaviour not necessarily

268 directed toward a more favourable habitat. However our design, specifically the humified
269 substrate used, offered rather unnatural conditions to epedaphic species compared to hemi
270 and euedaphic species. This may have affected their behaviour and consequently their
271 movement. It is thus difficult to conclude if we underestimated the distance they could
272 covered due to the disadvantage of the substrate or if we overestimated it because they
273 wanted to get away from this unnatural condition. Our results regarding this life-form might
274 thus be interpreted with caution.

275 Even if differences between life-forms were detected, our results also revealed
276 differences of exploratory pattern between species classified into the same life-form. For
277 example, half of the euedaphic species had a similar average distance of dispersal between
278 the three treatments while the other half showed strong differences of distance covered
279 between the treatments. This supports the view of several authors (Hågvar, 1983; Sjögren,
280 1997) concluding that morphologically equal species can show very different dispersal rates.
281 Feeding behaviour may be an important point in this respect. Through a stable isotope
282 approach, three feeding guilds in springtails were distinguished not correlated to life-forms
283 (Chahartaghi et al., 2005): phycophages/herbivores, primary decomposers and secondary
284 decomposers. According to data given by these authors, our four groups do not correspond
285 to the food habits revealed by $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ signatures, because our group 2 (migration affected by
286 food resources) was made of both primary and secondary decomposers. This can be
287 explained by the fact that in our experiment species with longer legs and furcula moved over
288 longer distances, which was also shared by species strongly attracted to microbes and/or
289 roots. Although our design was not purposed to demonstrate it, our results point to a
290 behavioural trade-off between dispersal rate and attraction to food resources.

291 The distance covered by *Protaphorura armata*, one of the few euedaphic species to be
292 phytophagous (Hopkin, 1997), was highest when a plant was introduced in a distant patch.
293 Bengtsson et al. 1994a also found *P. armata* to be attracted by mycorrhizal fungi. By
294 contrast, *Friesea truncata* a predatory euedaphic species, covered the same distance
295 whatever the treatment. Although not significant, *F. truncata* showed a slight tendency to
296 cover a higher distance in the microflora and plant treatment. It is probable that this species
297 feeding on eggs of collembolan (Hopkin 1997) started to respond to the overall collembolan
298 movement and that extending the experiment would have reinforced this process.
299 Nevertheless besides feeding behaviour, size should also be considered. For example,
300 *Mesaphorura macrochaeta*, though known as fungivorous only showed a tendency to
301 migrate more when a food source was tied at a distant patch. The very small size of *M.*
302 *macrochaeta* (the smallest species of our experiment) and thus its low active mobility might
303 explain this pattern. Finally, differences of pattern between quite similar species in terms of
304 ecology, for example *Parisotoma notabilis* and *Folsomia quadrioculata*, are interesting to
305 notice, because rather unexpected. However, Ojala et al. 2001 also found that *F.*
306 *quadrioculata* covers lower distance, by 34%, than *P. notabilis* in field conditions. Biotic
307 interactions (intra or interspecific) may also surely play a role. Bengtsson et al. 2002
308 documented a positive relationship between conspecific density and migration pattern of a
309 soil collembolan. Our study was not design to test for this specific factor, but it may have
310 played a role on the observed pattern. Furthermore we cannot exclude the fact that our
311 design favoured or in contrary disadvantaged the movement of several species. For example,
312 it is known that juveniles and adults may have very different behaviour and dispersal
313 patterns (Ronce, 2007).

314 Despite abovementioned limitations of laboratory experimental designs, which can never
315 reproduce the real environment of soil animal communities, our study revealed that the
316 presence of food (roots and/or microflora) influenced the migration of collembolan species
317 which differ according to the four criteria: morphology, life-form, feeding guild and dispersal
318 rate. We showed that none of them fully explained the active foraging of species placed at
319 distance from a food source, pointing to species-specific response patterns that can only be
320 explained by a combination of several criteria. Awaiting more complete screening, Table 2,
321 although based on a little number of species, can be suggested as a guide for field functional
322 ecologists.

323

324

325 **Acknowledgements**

326 The study was carried out within the context of the TRACES project funded by the French
327 Ministry of Ecology, Energy and Sustainable Development (MEEDDM) through the GESSOL 3
328 2009 call for projects. We thank all project partners, as well as the members of the Ecodiv
329 lab (Normandie Univ, Rouen) for invaluable technical assistance and stimulating discussions.

330

331 **REFERENCES**

- 332 Alef, K., Nannipieri, P., 1995. Methods in applied soil microbiology and biochemistry.
333 Academic Press, London.
- 334 Auclerc, A., Libourel, P.A., Salmon, S., Bels, V., Ponge, J.F., 2010. Assessment of movement
335 patterns in *Folsomia candida* (Hexapoda: Collembola) in the presence of food. *Soil Biol.*
336 *Biochem.* 42, 657-659.
- 337 Auclerc, A., Ponge, J.F., Barot, S., Dubs, F., 2009. Experimental assessment of habitat
338 preference and dispersal ability of soil springtails. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 41, 1596-
339 1604.
- 340 Bengtsson, G., Hedlund, K., Rundgren, S., 1994a. Food- and density-dependent dispersal:
341 Evidence from a soil collembolan. *J. Animal Ecol.* 63, 513-520.
- 342 Bengtsson, G., Rundgren, S., 1988. the Gusum case: a brass mill and the distribution of soil
343 Collembola. *Can. J. Zool.* 66, 1518-1526.
- 344 Bengtsson, G., Rundgren, S., Sjögren, M., 1994b. Modelling dispersal distances in a soil
345 gradient: the influence of metal resistance, competition, and experience. *Oikos* 71, 13-23.
- 346 Bengtsson, G., Rydén, T., Öhrn, M.S., Wiktorsson, M., 2002a. Statistical analysis of the
347 influence of conspecifics on the dispersal of a soil collembola. *Theoretical Population*
348 *Biology* 61, 97-113.
- 349 Bengtsson, G., Rydén, T., Öhrn, M.S., Wiktorsson, M., 2002b. Statistical Analysis of the
350 Influence of Conspecifics on the Dispersal of a Soil Collembola. *Theoretical Population*
351 *Biology* 61, 97-113.
- 352 Bowler, D.E., Benton, T.G., 2005. Causes and consequences of animal dispersal strategies:
353 relating individual behaviour to spatial dynamics. *Biol. Rev.* 80, 205-225.

354 Bullock, J.M., Kenward, R.E., Hails, R.S., 2002. *Dispersal Ecology*. Blackwell Science Ltd,
355 Oxford, UK.

356 Chahartaghi, M., Langel, R., Scheu, S., Ruess, L., 2005. Feeding guilds in Collembola based on
357 nitrogen stable isotope ratios. *Soil Biol. Biochem* 37, 1718-1725.

358 Clobert, J., Danchin, E., Dohndt, A.A., Nichols, J.D., 2001. *Dispersal*. Oxford University Press,
359 Oxford, UK.

360 Dieckmann, U., O'Hara, B., Weisser, W., 1999. The evolutionary ecology of dispersal. *Trends*
361 *in Ecology and Evolution* 14, 88-90.

362 Filser, J., 2002. The role of Collembola in carbon and nitrogen cycling in soil. *Pedobiologia* 46,
363 234-245.

364 Gisin, H., 1960. *Collembolenfauna Europas*. Museum d'histoire Naturelle, Genf.

365 Hagvar, S., 2000. Navigation and behaviour of four Collembola species migrating on the
366 snow surface. *Pedobiologia* 44, 221-233.

367 Hågvar, S., 1983. Collembola in Norwegian coniferous forest soils - II. Vertical distribution.
368 *Pedobiologia* 25, 383-401.

369 Hassall, M., Adl, S., Berg, M., Griffiths, B., Scheu, S., 2006. Soil fauna–microbe interactions:
370 towards a conceptual framework for research. *European Journal of Soil Biology* 42,
371 Supplement 1, S54-S60.

372 Hawes, T.C., 2008. Aeolian fallout on recently deglaciated terrain in the high Arctic. *Polar Biol*
373 31, 295-301.

374 Hopkin, S., 1997. *Biology of the springtails - Insecta: Collembola*. Oxford University Press,
375 New York.

376 Hopkin, S.P., 2007. *A key to the Collembola (springtails) of Britain and Ireland*. Field Studies
377 Council.

378 Jenkinson, D.S., Powelson, D.S., 1976. The effect of biocidal treatments on metabolism in soil -
379 I. Fumigation with chloroform. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 8, 167-177.

380 Klinger, J., 1965. On the orientation of plant Nematodes and of some other soil animals
381 *Nematologica* 11, 4-18.

382 Lenoir, L., 2003. Response of the foraging behaviour of red wood ants (*Formica rufa* group)
383 to exclusion from trees. *Agricultural and Forest Entomology* 5, 183-189.

384 Levin, S.A., Muller-Landau, H.C., Nathan, R., Chave, J., 2003. The ecology and evolution of
385 seed dispersal: A theoretical perspective. *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and*
386 *Systematics* 34, 575-604.

387 MacMillan, K., Haukeland, S., Rae, R., Young, I., Crawford, J., Hapca, S., Wilson, M., 2009.
388 Dispersal patterns and behaviour of the nematode *Phasmarhabditis hermaphrodita* in
389 mineral soils and organic media. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 41, 1483-1490.

390 Mathieu, J., Barot, S., Blouin, M., Caro, G., Decaens, T., Dubs, F., Dupont, L., Jouquet, P., Nai,
391 P., 2010. Habitat quality, conspecific density, and habitat pre-use affect the dispersal
392 behaviour of two earthworm species, *Aporrectodea icterica* and *Dendrobaena veneta*, in
393 a mesocosm experiment. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 42, 203-209.

394 Mitchell, R., 1970. An analysis of dispersal in mites. *The American Naturalist* 104, 425-431.

395 Nathan, R., 2001. The challenges of studying dispersal. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 16,
396 491-493.

397 Nilsson, E., Bengtsson, G., 2004. Death odour changes movement pattern of a *Collembola*.
398 *Oikos* 104, 509-517.

399 Ojala, R., Huhta, V., 2001. Dispersal of microarthropods in forest soil. *Pedobiologia* 45, 443-
400 450.

401 Petersen, H., 2002. General aspects of collembolan ecology at the turn of the millennium.
402 *Pedobiologia* 46, 246-260.

403 Ronce, O., 2007. How Does It Feel to Be Like a Rolling Stone? Ten Questions About Dispersal
404 Evolution. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* 38, 231-253.

405 Rusek, J., 1989. Ecology of Collembola, in: Dallai, R. (Ed.), 3rd International Seminar on
406 Apterygota. Univ. Siena Press, Siena, pp. 271-281.

407 Salmon, S., Ponge, J.F., 2001. Earthworm excreta attract soil springtails: laboratory
408 experiments on *Heteromurus nitidus* (Collembola: Entomobryidae). *Soil Biol. Biochem* 33,
409 1959-1969.

410 Schallhart, N., Tusch, M.J., Staudacher, K., Wallinger, C., Traugott, M., 2011. Stable isotope
411 analysis reveals whether soil-living elaterid larvae move between agricultural crops. *Soil*
412 *Biology and Biochemistry* 43, 1612-1614.

413 Sjögren, M., 1997. Dispersal rates of Collembola in metal polluted soil. *Pedobiologia* 41, 506-
414 513.

415 Winker, K., 2000. Evolution: Migration and speciation. *Nature* 404, 36-36.

416

417

418 **Table 1:** Mean exploratory behaviour (in percentage) with standard deviations of
 419 collembolan life-forms within three treatments corresponding to different food sources tied
 420 to a distant patch. Means of the same life-form sharing identical letters are not significantly
 421 different (Tukey HSD test). C: control; M: microflora treatment; M+P: microflora and plant
 422 treatment. Ep: Epedaphic, He: Hemiedaphic, Eu: Euedaphic.

	Treatments		
	C	M	M+P
Epedaphic	45.6 ^B (26.5)	91.1 ^A (6.0)	91.2 ^A (6.8)
Hemiedaphic	17.2 ^B (5.8)	66.4 ^A (21.2)	86.0 ^A (7.9)
Euedaphic	11.3 ^B (4.4)	58.9 ^A (6.9)	74.9 ^A (5.0)

423

424 **Table 2:** Mean covered distance (in cm) with standard deviations of different collembolan
 425 species covered after 12 days within three treatments corresponding to different food
 426 sources tied to a distant patch. Species are grouped according to their response pattern.
 427 Means of the same species sharing identical letters are not significantly different (Tukey HSD
 428 test; P level of significance: n.s. = not significant; ** = < 0.01; *** = < 0.001). C: control; M:
 429 microflora treatment; M+P: microflora and plant treatment. Ep: Epedaphic, He:
 430 Hemiedaphic, Eu: Euedaphic.

Group	Species	Life- form	F	P	C	M	M+P
1	<i>Mesaphorura macrochaeta</i>	Eu	3.2	n.s.	2.0 ^A (1.0)	5.4 ^A (3.4)	6.0 ^A (2.2)
	<i>Friesea truncata</i>	Eu	4.2	n.s.	1.1 ^A (1.3)	5.2 ^A (2.7)	4.2 ^A (2.0)
2	<i>Lepidocyrtus Lanuginosus</i>	Ep	8.9	**	5.7 ^B (2.3)	11.2 ^A (1.0)	10.6 ^A (2.5)
	<i>Entomobrya multifasciata</i>	Ep	8.3	**	1.9 ^B (2.2)	7.2 ^A (1.6)	6.9 ^A (2.4)
	<i>Folsomia quadrioculata</i>	He	66.0	***	0.6 ^B (0.3)	4.3 ^A (0.8)	4.8 ^A (0.6)
	<i>Sminthurinus signatus</i>	He	22.6	***	0.9 ^B (1.2)	7.8 ^A (2.5)	9.9 ^A (1.9)
3	<i>Protaphorura armata</i> gr.	Eu	12.9	**	0.0 ^B (0.0)	1.7 ^B (2.4)	7.9 ^A (3.2)
4	<i>Isotomiella minor</i>	Eu	70.1	***	0.8 ^C (0.6)	4.4 ^B (0.9)	9.3 ^A (1.5)
	<i>Parisotoma notabilis</i>	He	92.7	***	0.2 ^C (0.3)	3.8 ^B (0.8)	10.9 ^A (1.7)

431

Figure 1
[Click here to download Figure: Fig.1.eps](#)




Figure 2
[Click here to download Figure: Fig 2 as is.xlsx](#)




Figure 3
[Click here to download Figure: Fig 3 as is.xlsx](#)







Figure 4
[Click here to download Figure: Fig 4 as is.xlsx](#)



APPENDIX 1

Mean (and SD) number of Collembola found in each section (1 to 4) of the microcosms according to the different food sources placed at a distant point (section 5). C : control bio-assays ; M : microflora bio-assays ; M+ P : microflora and plant bio-assays

Section	C	M	M+P
1	72 (22.2)	26.8 (6.0)	17.8 (3.4)
2	10.3 (2.2)	26.8 (8.7)	23.5 (7.4)
3	1 (0.8)	13 (5.4)	27.3 (5.2)
4	1 (0.8)	5.5 (3.1)	16.3 (8.6)
Total	84.3 (21.7)	72 (9.5)	84.9 (13.2)