POPULATION ECOLOGY

ASSUMPTIONS OF LOGISTIC GROWTH MODEL

- *K* is constant over time
  - does not vary year to year etc.
- *dN / Ndt* declines **linearly** with *N*
  - alternative … nonlinear decline
- Effect of density *N* on *dN / Ndt* is instantaneous … no delays
  - alternative … density now affects *dN / Ndt* some time in the future (**time lag**)
- Continuous overlapping generations

LOGISTIC GROWTH: REAL DATA



Figure 12.8 Growth of an experimental population of the fruit fly Drosophila melanogaster. The circles are observed census counts, and the smooth curve is the fitted logistic. (After Pearl 1927.)

Laboratory population of Drosophila melanogaster

Laboratory populations of Paramecium aurelia & Paramecium caudatum

12.5 Population growth in the protozoans Paramecium aurelia and P. um at 26°C in buffered Osterhout's medium, pH 8.0, "one-loop" concen- of bacterial food. (Data form Gause 1934.)

Population Cycles – Continued

2. Self-regulating model

<u>Something is wrong with the individual</u>

Environment is ok but something is working on individuals to prevent their increase.

Physiol & Behavioral characteristics potential source of limitation

Population Cycles – Continued

2. Self-regulating model

Anecdotal evidence supports hypothesis

Population Cycles – Continued

2. Self-regulating model

Maternal Effects Hypothesis
Change in maternal quality occurs during peak phase and carries over to decline and low phase

---

Maternal Effects Hypothesis

Produced through d-d social inhibition of maturation in peak years

Yg born in spring forced to delay reproduction till next breeding season
- shift in population age structure
- older age mothers more prone to decline in reproduction and offspring quality



COMPETITION:

- Exploitation – competition in which 2 or more individuals consume the same limited resource
- Interference – competition in which one organism prevents the other from having access to a limiting resource. Active inhibition is used to deny others the resource

CHARACTERISTICS OF INTRASPECIFIC COMPETITION

- Ultimate effect is decreased contribution of organism to next generation. To be apparent competition must lead to a reduction in survivorship or fecundity.
- Resource must be limited.
- The effect of competition on any individual is greater, the greater the number of competitors there are (density dependent)

- 11 young/year
- 27% adults survive
- 6% of young

Does intraspecific competition limit population size of Great Tits?

Over 4 years
- removed 60% of young (4 young/year)

Do results suggest survival rates are density-dependent?

Treatment	Adult Survival	Young Return
Control	27%	6%
Removal	56%	22%

Increases were sufficient to compensate for the loss of young and breeding numbers continued to fluctuate around same numbers as before.

Competition in plant hoppers

Denno and Roderick 1992. Ecology 73:1323

Lives on
salt marsh
grass -
Spartina



FIG. 1. Experimental design used to evaluate the inter- and intraspecific effects of crowding on the wing form and fitness (survivorship, development time, and body size) of two species of *Prokelisia* planthoppers. Intraspecific effects were evaluated by raising each species in pure culture at densities of 3, 11, and 40 individuals per cage (dark planthoppers in top row). Interspecific effects were assessed by comparing the response of three individuals of one species (dark planthoppers) raised in pure culture to the response of three individuals (dark planthoppers) raised in mixed cultures with the other species (light planthoppers) at combined densities of 11 and 40 inds./cage (bottom row). The relative effect of interspecific crowding was evaluated at densities of 11 and 40 inds./cage (columns) by comparing the response of individuals of one species reared in pure culture (dark planthoppers in top row, the intraspecific effect) to when they were rare, but reared at the same combined density in the presence of the other species (three dark planthoppers in bottom row, the interspecific effect).

Density controlled by enclosing insects with Spartina seedlings
3, 11, 40



Results

-survivorship
-development
-Body length
- % Macropterous
females

FIG. 2. The survivorship (A), development time from nymph to adult (B), body length (C), and the percentage of macropterous females (D) of *Prokelisia marginata* subjected to intraspecific crowding (——) and interspecific crowding with *Prokelisia dolus* (— — —). Intraspecific effects were assessed in pure culture at densities of 3, 11, and 40 individuals per cage (least squares means ± 1 SE with different lowercase Roman letters are significantly different, $P < .05$, ANOVA followed by Sidak's adjustment for multiple comparisons). Interspecific effects were assessed by comparing the response of three individuals of *P. marginata* reared in pure culture to the response of three individuals of *P. marginata* reared in the presence of 8 and 37 individuals of *P. dolus* at combined densities of 11 and 40 individuals per cage, respectively (least squares means ± 1 SE with different lowercase Greek letters are significantly different, $P < .05$, ANOVA followed by Sidak's adjustment for multiple comparisons). The effect of inter- relative to intraspecific crowding was evaluated by comparing the response of individuals of *P. marginata* reared in pure culture at densities of 11 and 40 individuals per cage to when they were rare (three individuals per cage), but reared at the same combined density (11 and 40 individuals per cage) in the presence of *P. dolus*. Differences between intra- and interspecific means at densities of 11 and 40 are indicated just above the abscissa of each graph (**$P < .01$, * $P < .05$, ns = not significant; *t* test).

Colonial Species

Suggested that density may have a positive effect

- Fecundity increases with increased density

Common Guillemot

- Breed in subcolonies of different densities
- Females lay 1 egg
- Subcolonies with higher densities had higher reproductive success



Common Guillemot

- Inverse density-dependence

Common Guillemot

- Driving factor – deterrence of predators (Great Black-backed Gulls and Herring Gulls)



Tendency for destabilizing effect – as birth rates rise with increased density, death rates remain the same

Large populations get larger
Small populations get smaller



Other Mechanisms of Allee Effects

- predator dilution/swamping
- antipredator vigilance
- social thermoregulation
- reduction of inbreeding
- genetic drift
- antipredator aggression
- social facilitation of reproduction

SOURCE AND SINK POPULATIONS

Too simplistic to think environmental conditions are equally favorable everywhere an organism exists



Population Source

Excess young produced

Population Sink

Productivity not sufficient to balance mortality

What level of nesting success is needed to sustain a “healthy population”?

SNPL

	Mayfield Nesting Success (%)						
Study Site	2005	2004	2003	1993	1992	1991	1990
BEAR	24.5	50.4	53.8	-	-	-	-
FARM	42.1	61.8	54.3	-	-	-	-
SHORE	-	13.9	24.7	34.5	12.9	11.3	38.1

(Paton 1995)

CALCULATION OF LAMBDA

(finite population growth rate)

SNPL

$\lambda = P_A + P_J \beta$

where,

P_A = annual adult survival (set to 74% or 50% based on Paton 1994 and Nur et al. 1999);

P_J = juvenile survival from fledging to the following breeding season (set to 50% based on Nur et al. 1999)

β = mean annual production (calculated from this study, Paton 1995, Nur et al. 1999)

$\lambda = P_A + P_J \beta$

$\lambda > 1$ Population Source

$\lambda < 1$ Population Sink



SNPL

Study Site	Mayfield Nesting Success (%)						
	2005	2004	2003	1993	1992	1991	1990
BEAR	24.5	50.4	53.8	-	-	-	-
FARM	42.1	61.8	54.3	-	-	-	-
SHORE	-	13.9	24.7	34.5	12.9	11.3	38

(Paton 1995)

METAPOPULATIONS

A ‘metapopulation’ is a “population of populations” (Levins 1969,1970); in which distinct subpopulations (local populations) occupy spatially separated patches of habitat.



A metapopulation exists when dispersal rates are “low-moderate”, meaning that an individual will move from one patch to another at a rate high enough to maintain some interaction among subpopulations but low enough that those subpopulations remain distinct.



High rates of dispersal lead to the unification of patches into a single large, patchy population. All “patchy” populations are not necessarily metapopulations.

Figure 1. Types of spatially structured populations. shaded patches are occupied; white patches are vacant. (figure adapted from Harrison and Taylor 1997)



Metapopulation theory is particularly useful to wildlife biologists because most wildlife habitats are fragmented or maintain some degree of patchiness.

Animal dispersal among patches is an obvious concern for populations existing in heterogeneous landscapes. Rate of animal dispersal is affected by aspects of life history traits and population dynamics, but animal movement is also affected by aspects of landscape heterogeneity, including patch size, patch isolation, edge characteristics, and matrix characteristics.

LIFE HISTORY THEORY REVISITED

Life History Theory
A. Defined

Definition – Set of evolved strategies including behavioral, physiological, and anatomical adaptations that influence survival and reproductive success directly

Everything we know about NS indicates that those individuals with fecundity and survivorship schedules most suited to maximize fitness will be favored.

Crucial aspects of these schedules represent

LH Strategies

1. Age and size reproduction begins
2. Relative effort devoted to growth, reproduction, and survival
3. The apportionment of reproductive effort between many small or few large offspring
4. Distribution of reproductive effort over lifetime

B. Trade-offs

Hypothetical Organism
-Reproduces immediately after birth
- Large number of Large offspring
- Lavishes parental Care
- Reproduces repeatedly throughout a long life

$TE = G+M+R_{(c+f)}$

For real organisms, its LH Strategy must be a compromise or a trade-off

C. Cost of Reproduction

Individuals devoting considerable energy to one aspect of its strategy must pay for it by reducing investments in another.

Is there a cost to reproduction?

Nur Journal of Animal Ecology 53:479:496



Fig. 5. Adult weight during the nestling period in relation to brood size (1980): comparison of first and last weighings. (a) Females, (b) Males. Mean weight at first weighing, (●); mean weight at last weighing, (○). The arrows indicate direction of weight change. 78% of the adult weights at 'first-capture' were obtained on days 8–10, 14% on day 11, and 8% on days 12–14. 76% of the weights at 'last-capture' were obtained on days 13–16, 8% on day 12, and 16% on days 9–11. In this figure, the mean weight of females rearing broods of fifteen is greater than that of females rearing broods of nine and twelve. This anomaly is explained by the fact that females rearing broods of fifteen were heavier than other females before the manipulation of brood size. When the weight of all females was adjusted for their weight at incubation (by regressing female weight at day 10 on female weight at incubation and comparing the residuals), the mean weight for this group was shown to be 0.20 g lighter than any other brood-size group.



Fig. 6. Adult survival in relation to brood size in 1978. Female survival rate (as indicated by subsequent recapture) is represented by filled circles, male survival by the symbol ♂. For both males and females, bars indicate ± standard error of the mean survival rate for each brood size (assuming survival is binomially distributed). For females, $n = 22, 20, 21, 21$, and 21, respectively; for males, $n = 13, 17, 19, 16$, and 15, respectively. The plotted curve and its equation, a power function of form $Y = \alpha X^{\beta}$, indicate the best-fitting line as determined by the regression of ln(female survival) on ln(brood size). The 95% confidence interval for α is 0·419–1·028 and for β is −0·691– −0·268. Similar results were obtained when the arcsine-square root transformation was applied to the survival rate.

83



Fig. 1. The effect of fecundity on survival in a predation experiment using medium-sized immature guppies. Survival values were calculated for each cell corresponding to a given egg-number and size class, defined as the number remaining after predation in a given cell divided by the number in that cell initially presented to the fish. These values were then transformed with the arcsin square-root transformation commonly used to normalize proportions. Errors in estimation of egg-number resulted in misclassification of some animals and hence in survival values greater than one. Since the arcsin transformation cannot be performed on values greater than one, such cells were corrected by setting the survival equal to one, and redistributing the surplus animals in equal numbers to the two immediately neighbouring cells. In this way, all individual points were preserved for the analysis without altering the more general pattern of the results. This treatment affected only a very small proportion of the data (less than 5% of individuals). Differences in sample size between cells were taken into account in the analysis by weighting each point by the number of animals in that cell initially presented to the fish. Each point on the scatter diagram represents the mean from one trial, with numbers indicating the sample size of each observation. The best-fit least squares regression line is shown (weighted by the sample size in each point): $y = -0.01487x + 0.91478$, $r^2 = 0.15$, $P = 0.05$ (one-tailed F test). This differs slightly from the equation given in the text, which refers to the mean values of pooled replicates.