

Title

headerOrFooter

COURSE CODE  
*ABCS 349*

Title

Title

title

COURSE TITLE  
*ANIMAL ECOLOGY*

other

CREDIT HOURS  
*THREE*

## Lecture Period & Venue

institutions Universities and Publishers

- Mondays: **7:30 - 9:25 hrs** and **13:30 - 16:25 hrs**; Thursday: **10:30 – 12:25 hrs**; DABCS Lecture Theatre 2

## Course Instructors

institutions

Universities and Publishers

- **Dr. J. K. Quartey**; DABCS Room 40; Office Hours: Monday – Friday: 9:00 – 16:00; E-mail: [joquartey@ug.edu.gh](mailto:joquartey@ug.edu.gh)

institutions

- **Prof. D. K. Attuquayefio**; Office Location: DABCS Room 17; Office Hours: Tuesday-Friday: 10:00 - 12:00; E-mail: [dattuquayefio@ug.edu.gh](mailto:dattuquayefio@ug.edu.gh)

institutions

- **Mr. Y. Musah**; Office Location: DABCS/Marine & Fisheries Dept. Room 82; Office Hours: Monday-Friday: 09:00 - 16:00; E-mail: [ymusah@ug.edu.gh](mailto:ymusah@ug.edu.gh)

## Assessment & Grading

- Continuous Assessment 30% (Interim Assessment, Assignments & Quizzes)
- Examination 70%

# Course Outline

institutions

## ► Dr. Jones K. Quartey (5 weeks)

- **Introduction to Animal Ecology:** Scope and Objectives, Ecological Concepts, Definitions and Study Levels
  - **Experimental Methods in Ecology:** Laboratory, Field and Natural Experiments (Strengths & Limitations)
  - **Niche Theory and Competition:** Basis of understanding Community Structure and Organisation
  - **Species Diversity Pattern:** MacArthur's Species Diversity Model, S-Area Relationship, Island-Biogeography
  - **Foraging Ecology:** Optimum Foraging Theory, Predator-Prey Relationships, Predator-Avoidance Strategies
- 

authors

Title

## ► Mr. Yahaya Musah (3 weeks)

- **Measuring Ecological Diversity:** Within- and Between Habitat Diversity Indices, Strengths and Limitations
  - **Comparing Alpha and Beta Indices:** Shannon-Wiener, Simpson, Margalef, Berger-Parker, Jaccard, Sorenson
- 

Content

authors

Title

## ► Prof. D. K. Attuquayefio (2 weeks)

- **Behavioural Ecology:** Decisions, Adaptations, Social Behaviour and Mating Systems and Strategies

small  
B

# Objectives of lecture 1

## ➤ Introduction to the major scopes and concepts in Animal Ecology


- Trophism, Mobility, Ranges, Behaviour, Reproduction and Dispersion
- Plant-Animal Interactions: Symbiosis and targeted taxa

## ➤ An overview of 5 major aspects in Animal Ecology

- Evolutionary-Behavioural-Population-Community-Macro-Ecology

## ➤ Spatial/Organisational levels of Animal Ecology studies

- **Species:** Genetics (Phenotype/ genotype), niches, habitat requirements
- **Populations:** Growth, structure, regulation and interactions
- **Guilds:** Assemblages of similar species (ecological and/or taxonomical)
- **Communities:** Assemblages of similar and different guilds that interact
- **Ecosystems:** Species, guilds, communities and abiotic factors interacting
- **Biomes:** Highest level with large macro-ecological and geographical regions




# Scope and Objectives

## ❖ Basic differences between animals and plants

### 1. Trophism

- Plants only one trophic level; animals up to 5-7 or more levels (Predators of 6<sup>th</sup> degree)
- Algae – Copepod – Fish larvae (1) – Dragon fly larvae (2) – Tilapia (3) – Pied kingfisher (4)
- Grass – Locust – Preying mantis (1) – Lizard (2) – Cobra (3) – Mongoose (4) – Python (5) – Leopard (6)
- The relationship between competition and predation in community structuring is far more complex for animals as these can be both prey and predators at the same time (plants are normally only prey for herbivores and few are predatory – carnivorous plants e.g. *Drosera* spp.)



## 2. Mobility

Content

- Generally, all plants are immobile (except for a few algae) whereas all animals are mobile (except corals and barnacles)
- Field study of animals far more difficult due to seasonal movements, cryptic behaviour etc.
- Implications – challenges in assessing animal population dynamics (distribution, abundance, density and diversity)

## 3. Ranges

Content

- Animals have larger ranges than plants, especially for migratory animals
- Spatio-temporal (circadian/ circannual) variation in animal ranges poses challenges for describing community structure and interspecific interactions

## 4. Behaviour

Content

- Animal generally have more complex and diversified behavioural patterns (intra-/ inter- specific interaction, predation, reproduction)

## 5. Reproduction

Content

- Plants are immobile and reproduction is by fertilization agent (animals, wind or water)
- Many plants depend on animals for their reproduction. E.g. pollinators of pollen and dispersers of seeds
- Mobile animals actively search for reproductive partners, engage in complex courtship behaviour (e.g. vocalization, body display, pheromone attraction, building of structures such as nesting sites, mating chambers) to initiate copulation
- Immobile animals (e.g. marine corals and barnacles) reproduces in a way similar to that of plants (more passive fertilization modes)

## 6. Dispersion

- Plants depend on agents for dispersal whereas animals disperse by themselves by virtue of their mobility
- Good dispersers include flying organisms as well as aquatic organisms that can tolerate a broad temperature range, or highly prolific species with high population turnover

Content

heading

# Plant and Animal Interactions


Content

- Plants depend on animals and vice versa
- Examples of animal dependencies on plants: Food (Herbivory), Building materials (Nests), Roosting and shelter (Protection)
- Examples of plant dependencies on animals: Pollination, Seed dispersal, Protection (Predators on Herbivores)

# Different aspects of Animal Ecology

- **Evolutionary Ecology** – Focus on how ecology and evolution are linked as inter-related processes. Ecology drives speciation/extinction which again affect community structure
- **Behavioural Ecology** – Focus on how ecology and behaviour is linked. Survival strategies such as Optimal Foraging and Reproductive strategies such as Semelparity/Iteroparity
- **Population Ecology** – Focus on how populations grow, are regulated and interact within and between different species (Competition, Predation, Mutualism, Parasitism)
- **Community Ecology** – Focus on how communities of animals are structured with groups made up of taxonomical and ecological guilds
- **Macro-ecology**: Focus on large scale (global) patterns of animal communities, spatio-temporal patterns of distribution, abundance and diversity on the Earth

# Concepts, Definition and Levels



# Practical Implications

- Understanding the relationship amongst niches, species, community structure and functioning;
- ❖ **Land and water** – Species-area relationship, habitat heterogeneity, island biogeography models
- ❖ **Crop pests**: Predator-prey relations, anti-predator strategies, invasive species ecology
- ❖ **Design of conservation regions** - Species diversity concentrations, gradients, endemic centres
- ❖ **Vector control of tropical diseases** – Trophic organisations and food webs, predation, competition
- ❖ **World fish stock** – Food webs, predator-prey relations, invasive alien species

# In Summary

## 1. Animal Ecology is very complex. Plant-Animal interactions important for both

- *Trophism – Interactions – Mobility – Ranges – Dispersion – Behaviour – Reproduction - Communication*

## 2. Five major disciplines in the study of Animal Ecology

- *Evolutionary ecology, Behavioural ecology, Population ecology, Community ecology and Macro ecology*

## 3. Three major interrelated themes

- *Species abundance, Distribution and Diversity (spatio-temporal)*

## 4. Six major organisational/ Spatial levels

- *Species/Niche – Population – Guild – Community – Ecosystem - Biome*

# Lecture 2 – Experimental Methods in Animal Ecology

1. An introduction to the 3 major experimental methodologies in Animal Ecology:

**Laboratory tests, Field Experiments, Natural Experiments**

2. An overview of how ecologists use different field approaches to show that **Competitive Exclusion Principle (Gause's Law)** is real
3. A comparison of the strengths and weaknesses of experimental methodologies
4. An account of important ecological concepts related to Gause's Law – **Niche overlap** and **Niche shift**

## Method

### Laboratory Experiments

## Famous Examples

- Gause's on cultures of paramecium
- Park's on grain beetles

### Field (Manipulation) Experiments

- Connell's on barnacles
- Brown and Davidson's on desert mice and ants
- Paine's on starfish

### Natural Experiments

- Heller's Chipmunks on Californian mountains
- Diamond's island ground doves and honey eaters
- Nilsson's salmonids in Swedish lakes

## Major Advantages

- Better control of confounding factors
- Very cheap and fast
- Easy to replicate

- Relatively good controls
- Relatively easy to replicate

- Relatively cheap and fast to replicate
- Natural conditions only
- Large data samples
- No problems with large nor protected species

## Major Limitations

- Artificial and simplistic environment
- Behavioural limitations due to confinement
- Only feasible for small or unprotected animals


- Time consuming
- Rather expensive
- Problematic with large and protected species

- Problematic with controls if replicates and samples are small
- Confounding factors can compromise validity of patterns

# Laboratory Experiments

## □ Georgy Gause's (1934) Protozoa Cultures (*Paramecium aurelia* & *P. caudatum*)


- Glass tube experiments
- Grown separately (allopatric “A & B”) or together (sympatric “C”)
- Logistic population growth until carrying capacity (K) reached
- Carrying capacities (K) measured as volume density of each organism (population density)




© science music videos L.L.C. Created with BioRender.com

Image

## Allopatric Logistic Growth



## Sympatric Logistic Growth



references  
Rockwood, 2006

Headline

- Similar decrease in K:

$$\checkmark P. aurelia = (520 - 300)/520 = 42.3\%$$

$$\checkmark P. caudatum = (360 - 200)/360 = 44.4\%$$


# Laboratory Experiment 2

❑ Thomas Park's (1948) Three Grain Beetle species (*Tribolium confusum*, *T. castaneum* and *Oryzaephilus surinamensis*)

- **Variable** – Climatic conditions (temperature/ moisture) and food availability
  - Monitoring of competitive outcome (highest fitness) among 3 grain beetles
- ✓ Moisture gradient: Dry – Moist
- ✓ Temperature gradient: Hot – Warm – Cold

## • Demonstrations of Fundamental & Realised niches

Image



Gradient

- ✓ *T. castaneum*: hot-moist specialist
- ✓ *T. confusum*: cold-dry specialist

small

Copyright © The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. Permission required for reproduction or display.

small

When grown separately at 34°C and 70% relative humidity, populations of *T. confusum* and *T. castaneum* both did well.

small

small&lt;/div

Image

figure


# Reciprocal competitive exclusion



- Fundamental niches

figure

- Realised niches



Title

Content

- Hot-moist vs. cold-dry specialists
- Both species of beetles exhibit identical climate niches in allopatry
- Climatic extremes represented in only one of the two species, with the other species occupying the middle range

figure

- Both *T. confusum* and *Oryzaephilus surinamensis* exhibit similar fundamental niches in allopatry (Crombie, 1974)
- In sympatric medium, *T. confusum* always eliminate *O. surinamensis* because of its higher rate of reproduction and better predation ability
- An extra dimension, e.g. space in the form of glass tubes, allow co-existence of the two species

figure

## • Fundamental niche

figure

### fundamental niches




figure

## • Realised niche

figure

### realized niches



Content

figure  
From Begon, Mortimer & Thompson, 1985


# Interspecific Competition – Field Experiments

## Content

- Joseph H. Connell's (1961) Tidal Barnacles (*Balanus balanoides*/ *Chthamalus stellatus*)

- Adult *Chthamalus* usually occur above *Balanus*
  - *Chthamalus* larvae do settle in *Balanus* Lower Tide Zone (LTZ)
  - Adult *Balanus* never in high tide zones (due to desiccation)

## Image



**EXPERIMENT** Ecologist Joseph Connell studied two barnacle species—*Balanus balanoides* and *Chthamalus stellatus*—that have a stratified distribution on rocks along the coast of Scotland.

**Connell's Experiment:** In nature, *Balanus* fails to survive high on the rocks because it is unable to resist desiccation (drying out) during low tides. Its realized niche is therefore similar to its fundamental niche. In contrast, *Chthamalus* is usually concentrated on the upper strata of rocks. To determine the fundamental niche of *Chthamalus*, Connell removed *Balanus* from the lower strata.

**RESULTS** When Connell removed *Balanus* from the lower strata, the *Chthamalus* population spread into that area.

The diagram shows a vertical rock face with a dense colony of small, circular organisms (Chthamalus) at the top. The water level is indicated by a horizontal line. A double-headed vertical arrow on the right side of the rock face is labeled "small Chthamalus fundamental niche". To the left, a small rectangular box labeled "small Ocean" is shown. To the right, two boxes indicate the tide range: "small High tide" at the top and "small Low tide" at the bottom. The area between the tide marks is shaded orange.

**CONCLUSION** The spread of *Chthamalus* when *Balanus* was removed indicates that competitive exclusion makes the realized niche of *Chthamalus* much smaller than its fundamental niche.

- **Methodology** – Connell suspected that adult *Balanus* out competed adult *Chthamalus*. He kept removing *Balanus* adult in lower zones in experimental plots in one set as well as removing *Chthamalus* from upper zone in another

- **Results**

1. Removing *Balanus* from lower zones caused *Chthamalus* to survive
2. *Balanus* never settled in upper zone even as *Chthamalus* was removed there

- **Conclusion**

1. Adult barnacles compete over space in lower zones
2. *Balanus* is superior (crushing *Chthamalus*) leaving a small realized niche (upper zone) for *Chthamalus*
3. Fundamental niche of *Chthamalus* includes dry upper zones where *Balanus* cannot withstand desiccation

Headline

heading

# Interspecific competition – Field Experiment 2


Content

## Brown & Davidson's Granivorous Desert Ants and Rodents in Arizona

- Ants and rodents were observed to overlap in seed utilization, and the question was then: Are they competing for a limited resource (=seeds)?

## Experimental Design

1. Ant-Removal Plots were sprayed with pesticides regularly
2. Rodent-Removal Plots were fenced and subjected to intensive trapping protocols
3. Both ants and rodents removed
4. Control Plots with both ants and rodents present




## • Results

1. Rodents removed – Ant colonies increase above control plots

2. Ants removed – Rodents densities increase above control plots

Image



heading

## • Conclusions

- As one competitor is removed the remaining increase. Density Compensation occur – Release of extra resources that is no more utilized by the removed species
- Ants and rodents have overlapping limited food resource niche (seeds) over which they compete

heading

# Interspecific Competition – Field Experiment 3

Content

- Paine's (1966) starfish (*Pisaster*) in rocky intertidal zones of the US: Predator-mediated Coexistence

- Pisaster (a keystone predator) preys differentially on the dominant competitors (bivalves & acorn barnacles)
- Removal of the predator showed that the more dominant competitors crowded out the inferior species (goose barnacles, limpets and chitons)



- This reduced the total number of coexisting species from 15 to 8
- A classic example of Top-Down control of communities (trophic cascading effects or predator-mediated coexistence at lower trophic levels)

Content

Image



B




# Ecological Release (Habitat) – Natural Experiments 1

Content

Title

- ☐ Jared M. Diamond's (1975) Ground Doves on Papua New Guinea and associated islands (*Chalcophaps indica*, *C. stephani* and *Gallicolumba rufigula*)

- Mainland (New Guinea): All 3 Ground doves living sympatrically in distinct habitats (no overlap)
- Large island (Bagabag): Only 2 species – In the absence of *G. rufigula*, *C. stephani* expands its niche to include inland rainforest
- Very small islands (New Britain, Tolokiwa, Karkar, Espiritu Santo) – Only one species (*C. indica*) present and it's able to occupy all three types




## □Conclusion

- Fundamental niches of the 3 doves shown only when in allopatry
- When in sympatry, each species excludes the other two from its specialized habitat = Contiguous Allopatry
- There is competitive exclusion on New Guinea and competitive release elsewhere

# Ecological Release (Habitat) – Natural Experiments 2

- Jared M. Diamond's (1975) – 2 Honeyeaters on 3 Papua New Guinea mountains
- **Fundamental niche**: similar – *P. guisei* = 300 – 3500m; *P. peristriata* = 200 – 3850m
- **Fundamental niche**: overlap –  $3200/3650 \approx 88\%$
- Ranged reduced (allopatry to sympatry) from 200-3700 to 3000-3850 m:  $850/3500 \approx 25\%$
- **Realised niche** of inferior species (*P. peristriata*) only 25% of the fundamental niche
- Another example of habitat related (altitudinal = vertical spatial) Ecological Release




# Contiguous Allopatry – Natural Experiment 3

Title

Title


□ H. C. Heller's (1971) chipmunks in Sierra Nevada mountains, California



# Ecological Release/Niche Shift – Natural Experiment 4

## ☐ Nils-Arvid Nilsson's (1963) Salmonids in Swedish Lakes (Asymmetric Niche Shift)

- Assessment of diets (6 food types) of 2 Salmonids
- Great overlap in food utilization in allopatry
- Large crustaceans (C), Insect larvae (D) and terrestrial insects (E) preferred by both species in allopatry
- In sympatry;
- Char specializes greatly (60%) on small crustaceans (B), greatly reducing consumption of insect larvae (D) and terrestrial insects (E)
- Trout largely remains a generalist in sympatry
- Large crustaceans/molluscs are shared in sympatry
- Char's dietary composition greatly changed in sympatry; Trout's not




# Limiting Similarity – Character Displacement 1

☐ Tom Fenchel's (1975) Character Displacement in Marine Mud Snails, Denmark

- Measurement of lengths of 2 species of snails; *Hydrobia ulvae* and *H. ventrosa*
- Shell length correlated with food size
- Allopatry: Snail length almost identical, mode  $\approx 3.0$  mm
- Sympatry: Snail length distinctively smaller for *H. ventrosa*, mode  $\approx 1.8$  mm, but bigger for *H. ulvae*, mode  $\approx 3.7$  mm

# Tom Fenchel's (1975) Character Displacement in Marine Mud Snails, Denmark

- Food size of the two species in allopatry very similar
- Allopatry: Both species – mode = c. 60 µm in diameter
- Sympatry: *H. ulvae* = c. 100 µm; *H. ventrosa* = c. 60 µm
- **Conclusion:** The snails compete for the same limiting food resource and *H. ulvae* diverge towards the large-sized food hence reducing niche-overlap



# Limiting Similarity – Character Displacement (2)

## Community-wide Character Displacement & Hutchinson's Size Ratio Rule

- ☐ Niche partitioning among fruit pigeons - 4 key niche dimensions (Diamond 1973):


**1. Fruit Size:** Larger species feed mostly on larger fruits (**large beaks** can handle these)

**2. Bird Size and Weight:** Body size positively correlated to preferred **fruit sizes eaten**

**3. Thickness of Branches:** Body size positively correlated with **branch thickness**

**4. Position on Branches:** Small species foraging on **outer branches** and **twigs** due to lower weight.

Image



# Summary – Animal Ecology Experimental Methods

## 1. Three Animal Ecology Experimental Methods

- **Laboratory:** small animals, simple principles, strong controls
- **Field Experiments:** small-medium sized, advanced set-up, limited control
- **Natural Experiments:** any size of animal, large sample size, poor controls

## 2. Seven Major Ways to demonstrate competitive interactions

- **Competitive Exclusion:** Yeast and grain beetle competition for space
- **Niche shift:** Dietary shift between two salmonids (allopatry-sympatry)
- **Ecological release:** Barnacle competition for space (Displacement)
- **Density compensation:** Rodent-ant competition for seed (Displacement)
- **Contiguous allopatry:** Chipmunk habitat occupation (allopatry-sympatry)
- **Character displacement:** Food partitioning – Fruit pigeons, mud snails
- **Predator-mediated co-existence:** Starfish predation (Displacement)

heading

Headline

# Summary – Animal Ecology Experimental Methods

Content

## 3. Three Manipulation Methods to demonstrate competitive interactions

small

- Removals
- Displacement
- Occupational Comparative (allopatry-sympatry)

heading

## 4. The Explanatory Concept for competition: Fundamental vs Realised Niche

# Lecture 3: The Basis of the Ecological Niche Concept

## 1. Definitions of important terminologies in Ecological Niche Concept

- **Habitat component:** Grinnell (1917)
- **Trophic component:** Elton (1927)
- **Multi-dimensional:** Hutchinson (1957)
- **Abiotic-biotic multidimensional:** Begon-Krebs-Ricklefs (1986-1997)

## 2. Overview of perception of niche dimensionality

- **Niche dimensions:** Biotic and abiotic components interacting
- **Graphical depiction:** One-, two-, three-, multi-dimensional visualization
- **Dimensional interaction:** Dimensions can be unrelated or inter-dependent

# Lecture 3: The Basis of the Ecological Niche Concept

## 3. Comparison of 2 niches types and the eco-potential of a species

- **Eco-potential:** Genotype determined/ limited maximum potential
- **Fundamental:** Optimum niche, phenotype limited by environmental factors
- **Realised:** Limited by biotic interactions: competition, predation, parasitism

## 4. Foraging Niche concept and fitness of animals

- **Fitness:** Population size, reproductive and survivorship rates
- **Utilization and Response Curves:** Bell-shaped, normal distribution, idealized
- **Three Levels:** Trophic (what-), Spatial (where-), Temporal (when) to eat

- According to Joseph Grinnel, an American ecologist, **Ecological Niche** is defined it as “**The ultimate distributional unit of a species**”
- Grinnel implied that niches **do not overlap**, but are **disjunct**. Species display their fundamental niches; hence there is no apparent competition among them.
- Charles S. Elton (1927), a British ecologist, went further by using a more **functional view concept**, and defined **Ecological niche** as: “**The trophic position of a species in the biotic environment**”.
- Elton viewed the niche as a **simplistic subdivision** within the traditional trophic grouping as herbivores, carnivores etc., i.e. the mere **feeding habits or dietary trait** of a species.

- George Evelyn Hutchinson (1957), after 30 years, proposed the most comprehensive concept to date


Headline

## “The n-dimensional hypervolume or hyperspace of a species”

Content

- The Hutchinsonian concept implies the total range of environmental variables to which a species must be adapted, and under which a species population lives and reproduces indefinitely.
- The Hutchinsonian concept therefore involves both habitat and functional aspects
- The environmental variables include physical, chemical and biotic parameters

Image



- These variables can be viewed as a **gradient** along which species utilize with different intensities, and each gradient is considered as an **n-dimensional space**. Adding up all these forms the **niche hyperspace**
- The niche can be viewed as **an n-sided** flexible ball that can take any form in an **n-dimensional coordinate system** and represents the responses of the species population to all **environmental variables**.
- In multidimensional geometry with **n-number of axes**, the niche of an organism is graphically depicted, when all **relevant environmental variables** are included and these are **independent** of each other


- Begon *et al.* (1986): “The limits, for all important environmental features, within which all individuals of a species can survive, grow and reproduce”
- Krebs (1994): “The **role** or **profession** of an organism in the environment; its activities and relationships in the community”
  - ✓ A very broad definition comprising all biotic interactions (competition, mutualism etc)
- Ricklefs (1997): Formal Definition – “The ranges of many conditions and resource qualities within which the organism or species persists” (i.e. perceived as the multi-dimensional space)
  - ✓ Informal Definition – “The ecological role of a species in the community”
- Polechová & Storch (2008): “Ecological niche indicates the position of a species within an ecosystem, describing both the range of conditions necessary for persistence of species, and its ecological role in the ecosystem

- The diversity of definitions illustrates to what extent the niche is perceived as a species or community property: Is the niche created by the species itself, or by its surroundings?
  - Or as a dynamic mutual interaction? Let us examine an example – The Beaver

# The Niche Concept - Dynamics

- The Beaver (*Castor Canadensis, C. fiber*) creates dams by felling trees across fast-flowing rivers, hence creating a new environment of **stagnant water** in which they build their nests.
- Hence beavers **create their own habitat** which is conducive both for itself and for many other organisms - i.e. beavers impact their habitat by virtue of a specialised niche of dam building.

We can generalise that:



- **Eco- or Biotic Potential:** The full **genetic potential** of a species population in all ecological matters (Note: *Genotype limited*; not necessarily expressed in the **phenotype**).
- **Fundamental Niche:** Phenotype limited by environmental factors and physical constraints currently shaping the genotype; e.g. the temperature or food type range of an organism.
- **Realized Niche:** Phenotype limited by biotic interactions = competition, predation, parasitism; e.g. the population growth of an organism after predators have reduced it.

# The Niche Theory – Niche Dimensions & Fitness


Image

small  
**Temperature** →

Headline

(a) One Dimension:  
Abiotic: **Temperature**

Content



small  
Adapted from  
Begon & Mortimer (1985)

figure  
Humidity

small  
**Temperature** →

figure

**(b) Two Dimensions:**

figure

Abiotic: **Temperature** and **Moisture**

figure

**(c) Three dimensions:**

figure

Abiotic: **Temperature** and **Moisture**

figure

Biotic: **Food Size**

figure

• It is difficult to graphically depict more than three dimensions simultaneously


figure

• When assessing competition, ecologists often focus on the **assumingly most important and easiest to measure dimensions**, and analyse these one by one.

Title

heading


# The Niche Theory – Niche Dimensions & Fitness



- **Resource Utilisation Curve** (Resource Gradient = Seed size, Fruit ripeness, Tree height etc.)
- **Species Response Curve** (Environmental Gradient = Temperature, pH, Salinity etc.)
- Note that only *one dimension* is shown on these '**bell-shaped curves**'.

# The Niche Theory – Niche Dimensions & Fitness

- Graphical expressions of multidimensional niches can also incorporate fitness
- Again with more than three niche dimensions this becomes increasingly problematic to show in graphic diagrams.
- Examples are shown below: (a) Fitness highest at  $\mathbf{X} = 5.5$  units;  $\mathbf{Y} = 3.0$
- (b) Fitness highest at  $\mathbf{X} = 8.0 - 9.0$ ;  $\mathbf{Z} = 5.0 - 6.0$




# The Niche Theory – Niche Dimensions & Fitness

heading

## *Summarizing the Overall Levels of Ecological (Foraging) Niche Dimensions*

Image



# Summary of Lecture 3 – The Basis of the Ecological Niche Concept

1. Historically the **Niche Concept** was initiated and developed about 100 years ago

- **Grinnel (1917): Geographical-spatial** distributional unit of a species
- **Elton (1927): Trophic-foraging positioning** of a species in the ecosystems
- **Hutchinson (1957): The first comprehensive n-dimensional hyper volume**
- **Begon-Krebs-Ricklefs (1986-1997):** Further advancing of Hutchinson's
- **Polechová & Storch (2008): Duality** – both **position** and **role** in ecosystems

2. Species Niches are controlled by **Dynamic Ecological Interactions:**

- **Abiotic components:** Climatic conditions, chemical-physical environment
- **Biotic components:** Competitors, parasites, predators-prey, disease

# Summary of Lecture 3 – The Basis of the Ecological Niche Concept

3. Three types defined within the Theory of the ecological Niche Concept:

- Eco/Biotic Potential: Absolute maximum potentiality – genotype determined
- Fundamental: Actual uncontested, resource unlimited – phenotype determined
- Realized: Actual in the presence of other biotic interactors – resource limited

4. Three major Niche Dimensions: Trophic (food), Spatial (area), Temporal (time)

# Objectives of lecture 4 - Theory & Concept of the Ecological Niche

## 1. An introduction to Niche Width - populations and individual morphs:

- What is the effect of **phenotypic traits** on niche width and shape?
- What is the resulting effect of **all morphs** on niche width and shape?

## 2. An Overview of interspecies niche relationship and positioning:

- **Included niches:** Which are **inferior** and which are **superior**?
- **Disjunct niches:** How **distant** are niches – can **competition** be neglected?
- **Abutting niches:** How limited is **competition** such as in **Contiguous Allopatry**?
- **Overlapping niches:** How much can **niches overlap** before **exclusion** results?


## 3. A Comparison of Niche Overlap and Competition:

- **Intraspecific:** The relationship between **population density** and **niche width**
- **Interspecific:** The relationship between **species density** and **niche width**.

## 4. An Account of the rules for Niche Width, Overlap and Limiting Similarity:

- **Thresholds for:** **Exclusion**, **Coexistence**, **Disjunct Niches**, **Invasion of species**.
- **Diffuse Competition:** **Additive competitors** may drive exclusion from Niche.

# Niche Theory - Niche Width & Overlap (1)



- Natural populations have variability in both **resource use** and **diversity of morphs**

• (a) **Within Phenotype Component (WPC)**: the way resources are used by all the individuals in the total species population - how wide is their resource use


• (b) **Between Phenotype Component (BPC)**: morphological diversity of a population.

• Niche width ( $W$ ) =  $\text{WPC} + \text{BPC}$

• If **WPC** is **high** then the population consists of **mono/oligo-morph generalists (a)**

• If **BPC** is **high** then the population consists of **poly-morph specialists (b)**


## **ABCS349-AnimalEcology.Lecture4:NicheTheory-NicheWidth&Overlap(2)**




**(a) Intraspecific:** Increased population density ( $L \rightarrow H$ ) increases competition among individuals for limited resources (food and space), forcing individuals to **search for** and **adapt** to other **opportunities** = **increasing niche width**.

**(b) Interspecific:** Increased competition between species force these to reduce niche overlap or segregate niches by virtue of **specialisation** = **decreasing niche width** (narrow niches allow more dense packing of species in communities).

## ABCS349-Animal Ecology. Lecture 4: Niche Width & Limiting Similarity (2)



## ABCS349-Animal Ecology.Lecture4:Niche Width & Limiting Similarity(1)



- 3 competing species ( $S_{1-3}$ ) with overlapping idealised niche curves  $f_{1-3}(x)$
- $S_1$  and  $S_3$  both have a wide refuge niche
- $S_2$  has a much narrower uncontested refuge niche
- The niche width ( $W = STD$ ) in relation to the distance ( $d$ ) between the resource utilisation curve maximum denotes the magnitude of competition among the two species:  $d/W > 1 = \text{coexistence}$ ;  $d/W < 1 = \text{exclusion}$ ;  $d/W > 3$  no competition (= disjunct niches). Note:  $D/W = 1$  (then it can go either way!).

## ABCS349-Animal Ecology.Lecture4:Niche Width & Limiting Similarity(3)

**Question1:** Can the two flycatchers coexist? – is the D/W value greater than 1?

$$D = 12 - 8 = 4$$


$$W_{AB} = [(W_A^2 + W_B^2)/2]^{0.5} = [(3^2 + 3^2)/2]^{0.5} = [(9 + 9)/2]^{0.5} = (18/2)^{0.5} = \sqrt{9} = 3$$

$$D/W = 4/3 = 1.33$$

**Answer:** Yes they can coexist as  $D/W > 1.00$

**Question2:** Can a 3rd flycatcher wedge itself in between the Grey and Little Flycatchers?

**Answer:** No, because  $D/W < 1.56$





Headline



heading

# Niche Theory – Niche Width & Overlap (3)

Image



*Adapted from Giller (1984)*



- Possible niche relationships of two species ( $S_1$ ,  $S_2$  and  $S_3$ ; one niche dimension):
- A) Included, B) Overlapping, C) Abutting, D) Disjunct niches.

heading


Headline

# Niche Theory – Niche Width & Overlap (4)

Content

figure

**Contested niche space  
(A+B+C+D+E+F)**



small

figure

**Uncontested niche  
space (U)**

small

Adapted from

Giller (1984)

**Realized Niche (G) =**

$$G - \sum[(A+B+C+D+E+F)/G]$$

- **Diffuse competition** of several species on a single species.
- The **fundamental niche** of species **G** is greatly reduced by subtracting the overlapping fundamental niches of species **A-F**.
- This illustrates how several species may **squeeze out** another species by this **cumulative or diffuse competition**.

## Summary - Theory & Concept of the Ecological Niche

small

1. **The Niche Width** expressed by individual morphs in the whole population:

small  
math - Large Block

- **Within-phenotype component:** High - Few mono/oligo-morph **generalists**
- **Between-phenotype component:** High - Many poly-morph **specialists**.

small

2. **The general** relationship between Niche Overlap and Competition:

small

• **Intraspecific:** Population density  $\uparrow \rightarrow$  Degree of **generalists**  $\uparrow \rightarrow$  **Niche width**  $\uparrow$

small

• **Interspecific:** Species density  $\uparrow \rightarrow$  Degree of **specialists**  $\uparrow \rightarrow$  **Niche width**  $\downarrow$

small

3. **There are** 4 modes of interspecies niche relationship and positioning:

small

• **Included:** The included is **inferior** and will eventually be **excluded**

small

• **Disjunct:** Niches are **clearly separated** and **no competition** exist

small

• **Abutting:** Niches adjacent with **minimal competition (contiguous allopatry)**.

small

• **Overlapping:** Niches may **overlap** more than the **maximum for coexistence**

small

4. **Basic Rules** for niche width, niche overlap and limiting similarity

small

• **Niche width =  $W$ , Niche distance between two species =  $d$**

small

• **Coexistence:  $d/w > 1$ , Exclusion:  $d/w < 1$  (Note:  $d/w = 1$  - it can go either way!)**

• **No competition (disjunct):  $d/w > 3$ , Invasion of adjacent species:  $d/w > 1.56$ .**

# heading **Objectives - Differential Niche overlap & Complementarity**

## **1. An Introduction** to the concept of niche overlap and interspecific competition:

- How does spatio-temporal variation on food availability affect trophic niche?
- Which mechanisms separate species to limit similarity and segregate niches?

## **2. An Overview** of various modes of differential niche overlap

- How are niche dimensions complementary to each other?
- How does various means of niche segregations operate?
- What are the relationships among trophic and spatio-temporal niche division?

## **3. An Account** of relationships between niche dimensionality and complementarity:

- What is the effect of increasing niche dimensions and complementarity?
- What are the basic rules for complementarity and niche dimensionality?
- How does niche differentiation and complementarity increase coexistence?

## **4. A Comparison** of ways in which niches are partitioned at the community level:

- What are the basic structures of community wide niche partitioning?
- What are the basic rules (Hutchinson's) of community wide niche partitioning?

heading

Headline


# Differential Niche Overlap & Complementarity (1)

*Categories of species separation along complementary resource dimensions*

1. **Food type & habitat** – species showing overlap in habitat eat different foods, or vice versa
2. **Food type & time** – species use the same food at different times or different foods at the same time
3. **Habitat & time** – species uses the same habitat at different times or different habitats at the same time
4. **Habitat & habitat** – species overlapping in horizontal habitat often differ in vertical habitat or vice versa
5. **Food type and food type** – species may eat similar-sized foods but different species or types, or vice versa

# Differential Niche Overlap & Complementarity(2)

- Seasonal (temporal) variation in habitat and dietary overlap among granivorous birds in an Arizonian grassland (= spatio-temporal dietary niche segregation):
- Rainy Season (food plenty): Birds specialize on a seed type across overlapping habitat types
- Dry Season (food scarce): Birds specialize on separate habitats foraging on many seed types




## heading

# Differential Niche Overlap & Complementarity (3)

## Differential Niche Overlap between ~~4~~ hypothetical species (A, B, C, D)

- Horizontal niche dimension considered alone: **Species C** is apparently in trouble facing **diffuse competition** from both **B** and **D** – **coexistence doubtful**.
  - Vertical niche dimension considered alone: **Species C** subject to **heavy niche overlap** with **A**, and **moderate overlap** from **B** – **coexistence doubtful**.


- Both Niche dimensions considered simultaneously
  - A, B, C versus D disjunct
  - A versus B disjunct
  - A and C abutting
  - Only little overlap between species B and C



# Differential Niche Overlap & Complementarity (4)

- ## Foraging Techniques of 5 sympatric Bird Species in Oak Forest

- The time spent on 3 foraging tactics for each species monitored:  
1. Hovering, 2. Gleaning, 3. Hawking
  - All 5 species adopt all strategies, but to a variable degree.
  - Gleaners: *Parus inornatus* (tit), *Vermivora celata* (warbler).
  - Hover-Gleaners: *Vireo gilvus*, *V. huttoni* (shrike-warblers).
  - Glean-Hover-Hawker: *Polioptila caerulea* (gnatcatcher)
  - Differences in foraging techniques may reduce direct interference and also resource exploitation as each method is best designed for a particular prey type in a particular micro-habitat



heading

Headline

small

## Trophic and Spatial Niche Separation of Birds in Woodlands:

Image

small

### (B) Vertical Separation of Niche:

small

Similar Diet and Habitat Type

small

### Species pairs:

small  
• Nuthatch/Tits

small  
• Tree creeper/Tits

small  
• Nuthatch/Pied Flycatcher

small  
• Tree creeper/Pied Flycatcher

small  
• Nuthatch/Redstart

small  
• Tree creeper/Redstart

small  
• Tits/Pied Flycatcher

small  
• Tits/Redstart

small

### Species pairs:

small  
• Green woodpecker/Starling

small  
• Nuthatch/Tree creeper

small

B

small

### (A) Dietary Separation of Niche:

small

Similar Foraging Height and Habitat Type

small

A

small

### (C) Horizontal Separation of Niche:

small

Similar Diet and Foraging Height

small

C

small

• Wood Warbler/Willow Warbler

small  
• Redstart/Pied Flycatcher

small  
• Great Tit/Blue Tit/Marsh tit

small  
• Green Woodpecker/All other spp.

small  
• Starling/All other spp.

small  
• Species pairs


small  
Adapted from Giller (1984)

small  
65

# Differential Niche Overlap & Complementarity (6)

## Spatial Foraging Niche Separation of 2 water boatmen/bugs (Heteroptera)


- Perch positions monitored quantitatively over time:
- Species (a) prefers near bottom (55%), and least at water surface (5%)
- Species (b) prefers middle of water (58%), and least at water surface (7%)
- In this way they **separate foraging depth** and reduces competition



# Community Wide Niche Partitioning (1)

# **Nine squirrel species in African rainforest:**

- 3 Habitat types:
    - Dense growth (1 sp.), Flooded forest (1 sp.)
    - Mature & Disturbed Forest (7 sp.)
    - Trophic specialization (1 sp.)
    - Bark scraping on tree trunks
  - Frugivores separate spatially (6 sp.):
    - Ground (3 sp.) & Arboreal (3 sp.)
  - In each of the two vertical guilds, the 3 species separate on fruit size and hardness both of which is related to jaw musculature which again is related to mere body size (Hutchinson's Body Size Ratio Rule)




# Community Wide Niche Partitioning (2)

Nineteen species of Coral Reef Fish at Great Barrier Reef, Australia:

- Segregation into 4 main trophic levels (in which size/ body shape vary):
- Generalists (4 sp.): Typical fish shape, vary in size following Hutchinson's Rule
- Hard corals (8 sp.): 6 Small (typical shape/ extra deep body), 2 large (deep body)
- Soft/ Hard corals (4 sp.) 3 Large, 1 Small (all typical shape)
- Other invertebrates (3 sp.): Large (typical shape/ deep body)


**Typical shape:** Adapted to outer barrier with strong current (short snout)

**Extra deep body:**  
Adapted to near shore reef with timid water  
(long snout)



# Niche Overlap, Partitioning & Coexistence

Summarizing Flow Chart showing the various ways that ecologically similar species may segregate or differentiate the overlap of their foraging niches (Birds)



# Summary: Differential Niche Overlap & Complementarity

1. Differential Niche Overlap comprises 3 major dimensions:

- **Spatial:** Horizontal (habitat types) & vertical (altitude, vegetation strata)
- **Temporal:** Time of day/night, seasonal variation (dry/wet, summer/winter)
- **Trophic:** Generalist or Specialist dietary trait, foraging techniques/ strategies

2. Niche Differentiation, Complementarity and Coexistence often interrelated:

- Niche dimensionality ↑ → Niche differentiation ↑ → Complementarity ↑
- High niche differentiation predisposes Complementarity → Coexistence
- High overlap in some niche dimensions tolerated by otherwise low overlaps

# Summary: Differential Niche Overlap & Complementarity

## 3. Community wide niche partitioning limits similarity and increase coexistence:

- High overlap in vertical and horizontal space → low **trophic** overlap
- High dietary overlap → low, abutting, disjunct and spatial niches
- High dietary and spatial overlap → low overlap in temporal niche

## 4. Coexistence facilitated by limiting similarity and hence niche overlap:

- **Spatial separation:** vertical-horizontal habitat ranges, territoriality
- **Resource partitioning:** Diet and foraging techniques diverging
- **Morphological divergence:** Body size, feeding apparatus (teeth, claws, beaks)

# heading ABCS 349: Objectives of Lecture 6 – Niche Partitioning & Species Richness

## 1. An Introduction to modelling of species richness using niche partitioning:

- What pertinent factors within the niche concept theory predicts diversity?
- How are these factors interrelated and what are the dynamics among them?

## 2. An Overview of various models to explain species numbers in space and time:

- Are they mathematical stochastic or deterministic models?
- Graphically explained models to support the notational equations?
- How does the models explain the links between niche dimensionality and how many species than can be ‘packed’ into a natural system or community?

## 3. A Comparison of various models to explain species numbers on islands:

- The species-area models explained - islands and mainland islands
- The island biogeography model: immigration-emigration-speciation-extinction

## 4. An Account of the theories behind speciation and extinction processes:

- What drives speciation in relation to niche overlap and competition?
- What drives extinction in relation to niche overlap and competition?

# Niche Partitioning & Species Richness (1)

small  
Headline figure  
MacArthur's simple equation of factors influencing species diversity:


small  
 $D_s = \frac{Dr}{Du} (1 + Ca), \text{ where}$

small  
 $Dr$  = Resource diversity of entire community

small  
 $Du$  = Niche width of each species (assumed identical)

small  
 $C$  = Number of potential competitors (habitat dimensionality)

small  
 $\bar{a}$  = Mean competitive coefficient or mean niche overlap




- Based on MacArthur's model, communities diversity is shaped in 3 potentially interacting ways:
  1. **Resource base**: How big is **n** in the **niche hypervolume**. Areas with more available resource have larger  $Dr$  and  $C$  components (= niche space) and can therefore contain more species (**b**).
  2. **Niche width** or degree of specialization of component species ( $Du$ )  
Narrow niches can be packed tighter and thus contain more species (**c**)
  3. **Niche overlap** between species ( $\bar{a}$ ). Greater species overlap (i.e. smaller exclusive niches) leads to greater diversity even if two communities are similar in both (a) and (b) areas (**d**)
  4. **Niche curve shape** also counts, i.e. in thick-tailed (*leptokurtic*) curves (**e**) more species can be packed on the same resource gradient than thin-tailed (*platykurtic*) curves (**e**)

# Niche Partitioning & Species Richness (2)

## Forest Succession and Increased Bird Diversity (Species Richness):

- As habitat heterogeneity increases and more bird species are added, these have to separate on an increasing number of niche dimensions, particularly:

➤ Food type, Foraging techniques, Foraging height, Micro-habitat type



# Biogeography – The Species-Area Model (1)

- When increasing the **area (A)** from which one samples various species populations, the **total species number (S)** increase in a positive way according to the following logarithmic deterministic model:  $S = C \cdot A^z$  (Areas = **Oceanic islands** or **Habitat islands** on mainlands)

- Factors that specifically contribute to the **S-Area relationship** are:


1. Large islands are also subject to larger sampling sizes of individuals (N) from species populations thereby increasing the probability of encountering new species; hence a mere sampling phenomenon or artefact of more effective species sampling as N increases
2. As the island size increases, the probability of encountering different habitat types also increases: High landscape heterogeneity: Lakes, mountains, valleys, swamps, oases etc., and such features contain more potential niches that can be filled by species

# Biogeography – The Species-Area Model (2)

3. Large islands **inevitably** also contain large populations, and large populations are less **vulnerable to local extinction phenomena** (e.g. predation, parasites, pathogens)
4. Large island populations also have **higher speciation potentials** due to higher **population variability** contained herein (high **polymorphism** and **resource use diversity**)
5. Large islands **inevitably represent larger targets for colonizing species** (immigration) as the probability of encountering the area increases with size

# Biogeography – The Species-Area Model (3)

- The normal range of  $Z$  is  $0.20 - 0.40$  for **true (oceanic) islands** and often around  $0.25$ .
- $Z$  is only  $0.1 - 0.25$  for recently isolated **habitat islands** (e.g. forest surrounded by farms, a lake, a gap in the forest, or an oasis).
- $Z > 0.26$  for long-term isolated habitats on the mainland or very large islands such as Australia.
- As **habitat connectivity** increases, the S-Area relationship is reduced => Low z-value
- Habitat connectivity is related to habitat diversity and as oceanic islands are more isolated than mainland habitat islands, they display stronger S-Area relationship (high z-value)



# Biogeography – The Species-Area Model (4)

Content


- Logging both sides of the S-Area power function:

$$\log S = \log C + z \log A$$

- C and Z are constants depending on both **habitat type, animal community** and is specific to variability in dispersability and mobility of the species herein.


- In a x-y logarithmic plot, log C is the intercept on the y-axis, and z denotes the graph slope.

- The **z-value** denotes how strong the S and A relationship is (= positive correlation).




Species area relationship for fish in selected Quebec and Ontario lakes. Unpublished data from Jake Vender Zenden

Source: [www.redpath-museum.mcgill.ca](http://www.redpath-museum.mcgill.ca)




# Biogeography – The Species-Area Model (5)



# MacArthur-Wilson's Equilibrium Theory (1)

- Modelling species number ( $S$ ) on true islands:  $S$  depends on two independent variables:
  1. Immigration rate ( $I$ )
  2. Extinction rate ( $E$ )
- $S$  is determined when an **equilibrium** between **I** and **E** rates is obtained
- As  $S \uparrow$ , **I** rate is lowered ( $\downarrow$ ) as potential niche space is occupied (saturation  $\uparrow$ )
- In contrast when  $S \uparrow$  then **E** rate  $\uparrow$  due to increased **interspecific competition**

- Small islands have **high E** and **low I** rates:  
They are small **targets** and have **small vulnerable populations**; the opposite is the case for **large islands**; **high I** and **low E**
- Distance to mainland also a factor for I rate:  
Distance islands have **low I** and **close islands have higher I**.
- Thus, **S** is highest on large islands nearby mainland (D), and smallest on small islands far from the mainland (A)



# MacArthur-Wilson's Equilibrium Theory (2)

Content

Image

- **Extinction Rate:** Depends on 1) **Island Size**, 2) **Distance to mainland** (isolation degree)
- Island Size: Large islands have **larger populations**, hence **genetic population variability** is high and populations therefore more **resilient** towards predators, diseases, and **stochastic detrimental events**: e.g. storms, tsunamis, floods, drought etc.)
- Distance to mainland: If close to mainland, extinctions may be delayed by **regular immigration**, thus compensating for the species loss over time

# MacArthur-Wilson's Equilibrium Theory (3)

- **Immigration Rate:** Depends on 1) **Island Size**, 2) **Distance to mainland**
- **Island Size:** A large island represents a greater target for colonisers => higher probability of colonization.
- **Distance to mainland:** If the distance is short, the likeliness of species colonizing from the mainland is higher than for more remote islands, to which many species may have difficulties in reaching successfully (depends on **mobility** and **dispersability** of animals).
- In effect species number is highest **on large islands close to the mainland (CL)** and smallest **on small islands far away (remote/ isolated)** from the mainland (**DS**)

Image

heading

# Modelling Species Number on Habitat Islands

- On **habitat islands**, species numbers depend on: 1) **Speciation rate** and 2) **Extinction rate**
- Immigration plays a minor role on the large scale and is replaced by **speciation** processes.
- However, if **habitat connectivity** is high between islands, **immigration** from species rich areas is important in **ecological time frame**; speciation only **evolutionary time frame**

heading


## Speciation Rate

- As speciation saturation increases, the probability of **speciation decreases** as the potential niche space is reduced
- Fewer empty niches reduce the chances of adaptive radiation by virtue of reducing **character displacement** processes

heading

## Extinction Rate

- As species **saturation increases** interspecific competition increases extinction rate through the **competitive exclusion principle** (similarly to true islands)



heading

Content

Content

# Summary - Niche Partitioning & Species Richness (1)

1. Species richness and the niche concept are interrelated and determined by:

- **Niche dimensionality and differentiation:** Related to habitat heterogeneity
- **Niche width and shape:** Narrow and leptokurtic niches increase diversity
- **Niche overlap and competitive coefficient:** Complementarity increase S

2. Species richness and niches also interrelated with the habitat

- **Habitat complexity:** Both vertical and horizontal heterogeneity increase S
- **Habitat area:** Large and interconnected habitat areas increase richness

heading

# Summary - Niche Partitioning & Species Richness (2)

Content

Headline

Headline

3. The species-area model explains the number of species on islands ( $S = CA^z$ ):

- **True islands:** z-value higher than on mainland islands ( $z = 0.20 - 0.40$ ,  $z \approx 0.25$ )
- **Mainland islands:** Lower than for true islands ( $z = 0.10 - 0.25$ ,  $z > 0.26$ , if  $t \uparrow$ )
- **Lakes:** Similar to mainland islands but largely depends on connecting rivers.

4. The theory of island biogeography and species richness depend on

- **Area size:** Large size has larger populations and higher habitat heterogeneity
- **Distance to mainland:** Nearness → Higher colonization rate →  $S \uparrow$
- **Habitat connectivity:** Low connectivity means lower colonization rate
- **Speciation-extinction dynamics:** Related to time and population size/ area

# Lecture 7 – Foraging Theory

toc

## Objectives of the lecture

toc

## ➤ Optimal Foraging Theory

toc

- Definition of the Optimal foraging Theory

toc

- Assumptions of the theory

toc

- Parameterizing the Optimal Foraging Theory

toc

## ➤ Predator-Prey Relationships

toc

- Evolutionary-Behavioural-Population-Community-Macro-Ecology

toc

## ➤ Predator Avoidance Strategies

toc

- Species: Genetics (Phenotype/ genotype), niches, habitat requirements

toc

- Populations: Growth, structure, regulation and interactions

## ➤ What is Optimal Foraging Theory, OPT?

- It is a behavioral ecology model that helps predict how an animal behaves when searching for food

## ➤ Aim of the Optimal Foraging Theory

- To predict the foraging strategy of a forager/predator to be expected under specified condition

Content

### ❑ Important terminologies

- **Ideal Free Distribution theory** – theory which makes a case of uniform distribution of food for predators such that there is no need for foragers to switch foraging patches.
- **Functional response** – deals with a predator's intake rate in response to variation in prey distribution and densities

Headline

Content

- **Aggregate response** – explains how predators are distributed in response to prey availability

- **Total response** = Functional response + Aggregate response

# Assumptions inherent in Optimal Foraging Theory

1. The foraging behaviour that is exhibited by present-day animals is the one that has been favoured by natural selection in the past but almost enhances an animal's fitness at present
2. High fitness is achieved by a high net rate of energy intake (i.e. gross energy intake minus the energetic costs of obtaining that energy)
3. Experimental animals are observed in an environment to which their foraging behaviour is suited

heading

Content

# Scenarios which unjustify the OFT

1. Other aspects of the organism's behaviour may influence fitness more than optimal foraging does. E.g. premium on avoidance of predators coercing animals to forage at places and at times associated with lower predation risk trading off efficiency in food gathering.
2. Variation in the efficiencies of energy gathering process exploiting different dietary constituents (e.g. nitrogen) by many consumers (herbivores and omnivores) creating the need for consumers to forage on a mixed and balanced diet.

# Theoreticians & Mathematicians

- OFT makes predictions about foraging behaviour based on mathematical models

- Important Question

***• Is it necessary for a real forager to be equally omniscient and mathematical, if it is to adopt the appropriate , optimal strategy?***

# Theoreticians are omniscient mathematicians – the foragers need not be

- The answer is **NO**, because
- Theory says that if a forager that in some way manages to do the right thing in the right circumstances, then this forager
  1. Will be favoured by natural selection
  2. Possible inheritance of newly acquired abilities by future generations
  3. Abilities spread, in evolutionary time, throughout the population

# Parameterizing the OFT 1

- Foraging entails predators expending time and energy in obtaining food (MacArthur & Pianka, 1966)
- Intake rates of a predator is dependent on the searching (encounter rate) and handling (i.e. pursuing, subduing and consuming it) times of prey
- Generalists pursue (and may then subdue and consume) a large proportion of the prey types they encounter
- Specialists continue searching except when they encounter prey of their specifically preferred type

Headline

heading

# Parameterizing the OFT 2

Content

- Specialists will only pursue profitable prey items, but may expend a great deal of time and energy searching for them
- Generalists will spend relatively little time searching but they will pursue both more or less profitable types of prey
- An optimal forager should therefore balance the pros and cons so as to maximise its overall rate of energy intake

heading

Headline

# Parameterizing the OFT 3

- Given that a predator already includes a certain number of profitable items in its diet, should it expand its diet (and thereby decrease its search time) by including the next most profitable item as well?
- The next most profitable prey item for an optimal forager

$$\text{Profitability} = \frac{E_i}{h_i}$$

Content

where  $E_i$  is the energy content of the next most profitable  $i^{th}$  prey item and  $h_i$  its handling time

- In addition,  $\bar{E} / \bar{h}$  is the average profitability of the ‘present’ diet (i.e. one that includes all prey types that are more profitable than  $i$ , but does not include prey type  $i$  itself), and
- $\bar{s}$  is the average search time for the present diet

# Parameterizing the OFT 4

- If a predator does pursue a prey item of type  $i$ , then its expected rate of energy intake is  
Content  
 $E_i/h_i$
- If it ignores this prey item, whilst pursuing all those that are more profitable, then it can expect to search further. The total expected rate of energy intake

$$\frac{\bar{E}}{(\bar{s} + \bar{h})}$$

where  $\bar{E}$  is the average energy content,  $\bar{s}$  is the average search time and  $\bar{h}$  is the average handling time for the present diet

heading

# Parameterizing the OFT 4

- The most profitable, optimal strategy for a predator will be to pursue the  $i^{\text{th}}$  item if, and only if

$$E_i / h_i \geq \bar{E} / (\bar{s} + \bar{h})$$

heading

- The optimal diet model leads to a number of predictions

1. Predators with shorter handling times than search times should be generalists, because the short times taken to handle prey items already found would allow them to commence searching for another prey.
2. Predators with longer handling times than search times should be specialists because once a prey has been seen and began to be handled (include pursuit), the predator cannot go in for another food. Therefore, such predators should go in for the most profitable prey.

# Parameterizing the OFT 5

3. Predators should have broader diets in unproductive environments (where prey items are relatively rare and  $\bar{s}$  is relatively large) than in a productive environment (where  $\bar{s}$  is smaller)
4. Predators should ignore insufficiently profitable food types irrespective of their abundance
5. Provides a context for understanding the narrow specialization of predators that live in intimate association with their prey. Since their whole lifestyle and life cycle are finely tuned to those of their prey, handling time is low.

**small**  
**(a) Bluegill sunfish**

Low density

small small

0 0.4 0.8

small  
Ratio  
encountered

## small **Prediction of optimal diet theory**




**Observed  
ratio in diet**

**small**  
**(b) Great tit**

# small Proportion encountered

## small **Predicted proportion in diet**

## Observed proportion in diet



30

- Two studies of optimal diet choice that show a clear but limited

correspondence with the predictions of the optimal diet model. Diets are more specialised at high prey densities; but more low profitability items are included than predicted by the theory

# References

## Literature:

- Begon, M. and Mortimer, M. (1985): *Population Ecology*. Blackwell Scientific Publications.
- Begon, M., Townsend, C.R. & Harper, J.L. (2006): *Ecology – From Individuals to Ecosystems*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Fog, K. (1982): Basic Textbook in Ecology (*in Danish*). Nucleus. Copenhagen. Sections used in production of slides are translated to English.
- Gaston, K. J. and Spicer, J. I. (2004): *Biodiversity – An introduction*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Giller, P. S. (1984): *Community Structure and the Niche*. Chapman and Hall.
- Primack, R. B. (2002): *Essentials of Conservation Biology*. Sinauer Associates.
- Primack, R. B. (2004): *A Primer of Conservation Biology*. Sinauer Associates.
- Pullin, A. S. (2002): *Conservation Biology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rockwood, L. L. (2006): *Population Ecology*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Wiens, J. A. (1989): *The Ecology of Bird Communities*. Cambridge University Press.