

1 • The evolution of alternative reproductive tactics: concepts and questions

MICHAEL TABORSKY, RUI F. OLIVEIRA, AND H. JANE BROCKMANN

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Here we outline the meaning of the term alternative reproductive tactics, or ARTs, and discuss why the existence of ARTs is so widespread in animals. We ask what we need to know to understand the evolution of ARTs and the importance of general principles such as frequency dependence, density dependence, and condition dependence, and what we need to know about proximate mechanisms involved in the regulation of ARTs to comprehend evolutionary patterns. We discuss current issues in the study of ARTs and list 12 questions that we think need particular attention. Throughout we shall provide representative examples of ARTs in animals to illustrate the ubiquitous nature of this phenomenon.

1.1 WHAT IS THE MEANING OF ALTERNATIVE REPRODUCTIVE TACTIC?

1.1.1 Alternative

The concept of ARTs refers to *alternative* ways to obtain fertilizations in both males and females. In its most common use, this term refers to traits selected to maximize fitness in two or more alternative ways in the context of intraspecific and intrasexual reproductive competition. In general, alternative phenotypes are characterized by a discontinuous distribution of traits evolved towards the same functional end. Examples include size dimorphism, color polymorphism, dimorphic morphological structures involved in the monopolization of resources or mates, and various behavioral alternatives such as territoriality vs. floating, monopolization vs. scramble competition, or investment in primary access to a resource vs. social parasitism. Individuals allocate resources to either one or the other (mutually exclusive) way of achieving the same functional end using evolved decision-making rules (Brockmann 2001).

It is important to note here that in the study of allocation decisions in general, and ARTs in particular, any expression of *continuous* variation of traits is not regarded as *alternative* tactics. Discontinuity in morphological and physiological traits is often difficult to determine (Eberhard and Gutiérrez 1991, Emlen 1996, Kotiaho and Tomkins 2001). In behavioral traits, in contrast, discontinuities may seem easier to measure because of their visibility to observers. For example, there may be overlap between male types of dung beetles in their expression of horns and body sizes, but it is very clear-cut whether these male types fight for access to females or copulate without investing in primary access to mates (Kotiaho and Tomkins 2001; see also Hunt and Simmons 2000). However, subtle discontinuities might exist in any phenotype, including behavior (e.g., when the performance of alternative tactics depends on condition or situation: Brockmann and Penn 1992, Brockmann 2002). In a nutshell, in the context of ARTs, *alternative* refers to traits that show a *discontinuous* distribution.

1.1.2 Reproductive

We speak of alternative reproductive tactics when conspecific, intrasexual competitors find different solutions to *reproductive* competition. It is irrelevant whether the observed variation happens within or between individuals, but reproductive discontinuity within one population at the same time is of essence. In a general sense the concerned traits are alternative responses to competition from members of the same sex. Examples are males either courting females or forcing copulations, as in guppies and other poeciliid fishes (Bisazza 1993, Bisazza and Pilastro 1997), or females either digging burrows for their eggs or usurping those dug by others, as in digger wasps (Brockmann and Dawkins 1979, Brockmann *et al.* 1979). It is irrelevant whether adaptations to reproductive competition are mainly

Box 1.1 Examples of ARTs in animals

Reference to literature on ARTs in taxa mentioned here is given in the text of this chapter and in other chapters of this book.

Molluscs	Phallic and aphaallic males
Horseshoe crabs	Males attached to females and satellites
Mites	Fighter and scrambler males
Crustacea	Mate guarding vs. searching in amphipods Three alternative male mating types in isopods
Insects	Calling and noncalling males in crickets Winged and wingless male morphs in bladder grasshoppers Single- and joint-nest foundresses in social wasps Color and horn polymorphisms in male damselflies and beetles Territorial vs. roaming males in dragonflies
Fishes	Bourgeois males and reproductive parasites in sunfish, salmonids, wrasses, cichlids, blennies, and gobies Bourgeois males and helpers or satellites in ocellated wrasse, cooperative cichlids, and anabantoids Courting and coercive males in poeciliids
Amphibians	Calling males and silent interlopers in frogs and toads
Reptiles	Differently colored males with different mating tactics in lizards
Birds	Courting males and satellites in lekking birds such as ruffs Pair and extra-pair matings in many monogamous species (e.g., red-winged blackbirds, blue tits) Single vs. joint courtship in man-akins Nesting oneself or dumping eggs elsewhere (i.e., intraspecific brood parasitism) in many anatids

Dominant breeders with helpers that share in reproduction in scrubwrens, *Campylorhynchus* wrens, and dunnocks
Bourgeois males and satellites in ungulates such as waterbuck and kob
Displaying/defending males and harassing interlopers in fallow deer
Harem owners and opportunistic, submissive group males in many primates
Flanged and unflanged males in orang-utans

Mammals

What is *not* an ART?

Cooperative breeding, if helpers do not share in reproduction (*reproduction* is a necessary component of an *alternative reproductive tactic*)
Interspecific brood parasitism, as heterospecifics are not reproductive competitors
Sex change, even though in species with alternative tactics *within* one sex bourgeois and parasitic options in this phase may determine the threshold for the optimal timing of sex change (e.g., in wrasses with two or more male reproductive tactics: Munoz and Warner 2003)
Simultaneous hermaphroditism, as shedding sperm is not an *alternative* to shedding eggs among competitors for fertilizations
Infanticide, because it is not a *reproductive* tactic (i.e., to obtain fertilizations or produce offspring, even though it may indirectly contribute to this end)
Pure scramble competition for reproduction without discontinuous phenotypic variation
Alternative phenotypes in nonreproductive contexts (e.g., foraging or trophic polymorphisms such as left- and right-jawed fish, castes, and age polyethism in social insects when the different morphs do not engage in reproductive competition; polymorphisms that involve both males and females such as winged and wingless forms in some insects, alternative migratory patterns and diapause patterns; seasonal polyphenism that does not involve reproductive characters or individuals; and color polymorphisms caused by apostatic prey selection or other anti-predator strategies)

or partly resulting from intrasexual, intersexual, or natural selection mechanisms. For example, the evolution of courting and sneaking tactics in a species may be subject to intrasexual rivalry, but it may also be influenced by mate choice (intersexual selection) and by the tactic-specific potential to evade predation (natural selection). Alternatively, there may be specialization of same-sex conspecifics in exploiting different reproductive niches. Irrespective of the underlying selection mechanisms, ultimately the existence of the two alternative tactics will be the expression of different solutions to reproductive competition. Interspecific brood parasitism, for example, is not an ART, because it is *not* the result of reproductive competition; neither are phenomena like infanticide, sex change, or age polyethism in social insects (see Box 1.1).

1.1.3 Tactic

In a general sense *tactic* refers to a trait or set of traits serving a particular function. In the context of ARTs, tactics usually involve behavioral traits, but the term is by no means restricted to behavioral phenotypes. For instance, various types of horns in a male population of horned beetles may be expressions of alternative reproductive tactics (Emlen 1997, Emlen and Nijhout 2000, Moczek and Emlen 2000); so are color morphs of some lizards (Sinervo and Lively 1996) and male genitalia in certain snails (Doums *et al.* 1998; see Box 1.1). Often, suites of behavioral, morphological, and physiological traits are associated in creating alternative phenotypes within a species (e.g., in plainfin midshipman fish: Bass and Andersen 1991, Bass 1992, 1996, Brantley *et al.* 1993, Brantley and Bass 1994).

We do not think that a distinction between “tactic” and “strategy” is useful here, because these two terms relate to the same issue, but at different levels. A distinction is often made in evolutionary game theory models (Maynard Smith 1982) where strategy relates to a particular life-history pattern or “genetically based program” (Gross 1996), and tactic classifies the application of rules that are part of a strategy (i.e., the phenotype: Shuster and Wade 2003). When analyzing empirical data, usually our potential for inference is limited to the level of phenotype, even if we are ultimately interested in the *evolution* of traits and hence in the effect on genotype frequencies. However, most often we lack information about underlying genotypes. For instance, we do not know whether different genotypes are involved at all or whether phenotypic traits are the expression of conditional variation produced by *exactly the same* genotype

(Shuster and Wade 2003). This may not be so bad in the end (see Grafen’s [1991] discussion on “the phenotypic gambit”). The difference made between phenotypic traits produced by same or different genotypes has heuristic importance for (game theory) evolutionary models, but it ignores the fact that virtually all phenotypic traits are the product of genotypic *and* environmental influence (West-Eberhard 1989, 2003, Scheiner 1993). Hence, in reality the borders between the terms “strategy” and “tactic” are vague and flexible. The underlying mechanisms are usually unknown (i.e., to which extent patterns are genetically determined) at a point when we have not yet studied a phenomenon extensively but nonetheless wish to communicate about it. Therefore, we prefer an operational use of terms here instead of one encumbered with functional implications, just as in the sex-allocation literature (Charnov 1982; see Brockmann 2001). In short, we regard “tactic” and “strategy” as synonymous but prefer the use of “tactic” because we mainly deal with phenotypes and because of the connotations of the term strategy.

In essence, “alternative reproductive tactics” refers to discontinuous behavioral and other traits selected to maximize fitness in two or more alternative ways in the context of intraspecific and intrasexual reproductive competition. Individuals allocate resources to either one or the other (mutually exclusive) way of achieving the same functional end using evolved decision-making rules. This concept may apply to any major taxon, but we shall confine our discussion to the animal kingdom.

1.2 WHERE, WHEN, AND WHY DO WE EXPECT TO FIND ARTs?

We expect to find ARTs whenever there is fitness to be gained by pursuing different reproductive tactics and when intermediate expressions of a reproductive trait are either not possible (e.g., there is nothing in between nesting oneself and dumping eggs in conspecifics’ nests: Yom-Tov 1980, 2001) or selected against by disruptive selection (e.g., benefits of large size for bourgeois tactics and of small size for parasitic¹ tactics: Taborsky 1999). Most often we find

¹ The term “bourgeois” tactic refers to individuals investing in privileged access to mates, by behavioral (e.g., defense, courtship), physiological (e.g., pheromones), or morphological means (e.g., secondary sexual characters). The “parasitic” tactic, in contrast, is performed by individuals exploiting the investment of bourgeois conspecifics. In general discussions of the

ARTs when there is investment to be exploited by same-sex competitors (Brockmann and Dawkins 1979, Wirtz 1982, Field 1992, 1994, Andersson 1994, Taborsky 1994, 1998, 2001, Villalobos and Shelly 1996, Hogg and Forbes 1997, Tallamy 2005). In principle, this is possible in both sexes, but because of the unavoidable higher investment of females (even parasitic females assume the costs of egg production), ARTs are expected to evolve more often in the male sex. It is worth emphasizing that anisogamy biases not only the intensity of sexual selection between the sexes, but consequently also the evolution of ARTs.

Investment in the privileged access to mates or fertilizable gametes bears costs (Taborsky *et al.* 1987, Simmons *et al.* 1992, Bailey *et al.* 1993, Lens *et al.* 1994, Prestwich 1994, Cordts and Partridge 1996, Grafe 1996, Hoback and Wagner 1997, Reinhold *et al.* 1998, Grafe and Thein 2001, Thomas 2002, Yoccoz *et al.* 2002, Basolo and Alcaraz 2003, Ward *et al.* 2003, Barboza *et al.* 2004, Pruden and Uetz 2004, Wagner 2005; but see Hack 1998, Kotiaho and Simmons 2003). It may involve (1) the production of conspicuous signals that may not only attract mates but also predators and competitors (Andersson 1994); (2) the construction of energetically demanding structures for mate attraction and brood care (Hansell 1984, 2005); or (3) parental investment to protect, provision, and raise offspring (Clutton-Brock 1991). Individuals using parasitic tactics may omit these costs and exploit their competitors' investment to gain access to mates or fertilizable gametes (Wirtz 1982, Miller 1984, Taborsky *et al.* 1987, Tomkins and Simmons 2000; see Taborsky 1994 for review). Often they use secretive "sneaking" tactics or fast "streaking" that cannot be easily overcome by the exploited bourgeois males (Warner and Hoffman 1980, Gross 1982, Westneat 1993, Kempnaers *et al.* 1995, 2001, Hall and Hanlon 2002, Correa *et al.* 2003, Sato *et al.* 2004; see Taborsky 1994, Westneat and Stewart 2003 for review). Alternatively, males using parasitic tactics may receive resources required for mating, or brood care for their offspring from bourgeois males also by force (van den Berghe 1988, Sinervo and Lively 1996, Mboko and Kohda 1999).

function of alternative tactics, these terms are preferable to the more descriptive terms often used in particular case studies (e.g., bourgeois males have been named guarders, territorials, primary males, parentals, nest males, type 1 males, or cuckolds, while parasitic males have been referred to as sneakers, streakers, satellites, hidiers, pseudo-females, type 2 males, or cuckolders). For a discussion of reasons to use "bourgeois" and "parasitic" as collective, functional terms for ARTs see Taborsky (1997).

Cooperative behavior may be applied as an alternative to a purely parasitic tactic when individuals attempt to benefit from the effort of bourgeois competitors (Taborsky *et al.* 1987, Martin and Taborsky 1997, Dierkes *et al.* 1999, Taborsky 2001, Oliveira *et al.* 2002). Competing individuals may cooperate or "trade" with resource holders by paying for access to reproductive options by mutualism or reciprocity (Reyer 1984, 1986, Taborsky 1984, 1985, Lejeune 1985, Taborsky *et al.* 1987, Hatchwell and Davies 1992, Hartley *et al.* 1995, Davies *et al.* 1996, Magrath and Whittingham 1997, Martin and Taborsky 1997, Whittingham *et al.* 1997, Balshine-Earn *et al.* 1998, Johnstone and Cant 1999, Clutton-Brock *et al.* 2002, Oliveira *et al.* 2002, Richardson *et al.* 2002, Double and Cockburn 2003, Dickinson 2004, Huck *et al.* 2004, Webster *et al.* 2004, Bergmüller and Taborsky 2005). The relationships between such cooperating competitors are usually asymmetric, particularly in their resource-holding potential. The mechanisms regulating and stabilizing such cooperative relationships between reproductive competitors have been the target of much recent research (Vehrencamp 1983, Keller and Reeve 1994, Magrath and Whittingham 1997, Balshine-Earn *et al.* 1998, Johnstone and Cant 1999, Johnstone 2000, Kokko *et al.* 2002, Kokko 2003, Skubic *et al.* 2004, Bergmüller and Taborsky 2005, Bergmüller *et al.* 2005, Stiver *et al.* 2005), but there is still a great need for further integration of theory and empirical data.

Females may benefit from exploiting the nests built by other females (e.g., in digger wasps: Brockmann and Dawkins 1979, Brockmann *et al.* 1979, Field 1992, 1994) or by dumping eggs in another female's nest (or mouth) that will be cared for by the owner (i.e., intraspecific brood parasitism in insects: Eickwort 1975, Tallamy 1985, 2005, Müller *et al.* 1990, Brockmann 1993, Zink 2003; fish: Ribbink 1977, Yanagisawa 1985, Kellog *et al.* 1998; and birds: Yom-Tov 1980, 2001, Rohwer and Freeman 1989, Petrie and Møller 1991, Eadie and Fryxell 1992, Lyon 2003, Griffith *et al.* 2004). In this way, preparation of breeding sites and brood care can be spared by applying parasitic tactics (Sandell and Diemer 1999), or productivity can be increased (Tallamy and Horton 1990, Brown and Brown 1997, Ahlund and Andersson 2002, Zink 2003).

We may find ARTs also when animals use different niches for reproduction (such as temporally varying habitats). Selection may then favor multiple phenotypes that are specialized to exploit reproductive opportunities in each niche. Intermediate phenotypes will not be as effective as specialized ones when using the available options (Shuster

and Wade 2003). In this case, the frequency of morphs will depend on the reproductive potential in each niche (Zera and Rankin 1989, Mole and Zera 1993, Denno 1994, Langellotto *et al.* 2000, Langellotto and Denno 2001; see also Chapter 2 of this book).

1.3 WHICH EVOLUTIONARY PROCESSES ARE CAUSING THE PATTERNS WE FIND IN ARTs?

A major objective in evolutionary biology is to understand processes by which alternative phenotypes are created and maintained within populations (West-Eberhard 1986, Skúlason and Smith 1995, Smith and Skúlason 1996). This includes the question for the existence of two sexes (Parker *et al.* 1972), polymorphisms for the use of food and habitat (Sage and Selander 1975, Snorrason *et al.* 1994, Skúlason and Smith 1995, Robinson and Wilson 1996, Smith and Skúlason 1996), laterality (Hori 1993, McGrew and Marchant 1997, Nakajima *et al.* 2004), locomotion and migration patterns (Berthold and Querner 1982, Verspoor and Cole 1989, Berthold *et al.* 1990, Hindar and Jonsson 1993, Kaitala *et al.* 1993, Biro and Ridgway 1995, Smith and Skúlason 1996), predator evasion (Taborsky *et al.* 2003, Chipps *et al.* 2004), and the existence of reproductive “producers” and “scroungers” in same-sex conspecifics (Taborsky 1994, 2001, Gross 1996, Brockmann 2001). To understand the discontinuity of *reproductive* tactics, we should first look at the options of the involved players; that is, we should first know the patterns before disentangling the processes causing them. How do competitors achieve fertilizations? How divergent are the alternative tactics? Do individuals differ consistently in their tactics or are they choosing tactics according to circumstances? To identify underlying processes, we may analyze ARTs at three different levels of classification (Taborsky 1998).

1.3.1 Selection

Alternative tactics evolve when there is fitness to be gained by pursuing divergent allocation tactics. There are two principal conditions favoring the evolution of ARTs:

- (1) Investment may be there to be exploited by conspecific, same-sex competitors, as we have outlined above. In the chosen sex, sexual selection leads to high investment in structures promoting mate acquisition. This includes secondary sexual signals that indicate

quality (indirect benefits to mates) and supplying resources and brood care (direct benefits). Sexual selection has two major effects in this context; firstly, it causes variation in the success of the chosen sex (Darwin 1871). If some males are able to obtain several mates, others will end up without success (depending on the operational sex ratio: Shuster and Wade 2003), which selects for the pursuit of alternative tactics. Secondly, exploiting the investment of competitors without paying their costs may result in higher fitness (Fu *et al.* 2001). Both consequences of strong sexual selection set the stage for the evolution of ARTs. Indeed, a positive relationship between strong sexual selection and the evolution of ARTs has been observed (Gadgil 1972, Gross 1996, Sinervo 2001), although there may be negative feedback mechanisms involved as well (Jones *et al.* 2001a, b, Reichard *et al.* 2005).

- (2) Different reproductive niches may exist for conspecific, same-sex competitors (see Chapter 2). This may occur when reproductive habitats differ discontinuously (Denno 1994, Langellotto and Denno 2001, Hiebeler 2004) or when competitors differ in some important feature as a result of natural selection (e.g., food niches or predation may select for body-size divergence: Pigeon *et al.* 1997, Lu and Bernatchez 1999, Jonsson and Jonsson 2001, Trudel *et al.* 2001, Kurdziel and Knowles 2002, Taborsky *et al.* 2003, Snorrason and Skúlason 2004). Little is known about the consequences of such polymorphisms on reproductive tactics (but see Kurdziel and Knowles [2002] for a notable exception) or about what is cause and what is effect (e.g., is a particular size dimorphism caused by natural selection favoring divergence, with respective consequence for reproduction, or does it result from ARTs caused by sexual selection as outlined above, with respective consequences regarding other aspects of life such as feeding and predator evasion? See Parker *et al.* 2001).

1.3.2 Flexibility

On the individual level, alternative tactics may be performed at the same time (simultaneous ARTs), in succession (sequential ARTs), or they may be fixed for life (fixed ARTs: Taborsky 1998) (Figure 1.1). This is a general feature of allocation patterns (Brockmann 2001), as found also in sex allocation (simultaneous and sequential hermaphroditism,




Figure 1.1 Alternative reproductive tactics can be fixed over a lifetime or plastic. In the latter case, they may be performed at the

same time interval (simultaneous ARTs) or in a fixed or reversible sequence (sequential ARTs). See text for examples.

and gonochorism: Charnov 1982). Simultaneous and sequential ARTs are the product of a flexible or plastic response to conditions. A flexible response (i.e., phenotypic plasticity) may be beneficial if conditions vary either with regard to the physical or social environment of an animal, or its own physical condition (West-Eberhard 2003). If momentary conditions are highly unpredictable (e.g., number of potential partners, quality and number of current competitors in the neighborhood, tactic-dependent risk), there is selection for simultaneous ARTs as found, for example, in many fishes (Keenleyside 1972, Rowland 1979, Jennings and Philipp 1992; reviewed in Taborsky 1994), anurans (Perrill *et al.* 1982, Fukuyama 1991, Lucas *et al.* 1996, Byrne and Roberts 2004; reviewed in Halliday and Tejedo 1995), and birds (Westneat 1993, Kempnaers *et al.* 1995, 2001; reviewed in Westneat 2003). If conditions change with ontogeny, which applies in particular for organisms with indeterminate growth, sequential ARTs may be the optimal response (e.g., Warner *et al.* 1975, Magnhagen 1992, de Fraipont *et al.* 1993, Dierkes *et al.* 1999, Alonzo *et al.* 2000, Utami *et al.* 2002). If conditions either change rarely during the lifetime of an individual or change is unpredictable, fixed ARTs may be selected for (Shuster and Wade 2003). Additional factors influencing the existence (and coexistence) of fixed and flexible ARTs are differences in success between tactics and the costs of plasticity (Plastow *et al.* 2004).

1.3.3 Origin of variation

Discontinuous phenotypic variation may originate from monomorphic or polymorphic genotypes (Austad 1984, Gross 1996, Shuster and Wade 2003). In genetically uniform individuals, the response to reproductive competition may be triggered by current conditions or by developmental switches; individual tactics differ due to diverging conditions, despite the same underlying genetic architecture. For example, individuals finding themselves in an unfavorable condition may do best by adopting an alternative tactic to the monopolization of mates, thereby doing “the best of a bad job” (Dawkins 1980). If resource availability varies strongly during development, the decision to adopt one or the other tactic may depend on the passing of a threshold; an individual passing a size threshold, for example, may do best by continuing to grow to adopt a bourgeois reproductive tactic later, while if this threshold is not passed, it may pay to reproduce early and in a parasitic role (note that in some salmonid fishes, it works the other way round; see below). Size thresholds may be important particularly for short-lived animals in seasonal habitats: early-born individuals have more time to grow in favorable conditions, so they will be larger at the start of reproduction. Such “birthdate effects” (Taborsky 1998) apparently influence the occurrence of ARTs in temperate fish (see Thorpe 1986). Thresholds in

growth rates can also influence the choice of tactic (Hutchings and Myers 1994); fast-growing male salmon may start to reproduce earlier, while slow growers delay reproduction and end up in the bourgeois role as a consequence of prolonged growth (Thorpe and Morgan 1980, Thorpe 1986, Gross 1991). In anadromous salmonids this is linked to highly divergent feeding conditions between reproductive sites

(oligotrophic rivers) and productive foraging areas (sea habitats: Healey *et al.* 2000, Vollestad *et al.* 2004).

Discontinuous alternative reproductive tactics may result also from polymorphic genotypes, regardless of whether variation is due to major gene effects or polygenic origin. Examples are known from a wide taxonomic range – from mites (Radwan 1995, 2003) and isopods (Shuster and

Box 1.2 The origin of male polymorphisms in acarid mites

“Fighter” and “scrambler” males occur in a number of acarid mites belonging to at least three genera (*Sancassia-Sancassania*, *Rhizoglyphus*, *Schwiebia*: Woodring 1969, Radwan 1995, 2001). Fighter males can kill competitors by puncturing their cuticle with a modified third pair of legs. Fighters may outcompete scramblers in low-density situations, but not at high densities, where they suffer from frequent and costly fights (Radwan 1993). Both a genetic polymorphism and a conditional expression of tactics with strong environmental influence during development have been found in different species of this group. In *Rhizoglyphus robini*, fighters sire higher proportions of fighters and the heritability of the

male morphs is high; however the genetic mechanism underlying this polyphenism is not yet understood (Radwan 1995, 2003). Colony size and density have no effect on morph frequency, but diet provided during development does, with fewer fighters emerging under poor conditions (Radwan 1995). In this species, fighters survive longer, independently of colony density and morph ratio in the population (Radwan and Bogacz 2000, Radwan and Klimas 2001). Surprisingly, morph fitness was not found to be negatively frequency dependent, as would be expected if a genetic polymorphism is stabilized at an evolutionarily stable state (ESS) condition (Radwan and Klimas 2001).

In *R. echinopus*, no significant heritability of male morph was found, but the probability of males turning into fighters depended on chemical signals associated with colony density (Radwan 2001). In *Sancassania berlesei*, the decision by males to turn into fighters or scramblers strongly depends on social and food conditions during development (Timms *et al.* 1980, 1982, Radwan 1993, 1995, Radwan *et al.* 2002, Tomkins *et al.* 2004). In small or low density populations the proportion of fighter males is higher (Figure 1.2). Chemical (pheromonal) signals are used to determine tactic choice (Timms *et al.* 1980, Radwan *et al.* 2002), but the final-instar nymph weight is also important with heavier nymphs being more likely to become fighters, albeit at some costs: same-weight final-instar nymphs produced smaller fighters than scramblers (Radwan *et al.* 2002). Even though there is no indication of single-locus inheritance of morphs in this species, there is evidence for genetic covariance between sire status and offspring morph and considerable heritability of morph expression due to an adaptive response of the threshold reaction norm (Tomkins *et al.* 2004, Unrug *et al.* 2004). Data from this species are compatible with the status-dependent ESS model (Gross 1996), but a critical test showing that fitness functions of the alternative tactics cross at the phenotypic switch point is still missing (Tomkins *et al.* 2004).




Figure 1.2 The proportion of fighter males emerging in laboratory populations of the acarid mite *Sancassania berlesei* depends on density. In an experiment, larvae originating from three different field populations were introduced into vials either alone or in groups of 10–40 individuals. While the majority of lone males turned into the fighter morph, the proportions of fighter males declined with increasing density, especially strongly in mites coming from two out of three natural populations. (After Tomkins *et al.* 2004.)




Figure 1.3 (A) When male competitors in a population show either bourgeois or parasitic reproductive behavior depending on condition, e.g., body size, and their fitness functions cross at a given size, males should switch from one to the other tactic at this intersection. (B) The fitness of males may depend also on the relative numbers of both types of males. If the fitness functions depending on relative frequencies of both male types cross, tactic frequencies in the population should

converge towards the point of intersection. How does this relate to size-dependent tactic choice? We assume here that the fitness lines cross at a bourgeois male proportion of 0.5; if the population comprises 75% bourgeois males at some point, the average fitness of individuals performing the parasitic tactic would increase relative to that of bourgeois males. (C) The effect of this situation on optimal size-dependent tactic choice: while the fitness of bourgeois males drops due

Box 1.3 Do fitness curves always cross?

When condition-dependent fitness functions differ between bourgeois and parasitic males and the lines cross, tactic frequencies should depend on this point of intersection (Gross 1982, 1996) (Figure 1.3A). In addition, the fitness of each type of male may depend on the proportions of both male types in the population, resulting in frequency-dependent selection: the more parasitic males compete amongst each other, the less it may pay to choose this tactic (Figure 1.3B), which feeds back on condition-dependent tactic choice (Figure 1.3C and 1.3E). However, cases in which individuals differ in quality demonstrate that frequency dependence is not necessarily involved in the evolution of ARTs. Take a species with early- and late-born males in a seasonal environment that have very different lengths of growth periods before the first winter. In a short-lived species, reproduction may occur only within one reproductive season, i.e., after the first winter. Early- and late-born males will differ in size because they encountered good growth conditions in their first year during time periods of different period lengths (e.g., Mediterranean wrasses: Alonzo *et al.* 2000). Large males

may do best by monopolizing resources and access to females; small males may do best by parasitizing the reproductive effort of large males because they are not able to compete with their larger conspecifics when performing a bourgeois tactic. The average reproductive success of the small males may never reach the same level as the average success of the higher-quality (large) males, even if they are rare in the population, because their small size may act as a constraint on getting access to fertilizable gametes. The result will be ARTs that are not stabilized by frequency-dependent selection (Figure 1.3D). Parasitic males will still persist in the population because males differ in quality due to differing growth conditions, as outlined above. Quality differences between individuals due to developmental constraints are very widespread (Schlichting and Pigliucci 1998), but hitherto, they have not been dealt with in this context in much detail. In theoretical models Mart Gross and Joe Repka (Repka and Gross 1995, Gross and Repka 1998a, b) showed that equilibria between alternative tactics causing unequal fitnesses may be evolutionarily stable; this approach has been criticized, however, because of unrealistic assumptions (Shuster and Wade 2003).

Wade 1991, Shuster 1992) to fish (Ryan *et al.* 1992), lizards (Sinervo and Lively 1996), and birds (Lank *et al.* 1995, 1999). In this case, genotype frequencies underlying ARTs are believed to be balanced by frequency-dependent selection, leading to equal lifetime fitness expectations of individuals using different tactics (Shuster and Wade 1991, Ryan *et al.* 1992, Repka and Gross 1995; but see Boxes 1.2 and 1.3; see also Chapter 2 of this book).

The relative importance of genetic monomorphism with conditional responses as opposed to genetic polymorphism for the evolution of ARTs has been extensively debated

Caption for Fig. 1.3 (*cont.*) to competition among males of this type, the fitness of parasitic males increases, which means that males should switch to the bourgeois tactic at a larger size (size “5” instead of “4” as depicted in (A)). If in contrast only 25% of the males in the population perform the bourgeois tactic, the fitness of bourgeois males will increase because of low competition while that of parasitic males will drop due to competition of these males when exploiting the relatively small number of bourgeois males in the population (see (E)). Males should switch earlier now from the parasitic to the bourgeois tactic. Note that for simplicity in this graphical model we assume that the relative frequency of both tactics (as shown in (B)) influences the pay-

(Pienaar and Greeff 2003; see Gross 1996, Shuster and Wade 2003 for review). The vast majority of described cases of ARTs involves some conditional responses of reproductive competitors (Gross 1996, Lank *et al.* 1999). Because a conditional choice of tactics has been associated with genetic monomorphism, it has been argued that genetic polymorphisms play only a minor role in the causation of ARTs (Gross 1996, Gross and Repka 1998a). This view has been challenged (Shuster and Wade 2003). Why is this debate of general interest? To appreciate the importance of the issue, we need to consider the implications of these two

off of males in a similar way over the whole range of sizes, i.e., the intercept of the fitness function changes, but not its shape or slope (cf. panels (C) and (E), and panel (A)). (D) It may be, however, that the fitness functions depending on relative frequencies of both male types do not cross, i.e., bourgeois males may always do better than parasitic males, regardless of the proportions of males in the population performing either tactic (see explanation in text). If this is the case, frequency-dependent selection will not determine tactic choice in the population. Tactic choice and hence tactic frequencies will then depend only on other factors (like male phenotypic quality such as size, which may be determined by developmental constraints).

potential mechanisms. When animals act according to conditions without any genetic component responsible for the type of response (i.e., tactic performance is not heritable), (a) the form and frequency of this response is not subject to selection (Shuster and Wade 2003), which precludes adaptive evolution, (b) different tactics may result in unequal fitness (Repka and Gross 1995, Gross and Repka 1998b), and (c) the frequencies of tactics may be independent of each other and of their relative success (see Box 1.3). When tactic choice is under genetic control and heritable, frequency-dependent selection will lead to (a) a fitness equilibrium associated with alternative tactics and (b) stable frequencies of ARTs in the population (Ryan *et al.* 1992), or (c) oscillations of tactics if no stable equilibrium can be reached (particularly if more than two ARTs exist in a population: Shuster 1989, Shuster and Wade 1991, Sinervo and Lively 1996). According to the “status-dependent selection model” (Gross 1996), the assumption of conditional tactics based on genetic monomorphism coincides with unequal fitnesses of players, except at the switch point where an individual is expected to change from one tactic to another. On the contrary, a genetic polymorphism can only persist if the lifetime fitnesses of players are equal or oscillating (Slatkin 1978, 1979, Shuster and Wade 1991, 2003).

It would be naïve to assume that ARTs will be either “genetically” or “environmentally” determined (Caro and Bateson 1986). In reality, many if not most dimorphic traits seem to be threshold traits (Roff 1996) influenced by quantitative trait loci: morph expression depends on whether a “liability” value is above or below a threshold (Falconer and Mackay 1996). In the context of ARTs this was shown for the expression of different male morphs in mites with the help of selection experiments, by which the threshold reaction norm was shifted (Unrug *et al.* 2004) (see Box 1.2). In this scenario, developmental pathways may change abruptly, e.g., at a particular size, producing different phenotypes on either side of the threshold (Emlen and Nijhout 2000, Nijhout 2003, Lee 2005). The operation of genetically based developmental thresholds means that trait expression is both conditional *and* heritable. It allows alternative phenotypes to evolve largely independently from each other, which greatly increases the scope for the evolution of alternative tactics (West-Eberhard 1989, 2003; see also Tomkins *et al.* 2005).

If adaptive evolution is not underlying conditional ARTs (as argued by Shuster and Wade 2003), why do they exist in the first place, why are conditional decisions

apparently the rule rather than the exception, and why do genetic polymorphisms associated with ARTs appear to be rare? One may ponder whether these concepts are sufficient to explain the evolution of ARTs. The problem is that in this discussion, conditional response and the genetic basis of tactics apparently have been separated from each other. More realistically, the thresholds or developmental switch points involved in tactic choice have a genetic basis and will therefore be subject to selection and adaptive evolution (Tomkins *et al.* 2004). In other words, phenotypic plasticity is heritable, and genetically based plastic traits vary among individuals of a population (see Chapter 5 of this book). Conditional responses may have a genetic basis but still lead to different lifetime reproductive successes of tactics (Hazel *et al.* 1990). This issue needs further theoretical treatment (see Shuster and Wade 2003).

1.4 INTEGRATING ACROSS LEVELS: PROXIMATE AND ULTIMATE CAUSES OF ARTs

How do the proximate mechanisms underlying the expression of ARTs relate to their evolution? An important aspect in our understanding of ARTs is the degree of divergence between tactics, which may functionally relate to the underlying mechanisms (e.g., pleiotropic effects if genetic determination is involved, or variance in ontogenetic conditions). In this context it is necessary to understand the proximate mechanisms involved to be able to interpret observed patterns. A distinction should be made, for instance, between alternative phenotypes that diverge only in behavioral traits or also in the expression of morphological and anatomical traits. Since behavior is often more labile than morphology and anatomy, the mechanisms underlying the expression of behavioral variation should be more flexible than those underlying morphological and anatomical variation.

Hormonal regulation is usually involved in the expression of alternative reproductive behavior (Brantley *et al.* 1993, Oliveira *et al.* 2005). Ketterson and Nolan (1999) proposed that one could distinguish between adaptations and exaptations (*sensu* Gould and Vrba 1982) in hormone-dependent traits by assessing whether these traits arose either in response to selection on circulating hormone levels or in response to variation in the responsiveness of the target tissues to invariant hormone levels (Figure 1.4). In the former case, selection probably did not act on all correlated




Figure 1.4 A model of two alternative evolutionary mechanisms underlying the hormonal regulation of alternative reproductive phenotype expression. Upper panel Alternative reproductive traits arise in response to selection on circulating hormone levels, whereby selection may not act on all correlated traits. Lower

panel Alternative reproductive traits arise in response to selection on responsiveness of target tissues to (possibly invariant) hormone levels; here, traits result from the independent reaction of target tissue sensitivity to constant hormone levels.

traits and thus the ones that subsequently conferred an advantage to its carriers should be viewed as exaptations. In the latter case, selection probably acted independently on target tissue sensitivity to constant hormone levels, for example by varying density of receptors or the expression of enzymes for particular biosynthetic pathways. ARTs that involve the differential development of androgen-dependent traits within the same phenotype, such as the differentiation of larger testes in parasitic males without displaying secondary sex characters, suggest a compart-

mentalization of androgen effects on different target tissues that can be achieved by varying the densities of androgen receptors in different targets. Therefore, ARTs that involve the compartmentalization of different endocrine-mediated traits probably evolved as adaptations, whereas ARTs in which there are no compartmentalization effects (e.g., conditional tactics, such as the facultative use of sneaking behavior by nest-holder males in sticklebacks: Morris 1952, Rico *et al.* 1992) rather represent exaptations. This approach stresses the importance that studies of proximate

mechanisms may have to increasing our understanding of the evolution of alternative reproductive phenotypes.

The neural mechanisms behind alternative reproductive behavior patterns may involve the structural reorganization of neural circuits underlying the expression of reproductive behavior, or alternatively biochemical switching of existing circuits by neuromodulators (Zupanc and Lamprecht 2000). The former mechanisms may involve synaptogenesis, the regulation of apoptosis, and neurogenesis and thus should be associated with a slower, discontinuous but long-lasting expression of phenotypic plasticity. In contrast, the latter mechanisms should be associated with faster, gradual, and transient changes. These potential neural mechanisms underlying phenotypic plasticity may interact with hormonal mechanisms: structural (re)organization of neural circuits can be influenced by organizational effects of hormones during well-defined sensitive periods in the life of an individual, while biochemical switches can be driven by activational effects of hormones on central pathways underlying behavior (for a review on organizational vs. activational effects of hormones in vertebrates see Arnold and Breedlove 1985). Therefore, it is expected that simultaneous or reversible conditional tactics that may require rapid and transient changes in neural activity are mediated by biochemical switches influenced by hormones in an activational fashion (Zupanc and Lamprecht 2000, Hofmann 2003), whereas both fixed tactics involving the organization of the phenotype early in development and sequential tactics with a fixed sequence that involve a post-maturational reorganization of the phenotype are mediated by structural reorganization of neural networks. Concomitantly, the role of hormones in the expression of the different types of tactics would differ, with organizational (or reorganizational) effects predicted to be associated with fixed and fixed-sequence tactics, and activational effects expected in simultaneous or reversible conditional tactics (Moore 1991, Moore *et al.* 1998, Oliveira 2005).

Knowledge of the proximate mechanisms underlying the expression of ARTs may help to understand their evolution. Ketterson and co-workers (Ketterson *et al.* 1996, Ketterson and Nolan 1999) have proposed the use of phenotypic engineering to investigate the evolution of endocrine-mediated traits. This approach is based on the exogenous administration of hormones to study ecological consequences of the development of hormone-dependent traits. This approach can help to identify the costs and benefits associated with particular traits specific to each

tactic as well as the evolutionary scenario in which ARTs evolved. A cost-benefit analysis of ARTs in teleosts, for instance, would help to identify costs associated with specific tactics imposed by their underlying physiological mechanisms, which may act as constraints for the evolution of ARTs. For example, bourgeois males usually display a set of androgen-dependent behavioral traits that help them to compete with other males for resources or females (e.g., through territoriality), which suggests that costs associated with maintaining high androgen levels should be associated with the bourgeois tactic (e.g., increased energy consumption, effects on immunocompetence, increased risk of predation, and a higher incidence of injuries from agonistic interactions: e.g., Wingfield *et al.* 1999, 2001, Ros *et al.* 2006). Therefore, knowledge of the physiological mechanisms underlying the expression of ARTs may shed light on the evolutionary landscapes in which they might have evolved by helping to identify proximate mechanisms that act as mediators of adaptive traits or as potential physiological constraints imposed by pleiotropic-like effects of hormones on the evolution of ARTs.

1.5 CURRENT ISSUES: WHAT ARE THE QUESTIONS WE NEED TO SOLVE?

Based on the above discussion and arguments we should like to emphasize 12 important questions regarding the evolution of ARTs.

- (1) To what extent are thresholds and developmental switches responsible for the evolution of decision rules? In other words, is there genetic variance involved in the conditional response?
- (2) If there is sufficient genetic variance among individuals of a population, to what degree are thresholds and developmental switch points subject to selection? An experimental approach would be desirable here.
- (3) The occurrence of ARTs is apparently related to the intensity of sexual selection and to the existence of an opportunity to exploit the investment of same-sex conspecific competitors to acquire mates or fertilizations. These potential causes of the evolution of ARTs are not independent; however, they may independently influence the evolution of decision rules. Is one or the other of these factors more important (or of sole importance), or are additional factors involved?

- (4) Is the observed intrasexual variation in reproductive phenotypes necessarily adaptive, or are there sometimes constraints (e.g., because a certain part of the population faces inferior conditions during ontogeny, causing significant intrasexual size variation; see Box 1.3) that may produce ARTs?
- (5) Are there particular environmental circumstances (both physical and social) that favor either a combination between genetic monomorphism and conditional response or a genetic polymorphism underlying ARTs, either with or without conditional response components?
- (6) The expression of ARTs may be fixed for an individual or flexible over a lifetime (Figure 1.1): on the proximate level, to what extent are they caused by structural (re)organization of neural networks, and what organizational and activational hormonal effects regulate fixed vs. plastic alternative phenotypes?
- (7) What are the selective regimes favoring the evolution of fixed vs. plastic, simultaneous, or sequential ARTs? That is, which environmental conditions and intrinsic factors (i.e., constraints and life-history patterns) may take effect? Are fixed phenotypes associated with genetic polymorphisms and flexible ones with genetic monomorphism?
- (8) How does discontinuous phenotypic variation among competitors that evolved in other functional contexts (e.g., by food niches or predation scenarios) affect the evolution of ARTs?
- (9) What causes intermediate types to be less successful than “pure” alternatives? That is, why is selection disruptive?
- (10) What controls tactic frequencies? Is frequency-dependent (Repka and Gross 1995) and density-dependent (Tomkins and Brown 2004) selection involved if tactics are purely conditional (which may cause unequal average fitnesses)? When do crossing fitness curves predict relative tactic frequencies (see Box 1.3)?
- (11) What processes cause tactics to stabilize at an equilibrium frequency or to oscillate?
- (12) Why do particular phenotypes take the form they do? Why are particular solutions so frequent across a wide range of taxa (e.g., female mimicry in males)?

Most of these questions have been asked before in various contexts and often with focus on certain examples, and some have been partially answered either on an empirical or theoretical basis. However, for most if not all of them, we lack enough crucial information to be able to give an answer at the level of specific examples and on a more

general basis. This is not an exhaustive list. Of course there are other questions and details we need to consider (e.g., see Box 1.2 and other chapters of this book), but we believe that finding answers to these 12 questions will significantly advance our understanding of ARTs.

References

- Ahlund, M. and Andersson, M. 2002. Female ducks can double their reproduction. *Nature* **414**, 600–601.
- Alonzo, S. H., Taborsky, M., and Wirtz, P. 2000. Male alternative reproductive behaviors in a Mediterranean wrasse, *Symphodus ocellatus*: evidence from otoliths for multiple life-history pathways. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* **2**, 997–1007.
- Andersson, M. 1994. *Sexual Selection*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Arnold, A. B. and Breedlove, S. M. 1985. Organizational and activational effects of sex steroids on brain and behavior: a reanalysis. *Hormones and Behavior* **19**, 469–498.
- Austad, S. N. 1984. A classification of alternative reproductive behaviors and methods of field-testing ESS models. *American Zoologist* **24**, 309–319.
- Bailey, W. J., Withers, P. C., Endersby, M., and Gaull, K. 1993. The energetic costs of calling in the bush-cricket *Requena verticalis* (Orthoptera, Tettigoniidae, Listroscelidinae). *Journal of Experimental Biology* **178**, 21–37.
- Balshine-Earn, S., Neat, F. C., Reid, H., and Taborsky, M. 1998. Paying to stay or paying to breed? Field evidence for direct benefits of helping behavior in a cooperatively breeding fish. *Behavioral Ecology* **9**, 432–438.
- Barboza, P. S., Hartbauer, D. W., Hauer, W. E., and Blake, J. E. 2004. Polygynous mating impairs body condition and homeostasis in male reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus tarandus*). *Journal of Comparative Physiology B* **174**, 309–317.
- Basolo, A. L. and Alcaraz, G. 2003. The turn of the sword: length increases male swimming costs in swordtails. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **270**, 1631–1636.
- Bass, A. H. 1992. Dimorphic male brains and alternative reproductive tactics in a vocalizing fish. *Trends in Neurosciences* **15**, 139–145.
- Bass, A. H. 1996. Shaping brain sexuality. *American Scientist* **84**, 352–363.
- Bass, A. H. and Andersen, K. 1991. Intra- and inter-sexual dimorphisms in the sound-generating motor system in a vocalizing fish: motor axon number and size. *Brain, Behavior and Evolution* **37**, 204–214.

- Bergmüller, R. and Taborsky, M. 2005. Experimental manipulation of helping in a cooperative breeder: helpers “pay to stay” by pre-emptive appeasement. *Animal Behaviour* **69**, 19–28.
- Bergmüller, R., Heg, D., and Taborsky, M. 2005. Helpers in a cooperatively breeding cichlid stay and pay or disperse and breed, depending on ecological constraints. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **272**, 325–331.
- Berthold, P. and Querner, U. 1982. Partial migration in birds: experimental proof of polymorphism as a controlling system. *Experientia* **38**, 805–806.
- Berthold, P., Mohr, G., and Querner, U. 1990. Control and evolutionary potential of obligate partial migration: results of a 2-way selective breeding experiment with the blackcap (*Sylvia atricapilla*). *Journal für Ornithologie* **131**, 33–45.
- Biro, P. A. and Ridgway, M. S. 1995. Individual variation in foraging movements in a lake population of young-of-the-year brook charr (*Salvelinus fontinalis*). *Behaviour* **132**, 57–74.
- Bisazza, A. 1993. Male competition, female mate choice and sexual size dimorphism in poeciliid fishes. *Marine Behavior and Physiology* **23**, 257–286.
- Bisazza, A. and Pilastro, A. 1997. Small male mating advantage and reversed size dimorphism in poeciliid fishes. *Journal of Fish Biology* **50**, 397–406.
- Brantley, R. K. and Bass, A. H. 1994. Alternative male spawning tactics and acoustic signals in the plainfin midshipman fish *Porichthys notatus* Girard (Teleostei, Batrachoididae). *Ethology* **96**, 213–232.
- Brantley, R. K., Wingfield, J. C., and Bass, A. H. 1993. Sex steroid levels in *Porichthys notatus*, a fish with alternative reproductive tactics, and a review of the hormonal bases for male dimorphism among teleost fishes. *Hormones and Behavior* **27**, 332–347.
- Brockmann, H. J. 1993. Parasitizing conspecifics: comparisons between Hymenoptera and birds. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **8**, 2–4.
- Brockmann, H. J. 2001. The evolution of alternative strategies and tactics. *Advances in the Study of Behavior* **30**, 1–51.
- Brockmann, H. J. 2002. An experimental approach to altering mating tactics in male horseshoe crabs (*Limulus polyphemus*). *Behavioral Ecology* **13**, 232–238.
- Brockmann, H. J. and Dawkins, R. 1979. Joint nesting in a digger wasp as an evolutionarily stable preadaptation to social life. *Behaviour* **71**, 203–245.
- Brockmann, H. J. and Penn, D. 1992. Male mating tactics in the horseshoe crab, *Limulus polyphemus*. *Animal Behaviour* **44**, 653–665.
- Brockmann, H. J., Grafen, A., and Dawkins, R. 1979. Evolutionarily stable nesting strategy in a digger wasp. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **77**, 473–496.
- Brown, C. and Brown, M. 1997. Fitness components associated with alternative reproductive tactics in cliff swallows. *Behavioral Ecology* **9**, 158–171.
- Byrne, P. G. and Roberts, J. D. 2004. Intrasexual selection and group spawning in quacking frogs (*Crinia georgiana*). *Behavioral Ecology* **15**, 872–882.
- Cade, W. 1979. The evolution of alternative male reproductive strategies in field crickets. In M. S. Blum and N. A. Blum (eds.) *Sexual Selection and Reproductive Competition in Insects*, pp. 343–379. New York: Academic Press.
- Caro, T. M. and Bateson, P. 1986. Organization and ontogeny of alternative tactics. *Animal Behaviour* **34**, 1483–1499.
- Charnov, E. L. 1982. *The Theory of Sex Allocation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chippis, S. R., Dunbar, J. A., and Wahl, D. H. 2004. Phenotypic variation and vulnerability to predation in juvenile bluegill sunfish (*Lepomis macrochirus*). *Oecologia* **138**, 32–38.
- Clutton-Brock, T. H. 1991. *The Evolution of Parental Care*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Clutton-Brock, T. H., Russell, A. F., Sharpe, L. L., et al. 2002. Evolution and development of sex differences in cooperative behavior in meerkats. *Science* **297**, 253–256.
- Cordts, R. and Partridge, L. 1996. Courtship reduces longevity of male *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Animal Behaviour* **52**, 269–278.
- Correa, C., Baeza, J. A., Hinojosa, I. A., and Thiel, M. 2003. Male dominance hierarchy and mating tactics in the rock shrimp *Rhynchocinetes typus* (Decapoda: Caridea). *Journal of Crustacean Biology* **23**, 33–45.
- Darwin, C. 1871. *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*. London: John Murray.
- Davies, N. B., Hartley, I. R., Hatchwell, B. J., and Langmore, N. E. 1996. Female control of copulations to maximize male help: a comparison of polygynandrous alpine accentors, *Prunella collaris*, and dunnocks, *P. modularis*. *Animal Behaviour* **51**, 27–47.
- Dawkins, R. 1980. Good strategy or evolutionarily stable strategy? In G. W. Barlow and J. Silverberg (eds.) *Sociobiology: Beyond Nature/Nurture?* pp. 331–367. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- de Fraipont, M., FitzGerald, G. J., and Guderley, H. 1993. Age-related differences in reproductive tactics in the three-spined stickleback, *Gasterosteus aculeatus*. *Animal Behaviour* **46**, 961–968.

- Denno, R. F. 1994. The evolution of dispersal polymorphisms in insects: the influence of habitats, host plants and mates. *Researches on Population Ecology* **36**, 127–135.
- Dickinson, J. L. 2004. A test of the importance of direct and indirect fitness benefits for helping decisions in western bluebirds. *Behavioral Ecology* **15**, 233–238.
- Dierkes, P., Taborsky, M., and Kohler, U. 1999. Reproductive parasitism of broodcare helpers in a cooperatively breeding fish. *Behavioral Ecology* **10**, 510–515.
- Double, M. C. and Cockburn, A. 2003. Subordinate superb fairy-wrens (*Malurus cyaneus*) parasitize the reproductive success of attractive dominant males. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **270**, 379–384.
- Doums, C., Viard, F., and Jarne, P. 1998. The evolution of phally polymorphism. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **64**, 273–296.
- Eadie, J. M. and Fryxell, J. M. 1992. Density dependence, frequency dependence, and alternative nesting strategies in goldeneyes. *American Naturalist* **140**, 621–641.
- Eberhard, W. G. and Gutiérrez, E. E. 1991. Male dimorphisms in beetles and earwigs and the question of developmental constraints. *Evolution* **45**, 18–28.
- Eickwort, G. 1975. Gregarious nesting of the mason bee *Hoplitis anthocopoides* and the evolution of parasitism and sociality among megachilid bees. *Evolution* **29**, 142–150.
- Emlen, D. J. 1996. Artificial selection on horn length/body size allometry in the horned beetle *Onthophagus acuminatus* (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae). *Evolution* **50**, 1219–1230.
- Emlen, D. J. 1997. Alternative reproductive tactics and male-dimorphism in the horned beetle *Onthophagus acuminatus* (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **41**, 335–341.
- Emlen, D. J. and Nijhout, H. F. 2000. The development and evolution of exaggerated morphologies in insects. *Annual Review of Entomology* **45**, 661–708.
- Falconer, D. S. and Mackay, T. F. C. 1996. *Introduction to Quantitative Genetics*, 4th edn. New York: Longman.
- Field, J. 1992. Intraspecific parasitism as an alternative reproductive tactic in nest-building wasps and bees. *Biological Reviews* **67**, 79–126.
- Field, J. 1994. Selection of host nests by intraspecific nest-parasitic digger wasps. *Animal Behaviour* **48**, 113–118.
- Fu, P., Neff, B. D., and Gross, M. R. 2001. Tactic-specific success in sperm competition. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **268**, 1105–1112.
- Fukuyama, K. 1991. Spawning behaviour and male mating tactics of a foam-nesting treefrog, *Rhacophorus schlegelii*. *Animal Behaviour* **42**, 193–199.
- Gadgil, M. 1972. Male dimorphism as a consequence of sexual selection. *American Naturalist* **106**, 574–580.
- Gould, S. J. and Vrba, E. S. 1982. Exaptation: a missing term in the science of form. *Paleobiology* **8**, 4–15.
- Grafe, T. U. 1996. Energetics of vocalization in the African reed frog (*Hyperolius marmoratus*). *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology A* **114**, 235–243.
- Grafe, T. U. and Thein, J. 2001. Energetics of calling and metabolic substrate use during prolonged exercise in the European treefrog *Hyla arborea*. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B* **171**, 69–76.
- Grafen, A. 1991. Modelling in behavioural ecology. In J. R. Krebs and N. B. Davies (eds.) *Behavioural Ecology*, pp. 5–31. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Scientific.
- Griffith, S. C., Lyon, B. E., and Montgomerie, R. 2004. Quasi-parasitism in birds. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **56**, 191–200.
- Gross, M. R. 1982. Sneakers, satellites and parentals: polymorphic mating strategies in North-American sunfishes. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie* **60**, 1–26.
- Gross, M. R. 1991. Salmon breeding behavior and life history evolution in changing environments. *Ecology* **72**, 1180–1186.
- Gross, M. R. 1996. Alternative reproductive strategies and tactics: diversity within sexes. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **11**, 92–98.
- Gross, M. R. and Repka, J. 1998a. Inheritance in the conditional strategy. In L. A. Dugatkin and H. K. Reeve (eds.) *Game Theory and Animal Behavior*, pp. 168–187. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Gross, M. R. and Repka, J. 1998b. Stability with inheritance in the conditional strategy. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **192**, 445–453.
- Hack, M. A. 1998. The energetics of male mating strategies in field crickets (Orthoptera: Gryllinae: Gryllidae). *Journal of Insect Behavior* **11**, 853–867.
- Hall, K. C. and Hanlon, R. T. 2002. Principal features of the mating system of a large spawning aggregation of the giant Australian cuttlefish *Sepia apama* (Mollusca: Cephalopoda). *Marine Biology* **140**, 533–545.
- Halliday, T. M. and Tejedo, M. 1995. Intrasexual selection and alternative mating behaviour. In H. Heatwole and B. K. Sullivan (eds.) *Amphibian Biology*, vol. 2, pp. 469–517. Chipping Norton, NSW: Surrey Beatty and Sons.

- Hansell, M. H. 1984. *Animal Architecture and Building Behaviour*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Hansell, M. 2005. *Animal Architecture*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hartley, I. R., Davies, N. B., Hatchwell, B. J., *et al.* 1995. The polygynandrous mating system of the alpine accentor, *Prunella collaris*. 2. Multiple paternity and parental effort. *Animal Behaviour* **49**, 789–803.
- Hatchwell, B. J. and Davies, N. B. 1992. An experimental study of mating competition in monogamous and polyandrous dunnocks, *Prunella modularis*. 2. Influence of removal and replacement experiments on mating systems. *Animal Behaviour* **43**, 611–622.
- Hazel, W. N., Smock, R., and Johnson, M. D. 1990. A polygenic model for the evolution and maintenance of conditional strategies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **242**, 181–187.
- Healey, M. C., Henderson, M. A., and Burgetz, I. 2000. Precocious maturation of male sockeye salmon in the Fraser River, British Columbia, and its relationship to growth and year-class strength. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **57**, 2248–2257.
- Heath, D. D., Rankin, L., Bryden, C. A., Heath, J. W., and Shrimpton, J. M. 2002. Heritability and Y-chromosome influence in the jack male life history of chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). *Heredity* **89**, 311–317.
- Hiebeler, D. 2004. Competition between near and far dispersers in spatially structured habitats. *Theoretical Population Biology* **66**, 205–218.
- Hindar, K. and Jonsson, B. 1993. Ecological polymorphism in arctic charr. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **48**, 63–74.
- Hoback, W. W. and Wagner, W. E. 1997. The energetic cost of calling in the variable field cricket, *Gryllus lineaticeps*. *Physiological Entomology* **22**, 286–290.
- Hofmann, H. A. 2003. Functional genomics of neural and behavioral plasticity. *Journal of Neurobiology* **54**, 272–282.
- Hogg, J. T. and Forbes, S. H. 1997. Mating in bighorn sheep: frequent male reproduction via a high-risk “unconventional” tactic. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **41**, 33–48.
- Hori, M. 1993. Frequency-dependent natural selection in the handedness of scale-eating cichlid fish. *Science* **393**, 216–219.
- Huck, M., Lottker, P., and Heymann, E. W. 2004. The many faces of helping: possible costs and benefits of infant carrying and food transfer in wild moustached tamarins (*Saguinus mystax*). *Behaviour* **141**, 915–934.
- Hunt, J. and Simmons, L. W. 2000. Maternal and paternal effects on offspring phenotype in the dung beetle *Onthophagus taurus*. *Evolution* **54**, 936–941.
- Hutchings, J. A. and Myers, R. A. 1994. The evolution of alternative mating strategies in variable environments. *Evolutionary Ecology* **8**, 256–268.
- Jennings, M. J. and Philipp, D. P. 1992. Female choice and male competition in longear sunfish. *Behavioral Ecology* **3**, 84–94.
- Johnstone, R. A. 2000. Models of reproductive skew: a review and synthesis. *Ethology* **106**, 5–26.
- Johnstone, R. A. and Cant, M. A. 1999. Reproductive skew and the threat of eviction: a new perspective. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **266**, 275–279.
- Jones, A. G., Walker, D., Kvarnemo, C., Lindstrom, K., and Avise, J. C. 2001a. How cuckoldry can decrease the opportunity for sexual selection: data and theory from a genetic parentage analysis of the sand goby, *Pomatoschistus minutus*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **98**, 9151–9156.
- Jones, A. G., Walker, D., Lindstrom, K., Kvarnemo, C., and Avise, J. C. 2001b. Surprising similarity of sneaking rates and genetic mating patterns in two populations of sand goby experiencing disparate sexual selection regimes. *Molecular Ecology* **10**, 461–469.
- Jonsson, B. and Jonsson, N. 2001. Polymorphism and speciation in Arctic charr. *Journal of Fish Biology* **58**, 605–638.
- Kaitala, A., Kaitala, V., and Lundberg, P. 1993. A theory of partial migration. *American Naturalist* **142**, 59–81.
- Keenleyside, M. H. A. 1972. Intraspecific intrusions into nests of spawning longear sunfish (Pisces: Centrarchidae). *Copeia* **272–278**.
- Keller, L. and Reeve, H. K. 1994. Partitioning of reproduction in animal societies. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **9**, 98–103.
- Kellog, K. A., Markert, J. A., Stauffer, J. R., and Kocher, T. D. 1998. Intraspecific brood mixing and reduced polyandry in a maternal mouth-brooding cichlid. *Behavioral Ecology* **9**, 309–312.
- Kempnaers, B., Verheyen, G. R., and Dhondt, A. A. 1995. Mate guarding and copulation behavior in monogamous and polygynous blue tits: do males follow a best-of-a-bad-job strategy? *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **36**, 33–42.
- Kempnaers, B., Everding, S., Bishop, C., Boag, P., and Robertson, R. J. 2001. Extra-pair paternity and the reproductive role of male floaters in the tree swallow

- (*Tachycineta bicolor*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **49**, 251–259.
- Ketterson, E. D. and Nolan Jr., V. 1999. Adaptation, exaptation, and constraint: a hormonal perspective. *American Naturalist* **154**, S4–S25.
- Ketterson, E. D., Nolan Jr., V., Cawthorn, M. J., Parker, P. G., and Ziegenfus, C. 1996. Phenotypic engineering: using hormones to explore the mechanistic and functional bases of phenotypic variation in nature. *Ibis* **138**, 1–17.
- Kokko, H. 2003. Are reproductive skew models evolutionary stable? *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **270**, 265–270.
- Kokko, H., Johnstone, R. A., and Wright, J. 2002. The evolution of parental and alloparental effort in cooperatively breeding groups: when should helpers pay to stay? *Behavioral Ecology* **13**, 291–300.
- Kotiaho, J. S. and Simmons, L. W. 2003. Longevity cost of reproduction for males but no longevity cost of mating or courtship for females in the male-dimorphic dung beetle *Onthophagus binodis*. *Journal of Insect Physiology* **49**, 817–822.
- Kotiaho, J. S. and Tomkins, J. L. 2001. The discrimination of alternative male morphologies. *Behavioral Ecology* **12**, 553–557.
- Kurdziel, J. P. and Knowles, L. L. 2002. The mechanisms of morph determination in the amphipod *Jassa*: implications for the evolution of alternative male phenotypes. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **269**, 1749–1754.
- Langellotto, G. A. and Denno, R. F. 2001. Benefits of dispersal in patchy environments: mate location by males of a wing-dimorphic insect. *Ecology* **82**, 1870–1878.
- Langellotto, G. A., Denno, R. F., and Ott, J. R. 2000. A trade-off between flight capability and reproduction in males of a wing-dimorphic insect. *Ecology* **81**, 865–875.
- Lank, D. B., Smith, C. M., Hanotte, O., Burke, T., and Cooke, F. 1995. Genetic polymorphism for alternative mating behaviour in lekking male ruff *Philomachus pugnax*. *Nature* **378**, 59–62.
- Lank, D. B., Coupe, M., and Wynne-Edwards, K. E. 1999. Testosterone-induced male traits in female ruffs (*Philomachus pugnax*): autosomal inheritance and gender differentiation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **266**, 2323–2330.
- Lee, J. S. F. 2005. Alternative reproductive tactics and status-dependent selection. *Behavioral Ecology* **16**, 566–570.
- Lejeune, P. 1985. Etude écoéthologique des comportements reproducteurs et sociaux des Labridae méditerranéens des genres *Symphodus* Rafinesque, 1810 et *Coris* Lacepède, 1802. *Cahiers d'Ethologie* **5**, 1–208.
- Lens, L., Wauters, L. A., and Dhondt, A. A. 1994. Nest-building by crested tit *Parus cristatus* males: an analysis of costs and benefits. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **35**, 431–436.
- Lu, G. Q. and Bernatchez, L. 1999. Correlated trophic specialization and genetic divergence in sympatric lake whitefish ecotypes (*Coregonus clupeaformis*): support for the ecological speciation hypothesis. *Evolution* **53**, 1491–1505.
- Lucas, J. R., Howard, R. D., and Palmer, J. G. 1996. Callers and satellites: chorus behaviour in anurans as a stochastic dynamic game. *Animal Behaviour* **51**, 501–518.
- Lyon, B. E. 2003. Egg recognition and counting reduce costs of avian conspecific brood parasitism. *Nature* **422**, 495–499.
- Magnhagen, C. 1992. Alternative reproductive behaviour in the common goby, *Pomatoschistus microps*: an ontogenetic gradient? *Animal Behaviour* **44**, 182–184.
- Magrath, R. D. and Whittingham, L. A. 1997. Subordinate males are more likely to help if unrelated to the breeding female in cooperatively breeding white-browed scrubwrens. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **41**, 185–192.
- Martin, E. and Taborsky, M. 1997. Alternative male mating tactics in a cichlid, *Pelvicachromis pulcher*: a comparison of reproductive effort and success. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **41**, 311–319.
- Maynard Smith, J. 1982. *Evolution and the Theory of Games*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mboko, S. K. and Kohda, M. 1999. Piracy mating by large males in a monogamous substrate-breeding cichlid in Lake Tanganyika. *Journal of Ethology* **17**, 51–55.
- McGrew, W. C. and Marchant, L. F. 1997. On the other hand: current issues in and meta-analysis of the behavioral laterality of hand function in nonhuman primates. *Yearbook of Physical Anthropology* **40**, 201–232.
- Miller, P. L. 1984. Alternative reproductive routines in a small fly, *Puliciphora borinquenensis* (Diptera: Phoridae). *Ecological Entomology* **9**, 293–302.
- Moczek, A. P. and Emlen, D. J. 2000. Male horn dimorphism in the scarab beetle *Onthophagus taurus*: do alternative tactics favor alternative phenotypes? *Animal Behaviour* **59**, 459–466.
- Mole, S. and Zera, A. J. 1993. Differential allocation of resources underlies the dispersal-reproduction trade-off in the wing-dimorphic cricket, *Gryllus rubens*. *Oecologia* **93**, 121–127.

- Moore, M. C. 1991. Application of organization-activation theory to alternative male reproductive strategies: a review. *Hormones and Behavior* **25**, 154–179.
- Moore, M. C., Hews, D. K., and Knapp, R. 1998. Hormonal control and evolution of alternative male phenotypes: generalizations of models for sexual differentiation. *American Zoologist* **38**, 133–151.
- Morris, D. 1952. Homosexuality in the ten-spined stickleback (*Pygosteus pungitius* L.). *Behaviour* **4**, 233–261.
- Müller, J. K., Eggert, E. K., and Dressel, J. 1990. Intraspecific brood parasitism in the burying beetle, *Necrophorus vespilloides* (Coleoptera: Silphidae). *Animal Behaviour* **40**, 491–499.
- Munoz, R. C. and Warner, R. R. 2003. A new version of the size-advantage hypothesis for sex change: incorporating sperm competition and size-fecundity skew. *American Naturalist* **161**, 749–761.
- Nakajima, M., Matsuda, H., and Hori, M. 2004. Persistence and fluctuation of lateral dimorphism in fishes. *American Naturalist* **163**, 692–698.
- Nijhout, H. F. 2003. Development and evolution of adaptive polyphenisms. *Evolution and Development* **5**, 9–18.
- Oliveira, R. F. 2005. Neuroendocrine mechanisms of alternative reproductive tactics in fish. In K. A. Sloman, R. W. Wilson, and S. Balshine (eds.) *Fish Physiology*, vol. 24, *Behavior and Physiology of Fish*, pp. 297–357. New York: Elsevier.
- Oliveira, R. F., Carvalho, N., Miranda, J., et al. 2002. The relationship between the presence of satellite males and nest-holders' mating success in the Azorean rock-pool blenny *Parablennius sanguinolentus parvicornis*. *Ethology* **108**, 223–235.
- Oliveira, R. F., Ros, A. F. H., and Gonçalves, D. M. 2005. Intra-sexual variation in male reproduction in teleost fish: a comparative approach. *Hormones and Behavior* **48**, 430–439.
- Parker, G. A., Baker, R. R., and Smith, V. G. F. 1972. The origin and evolution of gamete dimorphism and the male-female phenomenon. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **36**, 529–553.
- Parker, H. H., Noonburg, E. G., and Nisbet, R. M. 2001. Models of alternative life-history strategies, population structure and potential speciation in salmonid fish stocks. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **70**, 260–272.
- Perrill, S. A., Gerhardt, H. C., and Daniel, R. E. 1982. Mating strategy shifts in male green treefrogs (*Hyla cinerea*): an experimental study. *Animal Behaviour* **30**, 43–48.
- Petrie, M. and Møller, A. P. 1991. Laying eggs in other's nests: intraspecific brood parasitism in birds. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **6**, 315–320.
- Pienaar, J. and Greeff, J. M. 2003. Different male morphs of *Otitella pseudoserrata* fig wasps have equal fitness but are not determined by different alleles. *Ecology Letters* **6**, 286–289.
- Pigeon, D., Chouinard, A., and Bernatchez, L. 1997. Multiple modes of speciation involved in the parallel evolution of sympatric morphotypes of lake whitefish (*Coregonus clupeaformis*, Salmonidae). *Evolution* **51**, 196–205.
- Plaistow, S. J., Johnstone, R. A., Colegrave, N., and Spencer, M. 2004. Evolution of alternative mating tactics: conditional versus mixed strategies. *Behavioral Ecology* **15**, 534–542.
- Prestwich, K. N. 1994. The energetics of acoustic signaling in anurans and insects. *American Zoologist* **34**, 625–643.
- Pruden, A. J. and Uetz, G. W. 2004. Assessment of potential predation costs of male decoration and courtship display in wolf spiders using video digitization and playback. *Journal of Insect Behavior* **17**, 67–80.
- Radwan, J. 1993. The adaptive significance of male polymorphism in the acarid mite *Caloglyphus berlesei*. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **33**, 201–208.
- Radwan, J. 1995. Male morph determination in two species of acarid mites. *Heredity* **74**, 669–673.
- Radwan, J. 2001. Male morph determination in *Rhizoglyphus echinopus* (Acaridae). *Experimental and Applied Acarology* **25**, 143–149.
- Radwan, J. 2003. Heritability of male morph in the bulb mite, *Rhizoglyphus robini* (Astigmata, Acaridae). *Experimental and Applied Acarology* **29**, 109–114.
- Radwan, J. and Bogacz, I. 2000. Comparison of life-history traits of the two male morphs of the bulb mite, *Rhizoglyphus robini*. *Experimental and Applied Acarology* **24**, 115–121.
- Radwan, J. and Klimas, M. 2001. Male dimorphism in the bulb mite, *Rhizoglyphus robini*: fighters survive better. *Ethology Ecology and Evolution* **13**, 69–79.
- Radwan, J., Unrug, J., and Tomkins, J. L. 2002. Status-dependence and morphological trade-offs in the expression of a sexually selected character in the mite, *Sancassania berlesei*. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **15**, 744–752.
- Reichard, M., Bryja, J., Ondrackova M., et al. 2005. Sexual selection for male dominance reduces opportunities for female mate choice in the European bitterling (*Rhodeus sericeus*). *Molecular Ecology* **14**, 1533–1542.
- Reinhold, K., Greenfield, M. D., Jang, Y. W., and Broce, A. 1998. Energetic cost of sexual attractiveness: ultrasonic advertisement in wax moths. *Animal Behaviour* **55**, 905–913.

- Repka, J. and Gross, M. R. 1995. The evolutionarily stable strategy under individual condition and tactic frequency. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **176**, 27–31.
- Reyer, H. U. 1984. Investment and relatedness: a cost/benefit analysis of breeding and helping in the pied kingfisher (*Ceryle rudis*). *Animal Behaviour* **32**, 1163–1178.
- Reyer, H. U. 1986. Breeder–helper interactions in the pied kingfisher reflect the costs and benefits of cooperative breeding. *Behaviour* **96**, 277–303.
- Ribbink, A. J. 1977. Cuckoo among Lake Malawi cichlid fish. *Nature* **267**, 243–244.
- Richardson, D. S., Burke, T., and Komdeur, J. 2002. Direct benefits and the evolution of female-biased cooperative breeding in Seychelles warblers. *Evolution* **56**, 2313–2321.
- Rico, C., Kuhnlein, U., and FitzGerald, G. J. 1992. Male reproductive tactics in the threespine stickleback: an evaluation by DNA fingerprinting. *Molecular Ecology* **1**, 79–87.
- Robinson, B. W. and Wilson, D. S. 1996. Genetic variation and phenotypic plasticity in a trophically polymorphic population of pumpkinseed sunfish (*Lepomis gibbosus*). *Evolutionary Ecology* **10**, 631–652.
- Roff, D. A. 1996. The evolution of threshold traits in animals. *Quarterly Review of Biology* **71**, 3–35.
- Rohwer, F. C. and Freeman, S. 1989. The distribution of conspecific nest parasitism in birds. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **67**, 239–253.
- Ros, A. F. H., Oliveira, R. F., Bouton, N., and Santos, R. S. 2006. Alternative male reproductive tactics and the immunocompetence handicap in the Azorean rock pool blenny, *Parablennius parvicornis*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **273**, 901–909.
- Rowland, W. J. 1979. Stealing fertilizations in the fourspine stickleback, *Apeltes quadracus*. *American Naturalist* **114**, 602–604.
- Ryan, M. J., Pease, C. M., and Morris, M. R. 1992. A genetic polymorphism in the swordtail, *Xiphophorus nigrensis*: testing the prediction of equal fitnesses. *American Naturalist* **139**, 21–31.
- Sage, R. D. and Selander, R. K. 1975. Trophic radiation through polymorphism in cichlid fishes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **72**, 4669–4673.
- Sandell, M. I. and Diemer, M. 1999. Intraspecific brood parasitism: a strategy for floating females in the European starling. *Animal Behaviour* **57**, 197–202.
- Sato, T., Hirose, M., Taborsky, M., and Kimura, S. 2004. Size-dependent male alternative reproductive tactics in the shell-brooding cichlid fish *Lamprologus callipterus* in Lake Tanganyika. *Ethology* **110**, 49–62.
- Scheiner, S. M. 1993. Genetics and evolution of phenotypic plasticity. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* **24**, 35–68.
- Schlichting, C. D. and Pigliucci, M. 1998. *Phenotypic Evolution: A Reaction Norm Perspective*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.
- Shuster, S. M. 1989. Male alternative reproductive strategies in a marine isopod crustacean (*Paracerceis sculpta*): the use of genetic markers to measure differences in fertilization success among a-, B-, and g-males. *Evolution* **43**, 1683–1698.
- Shuster, S. M. 1992. The reproductive behaviour of alpha, beta and gamma-male morphs in *Paracerceis sculpta*, a marine isopod crustacean. *Behaviour* **121**, 231–258.
- Shuster, S. M. and Wade, M. J. 1991. Equal mating success among male reproductive strategies in a marine isopod. *Nature* **350**, 606–611.
- Shuster, S. M. and Wade, M. J. 2003. *Mating Systems and Strategies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Simmons, L. W., Teale, R. J., Maier, M., et al. 1992. Some costs of reproduction for male bush-crickets, *Requena verticalis* (Orthoptera, Tettigoniidae): allocating resources to mate attraction and nuptial feeding. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **31**, 57–62.
- Sinervo, B. 2001. Runaway social games, genetic cycles driven by alternative male and female strategies, and the origin of morphs. *Genetica* **112**, 417–434.
- Sinervo, B. and Lively, C. M. 1996. The rock–paper–scissors game and the evolution of alternative male strategies. *Nature* **380**, 240–243.
- Skubic, E., Taborsky, M., McNamara, J. M., and Houston, A. I. 2004. When to parasitize? A dynamic optimization model of reproductive strategies in a cooperative breeder. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **227**, 487–501.
- Skúlason, S. and Smith, T. B. 1995. Resource polymorphisms in vertebrates. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **10**, 366–370.
- Slatkin, M. 1978. Equilibration of fitnesses by natural selection. *American Naturalist* **112**, 845–859.
- Slatkin, M. 1979. Evolutionary response to frequency-dependent and density-dependent interactions. *American Naturalist* **114**, 384–398.
- Smith, T. B. and Skúlason, S. 1996. Evolutionary significance of resource polymorphisms in fishes, amphibians, and birds. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* **27**, 111–133.
- Snorrrason, S. S. and Skúlason, S. 2004. Adaptive speciation in northern freshwater fishes: patterns and processes. In U. Dieckmann, H. Metz, M. Doebeli and D. Tautz (eds.) *Adaptive Speciation*, pp. 210–228. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Snorrason, S. S., Skúlason, S., Jonsson, B., *et al.* 1994. Trophic specialization in arctic charr *Salvelinus alpinus* (Pisces, Salmonidae): morphological divergence and ontogenetic niche shifts. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **52**, 1–18.
- Stiver, K. A., Dierkes, P., Taborsky, M., Gibbs, H. L., and Balshine, S. 2005. Relatedness and helping in fish: examining the theoretical predictions. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **272**, 1593–1599.
- Taborsky, B., Dieckmann, U., and Heino, M. 2003. Unexpected discontinuities in life-history evolution under size-dependent mortality. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **270**, 713–721.
- Taborsky, M. 1984. Broodcare helpers in the cichlid fish *Lamprologus brichardi*: their costs and benefits. *Animal Behaviour* **32**, 1236–1252.
- Taborsky, M. 1985. Breeder–helper conflict in a cichlid fish with broodcare helpers: an experimental analysis. *Behaviour* **95**, 45–75.
- Taborsky, M. 1994. Sneakers, satellites, and helpers: parasitic and cooperative behavior in fish reproduction. *Advances in the Study of Behavior*. **23**, 1–100.
- Taborsky, M. 1997. Bourgeois and parasitic tactics: do we need collective, functional terms for alternative reproductive behaviours? *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **41**, 361–362.
- Taborsky, M. 1998. Sperm competition in fish: bourgeois males and parasitic spawning. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **13**, 222–227.
- Taborsky, M. 1999. Conflict or cooperation: what determines optimal solutions to competition in fish reproduction? In R. F. Oliveira, V. Almada, and E. Gonçalves (eds.) *Behaviour and Conservation of Littoral Fishes*, pp. 301–349. Lisbon: Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada.
- Taborsky, M. 2001. The evolution of parasitic and cooperative reproductive behaviors in fishes. *Journal of Heredity* **92**, 100–110.
- Taborsky, M., Hudde, B., and Wirtz, P. 1987. Reproductive behaviour and ecology of *Symphodus (Crenilabrus) ocellatus*, a European wrasse with four types of male behaviour. *Behaviour* **102**, 82–118.
- Tallamy, D. W. 1985. “Egg dumping” in lace bugs (*Gargaphia solani*, Hemiptera: Tingidae). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **17**, 357–362.
- Tallamy, D. W. 2005. Egg dumping in insects. *Annual Review of Entomology* **50**, 347–370.
- Tallamy, D. W. and Horton, L. A. 1990. Costs and benefits of the eggdumping alternative in *Gargaphia* lace bugs (Hemiptera: Tingidae). *Animal Behaviour* **39**, 352–359.
- Thomas, R. J. 2002. The costs of singing in nightingales. *Animal Behaviour* **63**, 959–966.
- Thorpe, J. E. 1986. Age at first maturity in Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*: freshwater period influences and conflicts with smolting. In D. J. Meerburg (ed.) *Salmonid Age at Maturity*, pp. 7–14. Ottawa, ON: Department of Fisheries and Oceans.
- Thorpe, J. E. and Morgan, R. I. G. 1980. Growth rate and smolting rate of progeny of male Atlantic salmon parr (*Salmo salar* L.). *Journal of Fisheries Biology* **17**, 451–459.
- Timms, S., Ferro, D. N., and Waller, J. B. 1980. Suppression of production of pleomorphic males in *Sancassania berlesei* (Michael) (Acari: Acaridae). *International Journal of Acarology* **6**, 91–96.
- Timms, S., Ferro, D. N., and Emberson, R. M. 1982. Andropolymorphism and its heritability in *Sancassania berlesei* (Michael) (Acari, Acaridae). *Acarologia* **22**, 391–398.
- Tomkins, J. L. and Brown, G. S. 2004. Population density drives the local evolution of a threshold dimorphism. *Nature* **431**, 1099–1103.
- Tomkins, J. L. and Simmons, L. W. 2000. Sperm competition games played by dimorphic male beetles: fertilization gains with equal mating access. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **267**, 1547–1553.
- Tomkins, J. L., LeBas, N. R., Unrug, J., and Radwan, J. 2004. Testing the status-dependent ESS model: population variation in fighter expression in the mite *Sancassania berlesei*. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **17**, 1377–1388.
- Tomkins, J. L., Kotiaho, J. S., and LeBas, N. R. 2005. Matters of scale: positive allometry and the evolution of male dimorphisms. *American Naturalist* **165**, 389–402.
- Trudel, M., Tremblay, A., Schetagne, R., and Rasmussen, J. B. 2001. Why are dwarf fish so small? An energetic analysis of polymorphism in lake whitefish (*Coregonus clupeaformis*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **58**, 394–405.
- Unrug, J., Tomkins, J. L., and Radwan, J. 2004. Alternative phenotypes and sexual selection: can dichotomous handicaps honestly signal quality? *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **271**, 1401–1406.
- Utami, S. S., Goossens, B., Bruford, M. W., de Ruiter, J. R. and van Hooff, J. A. R. A. 2002. Male bimaturism and reproductive success in Sumatran orang-utans. *Behavioral Ecology* **13**, 643–652.
- van den Berghe, E. P. 1988. Piracy: a new alternative male reproductive tactic. *Nature* **334**, 697–698.
- Vehrencamp, S. L. 1983. A model for the evolution of despotic versus egalitarian societies. *Animal Behaviour* **31**, 667–682.

- Verspoor, E. and Cole, L. J. 1989. Genetically distinct sympatric populations of resident and anadromous Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*. *Canadian Journal of Zoology/Revue Canadienne de Zoologie* **67**, 1453–1461.
- Villalobos, E. M. and Shelly, T. E. 1996. Intraspecific nest parasitism in the sand wasp *Stictia heros* (Fabr.) (Hymenoptera: Sphecidae). *Journal of Insect Behavior* **9**, 105–119.
- Vollestad, L. A., Peterson, J., and Quinn, T. P. 2004. Effects of freshwater and marine growth rates on early maturity in male coho and Chinook salmon. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* **133**, 495–503.
- Wagner, W. E. 2005. Male field crickets that provide reproductive benefits to females incur higher costs. *Ecological Entomology* **30**, 350–357.
- Ward, S., Speakman, J. R., and Slater, P. J. B. 2003. The energy cost of song in the canary, *Serinus canaria*. *Animal Behaviour* **66**, 893–902.
- Warner, R. R. and Hoffman, S. G. 1980. Population density and the economics of territorial defense in a coral reef fish. *Ecology* **61**, 772–780.
- Warner, R. R., Robertson, D. R., and Leigh, E. G. J. 1975. Sex change and sexual selection. *Science* **190**, 633–638.
- Webster, M. S., Tarvin, K. A., Tuttle, E. M., and Pruett-Jones, S. 2004. Reproductive promiscuity in the splendid fairy-wren: effects of group size and auxiliary reproduction. *Behavioral Ecology* **15**, 907–915.
- West-Eberhard, M. J. 1986. Alternative adaptations, speciation, and phylogeny. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **83**, 1388–1392.
- West-Eberhard, M. J. 1989. Phenotypic plasticity and the origins of diversity. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* **20**, 249–278.
- West-Eberhard, M. J. 2003. *Developmental Plasticity and Evolution*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Westneat, D. F. 1993. Temporal patterns of within-pair copulations, male mate guarding, and extra-pair events in eastern red-winged blackbirds (*Agelaius phoeniceus*). *Behaviour* **124**, 267–290.
- Westneat, D. F. and Stewart, I. R. K. 2003. Extra-pair paternity in birds: causes, correlates, and conflict. *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics* **34**, 365–396.
- Whittingham, L. A., Dunn, P. O., and Magrath, R. D. 1997. Relatedness, polyandry and extra-group paternity in the cooperatively-breeding white-browed scrubwren (*Sericornis frontalis*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **40**, 261–270.
- Wingfield, J. C., Jacobs, J. D., Soma, K., et al. 1999. Testosterone, aggression, and communication: ecological bases of endocrine phenomena. In M. D. Hauser and M. Konishi (eds.) *The Design of Animal Communication*, pp. 257–283. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wingfield, J. C., Lynn, S. E., and Soma, K. K. 2001. Avoiding the “costs” of testosterone: ecological bases of hormone–behavior interactions. *Brain, Behavior, and Evolution* **57**, 239–251.
- Wirtz, P. 1982. Territory holders, satellite males and bachelor males in a high density population of waterbuck (*Kobus ellipsiprymnus*) and their associations with conspecifics. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie* **58**, 277–300.
- Woodring, J. P. 1969. Observations on the biology of six species of acarid mites. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America* **62**, 102–108.
- Yanagisawa, Y. 1985. Parental strategy of the cichlid fish *Perissodus microlepis*, with particular reference to intraspecific brood “farming out.” *Environmental Biology of Fish* **12**, 241–249.
- Yoccoz, N. G., Mysterud, A., Langvatn, R., and Stenseth, N. C. 2002. Age- and density-dependent reproductive effort in male red deer. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* **269**, 1523–1528.
- Yom-Tov, Y. 1980. Intraspecific nest parasitism in birds. *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **55**, 93–108.
- Yom-Tov, Y. 2001. An updated list and some comments on the occurrence of intraspecific nest parasitism in birds. *Ibis* **143**, 133–143.
- Zera, A. J. and Rankin, M. A. 1989. Wing dimorphism in *Gryllus rubens*: genetic basis of morph determination and fertility differences between morphs. *Oecologia* **80**, 249–255.
- Zink, A. G. 2003. Intraspecific brood parasitism as a conditional reproductive tactic in the treehopper *Publilia concava*. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **54**, 406–415.
- Zupanc, G. K. H. and Lamprecht, J. 2000. Towards a cellular understanding of motivation: structural reorganization and biochemical switching as key mechanisms of behavioral plasticity. *Ethology* **106**, 467–477.