



HAL
open science

Gap affordance judgments in bumblebees: same as humans?

Martin Giurfa, Marion Luyat

► **To cite this version:**

Martin Giurfa, Marion Luyat. Gap affordance judgments in bumblebees: same as humans?. Learning and Behavior, 2021, Learning & Behavior, 10.3758/s13420-021-00486-1 . hal-03394617

HAL Id: hal-03394617

<https://hal.univ-lille.fr/hal-03394617v1>

Submitted on 18 Sep 2024

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

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

1 Gap affordance judgments in bumblebees: same as humans?

2
3 **Martin Giurfa^{1,2} & Marion Luyat³**

4
5 ¹ Research Centre on Animal Cognition, Center for Integrative Biology, CNRS (UMR 5169), University of Toulouse, 118 route
6 de Narbonne, F-31062 Toulouse, France

7 ² Institut Universitaire de France (IUF), Paris, France

8 ³ Univ. Lille, ULR 4072 – PSITEC – Psychologie : Interactions, Temps, Emotions, Cognition, F-59000 Lille, France

9
10
11 **Abstract:** When flying through narrow gaps, bumblebees of different body sizes fly either
12 straightforward or sideways depending on the relation between their wingspan and the width of the
13 gap (Ravi et al., 2020). They thus behave like humans when walking through narrow passages, which
14 raises the question of the mechanisms underlying their own-body perception.

15
16 Moving through the environment requires choosing the safest path that ensures the least
17 physical damage to reach the expected place as quickly as possible. In most of the cases, this selection
18 consists in adapting our behavior with respect to the size of the obstacles encountered: bypassing
19 some, jumping others, tilting the head forward to pass under a beam or turning the shoulders when
20 an opening becomes too small. Taking this into account, James Jerome Gibson introduced in the
21 seventies the term “*affordance*”, a central concept in his ecological theory of visual perception (Gibson,
22 1979). Affordances are possibilities for action that depend on both an observer's capabilities and the
23 properties of the environment (Gibson, 1979). This complementarity is well illustrated by the case of
24 humans passing through an opening while walking, which implies making judgments about action
25 capabilities. In this case, one begins to turn the shoulders for an opening that is 1.3 times the width of
26 one's shoulders (Warren & Whang, 1987). This ratio (critical opening width / shoulder width) is
27 invariant in humans, whether we are small or tall, i.e. whether we have small or large shoulders.

28 A relevant question for the affordance concept is whether it is universal and thus observable in
29 other species beyond humans. Adopting a Gibsonian framework, a recent paper by Ravi et al. (Ravi et

30 al., 2020) has addressed this question in bumblebees and analyzed *whether these insects take into*
31 *account their own size to adopt the best flight maneuver while passing through a gap.*

32 Bumblebees navigate large distances and negotiate complex and cluttered environments during
33 their flight maneuvers. Avoiding collisions is thus important to them, as their wings are delicate
34 structures that can be easily damaged. Moreover, they exhibit a particular characteristic that cannot
35 be found in other flying social insects such as honey bees and wasps: individuals within a colony vary
36 significantly in size and interindividual body-mass differences can reach up to a factor of seven. Due
37 this size variation, bumblebees constitute a very interesting model to test how differences in the
38 perception of the own-body size may affect navigation decisions.

39 The particular behavior that was studied was the flight through a gap in a wall obstructing the
40 passage along a tunnel to which the bees were previously trained. To pass through the gap, the flying
41 bees had to estimate the horizontal extent of the gap to decide whether flying through it required
42 maneuvering or could be straightforward. The results reported show that this decision was mediated
43 by motion cues extracted in flight at the edges of the gap (Ravi et al., 2020).

44 Bee navigation relies heavily on optic flow (Egelhaaf & Kern, 2002), which is the pattern of
45 apparent motion of objects, surfaces, and edges in a visual scene caused by the relative motion
46 between an observer and a scene. Optic flow allows assessing the distance to objects encountered as
47 objects closer to an observer move faster in the retinal field than distant objects (i.e. motion-parallax),
48 so that approaching a target induces higher optic flow while moving away from it decreases it. Motion
49 cues can be extracted at the edge of objects through parallax and allow evaluating the distance of
50 targets with respect to their background based on differences in their relative retinal speed. Edges are
51 therefore contrasting regions in terms of motion-parallax cues and are privileged by insects to estimate
52 distances and facilitate landing (Egelhaaf & Kern, 2002). In the experiments of Ravi et al. (Ravi et al.,
53 2020), bumblebees facing the edges of the obstructing wall within the tunnel performed consistent
54 peering maneuvers while maintaining the gap in their frontal visual field. In this way, while oscillating
55 in suspended flight in front of the gap edges, they extracted information about the gap extent, which
56 they could then refer to their own size considered from one extended wing to the other extended
57 wing.

58 Peering movements increased in amplitude in the case of narrow gaps, thus showing that the
59 bees privileged information extraction before engaging in a potential difficult maneuver. Segregating
60 the flight behavior of bees according to their size (i.e. their wingspan) showed that larger bees, whose
61 passing through a narrow gap was more compromised, performed more peering than smaller bees,
62 thus showing that appreciating the difficulty of the maneuver was relative to body size. Yet, the most

63 interesting result was observed when the animal passed through the gap once it had evaluated its
64 extent: when the gap was large, the bees simply flew straightforward; yet, when it was narrow, the
65 bees re-oriented their body axis and flew sideways (i.e. they varied their yaw angle in 90° to pass
66 through the gap). Like humans who rotate their shoulders to avoid frontal collision with edges when
67 passing through a narrow gap, the bees also changed their flight axis and passed laterally, to avoid
68 wing contact with the edges. Differences depending on wingspan were particularly interesting in the
69 case of intermediate-size gaps. For smaller bees, such gaps posed no problem and they flew directly
70 through them; for larger bees, on the contrary, the risk of frontal collision was high so that they passed
71 sideways. This result indicates that the perception of the own-body size relative to the size of the
72 physical aperture determined different strategies when facing the same gap.

73 In sum, bumblebees behave like humans in front of a challenging, narrow gap. They quickly
74 adapt their flight trajectory to the point that they can even fly entirely sideways when negotiating
75 extremely small openings. As in humans, what determines the strategy adopted is not the absolute
76 size of the opening but its size relative to the bumblebee's own size, i.e. the ratio between the critical
77 opening and the wingspan, which remains invariant, irrespective of the size of the bumblebees. Are
78 bees cognitively aware of their own size? This question is difficult to answer but the behavioral results
79 indicate that body size is taken into account and determines their flight maneuvers.

80 In humans, several experiments have shown that the Visual Eye Height (VEH)—the distance in
81 the visual scene from the horizon (corresponding to the observer's line of gaze) to the ground on which
82 the observer is standing—constitutes an important reference in perceiving the passability of an
83 aperture (Warren & Whang, 1987). VEH is a static information that can be extracted and used even
84 when the head is restrained and under monocular vision. Other sources of information, in particular
85 dynamic ones, could also play a role such as those linked to head sway or stride length during walking.
86 On Earth, VEH can be used as a reference because the observer's eye height and the object to be
87 perceived (e.g., the edges defining the aperture) share a common surface: the ground. Thus, this
88 information cannot be used in flight so that it would be inaccessible to bumblebees. These insects
89 determined gap size using optic flow, which is also used to estimate distances travelled (Egelhaaf &
90 Kern, 2002). As smaller bees fly faster than larger bees (Crall, Ravi, Mountcastle, & Combes, 2015), the
91 optic flow units used to this end are directly related to body size, so that gap-size information would
92 be equally scaled to body size. In addition, navigation towards and from exploited flowers in a field of
93 bushes and tall grass, provides multiple opportunities to improve progressively body-size scaling via
94 individual experience. Bees perform numerous foraging flights along their live as individual and
95 collective survival depend on these activities. In these flights, cumulative collisions with herbs and
96 leaves – which do not inflict serious damages to the wings – could refine the bees' own-body

97 perception. Thus, studying bumblebees offers the interesting possibility of discovering the nature of
98 the information allowing these body-scaled actions in suspended flight. Whether humans would use
99 similar information under comparable conditions – in flight or for instance when astronauts move in
100 microgravity conditions – remains to be determined but bumblebees could already give us some clues.

101

102 **References**

- 103 Crall, J. D., Ravi, S., Mountcastle, A. M., & Combes, S. A. (2015). Bumblebee flight performance in
104 cluttered environments: effects of obstacle orientation, body size and acceleration. *Journal*
105 *of Experimental Biology*, 218(Pt 17), 2728-2737. doi:10.1242/jeb.121293
- 106 Egelhaaf, M., & Kern, R. (2002). Vision in flying insects. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 12(6), 699-
107 706. doi:10.1016/s0959-4388(02)00390-2
- 108 Gibson, J. J. (1979). *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
109 Company.
- 110 Ravi, S., Siesenop, T., Bertrand, O., Li, L., Doussot, C., Warren, W. H., . . . Egelhaaf, M. (2020).
111 Bumblebees perceive the spatial layout of their environment in relation to their body size
112 and form to minimize inflight collisions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
113 117(49), 31494. doi:10.1073/pnas.2016872117
- 114 Warren, W. H., Jr., & Whang, S. (1987). Visual guidance of walking through apertures: body-scaled
115 information for affordances. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and*
116 *Performance* 13(3), 371-383. doi:10.1037//0096-1523.13.3.371

117