

1 **Effect of food abundance on aggressiveness and territory size of juvenile rainbow trout,**

2 *Oncorhynchus mykiss*

3

4 Asra Toobaie*, James W.A. Grant

5

6 *Department of Biology, Concordia University, Montréal, Qc, Canada*

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

* Correspondence : A. Toobaie, Department of Biology, Concordia University, 7141
Sherbrooke street West, Montreal, QC H2B 1R6, Canada

E-mail addresses: a_toob@live.concordia.ca (A. Toobaie), grant@alcor.concordia.ca (J.
Grant).

15 How food abundance affects (1) whether or not individuals defend territories and (2) what size of
16 territory is defended, are crucial to understanding the role that territoriality plays in regulating
17 the population size of stream-dwelling salmonids. The threshold model of feeding territoriality
18 predicts that territorial defence will be most intense at intermediate levels of food abundance,
19 whereas optimal territory-size models predict that territory size will decrease with increasing
20 food abundance. While the latter prediction has been supported by several studies of stream
21 salmonids, too few levels of food abundance were typically used to describe the exact
22 relationship between territory size and food abundance. Hence, to quantify the relationship
23 between the intensity of defence and territory size in relation to food abundance, we manipulated
24 food abundance over a broad range of values (0.62, 1.25, 2.5, 5, 10, and 20% of the fish wet
25 body weight in dry food per day) in artificial stream channels (1.92 x 0.77m), while monitoring
26 the territorial behaviour of juvenile rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss*. As predicted by the
27 threshold model of feeding territoriality, the frequency of territorial aggression was highest at
28 intermediate levels of food abundance, but fish never ceased defending territories entirely,
29 particularly at food densities likely found in the wild. Also as predicted, the aggressive radius of
30 rainbow trout decreased significantly, but only by 30% over a 32-fold increase in food
31 abundance, equivalent to a 51% decrease in territory size. Our results suggest that territory size
32 was relatively insensitive to changes in food abundance, and may have a regulatory effect on
33 population density.

34

35 *Keywords:* juvenile salmonids, food density, territoriality, optimal territory size, aggressive
36 behaviour

37 The threshold model of feeding territoriality originally predicted that animals defend
38 territories between a lower and upper threshold of food abundance in an all-or-none fashion
39 (Carpenter & MacMillen 1976; Wilcox & Ruckdeschel 1982; Carpenter 1987). However, when
40 individual variation was incorporated into resource defense theory, a more continuous change in
41 aggression was predicted (Wolf 1978; Craig & Douglas 1986; Grant 1997). As food abundance
42 increases, the frequency or intensity of territorial aggression initially increases continuously from
43 low-intensity scramble competition to the infrequent defence of non-exclusive territories, to the
44 vigorous defence of exclusive territories, (Craig & Douglas 1986; Grant 1993) and then
45 decreases continuously as food becomes superabundant. Therefore, the threshold model of
46 territoriality, or its more continuous version, predict either an upper and lower threshold for
47 defence or a dome-shaped relationship between the frequency or intensity of territorial
48 aggression and food abundance, respectively (Grant 1993).

49 Considerable evidence of the variability in how frequently individuals defend territories
50 or whether or not territories are defended at all has now been documented in various taxa
51 (Wilcox & Ruckdeschel 1982; Monaghan & Metcalfe 1985; Lott 1991; Goldberg et al. 2001;
52 Grant et al. 2002()). While many studies show a decrease in aggression as food abundance
53 increases (i.e. the right side of the dome-shaped relationship: Magnuson 1962; Slaney &
54 Northcote 1974; Johnson et al. 2004), fewer studies have shown an increase in aggression as
55 food abundance initially increases (i.e. Newman 1956; Keenleyside & Yamamoto 1962), and
56 even fewer have documented the dome-shaped relationship (i.e. Wyman & Hotaling 1988; Grant
57 et al. 2002). Given that an individual defends a territory, optimality models (Hixon 1980;
58 Schoener 1983) predict that territory size will decrease with an increase in food abundance and

59 intruder pressure (Schoener 1983). These predictions have now been supported by many studies
60 in a variety of taxa defending both ephemeral and more permanent territories (Grant 1997;
61 Adams 2001).

62 Juvenile stream dwelling salmonids defend feeding territories against conspecifics under
63 laboratory and field conditions (Slaney & Northcote 1974; Dill et al. 1981; Keeley 2000; Imre et
64 al. 2004). Because territory size can limit the abundance of juvenile (Grant & Kramer 1990;
65 Elliott 1994) and adult (Jonsson et al. 1998) salmon, any environmental factor that reduces
66 territory size should increase their population density (Grant et al. 1998). Hence, describing the
67 exact relationship between territory size and important environmental variables, such as food
68 abundance, are crucial to understanding the role that territoriality plays in regulating population
69 size. The territory size of juvenile salmonids is inversely related to food abundance in both
70 observational field (Keeley & Grant 1995; Keeley & McPhail 1998) and experimental laboratory
71 (Slaney & Northcote 1974; Keeley 2000; but see Imre et al. 2004) studies. However, laboratory
72 studies typically use only three levels of food abundance, making it difficult to describe the
73 quantitative relationship between territory size and food abundance. If fish vary the size of their
74 territory to maintain a constant abundance of food, then territory size is predicted to be inversely
75 proportional to food abundance (a slope of -1.0), and salmonid abundance will be regulated by
76 food abundance rather than territorial behaviour (Grant et al. 1998). For example, a doubling of
77 food abundance would cause a halving of territory size and a doubling of salmonid abundance.
78 However, a review of the available data indicated that a doubling of food abundance causes
79 territories to shrink by only 25% (Grant et al. 1998).

80 Our study had two primary goals. First, we tested the competing predictions of the
81 threshold model of territoriality and the more continuous version of the model: (1) territoriality
82 will cease entirely when food abundance is low or in excess; or (2) the frequency of territorial
83 aggression will follow a dome-shaped relationship over a broad range of food abundance.
84 Second, we quantified the relationship between territory size and food abundance in juvenile
85 rainbow trout over a 32-fold increase in food abundance. Specifically, we tested these
86 competing predictions: with increasing food abundance territory size (3) does not change; (4)
87 decreases with a slope of -1.0; or (4) decreases with a slope that is shallower than -1.0.

88 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

89 90 *Experimental Subjects*

91
92 We obtained 400 young-of-the-year (YOY) rainbow trout from Pisciculture Arpents
93 Verts, Ste-Edwidge-de-Clifton, Québec, Canada. The trout were kept in holding tanks filled with
94 filtered, dechlorinated water on a 12-hour light: 12-hour dark cycle. Water temperature varied
95 throughout the experimental period from 14 to 22°C in May-July and from 14 to 18.7°C in
96 September-November, within the preferred temperature range for rainbow trout (Kerr & Lasenby
97 2000). The fish were fed daily with Vigor # 4 floating feed (Corey Feed Mills) while in holding
98 tanks. Three hundred and sixty trout were used in the experiments. After the experiments were
99 completed, all fish were euthanized with MS-222 as per animal care protocol AREC-2010-
100 GRAN issued to JWA Grant by the Concordia University Animal Research Ethics Committee in
101 accordance with the guidelines of the Canadian Council on Animal Care.

102

103 *Experimental Set up*

104

105 Experiments were carried out in artificial stream channels (1.92 x 0.77 m) filled with
106 continuously recirculating (approximately 10% new water per day), filtered, dechlorinated tap
107 water to a depth of approximately 20 cm (mean \pm SD = 19.7 \pm 2.1 cm) on a 12 hour light: 12
108 hour dark cycle (09:00-21:00). Current velocity was recorded at three different points in each
109 tank at the end of each trial (mean \pm SD = 0.032 \pm 0.017 m/s). Water temperature varied with the
110 outdoor temperature and was measured daily for each trial (mean \pm SD temperature = 17.23 \pm
111 2.43 °C). The bottom of each tank was covered with a layer of aquarium gravel overlaid by a
112 four by eight grid of cobbles (mean diameter = 7.84 cm; range = 5.7-10.5 cm). The cobbles were
113 placed with their centres 15.3 cm apart along the width and 21.3 cm apart along the length of the
114 tank and were used as visual markers to facilitate estimating the relative position of individuals
115 as well as to aid fish in establishing territories (La Manna & Eason 2003). Each stream channel
116 was stocked with 12 fish (mean \pm SD fork length = 4.20 \pm 0.22 cm; mean \pm SD mass = 1.18 \pm
117 0.28 g), equivalent to 8 YOY/m², corresponding to a high density for fish of this size in the wild
118 (Grant & Kramer 1990). The experimental treatments consisted of six different food levels: 0.62,
119 1.25, 2.5, 5, 10, and 20% of the fish wet body weight in dry food per day. Each food level was a
120 multiple of the highest amount of food typically encountered by juvenile salmonids in the wild
121 (Keeley 2000), equivalent to 5% of the wet body weight in dry food (Imre et al. 2004). Each of
122 the food treatments was replicated 5 times, with each trial lasting 7 days. The daily ration of food
123 (Optimum 0.7 granulated fish feed, Corey Feed Mills) was spread evenly on an automatic belt
124 feeder that dispensed the food at the upstream end of the channel at a constant rate over the 12-
125 hour “daylight” period.

126 *Data Collection*

127

128 Trials were carried out from May-July and September-November 2010. Prior to each
129 trial, the initial fork length (to the nearest mm) and body weight (to the nearest 0.01g) of
130 individuals were recorded. Individuals were given a unique mark with fluorescent elastomer tags
131 in the dorsal and/or caudal fins to allow for individual identification. Fish were given a
132 conditioning period of approximately 24 hours before the beginning of each trial to allow them
133 to acclimate to the new environment and to the method of food delivery. On the final day of each
134 trial, a scan sample was conducted in order to record the position of each fish on a schematic
135 map. Then, each individual was observed independently for 15 minutes to record the distance
136 and frequency of aggressive acts, such as charges, chases, and nips (sensu Keenleyside &
137 Yamamoto 1962), and the location of each station (sensu Steingrímsson & Grant 2008) from
138 which aggressive acts were initiated. The grid of labeled cobbles acted as a simple x-y coordinate
139 system, with the 0,0 (x,y) position in the downstream left corner of stream channel. Following
140 the observation, the final fork length and weight of all individuals were recorded. Specific
141 growth rate was calculated for all individuals as $G = (\log_e W_{\text{Final}} - \log_e W_{\text{Initial}}) / t$, where G is the
142 specific growth rate of weight (W) increase and t is the duration of the trial in days (Ricker
143 1975).

144 In each tank one dominant individual defended a large portion of the stream channel. Of
145 the remaining individuals, called subordinates, some were aggressive while being subordinate to
146 the dominant fish. Aggressive subordinates included territorial individuals that defended a fixed
147 area (sensu Maher & Lott 1995) and “floaters” (sensu Puckett & Dill 1985) that did not defend
148 fixed home ranges or maintain a station, but occasionally displayed aggressive behaviour.

149 Territories were relatively exclusive areas, except that subordinate territorial individuals did not
150 chase the dominant. The aggressive rate was obtained for all individuals in each tank by counting
151 the number of aggressive acts during focal animal observations.

152 In each tank, the defended area of all territorial fish was estimated by calculating the
153 individual's mean aggressive radius, the distance between the location of the chasee and the
154 position of the chaser when the aggressive act was initiated. We did not estimate territory size
155 using the minimum convex polygon technique because it is sensitive to sample size (i.e.
156 frequency of aggression; Schoener 1981), which varied considerably among treatments.
157 However, mean aggressive radius will be unbiased by differences in the frequency of aggression
158 between trials. The number of territorial subordinates per trial varied from 2 to 11, so we
159 calculated two territory size measurements for each trial: the average chase radius of the
160 dominant fish and the mean of average chase radii for each territorial subordinate. At the lowest
161 food abundance, the dominant fish did not show any aggressive behaviour over the course of
162 observation in 2 of the trials, and were excluded from the calculation of aggressive radius. To
163 compare our data with those from the literature, we estimated territory area by first calculating
164 the average aggressive radius for all the fish in a trial and then assuming that territories are
165 circular (see Keeley & Grant 1995).

166

167 *Statistical Analysis*

168

169 Because food levels increased in a geometric series, we \log_{10} -transformed the food
170 abundance before fitting regressions. To meet the assumptions of parametric tests, aggressive
171 radius was also \log_{10} -transformed. Because the dominant individual defended a relatively large

172 portion of the stream compared to other fish, a two-way ANOVA was used to determine whether
173 there was a main effect of dominance status (dominant versus subordinates) and food treatment
174 on aggressive radius and growth rate. Only significant interactions between dominance status
175 and food treatment were reported in the results.

176 Average water temperature and initial fork length of individuals were added as covariates
177 in all analyses. Initial fork length of the fish did not have a significant effect on any variable,
178 whereas water temperature had a significant effect on aggressive radius. Thus, we reported the
179 results of the two-way ANCOVA in the section on aggressive radius. SPSS ver. 12.0.1 was used
180 for all statistical tests ($\alpha = 0.05$).

181 **RESULTS**

182

183 *General Behaviour*

184

185 At the beginning of trials, fish initially gathered at the downstream end of the streamchannel.
186 Within 1-2 days, a dominant fish moved upstream and defended an area of the stream channel
187 directly downstream of the feeder. Subordinate territorial individuals (2-11 per trial) defended
188 territories immediately downstream of the dominant's defended area, whereas floaters existed in
189 the spaces between territories of other fish. Non-aggressive fish occupied undefended home
190 ranges at the downstream end of the stream channel. While dominant fish were initially larger
191 than subordinates (dominants: mean \pm SD mass = 1.30 ± 0.30 g; subordinates: mean \pm SD mass
192 = 1.17 ± 0.26 ; paired t-test: $t_{29} = 6.82$, $P < 0.001$), dominant fish were the largest in their groups
193 in only 13 of 30 cases. At the end of the 7-day trials, dominants were still larger than
194 subordinates (dominants: mean \pm SD mass = 2.28 ± 0.60 g; subordinates: mean \pm SD mass =
195 1.58 ± 0.67 g; paired t-test: $t_{29} = 10.37$, $P < 0.001$). and were the largest fish in 21 of 30 cases

196

197 *Frequency of Aggression*

198

199 The total number of aggressive acts over the course of the 15-minute observation period
200 differed significantly across the food treatments (Fig. 1a; ANOVA: $F_{5, 24} = 11.10$, $P < 0.001$).

201 The total rate of aggression initially increased with increasing food abundance and then declined
202 when food was abundant, as indicated by a significant quadratic term in a polynomial regression
203 after the linear term was first entered in the model ($t_{27} = 4.51$, $P < 0.001$). On average, the fish
204 engaged in 130 aggressive acts per 15-minute observation during the 5% treatment, whereas
205 aggression rate dropped to only 45 acts per 15 minutes when food was scarce (i.e. 0.63%) or
206 abundant (i.e. 10 and 20%). Fish were satiated and did not eat all the food during the 10 and 20%
207 treatments.

208 The dome-shaped pattern of total aggression was related to two other measures of
209 aggression. The percentage of individuals engaging in aggression also differed among food
210 treatments (ANOVA: $F_{5, 24} = 4.70$, $P = 0.004$). About 40% of individuals were aggressive at low
211 and high levels of food abundance compared to 60-70% at intermediate levels of food abundance
212 (Fig. 1b). The per capita rate of aggression by the aggressive fish also differed significantly
213 among the levels of food abundance (ANOVA: $F_{5, 24} = 11.03$, $P < 0.001$). As with the other
214 measures, the per capita rate of aggression initially increased with increasing food abundance,
215 peaked at intermediate level of food abundance, and then decreased (Fig. 1c). Both relationships
216 (Figs. 1b, c) were confirmed by a significant quadratic term in a polynomial regression ($t_{27} =$
217 3.18 , $P = 0.004$ and $t_{27} = 4.92$, $P < 0.001$, respectively).

218

219 *Territory Size*

220
221 Water temperature had a significant positive effect on aggressive radius (two-way
222 ANCOVA: $F_{1,43} = 10.07, P = 0.003$), and hence was included as a covariate in all analyses.
223 Mean aggressive radius of the focal fish differed significantly across food treatments (two-way
224 ANCOVA: $F_{5,43} = 3.46, P = 0.01$) and decreased with increasing food abundance for both
225 dominant and subordinate fish (Fig. 2; two-way ANCOVA, linear contrast: $P = 0.005$). Overall,
226 dominant fish had a larger aggressive radius than subordinate fish (two-way ANCOVA: $F_{1,43} =$
227 $12.50, P = 0.001$).

228
229 *Growth*

230
231 As food abundance increased, the growth rate of all subordinates increased at a faster rate
232 than dominant individuals as indicated by a significant interaction between dominance status and
233 food treatment (Fig. 3; two-way ANOVA: $F_{5,48} = 19.56, P < 0.001$). In spite of the significant
234 interaction, the specific growth rate of focal fish increased with increasing food abundance for
235 both dominant (ANOVA, linear contrast: $F_{1,24} = 10.05, P = 0.004$) and subordinate individuals
236 (ANOVA, linear contrast: $F_{1,24} = 504.20, P < 0.001$). Growth rate appeared to decline at the
237 highest food level, but the difference between the 10 and 20% treatments was not significant
238 (Tukey post hoc tests: dominant fish: $P = 0.966$; subordinate fish: $P = 0.422$). Dominant fish
239 grew faster than subordinate individuals in all food treatments except the 10 (Tukey post hoc
240 test: $P = 0.998$) and 20% (Tukey post hoc test: $P = 0.999$) treatments.

241
242 *Territory Size versus Food Abundance*

243
244 We compared the effect of food abundance on territory size in our study to that of Slaney &
245 Northcote (1974) and Keeley (2000); both studies introduced young rainbow trout to three levels
246 of food abundance (Fig. 4). Because the absolute amount of food could not be easily compared
247 between studies, territory size and food abundance were transformed to multiples of the mean
248 territory size and food abundance for each study. Like previous studies, territory size in our study
249 changed inversely with food abundance (Fig. 2), confirming the prediction of models of optimal
250 territory size (Schoener 1983). However, the relationship in our study had a shallower slope
251 compared to those of Slaney and Northcote (1974) and Keeley (2000) (Fig. 4); the mean slopes
252 in their studies were above the 95% C.I. about the slope in our analysis. All the observed slopes
253 were shallower than the slope of -1.0, suggesting that territory size changed less than one would
254 expect if fish were maintaining a constant amount of food in their territories.

255 **DISCUSSION**

256
257 As predicted by the continuous version of the threshold model of territoriality, there was a
258 dome-shaped relationship between the frequency of aggression and food abundance, indicating
259 that fish modified their aggressive behaviour to conspecifics in response to changes in food
260 abundance. Despite the broad range of food abundance used, dominant rainbow trout never
261 ceased defending territories in our experiment. As mentioned in the Introduction, many studies
262 show a decrease in aggression when food is superabundant (i.e. Magnuson 1962; Slaney &
263 Northcote 1974), mainly due to satiation. In natural streams, however, food abundance is
264 variable and tends to be lower than the rations provided in laboratory experiments (see Keeley
265 2000). Thus, only large temporary increases in invertebrate production, such as caused by heavy

266 rainfall or an emergence of insects (Waters 1966), would likely cause satiation of fish in natural
267 streams. On the other hand, in the absence of satiation, fish increase their territorial aggression
268 when food abundance increases - i.e. the left side of the dome-shaped relationship (Keenleyside
269 & Yamamoto 1962; Newman 1956). Hence, our study suggests that the intensity of territoriality
270 (e.g. percent of intruders chased) will increase monotonically over the range of food densities
271 typically found in the wild. However, we cannot rule out the possibility that the increase in
272 aggression rate was due to an increase in the rate of intrusion on territories (see Grant & Guha
273 1993). The only other studies to document a dome-shaped relationship between aggression and
274 food abundance also used a broad range of food abundance with aggression decreasing when
275 food was in excess (Wyman and Hotaling 1989; Grant et al. 2002).

276 As predicted by models of optimal territory size (Hixon 1980; Schoener 1983), the
277 aggressive radius of dominant fish decreased with increasing food abundance. However, a
278 doubling of food abundance caused territories to shrink by only 13% of their initial size, which is
279 much less than the 50% decrease in defended area that would be expected if fish varied the size
280 of their territories to maintain a constant supply of food (Grant et al. 1998). Both Slaney and
281 Northcote (1974) and Keeley (2000) reported a steeper decrease in territory size with increasing
282 food abundance. The steeper slopes in their studies may have been related to fish being allowed
283 to emigrate, which resulted in a decrease in fish density when food abundance was low. Thus,
284 changes in territory size in their studies were caused by changes in both intruder pressure and
285 food abundance. By contrast, in our study fish density was held constant and changes in territory
286 size were the result of changes in food abundance alone.

287 Stream fertilization has been considered as a habitat management option to increase
288 salmonid abundance in nutrient deficient streams (Slaney et al. 1994). The 32-fold increase in
289 food abundance in our experiment caused territories to shrink to only 51% of their initial size,
290 suggesting that an increase in food abundance would have a relatively small effect on territory
291 size and fish population density in mesotrophic streams (Grant et al. 1998). However, the 32-
292 fold increase in food abundance caused the growth rate of individual fish to increase by 9 fold,
293 suggesting that an increase in food abundance may increase salmonid abundance primarily by
294 affecting the individual growth rate rather than the population density. Similar to our results, a
295 review of four stream fertilization experiments (Grant et al. 1998) revealed that most of the
296 increase in salmonid abundance resulted from an increase in growth rate rather than an increase
297 in population density. Increased growth rate can be beneficial to fish populations, because it can
298 increase the overwinter survival of juveniles (e.g. Hunt 1969) and decrease the age of fish
299 migrating to sea (Hutchings & Jones 1998). However, an increased growth rate can also cause a
300 higher proportion of sexually mature male parr (Hutchings & Jones 1998), which may reduce the
301 number of anadromous males returning to spawn. Hence, any attempt to enhance salmonid
302 populations by increasing the productivity of the stream should carefully consider the potential
303 benefits and costs of increasing the growth rate of individuals.

304 As expected, dominant individuals occupied a central upstream foraging station, and had a
305 priority of access to food items as they fell from the feeder. While dominant fish were not
306 initially always the largest individual, they had a larger aggressive radius and a higher growth
307 rate than subordinates over the course of the experiment. Consistent with our results, the
308 dominant status of juvenile Atlantic salmon is influenced more by an individual's aggression

309 than its size (Huntingford et al. 1990; Thorpe et al. 1992). Dominant fish often have a higher
310 growth rate than subordinates (Yamagishi 1962; Li & Brocksen 1977), mainly due to differential
311 access to food (Yamagishi 1962). In addition, the social stress caused by dominant fish may
312 result in a higher metabolic rate and lower growth rate of subordinates (Millidine et al. 2009),
313 even if the food consumption by dominant and subordinates is equal (Abbott & Dill 1989; Lee et
314 al. 2011).

315 Laboratory studies may overestimate the fitness advantage of dominant individuals in the
316 wild (Höjesjö et al. 2002). Natural environments are more complex than simple laboratory
317 environments and may weaken the strength of social interactions. For example, structural
318 complexity can reduce territory size (Imre et al. 2002), lower aggression, reduce the
319 monopolization of food (Basquill & Grant 1998; Sundbaum & Naslund 1998) and decrease the
320 growth advantage of dominant individuals (Höjesjö et al. 2004). In complex habitats, aggressive
321 fish may not be able to monopolize food as efficiently, due to a decrease in their ability to detect
322 (Savino & Stein 1982) and chase intruders (Stamps 1984). Therefore, the differences between
323 dominants and subordinates observed in our experiment may be less extreme in a natural stream.

324 In summary, in our experiment the frequency of territorial defence increased and territory
325 size decreased over the range of food abundance expected to be found in the wild. Because
326 territory size was relatively insensitive to changes in food abundance, territoriality should have a
327 regulatory effect on population density.

328

329 **Acknowledgements**

330

331 We thank G. Brown, D. Fraser, D. McLaughlin, and two anonymous referees for their
332 helpful comments on a previous version of this paper. We also thank A. Lindeman for providing
333 experimental and statistical support. This study was financially supported by grants from the
334 Natural Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada to J.W.A. Grant.

335

336 **References**

337

338 **Abbott, J.C. & Dill, L.M.** 1989. The relative growth of dominant and subordinate juvenile
339 steelhead trout (*Salmo gairdneri*) fed equal rations. *Behaviour*, **108**, 104-113.

340 **Adams, E.S.** 2001. Approaches to the study of territory size and shape. *Annual Review of*
341 *Ecology and Systematics*, **32**, 277-303.

342 **Basquill, S.P. & Grant, J.W.A.** 1998. An increase in habitat complexity reduces aggression and
343 monopolization of food by zebra fish (*Danio rerio*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **76**, 770-772.

344 **Carpenter, F.L.** 1987. Food abundance and territoriality: to defend or not to defend? *American*
345 *Zoologist*, **27**, 387-399.

346 **Carpenter, F.L. & MacMillen, R.E.** 1976. Threshold model of feeding territoriality and test
347 with a Hawaiian honeycreeper. *Science*, **194**, 639-642.

348 **Craig, J.L. & Douglas, M.E.** 1986. Resource distribution, aggressive asymmetries and variable
349 access to resources in the nectar feeding bellbird. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology*, **18**,
350 231-240.

351 **Dill, L. M., Ydenberg, R. C. & Fraser, A.H. G.** 1981. Food abundance and territory size in
352 juvenile coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus-kisutch*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **59**, 1801-1809.

353 **Elliott, J. M.** 1994. *Quantitative ecology and the brown trout*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

354 **Goldberg, J.L., Grant, J. W. A. & Lefebvre, L.** 2001. Effects of the temporal predictability
355 and spatial clumping of food on the intensity of competitive aggression in the Zenaida dove.
356 *Behavioral Ecology*, **12**, 490-495.

357 **Grant, J. W. A.** 1993. Whether or not to defend: the influence of resource distribution. *Marine*
358 *Behaviour and Physiology*, **23**, 137-153.

359 **Grant, J. W. A.** 1997. Territoriality. In: *Behavioural ecology of teleost fishes* (Ed. by J-G.J.
360 Godin), pp. 81-103. Oxford University Press, New York.

361 **Grant, J.W.A. & Guha, R.T.** 1993. Spatial clumping of food increases its monopolization and
362 defence by convict cichlids, *Cichlasoma nigrofasciatum*. *Behavioral Ecology*, **4**, 293-296.

363 **Grant, J. W. A., Girard, I.L., Breau, C. & Weir, L.K.** 2002. Influence of food abundance on
364 competitive aggression in juvenile convict cichlids. *Animal Behaviour*, **63**, 323-330.

365 **Grant, J. W. A. & Kramer, D. L.** 1990. Territory size as a predictor of the upper limit to
366 population density of juvenile salmonids in streams. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*
367 *Sciences*, **47**, 1724-1737.

368 **Grant, J. W. A., Steingrímsson, S. O., Keeley, E.R. & Cunjak, R. A.** 1998. Implications of
369 territory size for the measurement and prediction of salmonid abundance in streams. *Canadian*
370 *Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, **55**, 181-190.

371 **Hixon, M. A.** 1980. Food production and competitor density as the determinants of feeding
372 territory size. *American Naturalist*, **115**, 510-530.

373 **Höjesjö, J., Johnsson, J. I. & Bohlin, T.** 2002. Can laboratory studies on dominance predict
374 fitness of young brown trout in the wild? *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology*, **52**, 102-108.

375 **Höjesjö, J., Johnsson, J. I. & Bohlin, T.** 2004. Habitat complexity reduces the growth of
376 aggressive and dominant brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) relative to subordinates. *Behavioural*
377 *Ecology and Sociobiology*, **56**, 286-289.

378 **Hunt, R. L.** 1969. Overwinter survival of wild fingerling brook trout in Lawrence Creek,
379 Wisconsin. *Journal of Fisheries Research Board of Canada*, **26**, 1473-83.

380 **Huntingford, F. A., Metcalfe, N. B., Thorpe, J. E., Graham, W. D. & Adams, C. E.** 1990.
381 Social dominance and body size in Atlantic salmon parr, *Salmo salar* L. *Journal of Fish Biology*,
382 **36**, 877-881.

- 383 **Hutchings, J.A., and Jones, M.E.B.** 1998. Life history variation and growth rate thresholds for
384 maturity in Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*,
385 **55**, 22-47.
- 386 **Imre, I., Grant, J. W. A. & Keeley, E. R.** 2002. The effect of visual isolation on territory size
387 and population density of juvenile rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Canadian Journal of*
388 *Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, **59**, 303-309.
- 389 **Imre, I., Grant, J. W. A. & Keeley, E. R.** 2004. The effect of food abundance on territory size
390 and population density of juvenile steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Oecologia*, **138**, 371-
391 378.
- 392 **Johnson, C. A., Grant, J. W. A. & Giraldeau, L. A.** 2004. The effect of patch size and
393 competitor number on aggression among foraging house sparrows. *Behavioural Ecology*, **15**,
394 412-418.
- 395 **Jonsson, N., Jonsson, B. & Hansen, L.P.** 1998. The relative role of density-dependent and
396 density-independent survival in the life cycle of Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar*. *Journal of Animal*
397 *Ecology*. **67**, 751-762.
- 398 **Keeley, E. R.** 2000. An experimental analysis of territory size in juvenile steelhead trout.
399 *Animal Behaviour*, **59**, 477-490.

400 **Keeley, E. R. & Grant, J. W. A.** 1995. Allometric and environmental correlates of territory
401 size in juvenile Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*
402 *Sciences*, **52**, 186-196.

403 **Keeley, E. R. & McPhail, J. D.** 1998. Food abundance, intruder pressure, and body size as
404 determinants of territory size in juvenile steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Behaviour*, **135**,
405 65-82.

406 **Keenleyside, M.H.A. & Yamamoto, F.T.** 1962. Territorial behaviour of juvenile Atlantic
407 salmon (*Salmo salar* L.). *Behaviour*, **19**, 139-169.

408 **Kerr, S. J., and Lasenby, T. A.** 2000. *Rainbow trout stocking in inland lakes and streams: an*
409 *annotated bibliography and literature review*. Fish and Wildlife Branch, Ontario Ministry of
410 Natural Resources, Peterborough, Ontario.

411 **LaManna, J. R. & Eason, P. K.** 2003. Effects of landmarks on territorial establishment.
412 *Animal Behaviour*, **65**, 471-478.

413 **Lee, G., Grant, J.W.A. & Comolli, P.** 2011. Dominant convict cichlids (*Amatitlania*
414 *nigrofasciata*) grow faster than subordinates when fed an equal ration. *Behaviour*, **148**, 877-887.

415 **Li, H.W. & Brocksen, R. W.** 1977. Approaches to the analysis of energetic costs of
416 intraspecific competition for space by rainbow trout, *Salmo gairdneri*. *Journal of Fish Biology*,
417 **11**, 329-41.

- 418 **Lott, D.F.** 1991. *Intraspecific variation in the social systems of wild vertebrates*. Cambridge
419 University Press, Cambridge.
- 420 **Magnuson, J. J.** 1962. An analysis of aggressive behaviour, growth, and competition for food
421 and space in medaka (*Oryzias latipes*, Pisces, Cyprinodontidae). *Canadian Journal of Zoology*,
422 **40**, 314-363.
- 423 **Maher, C.R. & Lott, D.F.** 1995. Definitions of territoriality used in the study of variation in
424 vertebrate spacing systems. *Animal Behaviour*, **49**, 1581-1597.
- 425 **Millidine, K.J., Metcalfe, N.B. & Armstrong, J.D.** 2009. Presence of a conspecific causes
426 divergent changes in resting metabolism, depending on its relative size. *Proceedings of the Royal*
427 *Society of B: Biological Sciences*, **276**, 3989-3993.
- 428 **Monaghan, P. & Metcalfe, N. B.** 1985. Group foraging in wild brown hares: effects of resource
429 distribution and social status. *Animal Behaviour*, **33**, 993-999.
- 430 **Newman, M.A.** 1956. Social behavior and interspecific competition in two trout species.
431 *Physiological Zoology*, **29**, 64-81.
- 432 **Puckett, K. J. & Dill, L. M.** 1985. The energetics of feeding territoriality in juvenile coho
433 salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*). *Behaviour*, **92**, 97-111.
- 434 **Ricker, W. E.** 1975. Computation and interpretation of biological statistics of fish populations.
435 *Bulletin of Fisheries Research Board of Canada*, **191**, 303-33.

436 **Savino, J.A. F. & Stein, R.** 1982. Predator-prey interaction between largemouth bass and
437 bluegills as influenced by simulated, submersed vegetation. *Transactions of the American*
438 *Fisheries Society*, **111**, 255-266.

439 **Schoener, T.W.** 1981. An empirically based estimate of home range. *Theoretical Population*
440 *Biology*, **20**, 281-325.

441 **Schoener, T. W.** 1983. Simple models of optimal feeding territory size: a reconciliation.
442 *American Naturalist*, **121**, 608-629.

443 **Slaney, P., Ashley, K., Wightman, C., Ptolemy, R. & Zaldokas, D.** 1994. Low-level
444 fertilization has a habitat management option for nutrient deficient trout streams in British
445 Columbia. In: *Proceedings of the 9th international trout stream habitat improvement workshop*,
446 pp. 1-23. Trout Unlimited Canada.

447 **Slaney, P.A. & Northcote, T.G.** 1974. Effects of prey abundance on density and territorial
448 behaviour of young rainbow trout (*Salmo gairdneri*) in laboratory stream channels. *Journal of*
449 *Fisheries Research Board of Canada*, **31**, 1201-1209.

450 **Stamps, J.A.** 1984. Growth costs of territorial overlap: experiments with juvenile lizards (*Anolis*
451 *aeneus*). *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology*, **15**, 115-119.

452 **Steingrímsson, S.O. & Grant, J.W.A.** 2008. Multiple central-place territories in wild young-of-
453 the-year Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*. *Animal Ecology*, **77**, 448-457.

- 454 **Sundbaum, K. & Naslund, I.** 1998. Effects of woody debris on the growth and behaviour of
455 brown trout in experimental stream channels. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **76**, 56-61.
- 456 **Thorpe, J. E., Metcalfe, N.B. & Huntingford, F. A.** 1992. Behavioral influences on life-
457 history variation in juvenile Atlantic salmon, *Salmo-salar*. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, **33**,
458 331-340.
- 459 **Waters, T.F.** 1966. Production rate, population density, and drift of a stream invertebrate.
460 *Ecology*, **47**, 595-604.
- 461 **Wilcox, R. S. & Ruckdeschel, T.** 1982. Food threshold territoriality in a water strider (*Gerris*
462 *remigis*). *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology*, **11**, 85-90.
- 463 **Wolf, L.L.** 1978. Aggressive social organization in nectarivorous birds. *American Zoologist*, **18**,
464 765-778.
- 465 **Wyman, R. L. & Hotaling, L.** 1988. A test of the model of the economic defendability of a
466 resource and territoriality using young *Etroplus maculatus* and *Pelmatochromis subocellatus*
467 *kribensis*. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, **21**, 69-76.
- 468 **Yamagishi, H.** 1962. Growth relation in some small experimental populations of rainbow trout
469 fry, *Salmo gairdneri*, Richardson with special reference to social relations among individuals.
470 *Japanese Journal of Ecology*, **12**, 43-53.

471 Figure Captions

472

473 **Figure 1.** Effect of food abundance on mean (\pm SE, N = 5) (a) number of aggressive acts
474 ($Y = -117.36 \log_{10}X^2 + 126.57 \log_{10}X + 69.37$, $r^2 = 0.43$, $P < 0.001$), (b) proportion of
475 aggressive individuals ($Y = -40.96 \log_{10}X^2 + 39.52 \log_{10}X + 55$, $r^2 = 0.29$, $P = 0.009$), and (c) per
476 capita aggressive rate of aggressive fish (chases/fish/min) ($Y = -0.71 \log_{10}X^2 + 0.74 \log_{10}X +$
477 0.41 , $r^2 = 0.48$, $P < 0.001$). The solid lines represent the quadratic regressions. Note the
478 logarithmic scale on the x-axis.

479

480 **Figure 2.** Mean (\pm SE, N = 5) aggressive radius of dominant (●) and aggressive subordinate fish
481 (■) in relation to food abundance. The lines represent linear regressions (solid line: $\log_{10}Y = -$
482 $0.10 \log_{10}X + 1.55$, $r^2 = 0.19$; dotted line: $\log_{10}Y = -0.11 \log_{10}X + 1.46$, $r^2 = 0.26$). Note that N =
483 3 for dominant fish in the 0.63% treatment and the logarithmic scale on both the axes.

484

485

486 **Figure 3.** Effect of food abundance on mean (\pm SE, N = 5) specific growth rate of dominant (●)
487 and the average subordinate fish (■) in relation to food abundance. Note the logarithmic scale on
488 the x-axis.


489

490 **Figure 4.** Effect of food abundance (multiples of the mean) on territory size (multiples of the
491 mean). The solid line is the predicted territory size if fish defend a constant amount of food.
492 Note the logarithmic scale on both axes.


493 **Figure 1**

494

495



496 **Figure 2**



518 **Figure 3**

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539


540

541

542

543

544



545 **Figure 4**

