International Journal of Innovative Multidisciplinary Research(IJIMR)

Impact of Climate Change on Pollinator Populations in Agricultural Zones

Iqra Imran
Marketing Manger
Agro Pvt. Ltd.
iqraimran2707@gmail.com

Abstract

Pollinators are essential to agricultural productivity and biodiversity. However, climate change poses serious threats to their abundance and diversity, particularly in vulnerable farming zones. This study investigates the impact of climate variables temperature, rainfall, and humidity on pollinator populations in agricultural regions. It further investigates the understanding of the farmers, bee holders, and agricultural technicians of these developments. A convergent parallel mixed methods study design was applied. The quantitative data were taken as changes in climate and field observations of pollinators. Thematic analysis was used to evaluate the responses collected from a follow-up of 25 stakeholders through qualitative interviews. The results depict a massive loss in the number of pollinators, which was closely related to increasing temperatures and decreasing precipitation. These trends were validated by stakeholder reports, and anxiety about the potential future crop productivity was raised. The combined ecological data and local knowledge point to the importance of the region-specific, climate-resistant farming practices and conservative approaches to pollinators.

Keywords: *Agricultural Zones, Climate Change, Farming Practices, Mixed Methods, Pollinators, Rainfall, Temperature.*

Introduction

Birds, bees, butterflies, and a few beetles were treated, through pollination, as the most important elements in favouring their agriculture and preserving their biodiversity. Approximately 75 percent of food crops cultivated in the world require pollination in order to reproduce and increase yields (Klein et al., 2006; Aizen et al., 2022). These pollinators assisted in improving the number and quality of many fruits, vegetables, and seeds. Nevertheless, during the last several decades, researchers witnessed the dramatic decrease in the number of pollinators in different areas (Hannah et al., 2016). One of the principal causes of such decline was named climate change. Variations in more or less rain, droughts, and changes in flowering seasons influenced the behavior and ability of the pollinators to survive (Scaven & Rafferty, 2013; Mahdi et al., 2024).

The effects were more severe in the agricultural areas as they faced the extra pressure of the pesticides, monocultures, and changes in land use. It decreased the probability of a successful pollination when flowering blooms of plants and the active period of pollinators did not coincide (Forrest, 2014; Villa-Galaviz et al., 2023). Higher temperatures also interfered with the migration of pollinators as well as nesting patterns. As an example, bees moved out earlier in the season, and even before the flower supply was present. Such mismatches resulted in yield loss of crops in areas where crops relied heavily on pollination (Rahimi & Jung, 2025; Mishra et al., 2023). This is why it became essential to examine how climate change had an impact on pollinators within farming areas and food production, as well as environmental stability.

Numerous scientists actively discussed the overall downward trend of pollinators. However, there are few grounds to relate the alteration of pollinators to concrete climatic parameters, especially to an increase in temperature and variations in precipitation, and to extreme weather conditions were brought into the relationship (Potts et al., 2010). Also, it did not have any studies that overlapped scientific observations and the perspectives of local farmers, workers in the agricultural sector, and policymakers (Maas et al., 2021; Pawlak & Kołodziejczak, 2020). Such stakeholders found themselves first-hand partaking in the changes taking place within their professions and thus came up with very valuable suggestions.

Effective solutions were not easy to design because only the fuller picture of both scientific data and human points of view was not understood. Most of the conservation policies were too general or not related to local requirements. Also, the interaction between climate stress and other threats, such as pesticide use or habitat loss, was not well understood. As a result, the response to pollinator decline lacked focus, and practical solutions were not always successful in farming zones where they were needed most (Goulson et al., 2015; Stout & Dicks, 2022).

Research Objectives

1. To examine the effects of climate change (temperature, rainfall, humidity) on the population and diversity of pollinators in agricultural zones.
2. To explore the perceptions of farmers, agricultural experts, and beekeepers regarding climate-related changes in pollinator activity and abundance.
3. To integrate ecological data with stakeholder insights to develop a holistic understanding of the issue.

Research Questions

1. Which statistics exist between climatic factors and populations of pollinators in the chosen agricultural areas?
2. How do local stakeholders perceive the impacts of climate change on pollinators?
3. In what ways do quantitative and qualitative findings complement or diverge from each other?

The proposed study was important because it covered a significant topic in climate change research and investigated how an increase in temperature and the emergence of unpredictable weather influenced the presence of the pollinators in agricultural landscapes (Muluneh, 2021; Skendžić et al., 2021). It provided new data on climate levels and field realities, offering a clearer understanding of what was happening to pollinators. The results have a favorable impact on biodiversity protection by revealing the role of pollinator-friendly agricultural farming and climate-smart agricultural planning (Dicks et al., 2016; Moldoveanu et al., 2024).

The science-policy gap was also provided with a solution by the study. The research carried out practical recommendations in terms of land use and crop management by involving the views of farmers and specialists in the field of agriculture (Kalpana et al., 2024). These lessons may assist policymakers in devising better, local policies to safeguard the pollinators. On the whole, the study led to food security and ecological sustainability in the era of rapid climate change.

Literature Review

Climate change has had a significant impact on global ecosystems over the past few decades. The world was already experiencing a warmer climate, the changes in rainfall patterns, and an increased rate of extreme weather phenomena (IPCC, 2021; Bolan et al., 2023). These alterations have still affected the agricultural areas, such as modifying the moisture level of the soil, crop cycles, and growing seasons. As an example, climatic change has resulted in warmer winters and the introduction of spring earlier, thus causing early flowering of crops that have distorted the timing of relationships between plants and their pollinating partners (Scaven & Rafferty, 2013). In other areas like South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, extended drought and uncertain rainfall caused a low production of crops and enhanced susceptibility of natural systems (Govind & Verchick, 2015).

All these changes in the environment not only affected plants, but also insects and birds, which relied on these plants for their survival. There was a dynamic transformation in pollination, with plants blossoming at specific times of the year or in a reduced time frame. Consequently, the pollinators had less access to floral resources when they were most active, which implied less reproduction and survival (Faust & Iler, 2021; Hannah et al., 2016). Scientists have witnessed that changes in climate patterns resulted in the decreased stability in the ecosystems that further complicated their adaptations by both flora and fauna (Tylianakis et al., 2008). These aggravations of the climate created critical situations in agricultural ecosystems that already had biodiversity suppressed by monoculture practices.

Pollinator Species and Their Role in Agriculture

Bees, butterflies, birds, beetles, among others, were the pollinators that contributed to the food production in the world. Researchers projected that approximately three-quarters of the significant crops were partly or entirely determined by animal pollination (Klein et al., 2006). These were fruits, vegetables, nuts, and oilseeds, which were very important in terms of nutrition as well as economic benefits. Managed and wild honeybees were the best pollinators because they would visit many flowers. But two additional species, such as flies and wasps, were the other contributors to pollination, at least in a varied agricultural system (Rader et al., 2015; Hannah et al., 2016).

The agricultural systems became more resilient due to the diversity of the species of pollinators. Where there were more than two species involved in pollination, crops got more pollinated despite one of the species having deteriorated. Indicatively, the native bees frequently came in to fill the gaps left by the populated honeybee groups and in those areas where hives were decimated either due to disease or by use of pesticides (Garibaldi et al., 2013). In addition, healthy populations of pollinators were maintained by natural habitats that were close to farms. These were important living places which provided nesting sites, food, and pesticide protection and thus were of significant importance in sustainable crops (Kennedy et al., 2013).

Evidence of Pollinator Decline and Climate Factors

There was a lot of evidence monitored, which made it clear that populations of pollinators were declining, and climate change significantly contributed to this. It was proven over the long-term studies in Europe and North America that the abundance and diversity of wild and managed pollinators had declined in the last few decades (Potts et al., 2010). Mismatch between the activity of pollinators and flowering seasons was due to climate-related aspects, including increasing temperature, spring advances, and an increase in droughts. Such a discrepancy caused challenges in the process of searching for enough food by pollinators, especially at critical points in life (Forrest, 2014).

Rainfall also changed, and this affected most of the bee species in terms of nesting. As an example, ground-nesting bees were susceptible to soil moisture; when the conditions were drier, the number of nesting sites and reproductive success decreased (Radmacher & Strohm, 2009; Hannah et al., 2016). Temperature increase in these mountainous areas left some species with little to no habitats similar to their cool climate due to the necessity to relocate further up the mountains (Kerr et al., 2015). Such changes led to strains on the pollinators as well as the plants that relied on them.

In addition, climate change tended to act in collaboration with other risks, such as pesticides, diseases, and habitat destruction, which added extra pressure to the pollinator population. Their effects combined forced a decrease in resistance to these populations and made the local ecosystems vulnerable to collapse (Goulson et al., 2015). The researchers did not only indicate that the relationship between pollinators and climate required further elaboration, but also a number of environmental and anthropogenic variables had to be taken into context.

Mixed Methods in Environmental and Agricultural Research

Problems including decrease of pollinators were interdisciplinary and had to be dealt with. Multi techniques studies involving both the quantitative and qualitative information have succeeded in many environmental study projects. The approach allowed the researchers to generate scientific evidence regarding changes that the species undergo, the environmental factors, and have an overview of the experience and response of the farmers, land managers, and communities towards the changes (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017).

To illustrate, saturating the studies of agricultural climatic adaptation with satellite data on weather patterns and farmer interviews, which were adopted to understand the local impact and decision-making process, was a consistent component of the investigation (Berry et al., 2018). In the biodiversity studies, the views of the stakeholders on land utilisation, pesticide use and the perception on the ecosystem service were added to the surveys of the pollinator population. This strategy helped in decreasing the gap between the reality and the ecological knowledge in the field of reality that is agriculture. The mixed-method approach also enhanced the policy implications of the research findings by providing insights into the research findings to policymakers and local groups. The scientific models demonstrated large-scale patterns, whereas interviews and focus groups demonstrated challenging issues within the context and traditional knowledge. The synthesis of the two perspectives was more apt to solve problems on the basis of practicality and local acceptability (Newing et al., 2011). With climate change persisting in the ecosystems and agriculture, a mixed methods research proved to be the best and flexible tool for creating integrated responses.

Research Gap Identification

Although a considerable number of studies have been conducted on pollinators and climate change, there are still some gaps. To begin with, the bulk of the research was focused in Europe and North America, and the data from tropical and developing countries were meager, where the type of agriculture and pollinator availability varied largely (IPBES, 2017). There would be a tendency that such regions would not have long-term monitoring programs in place, besides encountering other issues such as limits in resources and pressure on land use.

Secondly, most researches were dedicated to local species or temporary variations, whereas the whole pollinator diversity in the agricultural landscapes was far unexplored. It was necessary to conduct additional research that addressed various pollinators simultaneously, whereby bees, butterflies, and birds were considered, so that the dynamism of ecosystem services can be understood better (Winfree et al., 2011).

Third, whoever studied the view of stakeholders regarding ecological situations and climate change coupled their study with limited ecological data. Although numerous farmers have observed that fewer pollinators or variations in flowering periods occur, such observations were not considered in scientific research in any way. Through this, much valuable local knowledge would be underrepresented in the planning of the conservation (Samanta et al., 2024). This lack of combined research hindered the elaboration of an all-around approach that can clearly be used to solve both scientific and functional aspects of pollinator decline. Thus, the necessity of interdisciplinary works that applied the mixed methods to the consideration of the influence of climate change on pollinators in agricultural areas, including deprived regions, was evident.

Methodology

The research was done through a convergent parallel design of mixed methods research. Quantitative and qualitative information were combined into the collection. Each of the types of data was analyzed independently and then combined further to provide a more adequate picture of the impact of climate change on the population of pollinators in agricultural regions. This method assisted in comparing quantifiable data measuring climate and pollinators, and personal experiences of individuals who work in the agricultural sector.

In the quantitative aspect, two primary sources of data were used by the research. First, information regarding temperature, rainfall, and humidity was available through meteorological records. Second, data on the abundance and diversity of pollinators in chosen agricultural zones were collected on the basis of field observations. The sampling was concentrated on the areas with an agricultural background and the availability of long-term ecological and climatic data. These were selected since they enabled researchers to take note of the changes that occurred with time. A series of conventional pollinator observation techniques, such as the number of pollinators visiting flowers in specific plots, were used to collect data. Satellite systems and ground weather stations were used to obtain climate data.

The researchers employed statistical approaches in the analysis of the data, including correlation analysis, regression modeling, and time-series analysis. These instruments assisted in establishing whether there was any relation between altered temperature, rainfall, or humidity and the alteration in the number of pollinators.

Qualitative Component

The qualitative part was supposed to understand personal experience and local knowledge concerning the impact of climate change on pollinators. The research had purposive sampling, where 25 participants were chosen. The participants of this group were 10 farmers, five beekeepers, five agricultural extension workers, and five entomologists. The choices of these participants were based on the fact that they all have a strong relationship with agriculture and pollinators. The collection of data was provided by means of semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions. Responses were recorded using interview guides, shoulder recorders, and field notes. Respondents were asked to give their opinions about seasonal variations, crop production, and sightings of pollinators, and what could have caused the decline in pollinators.

A thematic analysis was done by the researchers after collecting the data. It also included participating in reading and coding interview transcripts in order to identify dissimilar themes, including early flowering, heat stress, and pollinator disappearance. These perceptions were used in trying to explain how communities were monitoring and reacting to changes, which were brought about by climate stress.

Integration Strategy

The analysis of the two types of data was followed by the comparison of the results. The researchers sought convergence, to find a place where the results of both sources complemented each other in the same aspects; divergence, noting where they did not match; and expansion, where one source provided a supplement to another. This was because the integration enhanced the enrichment and practicality of the findings on future direction regarding agriculture and conservation.

Ethical treatment was conducted on all the participants. All interviewed people provided informed consent, and no interviews started or recordings were made without it. Absolute anonymity and confidentiality were adhered to. The institutional review boards also approved the research in terms of ethics, so that the research was conducted as per the standards of research. To ensure the research was reliable and valid, triangulation was used by comparing data from different sources. In the qualitative part, peer debriefing and member checking were done to confirm the accuracy of findings. For the quantitative data, standardized observation methods were applied to maintain consistency and scientific accuracy.

Results

Quantitative Findings

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Climate Trends and Pollinator Abundance

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Average Temperature Increase (°C)	1.8	0.6	0.8	3.0
Change in Rainfall (mm/year)	-85	35	-130	-20
Humidity Decline (%)	-5.6	2.3	-10	0
Pollinator Abundance Score (1–5)	2.3	0.9	1	4
Number of Pollinator Species	6.2	2.1	3	10

The data shows a consistent increase in average temperatures, a significant reduction in annual rainfall, and a slight decline in humidity. Pollinator abundance has a mean score of 2.3, suggesting a moderate to severe decrease in observed pollinators. The number of pollinator species per site has also reduced.

Relationship between Climatic Variables and Pollinator Data (Correlation & Regression)

Table 2: Pearson Correlation Matrix

Variable	Temperature	Rainfall	Humidity	Pollinator Abundance
Temperature	1.00	-0.78	-0.64	-0.71
Rainfall	-0.78	1.00	0.55	0.60
Humidity	-0.64	0.55	1.00	0.50
Pollinator Abundance	-0.71	0.60	0.50	1.00

$P < 0.01$

Table 3 Regression Model Summary (Pollinator Abundance as Dependent Variable)

Predictor	β Coefficient	Std. Error	t-value	p-value
Temperature	-0.52	0.14	-3.71	0.001
Rainfall	0.41	0.13	3.15	0.003
Humidity	0.22	0.12	1.83	0.075

R^2 = 0.61

There is a strong negative correlation between temperature and pollinator abundance (r = -0.71). Rainfall and humidity are positively associated with pollinator levels. The regression model explains 61% of the variance in pollinator abundance, with temperature being the strongest predictor of decline.

Temporal and Spatial Trends across Seasons or Years

Table 4 Temporal Trend Analysis (2013–2023)

Year	Avg. Temp (°C)	Annual Rainfall (mm)	Pollinator Abundance Score
2013	24.1	1100	4.0
2016	25.0	980	3.3
2019	25.6	910	2.6
2023	26.4	860	2.1

Interpretation: Over the past decade, there has been a clear increase in temperature and a decline in rainfall. These climatic changes align with a significant drop in pollinator abundance, reflecting a worrying trend in ecosystem stability.

Table 5 Spatial Trends (Across Study Sites)

Region	Mean Temperature	Rainfall (mm)	Avg. No. of Pollinators Observed
Site A (North)	24.8°C	980	8.1
Site B (Central)	25.7°C	890	5.7
Site C (South)	26.9°C	850	4.3

Regions with higher temperatures and lower rainfall observed fewer pollinators. Northern sites had higher biodiversity and abundance, likely due to cooler microclimates and better floral resources.

Qualitative Findings

Perceived Decline in Pollinators

Many stakeholders, particularly farmers and beekeepers, consistently reported a noticeable decline in pollinator presence over the past several years. This perception was often linked to changing climate patterns, including prolonged dry spells and erratic rainfall. “In the past, our fields were always buzzing with bees during flowering. But now, I see very few. Even butterflies seem to have vanished during some seasons.” *(Farmer, 15 years' experience, District A)*

Beekeepers echoed similar concerns, observing not only fewer wild pollinators but also changes in the behavior of managed honeybees.

“My bees come out earlier now, even before the mustard starts flowering. Sometimes they return with little nectar it’s like their rhythm is off.” *(Beekeeper, 8 years' experience, District B)*

These accounts indicate that both abundance and activity periods of pollinators are shifting, potentially due to rising temperatures and phonological mismatches between crops and pollinators.

Adaptive Farming Practices

Some farmers reported attempts to adapt to pollinator decline by changing their practices. This included reducing pesticide use, planting more flowering species, and leaving parts of their land fallow to support biodiversity.

“We started planting sunflower strips between crops. I was told it helps bring bees back. It’s not a huge change, but I think it helps a little.” *(Farmer, District C)*

Extension workers and entomologists also confirmed that awareness programs have slowly begun influencing farming behavior.

“We encourage farmers to plant nectar-rich plants and avoid spraying during the blooming period. A few have started listening, but there’s still a long way to go.” *(Agricultural Extension Officer, 10 years' experience)*

These adaptations suggest a growing, though uneven, response among agricultural communities to counter the loss of pollination services.

Concerns about Future Agricultural Yields

A dominant concern across all stakeholder groups was the potential impact of pollinator decline on crop production. Several participants linked lower yields of fruits and vegetables with decreased pollinator activity.

"Last year, our cucumbers looked deformed and fewer in number. The agronomist said it might be due to poor pollination. I'm worried this will only get worse." *(Farmer, District D)*

Entomologists also highlighted that farmers' observations matched field data, indicating lower pollination success in some areas.

"There's definitely a gap now between flowering times and peak pollinator activity. This mismatch could affect crop yields if the trend continues." *(Entomologist, Research Institute)*

The expressed fears underscore the broader implications of pollinator loss not only for ecological health but also for livelihoods and food security.

Integrated Interpretation

Alignment between Ecological Data and Stakeholder Perceptions

A strong convergence was observed between the quantitative ecological trends and the perceptions of stakeholders. Statistical data indicated a consistent decline in pollinator abundance correlated with rising temperatures and decreasing rainfall, particularly in southern and central agricultural zones. This matched closely with reports from farmers and beekeepers who noted a visible reduction in bee activity, butterfly sightings, and pollination success.

"*Even the flowering crops don't seem to attract insects the way they used to*," reported one farmer, echoing the regression findings showing a negative correlation ($r = -0.71$) between rising temperature and pollinator abundance.

Similarly, time-series data from 2013 to 2023 revealed that as rainfall declined and average temperature rose, pollinator scores dropped from 4.0 to 2.1. Farmers and entomologists, without seeing the data, independently highlighted this timeline and linked it to climate anomalies, such as early flowering and heat stress, providing strong evidence of experiential knowledge aligning with empirical trends.

Areas of Contrast and Observed Discrepancies

Despite the overall alignment, certain contrasts were evident. While ecological data identified humidity as a relatively weaker predictor of pollinator abundance ($\beta = 0.22$, $p > 0.05$), several participants emphasized increased dryness and "drought-like soil" as major stressors. These perceptions may stem from a holistic understanding of local microclimates, where soil moisture and plant health—indirectly tied to humidity—play a more observable role in pollinator visibility.

Additionally, in regions with slightly better climatic conditions (e.g., northern sites with higher rainfall), pollinator species richness remained relatively stable (mean = 8.1). Yet, even here, some farmers expressed concerns about "losing bees soon" due to pesticide drift or land-use change. This indicates that in certain cases, perceived pollinator decline may also be influenced by factors beyond climatic stress, such as farming intensification or anecdotal observation bias.

Local Contextualization of Findings

When contextualized locally, the integration of datasets paints a nuanced picture. Stakeholders' concerns about future agricultural yields due to pollinator decline were substantiated by field data showing reduced pollination services in areas with high temperature anomalies and lower floral diversity. This reflects an ecological feedback loop that stakeholders are beginning to observe firsthand: climate change alters flowering patterns, which disrupts pollinator behavior, leading to reduced crop productivity, thus validating their fears.

Moreover, adaptive practices reported by farmers (e.g., planting flowering crops, reducing pesticide use) were mostly found in northern regions where NGO awareness campaigns had been more active. This demonstrates that local institutional efforts, awareness, and environmental conditions collectively shape both the severity of climate impacts and the community's capacity to respond.

The convergence of ecological and social data highlights the reliability of local knowledge in tracking environmental change. At the same time, subtle divergences underscore the importance of using mixed methods to capture the complexity of climate–pollinator interactions. This integrated understanding can inform more targeted, context-sensitive strategies to mitigate pollinator loss and support climate-resilient agriculture.

Discussion

This study reveals a clear negative relationship between climate change variables particularly increased temperature and reduced rainfall and pollinator abundance in agricultural zones. The statistical findings indicate a strong negative correlation between temperature and pollinator presence ($r = -0.71$, $p < 0.01$), while rainfall shows a positive association ($r = 0.60$, $p < 0.01$), with temperature emerging as the strongest predictor of pollinator decline in the regression model ($\beta = -0.52$, $p = 0.001$). These results align with the central research objective of quantifying the climatic determinants of pollinator loss.

Qualitative insights provide further depth, with farmers and beekeepers consistently reporting reduced sightings of bees and butterflies and observing shifts in flowering and foraging behavior. Such experiential knowledge corresponds closely with the ecological data, underscoring both the accuracy and relevance of stakeholder perceptions. For example, one beekeeper noted: "My bees come out earlier now, even before the mustard starts flowering... their rhythm is off," a statement that reflects the phenological mismatches confirmed in the literature (Scaven & Rafferty, 2013; Forrest, 2014).

Furthermore, adaptation strategies, such as planting sunflower strips and reducing pesticide use, suggest that some communities are already responding to environmental stressors. However, these actions remain inconsistent and localized, highlighting the need for broader, more coordinated interventions.

Comparison with Existing Literature

The observed trends are in strong agreement with existing literature linking pollinator decline to climate-related factors. Previous studies have emphasized that temperature increases and precipitation shifts disrupt the synchrony between pollinators and flowering plants (Potts et al., 2010; Forrest, 2014), a pattern clearly reflected in this study's findings from 2013 to 2023. Similar to the results of Radmacher and Strohm (2009), farmers also identified increased soil dryness and reduced nesting success particularly among ground-nesting bees as significant challenges.

The qualitative findings complement and extend prior research emphasizing the importance of integrating stakeholder perspectives in ecological studies. For instance, Maas et al. (2021) highlighted the value of farmer insights in biodiversity monitoring, while Samanta et al. (2024) stressed the absence of such perspectives in many scientific studies. The current study addresses this gap by demonstrating that local knowledge often mirrors long-term ecological trends, reinforcing the importance of mixed methods in conservation science (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017; Berry et al., 2018).

Notably, a divergence emerged around the role of humidity. While statistical results show humidity to be a weaker predictor ($\beta = 0.22$, $p > 0.05$), many interviewees cited "dryness" and "drought-like soil" as major concerns. This discrepancy may stem from a broader interpretation of microclimatic conditions that encompass both soil and air moisture, factors not fully captured by ambient humidity measures alone.

Implications for Agricultural Policy and Practice

The study's findings carry significant implications for agricultural policy and practice. First, climate-resilient farming must include pollinator-friendly practices, such as planting nectar-rich flora, preserving natural habitats, and limiting pesticide use during blooming periods. The benefits of these strategies have already been demonstrated in pilot efforts within northern sites, where higher pollinator diversity and farmer awareness coexisted.

Second, policy frameworks must be localized. Regional differences in climate impact, biodiversity, and community response capacity mean that uniform solutions may fail. Instead, place-based adaptation strategies should be promoted, ideally informed by both scientific monitoring and stakeholder consultation (Newing et al., 2011; Moldoveanu et al., 2024).

Third, this study reinforces the need for interdisciplinary collaboration. Effective mitigation of pollinator loss requires integrating ecological science with agronomy, rural sociology, and environmental governance. Governmental and non-governmental institutions must support data-sharing platforms, farmer training programs, and subsidies for sustainable practices.

Lastly, pollinator conservation must be integrated into broader biodiversity protection and food security agendas. Given the critical role pollinators play in crop yield and quality (Klein et al., 2006; Garibaldi et al., 2013), their decline threatens not only ecosystems but also the livelihoods of smallholder farmers and national food systems. Policies that strengthen ecosystem services while supporting agricultural productivity are urgently needed.

Limitations of the Study

This study, while comprehensive in its mixed methods approach, has several limitations. Firstly, the geographic focus was limited to selected agricultural zones, which may not fully represent the diversity of climates and pollinator species across broader regions. The results, therefore, may not be generalizable to all agro-ecological contexts, especially in regions with different environmental, cultural, or agricultural characteristics.

Second, the time frame of the quantitative information was limited to ten years. Although this enabled the determination of major trends, they might not capture long-run climatic cycles and the historical baselines that would enable stronger projections. Likewise, the qualitative findings, despite their richness and information, included a fairly small group of stakeholders. This may bring bias or constrain the input of diverse opinions in the community.

Finally, the study was unable to isolate the effects of climate change fully since the actions of climate change experience the complications of many components of climate change that co-occur with it in the real world, like pesticide use, land-use change, or habitat fragmentation. While these were acknowledged by participants and observed in broader contexts, they were not systematically measured in this study.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. Future studies should cover a wider range of agricultural zones, including arid, mountainous, and coastal areas, to capture varied ecological conditions affecting pollinators.
2. Longitudinal research spanning several decades is recommended to distinguish short-term changes from long-term trends in pollinator populations.
3. Research should incorporate more detailed seasonal data to better understand how pollinator dynamics shift within and across growing seasons.
4. Future work should assess how climate change interacts with other stressors—such as pesticide use, disease, invasive species, and habitat loss—to impact pollinator health.
5. Engaging local communities and farmers in data collection through citizen science can improve both the quantity and relevance of research data.
6. Studies should evaluate the costs and benefits of adaptive practices to inform policies that are both effective and economically viable for farmers.

Conclusion

The effect of climate change on pollinator populations in the agricultural areas is thoughtfully explored in this study, with the combination of ecology and the perceptions of stakeholders. The analysis also shows a distinct reduction in the abundance and diversity of pollinators and is directly linked to an increase in temperatures and a decrease in rainfall. These quantitative trends get a firm echo in qualitative intensities of farmers, beekeepers, and agricultural specialists, who note significant changes in the behavior of pollinators, as well as crop productivity.

Significantly, the report shows the importance of integrating both scientific and local information to establish a more pieced-together and sensitive perspective of the change in the environment. This reflected congruence of the empirical data with the community experience supports the validity of cross-disciplinary applications in solving the complicated ecological problems. Solutions to the loss of pollinators should be based on region-specific solutions; however, region-specific solutions must take into consideration local climate trends, land-use trends, and socio-economic realities. These plans ought to facilitate pollinator-compatible agriculture, climate-smart and inclusive agriculture, and participatory policy formulations. In the future, efforts to renew pollinators will be part of biodiversity protection, as well as the sustainable food system and rural livelihoods under changing climate conditions.

References

Aizen, M. A., Garibaldi, L. A., & Harder, L. D. (2022). Myth and Reality of a Global Crisis for Agricultural Pollination. *Ecología Austral*, *32*(2bis), 698–715. https://doi.org/10.25260/ea.22.32.2.1.1875.

Berry, E., Metternicht, G., & Baumber, A. (2018). 'This Country Just Hangs Tight': Perspectives on Managing Land Degradation and Climate Change in Far West NSW. *The Rangeland Journal*, *41*(3), 197–210.

Bolan, S., Padhye, L. P., Jasemizad, T., Govarthanan, M., Karmegam, N., Wijesekara, H., Amarasiri, D., Hou, D., Zhou, P., Biswal, B. K., Balasubramanian, R., Wang, H., Siddique, K. H., Rinklebe, J., Kirkham, M., & Bolan, N. (2023). Impacts of Climate Change on the Fate of Contaminants through Extreme Weather Events. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *909*, 168388. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.168388.

Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research. *Sage publications*.

Dicks, L. V., Viana, B., Bommarco, R., Brosi, B., Del Coro Arizmendi, M., Cunningham, S. A., Galetto, L., Hill, R., Lopes, A. V., Pires, C., Taki, H., & Potts, S. G. (2016). Ten Policies for Pollinators. *Science*, *354*(6315), 975–976. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aai9226.

Faust, M. N., & Iler, A. M. (2021). Pollinator-Mediated Reproductive Consequences of Altered Co-Flowering Under Climate Change Conditions Depend on Abiotic Context. *Climate Change Ecology*, *3*, 100043. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecochg.2021.100043.

Forrest, J. R. K. (2014). Plant–Pollinator Interactions And Phenological Change: What Can We Learn About Climate Impacts From Experiments And Observations? *Oikos*, *124*(1), 4–13. https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.01386.

Garibaldi, L. A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Winfree, R., Aizen, M. A., Bommarco, R., Cunningham, S. A., Kremen, C., Carvalheiro, L. G., Harder, L. D., Afik, O., Bartomeus, I., Benjamin, F., Boreux, V., Cariveau, D., Chacoff, N. P., Dudenhöffer, J. H., Freitas, B. M., Ghazoul, J., Greenleaf, S., . . . Klein, A. M. (2013). Wild Pollinators Enhance Fruit Set Of Crops Regardless of Honey Bee Abundance. *Science*, *339*(6127), 1608–1611. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1230200.

Goulson, D., Nicholls, E., Botías, C., & Rotheray, E. L. (2015). Bee declines driven by combined stress from parasites, pesticides, and lack of flowers. *Science*, *347*(6229). https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1255957.

Govind, P. J., & Verchick, R. R. (2015). Natural Disaster and Climate Change. *International Environmental Law and the Global South*, 491–507.

Hannah, L., Steele, M., Fung, E., Imbach, P., Flint, L., & Flint, A. (2016). Climate Change Influences on Pollinator, Forest, and Farm Interactions Across A Climate Gradient. Climatic Change, 141(1), 63–75. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-016-1868-x.

IPBES. (2017). *The assessment report on pollinators, pollination and food production*. Bonn, Germany: Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. https://files.ipbes.net/ipbes-web-prod-public-files/spm_deliverable_3a_pollination_20170222.pdf.

IPCC. (2021). *Sixth Assessment Report: Climate Change 2021 – The Physical Science Basis*. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/.

Kalpana, K., Reddy, G. S. V., Chellem, S. R., Rajalakshmi, J., Indrani, K., Lavanya, P., & Navya, D. S. (2024). The Role of Pollinators in Enhancing Biodiversity and Pollination Mechanisms: A Review. *Uttar Pradesh Journal of Zoology*, *45*(13), 226–241. https://doi.org/10.56557/upjoz/2024/v45i134150.

Kennedy, C. M., Lonsdorf, E., Neel, M. C., Williams, N. M., Ricketts, T. H., Winfree, R., Bommarco, R., Brittain, C., Burley, A. L., Cariveau, D., Carvalheiro, L. G., Chacoff, N. P., Cunningham, S. A., Danforth, B. N., Dudenhöffer, J., Elle, E., Gaines, H. R., Garibaldi, L. A., Gratton, C., . . . Kremen, C. (2013). A Global Quantitative Synthesis of Local and Landscape Effects on Wild Bee Pollinators in Agroecosystems. *Ecology Letters*, *16*(5), 584–599. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12082.

Kerr, J. T., Pindar, A., Galpern, P., Packer, L., Potts, S. G., Roberts, S. M., ... & Pantoja, A. (2015). Climate Change Impacts On Bumblebees Converge Across Continents. *Science*, *349*(6244), 177–180.

Klein, A., Vaissière, B. E., Cane, J. H., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham, S. A., Kremen, C., & Tscharntke, T. (2006). Importance of Pollinators in Changing Landscapes For World Crops. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B Biological Sciences*, *274*(1608), 303–313. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2006.3721.

Maas, B., Fabian, Y., Kross, S. M., & Richter, A. (2021). Divergent Farmer and Scientist Perceptions of Agricultural Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services and Decision-Making. *Biological Conservation*, *256*, 109065. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2021.109065.

Mahdi, S. S., Singh, R., & Dhekale, B. (2024). *Adapting to Climate Change in Agriculture-Theories and Practices*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-28142-6.

Mishra, M., Bhunia, P., Shubham, S., Sen, R., Bhunia, R., Gulia, J., Mondal, T., Zidane, Z., Saha, T., Chacko, A., Raj, R., S, V. S., & Kaushal, L. (2023). The Impact of Weather Change On Honey Bee Populations And Disease. *Journal of Advanced Zoology*, *44*(S7), 180–190. https://doi.org/10.17762/jaz.v44is7.2755.

Moldoveanu, O. C., Maggioni, M., & Dani, F. R. (2024). Environmental Ameliorations and Politics In Support Of Pollinators. Experiences From Europe: A review. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *362*, 121219. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2024.121219.

Muluneh, M. G. (2021). Impact of Climate Change on Biodiversity and Food Security: A Global Perspective—A Review Article. Agriculture & Food Security, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40066-021-00318-5.

Newing, H., Eagle, C., Puri, R. K., & Watson, C. W. (2011). *Conducting research in conservation* (Vol. 775). Oxfordshire: Routledge.

Pawlak, K., & Kołodziejczak, M. (2020). The Role of Agriculture in Ensuring Food Security in Developing Countries: Considerations in the Context of the Problem of Sustainable Food Production. *Sustainability*, *12*(13), 5488. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12135488.

Potts, S. G., Biesmeijer, J. C., Kremen, C., Neumann, P., Schweiger, O., & Kunin, W. E. (2010). Global pollinator declines: trends, impacts and drivers. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *25*(6), 345–353. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2010.01.007.

Rader, R., Bartomeus, I., Garibaldi, L. A., Garratt, M. P. D., Howlett, B. G., Winfree, R., Cunningham, S. A., Mayfield, M. M., Arthur, A. D., Andersson, G. K. S., Bommarco, R., Brittain, C., Carvalheiro, L. G., Chacoff, N. P., Entling, M. H., Foully, B., Freitas, B. M., Gemmill-Herren, B., Ghazoul, J.,... Woyciechowski, M. (2015). Non-bee insects are important contributors to global crop pollination. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *113*(1), 146–151. Https://Doi.Org/10.1073/Pnas.1517092112.

Radmacher, S., & Strohm, E. (2009). Factors Affecting Offspring Body Size In The Solitary Beeosmia Bicornis(Hymenoptera, Megachilidae). Apidologie, 41(2), 169–177. https://doi.org/10.1051/apido/2009064.

Rahimi, E., & Jung, C. (2025). Exploring Climate-Driven mismatches between Pollinator-Dependent crops and honeybees in Asia. *Biology*, *14*(3), 234. https://doi.org/10.3390/biology14030234.

Samanta, S., Senapati, S., Ganaie, M. H., Maji, A., Sarkar, S. K., Das, M., & Banerjee, S. (2024). Impact of Climate Change and Global Warming on Crop Pollinators and their Mitigation Strategies: A Review. *Agricultural Reviews*, *Of*. https://doi.org/10.18805/ag.r-2684.

Scaven, V. L., & Rafferty, N. E. (2013). Physiological effects of climate warming on flowering plants and insect pollinators and potential consequences for their interactions. *Current zoology*, *59*(3), 418–426.

Skendžić, S., Zovko, M., Živković, I. P., Lešić, V., & Lemić, D. (2021). The Impact of Climate Change on Agricultural Insect Pests. *Insects*, *12*(5), 440. https://doi.org/10.3390/insects12050440.

Stout, J. C., & Dicks, L. V. (2022). From Science To Society: Implementing Effective Strategies To Improve Wild Pollinator Health. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B Biological Sciences*, *377*(1853). https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2021.0165.

Tylianakis, J. M., Didham, R. K., Bascompte, J., & Wardle, D. A. (2008). Global Change and Species Interactions In Terrestrial Ecosystems. *Ecology Letters*, *11*(12), 1351–1363. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01250.x.

Villa-Galaviz, E., Cirtwill, A. R., Gibson, R., Timberlake, T., Roslin, T., & Memmott, J. (2023). What Makes A Good Pollinator? Abundant And Specialised Insects With Long Flight Periods Transport The Most Strawberry Pollen. *Ecological Solutions and Evidence*, *4*(3). https://doi.org/10.1002/2688-8319.12253.

Winfree, R., Bartomeus, I., & Cariveau, D. P. (2011). Native Pollinators in Anthropogenic Habitats. *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics*, *42*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-102710-145042.

International Journal of Innovative Multidisciplinary Research(IJIMR)