. Observations on the breeding biology of Wilson's phalarope (*Steg-*
ricolor) in central Alberta. Auk 84:220-244.

Birds of paradise and bower birds. Georgian H., Melbourne. 239 p.
1960. The mechanism of natural selection for the sex ratio. Amer.
)4:373-377.

'he natural regulation of animal numbers. Clarendon, Oxford. 343 p.

ological adaptations for breeding in birds. Methuen, London. 409 p.

1964. Biology of the brushland tinamou, *Nothoprocta cinerascens*.
us. Natur. Hist. Bull. 127:270-314.

954. Bower-birds. Clarendon, Oxford. 208 p.

J. 1958. The theory of evolution. Penguin, Harmondsworth. 320 p.

1958. Age determination and molt in the boat-tailed grackle. Condor
76.

c ratio of nestling and clutch size in the boat-tailed grackle. Condor

pplemental data on the sex ratio of nestling boat-tailed grackles.
i3:504.

mating systems and sexual selection. Amer. Natur. 99:129-141.

19. Do tropical birds rear as many young as they can nourish? Ibis
55.

. Notes on the behavior of three cotingidae. Auk 78:150-161.

la. A field study of the black and white manakin, *Manacus manacus*,
lad. Zoologica 47:60-104.

field study of the golden-headed manakin, *Pipra erythrocephala*,
lad, W. I. Zoologica 47:183-198.

e evolution of manakin displays, p. 553-561. *In* 13th Int. Ornitho-
ongr., Proc., Ithaca, N.Y., 1962.

Evolution of polygamy in the long-billed marsh wren. Evolution 18:

[. F. Willson. 1966. The influence of habitats on mating systems of
nerican passerine birds. Ecology 47:143-147.

d C. S. Spatcher. 1965. Role of habitat in the distribution and abun-
marsh birds. Iowa State Univ. Agr. Home Econ. Exp. Sta. Spec. Rep.

940. The sex ratio in nestling eastern red-wings. Wilson Bull. 52:

d E. R. Pianka. 1963. Sexual selection, sex ratio, and mating system.
itur. 97:405-407.

l M. H. Wright. 1944. The reproductive cycle of the male red-winged
. Condor 46:46-59.

V. C. 1962. Animal dispersion in relation to social behavior. Oliver
Edinburgh. 653 p.

1966. Polygyny in the dickcissel. Auk 83:534-546.

7

ROBERT L. TRIVERS

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Parental Investment and Sexual Selection

Introduction

Charles Darwin's (1871) treatment of the topic of sexual selection was
sometimes confused because he lacked a general framework within which
to relate the variables he perceived to be important: sex-linked inheritance,
sex ratio at conception, differential mortality, parental care, and the form
of the breeding system (monogamy, polygyny, polyandry, or promiscuity).
This confusion permitted others to attempt to show that Darwin's terminol-
ogy was imprecise, that he misinterpreted the function of some structures,
and that the influence of sexual selection was greatly overrated. Huxley
(1938), for example, dismisses the importance of female choice without
evidence or theoretical argument, and he doubts the prevalence of adapta-
tions in males that decrease their chances of surviving but are selected be-
cause they lead to high reproductive success. Some important advances,
however, have been achieved since Darwin's work. The genetics of sex has
now been clarified, and Fisher (1958) has produced a model to explain sex
ratios at conception, a model recently extended to include special mecha-
nisms that operate under inbreeding (Hamilton 1967). Data from the lab-
oratory and the field have confirmed that females are capable of very subtle
choices (for example, Petit & Ehrman 1969), and Bateman (1948) has sug-
gested a general basis for female choice and male-male competition, and
he has produced precise data on one species to support his argument.

Parental Investment and Sexual Selection 137

This paper presents a general framework within which to consider sexual selection. In it I attempt to define and interrelate the key variables. No attempt is made to review the large, scattered literature relevant to sexual selection. Instead, arguments are presented on how one might *expect* natural selection to act on the sexes, and some data are presented to support these arguments.

Variance in Reproductive Success

Darwin defined sexual selection as (1) competition within one sex for members of the opposite sex and (2) differential choice by members of one sex for members of the opposite sex, and he pointed out that this usually meant males competing with each other for females and females choosing some males rather than others. To study these phenomena one needs accurate data on differential reproductive success analysed by sex. Accurate data on female reproductive success are available for many species, but similar data on males are very difficult to gather, even in those species that tend toward monogamy. The human species illustrates this point. In any society it is relatively easy to assign accurately the children to their biological mothers, but an element of uncertainty attaches to the assignment of children to their biological fathers. For example, Henry Harpending (personal communication) has gathered biochemical data on the Kalahari Bushmen showing that about two per cent of the children in that society do not belong to the father to whom they are commonly attributed. Data on the human species are, of course, much more detailed than similar data on other species.

To gather precise data on both sexes Bateman (1948) studied a single species. *Drosophila melanogaster,* under laboratory conditions. By using a chromosomally marked individual in competition with individuals bearing different markers, and by searching for the markers in the offspring, he was able to measure the reproductive success of each individual, whether female or male. His method consisted of introducing five adult males to five adult female virgins, so that each female had a choice of five males and each male competed with four other males.

Data from numerous competition experiments with *Drosophila* revealed three important sexual differences: (1) Male reproductive success varied much more widely than female reproductive success. Only four per cent of the females failed to produce any surviving offspring, while 21 per cent of the males so failed. Some males, on the other hand, were phenomenally successful, producing nearly three times as many offspring as the most successful female. (2) Female reproductive success did not appear to be limited by ability to attract males. The four per cent who failed to copulate were apparently courted as vigorously as those who did copulate. On the other hand, male reproductive success was severely limited by ability to

attract or arouse females. The 21 per cent who failed to reproduce showed no disinterest in trying to copulate, only an inability to be accepted. (3) A female's reproductive success did not increase much, if any, after the first copulation and not at all after the second; most females were uninterested in copulating more than once or twice. As shown by genetic markers in the offspring, males showed an almost linear increase in reproductive success with increased copulations. (A corollary of this finding is that males tended not to mate with the same female twice.) Although these results were obtained in the laboratory, they may apply with even greater force to the wild, where males are not limited to five females and where females have a wider range of males from which to choose.

Bateman argued that his results could be explained by reference to the energy investment of each sex in their sex cells. Since male *Drosophila* invest very little metabolic energy in the production of a given sex cell, whereas females invest considerable energy, a male's reproductive success is not limited by his ability to produce sex cells but by his ability to fertilize eggs with these cells. A female's reproductive success is not limited by her ability to have her eggs fertilized but by her ability to produce eggs. Since in almost all animal and plant species the male produces sex cells that are tiny by comparison to the female's sex cells, Bateman (1948) argued that his results should apply very widely, that is, to "all but a few very primitive organisms, and those in which monogamy combined with a sex ratio of unity eliminated all intra-sexual selection."

Good field data on reproductive success are difficult to find, but what data exist, in conjunction with the assumption that male reproductive success varies as a function of the number of copulations,[1] support the contention that in all species, except those mentioned below in which male parental care may be a limiting resource for females, male reproductive success varies more than female reproductive success. This is supported, for example, by data from dragonflies (Jacobs 1955), baboons (DeVore 1965), common frogs (Savage 1961), prairie chickens (Robel 1966), sage grouse (Scott 1942), black grouse (Koivisto 1965), elephant seals (LeBoeuf & Peterson, 1969), dung flies (Parker 1970a) and some anoline lizards (Rand 1967 and Trivers, in preparation, discussed below.) Circumstantial evidence exists for other lizards (for example, Blair 1960, Harris 1964) and for many mammals (see Eisenberg 1965). In monogamous species, male reproductive success would be expected to vary as female reproductive success, but there is always the possibility of adultery and differential female mortality (discussed below) and these factors should increase the

1. Selection should favor males producing such an abundance of sperm that they fertilize all a female's available eggs with a single copulation. Futhermore, to decrease competition among offspring, natural selection may favor females who prefer single paternity for each batch of eggs (see Hamilton 1964). The tendency for females to copulate only once or twice per batch of eggs is supported by data for many species (see, for example, Bateman 1948, Savage 1961, Burns 1968 but see also Parker 1970b).

variance of male reproductive success without significantly altering that of the female.

Relative Parental Investment

Bateman's argument can be stated in a more precise and general form such that the breeding system (for example, monogamy) as well as the adult sex ratio become functions of a single variable controlling sexual selection. I first define parental investment as *any investment by the parent in an individual offspring that increases the offspring's chance of surviving (and hence reproductive success) at the cost of the parent's ability to invest in other offspring.* So defined, parental investment includes the metabolic investment in the primary sex cells but refers to any investment (such as feeding or guarding the young) that benefits the young. It does not include effort expended in finding a member of the opposite sex or in subduing members of one's own sex in order to mate with a member of the opposite sex, since such effort (except in special cases) does not affect the survival chances of the resulting offspring and is therefore not *parental* investment.

Each offspring can be viewed as an investment independent of other offspring, increasing investment in one offspring tending to decrease investment in others. I measure the size of a parental investment by reference to its negative effect on the parent's ability to invest in other offspring: a large parental investment is one that strongly decreases the parent's ability to produce other offspring. There is no necessary correlation between the size of parental investment in an offspring and its benefit for the young. Indeed, one can show that during a breeding season the benefit from a given parental investment must decrease at some point or else species would not tend to produce any fixed number of offspring per season. Decrease in reproductive success resulting from the negative effect of parental investment on *nonparental* forms of reproductive effort (such as sexual competition for mates) is excluded from the measurement of parental investment. In effect, then, I am here considering reproductive success as if the only relevant variable were parental investment.

For a given reproductive season one can define the total parental investment of an individual as the sum of its investments in each of its offspring produced during that season, and one assumes that natural selections has favored the total parental investment that leads to maximum net reproductive success. Dividing the total parental investment by the number of individuals produced by the parent gives the typical parental investment by an individual per offspring. Bateman's argument can now be reformulated as follows. Since the total number of offspring produced by one sex of a sexually reproducing species must equal the total number produced by the other (and assuming the sexes differ in no other way than in their

ROBERT L. TRIVERS

Figure 7.1. *Reproductive success (RS) and decrease in future reproductive success resulting from parental investment (PI) are graphed as functions of the number of offspring produced by individuals of the two sexes. At M and L the net reproductive success reaches a maximum for sex 1 and sex 2 respectively. Sex 2 is limited by sex 1 (see text). The shape of the PI curves need not be specified exactly.*

typical parental investment per offspring)[2] then the sex whose typical parental investment is greater than that of the opposite sex will become a limiting resource for that sex. Individuals of the sex investing less will compete among themselves to breed with members of the sex investing more, since an individual of the former can increase its reproductive success by investing successively in the offspring of several members of the limiting sex. By assuming a simple relationship between degree of parental investment and number of offspring produced, the argument can be presented graphically (Figure 7.1). The potential for sexual competition in the sex investing less can be measured by calculating the ratio of the number of offspring that sex optimally produces (as a function of parental invest-

2. In particular, I assume an approximately 50/50 sex ratio at conception (Fisher 1958) and no differential mortality by sex, because I later derive differential mortality as a function of reproductive strategies determined by sexual selection. (Differential maturation, which affects the adult sex ratio, can also be treated as a function of sexual selection.) For most species the disparity in parental investment between the sexes is so great that the assumptions here can be greatly relaxed.

ment alone, assuming the opposite sex's investment fixed at its optimal value) to the number of offspring the limiting sex optimally produces (L/M in Figure 7.1).

What governs the operation of sexual selection is the relative parental investment of the sexes in their offspring. Competition for mates usually characterizes males because males usually invest almost nothing in their offspring. Where male parental investment per offspring is comparable to female investment one would expect male and female reproductive success to vary in similar ways and for female choice to be no more discriminating than male choice (except as noted below). Where male parental investment strongly exceeds that of the female (regardless of which sex invests more in the sex cells) one would expect females to compete among themselves for males and for males to be selective about whom they accept as a mate.

Note that it may not be possible for an individual of one sex to invest in only part of the offspring of an individual of the opposite sex. When a male invests less per typical offspring than does a female but more than one-half what she invests (or vice-versa) then selection may not favor male competition to pair with more than one female, if the offspring of the second female cannot be parcelled out to more than one male. If the net reproductive success for a male investing in the offspring of one female is larger than that gained from investing in the offspring of two females, then the male will be selected to invest in the offspring of only one female. This argument is graphed in Figure 7.2 and may be important to understanding differential mortality in monogamous birds, as discussed below.

Fisher's (1958) sex ratio model compares the parental expenditure (undefined) in male offspring with that in female offspring and suggests energy and time as measures of expenditure. Restatements of Fisher's model (for example, Kolman 1960, Willson & Pianka 1963, T. Emlen 1968, Verner 1965, Leigh 1970) employ either the undefined term, parental expenditure, or the term energy investment. In either case the key concept is imprecise and the relevant one is parental investment, as defined above. Energy investment may often be a good approximation of parental investment, but it is clearly sometimes a poor one. An individual defending its brood from a predator may expend very little energy in the process but suffer a high chance of mortality; such behavior should be measured as a large investment, not a small one as suggested by the energy involved.

Parental Investment Patterns

Species can be classified according to the relative parental investment of the sexes in their young. In the vast majority of species, the male's only contribution to the survival of his offspring is his sex cells. In these species, female contribution clearly exceeds male and by a large ratio.

A male may invest in his offspring in several ways. He may provide his

142   ROBERT L. TRIVERS

Figure 7.2. RS and PI as *functions of the number of offspring produced for two sexes. Sex 2 invests per typical offspring more than half of what sex 1 invests. Condition A: maximum net RS for a member of sex 2 assuming he can invest in any number of offspring between N and 2N. Condition B: net RS assuming member of sex 2 invests in 2N offspring. Condition C: net RS assuming member of sex 2 invests in N offspring. If member of sex 2 must invest in an integral multiple of N offspring, natural selection favors condition C.*

mate with food as in baloon flies (Kessel 1955) and some other insects (Engelmann 1970), some spiders, and some birds (for example, Calder 1967, Royama 1966, Stokes & Williams, 1971). He may find and defend a good place for the female to feed, lay eggs or raise young, as in many birds. He may build a nest to receive the eggs, as in some fish (for example, Morris 1952). He may help the female lay the eggs, as in some parasitic birds (Lack 1968). The male may also defend the female. He may brood the eggs, as in some birds, fish, frogs, and salamanders. He may help feed the young, protect them, provide opportunities for learning, and so on, as in wolves and many monogamous birds. Finally, he may provide an indirect group benefit to the young (such as protection), as in many primates. All of these forms of male parental investment tend to decrease the disparity in investment between male and female resulting from the initial disparity in size of sex cells.

To test the importance of relative parental investment in controlling sexual selection one should search for species showing greater male than

female parental investment (see Williams 1966, pp. 185–186). The best candidates include the Phalaropidae and the polyandrous bird species reviewed by Lack (1968). In these species, a female's parental investment ends when she lays her eggs; the male alone broods the eggs and cares for the young after hatching. No one has attempted to assess relative parental investment in these species, but they are striking in showing very high male parental investment correlating with strong sex role reversal: females tend to be more brightly colored, more aggressive and larger than the males, and tend to court them and fight over them. In the phalaropes there is no evidence that the females lay multiple broods (Höhn 1967, Johns 1969), but in some polyandrous species females apparently go from male to male laying successive broods (for example, Beebe 1925; see also Orians 1969). In these species the female may be limited by her ability to induce males to care for her broods, and female reproductive success may vary more than male. Likewise, high male parental investment in pipefish and seahorses (syngnathidae) correlates with female courtship and bright coloration (Fiedler 1954), and female reproductive success may be limited by male parental investment. Field data for other groups are so scanty that it is not possible to say whether there are any instances of sex role reversal among them, but available data for some dendrobatid frogs suggest at least the possibility. In these species, the male carries one or more young on his back for an unknown length of time (for example, Eaton 1941). Females tend to be more brightly colored than males (rare in frogs) and in at least one species, *Dendrobates aurata*, several females have been seen pursuing, and possibly courting, single males (Dunn 1941). In this species the male carries only one young on his back, until the tadpole is quite large, but females have been found with as many as six large eggs inside, and it is possible that females compete with each other for the backs of males. There are other frog families that show male parental care, but even less is known of their social behavior.

In most monogamous birds male and female parental investment is probably comparable. For some species there is evidence that the male invests somewhat less than the female. Kluijver (1933, cited in Coulson 1960) has shown that the male starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*) incubates the eggs less and feeds the young less often than the female, and similar data are available for other passerines (Verner & Willson, 1969). The fact that in many species males are facultative polygynists (von Haartman 1969) suggests that even when monogamous the males invest less in the young than their females. Because sex role reversal, correlating with evidence of greater male than female parental investment, is so rare in birds and because of certain theoretical considerations discussed below, I tentatively classify most monogamous bird species as showing somewhat greater female than male investment in the young.

A more precise classification of animals, and particularly of similar species, would be useful for the formulation and testing of more subtle

hypotheses. Groups of birds would be ideal to classify in this way, because slight differences in relative parental investment may produce large differences in social behavior, sexual dimorphism and mortality rates by sex. It would be interesting to compare human societies that differ in relative parental investment and in the details of the form of the parental investment, but the specification of parental investment is complicated by the fact that humans often invest in kin other than their children. A wealthy man supporting brothers and sisters (and their children) can be viewed functionally as a polygynist if the contributions to his fitness made by kin are devalued appropriately by their degree of relationship to him (see Hamilton 1964). There is good evidence that premarital sexual permissiveness affecting females in human societies relates to the form of parental investment in a way that would, under normal conditions, tend to maximize female reproductive success (Goethals 1971).

The Evolution of Investment Patterns

The parental investment pattern that today governs the operation of sexual selection apparently resulted from an evolutionarily very early differentiation into relatively immobile sex cells (eggs) fertilized by mobile ones (spermatozoa). An undifferentiated system of sex cells seems highly unstable: competition to fertilize other sex cells should rapidly favor mobility in some sex cells, which in turn sets up selection pressures for immobility in the others. In any case, once the differentiation took place, sexual selection acting on spermatozoa favored mobility at the expense of investment (in the form of cytoplasm). This meant that as long as the spermatozoa of different males competed directly to fertilize eggs (as in oysters) natural selection favoring increased parental investment could act only on the female. Once females were able to control which male fertilized their eggs, female choice or mortality selection on the young could act to favor some new form of male investment in addition to spermatozoa. But there exist strong selection pressures against this. Since the female already invests more than the male, breeding failure for lack of an additional investment selects more strongly against her than against the male. In that sense, her initial very great investment commits her to additional invest-——ment more than the male's initial slight investment commits him. Furthermore, male-male competition will tend to operate against male parental investment, in that any male investment in one female's young should decrease the male's chances of inseminating other females. Sexual selection, then, is both controlled by the parental investment pattern and a force that tends to mold that pattern.

The conditions under which selection favors male parental investment have not been specified for any group of animals. Except for the case of polygyny in birds, the role of female choice has not been explored; instead,

it is commonly assumed that, whenever two individuals can raise more individuals together than one alone could, natural selection will favor male parental investment (Lack 1968, p. 149), an assumption that overlooks the effects of both male-male competition and female choice.

INITIAL PARENTAL INVESTMENT

An important consequence of the early evolutionary differentiation of the sex cells and subsequent sperm competition is that male sex cells remain tiny compared to female sex cells, even when selection has favored a total male parental investment that equals or exceeds the female investment. The male's initial parental investment, that is, his investment at the moment of fertilization, is much smaller than the female's, even if later, through parental care, he invests as much or more. Parental investment in the young can be viewed as a sequence of discrete investments by each sex. The relative investment may change as a function of time and each sex may be more or less free to terminate its investment at any time. In the human species, for example, a copulation costing the male virtually nothing may trigger a nine-month investment by the female that is not trivial, followed, if she wishes, by a fifteen-year investment in the offspring that is considerable. Although the male may often contribute parental care during this period, he need not necessarily do so. After a nine-month pregnancy, a female is more or less free to terminate her investment at any moment but doing so wastes her investment up until then. Given the initial imbalance in investment the male may maximize his chances of leaving surviving offspring by copulating and abandoning many females, some of whom, alone or with the aid of others, will raise his offspring. In species where there has been strong selection for male parental care, it is more likely that a mixed strategy will be the optimal male course—to help a single female raise young, while not passing up opportunities to mate with other females whom he will not aid.

In many birds, males defend a territory which the female also uses for feeding prior to egg laying, but the cost of this investment by the male is difficult to evaluate. In some species, as outlined above, the male may provision the female before she has produced the young, but this provisioning is usually small compared to the cost of the eggs. In any case, the cost of the copulation itself is always trivial to the male, and in theory the male need not invest anything else in order to copulate. If there is any chance the female can raise the young, either alone or with the help of others, it would be to the male's advantage to copulate with her. By this reasoning one would expect males of monogamous species to retain some psychological traits consistent with promiscuous habits. A male would be selected to differentiate between a female he will only impregnate and a female with whom he will also raise young. Toward the former he should be more

146   ROBERT L. TRIVERS

eager for sex and less discriminating in choice of sex partner than the female toward him, but toward the latter he should be about as discriminating as she toward him.

If males within a relatively monogamous species are, in fact, adapted to pursue a mixed strategy, the optimal is likely to differ for different males. I know of no attempt to document this possibility in humans, but psychology might well benefit from attempting to view human sexual plasticity as an adaptation to permit the individual to choose the mixed strategy best suited to local conditions and his own attributes. Elder (1969) shows that steady dating and sexual activity (coitus and petting) in adolescent human females correlate inversely with a tendency to marry up the socioeconomic scale as adults. Since females physically attractive as adolescents tend to marry up, it is possible that females adjust their reproductive strategies in adolescence to their own assets.

Desertion and Cuckoldry

There are a number of interesting consequences of the fact that the male and female of a monogamous couple invest parental care in their offspring at different rates. These can be studied by graphing and comparing the cumulative investment of each parent in their offspring, and this is done for two individuals of a hypothetical bird species in Figure 7.3. I have graphed no parental investment by the female in her young before copulation, even though she may be producing the eggs before then, because it is not until the act of copulation that she commits the eggs to a given male's genes. In effect, then, I have graphed the parental investment of each individual in the other individual's offspring. After copulation, this is the same as graphing investment in their own offspring, assuming, as I do here, that the male and female copulate with each other and each other only.

To discuss the problems that confront paired individuals ostensibly cooperating in a joint parental effort, I choose the language of strategy and decision, as if each individual contemplated in strategic terms the decisions it ought to make at each instant in order to maximize its reproductive success. This language is chosen purely for convenience to explore the adaptations one might expect natural selection to favor.

At any point in time the individual whose cumulative investment is exceeded by his partner's is theoretically tempted to desert, especially if the disparity is large. This temptation occurs because the deserter loses less than his partner if no offspring are raised and the partner would therefore be more strongly selected to stay with the young. Any success of the partner will, of course, benefit the deserter. In Figure 7.3, for example, desertion by the male right after copulation will cost him very little, if no offspring are raised, while the chances of the female raising some young alone may be great enough to make the desertion worthwhile. Other factors are

Parental Investment and Sexual Selection

Figure 7.3. *Hypothetical cumulative parental investment of a male and a female bird in their offspring as a function of time.* Territory defense: *Male defends area for feeding and nest building.* Copulation and egg-laying: *Female commits her eggs to male who commits his defended nest to the female.* Incubation: *Male incubates eggs while female does nothing relevant to offspring.* Feeding of young: *Each parent feeds young but female does so at a more rapid rate.*

important in determining the adaptiveness of abandonment, factors such as the opportunities outside the pair for breeding and the expected shape of the deserter's investment curve if he does not desert. If the male's investment curve does not rise much after copulation, then the female's chances of raising the young alone will be greater and the time wasted by the male investing moderately in his offspring may be better spent starting a new brood.

What are the possible responses of the deserted individual? If the male is deserted before copulation, he has no choice but to attempt to start the process over again with a new female; whatever he has invested in that female is lost. If either partner is deserted after copulation, it has three choices. (1) It can desert the eggs (or eat them) and attempt to breed again with another mate, losing thereby all (or part of) the initial investment. (2) It can attempt to raise the young on its own, at the risk of overexertion and failure. Or, (3) it can attempt to induce another partner to help it raise the young. The third alternative, if successful, is the most adaptive for it, but this requires deceiving another organism into doing something contrary to its own interests, and adaptations should evolve to guard individuals from such tasks. It is difficult to see how a male could be successful in deceiving a new female, but if a female acts quickly, she might fool a male. As time goes on (for example, once the eggs are laid),

it is unlikely that a male could easily be fooled. The female could thus be programmed to try the third strategy first, and if it failed, to revert to the first or second. The male deserter gains most if the female succeeds in the third strategy, nothing if she chooses the first strategy, and possibly an intermediate value if she chooses the second strategy.

If neither partner deserts at the beginning, then as time goes on, each invests more and more in the young. This trend has several consequences. On the one hand, the partner of a deserter is more capable of finishing the task alone and natural selection should favor its being more predisposed to try, because it has more to lose. On the other hand, the deserter has more to lose if the partner fails and less to gain if the partner succeeds. The balance between these opposing factors should depend on the exact form of the cumulative investment curves as well as the opportunities for further breeding outside the pair.

There is another effect with time of the increasing investment by both parents in the offspring. As the investments increase, natural selection may favor *either* partner deserting even if one has invested more in the young than the other. This is because the desertion may put the deserted partner in a cruel bind: he has invested so much that he loses considerably if he also deserts the young, even though, which should make no difference to him, the partner would lose even more. The possibility of such binds can be illustrated by an analogous situation described by Rowley (1965). Two neighboring pairs of wrens happened to fledge their young simultaneously and could not tell their young apart, so both pairs fed all six young indiscriminately, until one pair "deserted" to raise another brood, leaving their neighbors to feed all six young, which they did, even though this meant they were, in effect, being taken advantage of.

Birds should show adaptations to avoid being deserted. Females, in particular, should be able to guard against males who will only copulate and not invest subsequent parental effort. An instance of such an adaptation may be found in the red-necked phalarope, *Phalaropus lobatus*. In phalaropes the male incubates the eggs alone and alone cares for the young after hatching (Höhn 1967, Johns 1969), so that a graph of cumulative parental investment would show an intitial large female investment which then remains the same through time, whereas the initial male investment is nil and increases steadily, probably to surpass the female investment. Only the female is vulnerable to being deserted and this right after copulation, since any later desertion by the male costs him his investment in incubation, the young being almost certain to perish. Tinbergen (1935) observed a female vigorously courting a male and then flying away as soon as he responded to the courtship by attempting to copulate. This coy performance was repeated numerous times for several days. Tinbergen attributed it to the "waxing and waning of an instinct," but the behavior may have been a test

of the male's willingness to brood the female's eggs. The male under obser-
vation was, in fact, already brooding eggs and was courted when he left
the eggs to feed on a nearby pond. In order to view a complete egg-laying
sequence, Tinbergen destroyed the clutch the male was brooding. Within
a half day the female permitted the male sexual access, and he subse-
quently brooded her eggs. The important point is that the female could
apparently tell the difference between a free and an encumbered male, and
she withheld sex from the latter. Courtship alternating with flight may be
the test that reveals the male's true attachments: the test can show, for ex-
ample, whether he is free to follow the female.

It is likely that many adaptations exist in monogamous species to guard
against desertion, but despite evidence that desertion can be common
(Rowley 1965) no one has attempted to analyze courtship with this danger
in mind. Von Haartman (1969) has reviewed some evidence for adapta-
tions of females to avoid being mated to a polygynous male, and being so
mated is sometimes exactly equivalent to being deserted by the male (von
Haartman, 1951).

External fertilization requires a synchrony of behavior such that the
male can usually be certain he is not attempting to fertilize previously
fertilized eggs. With the evolution of internal fertilization the male cannot
be so certain. For many species (for example, most mammals), the distinc-
tion is not important because the male loses so little by attempting to fertil-
ize previously fertilized eggs. Where male parental care is involved, how-
ever, the male runs the risk of being cuckolded, of raising another male's
offspring. For Figure 7.1 it was assumed that the pair copulated with each
other and each other only, but the male can usually not be sure that such
is the case and what is graphed in such a situation is the male's investment
in the *female's* offspring. Adaptations should evolve to help guarantee that
the female's offspring are also his own, but these can partly be countered
by the evolution of more sophisticated cuckolds.

One way a male can protect himself is to ensure that other males keep
their distance. That some territorial aggression of monogamous male birds
is devoted to protecting the sanctity of the pair bond seems certain, and hu-
man male aggression toward real or suspected adulterers is often extreme.
Lee (1969), for example, has shown that, when the cause is known, the
major cause of fatal Bushman fights is adultery or suspected adultery. In fact,
limited data on other hunter-gathering groups (including Eskimos and
Australian aborigines) indicate that, while fighting is relatively rare (in
that organized intergroup aggression is infrequent), the "murder rate" may
be relatively high. On examination, the murderer and his victim are usually
a husband and his wife's real or suspected lover. In pigeons (*Columba
livia*) a new male arriving alone at a nocturnal roosting place in the fall is
attacked day after day by one or more resident males. As soon as the same

male appears with a mate, the two are treated much more casually (Trivers, unpublished data), suggesting that an unpaired male is more threatening than a paired one.

I have argued above that a female deserted immediately after copulation may be adapted to try to induce another male to help raise her young. This factor implies adaptations on the part of the male to avoid such a fate. A simple method is to avoid mating with a female on first encounter, sequester her instead and mate with her only after a passage of time that reasonably excludes her prior impregnation by another male. Certainly males guard their females from other males, and there is a striking difference between the lack of preliminaries in promiscuous birds (Scott 1942, Kruijt & Hogan 1967) and the sometimes long lag between pair bonding and copulation in monogamous birds (Nevo 1956), a lag which usually seems to serve other functions as well.

Biologists have interpreted courtship in a limited way. Courtship is seen as allowing the individual to choose the correct species and sex, to overcome antagonistic urges and to arouse one's partner (Bastock 1967). The above analysis suggests that courtship should also be interpreted in terms of the need to guard oneself from the several possibilities of maltreatment at the hands of one's mate.

Differential Mortality and the Sex Ratio

Of special interest in understanding the effects of sexual selection are accurate data on differential mortality of the sexes, especially of immature individuals. Such data are, however, among the most difficult to gather, and the published data, although important, are scanty (for example, Emlen 1940, Hays 1947, Chapman, Casida, & Cote 1938, Robinette et al. 1957, Coulson 1960, Potts 1969, Darley 1971, Myers & Krebs 1971). As a substitute one can make use of data on sex ratios within given age classes or for all age classes taken together. By assuming that the sex ratio at conception (or, less precisely, at birth) is almost exactly 50/50, significant deviations from this ratio for any age class or for all taken together should imply differential mortality. Where data exist for the sex ratio at birth and where the sex ratio for the entire local population is unbalanced, the sex ratio at birth is usually about 50/50 (see above references, Selander 1965, Lack 1954). Furthermore, Fisher (1958) has shown, and others refined (Leigh 1970), that parents should invest roughly equal energy in each sex. Since parents usually invest roughly equal energy in each individual of each sex, natural selection, in the absence of unusual circumstances (see Hamilton 1967), should favor approximately a 50/50 sex ratio at conception.

Parental Investment and Sexual Selection 151

It is difficult to determine accurately the sex ratio for any species. The most serious source of bias is that males and females often make themselves differentially available to the observer. For example, in small mammals sexual selection seems to have favored male attributes, such as high mobility, that tend to result in their differential capture (Beer, Frenzel, & MacLeod 1958; Myers & Krebs, 1971). If one views one's capture techniques as randomly sampling the existing population, one will conclude that males are more numerous. If one views one's capture techniques as randomly sampling the effects of mortality on the population, then one will conclude that males are more prone to mortality (they are captured more often) and therefore are less numerous. Neither assumption is likely to be true, but authors routinely choose the former. Furthermore, it is often not appreciated what a large sample is required in order to show significant deviations from a 50/50 ratio. A sample of 400 animals showing a 44/56 sex ratio, for example, does not deviate significantly from a 50/50 ratio. (Nor, although this is almost never pointed out, does it differ significantly from a 38/62 ratio.)

Mayr (1939) has pointed out that there are numerous deviations from a 50/50 sex ratio in birds and I believe it is likely that, if data were sufficiently precise, most species of vertebrates would show a significant deviation from a 50/50 sex ratio. Males and females differ in numerous characteristics relevant to their different reproductive strategies and these characters are unlikely to have equivalent effects on survival. Since it is not advantageous for the adults of each sex to have available the same number of adults of the opposite sex, there will be no automatic selective agent for keeping deviations from a 50/50 ratio small.

A review of the useful literature on sex ratios suggests that (except for birds) when the sex ratio is unbalanced it is usually unbalanced by there being more females than males. Put another way, males apparently have a tendency to suffer higher mortality rates than females. This is true for those dragonflies for which there are data (Corbet, Longfield, & Moore 1960), for the house fly (Rockstein 1959), for most fish (Beverton & Holt 1959), for several lizards (Tinkle 1967, Harris 1964, Hirth 1963, Blair 1960, Trivers, discussed below) and for many mammals (Bouliere & Verschuren 1960, Cowan 1950, Eisenberg 1965, Robinette et al. 1957, Beer, Frenzel, & MacLeod 1958, Stephens 1952, Tyndale-Biscoe & Smith, 1969, Myers & Krebs, 1971, Wood 1970). Hamilton (1948) and Lack (1954) have reviewed studies on other animals suggesting a similar trend. Mayr (1939) points out that where the sex ratio can be shown to be unbalanced in monogamous birds there are usually fewer females, but in polygynous or promiscuous birds there are fewer males. Data since his paper confirm this finding. This result is particularly interesting since in all other groups in which males tend to be less numerous monogamy is rare or nonexistent.

THE CHROMOSOMAL HYPOTHESIS

There is a tendency among biologists studying social behavior to regard the adult sex ratio as an independent variable to which the species reacts with appropriate adaptations. Lack (1968) often interprets social behavior as an adaptation in part to an unbalanced (or balanced) sex ratio, and Verner (1964) has summarized other instances of this tendency. The only mechanism that will generate differential mortality independent of sexual differences clearly related to parental investment and sexual selection is the chromosomal mechanism, applied especially to humans and other mammals: the unguarded X chromosome of the male is presumed to predispose him to higher mortality. This mechanism is inadequate as an explanation of differential mortality for three reasons.

1. The distribution of differential mortality by sex is not predicted by a knowledge of the distribution of sex determining mechanisms. Both sexes of fish are usually homogametic, yet males suffer higher mortality. Female birds are heterogametic but suffer higher mortality only in monogamous species. Homogametic male meal moths are outsurvived by their heterogametic female counterparts under laboratory conditions (Hamilton & Johansson 1965).

2. Theoretical predictions of the degree of differential mortality expected by males due to their unguarded X chromosome are far lower than those observed in such mammals as dogs, cattle and humans (Ludwig & Boost 1951). It is possible to imagine natural selection favoring the heterogametic sex determining mechanism if the associated differential mortality is slight and balanced by some advantage in differentiation or in the homogametic sex, but a large mortality associated with heterogamy should be counteracted by a tendency toward both sexes becoming homogametic.

3. Careful data for humans demonstrate that castrate males (who remain of course heterogametic) strongly outsurvive a control group of males similar in all other respects and the earlier in life the castration, the greater the increase in survival. (Hamilton & Mestler 1969). The same is true of domestic cats (Hamilton, Hamilton & Mestler 1969), but not of a species (meal moths) for which there is no evidence that the gonads are implicated in sexual differentiation (Hamilton & Johansson 1965).

An Adaptive Model of Differential Mortality

To interpret the meaning of balanced or unbalanced sex ratios one needs a comprehensive framework within which to view life historical phenomena. Gadgil & Bossert (1970) have presented a model for the adaptive interpretation of differences between species' life histories; for example, in the age of first breeding and in the growth and survival curves. Although they did not apply this model to sexual differences in these parameters,

Parental Investment and Sexual Selection 153

their model is precisely suited for such differences. One can, in effect, treat the sexes as if they were different species, the opposite sex being a resource relevant to producing maximum surviving offspring. Put this way, female "species" usually differ from male species in that females compete among themselves for such resources as food but not for members of the opposite sex, whereas males ultimately compete only for members of the opposite sex, all other forms of competition being important only insofar as they affect this ultimate competition.

To analyze differential mortality by sex one needs to correlate different reproductive strategies with mortality, that is, one must show how a given reproductive strategy entails a given risk of mortality. One can do this by graphing reproductive success (RS) for the first breeding season as a function of reproductive effort expended during that season, and by graphing the diminution in future reproductive success (D) in units of first breeding season reproductive success. (Gadgil and Bossert show that the reproductive value of a given effort declines with age, hence the need to convert future reproductive success to comparable units.) For simplicity I assume that the diminution, D, results entirely from mortality between the first and second breeding seasons. The diminution could result from mortality in a later year (induced by reproductive effort in the first breeding season) which would not change the form of the analysis, or it could result from decreased ability to breed in the second (or still later) breeding season, which sometimes occurs but which is probably minor compared to the diminution due to mortality, and which does not change the analysis as long as one assumes that males and females do not differ appreciably in the extent to which they suffer this form of diminution.

Natural selection favors an individual expending in the first breeding season the reproductive effort (RE) that results in a maximum net reproductive success (RS—D). The value of D at this RE gives the degree of expected mortality between the first and second breeding seasons (see Figures 7.4 and 7.5). Differences between the sexes in D will give the expected differential mortality. The same analysis can be applied to the nth breeding season to predict mortality between it and the nth + 1 breeding season. Likewise, by a trivial modification, the analysis can be used to generate differences in juvenile mortality: let D represent the diminution in chances of surviving to the first breeding season as a function of RE at first breeding. Seen this way, one is measuring the cost in survival of developing during the juvenile period attributes relevant to adult reproductive success.

SPECIES WITH LITTLE OR NO MALE PARENTAL INVESTMENT

In Figure 7.4, I have graphed RS and D as functions of reproductive effort in the first breeding season for females of a hypothetical species in which

males invest very little parental care. The RS function is given a sigmoidal shape for the following reasons. I assume that at low values of RE, RS increases only very gradually because some investment is necessary just to initiate reproduction (for example, enlarging the reproductive organs). RS then increases more rapidly as a function of RE but without achieving a very steep slope. RS finally levels off at high values of RE because of increased inefficiencies there (for example, inefficiencies in foraging; see Schoener 1971). I have graphed the value, f, at which net reproductive success for the female reaches a maximum. Technically, due to competition, the shape of the RS function for any given female will depend partly on the reproductive effort devoted by other females; the graph therefore assumes that other females tend to invest near the optimal value, f, but an important feature of a female's RS is that it is *not* strongly dependent on the RE devoted by other females: the curve would not greatly differ if all other females invested much more or less. I have graphed D as a linear function of RE. So doing amounts to a definition of reproductive effort, that is, a given increment in reproductive effort during the first breeding season can be detected as a proportionately increased chance of dying be-


Figure 7.4. Female reproductive success during the first breeding season (RS) and diminution of future reproductive success (D) as functions of reproductive effort during first breeding. D is measured in units of first breeding (see text). At f the net reproductive success reaches a maximum. Species is one in which there is very little male parental investment.

male

RS

NET
REPRODUCTIVE
SUCCESS

D

RS and D

m

REPRODUCTIVE EFFORT

Figure 7.5. Same as Figure 7.4 except that it is drawn for the male instead of the female. At m the net reproductive success reaches a maximum.

tween the first and second breeding seasons. Note that reproductive effort for the female is essentially synonymous with parental investment.

Male RS differs from female RS in two important ways, both of which stem from sexual selection. (1) A male's RS is highly dependent on the RE of other males. When other males invest heavily, an individual male will usually not outcompete them unless he invests as much or more. A considerable investment that is slightly below that of other males may result in zero RS. (2) A male's RS is potentially very high, much higher than that of a conspecific female, but only if he outcompetes other males. There should exist some factor or set of factors (such as size, aggressiveness, mobility) that correlates with high male RS. The effect of competition between males for females is selection for increased male RE, and this selection will continue until greater male than female RE is selected as long as the higher associated D is offset by the potentially very high RS. This argument is graphed in Figure 7.5, where the steep slope of RS reflects the high interaction between one male's RS and the RE of the other males. Note that the argument here depends on the existence of a set of factors correlated with high male reproductive success. If these factors exist, natural selection will predispose the male to higher mortality rates than the female. Where a male can achieve very high RS in a breeding season (as in land-breeding seals, Bartholemew 1970), differential mortality will be correspondingly high.

ROBERT L. TRIVERS

SPECIES WITH APPRECIABLE MALE PARENTAL INVESTMENT

The analysis here applies to species in which males invest less parental care than, but probably more than one-half, what females invest. I assume that most monogamous birds are so characterized, and I have listed reasons and some data above supporting this assumption. The reasons can be summarized by saying that because of their initial large investment, females appear to be caught in a situation in which they are unable to force greater parental investment out of the males and would be strongly selected against if they unilaterally reduced their own parental investment.

Functions relating RS to parental investment are graphed for males and females in Figures 7.6 and 7.7, assuming for each sex that the opposite sex shows the parental investment that results for it in a maximum net reproductive success. The female curve is given a sigmoidal shape for the reasons that apply to Figure 7.4; in birds the female's initial investment in the eggs will go for nothing if more is not invested in brooding the eggs and feeding the young, while beyond a certain high RE further increments do not greatly affect RS. Assuming the female invests the value, f, male RS will vary as a function of male parental investment in a way similar to female RS, except the function will be displaced to the left (Figure 7.7) and some RS will be lost due to the effects of the cuckoldry graphed in Figure 7.8.

Because males invest in parental care more than one-half what females

Figure 7.6. *Female reproductive success and diminution in future reproductive success as functions of reproductive effort (RE) assuming male reproductive effort of* m_1*. Species is a hypothetical monogamous bird in which males invest somewhat less than females in parental care (see Figure 7.7 and 7.8).*

male

Figure 7.7. *Male reproductive success and diminution in future reproductive success as functions of reproductive effort, assuming female reproductive effort of f. Species is same as in Figure 7.6. Reproductive effort of male is invested as parental care in one female's offspring. Net reproductive success is a maximum at m_1.*

invest and because the offspring of a given female tend to be inseminated by a single male, selection does not favor males competing with each other to invest in the offspring of more than one female. Rather, sexual selection only operates on the male to inseminate females whose offspring he will not raise, especially if another male will raise them instead. Since selection presumably does not strongly favor female adultery and may oppose it (if, for example, detection leads to desertion by the mate), the opportunities for cuckoldry are limited: high investment in promiscuous activity will bring only limited RS. This argument is graphed in Figure 7.8. The predicted differential mortality by sex can be had by comparing D (f) with D $(m_1 + m_2)$.

It may seem ironic, but in moving from a promiscuous to a monogamous life, that is, in moving toward *greater* parental investment in his young, the male tends to *increase* his chances of surviving relative to the female. This tendency occurs because the increased parental investment disproportionately decreases the male's RE invested in male-male competition to inseminate females.

Note that in both cases above differential mortality tends to be self-limiting. By altering the ratio of possible sexual partners to sexual competitors differential mortality sets up forces that tend to keep the differential mortality low. In species showing little male parental investment differential male mortality increases the average number of females available for those males who survive. Other things being equal, this increase tends to make it more difficult for the most successful males to maintain their relative ad-

Figure 7.8. Male reproductive success and diminution of future reproductive success as a function of reproductive effort solely devoted to promiscuous behavior. Net reproductive success at m_2 is a maximum. Same species as in Figures 7.6 and 7.7.

vantage. In monogamous birds differential female mortality induces competition among males to secure at least one mate, thereby tending to increase male mortality. Such competition presumably also increases the variance in male reproductive success above the sexual differential expected from cuckoldry.

SPECIES WITH GREATER MALE THAN FEMALE PARENTAL INVESTMENT

Since the above arguments were made with reference to relative parental investment and not sex, they apply to species in which males invest more parental effort than females, except that there is never apt to be a female advantage to cuckolding other females, and this advantage is always alive with males. Where females invest more than one-half what males invest, one would predict differential female mortality. Where females invest less than one-half what males invest, one would predict competition, and a resulting differential female mortality.

Male–Male Competition

Competition between males does not necessarily end with the release of sperm. Even in species with internal fertilization, competition between sperm of different males can be an important component of male-male competition (see the excellent review by Parker 1970b). In rare cases, competition between males may continue after eggs are fertilized. For ex-

Parental Investment and Sexual Selection   159

ample an adult male langur (*Presbytis entellus*) who ousts the adult male
of a group may systematically kill the infants of that group (presumably
fathered by the ousted male) thereby bringing most of the adult females
quickly into estrus again (Sugiyama 1967). While clearly disadvantageous
for the killed infants and their mothers, such behavior, benefiting the new
male, may be an extreme product of sexual selection. Female mice spon-
taneously abort during the first four days of pregnancy when exposed to
the smell of a strange male (Bruce 1960, reviewed in Sadleir 1967), a situa-
tion subject to several interpretations including one based on male-male
competition.

Sperm competition may have important effects on competition between
males prior to release of sperm. In those insects in which later-arriving
sperm take precedence in fertilizing eggs, selection favors mating with a
female just prior to release of eggs, thereby increasing competition at ovu-
lation sites and intensifying selection for a postovulatory guarding phase
by the male (see Parker 1970bcd, Jacobs 1955). I here concentrate on male-
male competition prior to the release of sperm in species showing very
little male parental investment.

The form of male-male competition should be strongly influenced by the
distribution in space and time of the ultimate resource affecting male re-
productive success, namely, conspecific breeding females. The distribution
can be described in terms of three parameters: the extent to which females
are clumped or dispersed in space, the extent to which they are clumped
or dispersed in time, and the extent to which their exact position in space
and time is predictable. I here treat females as if they are a passive re-
source for which males compete, but female choice may strongly influence
the form of male-male competition, as, for example, when it favors males
clumping together on display grounds (for example, S. Emlen 1968) which
females then search out (see below under "Female Choice").

DISTRIBUTION IN SPACE

Cervids differ in the extent to which females are clumped in space or ran-
domly dispersed (deVos, Broky & Geist 1967) as do antelopes (Eisenberg
1965), and these differences correlate in a predictable way with differences
in male attributes. Generally male-male aggression will be the more severe
the greater the number of females two males are fighting over at any given
moment. Searching behavior should be more important in highly dispersed
species especially if the dispersal is combined with unpredictability.

DISTRIBUTION IN TIME

Clumped in time refers to highly seasonal breeders in which many females
become sexually available for a short period at the same moment (for ex-
ample, explosive breeding frogs; Bragg 1965, Rivero & Estevez 1969),

while highly dispersed breeders (in time) are species (such as chimpanzees; Van Lawick-Goodall 1968) in which females breed more or less randomly throughout the year. One effect of extreme clumping is that it becomes more difficult for any one male to be extremely successful: while he is copulating with one female, hundreds of other females are simultaneously being inseminated. Dispersal in time, at least when combined with clumping in space, as in many primates, permits each male to compete for each newly available female and the same small number of males tend repeatedly to inseminate the receptive females (DeVore 1965).

PREDICTABILITY

One reason males in some dragonflies (Jacobs 1955) may compete with each other for female oviposition sites is that those are highly predictable places at which to find receptive females. Indeed, males display several behaviors, such as testing the water with the tips of their abdomen, that apparently aid them in predicting especially good oviposition sites, and such sites can permit very high male reproductive success (Jacobs 1955). In the cicada killer wasp (*Sphecius spheciosus*) males establish mating territories around colony emergency holes, presumably because this is the most predictable place at which to find receptive females (Lin 1963).

The three parameters outlined interact strongly, of course, as when very strong clumping in time may strongly reduce the predicted effects of strong clumping in space. A much more detailed classification of species with non-obvious predictions would be welcome. In the absence of such models I present a partial list of factors that should affect male reproductive success and that may correlate with high male mortality.

SIZE

There are very few data showing the relationship between male size and reproductive success but abundant data showing the relationship between male dominance and reproductive success: for example, in elephant seals (LeBoeuf & Peterson 1969), black grouse (Koivisto 1965, Scott 1942), baboons (DeVore 1965) and rainbow lizards (Harris 1964). Since dominance is largely established through aggression and larger size is usually helpful in aggressive encounters, it is likely that these data partly reveal the relationship between size and reproductive success. (It is also likely that they reflect the relationship between experience and reproductive success.)

Circumstantial evidence for the importance of size in aggressive encounters can be found in the distribution of sexual size dimorphism and aggressive tendencies among tetrapods. In birds and mammals males are generally larger than females and much more aggressive. Where females

are known to be more aggressive (that is, birds showing reversal in sex roles) they are also larger. In frogs and salamanders females are usually larger than males, and aggressive behavior has only very rarely been recorded. In snakes, females are usually larger than males (Kopstein 1941) and aggression is almost unreported. Aggression has frequently been observed between sexually active crocodiles and males tend to be larger (Allen Greer, personal communication). In lizards males are often larger than females, and aggression is common in some families (Carpenter 1967). Male aggressiveness is also common, however, in some species in which females are larger, for example, *Sceloporus,* (Blair 1960). There is a trivial reason for the lack of evidence of aggressiveness in most amphibians and reptiles: the species are difficult to observe and few behavioral data of any sort have been recorded. It is possible, however, that this correlation between human ignorance and species in which females are larger is not accidental. Humans tend to be more knowledgeable about those species that are also active diurnally and strongly dependent on vision, for example, birds and large mammals. It may be that male aggressiveness is more strongly selected in visually oriented animals because vision provides long-range information on the behavior of competitors. The male can, for example, easily observe another male beginning to copulate and can often quickly attempt to intervene (for example, baboons, DeVore 1965 and sage grouse, Scott 1942).

Mammals and birds also tend towards low, fixed clutch sizes and this may favor relatively smaller females, since large female size may be relatively unimportant in reproductive success. In many fish, lizards and salamanders female reproductive success as measured by clutch size is known to correlate strongly within species with size (Tinkle, Wilbur & Tilley 1970, Tilley 1968).

Measuring reproductive success by frequency of copulation, I have analyzed male and female reproductive success as a function of size in *Anolis garmani* (Figures 7.9 and 7.10). Both sexes show a significant positive correlation between size and reproductive success, but the trend in males is significantly stronger than the trend in females ($p < .01$). Consistent with this tendency, males grow faster at all sizes than females (Figure 7.11) and reach an adult weight two and one-half times that of adult females. The sex ratio of all animals is unbalanced in favor of females, which would seem to indicate differential mortality, but the factors that might produce the difference are not known. Males are highly aggressive and territorial, and large males defend correspondingly large territories with many resident females. No data are available on size and success in aggressive encounters, but in the closely related (and behaviorally very similar) *A. lineatopus,* 85 per cent of 182 disputes observed in the field were won by the larger animal (Rand 1967). Females lay only one egg at a time, but it is likely that larger adult females lay eggs slightly more often

Figure 7.10. Reproductive success in male and female A. garmani *as a function of size. Reproductive success is measured by the number of copulations observed per number of individuals (male or female) in each nonoverlapping 5 mm size category. Data combined from five separate visits to study area between summer 1969 and summer 1971.*

than smaller ones, and this may partly be due to advantages in feeding through size-dependent aggressiveness, since larger females wander significantly more widely than smaller adult ones. An alternate interpretation (based on ecological competition between the sexes) has been proposed for sexual dimorphism in size among animals (Selander 1966), and the interpretation may apply to *Anolis* (Schoener 1967).

METABOLIC RATE

Certainly more is involved in differential male mortality than size, even in species in which males grow to a larger size than females. Although data show convincingly that nutritional factors strongly affect human male survival *in utero*, a sexual difference in size among humans is not detected until the twenty-fourth week after conception whereas differences in mortality appear as soon as the twelfth week. Sellers et al. (1950) have shown that male rats excrete four times the protein females do; the difference is removed by castration. Since males suffer more from protein-deficient diets than females (they gain less weight and survive less well) the sex-linked proteinuria, apparently unrelated to size, may be a factor in causing lower male survival in wild rats (Schein 1950). (The connection between

Figure 7.11. *Male and female growth rates in* A. garmani *as a function of initial size based on summer 1970 recaptures of animals marked 3 to 4 months before. A line has been fitted to each set of data; d indicates how much larger a male is when a similar aged female reaches sexual maturity.*

proteinuria and male reproductive success is obscure.) Again, although human male survival is more adversely affected by poor nutritional conditions than female survival, Hamilton (1948) presents evidence that the higher metabolic rate of the male is an important factor increasing his vulnerability to many diseases which strike males more heavily than females. Likewise, Taber & Dasmann (1954) argue that greater male mortality in the deer, *Odocoileus hemionus,* results from a higher metabolic rate. High metabolic rate could relate to both aggressiveness and searching behavior.

EXPERIENCE

If reproductive success increases more rapidly in one sex than the other as a function of age alone (for example, through age-dependent experience), then one would expect a postponement of sexual maturity in that sex and a greater chance of surviving through a unit of time than in the opposite sex. Thus, the adult sex ratio might be biased in favor of the earlier maturing sex but the sex ratio for all ages taken together should be biased in favor of the later maturing sex. Of course, if reproductive success for one sex increases strongly as a function of experience and experience only partly

correlates with age, then the sex may be willing to suffer increased mortality —if this mortality is sufficiently offset by increases in experience. Selander (1965) has suggested that the tendency of immature male blackbirds to exhibit some mature characteristics may be adaptive in that it increases the male's experience, although it also presumably increases his risk of mortality.

MOBILITY

Data from mammals (reviewed by Eisenberg 1965 and Brown 1966) and from some salamanders (Madison & Shoop 1970) and numerous lizards (Tinkle 1967 and Blair 1960) suggest that males often occupy larger home ranges and wander more widely than females *even when males are smaller* (Blair 1965). Parker (1970a) has quantified the importance of mobility and searching behavior in dung flies. If females are a dispersed resource, then male mobility may be crucial in exposing the male to a large number of available females. Again, males may be willing to incur greater mortality if this is sufficiently offset by increases in reproductive success. This factor should only affect the male during the breeding season (Kikkawa 1964) unless factors relevant to mobility (such as speed, agility or knowledge of the environment) need to be developed prior to the reproductive season. Lindburg (1969) has shown that macaque males, but not females, change troops more frequently during the reproductive season than otherwise and that this mobility increases male reproductive success as measured by frequency of copulation, suggesting that at least in this species, greater mobility can be confined to the reproductive season (see also Miller 1958). On the other hand, Taber & Dasmann (1954) present evidence that as early as six months of age male deer wander more widely from their mothers than females—a difference whose function, of course, is not known. Similar very early differences in mobility have been demonstrated for a lizard (Blair 1960) and for several primates, including man (Jensen, Bobbitt & Gordon 1968).

Female Choice

Although Darwin (1871) thought female choice an important evolutionary force, most writers since him have relegated it to a trivial role (Huxley 1938, Lack 1968; but see Fisher 1958, and Orians 1969). With notable exceptions the study of female choice has limited itself to showing that females are selected to decide whether a potential partner is of the right species, of the right sex and sexually mature. While the adaptive value of such choices is obvious, the adaptive value of subtler discriminations among broadly appropriate males is much more difficult to visualize or document. One needs both theoretical arguments for the adaptive value

of such female choice and detailed data on how females choose. Neither of these criteria is met by those who casually ascribe to female (or male) choice the evolution of such traits as the relative hairlessness of both human sexes (Hershkovitz 1966) or the large size of human female breasts (Morris 1967). I review here theoretical considerations of how females might be expected to choose among the available males, along with some data on how females do choose.

SELECTION FOR OTHERWISE NEUTRAL OR DISFUNCTIONAL MALE ATTRIBUTES

The effects of female choice will depend on the way females choose. If some females exercise a preference for one type of male (genotype) while others mate at random, then other things being equal, selection will rapidly favor the preferred male type and the females with the preference (O'Donald 1962). If each female has a specific image of the male with whom she prefers to mate and if there is a decreasing probability of a female mating with a male as a function of his increasing deviation from her preferred image, then it is trivial to show that selection will favor distributions of female preferences and male attributes that coincide. Female choice can generate continuous male change only if females choose by a relative rather than an absolute criterion. That is, if there is a tendency for females to sample the male distribution and to prefer one extreme (for example, the more brightly colored males), then selection will move the male distribution toward the favored extreme. After a one generation lag, the distribution of female preferences will also move toward a greater percentage of females with extreme desires, because the granddaughters of females preferring the favored extreme will be more numerous than the granddaughters of females favoring other male attributes. Until countervailing selection intervenes, this female preference will, as first pointed out by Fisher (1958), move both male attributes and female preferences with increasing rapidity in the same direction. The female preference is capable of overcoming some countervailing selection on the male's ability to survive to reproduce, if the increased reproductive success of the favored males when mature offsets their chances of surviving to reproduce.

There are at least two conditions under which one might expect females to have been selected to prefer the extreme male of a sample. When two species, recently speciated, come together, selection rapidly favors females who can discriminate the two species of males. This selection may favor females who prefer the appropriate extreme of an available sample, since such a mechanism would minimize mating mistakes. The natural selection of females with such a mechanism of choice would then initiate sexual selection in the same direction, which in the absence of countervailing selection would move the two male phenotypes further apart than necessary to avoid mating error.

Natural selection will always favor female ability to discriminate male sexual competence, and the safest way to do this is to take the extreme of a sample, which would lead to runaway selection for male display. This case is discussed in more detail below.

SELECTION FOR OTHERWISE FUNCTIONAL MALE ATTRIBUTES

As in other aspects of sexual selection, the degree of male investment in the offspring is important and should affect the criteria of female choice. Where the male invests little or nothing beyond his sex cells, the female has only to decide which male offers the ideal genetic material for her offspring, assuming that male is willing and capable of offering it. This question can be broken down to that of which genes will promote the survival of her offspring and which will lead to reproductive success, assuming the offspring survive to adulthood. Implicit in these questions may be the relation between her genes and those of her mate: do they complement each other?

Where the male invests parental care, female choice may still involve the above questions of the male's genetic contribution but should also involve, perhaps primarily involve, questions of the male's willingness and ability to be a good parent. Will he invest in the offspring? If willing, does he have the ability to contribute much? Again, natural selection may favor female attentiveness to complementarity: do the male's parental abilities complement her own? Can the two parents work together smoothly? Where males invest considerable parental care, most of the same considerations that apply to female choice also apply to male choice. The alternate criteria for female choice are summarized in Table 7.1.

SEXUAL COMPETENCE

Even in males selected for rapid, repeated copulations the ability to do so is not unlimited. After three or four successive ejaculations, for example, the concentration of spermatozoa is very low in some male chickens (Parker, McKenzie & Kempster 1940), yet males may copulate as often as 30 times in an hour (Guhl 1951). Likewise, sperm is completely depleted in male *Drosophila melanogaster* after the fifth consecutive mating on the same day (Demerec & Kaufmann 1941, Kaufmann & Demerec 1942). Duration of copulation is cut in half by the third copulation of a male dung fly on the same day and duration of copulation probably correlates with sperm transferred (Parker 1970a). In some species females may be able to judge whether additional sperm are needed (for example, house flies; Riemann, Moen & Thorson 1967) or whether a copulation is at least behaviorally successful (for example, sea lions; Peterson & Bartholomew 1967), but in many species females may guarantee reproductive success by mat-

Table 7.1. Theoretical criteria for female choice of males

I.   All species, but especially those showing little or no male parental investment
  A.   Ability to fertilize eggs
    (1)   correct species
    (2)   correct sex
    (3)   mature
    (4)   sexually competent
  B.   Quality of genes
    (1)   ability of genes to survive
    (2)   reproductive ability of genes
    (3)   complementarity of genes
II. Only those species showing male parental investment
  C.   Quality of parental care
    (1)   willingness of male to invest
    (2)   ability of male to invest
    (3)   complementarity of parental attributes

ing with those males who are most vigorous in courtship, since this vigor may correlate with an adequate supply of sperm and a willingness to transfer it.

When the male is completely depleted, there is no advantage in his copulating but selection against the male doing so should be much weaker than selection against the female who accepts him. At intermediate sperm levels, the male may gain something from copulation, but the female should again be selected to avoid him. Since there is little advantage to the male in concealing low reproductive powers, a correlation between vigor of courtship and sperm level would not be surprising. Females would then be selected to be aroused by vigorous courtship. If secondary structures used in display, such as bright feathers, heighten the appearance of vigorousness, then selection may rapidly accentuate such structures. Ironically, the male who has been sexually most successful may not be ideal to mate with if this success has temporarily depleted his sperm supply. Males should not only be selected to recover rapidly from copulations but to give convincing evidence that they have recovered. It is not absurd to suppose that in some highly promiscuous species the most attractive males may be those who, having already been observed to mate with several females, are still capable of vigorous display toward a female in the process of choosing.

GOOD GENES

Maynard Smith (1956) has presented evidence that, given a choice, female *Drosophila subobscura* discriminate against inbred males of that species and that this behavior is adaptive: females who do not so discriminate leave about ¼ as many viable offspring as those who do. Females may

choose on the basis of courtship behavior: inbred males are apparently un-able to perform a step of the typical courtship as rapidly as outbred males. The work is particularly interesting in revealing that details of courtship behavior may reveal a genetic trait, such as being inbred, but it suffers from an artificiality. If inbred males produce mostly inviable offspring, then, even in the absence of female discrimination, one would expect very few, if any, inbred males to be available in the adult population. Only be-cause such males were artificially selected were there large numbers to ex-pose to females in choice experiments. Had that selection continued one generation further, females who chose inbred males would have been the successful females.

Maynard Smith's study highlights the problem of analyzing the potential for survival of one's partner's genes: one knows of the adult males one meets that they have survived to adulthood; by what criterion does one de-cide who has survived better? If the female can judge age, then all other things being equal, she should choose older males, as they have demon-strated their capacity for long survival. All other things may not be equal, however, if old age correlates with lowered reproductive success, as it does in some ungulates (Fraser 1968) through reduced ability to impregnate. If the female can judge the physical condition of males she encounters, then she can discriminate against undernourished or sickly individuals, since they will be unlikely to survive long, but discrimination against such individuals may occur for other reasons, such as the presumed lowered ability of such males to impregnate successfully due to the weakened condition.

In some very restricted ways it may be possible to second-guess the future action of natural selection. For example, stabilizing selection has been demonstrated to be a common form of natural selection (see Mayr 1963) and under this form of selection females may be selected to exercise their own discrimination against extreme types, thereby augmenting the effects of any stabilizing selection that has occurred prior to reproduction. Mason (1969) has demonstrated that females of the California Oak Moth discriminate against males extreme in some traits, but no one has shown independent stabilizing selection for the same traits. Discrimination against extreme types may run counter to selection for diversity; the pos-sible role of female choice in increasing or decreasing diversity is discussed below as a form of complementarity.

Reproductive success, independent of ability to survive is easier for the female to gauge because she can directly observe differences in reproduc-tive success before she chooses. A striking feature of data on lek behavior of birds is the tendency for females to choose males who, through competi-tion with other males, have already increased their likelihood of mating. Female choice then greatly augments the effects of male–male competition. On the lek grounds there is an obvious reason why this may be adaptive.

By mating with the most dominant male a female can usually mate more quickly, and hence more safely, than if she chooses a less dominant individual whose attempts at mating often result in interference from more dominant males. Scott (1942) has shown that many matings with less dominant individuals occur precisely when the more dominant individuals are unable, either because of sexual exhaustion or a long waiting line, to quickly service the female. Likewise, Robel (1970) has shown that a dominant female prevents less dominant individuals from mating until she has mated, presumably to shorten her stay and to copulate while the dominant male still can. A second reason why choosing to mate with more dominant males may be adaptive is that the female allies her genes with those of a male who, by his ability to dominate other males, has demonstrated his reproductive capacity. It is a common observation in cervids that females placidly await the outcome of male strife to go with the victor. DeVore (1965) has quantified the importance of dominance in male baboon sexual success, emphasizing the high frequency of interference by other males in copulation and the tendency for female choice, when it is apparent, to be exercised in favor of dominant males. That previous success may increase the skill with which males court females is suggested by work on the black grouse (Kruijt, Bossema and deVos, *in press*), and females may prefer males skillful at courting in part because their skill correlates with previous success.

In many species the ability of the male to find receptive females quickly may be more important than any ability to dominate other males. If this is so, then female choice may be considerably simplified: the first male to reach her establishes thereby a *prima facie* case for his reproductive abilities. In dung flies, in which females must mate quickly while the dung is fresh, male courtship behavior is virtually nonexistent (Parker 1970a). The male who first leaps on top of a newly arrived female copulates with her. This lack of female choice may also result from the *prima facie* case the first male establishes for his sound reproductive abilities. Such a mechanism of choice may of course conflict with other criteria requiring a sampling of the male population, but in some species this sampling could be carried out prior to becoming sexually receptive.

There are good data supporting the importance of complementarity of genes to female choice. Assortative mating in the wild has been demonstrated for several bird species (Cooch & Beardmore 1959, O'Donald 1959) and disassortative mating for a bird species and a moth species (Lowther 1961, Sheppard 1952). Petit & Ehrman (1969) have demonstrated the tendency in several *Drosophila* species for females to prefer mating with the rare type in choice experiments, a tendency which in the wild leads to a form of complementarity, since the female is presumably usually of the common type. These studies can all be explained plausibly in terms of selection for greater or lesser genetic diversity, the female choosing a male

whose genes complement her own, producing an "optimal" diversity in the offspring. _____

GOOD PARENT

Where male parental care is involved, females certainly sometimes choose males on the basis of their ability to contribute parental care. Orians (1969), for example, has recently reviewed arguments and data suggesting that polygyny evolves in birds when becoming the second mate of an already mated male provides a female with greater male parental contribution than becoming the first mate of an unmated male would. This will be so, for example, if the already mated male defends a territory considerably superior to the unmated male's. Variability in territory quality certainly occurs in most territorial species, even in those in which territories are not used for feeding. Tinbergen (1967), for example, has documented the tendency for central territories in the black-headed gull to be less vulnerable to predation. If females compete among themselves for males with good territories, or if males exercise choice as well, then female choice for parental abilities will again tend to augment intra-male competition for the relevant resources (such as territories). The most obvious form of this selection is the inability of a nonterritory holding male to attract a female.

Female choice may play a role in selecting for increased male parental investment. In the roadrunner, for example, food caught by a male seems to act on him as an aphrodisiac: he runs to a female and courts her with the food, suggesting that the female would not usually mate without such a gift (Calder 1967). Male parental care invested after copulation is presumably not a result of female choice after copulation, since she no longer has anything to bargain with. In most birds, however, males defend territories which initially attract the females (Lack 1940). Since males without suitable territories are unable to attract a mate, female choice may play a role in maintaining male territorial behavior. Once a male has invested in a territory in order to attract a mate his options after copulating with her may be severely limited. Driving the female out of his territory would almost certainly result in the loss of his investment up until then. He could establish another territory, and in some species some males do this (von Haartman 1951), but in many species this may be difficult, leaving him with the option of aiding, more or less, the female he has already mated. Female choice, then, exercised *before* copulation, may indirectly force the male to increase his parental investment *after* copulation.

There is no reason to suppose that males do not compete with each other to pair with those females whose breeding potential appears to be high. Darwin (1871) argued that females within a species breeding early for nongenetic reasons (such as being in excellent physical condition) would produce more offspring than later breeders. Sexual selection, he argued,

would favor males competing with each other to pair with such females. Fisher (1958) has nicely summarized this argument, but Lack (1968, p. 157) dismisses it as being "not very cogent," since "the date of breeding in birds has been evolved primarily in relation to two different factors, namely the food supply for the young and the capacity of the female to form eggs." These facts are, of course, fully consistent with Darwin's argument, since Darwin is merely supposing a developmental plasticity that allows females to breed earlier if they are capable of forming the eggs, and data presented elsewhere in Lack (1968) support the argument that females breeding earlier for nongenetic reasons (such as age or duration of pair bond) are more successful than those breeding later (see also, for example, Fisher 1969, and Coulson 1966). Goforth & Baskett (1971) have recently shown that dominant males in a penned Mourning Dove population preferentially pair with dominant females; such pairs breed earlier and produce more surviving young than less dominant pairs. It would be interesting to have detailed data from other species on the extent to which males do compete for females with higher breeding potential. Males are certainly often initially aggressive to females intruding in their territories, and this aggressiveness may act as a sieve, admitting only those females whose high motivation correlates with early egg laying and high reproductive potential. There is good evidence that American women tend to marry up the socioeconomic scale, and physical attractiveness during adolescence facilitates such movement (Elder 1969). Until recently such a bias in female choice presumably correlated with increased reproductive success, but the value, if any, of female beauty for male reproductive success is obscure.

The importance of choice by both female and male for a mate who will not desert nor participate in sex outside the pair bond has been emphasized in an earlier section ("Desertion and cuckoldry"). The importance of complementarity is documented in a study by Coulson (1966).

CRITERIA OTHER THAN MALE CHARACTERS

In many species male–male competition combined with the importance of some resource in theory unrelated to males, such as oviposition sites may mitigate against female choice for male characters. In the dragonfly *Parthemis tenera* males compete with each other to control territories containing good oviposition sites, probably because such sites are a predictable place at which to find receptive females and because sperm competition in insects usually favors the last male to copulate prior to oviposition (Parker 1970b). It is clear that the females choose the oviposition site and not the male (Jacobs 1955), and male courtship is geared to advertise good oviposition sites. A male maintaining a territory containing a good oviposi-

Parental Investment and Sexual Selection 173

tion site is *not* thereby contributing parental investment unless that maintenance benefits the resulting young.

Female choice for oviposition sites may be an especially important determinant of male competition in those species, such as frogs and salamanders. showing external fertilization. Such female choice almost certainly predisposed these species to the evolution of male parental investment. Female choice for good oviposition sites would tend to favor any male investment in improving the site, and if attached to the site to attract other females the male would have the option of caring more or less for those eggs already laid. A similar argument was advanced above for birds. Internal fertilization and development mitigate against evolution of male parental care in mammals, since female choice can then usually only operate to favor male courtship feeding, which in herbivores would be nearly valueless. Female choice may also favor males who mate away from oviposition sites if so doing reduced the probability of predation.

Where females are clumped in space the effects of male competition may render female choice almost impossible. In a monkey troop a female preference for a less dominant male may never lead to sexual congress if the pair are quickly broken up and attacked by more dominant males. Apparent female acquiescence in the results of male–male competition may reflect this factor as much as the plausible female preference for the male victor outlined above.

Summary

The relative parental investment of the sexes in their young is the key variable controlling the operation of sexual selection. Where one sex invests considerably more than the other, members of the latter will compete among themselves to mate with members of the former. Where investment is equal, sexual selection should operate similarly on the two sexes. The pattern of relative parental investment in species today seems strongly influenced by the early evolutionary differention into mobile sex cells fertilizing immobile ones, and sexual selection acts to mold the pattern of relative parental investment. The time sequence of parental investment analyzed by sex is an important parameter affecting species in which both sexes invest considerable parental care: the individual initially investing more (usually the female) is vulnerable to desertion. On the other hand, in species with internal fertilization and strong male parental investment, the male is always vulnerable to cuckoldry. Each vulnerability has led to the evolution of adaptations to decrease the vulnerability and to counter-adaptations.

Females usually suffer higher mortality rates than males in monogamous birds. but in nonmonogamous birds and all other groups, males usually

suffer higher rates. The chromosomal hypothesis is unable to account for the data. Instead, an adaptive interpretation can be advanced based on the relative parental investment of the sexes. In species with little or no male parental investment, selection usually favors male adaptations that lead to high reproductive success in one or more breeding seasons at the cost of increased mortality. Male competition in such species can only be analyzed in detail when the distribution of females in space and time is properly described. Data from field studies suggest that in some species, size, mobility, experience and metabolic rate are important to male reproductive success.

Female choice can augment or oppose mortality selection. Female choice can only lead to runaway change in male morphology when females choose by a relative rather than absolute standard, and it is probably sometimes adaptive for females to so choose. The relative parental investment of the sexes affects the criteria of female choice (and of male choice). Throughout, I emphasize that sexual selection favors different male and female reproductive strategies and that even when ostensibly cooperating in a joint task male and female interests are rarely identical.

References

Bartholomew, G. A. 1970. A model for the evolution of pinniped polygyny. *Evolution* 24: 546–559.

Bastock, M. 1967. *Courtship: An ethological study*. Chicago: Aldine.

Bateman, A. J. 1948. Intrasexual selection in Drosophila. *Heredity* 2: 349–368.

Beebe, W. 1925. The variegated Tinamou *Crypturus variegatus variegatus* (Gmelin). *Zoologica* 6: 195–227.

Beer, J. R., L. D. Frenzel, & C. F. MacLeod. 1958. Sex ratios of some Minnesota rodents. *American Midland Naturalist* 59: 518–524.

Beverton, J. M., & S. J. Holt. 1959. A review of the lifespan and mortality rates of fish in nature and their relation to growth and other physiological characteristics. In *The lifespan of animals*, ed. G. Wolstenhome & M. O'Connor, pp. 142–177. London: J. & A. Churchill.

Blair, W. F. 1960. *The Rusty Lizard*. Austin: University of Texas.

Bouliere, Z. F., & Verschuren, J. 1960. *Introduction a l'ecologie des ongules du Parc National Albert*. Bruxelles: Institut des Parcs Nationaux du Congo Belge.

Bragg, A. N. 1965. *Gnomes of the night*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Brown, L. E. 1966. Home range and movement of small mammals. *Symposium of the Zoological Society of London* 18: 111–142.

Bruce, H. 1960. A block to pregnancy in the mouse caused by the proximity of strange males. *Journal of Reproduction and Fertility* 1: 96–103.

Burns, J. M. 1968. Mating frequency in natural populations of skippers and butterflies as determined by spermatophore counts. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 61: 852–859.

Calder, W. A. 1967. Breeding behavior of the Roadrunner, *Geococcyx californianus*. *Auk* 84: 597–598.

Carpenter, C. 1967. Aggression and social structure in Iguanid lizards. In *Lizard ecology*, ed. W. Milstead. Columbia, Mo.: University of Missouri.

Chapman, A. B., L. E. Casida, & A. Cote. 1938. Sex ratios of fetal calves. *Proceedings of the American Society of Animal Production* 1938, pp. 303–304.

Cooch, F. G., & M. A. Beardmore. 1959. Assortative mating and reciprocal difference in the Blue-Snow Goose complex. *Nature* 183: 1833–1834.

Corbet, P., C. Longfield, & W. Moore. 1960. *Dragonflies.* London: Collins.

Coulson, J. C. 1960. A study of the mortality of the starling based on ringing recoveries. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 29: 251–271.

———. 1966. The influence of the pair-bond and age on the breeding biology of the kittiwake gull *Rissa tridactyla. Journal of Animal Ecology* 35: 269–279.

Cowan, I. M. 1950. Some vital statistics of big game on overstocked mountain range. *Transactions of North American Wildlife Conference* 15: 581–588.

Darley, J. 1971. Sex ratio and mortality in the brown-headed cowbird. *Auk* 88: 560–566.

Darwin, C. 1871. *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex.* London: John Murray.

Demerec, M., & Kaufmann, B. P. 1941. Time required for *Drosophila* males to exhaust the supply of mature sperm. *American Naturalist* 75: 366–379.

DeVore, I. 1965. Male dominance and mating behavior in baboons. In *Sex and behavior,* ed. Frank Beach. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

deVos, A., P. Broky, & V. Geist. 1967. A review of social behavior of the North American Cervids during the reproductive period. *American Midland Naturalist* 77: 390–417.

Dunn, E. R. 1941. Notes on *Dendrobates auratus. Copeia* 1941, pp. 88–93.

Eaton, T. H. 1941. Notes on the life history of *Dendrobates auratus. Copeia* 1941, pp. 93–95.

Eisenberg, J. F. 1965. The social organizations of mammals. *Handbuch der Zoologie* 10 (7): 1–92.

Elder, G. 1969. Appearance and education in marriage mobility. *American Sociological Review* 34: 519–533.

Emlen, J. M. 1968. A note on natural selection and the sex-ratio. *American Naturalist* 102: 94–95.

Emlen, J. T. 1940. Sex and age ratios in the survival of the California Quail. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 4: 91–99.

Emlen, S. T. 1968. Territoriality in the bullfrog, *Rana catesbeiana. Copeia* 1968, pp. 240–243.

Engelmann, F. 1970. *The physiology of insect reproduction.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Fiedler, K. 1954. Vergleichende Verhaltensstudien an Seenadeln, Schlangennadeln und Seepferdchen (Syngnathidae). *Zeitsch. Tierpsych.* 11: 358–416. 358–416.

Fisher, H. 1969. Eggs and egg-laying in the Laysan Albatross, *Diomedea immutabilis. Condor* 71: 102–112.

Fisher, R. A. 1958. *The genetical theory of natural selection.* New York: Dover Publications.

Fraser, A. F. 1968. *Reproductive behavior in Ungulates.* London and New York: Academic Press.

Gadgil, M., & W. H. Bossert. 1970. Life historical consequences of natural selection. *American Naturalist* 104: 1–24.

Goethals, G. W. 1971. Factors affecting permissive and nonpermissive rules regarding premarital sex. In *Studies in the sociology of sex: a book of readings,* ed. J. M. Henslin. New York: Appleton-Century-Croft.

Goforth, W., & T. Baskett. 1971. Social organization of penned Mourning Doves. *Auk* 88: 528–542.

ROBERT L. TRIVERS

Guhl, A. M. 1951. Measurable differences in mating behavior of cocks. *Poultry Science* 30: 687.

Haartman, L. von. 1951. Successive polygamy. *Behavior* 3: 256–274.

————. 1969. Nest-site and evolution of polygamy in European Passerine birds. *Ornis Fennica* 46: 1–12.

Hamilton, J. B. 1948. The role of testicular secretions as indicated by the effects of castration in man and by studies of pathological conditions and the short lifespan associated with maleness. *Recent Progress in Hormone Research* 3: 257–322.

Hamilton, J. B., & M. Johansson. 1965. Influence of sex chromosomes and castration upon lifespan: studies of meal moths, a species in which sex chromosomes are homogenous in males and heterogenous in females. *Anatomical Record* 24: 565–578.

Hamilton, J. B., & G. E. Mestler. 1969. Mortality and survival: comparison of eunuchs with intact men and women in a mentally retarded population. *Journal of Gerontology* 24: 395–411.

Hamilton, J. B., R. S. Hamilton, & G. E. Mestler. 1969. Duration of life and causes of death in domestic cats: influence of sex, gonadectomy and inbreeding. *Journal of Gerontology* 24: 427–437.

Hamilton, W. D. 1964. The genetical evolution of social behavior. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 7: 1–52.

————. 1967. Extraordinary sex ratios. *Science* 156: 477–488.

Harris, V. A. 1964. *The life of the Rainbow Lizard*. Hutchinson Tropical Monographs. London.

Hays, F. A. 1947. Mortality studies in Rhode Island Reds II. *Massachusetts Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin* 442: 1–8.

Hershkovitz, P. 1966. Letter to *Science* 153: 362.

Hirth, H. F. 1963. The ecology of two lizards on a tropical beach. *Ecological Monographs* 33: 83–112.

Höhn, E. O. 1967. Observations on the breeding biology of Wilson's Phalarope (*Steganopus tricolor*) in Central Alberta. *Auk* 84: 220–244.

Huxley, J. S. 1938. The present standing of the theory of sexual selection. In *Evolution*, ed. G. DeBeer. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Jacobs, M. 1955. Studies in territorialism and sexual selection in dragonflies. *Ecology* 36: 566–586.

Jensen, G. D., Bobbitt, R. A. & Gordon, B. N. 1968. Sex differences in the development of independence of infant monkeys. *Behavior* 30: 1–14.

Johns, J. E. 1969. Field studies of Wilson's Phalarope. *Auk* 86: 660–670.

Kaufmann, B. P., & Demerec, M. 1942. Utilization of sperm by the female *Drosophila melanogaster*. *American Naturalist* 76: 445–469.

Kessel, E. L. 1955. The mating activities of baloon flies. *Systematic Zoology* 4: 97–104.

Kikkawa, J. 1964. Movement, activity and distribution of small rodents *Clethrionomys glareolus* and *Apodemus sylvaticus* in woodland. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 33: 259–299.

Kluijver, H. N. 1933. Bijrage tot de biologie en de ecologie van den spreeuw (*Sturnus vulgaris* L.) gedurende zijn voortplantingstijd. *Versl. Plantenziektenkundigen dienst, Wageningen* 69: 1–145.

Koivisto, I. 1965. Behaviour of the black grouse during the spring display. *Finnish Game Research* 26: 1–60.

Kolman, W. 1960. The mechanism of natural selection for the sex ratio. *American Naturalist* 94: 373–377.

Parental Investment and Sexual Selection   177

Kopstein, F. 1941. Über Sexualdimorphismus bei Malaiischen Schlangen. *Temminckia*, 6: 109–185.

Kruijt, J. P, I. Bossema, & G. J. deVos. *In Press*. Factors underlying choice of mate in Black Grouse. *15th Congr. Intern. Ornith.*, The Hague, 1970.

Kruijt, J. P., & J. A. Hogan. 1967. Social behavior on the lek in Black Grouse, *Lyrurus tetrix tetrix* (L.) *Ardea* 55: 203–239.

Lack, D. 1940. Pair-formation in birds. *Condor* 42: 269–286.

————. 1954. *The natural regulation of animal numbers*. New York: Oxford University Press.

————. 1968. *Ecological adaptations for breeding in birds*. London: Methuen.

LeBoeuf, B. J., & R. S. Peterson. 1969. Social status and mating activity in elephant seals. *Science* 163: 91–93.

Lee, R., 1969, King Bushman violence. Paper presented at meeting of American Anthropological Association, November, 1969.

Leigh, E. G. 1970. Sex ratio and differential mortality between the sexes. *American Naturalist* 104: 205–210.

Lin, N. 1963. Territorial behavior in the Cicada killer wasp *Sphecius spheciosus* (Drury) (Hymenoptera: Sphecidae.) I. *Behaviour* 20: 115–133.

Lindburg, D. G. 1969. Rhesus monkeys: mating season mobility of adult males. *Science* 166: 1176–1178.

Lowther, J. K. 1961. Polymorphism in the white-throated sparrow, *Zonotrichia albicollis* (Gmelin). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 39: 281–292.

Ludwig, W., & C. Boost. 1951. Über Beziehungen zwischen Elternalter, Wurfgrösse und Geschlechtsverhältnis bei Hunden. *Zeitschrift fur indukt. Abstammungs und Vererbungslehre* 83: 383–391.

Madison, D. M., & Shoop, C. R. 1970. Homing behavior, orientation, and home range of salamanders tagged with tantalum–182. *Science* 168: 1484–1487.

Mason, L. G. 1969. Mating selection in the California Oak Moth (Lepidoptera, Droptidae). *Evolution* 23: 55–58.

Maynard Smith, J. 1956. Fertility, mating behaviour and sexual selection in *Drosophila subobscura. Journal of Genetics* 54: 261–279.

Mayr, E. 1939. The sex ratio in wild birds. *American Naturalist* 73: 156–179.

————. 1963. *Animal species and evolution*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Miller, R. S. 1958. A study of a wood mouse population in Wytham Woods, Berkshire. *Journal of Mammalogy* 39: 477–493.

Morris, D. 1952. Homosexuality in the Ten-spined Stickleback (*Pygosteus pungitius*). *Behaviour* 4: 233–261.

————. 1967. *The naked ape*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Myers, J., & C. Krebs. 1971. Sex ratios in open and closed vole populations: demographic implications. *American Naturalist* 105: 325–344.

Nevo, R. W. 1956. A behavior study of the red-winged blackbird. 1. Mating and nesting activities. *Wilson Bulletin* 68: 5–37.

O'Donald, P. 1959. Possibility of assortative mating in the Arctic Skua. *Nature* 183: 1210.

————. 1962. The theory of sexual selection. *Heredity* 17: 541–552.

Orians, G. H. 1969. On the evolution of mating systems in birds and mammals. *American Naturalist* 103: 589–604.

Parker, G. A. 1970a. The reproductive behavior and the nature of sexual selection in *Scatophaga stercoraria* L. (Diptera: Scatophagidae) 2. The fertilization rate and the spatial and temporal relationships of each sex around the site of mating and oviposition. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 39: 205–228.

————. 1970b. Sperm competition and its evolutionary consequences in the insects. *Biological Reviews* 45: 525–568.

————.1970c. The reproductive behaviour and the nature of sexual selection in *Scatophaga stercoraria* L. (Diptera: Scatophagidae) VI. The adaptive significance of emigration from the oviposition site during the phase of genital contact. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 40: 215–233.

————. 1970d. The reproductive behaviour and the nature of sexual selection in *Scatophaga stercoraria* L. (Diptera: Scatophagidae). VI. The adaptive sig-evolution of the passive phase. *Evolution* 24: 774–788.

Parker, J. E., F. F. McKenzie, & H. L. Kempster. 1940. Observations on the sexual behavior of New Hampshire males. *Poultry Science* 19: 191–197.

Peterson, R. S., & G. A. Bartholomew. 1967. *The natural history and behavior of the California Sea Lion.* Special Publications #1, American Society of Mammalogists.

Petit, C., & L. Ehrman. 1969. Sexual selection in *Drosophila.* In *Evolutionary biology,* vol. 5, ed. T. Dobzhansky, M. K. Hecht, W. C. Steere. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Potts, G. R. 1969. The influence of eruptive movements, age. population size and other factors on the survival of the Shag (*Phalacrocorax aristotelis* L.). *Journal of Animal Ecology* 38: 53–102.

Rand, A. S. 1967. Ecology and social organization in the Iguanid lizard *Anolis lineatopus. Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus.* 122: 1–79.

Riemann, J. G., D. J. Moen, & B. J. Thorson. 1967. Female monogamy and its control in house flies. *Insect Physiology* 13: 407–418.

Rivero, J. A., & A. E. Estevez. 1969. Observations on the agonistic and breeding behavior of *Leptodactylus pentadactylus* and other amphibian species in Venezuela. *Breviora No.* 321: 1–14.

Robel, R. J. 1966. Booming territory size and mating success of the Greater Prairie Chicken (*Tympanuchus cupido pinnatus*). *Animal Behaviour* 14: 328–331.

Robel, R. J. 1970. Possible role of behavior in regulating greater prairie chicken populations. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 34: 306–312.

Robinette, W. L., J. S. Gashwiler, J. B. Low, & D. A. Jones. 1957. Differential mortality by sex and age among mule deer. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 21: 1–16.

Rockstein, M. 1959. The biology of ageing insects. In *The lifespan of animals,* ed. G. Wolstenhome & M. O'Connor, pp. 247–264. London: J. A. Churchill.

Rowley, I. 1965. The life history of the Superb Blue Wren *Malarus cyaneus. Emu* 64: 251–297.

Royama, T. 1966. A re-interpretation of courtship feeding. *Bird Study* 13: 116–129.

Sadleir, R. 1967. *The ecology of reproduction in wild and domestic mammals.* London: Methuen.————

Savage, R. M. 1961. *The ecology and life history of the common frog.* London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons.

Schein, M. W. 1950. The relation of sex ratio to physiological age in the wild brown rat. *American Naturalist* 84: 489–496.

Schoener, T. W. 1967. The ecological significance of sexual dimorphism in size in the lizard *Anolis conspersus. Science* 155: 474–477.

————. 1971. Theory of feeding strategies. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics,* 2: 369–404.

Scott, J. W. 1942. Mating behavior of the Sage Grouse. *Auk* 59: 477–498.

Parental Investment and Sexual Selection 179

Selander, R. K. 1965. On mating systems and sexual selection. *American Naturalist* 99: 129–141.

————. 1966. Sexual dimorphism and differential niche utilization in birds. *Condor* 68: 113–151.

Sellers, A., H. Goodman, J. Marmorston, & M. Smith. 1950. Sex differences in proteinuria in the rat. *American Journal of Physiology* 163: 662–667.

Sheppard, P. M. 1952. A note on non-random mating in the moth *Panaxia dominula*. (L.) *Heredity* 6: 239–241.

Stephens, M. N. 1952. Seasonal observations on the Wild Rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus cuniculus* L.) in West Wales. *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* 122: 417–434.

Stokes, A., & H. Williams. 1971. Courtship feeding in gallinaceous birds. *Auk* 88: 543–559.

Sugiyama, U. 1967. Social organization of Hanuman langurs. In *Social communication among primates*, ed. S. Altmann. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Taber, R. D., & R. F. Dasmann. 1954. A sex difference in mortality in young Columbian Black-tailed Deer. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 18: 309–315.

Tilley, S. 1968. Size-fecundity relationships and their evolutionary implications in five Desmognathine salamanders. *Evolution* 22: 806–816.

Tinbergen, N. 1935. Field observations of East Greenland birds. 1. The behavior of the Red-necked Phalarope (*Phalaropus lobatus* L.) in Spring. *Ardea* 24: 1–42.

————. 1967. Adaptive features of the Black-headed Gull *Larus ridibundus* L. *Proceedings of the International Ornithological Congress* 14: 43–59.

Tinkle D. W. 1967. The life and demography of the Side-blotched Lizar' *'ta stansburiana*. *Miscellaneous Publications of the Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan* 132: 1–182.

Tinkle, D., H. Wilbur, & S. Tilley. 1970. Evolutionary strategies in lizard reproduction. *Evolution* 24: 55–74.

Tyndale-Biscoe, C. H. and R. F. C. Smith. 1969. Studies on the marsupial glider, *Schoinobates volans* (Kerr). 2. Population structure and regulatory mechanisms. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 38: 637–650.

Van Lawick-Goodall, J. 1968. The behavior of free-living chimpanzees in the Gombe Stream Reserve. *Animal Behaviour Monographs* 1: 161–311.

Verner, J. 1964. Evolution of polygamy in the long-billed marsh wren. *Evolution* 18: 252–261.

————. 1965. Selection for sex ratio. *American Naturalist* 99: 419–421.

Verner, J., & M. Willson. 1969. Mating systems, sexual dimorphism, and the role of male North American passerine birds in the nesting cycle. *Ornithological Monographs* 9: 1–76.

Williams, G. C. 1966. *Adaptation and natural selection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Willson, M., & E. Pianka. 1963. Sexual selection, sex ratio, and mating system. *American Naturalist* 97: 405–406.

Wood, D. H. 1970. An ecological study of *Antechinus stuartii* (Marsupialia) in a Southeast Queensland rain forest. *Australian Journal of Zoology* 18: 185–207.