

1 **Public information use by foraging ninespine sticklebacks: social learning or**
2 **an unlearned social influence on travel direction?**

3

4 Short title: Public information and learning in sticklebacks

5

6 M.M. Webster¹ & K.N. Laland¹

7

8 ¹ School of Biology, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, Fife KY16 9TS, United Kingdom

9

10

11 Corresponding author: Mike M. Webster, mike.m.webster@gmail.com

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 **Summary**

25 If we are to understand the cognitive basis and evolutionary origins of a particular behaviour, it
26 is necessary to identify its underlying mechanism. Ninespine sticklebacks (*Pungitius pungitius*)
27 can identify the richer of two prey patches by observing other foragers' success. This may be due
28 to social learning, or an unlearned social effect on travel direction, brought about by the fish
29 being more likely to face and subsequently travel towards areas where they have observed more
30 feeding activity. Here we show that observer orientation does not predict patch choice, and that
31 fish are still more likely to spend more time in richer patches even if they have to take an indirect
32 route to reach them. This suggests that sticklebacks can learn the location of the richer patch
33 through observation, and viewed in conjunction with other published findings, suggests that
34 learned local enhancement lies behind public information use in this species.

35

36 **Key Words:** Diffusion; Local enhancement; Producer-scrounger; Social learning strategies;
37 Social transmission

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47 **Introduction**

48

49 Animals can acquire information about the quality of a resource by monitoring the behaviour of
50 others as they sample or exploit it. Such information, usually produced passively and
51 inadvertently, is known as public information (Valone & Templeton, 2002; Chittka & Leadbeater
52 2005; Danchin et al. 2005). Public information may be used in a variety of contexts. Social
53 foragers may monitor the behaviour of group mates so as to identify those that have located food
54 that can be scrounged (Giraldeau & Caraco 2000), using cues such as their posture or activity to
55 indirectly locate the food upon which they are feeding (Coolen et al. 2001). The hermit crab
56 *Coenobita compressus* uses public information arising from competitive interactions, and is
57 attracted to areas of greater commotion, which can be indicative of higher quality patches of food
58 or high quality shells, a resource necessary for shelter (Laidre 2013). Some bird species use
59 public information about conspecific breeding success when selecting areas of habitat in which
60 to locate their own nests. In collared flycatchers (*Ficedula albicollis*), breeding pairs are less
61 likely to settle in areas where other pairs are raising fewer young, and residents leave areas at
62 higher rates if the number and quality of other pairs' nestlings there are low (Doligez et al.
63 2002). Lesser kestrels (*Falco naumanni*) use the reproductive success of other breeders to select
64 breeding sites over successive breeding seasons, with the number of new immigrants to a
65 particular site depending upon the number of successful breeding pairs in the previous year
66 (Aparici et al. 2007).

67

68 Comparative studies focussing on how animals acquire, process and learn from public
69 information, and the conditions under which they are most likely to respond to it, inform

70 research in a diverse range of fields, from behavioural ecology and psychology to anthropology,
71 economics and artificial intelligence (Heyes & Galef, 1996; Laland 2004; Nehaniv &
72 Dautenhahn, 2007; Galef 2009; Rendell et al. 2010; 2011; Webster & Ward 2011; Hoppitt &
73 Laland, 2013; Zentall & Galef, 2013). Understanding the mechanisms that bring about
74 behavioural responses to public information is vital if we wish to infer the cognitive processes
75 that drive them and the evolutionary and developmental forces that have shaped them. This
76 entails, among other things, identifying the stimuli to which the animals are responding,
77 determining how these affect changes in the behaviour of the animal, confirming whether
78 exposure to public information results in learning, and if it does, determining what is learned. In
79 many cases, social influences upon behaviour and learning might plausibly arise via several
80 different mechanisms. It is therefore essential for researchers to discriminate between these,
81 allowing them to rule out those that cannot adequately account for the observed behaviours, and
82 thereby allowing the most likely candidate mechanisms to be identified (Byrne, 2002; Hoppitt &
83 Laland, 2013).

84

85 The social foraging behaviour of stickleback fish (*Gasterosteidae*) has proved to be one of a
86 range of useful model systems for studying how and when animals rely upon public information
87 (reviewed by Laland et al., 2011). A number of studies using this system have deployed a binary
88 choice assay, in which a subject, 'the observer', is given the opportunity to watch two groups of
89 demonstrator fish feeding from artificial patches that yield prey at different rates. Following an
90 observation period, the demonstrators are removed and the observer is released from its holding
91 unit and allowed to visit the locations of the two prey patches. Statistical models can then be
92 used to infer whether a majority of observers visit the richer patch first, and/or spend more time

93 within it relative to the poorer patch, and whether therefore they are selecting patches under the
94 influence of public information. Ninespine sticklebacks (*Pungitius pungitius*) have been found to
95 be particularly adept at this task (Coolen et al. 2003; Laland et al., 2011; Webster & Laland
96 2015). Research into the mechanism underlying public information use in the ninespine
97 stickleback has revealed that ninespines tend to visit the location where they saw demonstrators
98 feeding at the greatest rate, but that they are not able to generalise to other locations with similar
99 physical characteristics or landmarks as the richer patch (Webster & Laland, 2013). In other
100 words, public information use in this species operates via a form of local enhancement, but not
101 stimulus enhancement (Hoppitt & Laland, 2008; 2013).

102

103 Building upon this work on the cognitive mechanisms of public information use, in this study,
104 we sought to determine whether the observers' patch selection was based upon social learning or
105 whether it arose from an unlearned social influence upon travel direction. It is possible that if, at
106 the end of the demonstration phase, the observer is more likely to be facing towards the rich
107 patch, to which its attention has been drawn by the more frequent or intense feeding-related
108 behaviours of the demonstrators at that location, then it may simply be more likely to travel in
109 that direction when released. This might cause it to become more likely to encounter the rich
110 patch first, and perhaps once there to spend more time within it, without having necessarily
111 learning anything about patch quality. This means of patch selection seems plausible in light of
112 recent studies of social foraging that have employed diffusion analyses to infer the spread of
113 foraging-related information through freely-moving shoals. These have shown that indirect
114 social effects on foraging patch detection are an important means by which group members
115 locate hidden prey patches (Atton et al., 2012; 2014; Webster et al., 2013). Indirect social effects

116 occur, for example, when searching individuals travel together and influence each other's
117 directions of heading, and therefore encounter and learn about resources at the same time, or
118 when naïve individuals discover resources simply because they happen to be following
119 experienced individuals that have already found them for themselves.

120

121 In order to distinguish between these mechanisms, we carried out two experiments. Our first
122 experiment tested whether the direction that the observer fish were facing at the moment that
123 they were released was related to whether the rich or poor patch was entered first. Finding that
124 fish were more likely to enter first the patch that they were facing would not necessarily rule out
125 social learning. However finding that the majority of fish first entered the richer patch, even if
126 they were not facing towards it when released, would strongly suggest that an unlearned social
127 effect on travel direct was unlikely to account for such a patch choice bias. Our second
128 experiment asked whether fish were still able to select the richer patch if they were forced to
129 swim through a chicane, causing them to change travel direction, before they were able to
130 approach the prey patches. If the fish were still more likely to enter the rich patch first, even after
131 orientating away from it, then an unlearned social effect on travel direct could be ruled out,
132 leaving social learning of rich patch location as the most plausible explanation.

133

134 **Materials and Methods**

135 *Collection and housing*

136 Sticklebacks were collected from Melton Brook, Leicestershire, UK (GRID REF: SP 602075) in
137 October 2009 with testing taking place between February and April 2010. In the laboratory they
138 were held in groups of 40 to 50 in 90L aquaria. Each aquarium contained a layer of coarse sand,

139 an external filter, and artificial vegetation for cover. The light: dark regime was held at 14: 10
140 hours and the temperature was maintained at 8°C. They were fed daily with frozen bloodworms.

141

142 *Overview*

143 The experimental set up used in these experiments is derived from that of Coolen et al. (2003).

144 Initially restrained observers were allowed to watch two groups of demonstrators feed from

145 artificial patches that yielded prey at different rates. They were then released and allowed to

146 enter goal zones located next to the prey patches. Previously published experiments that have

147 used this set up have typically found that ninespine sticklebacks exhibit a bias towards

148 approaching the patch where they saw demonstrators feeding at the higher rate (Laland et al.,

149 2011). In experiment 1 we sought to determine whether the first patch that the observer entered

150 was affected by the direction that it was facing at the moment that it was released. In experiment

151 2 we asked whether the observer showed a bias towards the rich patch if it had to navigate a

152 chicane, briefly turning away from it, after it was released.

153

154 *Experiment 1*

155 We established a binary choice test tank consisting of a glass aquarium measuring 90 x 30 x 30

156 cm (Figure 1). Abutting this we placed two 30 x 15 x 15 cm glass demonstrator tanks. The three

157 tanks were separated by 5 mm. The sides of the tanks that faced each other were left uncovered,

158 while the other sides were covered in black plastic sheeting. Each tank contained a 1 cm layer of

159 sand. The water depth in all tanks was 12 cm. The central aquarium housed the observer, initially

160 within a 10x10 cm base, 15 cm tall holding unit constructed from clear Perspex. This was

161 attached via a monofilament line to an arm at the top of the tank, allowing it to be raised via a

162 pulley. The holding unit was placed in the centre of the larger aquarium. The rich and poor patch
163 goal zones were located within the 15 cm wide section at each end of the observer tank, next to
164 the demonstrator tanks. They were indicated using a yellow plastic bar across placed across the
165 width of the tank and set within the sand substrate, so that the surface of the bar was level with
166 the surface of the sand. The goal zones were used to determine prey patch preferences, as
167 described below. During the test phase, described below, the movement of the observer was
168 recorded via a high-definition webcam fixed above the tank and connected to a laptop.

169
170 (Fig. 1 here)

171
172 Each of the smaller aquaria held a group of three conspecific demonstrators, and a feeder which
173 was used to deliver prey to the demonstrators during the experiment. The feeders consisted of a 4
174 by 4 cm base, 30 cm tall tower. The front wall, facing the demonstrators, and angled 90° away
175 from the observer holding unit, was transparent so that the demonstrators could see the prey as it
176 was delivered. The rear wall was white to contrast with the prey. The side walls were opaque, so
177 that the observer in the central aquarium could not see the prey. Demonstrators were unable to
178 reach the prey until it sank to the bottom of the feeder, but nonetheless attempted to do so by
179 striking at the transparent wall as the prey item fell. The front wall of the feeder stopped 1 cm
180 short of the floor of the tank, allowing the demonstrators to eat the prey once it had reached the
181 bottom of the feeder. Prey consisted of 3 mm long pieces of thawed frozen bloodworm, small
182 enough to be consumed with minimal handling by the demonstrators, ensuring that the observer
183 could see the feeding behaviour of the demonstrators, but not the prey itself. Using separate

184 tanks to hold the demonstrators prevented the observer from using prey chemical cues to acquire
185 private information about prey distribution (Webster et al., 2007).

186

187 We used 38 fish as observers, with an additional pool of approximately 200 fish as
188 demonstrators. Observers, the test subjects, were only used once. Some demonstrators were used
189 more than once, but not within the same 72h period. Fish showing signs of having entered
190 reproductive state were excluded, since this has been shown to influence public information use
191 in the species (Webster & Laland, 2011). The demonstrators and observers were deprived of
192 food for 24 h before testing. Before the start of each trial one of the two feeders was randomly
193 selected to be the rich feeder, yielding three times more prey than the poor feeder. Three
194 demonstrators were added to each demonstrator chamber and allowed to settle for 10 minutes
195 before the observer was added to the holding unit and allowed to settle for a further 10 minutes.

196

197 The demonstration phase lasted for 6 minutes and ran as follows. At the beginning of the first,
198 third and fifth minute, 2 pieces of prey suspended in 1 cm³ of tank water were added to the rich
199 feeder, using a pipette. The poor feeders received no prey during the first and third minute, but
200 were given 'blank' consisting of 1 cm³ of tank water at the same time that the rich feeder
201 received prey. During the fifth minute of the two-feeder treatments the poor feeder also received
202 prey. This ensured that while prey were delivered at a 3:1 ratio, the observer was unable to select
203 a prey patch simply on the basis of it being the last place it saw fish feeding. After six minutes
204 opaque black plastic walls were inserted into the 5 mm gaps between the central tank and the two
205 demonstrator aquaria. The observer was allowed to settle for sixty seconds, then the holding unit
206 was raised 5 cm using the pulley. In raising the holding unit we were careful not to disturb the

207 surface of the water, as this can startle the fish. It took less than 1 second to raise the holding
208 unit, and none of the fish displayed any fright response, such as darting away immediately,
209 erecting the pelvic spines or attempting to hide on the bottom of the tank. Raising the holding
210 unit commenced the test phase of the trial.

211

212 We recorded the direction that the focal fish was facing at the moment that the holding unit was
213 raised. Since we were only interested in the direction that the fish was facing at the moment that
214 it was allowed to exit the holding unit, we did not collect any data on the direction that it was
215 facing during the demonstration period. Facing direction was scored using six pairs of ordinal
216 category bins of 30 degrees each, such that 0 to 30 indicated a fish facing towards the rich patch
217 and 151-180 indicated a fish facing towards the poor patch (Figure 2a). We gauged facing
218 direction based upon the direction that the snout of the fish was pointing. To measure this
219 accurately we took measurements from a still image consisting of the frame of video at the
220 moment from the moment that the holding unit was raised. We used the program TPS digit
221 (Rohlf, 2010) to draw a line running from a position midway between the eyes of the fish, and
222 measured the midpoint of this line. We then drew a second line at 90 degrees to the first, running
223 from the midpoint of the first line out through the centre of the snout of the fish. A circle divided
224 into 12 sectors and aligned as in Figure 2a was superimposed over the frame and centred on the
225 holding unit. The sector through which the second line passed, corresponding to a 30 degree
226 category bin, was taken as the direction of facing (Figure 2b). After the holding unit had been
227 raised we recorded which patch the fish visited first, and how long it took to reach it.

228

229 *Experiment 2*

230 Experiment 2 used the same binary choice experimental arena as did experiment 1, with the
231 exception that half of the trials included a chicane, within which the holding unit was housed
232 (Figure 1c). The chicane measured 15 cm tall, 12 cm wide and 20 cm long. Two 8 cm barriers
233 formed the chicane itself. The inner barrier was positioned on the same side of the chicane wall
234 as the rich patch, and the outer barrier on the opposite side. This forced the fish to perform a
235 switchback, away from the rich patch goal zone, before the fish was able to exit the chicane and
236 access it. Two such chicanes were built so that each could be matched to the location of the rich
237 patch (left or right) which was randomised as in experiment 1, so that in all trials the fish was
238 forced to turn away from the rich patch before it was able to exit the chicane and enter the main
239 arena, and approach either patch.

240

241 We performed 50 trials in total, half with the chicane apparatus and half without it. Thus, half the
242 observers were able to approach the goals directly following release, while the other half were
243 forced to take an indirect route, via the chicane, to get to them. No observer was tested more than
244 once and none of the observers used in Experiment 2 had previously been used as observers or
245 demonstrators in Experiment 1. The set up and procedure during the demonstration phase were
246 otherwise the same as described for Experiment 1. During the test phase, the holding unit was
247 raised as described above, while the chicane (in those trials where it was deployed) remained on
248 the floor of the tank. In this experiment we recorded not only the first goal zone entered by the
249 observer, but also its location every six seconds for five minutes following the raising of the
250 holding unit, whether within either goal zone or the central ‘neutral’ zone (including within the
251 chicane), yielding a total of 50 data points.

252

253 *Ethical Note*

254 All procedures performed in this study were in accordance with the ethical standards of the
255 University of St Andrews, where the study was conducted. No fish died or suffered apparent ill
256 health after being used in this study. Following the completion of this study the fish were
257 retained in our laboratory for use in further studies.

258

259 *Statistical analysis*

260 In Experiment 1, the first goal zone that the observers entered was analysed using a binary
261 logistic regression. Direction of facing and latency to enter the goal zone were included as
262 ordinal and continuous covariates respectively, while the location of the rich patch, left or right,
263 was included as a fixed factor.

264

265 In Experiment 2, we compared first choice and time allocation to the rich and poor patches
266 within each of the two treatments (chicane or no chicane) using binomial and t-tests. Between
267 treatments, we compared first choice using a binary logistic regression. Time allocation (time in
268 rich patch minus time in poor patch) was compared between treatments using a general linear
269 model. In both models, treatment and the location of the rich patch were included as fixed factors
270 and latency to enter either goal zone was included as a continuous factor.

271

272 **Results**

273 *Experiment 1*

274 Overall, the majority of observers entered the rich patch goal zone first (27 versus 11, binomial
275 test: $N=38$, $P=0.014$). A binary logistic regression revealed that direction of facing, latency to

276 enter either patch, and the location of the rich patch did not affect the observers' first goal zone
277 choice (direction of facing: $X^2=1.45$, $df=5$, $P=0.91$, 95% confidence intervals (CI): -0.02, 3.62;
278 location of rich patch: $X^2=1.83$, $df=1$, $P=0.17$, 95% CI: -0.06, 1.66 ; latency to enter either patch:
279 $X^2=0.55$, $df=1$, $P=0.46$, 95% CI: -0.97, 1.01; Figure 2c).

280

281 (Fig. 2 here)

282

283 *Experiment 2*

284 We saw that observers were not more likely to enter the rich patch goal zone first more
285 frequently than would be expected by chance when each of the chicane and no-chicane
286 treatments were considered separately, but that such an effect was apparent when data from the
287 two treatments were pooled, suggesting a weak effect (binomial test, chicane: 16 versus 9, $N=25$,
288 $P=0.23$; no chicane: 17 versus 8, $N=25$, $P=0.11$; pooled, 33 versus 17, $N=50$, $P=0.03$, Figure 3a).
289 Observers did however spend more time in the rich patch goal zone than they did in the poor
290 patch goal zone in both the chicane and no-chicane treatments (paired samples t -test, chicane:
291 $t=2.64$, $df=24$, $P=0.014$; no chicane: $t=3.20$, $df=24$, $P=0.004$, Figure 3b).

292

293 Comparing the data for chicane and no-chicane treatments, we saw no differences between the
294 two treatments in either the number of observers first entering the rich patch goal zone (binary
295 logistic regression: treatment: $X^2=0.13$, $df=1$, $P=0.71$, 95% CI: -0.22, 2.70; location of rich patch:
296 $X^2=1.88$, $df=1$, $P=0.11$, 95% CI: 0.09, 1.11; latency to enter either patch: $X^2=0.29$, $df=1$, $P=0.59$,
297 95% CI: -0.98, 1.01). We also saw no difference between the two treatments in the amount of
298 time that the observers spent in the rich compared to the poor goal zone (general linear model:

299 treatment: $F_{(1, 49)} = 0.96$, $P = 0.33$, 95% CI: -0.79, 5.81; location of rich patch: $F_{(1, 49)} = 0.01$,
300 $P = 0.91$, 95% CI: -3.89, 1.49; latency to enter either goal zone: $F_{(1, 49)} = 2.30$, $P = 0.10$, 95% CI: -
301 0.07, 3.31).

302

303 (Fig. 3 here)

304

305 **Discussion**

306 In our first experiment, the direction that the fish were facing at the moment that they were

307 released from the holding unit was not seen to have any effect upon their likelihood of entering

308 the rich or poor patch goal zone first. In experiment 2, fish spent as much time in the rich patch

309 goal zone if they first had to swim through a chicane forcing them to move in the opposite

310 direction as they did in the condition where they could swim directly towards the goal zone

311 unimpeded, with fish in both treatments spending more time in the rich than the poor goal zone.

312 Taken together, the results of these two experiments provide no support for the hypothesis that

313 patch choice results from an unlearned social influence upon travel direction. To the contrary, the

314 experiments suggest these findings are underpinned by social learning.

315

316 In a previously published study we showed that ninespine sticklebacks were attracted to the

317 location at which they saw conspecifics feeding, but that they showed no evidence of learning

318 associations between physical cues present at the demonstrated feeding site and the presence of

319 food (Webster & Laland, 2013). The combined findings of this and the present study then point

320 towards learned local enhancement as the mechanism underlying public information use in this

321 species. Useful further work could focus upon the relative importance of social learning in social

322 foraging and producer-scrounger interactions. Other recent studies have documented unlearned
323 social effects on travel direction brought about through attraction to other group members, that
324 explain the rate and order in which individual group members encounter resources as they forage
325 (Webster & Laland, 2012; Atton et al., 2012; 2014; Webster et al., 2013). It would be
326 informative to determine how this form of social learning operates in nature.

327

328 Further useful work might also address the relationship between social information use and
329 behavioural lateralisation. Lateralisation research has revealed evidence of left or right-eye bias
330 in some species of fish when monitoring predators or other stimuli (Bisazza et al. 1999). We saw
331 no evidence of a population level bias in direction of facing at release in the sticklebacks tested
332 here. We collected no data on eye use or direction of facing during the demonstration phase of
333 the trial, since determining whether lateralisation exists in this species and context was not an
334 objective of our study. Nonetheless, this is an interesting question that we plan to address in a
335 future study. Individual and/or population level lateralisation should be simple to detect using a
336 binary choice approach such the one used in this study, while in principle it ought to be possible
337 to identify any such biases using information diffusion analyses to in free-ranging fish, under
338 more naturally realistic conditions too (Atton et al., 2012; 2014; Webster et al., 2013).

339

340 Building further on this finding, we might ask what are animals actually learning when they
341 select resource patches under the influence of public information? One plausible explanation is
342 that public information use reflects the integration of two learned associations. Such a
343 mechanism was recently found to underlie flower colour-copying behaviour in bumblebees
344 (*Bombus terrestris*). Here, bumblebees visited artificial flowers of the same colour that they had

345 others visit only if they had previously learned to associate the presence of conspecifics with a
346 sucrose solution reward. Similarly, bumblebees that were trained to associate the present of
347 conspecifics with a bitter, unpalatable stimulus were more likely to avoid flower colours that
348 they had seen others foraging upon (Dawson et al. 2013). In the case of public information using
349 fishes (Webster & Laland 2008; Laland et al. 2011; this study), such an association might arise
350 from individuals being exposed to some aspect of the foraging behaviour of their group mates,
351 such as their posture or activity levels, while they themselves are feeding. Potentially they could
352 come to learn an association between these behaviours and the presence of food, and by
353 extension, learn that the performance of this behaviour by others at a particular location is
354 predictive of the likelihood of there being food at that location. A topic that is currently
355 interesting researchers interested in the mechanisms, function and evolution of social learning
356 relates to whether such behaviour reflects an adaptive specialisation or whether it is merely
357 asocial learning in which one or more of the learned stimuli happens to be the presence or
358 products of another animal (Lefebvre & Giraldeau, 1996; Sterelny, 2009; Heyes, 2012). This is a
359 fundamental question, and one that is likely to garner more research attention in the coming
360 years. Public information use and social learning more generally are taxonomically widespread
361 and affect behaviour in a variety of different contexts (Valone & Templeton, 2002; Chittka &
362 Leadbeater 2005; Danchin et al. 2005). Carefully designed experiments that take into account the
363 social environments that animal experience and the potential sources of information that they are
364 exposed to both before and during their participation in experiments or field studies will be
365 necessary if we are to further understand the mechanism or mechanisms that underpin these.
366
367

368 **Acknowledgements**

369 This work was funded by NERC and ERC grants to KNL (NE/D010365/1 and EVOCULTURE,

370 Ref: 232823).

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391 **References**

392

393 Aparicio, J. M., Bonal, R., & Muñoz, A. (2007). – Experimental test on public information use in
394 the colonial lesser kestrel. *Evol Ecol.* 21: 783-800.

395

396 Atton, N., Hoppitt, W., Webster, M.M., Galef, B.G. & Laland, K.N. (2012). – Information flow
397 through threespine stickleback networks without social transmission. *P Roy Soc B-Biol Sci.* 279:
398 4272-4278.

399

400 Atton, N., Galef, B.G., Hoppitt, W., Webster, M.M. & Laland, K.N. (2014). – Familiarity affects
401 social network structure and discovery of prey patch locations in foraging stickleback shoals. *P*
402 *Roy Soc B-Biol Sci* 281: 20140579.

403

404 Bisazza, A.J. Rogers, L. & Vallortigara, G. (1998). The origins of cerebral asymmetry: a review
405 of evidence of behavioural and brain lateralization in fishes, reptiles and amphibians. *Neurosci*
406 *Biobehav Rev* 22: 411-426.

407

408 Byrne, R.W. (2002). – Imitation of novel complex actions: what does the evidence from animals
409 mean? *Adv Stud Behav* 31:77-105.

410

411 Chittka, L., & Leadbeater, E. (2005). – Social learning: public information in insects. *Curr Biol*
412 15: 869-871.

413

414 Coolen, I., Giraldeau, L. A., & Lavoie, M. (2001). –Head position as an indicator of producer
415 and scrounger tactics in a ground-feeding bird. *Anim Behav* 61: 895-903.
416

417 Coolen, I., Bergen, Y.V., Day, R.L. & Laland, K.N. (2003). – Species difference in adaptive use
418 of public information in sticklebacks. *P Roy Soc B-Biol Sci* 270: 2413-2419.
419

420 Danchin, E., Giraldeau, L. A., Valone, T. J. & Wagner, R. H. (2004). – Public information: from
421 nosy neighbors to cultural evolution. *Science* 305: 487-491.
422

423 Dawson, E.H., Avarguès-Weber, A., Chittka, L. & Leadbeater, E. (2013). – Learning by
424 observation emerges from simple associations in an insect model. *Curr Biol* 23: 727-730.
425

426 Doligez, B., Danchin, E., & Clobert, J. (2002). – Public information and breeding habitat
427 selection in a wild bird population. *Science*. 297:1168-1170.
428

429 Galef, B.G. (2009). – Strategies for social learning: testing predictions from formal theory. *Adv*
430 *Stud Behav* 39: 117-151.
431

432 Giraldeau, L. A., & Caraco, T. (2000). – Social foraging theory. Princeton University Press,
433 Princeton.
434

435 Heyes, C.M. & Galef, B.G. (1996). – Social learning in animals: the roots of culture. Academic
436 Press, San Diego.

437

438 Heyes, C.M. (2012). – What's social about social learning? *J Comp Psychol* 126: 193-204.

439

440 Hoppitt, W. & Laland, K.N. (2008). – Social processes influencing learning in animals: a review
441 of the evidence. *Adv Stud Behav* 38: 105-165.

442

443 Hoppitt, W. & Laland, K.N. (2013). – Social learning: an introduction to mechanisms, methods,
444 and models. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

445

446 Laidre, M. E. (2013). – Eavesdropping foragers use level of collective commotion as public
447 information to target high quality patches. *Oikos* 122: 1505-1511.

448

449 Laland, K.N. (2004). – Social learning strategies. *Learn Behav* 32: 4-14.

450

451 Laland, K.N., Atton, N. & Webster, M.M. (2011). – From fish to fashion: experimental and
452 theoretical insights into the evolution of culture. *Philos T R Soc B* 366: 958-968.

453

454 Lefebvre, L. & Giraldeau, L.-A. (1996). – Is social learning an adaptive specialization? In Heyes
455 CM, Galef BG (Eds.), *Social learning and the roots of culture* (pp. 107–152). Academic Press,
456 San Diego.

457

458 Nehaniv, C.L. & Dautenhahn, K. (2007). – Imitation and social learning in robots, humans and
459 animals: behavioural, social and communicative dimensions. Cambridge University Press,
460 Cambridge.
461

462 Rendell, L., Boyd, R., Cownden, D., Enquist, M., Eriksson, K., Feldman, M.W. et al. (2010). –
463 Why copy others? Insights from the social learning strategies tournament. *Science* 328: 208-213.
464

465 Rendell, L., Fogarty, L., Hoppitt, W., Morgan, T.J., Webster, M.M. & Laland, K.N. (2011). –
466 Cognitive culture: theoretical and empirical insights into social learning strategies. *Trends Cogn*
467 *Sci* 15: 68-76.
468

469 Rohlf, F.J. (2010). – TPSDig2 Version 2.16. Department of Ecology and Evolution, Stony Brook
470 University, NY, USA.
471

472 Sterelny, K. (2009). – Peacekeeping in the culture wars. In KN Laland, BG Galef (Eds.), *The*
473 *Question of Animal Culture* (pp. 288–304). Harvard University Press, Boston.
474

475 Valone, T. J. & Templeton, J. J. (2002). – Public information for the assessment of quality: a
476 widespread social phenomenon. *Philos T R Soc B* 357: 1549-1557.
477

478 Webster, M.M., Atton, N., Ward, A.J.W. & Hart, P.J.B. (2007). – Turbidity and foraging rate in
479 threespine sticklebacks: the importance of visual and chemical prey cues. *Behaviour* 144: 1347-
480 1360.

481

482 Webster, M.M. & Laland, K.N. (2008). – Social learning strategies and predation risk: minnows
483 copy only when using private information would be costly. *P Roy Soc B-Biol Sci* 275: 2869-
484 2876.

485

486 Webster, M.M. & Laland, K.N. (2011). – Reproductive state affects reliance on public
487 information in sticklebacks. *P Roy Soc B-Biol Sci* 278: 619-627.

488

489 Webster, M.M. & Laland, K.N. (2012). – Social information, conformity and the opportunity
490 costs paid by foraging fish. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 66: 797-809.

491

492 Webster, M.M. & Ward, A.J. (2011). – Personality and social context. *Biol Rev*, 86: 759-773.

493

494 Webster, M.M. & Laland, K.N. (2013). – The learning mechanism underlying public information
495 use in ninespine sticklebacks (*Pungitius pungitius*). *J Comp Psychol* 127: 154-165.

496

497 Webster, M.M., Atton, N., Hoppitt, W.J. & Laland, K.N. (2013). – Environmental complexity
498 influences association network structure and network-based diffusion of foraging information in
499 fish shoals. *Am Nat* 181: 235-244.

500

501 Webster, M. M., & Laland, K. N. (2015). – Space-use and sociability are not related to public-
502 information use in ninespine sticklebacks. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol*. In Press 10.1007/s00265-015-
503 1901-5

504

505 Zentall, T.R. & Galef, B.G. (2013). – Social learning: psychological and biological perspectives.

506 Psychology Press, New Jersey.

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527 **Figure legends**

528

529 **Figure 1.** The public information binary choice tank used in Experiments 1 and 2, consisting of a
530 larger central choice tank housing the test subject and two smaller demonstration tanks, holding
531 the demonstrators and feeder units. Solid and broken lines indicate opaque and transparent
532 barriers respectively. The grey shaded areas indicate the goal zones. Panel (a) shows the layout
533 of the tank during the demonstration phase while panel (b) shows the layout during the test
534 phase, with opaque barriers now in place between the central and demonstrator tanks, and the
535 focal fish released from the raised holding unit. Panel (c) shows the chicane used in Experiment
536 2. The fish, once released from the inner holding unit is forced to swim out through the chicane,
537 before it can enter the wider arena and enter either goal zone.

538

539 **Figure 2.** Experiment 1: effect of facing direction at release upon patch choice. (a) Direction of
540 facing at moment of release was placed within six ordinal category bins of 60 degrees each, with
541 fish facing directly towards the rich patch, 0-30 degrees, up to fish facing directly towards the
542 poor patch, 151-180 degrees. (b) The (categorical) angle of orientation was determined using a
543 digital imaging program. Using a still image taken from the video, a straight line was placed
544 between the fish's eyes, and a second line, 90 degrees to the first, was drawn between the point
545 midway between the eyes and the centre of the tip of the snout. A 12-sector circle was
546 superimposed over the frame and centred on the holding unit. The sector that this line passed
547 through was taken as the fish's direction of facing. (c) Count data indicating the first goal zone
548 entered by the fish, grouped by the direction that they were facing at the moment they were
549 released. The colours of the bars correspond to the sectors in (a), and indicate direction of facing.

550 The solid and hatched portions of the bars indicate the number of fish that entered the rich and
551 poor patch goal zone first respectively. The numbers on each bar indicate the number of trials in
552 which the fish was facing in that direction. Direction of facing was not seen to influence first
553 goal zone entered.

554

555 **Figure 3.** Experiment 2: (a) Comparing the first goal zone entered by fish that were either
556 allowed to swim unimpeded following release, or which had to first navigate a simple chicane.
557 The solid and hatched portions of the bars indicate the number of fish that entered the rich and
558 poor patch goal zone first respectively. There was no difference in first goal zone entered
559 between the two treatments. (b) Comparing the time spent in the rich (solid bars) and poor
560 (hatched bars) goal zones for fish tested in the chicane and no chicane conditions. In both
561 treatments, fish spent more time in the rich than the poor goal zones. There was no difference in
562 net time allocation (time in rich patch – time in poor patch) between the two treatments.

563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582

Figure 1





Figure 2



585
586

Figure 3

