Informative title

Plant protection habits among Hungarian farmers and garden owners and their implications for pollinator protection

Concise title

Pesticide use and pollinator support in Hungarian plant growers

Zsófia Varga-Szilay[1*], Gábor Pozsgai[2]

[1]Doctoral School of Biology, Institute of Biology, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

[2]cE3c – Centre for Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Changes/Azorean Biodiversity Group, CHANGE – Global Change and Sustainability Institute, Departamento de Ciências e Engenharia do Ambiente, Universidade dos Açores, Açores, Portugal

*Corresponding author: Zsófia Varga-Szilay, Doctoral School of Biology, Institute of Biology, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, 1117 Budapest, Hungary, email: zsofia@vargaszilay.hu, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9712-7654

Abstract

Pesticides are one of the most important anthropogenic-related stressors. In times of global pollinator decline, the role of integrated farming and that of urban gardens in supporting wild pollinators is becoming increasingly important. We circulated an online questionnaire to survey the plant protection practices among Hungarian farmers and garden owners with a particular emphasis on pollinator protection. We found that plant growers heavily rely on pesticide use, and pesticides are widely used in otherwise pollinator-friendly gardens. Whether pesticide use practices were driven by expert opinion and the respondents' sex were the best predictors of pesticide use. Although most respondents supported pollinators, pesticides are also widely used among home garden owners, which can pose a non-evident ecological trap for pollinator populations in the gardens. Special attention should be paid to implementing measures to reduce pesticide, use not only in farmlands but also in home gardens. Environmental education and financial support through agroecological schemes could efficiently promote the transition. However, whereas farmers can be encouraged to reduce pesticide use mostly by expert advice, garden owners are likely to rely on more conventional information channels. The attitude of Hungarian plant growers can provide an insight into pesticide use practices of Central and Eastern European countries, but similar surveys are needed across Europe for a complete understanding of broad-scale processes. This work lays the foundations for similar studies which can inform and facilitate the transformation processes to pesticide-free farming and gardening.

Keywords: pest management, plant growing practices, synthetic pesticides, neonicotinoids, pollinator-friendly gardens, ecological trap

Introduction

In the Anthropocene, biodiversity declines at an alarming pace. One of the important groups, the insects, is among the most impacted (e.g. Hallmann et al. 2017; Zattara and Aizen 2021). Insect declines pose a major threat to a variety of ecosystem functions and the delivery of the derived ecosystem services, all of which are vital to humans (Dangles and Casas 2019; Vanbergen and the Insect Pollinators Initiative 2013). One important ecosystem service, mostly provided by insects, is pollination (Hanley et al. 2015). Insect pollinators suffer from habitat fragmentation, reduction of flower resources, lack of nesting space, as well as from exposure to pesticides from agricultural activities (Baldock 2020; Goulson and Nicholls 2022; Potts et al. 2016). Despite their long-known negative effects on human and environmental health (Rani et al. 2021, Zaller 2020), pesticides are widely used both in industrial-scale farming and urban green areas and their application has even increased with agricultural intensification in recent decades (FAO 2021). Indeed, the spillover of chemical insecticide residues from farmland can negatively affect wild insect pollinators in adjacent natural and semi-natural areas (Botías et al. 2015; Krupke et al. 2012) causing direct mortality, behavioural abnormalities, and reduced reproduction rates (Pisa et al. 2015). Furthermore, the concomitant use of agrochemicals (pesticides and fertilisers) can cause an even more detrimental ‘cocktail effect’ to insect pollinators (Raimets et al. 2018; Siviter et al. 2021; Wernecke and Castle 2020). In fact, a combination of over sixteen different agrochemicals was detected in flying insects in nature conservation areas adjacent to agricultural lands across Germany (Brühl et al. 2021) and the USA (Main et al. 2020). Thus, agrochemicals are suggested to play a major role in driving global insect declines (Sánchez-Bayo and Wyckhuys 2019; Tooker and Pearsons 2021), particularly on farmlands (Emmerson et al. 2016).

To address biodiversity loss on farmlands, particularly that of pollinators, the European Commission created a farm strategy to cut the use of chemical pesticides in European countries (European Commission 2020) and the reduction or complete elimination of pesticide use has been advised by the scientific community (e.g. Goulson and Nicholls 2022). A number of modern synthetic pesticides have been banned (e.g. in the European Union all neonicotinoids except acetamiprid) after they have been proven to harm non-target insects (like bees) in addition to the pest species targetted. In fact, the transition to alternative agricultural practices is possible without yield losses (EPRS 2019) whilst pest damage can be reduced and farm profitability maintained after lowering, but not completely abandoning, pesticide use (Lechenet et al. 2017; Pecenka et al. 2021). Despite the increasing number of organic farms (European Commission n.d. a; Willer and Lernoud 2018) in the European Union, the process leading to biodiversity-friendly farming can take years because the current conventional plant protection strategies employed on non-organic farms still require synthetic pesticide input. Nevertheless, evidence suggests that these integrated efforts may be a first step toward maintaining healthy ecosystems. For example, management that promotes ecosystem services (such as biological control or pollination) can support high insect diversity in areas of agricultural mosaics (Grass et al. 2019). Moreover, even in conventionally managed farms, increasing the proportion of semi-natural habitats, such as hedges or field-edge flower strips, can dramatically increase the diversity of insects that are beneficial to agriculture, including that of pollinators (Gurr et al. 2017; Pywell et al. 2015). However, although increasing natural habitat areas or employing other integrated pest management approaches can lead to increased pollinator and other insect diversity, unless these ecosystem-based approaches are combined with pollinator-friendly management, their

positive effect will be reduced or completely eliminated by the use of synthetic pesticides (Brühl et al. 2022; Saqib et al. 2020; Tscharntke et al. 2021, 2022). Since socio-economic factors can dictate how rapidly the transition to pesticide-free farming unfolds, knowing farmers' approaches to these novel strategies is essential for future planning.

Whilst it may be difficult to achieve pesticide-free pest control within high-intensity farming (especially in monocultures), it may be a more feasible approach in small-scale farms and urban areas. Small-scale sustainable farming systems and well-planned urban green areas, such as biodiversity-friendly parks and allotments (community gardens), can mitigate pollinator declines (Baldock et al., 2019; Hülsmann et al., 2015). In fact, in a landscape mosaic with a high proportion of urban areas, organically managed parcels of land can maintain high biodiversity and serve as a source of native pollinators within a landscape where most land is not managed with the maintenance of biodiversity as a key goal (Holzschuh et al. 2008; Wray and Elle 2015).

Moreover, an increasing number of scientific papers support the premise that urban and suburban gardens function as refuges and local hotspots for biodiversity (Hall et al. 2017; Theodorou et al. 2020), and support diverse communities of insect pollinators, even in highly urbanised areas (Sirohi et al. 2015). Near-natural gardens can even support viable metapopulations of rare species (Baldock et al., 2015). However, the true conservation potential of human-altered areas for pollinators depends on the available floral resources, nesting and hiding spaces, and on the proportion of near natural areas that can be found in the urban landscape. These factors also determine the abundance and diversity of pollinator communities (Hülsmann et al. 2015; Wenzel et al. 2020).

Urban gardens may not be always beneficial for insect pollinators though. First, there is a wide selection of pesticides in shops and supermarkets that are targeted at

domestic users and which may be applied in otherwise pollinator-friendly gardens. Second, synthetic pesticides can also get into gardens unintentionally when ornamental plants sold as ‘bee-friendly’ in horticultures are treated with various fungicides and insecticides (Lentola et al. 2017). As a consequence, insects lured to supposedly bee-friendly gardens can be exposed to a number of synthetic pesticides (especially neonicotinoids) and their residues and this exposure, in turn, can lead to lethal and sublethal effects (Botías et al. 2017; Main et al. 2020). The process of banning synthetic pesticides for non-agricultural uses has already begun in some European countries (such as France (Garden Organic n.d.; PAN Europe 2019; PAN Europe n.d.)) but others, including Hungary, are lagging behind. Yet, we have no information on what proportion of private gardens are treated with chemical plant protection products.

There is a large knowledge gap in our understanding of how efficiently farmlands and urban and suburban gardens mitigate insect biodiversity loss at a country scale and how farmers and garden owners approach the transition away from the use of pesticides. Gaining insight into their management habits, motivations and willingness to change is vital for developing further action.

Thus, we conducted a survey to measure plant growers’ dependence on pesticides (highlighting acetamiprid-containing insecticides), particularly to investigate the pesticide application practices and the attitude towards protecting wild pollinators of those who own less than one hectare of land (henceforth home gardens or gardens). We focussed our work on Hungary, a typical, Central-Eastern European country with mainly conventional agriculture in which chemical and more hazardous pesticide use trends are likely to reflect those of general Europeans (European Commission n.d. b).

We aimed to investigate 1) what factors best predict pesticide use in agricultural areas and to what extent plant growers think their application is necessary, 2) to what extent plant growers think the use of insecticides (as a subset of pesticides) is necessary and what are the main considerations determining their selection, 3) how dependent plant growers are on the single currently allowed neonicotinoid (acetamiprid), and 4) if acetamiprid is used, what other pesticides are used simultaneously. Our additional aims were to specifically investigate the home garden owners' approach to pesticide use and pollinator support. We were interested in 1) how necessary garden owners think it is to use pesticides, 2) what they think about the threats to wild pollinators and how this affects their management practices and 3) what factors predict whether or not gardeners provide support for wild pollinators and what the most common such forms of support are.

We hypothesised that Hungarian plant growers are highly dependent on pesticide input and home garden owners have little awareness of linked environmental issues. Nevertheless, we predicted that home garden owners who predominantly produced for their own needs were more aware of the environmental hazards of pesticides than large-scale farmers and we also hypothesised that those who supported pollinators used pesticides less frequently.

Material and methods

Questionnaire Design

We circulated an online questionnaire that consisted of 61 closed-ended questions, all of which were mandatory to respond to. The questionnaire had eight sections to collect information about 1) sociodemographic factors, 2) type of farming, 3) use of plant protection products and 4-6) insecticides and their means of application, 7) protection of

wild pollinators, and the questionnaire included one question 8) about how the questionnaire reached respondents (**Electronic Supplementary Material S1**). All responses were recorded anonymously, however, respondents could provide their email addresses at the end. The questionnaire was designed in Google Forms and circulated in Hungarian language. The questionnaire was shared on social media platforms (such as Facebook groups and Facebook pages, and agricultural websites) and on farming and entomological mailing lists. The form was available from 26 April to 20 August in 2021.

Respondents who do not farm in Hungary were excluded from the analysis and data from Pest county were merged with those from Budapest. The number of respondents was standardised for 100,000 inhabitants in Hungary to improve representativeness.

In this study, we include both chemical and non-chemical pesticides in the group of 'pesticides' and 'plant protection products'. We also use the word 'insecticide' inclusively for synthetic insecticides and insecticides that can be used in organic farming.

Data processing and statistical analysis

The original categorical replies were on a few occasions re-categorised for analytical purposes. Education categories were merged into 'elementary', 'middle', 'high', and 'postgraduate' levels. The most important sociodemographic parameters and the categories used are listed in **Table 1**, and all other parameters can be found in **Electronic Supplementary Material S1.** Although they were separated in the original questionnaire, the two kinds of agricultural experts, 'plant doctors' and 'plant protection experts' were later merged into a combined 'expert' category. When the additional plant protection products which were used with acetamiprid were named, they were assigned into nine categories or the combination of those, as 'adhesion promoter', 'insecticide(s)',

‘insecticide(s) and acaricide(s)’, ‘insecticide(s) and fungicide(s)’, ‘insecticide(s), fungicide(s) and fertiliser’, ‘fertiliser’, ‘fungicide(s)’, ‘fungicide(s) and acaricide(s)’, ‘fungicide(s) and fertiliser’. In the question about how respondents support pollinators the textual responses for food and habitat provision-related answers may overlap although when categorising these, we choose the one which was most strongly emphasised by the respondent. In the same question, we did not create a separate category for ’outreach’, because it only occurred in a single response. When textual responses were given to the types of support which could not have been categorised as direct action (e.g. ‘I do not harm them’), they were interpreted as ‘no support’.

When the approach solely of garden owners to pesticide use and their attitude to wild pollinators were investigated, only landowners with less than 1-hectare land were included in the analysis.

We used Spearman correlation tests to examine if sociodemographic factors and farming habits correlate with pesticide use. P-values were corrected according to Holm’s method. For calculating the correlation matrix the ‘*psych*’ (version 2.1.9) (Revelle 2021), and for visualising them the ‘*corrplot*’ (version 0.92) (Wei and Simko 2021) R packages were used. We used the chi-square test to compare plant protection habits of home garden owners and large-scale farmers. We used machine learning techniques with Gradient Boosting Machine (GBM) for generating our models to investigate 1) which socioeconomic factors determine whether or not pesticides were used in farmlands, and 2) which socioeconomic factors determine whether or not pollinators were supported in home gardens. The model fit was evaluated using the Area Under the Curve (AUC) score and by examining the accuracy of the best fitting model. We used the ‘*gbm*’ (version 2.1.8) (Greenwell et al. 2020), ‘*caret*’ (version 6.0.90) (Kuhn 2021), and ‘*yardstick’*

(version 0.0.9) (Kuhn and Vaughan 2021) R packages for modelling. Likert Scales figures were plotted using the '*likert*' (version 1.3.5) (Bryer and Speerschneider 2016) and the map was created using the '*sf*' (version 1.0.3) (Pebesma 2018) R packages. All analyses were done and figures were created using the R 4.1.1 statistical software (R Core Team 2021).

Results

Of the 463 people who completed the questionnaire, 246 were male, 214 were female, and three did not state their gender. The willingness to respond was slightly unbalanced, as more responses were received from the western than from the eastern counties (**Figure 1**). Pest country was the region that yielded the largest proportion of responses (22.0%).



Figure 1. Distribution of respondents by gender (”M” = male, ”F” = female, ”O” = unknown). Y-axis shows the percentage of the sexes and the numbers on the barplots indicate the exact number of respondents in the 19 counties of Hungary. County names are indicated in bold. The colour depth in the map indicates the number of respondents per 100,000 inhabitants. Note that the sum of the numbers indicated on the barplots is greater than the number of respondents because respondents who farmed in more than one county were counted multiple times.

Among the respondents, the two middle-age categories (36–45 and 46–55 years old) were the most frequent, and 60.3% of all respondents (n = 279) fall into the high-level (but not Ph.D.) education group. Of all plant growers, 302 (65.2%) had less than one hectare of farming area (**Table 1**). The most commonly grown crops were vegetables and fruits, followed by grapes and root/tuberous plants (**Electronic Supplementary Material S2**). Of the respondents, 181 (39.1%) used a pest forecasting system and 370 growers (79.9%) supported natural enemies of pests (**Electronic Supplementary Material S3**).

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of the study population (n = 463)

Variables		Total (n = 463)	
		n	%
Sex	Male	246	53.1
	Female	214	46.2
	Unknown	3	0.6
Age	18-25	27	5.8
	26-35	73	15.8
	36-45	126	27.2
	46-55	117	25.3
	56-65	62	13.4

	over 65	58	12.5
Education level	Elementary	6	1.3
	Middle	139	30.0
	High	279	60.3
	Postgraduate	39	8.4
Residence type	Farmland	20	4.3
	Countryside	174	37.6
	Town	136	29.4
	Major city	93	20.1
	Capital	40	8.6
Farming area size	< 1 ha	302	65.2
	1-9.9 ha	58	12.5
	10-29.9 ha	25	5.4
	30-49.9 ha	8	1.7
	50-99.9 ha	16	3.5
	100-299.9 ha	14	3.0
	300-499.9 ha	11	2.4
	500-999.9 ha	7	1.5
	≥ 1.000 ha	22	1.5

Plant protection habits of plant growers

The majority of plant growers in an area of less than one hectare were individual farmers who produce exclusively for their own consumption (n = 251), while the majority of farmers in an area larger than one hectare either produce for sale privately or as part of a farmers' association (n = 107). Of these smallholders, over 95% used pesticides (**Table 2**). However, of all respondents, 311 (67.2%) used pesticides, and 212 of them (68.2%) used them together with some additives. Among the pesticide users, 244 (78.5%) usually did not spray during daytime in a flowering culture (**Electronic Supplementary Material 4**). Of those plant growers who used pesticides, 243 (79.0 %) felt these products

were necessary for farming, with 150 (48.2%) of users considering pesticides as being crucial, and 93 (29.9%) of them regarding them as important.

Table 2. Distribution of farming types among the study population (n = 463)

Area size	Type of farming	Uses pesticide		Pesticide-free	
		n	%	n	%
<1ha	Individual: production for oneself	134	53.4	117	46.6
	Individual: production for oneself and sale	27	69.2	12	30.8
	Individual: production for sale	9	81.8	2	18.2
	In farmers' association	1	100.0	-	-
>1ha	Individual: production for oneself	5	50.0	5	50.0
	Individual: production for oneself and sale	33	75.0	11	25.0
	Individual: production for sale	59	95.2	3	4.8
	In farmers' association	43	95.6	2	4.4

The sociodemographic and farming habit factors that were examined did not show a strong correlation with pesticide use (and nor with each other); the highest significant correlation ($p < 0.05$, Spearman's Rho = 0.35) was with what growers thought about the risks of pesticide use (**Electronic Supplementary Material S5**). However, the GBM model suggested that the best predictors for pesticide use in agricultural areas were if the respondents had consulted with an expert or were themselves trained agricultural experts (relative influence: 27.04, 84.4% of those who do versus 42.0% of those who do not consult with experts, or are expert themselves, used pesticides) and the respondents' gender (relative influence: 18.41, 50.5% of females versus 82.1% of males used pesticides) (model accuracy: 0.79, AUC = 0.86, Sensitivity: 0.89, Specificity: 0.60) (**Figure 2, Electronic Supplementary Material S6**).



Figure 2. The relative influence of factors generated from the Gradient Boosting Machine (GBM) model for predicting pesticides used in farming areas.

Out of the 311 pesticide users, 243 (78.1%) felt that the use of insecticide was particularly indispensable for them. The main aspects that determined the choice of an insecticide were if they were harmless to humans, posed a low risk for bees and whether growers had previous experience with the product. The techniques by which the insecticide can be applied (such as if they can be used in flowering crops, if they can be used during daytime, or if they can be sprayed from the air) were the least important aspects to users (**Figure 3**).



Figure 3. Relative frequency (%) of respondents' opinions on how important different considerations are when choosing an insecticide. The response is colour-coded as follows: dark grey – not important, light grey – negligible importance, light yellow – moderately, light orange – important, dark orange – crucial.

Of those who used pesticides, 143 (46.0%) thought that banning neonicotinoids in the EU impacted their management practices, and 218 (70.1%) used at a minimum one acetamiprid-containing insecticides. Most users (55.2%) consider Mospilan (an acetamiprid-containing insecticide) indispensable. Of those who used Mospilan, 124 (56.11%) use it together with other pesticides, mostly with fungicides.

Plant protection habits and the protection of pollinators of garden owners

Of all questionnaire respondents, 302 (65.2%) had less than one hectare of land and 171 (56.6%) of home garden owners used pesticides on their land. The use of pesticides was considered acceptable by most garden owners, and 34.5% and 31.6% of them even thought it was important or crucially important, respectively. However, a significantly lower proportion of garden owners than of larger-scale farmers used pesticides (Chi-squared = 42.455, p-value <0.001) and a significantly higher proportion of home garden owners than of large-scale farmers believed that pesticide-free farming is achievable (Chi-squared = 3.593, p-value = 0.029).

The home garden owners who responded to our questionnaire specified that widespread use of pesticides, habitat loss due to agriculture and intensive agricultural production were the three most likely threats for wild pollinators (**Figure 4**), whilst they thought the appearance of invasive species was the least significant. Nonetheless, this factor was labelled as crucial by over half of the respondents (Figure 4). Of these garden owners, 259 (85.8%) recognise that widespread use of pesticides is a crucial problem for wild pollinators and 87.7% have heard that certain pesticides that are considered safe may also harm these insects. A significantly higher proportion of home garden owners than of large-scale farmers assumed that the conversion of agricultural production can slow down the depletion of pollinator populations (Chi-squared = 10.998, p-value = <0.001).



Figure 4. Relative frequency (%) of garden owners' (with less than 1-hectare of land) opinions about the importance of factors that may threaten wild pollinators. The response is colour-coded as follows: grey – not at all, yellow – negligible, orange – crucial.

Of the garden owners, 81.1% carried out actions aimed at supporting wild pollinators. The examined sociodemographic and farming habits did not show a strong correlation with whether or not pollinators were supported (and neither did they with each other); yet the highest significant correlation with pollinator support was the growers' pesticide use ($p < 0.05$, Spearman's Rho = -0.22) (**Electronic Supplementary Material S7**). The GBM model suggested that the best predictors for supporting pollinators were whether garden owners had promoted biocontrol (relative influence: 38.85) and garden owners' age (relative influence: 26.34) (**Figure 5)**. This model had relatively high accuracy (0.82),

and sensitivity (0.96) though only a moderate AUC (0.73), and very low specificity (0.18) (**Electronic Supplementary Material S8**).

The proportion of those who supported pollinators was not significantly different between home garden owners and large-scale farmers (Chi-squared = 0.856, p-value = 0.178). A significantly higher proportion of pesticide-free garden owners supported pollinators than pesticide-using garden owners (Chi-squared = 13.159, p-value = <0.001).



Figure 5. The relative influence of factors generated from the Gradient Boosting Machine (GBM) model for predicting whether or not garden owners support wild pollinators.

Among home garden owners, the most common activities to support wild pollinators were to provide additional food sources (37.3%) (primarily by pollinator-friendly flowers) and natural habitat improvement (35.7%) (e.g. wildflower strips). Providing artificial habitat (19.9%) (e.g. bee hotels) and water (4.1%) were other forms of support. In some cases

(3.1%), growers claimed they support pollinators without providing additional information. One respondent actively educated the neighbouring areas about the importance of wild pollinators and how to protect them.

Discussion

In this study, we conducted an online survey in Hungary to investigate pesticide application practices of plant growers, particularly of home garden owners and their dependence on pesticides. Additionally, we also investigated the garden owners' perspectives on environmental issues related to pesticides and their attitude to mitigating pollinator declines.

Supporting our first hypothesis, we found that almost half of those who completed our questionnaire claimed that general pesticide use is unavoidable in farming. This proportion was even higher amongst those who actively used pesticides.

We found that expert knowledge was the best predictor of whether pesticides were used in farming, and this was disproportionally important for large-scale farmers. Most of the respondents who usually consult an expert, or who are experts themselves with plant protection qualifications (e.g. plant doctor degree), use pesticides. Thus, farmers strongly rely on (external) expert information for making decisions and embracing alternative pest management practices this expert advice may be essential for encouraging growers to move away from pesticide-based farming. The economic value of pollination ecosystem services (Porto et al. 2020) and the yield losses related to pollinator decline (Fijen et al. 2020) may be the most important points to raise in addition to emphasising that maintaining pollinator populations requires drastic reduction or complete abandonment of pesticide use (Geiger et al. 2010; Jacquet et al. 2022). However, farmers

who grow crops that are not dependent on insect pollination and do not face the negative effects of their decline may be sceptical about the importance of this issue. Nonetheless, in our study, 40% of large-scale farmers personally observed pollinator declines and over 70% of them believed that transitional agriculture can mitigate pollinator declines. These results suggest that most growers are aware of the problem, yet their high level of dependency on pesticides implies a distrust or lack of knowledge of alternative methods. Also, for some crops no satisfactory management alternatives that protect yields are available. Environmental education, subsidising ecological management (e.g. agri-environment schemes supporting less intensive farming), and effective biodiversity offset schemes can play an important role, especially when combined with expert advice. However, the accessibility of this information varies from country to country (Wyckhuys et al. 2019), and so increasing the ease with which stakeholders can access this information is key in the transition process. Moreover, pressure from the agricultural chemical lobby and the distrust among agricultural advisers of alternative plant protection measures can strengthen market resistance (Villemaine et al. 2021), which can slow down the dissemination of ecologically friendly practices.

The second-best predictor of whether respondents used pesticides or not was gender. Despite sexes being evenly distributed among respondents, almost twice as many men used pesticides as women. Indeed, in many respects, for instance, in eating habits (such as food-selecting behaviour), women are more health-conscious than men (Wardle et al. 2004), which can be reflected in differences in attitudes towards pesticide use (e.g. Wang et al. 2017). Similar behavioural backgrounds may have created the emerging between-gender imbalance in our study.

Besides showing patterns of general pesticide use, our survey showed that the most important aspect for specifically choosing insecticides was the level of their effects on humans and bees. This suggests that most users were aware that insecticides can cause adverse, mostly sublethal, effects both in humans (Rani et al. 2021) and non-target insects (Desneux et al. 2007; Müller 2018). This was further underpinned by the large proportion of respondents (86.5%) who were aware that even insecticides labelled as harmless to insect pollinators can nevertheless have negative effects. Previous experience with a particular insecticide also influenced users' choices. Repeatedly using well-known pesticides, however, may relax rigorous portioning habits which, in turn, may lead to insecticide overuse (Huang et al. 2020). This fixed choice may also lead to brand fidelity, which, consequently, may prevent experimenting with alternative, more environmentally friendly, pesticides.

Indeed, despite scientific advice calling for the banning of all neonicotinoids (Goulson and 232 Signatories 2018), this study showed that most respondents already experience the effects of the present ban on neonicotinoids and that they heavily depend on the use of acetamiprid, which is currently the only one freely available in the EU. This may lead to a higher demand for acetamiprid-containing insecticides among plant growers in the coming years (Varga-Szilay and Tóth 2022). Acetamiprid, like all neonicotinoids, can persist in the tissues of treated plants (Lentola et al. 2017) and its half-life can reach 450 days in soil (Goulson 2013) inducing sublethal effects in beneficial organisms (Varga-Szilay and Tóth 2022), such as pollinators. On top of this, we also found that many of those plant growers who used acetamiprid-containing pesticides co-applied them in combination with other agrochemicals. Although concerns have been raised about the negative effects of cocktails of pesticides on the fitness of non-target

insects (e.g. Gill et al. 2012; Williamson and Wright 2013), in our study the most extreme example was one home garden owner who used Mospilan along with seven additional fungicides. Based on our results, we can assume that a substantial proportion of Hungarian growers have not yet attempted to reduce insecticides. Similarly to when aiming to reduce pesticides at large, the publicising of relevant methodological advances or alternative technologies is likely to be critical to achieving a reduction in insecticides use and a transition to ecological farming.

Home gardens as ecological traps

Home gardens could be transformed into pesticide-free cultivation more quickly than larger-scale farming areas, but, according to our study, Hungarian garden owners seem to be reluctant of this conversion. Contrary to our expectations, pesticide use was widespread among gardeners, and almost all respondents who considered that the issue of pesticides causing harm to wild pollinators was unimportant themselves used pesticides. Even those garden owners who acknowledged that the widespread use of pesticides was a crucial problem for pollinators and have heard that certain pesticides considered safe may also be harmful to wild pollinators kept using them. Hence, our second hypothesis was not supported. Although a significantly greater proportion of home gardeners than of large-scale farmers believed that pesticide-free farming is achievable. Only 43.4% of the garden owners who completed our questionnaire grow plants pesticide-free, and more than half of the garden owners who produce fruits and vegetables for themselves and are not profit-oriented, use pesticides. These numbers are alarming and suggest that despite the known negative effects of pesticide use and the potential benefits of pesticide-free management, garden owners favour conventional approaches

including the use of pesticides. The proportion of pesticide-free gardeners is similar to that found in Austria and Poland (pesticide-free: 41.0-51.7%) (Voigt et al. 2015) among small-scale gardeners. In another survey conducted in the UK, only 30% of small gardeners did not use pesticides (Resource Futures 2013). However, the comparability of these results may be hampered by the differences in the definition of a 'home garden' among surveys.

The majority of those who completed the questionnaire supported pollinators. Our model indicated that whether or not one promoted biocontrol was the best predictor of whether a garden owner also supported wild pollinators. However, due to the skew in number towards pollinator-supporting garden owners, the model specificity was low, making this prediction unreliable. A significantly higher proportion of pesticide-free garden owners supported pollinators than of those who used pesticides, supporting our third hypothesis. The most common means to support wild pollinators were to provide pollinator-friendly flowers and many respondents provided bee hotels as a means of support. These two approaches are probably widespread because in recent years pollinators (particularly wild bees) have become an increasingly important part of environmental education programs in the European Union (European Commission n.d. c), including Hungary (e.g. the annual 'Pollinators day' event). Yet, Schmied et al. (2022) demonstrated that urbanised areas, whilst being safe habitats in some cases (e.g. Theodorou et al. 2020), can also act as ecological traps (e.g. Campioni et al. 2022; Lehtonen et al. 2021) for insects in other cases. Indeed, although home gardens lure insect pollinators, pesticides are used in many of those gardens, contaminating the nectar and pollen of flowers (Nicholls et al. 2018) which, in turn, can have deleterious effects on pollinators' fitness. Thus, these non-pesticide-free gardens act as ecological traps for

insect pollinators. For that reason, plant growers should be encouraged and motivated to produce their vegetables and fruits pesticide-free. Garden owners should be aware that to fully support pollinators in urban areas, pesticide use should be reduced or fully abandoned. Realising the potential benefits of urban gardens as biodiversity refuges, and the problems that pesticide use brings about for meeting this target, drive an increasing number of European countries to aim to ban plant protection products in private areas in addition to public areas (Goulson and Nicholls 2022). Home growers could also be discouraged from buying and using these products if they are removed from being freely available on supermarket shelves, as recently proposed in the UK (PAN UK n.d.).

Study limits and future perspectives

There are some limitations to our work. The respondents of the questionnaire were not chosen randomly. Our population is a subsample of those who were aware of the announcement and voluntarily took part in the study. The questionnaire could only be completed online, therefore, it had a lower chance to reach the eastern part of the country where there is a lower rate of internet access (KSH, n.d.). Most of the large-scale agriculture takes place in Eastern Hungary, hence large-scale farmers may be underrepresented. Nonetheless, our questionnaire was completed by a sufficiently large number of people such that it should represent general plant protection habits and trends in pesticide use among Hungarian growers.

Our study could have provided further insights if more landscape and biodiversity variables had been available. However, asking for providing these may have been demanding for farmers and so reduced response rates. Thus, unfortunately, we had to compromise on this issue.

Furthermore, the generalisability of the result is limited by the fact that the survey was conducted only among Hungarian plant growers, although it does provide a useful case study in which results are not compounded by inter-country factors. Countries at a similar development level and using similar agricultural practices should also be involved in future studies to expand understanding of how pesticide use patterns and attitudes apply across a wider geographic scale.

Conclusions and future perspectives

Additional questions in similar studies could provide deeper insight into farmers' practices, for instance, the chemical structure of pesticides used, whether they were synthetic or organic, or which organism were they used against.

One of the most pressing questions is whether home garden owners really want to convert to a completely pesticide-free plant growing. Focused research is needed to understand the willingness and motivations of garden owners for making this transition and why (if so) they prefer to continue conventional practices. Additionally, environmental education should establish the ecological foundations of insect-friendly gardens and promote their local and global benefits. In particular, demonstration gardens and demonstration farms should be set up which could demonstrate and teach pesticide-free farming to plant growers. Alternatively, incentives and direct subsidies could be provided to those who abandon the use of pesticides. Moreover, pesticide-free farming could be advocated through mobile applications and social recognition, or through granting 'pollination friendly' certification to home gardens. These gardens could also be involved in biomonitoring programs to further strengthen links between nature and garden owners.

However, at present, due to the unintentionally introduced pesticide pollution in gardens (Lentola et al. 2017), not even the exact magnitude of exposure of pollinators to chemical pesticides can be assessed. Therefore, future research should focus on this invisible contamination and its effects on the assemblages of garden insects. From the side of decision-makers, to deal with this issue, clear labelling practices should be requested from suppliers to indicate whether or not products have come from pesticide-free farms (e.g. Ecolabel Index, n.d.). The amount of freely available plant protection products should be reduced, particularly those available in supermarkets, to discourage direct and indirect pesticide pollution in the gardens.

Driving large-scale farmers and home garden owners toward pesticide-free farming however may need different approaches. Whereas large scale farmers mostly rely on expert advice, and therefore advisers should inform them about pesticide-free practices, home gardeners may more heavily rely on conventional information channels (such as social media and personal networks).

The attitude of Hungarian plant growers can provide a general insight into the viewpoint of other Central and Eastern European countries and similar surveys would be needed across Europe. Since survey approaches, similar to ours, through directed questions about pesticide use habits, help us to better understand plant growers' motivations, we hope this survey proves to be useful as an example for further online questionnaires. The information gained then can help to find solutions towards a pesticide-free future.

References

Baldock KCR (2020) Opportunities and threats for pollinator conservation in global towns and cities. Curr Opin Insect Sci 38:63–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2020.01.006

Baldock KCR, Goddard MA, Hicks DM, et al (2019) A systems approach reveals urban pollinator hotspots and conservation opportunities. Nat Ecol Evol 3:363–373. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-018-0769-y

Baldock KCR, Goddard MA, Hicks DM, et al (2015) Where is the UK's pollinator biodiversity? The importance of urban areas for flower-visiting insects. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci 282:20142849. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.2849

Botías C, David A, Hill EM, Goulson D (2017) Quantifying exposure of wild bumblebees to mixtures of agrochemicals in agricultural and urban landscapes. Environ Pollut 222:73–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.01.001

Botías C, David A, Horwood J, et al (2015) Neonicotinoid residues in wildflowers, a potential route of chronic exposure for bees. Environ Sci Technol 49:12731–12740. https://doi.org/10/8bk

Brühl CA, Bakanov N, Köthe S, et al (2021) Direct pesticide exposure of insects in nature conservation areas in Germany. Sci Rep 11:24144. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-03366-w

Brühl CA, Zaller JG, Liess M, Wogram J (2022) The rejection of synthetic pesticides in organic farming has multiple benefits. Trends Ecol Evol 37:113–114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2021.11.001

Bryer J, Speerschneider K (2016) likert: Analysis and visualization likert items

Campioni L, Marengo I, Román J, D'Amico M (2022) Mud-puddling on roadsides: a potential ecological trap for butterflies. J Insect Conserv 26:131–134. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-021-00367-y

Dangles O, Casas J (2019) Ecosystem services provided by insects for achieving sustainable development goals. Ecosyst Serv 35:109–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2018.12.002

Desneux N, Decourtye A, Delpuech J-M (2007) The sublethal effects of pesticides on beneficial arthropods. Annu Rev Entomol 52:81–106. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ento.52.110405.091440

Emmerson M, Morales MB, Oñate JJ, et al (2016) Chapter two - How agricultural intensification affects biodiversity and ecosystem services. In: Dumbrell AJ, Kordas RL, Woodward G (eds) Advances in Ecological Research. Academic Press, pp 43–97

EPRS (2019) Farming without plant protection products. Can we grow without using herbicides, fungicides and insecticides? In: Service EEPR (ed). Publications Office, Panel for the Future of Science and Technology, PE 634.416

European Commission (2020) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: A Farm to Fork Strategy for a fair, healthy and environmentally-friendly food system COM/2020/381 final. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:ea0f9f73-9ab2-11ea-9d2d-01aa75ed71a1.0001.02/DOC_1&format=PDF. Accessed 20 Jan 2022

European Commission Organic farming statistics. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Organic_farming_statistics. Accessed 18 Feb 2022a

European Commission Member States: Trends. Trend in use and risk of chemical and more hazardous pesticides. https://ec.europa.eu/food/plants/pesticides/sustainable-use-pesticides/farm-fork-targets-progress/member-states-trends_en. Accessed 20 Jan 2022b

European Commission EU Pollinators Initiative. https://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/species/pollinators/policy_en.htm. Accessed 14 Feb 2022c

FAO (2021) Pesticides use, pesticides trade and pesticides indicators. Global, regional and country trends, 1990–2019. FAOSTAT Anal Brief Ser No 29 Rome 22

Fijen TPM, Scheper JA, Vogel C, et al (2020) Insect pollination is the weakest link in the production of a hybrid seed crop. Agric Ecosyst Environ 290:106743. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.106743

Garden Organic France declares public spaces pesticide free - private gardens will follow. https://www.gardenorganic.org.uk/news/france-declares-public-spaces-pesticide-free. Accessed 1 Mar 2022

Geiger F, Bengtsson J, Berendse F, et al (2010) Persistent negative effects of pesticides on biodiversity and biological control potential on European farmland. Basic Appl Ecol 11:97–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2009.12.001

Gill RJ, Ramos-Rodriguez O, Raine NE (2012) Combined pesticide exposure severely affects individual- and colony-level traits in bees. Nature 491:105–108. https://doi.org/10/f4cg7z

Goulson D (2013) REVIEW: An overview of the environmental risks posed by neonicotinoid insecticides. J Appl Ecol 50:977–987. https://doi.org/10/mv6

Goulson D, 232 Signatories (2018) Call to restrict neonicotinoids. Science 360:973. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau0432

Goulson D, Nicholls E (2022) Anthropogenic influences on bee foraging. Science 375:970–972. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abn0185

Grass I, Loos J, Baensch S, et al (2019) Land-sharing/-sparing connectivity landscapes for ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation. People Nat 1:262–272. https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.21

Greenwell B, Boehmke B, Cunningham J, Developers G (2020) gbm: Generalized boosted regression models

Gurr GM, Wratten SD, Landis DA, You M (2017) Habitat management to suppress pest populations: progress and prospects. Annu Rev Entomol 62:91–109. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-031616-035050

Hall DM, Camilo GR, Tonietto RK, et al (2017) The city as a refuge for insect pollinators. Conserv Biol 31:24–29. https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12840

Hallmann CA, Sorg M, Jongejans E, et al (2017) More than 75 percent decline over 27 years in total flying insect biomass in protected areas. PLOS ONE 12:e0185809. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185809

Hanley N, Breeze TD, Ellis C, Goulson D (2015) Measuring the economic value of pollination services: Principles, evidence and knowledge gaps. Ecosyst Serv 14:124–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2014.09.013

Holzschuh A, Steffan-Dewenter I, Tscharntke T (2008) Agricultural landscapes with organic crops support higher pollinator diversity. Oikos 117:354–361. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2007.0030-1299.16303.x

Huang Y, Luo X, Tang L, Yu W (2020) The power of habit: does production experience lead to pesticide overuse? Environ Sci Pollut Res 27:25287–25296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-08961-4

Hülsmann M, von Wehrden H, Klein A-M, Leonhardt SD (2015) Plant diversity and composition compensate for negative effects of urbanization on foraging bumble bees. Apidologie 46:760–770. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13592-015-0366-x

Jacquet F, Jeuffroy M-H, Jouan J, et al (2022) Pesticide-free agriculture as a new paradigm for research. Agron Sustain Dev 42:8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-021-00742-8

KSH Központi Statisztikai Hivatal A háztartások információs- és kommunikációseszköz-használatának főbb jellemzői. https://www.ksh.hu/docs/hun/xftp/idoszaki/ikt/2020/01/index.html. Accessed 5 Apr 2022

Krupke CH, Hunt GJ, Eitzer BD, et al (2012) Multiple routes of pesticide exposure for honey bees living near agricultural fields. PLOS ONE 7:e29268. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0029268

Kuhn M (2021) caret: Classification and regression training

Kuhn M, Vaughan D (2021) yardstick: Tidy characterizations of model performance

Lechenet M, Dessaint F, Py G, et al (2017) Reducing pesticide use while preserving crop productivity and profitability on arable farms. Nat Plants 3:1–6. https://doi.org/10.1038/nplants.2017.8

Lehtonen TK, Babic NL, Piepponen T, et al (2021) High road mortality during female-biased larval dispersal in an iconic beetle. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 75:26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-020-02962-6

Lentola A, David A, Abdul-Sada A, et al (2017) Ornamental plants on sale to the public are a significant source of pesticide residues with implications for the health of pollinating insects. Environ Pollut 228:297–304. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.03.084

Main AR, Hladik ML, Webb EB, et al (2020) Beyond neonicotinoids – Wild pollinators are exposed to a range of pesticides while foraging in agroecosystems. Sci Total Environ 742:140436. https://doi.org/10/ghp9xk

Müller C (2018) Impacts of sublethal insecticide exposure on insects — Facts and knowledge gaps. Basic Appl Ecol 30:1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2018.05.001

Nicholls E, Botías C, Rotheray EL, et al (2018) Monitoring neonicotinoid exposure for bees in rural and peri-urban areas of the U.K. during the transition from pre- to post-moratorium. Environ Sci Technol 52:9391–9402. https://doi.org/10/gh6hqh

PAN Europe (2019) Pesticide Action Week 2019: No more pesticides in non-agricultural areas! https://www.pan-europe.info/sites/pan-europe.info/files/PANEurope_PR_PesticideActionWeek2019_Final.pdf. Accessed 7 Mar 2022

PAN Europe Pesticide Free Towns. https://www.pan-europe.info/campaigns/pesticide-free-towns. Accessed 7 Mar 2022

PAN UK Pesticide Action Network UK. https://www.pan-uk.org/. Accessed 28 Feb 2022

Pebesma E (2018) Simple features for r: Standardized support for spatial vector data. R J 10:439–446. https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2018-009

Pecenka JR, Ingwell LL, Foster RE, et al (2021) IPM reduces insecticide applications by 95% while maintaining or enhancing crop yields through wild pollinator conservation. Proc Natl Acad Sci 118:e2108429118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2108429118

Pisa LW, Amaral-Rogers V, Belzunces LP, et al (2015) Effects of neonicotinoids and fipronil on non-target invertebrates. Environ Sci Pollut Res 22:68–102. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-014-3471-x

Porto RG, de Almeida RF, Cruz-Neto O, et al (2020) Pollination ecosystem services: A comprehensive review of economic values, research funding and policy actions. Food Secur 12:1425–1442. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-020-01043-w

Potts SG, Imperatriz-Fonseca V, Ngo HT, et al (2016) Safeguarding pollinators and their values to human well-being. Nature 540:220–229. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature20588

Pywell RF, Heard MS, Woodcock BA, et al (2015) Wildlife-friendly farming increases crop yield: evidence for ecological intensification. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci 282:20151740. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.1740

R Core Team (2021) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria

Raimets R, Karise R, Mänd M, et al (2018) Synergistic interactions between a variety of insecticides and an ergosterol biosynthesis inhibitor fungicide in dietary exposures of bumble bees (*Bombus terrestris* L.). Pest Manag Sci 74:541–546. https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.4756

Rani L, Thapa K, Kanojia N, et al (2021) An extensive review on the consequences of chemical pesticides on human health and environment. J Clean Prod 283:124657. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.124657

Resource Futures (2013) Pesticide user habits survey 2013: public purchasing, use, storage, and disposal of pesticides in plant protection products

Revelle W (2021) psych: Procedures for psychological, psychometric, and personality research. Evanston, Illinois

Sánchez-Bayo F, Wyckhuys KAG (2019) Worldwide decline of the entomofauna: A review of its drivers. Biol Conserv 232:8–27. https://doi.org/10/gfvb6r

Saqib HSA, Chen J, Chen W, et al (2020) Local management and landscape structure determine the assemblage patterns of spiders in vegetable fields. Sci Rep 10:15130. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-71888-w

Schmied H, Getrost L, Diestelhorst O, et al (2022) Between perfect habitat and ecological trap: even wildflower strips mulched annually increase pollinating insect numbers in intensively used agricultural landscapes. J Insect Conserv. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-022-00383-6

Sirohi MH, Jackson J, Edwards M, Ollerton J (2015) Diversity and abundance of solitary and primitively eusocial bees in an urban centre: a case study from Northampton (England). J Insect Conserv 19:487–500. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-015-9769-2

Siviter H, Bailes EJ, Martin CD, et al (2021) Agrochemicals interact synergistically to increase bee mortality. Nature 596:389–392. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03787-7

Theodorou P, Radzevičiūtė R, Lentendu G, et al (2020) Urban areas as hotspots for bees and pollination but not a panacea for all insects. Nat Commun 11:576. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-14496-6

Tooker JF, Pearsons KA (2021) Newer characters, same story: neonicotinoid insecticides disrupt food webs through direct and indirect effects. Curr Opin Insect Sci 46:50–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2021.02.013

Tscharntke T, Grass I, Wanger TC, et al (2021) Beyond organic farming – harnessing biodiversity-friendly landscapes. Trends Ecol Evol 36:919–930. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2021.06.010

Tscharntke T, Grass I, Wanger TC, et al (2022) Restoring biodiversity needs more than reducing pesticides. Trends Ecol Evol 37:115–116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2021.11.009

Vanbergen AJ, the Insect Pollinators Initiative (2013) Threats to an ecosystem service: pressures on pollinators. Front Ecol Environ 11:251–259. https://doi.org/10.1890/120126

Varga-Szilay Z, Tóth Z (2022) Is acetamiprid really not that harmful to bumblebees (Apidae: *Bombus* spp.)? Apidologie 53:2. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13592-022-00909-6

Villemaine R, Compagnone C, Falconnet C (2021) The social construction of alternatives to pesticide use: A study of biocontrol in Burgundian viticulture. Sociol Rural 61:74–95. https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12320

Voigt A, Latkowska M, Rutecka A, et al (2015) Environmental behavior of urban allotment gardeners in Europe. Landsc Flux Est Univ Life Sci Est 78–82

Wang W, Jin J, He R, Gong H (2017) Gender differences in pesticide use knowledge, risk awareness and practices in Chinese farmers. Sci Total Environ 590–591:22–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.03.053

Wardle J, Haase AM, Steptoe A, et al (2004) Gender differences in food choice: The contribution of health beliefs and dieting. Ann Behav Med 27:107–116. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324796abm2702_5

Wei T, Simko V (2021) R package “corrplot”: Visualization of a correlation matrix

Wenzel A, Grass I, Belavadi VV, Tscharntke T (2020) How urbanization is driving pollinator diversity and pollination – A systematic review. Biol Conserv 241:108321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.108321

Wernecke A, Castle D (2020) Effects of tank mixtures of plant protection products on honey bees and possible physiological interactions. J Für Kult 154-161 Seiten. https://doi.org/10.5073/JFK.2020.05.05

Willer H, Lernoud J (2018) The world of organic agriculture. Statistics and emerging trends 2018. https://orgprints.org/id/eprint/34669/1/WILLER-LERNOUD-2018-final-PDF-low.pdf. Accessed 14 Feb 2022

Williamson SM, Wright GA (2013) Exposure to multiple cholinergic pesticides impairs olfactory learning and memory in honeybees. J Exp Biol 216:1799–1807. https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.083931

Wray JC, Elle E (2015) Flowering phenology and nesting resources influence pollinator community composition in a fragmented ecosystem. Landsc Ecol 30:261–272. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-014-0121-0

Wyckhuys KAG, Pozsgai G, Lovei GL, et al (2019) Global disparity in public awareness of the biological control potential of invertebrates. Sci Total Environ 660:799–806. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.01.077

Zaller JG (2020) Pesticide Impacts on the Environment and Humans. In: Zaller JG (ed) Daily Poison : Pesticides - an Underestimated Danger. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp 127–221

Zattara EE, Aizen MA (2021) Worldwide occurrence records suggest a global decline in bee species richness. One Earth 4:114–123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.12.005

Ecolabel Index - All ecolabels on food. https://www.ecolabelindex.com/ecolabels/?st=category,food. Accessed 14 Feb 2022

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Zoltán Tóth for pointing us towards conducting a questionnaire-based study. We also thank Marco Ferrante and Nick Littlewood for their comments on the manuscript.

Author information

Affiliations

Doctoral School of Biology, Institute of Biology, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

Zsófia Varga-Szilay

cE3c – Centre for Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Changes/Azorean Biodiversity Group, Departamento de Ciências e Engenharia do Ambiente, Universidade dos Açores, Açores, Portugal

Gábor Pozsgai

Corresponding author

Correspondence to Zsófia Varga-Szilay

ORCID number of authors

Zsófia Varga-Szilay: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9712-7654

Gábor Pozsgai: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2300-6558

Author contributions

Zsófia Varga-Szilay conceived and designed the study. The questionnaire was created and data were collected by Zsófia Varga-Szilay. Analysis was performed by Zsófia Varga-Szilay and Gábor Pozsgai. The manuscript was written by Zsófia Varga-Szilay and Gábor Pozsgai. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Declarations

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no competing interests.

Code availability

The underlying computer code is available in the GitHub repository https://github.com/zsvargaszilay/pesticide_questionnaire


Borsod−Abaúj−Zemplén
9
10
Szabolcs−Szatmár−Bereg
11
5
Nógrád
4
4
Heves
10
7
Győr−
Moson−Sopron
9
7
Komárom−Esztergom
9
8
Pest
51
51
Hajdú−Bihar
10
10
Vas
9
10
Veszprém
28
14
Fejér
14
11
Jász−Nagykun−Szolnok
5
7
Zala
15
14
Somogy
17
14
Tolna
10
6
Bács−Kiskun
23
21
1
Békés
9
6
Csongrád−
Csanád
9
8
2
Baranya
10
6
M
F
O
The number of respondents for 100k inhabitants
5.0
7.5
10.0
48.5°N
48.0°N
47.5°N
47.0°N
46.5°N
46.0°N
16°E
17°E
18°E
19°E
20°E
21°E
22°E
23°E


Expert knowledge
Sex
Uses prediction system
Participated agrotraining
Aware of pesticide risks
Promotes biocontrol
Individual or association
Supports pollinators
Residence type
Age
Farming area size
Member of an association
Education level
Variables
0
10
20
30
Relative Influence


not important
negligible importance
moderately
important
crucial
Low risk on humans
6%
8%
86%
Low risk on bees
8%
11%
81%
Previous experience
7%
14%
79%
Long−lasting effects
12%
17%
72%
Broad spectrum
14%
19%
67%
Protective clothing needed
27%
19%
54%
Price
21%
33%
46%
Spraying in flowering crops
33%
20%
46%
Can be used daytime
38%
22%
41%
Spraying from air
77%
10%
14%
0
25
50
75
100
Percentage


not at all
negligible
crucial
Widespread use of pesticides
1%
13%
86%
Habitat loss in agricultural areas
3%
14%
83%
Agricultural intensification
1%
18%
81%
Habitat loss in urban areas
5%
34%
61%
Diseases and pathogens
4%
38%
59%
Spread of invasive species
7%
40%
53%
0
25
50
75
100
Percentage


Promotes biocontrol
Age
Uses pesticides
Aware of pesticide risks
Uses prediction system
Residence type
Expert knowledge
Education level
Sex
Participated agrotraining
Member of an association
Individual or association
Variables
0
10
20
30
40
Relative Influence


Uses prediction system
Sex
Participated agrotraining
Uses pesticides
Aware of pesticide risks
Residence type
Individual or association
Expert consulting
Farming area size
Promotes biocontrol
Supports pollinators
Age
Education level
Member of an association 0.12 0.18 0.2 −0.24 −0.08 −0.02
Uses prediction system 0 −0.31 0
Sex 0.34 0.22
Participated agrotraining −0.37 −0.02
Uses pesticides 0.35 −0.32 −0.18 0.02
Aware of pesticide risks −0.01 −0.33 0.08
Residence type 0 −0.01
Individual or association 0.36 0.05 −0.15
Expert consulting 0.07 −0.01
Farming area size 0 0
Promotes biocontrol
Supports pollinators −0.01
Age
1
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0
−0.2
−0.4
−0.6
−0.8
−1


0.84
0.83
0.82
0.81
0.80
ROC (Cross−Validation)
50
100
150
200
250
Boosting Iterations
Max Tree Depth
1
2
3
4
5


1.00
0.75
0.50
0.25
0.00
sensitivity
0.00
0.25
0.50
0.75
1.00
1 − specificity


100
75
50
25
0
% Found
0
25
50
75
100
% Tested


Sex
Uses pesticides
Participated agrotraining
Aware of pesticide risks
Residence type
Member of an association
Age
Education level
Expert consulting
Individual or association
Promotes biocontrol
Supports pollinators
Uses prediction system
−0.11
Sex
Uses pesticides
0.12
0.26
−0.33
−0.22
Participated agrotraining
0
Aware of pesticide risks
Residence type
0.02
0.02
Member of an association
0.07
−0.04
0
Age
0
Education level
Expert consulting
0.05
Individual or association
Promotes biocontrol
1
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0
−0.2
−0.4
−0.6
−0.8
−1


ROC (Cross−Validation)
0.70
0.68
0.66
50
100
150
200
250
Boosting Iterations
Max Tree Depth
1
2
3
4
5


1.00
0.75
0.50
0.25
0.00
sensitivity
0.00
0.25
0.50
0.75
1.00
1 − specificity


100
75
50
25
0
% Found
0
25
50
75
100
% Tested