



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Ward, A. J. W., Hoare, D. J., Couzin, I. D., Broom, M. & Krause, J. (2002). The effects of parasitism and body length on positioning within wild fish shoals. *Journal Of Animal Ecology*, 71(1), pp. 10-14. doi: 10.1046/j.0021-8790.2001.00571.x

This is the unspecified version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/989/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0021-8790.2001.00571.x>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

1 **The effects of parasitism and body length on**
2 **positioning within wild fish shoals**

3
4 **WARD, A.J.W.¹, HOARE, D.J.¹, COUZIN, I.D.¹, BROOM,**
5 **M.² & KRAUSE, J.¹**

6
7 ¹**School of Biology, University of Leeds, Leeds**

8 ²**School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Sussex, UK**

9
10 Running headline: WARD et al: POSITIONING IN WILD FISH SHOALS

11
12 Correspondence: A. J. W. Ward, School of Biology, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2

13 9JT, UK (email: bgyajww@leeds.ac.uk).

14
15 Word Count: 3501.

16

- 1 1. The influence of body length and parasitism on the positioning behaviour of
2 individuals in wild fish shoals was investigated by a novel means of capturing
3 entire shoals of the banded killifish (Fundulus diaphanus) using a grid-net that
4 maintained the two-dimensional positions of individuals within shoals.
- 5 2. Fish in the front section of a shoal were larger than those in the rear.
- 6 3. Individuals parasitised by the digenean trematode (Crassiphalaria bulboglossa)
7 showed a tendency to occupy the front of shoals. Parasitised fish were also found
8 more in peripheral positions than central ones in a significant number of shoals.
- 9 4. Shoal geometry was affected by the overall parasite prevalence of shoal members;
10 shoals with high parasite prevalence displayed increasingly phalanx-like shoal
11 formations, whereas shoals with low prevalence were more elliptical.
- 12 5. There was no relationship between body length and parasite load or prevalence in
13 the fish population which suggests body length and parasite status are independent
14 predictors of positioning behaviour.
- 15 6. Solitary individuals found outside shoals were both more likely to be parasitised
16 and had higher parasite loads than individuals engaged in shoaling.
- 17 7. Differences in the shoaling behaviour of parasitised and unparasitised fish are
18 discussed in the context of the adaptive manipulation hypothesis.

19

20

1 Fish shoals present biologists with an ideal opportunity to investigate social living and
2 self-organisation in vertebrates. Despite the attention paid to these subjects, relatively
3 little is known about fish shoals in the wild and still less is known about the
4 positioning of individuals in such shoals. The absence of a method for capturing entire
5 free-ranging shoals whilst preserving the intra-shoal positional integrity has until now
6 prevented the testing of laboratory predictions in the field.

7 The composition of a fish shoal affects its members in a number of ways,
8 particularly in terms of individual predation risk and foraging efficiency (see Krause
9 et al. 2000 for a review). These costs and benefits vary for different positions
10 throughout the shoal. A number of studies have reported increased foraging success
11 for individuals in the front of a shoal. O'Connell (1972) found lower food capture
12 rates of rear individuals in shoals of the northern anchovy (Engraulis mordax).
13 DeBlois & Rose (1996) reported that individuals foraging at the front of a large
14 moving shoal of Atlantic cod (Gadus morhua) gained more food items and those food
15 items tended to be of higher quality than those gathered by fish at the rear of shoals.
16 Major (1978) recorded biased foraging success of leading fish in shoals of striped jack
17 (Caranx ignobilis). However, there is an associated cost with occupying front
18 positions in a moving group in terms of increased per capita risk of predation.
19 Bumann et al. (1997) modelled predator encounters with moving prey groups and
20 were able to identify a significantly greater predation risk to individuals at the front of
21 groups. These findings were supported by empirical data (Krause et al. 1998a). In both
22 studies, lead fish were attacked and killed by a predator significantly more than fish
23 towards the rear.

24 There are a number of phenotypic and context-dependent factors known to
25 influence the positioning behaviour of individuals. In a laboratory study, Krause et al.

1 (1998b) found that large fish occupied the front positions in shoals more frequently
2 than small conspecifics. Differences in swimming speed between small and large fish
3 was proposed as a mechanism for this.

4 The nutritional state of an individual is also known to affect its position.
5 Romey (1995) studied the positioning behaviour of whirligig beetles (Gyrinus sp.) in
6 relation to their nutritional state. Individuals were removed from groups and deprived
7 of food. When those individuals were reintroduced to groups they showed a
8 preference for positioning themselves on the periphery of the group where they were
9 able to gather the most food items. Krause et al. (1993) demonstrated an initial
10 preference of experimentally food-deprived roach (Rutilus rutilus) to occupy front
11 positions when joining a shoal of conspecifics. These individuals subsequently
12 enjoyed higher feeding rates. However, once the experimentally food-deprived
13 individuals satisfied their nutritional requirements their preference for the front of the
14 shoal disappeared.

15 Studies on the positioning behaviour of parasitised individuals have also
16 revealed significant trends. Parasitised fish were more likely to occupy peripheral
17 shoal positions and have greater nearest neighbour distances than unparasitised fish
18 (Krause & Godin: banded killifish (Fundulus diaphanus); Barber & Huntingford 1996:
19 minnow (Phoxinus phoxinus)). Both studies investigated parasites with complex life-
20 cycles which use fish as intermediate hosts. It has been suggested that there should be
21 high selection pressure in such cases for parasites to evolve strategies to manipulate
22 their intermediate host to increase the probability of transmission to their final host,
23 often a piscivorous bird (Poulin 2000). This argument is known as the adaptive
24 manipulation hypothesis and has received support from a number of empirical studies
25 (e.g. Lafferty & Morris 1996). The mechanism by which the parasitic worms brought

1 about the above changes in fish behaviour is not known but could potentially include
2 starving the host. Starvation would be an effective way of making fish take up
3 peripheral shoal positions where food intakes are higher or to make them leave a shoal
4 entirely thus increasing risk of predation and transmission to the final host (Lafferty
5 1999).

6 This study investigates the shoaling behaviour of the banded killifish (E.
7 diaphanus) with specific consideration of the influence of body length and of
8 parasitism on intra-shoal positioning and shoal geometry. The banded killifish is an
9 intermediate host of the trematode parasite, Crassiphalaria bulboglossa. Infected fish
10 develop an externally visible, pigmented cyst which is not horizontally transmissible
11 (Hoffman 1956; Olsen 1974). The exclusive final host of C. bulboglossa is the belted
12 kingfisher, Megaceryle alcyon.

13 Based on previous studies conducted in the laboratory, we predict that:

- 14 1. Larger fish should occupy positions towards the front of shoals given that body
15 length and swimming speed are positively correlated (Beamish 1978).
- 16 2. Parasitised individuals will be more likely to occupy positions at the front and in
17 the periphery of shoals or to occur outside shoals as solitary individuals.
- 18 3. Moving shoals should exhibit an ellipsoid geometry with shoals being longer than
19 they are wide along the axis of locomotion (Bumann et al. 1997)

20

21

GENERAL METHODS

22

Study Site

23

The study site was an 80 m strip of the littoral zone of a northern bay of Morice Lake

24

(near Sackville, New Brunswick, Canada) (45°55'N, 64°21'W). The northern shore of

25

the lake where this study was conducted is not accessible to the general public and is

1 fringed by trees to the west. A combination of these factors and the presence of high
2 fish densities provides suitable habitat for the belted kingfisher and hence the
3 trematode parasite, C. bulboglossa. In fact, belted kingfishers have been observed
4 nesting in the vicinity (pers. obs.). The lake bed shelved gently (ratio approximately
5 1:20), the substrate was principally fine sand with aquatic vegetation being absent in
6 the vicinity of the study area. The water was clear.

7

8 Procedure.

9 Entire free-ranging shoals were collected using a grid-net, which holds individual fish
10 within pockets of netting. The design and operation of the grid net is described in
11 detail in Hoare et al. (see enclosed copy). The grid net was situated in 15 cm of water,
12 2.5 m from the shore. An area of the lake bed equal to that of the grid net (0.25 m²)
13 was excavated to form a shallow (1 cm) recess to accommodate the grid net, ensuring
14 that it lay flush with the surrounding substrate. Once the net was in place, a small
15 amount of the excavated sand was distributed about its surface to act as additional
16 camouflage. When an entire shoal crossed over the grid net it was lifted rapidly and
17 synchronously by two observers using cords fastened to the net. If it could be clearly
18 established by both observers that the entire shoal had been captured, the grid net
19 pocket position, total length (mm) and parasite load of each individual fish was
20 recorded. In addition, the overall shoal direction of travel was noted with respect to
21 the grid net.

22 In a further study, single fish (defined as being > 10 body lengths from a
23 conspecific) were captured using the grid net. This method allowed us to confirm that
24 no other fish were in the vicinity and therefore that the fish captured were indeed
25 solitary. Total length and parasite status were recorded for all single fish. Furthermore,

1 a random sample of the banded killifish population at the site used for the grid-net
2 was taken in order to provide background information on the parasite status of the
3 local killifish population as a whole using a 10 m fine (5 mm) mesh seine net. All fish
4 captured were measured, inspected for parasites and returned.

5 The banded killifish was selected for this study as it is one of the most
6 common species in Morice Lake (Godin & Morgan 1985) and forms two dimensional
7 shoals in the littoral zone.

8

9 Data Analysis

10 Two-dimensional positions of individual fish within a shoal were recorded as x, y co-
11 ordinates on the grid-net. Laboratory controls were conducted using this technique to
12 estimate the intrinsic error. These are discussed in Hoare et al. (see enclosed copy).

13 The centroid was calculated for each shoal. To divide shoals into front and rear
14 sections a line was drawn perpendicular to the direction of travel and bisecting the
15 centroid. Fish in front of this line were deemed to be in the front of the shoal, those
16 behind the line were deemed to be in the back. Median body length, median parasite
17 load and the parasite prevalence were calculated and compared between front and
18 back of each shoal. Distance from the centroid was also determined for each
19 individual fish and comparisons were made between median distance from the
20 centroid for parasitised and unparasitised individuals. The latter comparison was only
21 made in shoals containing more than two fish and where both parasitised and
22 unparasitised fish were present.

23 The degree of the elongation of each shoal was measured by treating shoal
24 members as data points and plotting a linear regression. The angle between the
25 regression line and the shoal direction of travel was determined as shown in Fig. 1.

1 Comparisons were made regarding this angle for shoals composed of > 50%
2 parasitised fish and for shoals composed of < 50% parasitised fish.

3

4 RESULTS

5

6 A total of 21 complete shoals comprising 128 fish were captured using the grid net.
7 Shoal size ranged from 2 individuals to 24, with a median shoal size of 5 (lower
8 quartile = 3; upper quartile = 8). The median body length for all individuals captured
9 using the grid net was 34 mm (lower quartile = 29 mm; upper quartile = 38 mm) and
10 parasite prevalence was 62%. There was no correlation between body length and
11 parasite prevalence (Spearman Rank: $r_s = 0.132$, $P = 0.14$, $N = 128$) or parasite load
12 (Spearman Rank: $r_s = 0.135$, $P = 0.13$, $N = 128$).

13 Median body length and parasite prevalence were greater in the front of a shoal
14 than in the rear (Wilcoxon matched pairs test: body length $Z = 2.66$, $P = 0.008$, $N=21$
15 (Fig. 2); parasite prevalence $Z = 2.55$, $P = 0.011$, $N = 21$ (Fig. 3)). However,
16 parasitised fish in the front of shoals did not have greater parasite loads than
17 parasitised fish to the rear (Wilcoxon matched pairs test: $Z = 0.36$, $P = 0.71$, $N = 16$).

18 Parasitised fish were not further from the shoal centroid than unparasitised fish
19 when tested using a matched pairs test (Wilcoxon signed ranks test: $Z = 1.22$, $P = 0.11$
20 $N = 14$). However, this may have been due to both the small sample size and the
21 presence of outliers. Parasitised fish were further from the shoal centroid than
22 unparasitised fish in 11 of the 14 shoals (Binomial Test: $P = 0.029$).

23 Shoals composed of a majority of parasitised fish showed greater angles
24 between a fitted linear regression trendline and the direction of travel than shoals

1 composed of a majority of unparasitised fish (Mann-Whitney U-test: $Z_{3,12} = 2.6$, $P =$
2 0.009 , $N = 15$) (see Fig. 1).

3 A total of 18 solitary (non-shoaling) killifish were captured. These were
4 compared with the shoaling individuals caught using the grid net. The solitary fish
5 were more likely to be parasitised than fish from a random sample (Resampling test: P
6 $= 0.048$, $N = 1000$) and showed higher parasite loads (Resampling test: $P = 0.005$, $N =$
7 1000).

8

9

DISCUSSION

10

11 This study is the first to document the influence of parasitism on positioning within
12 wild fish shoals. It is also the first to report clear body length related front-back trends
13 in entire free-ranging shoals. Fish in the front half of a shoal were more likely to be
14 parasitised than their shoal-mates. They were not, however, likely to have greater
15 parasite loads. Furthermore, we found that individuals at the front of shoals were
16 larger than their conspecifics in the back of the shoal.

17 Trends within shoals concerning body length may be explained by variation in
18 competitive ability, feeding motivation and swimming ability. Large fish have a
19 higher mass-specific metabolic efficiency than do smaller conspecifics (Wootton
20 1994) and may be less motivated to feed. However, as foraging rewards are greater for
21 the fish at the front of moving shoals, stronger competitors should occupy front
22 positions especially in environments with low predation regimes. The greater
23 swimming capability of large fish (Beamish 1978) in terms of speed and stamina
24 seems likely to be a contributory factor, but not enough is yet known about the
25 swimming speeds of shoaling fish.

1 Individuals in the front of a shoal were significantly more likely to be
2 parasitised than individuals in the rear of shoals. By exploiting the hosts energy
3 reserves, *C. bulboglossa* appears to manipulate host behaviour (Barber et al 2000),
4 increasing its motivation to feed and causing the infected killifish to seek shoal
5 positions that will maximise its foraging rate, such as in the front or on the periphery
6 of shoals. However, we did not find that individuals in the front of a shoal were more
7 heavily parasitised than the fish in the rear. This suggests that whilst parasites may
8 manipulate positioning behaviour by increasing foraging motivation, more heavily
9 parasitised individuals may be unable to either withstand the foraging competition
10 associated with shoaling or are unable to shoal for other reasons, such as increased
11 swimming costs. The cyst may deleteriously affect the hydrodynamic efficiency of the
12 parasitised individual. Similarly, the positioning of the cyst on or around the dorsal
13 musculature may impinge on swimming ability by obstructing blood flow,
14 precipitating atrophication of the muscle or otherwise disrupting motor function.
15 Krause & Godin (1994) reported a lack of motor control in heavily parasitised fish.
16 This means that parasitised individuals are likely to have to work harder than
17 unparasitised fish, or individuals with lower parasite loads, to maintain a position
18 towards the front of a shoal. It is also likely that heavily infected individuals need to
19 spend more time foraging to attain the same nutritional benefit as marginally or non-
20 parasitised individuals (Barber et al. 2000). This may explain the observed trend for
21 higher parasite loads observed in the solitary fish caught. The isolation of an
22 individual of a shoaling species is likely to increase its likelihood of being predated,
23 which is potential evidence for the phenomenon described by Lafferty (1999) as
24 ‘parasite increased trophic transmission’ (PITT). Lafferty & Morris (1996) were able

1 to show that killifish parasitised by trematode worms suffered increased predation,
2 increasing the probability of transmission of the parasite to its final host.

3 For the strategy of the parasite to be described as adaptive, it must cause
4 greater predation by the final host on the intermediate host. No data as yet exists to
5 describe the per capita predation risks associated with different positions in shoals of
6 banded killifish in direct relation to predation by the belted kingfisher. However, it is
7 likely that a putative reduction in vigilance associated with increased feeding
8 requirements, and the isolation of heavily parasitised individuals, could both
9 contribute to an increased predation risk.

10 The difference in shoal geometry between shoals consisting mainly of
11 parasitised individuals and shoals made up mainly of unparasitised individuals may be
12 explained by heterogeneity in foraging benefits between shoal positions and the
13 hypothesised higher feeding motivation of parasitised fish. As a position on the
14 leading edge of a moving shoal is the most beneficial for individuals with high
15 metabolic requirements, it appears intuitive that a shoal of parasitised fish might
16 arrange themselves such that the entire shoal becomes like a leading edge, i.e.
17 phalanx-shaped, to maximise foraging benefits. Shoals containing a majority of
18 unparasitised individuals with lower foraging requirements may be expected to adopt
19 a more risk-aware strategy with respect to shoal positions adopted. This could impinge
20 on shoal geometry by producing more typically aligned and elongated shoals.

21 Useful further work would include additional data on the role played by
22 passive factors such as swimming speed in shaping shoal positions. More information
23 needs to be gathered on the existence of any increased incidence of predation by both
24 the definitive host and by non-hosts on parasitised fish (Lafferty & Morris 1996).

25

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6

The authors would like to thank Jean-Guy Godin and Wayne Anderson for their support throughout this study. J.K. was financially supported by a NERC grant. A.W. was funded by a Parkinson Scholarship of the University of Leeds.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1

2

3 Able, K.W. (1990) Life history patterns of New Jersey salt marsh killifishes. *Bull N J*
4 *Acad Sci* **35** 23-20.

5 Arme, C. & Owen, R.W. (1967) Infections of the three-spined sticklebacks,
6 *Gasterosteus aculeatus* L., with the plerocercoid larvae of *Schistocephalus*
7 *solidus* (Muller 1776) with special reference to pathological effects.
8 *Parasitology* **57** 301-314.

9 Barber I & Huntingford FA (1996) Parasite infection alters schooling behaviour:
10 Deviant positioning of helminth-infected minnows in conspecific groups *Proc*
11 *Roy Soc Lond Ser B* **263** 1095-1102

12 Barber, I., Hoare, D.J. & Krause, J. (2000) The effects of parasites on fish behaviour:
13 an evolutionary perspective and review. *Rev Fish Biol Fisheries* **10** 1-35.

14 Beamish, F.W.H. (1978) Swimming capacity – In: Fish Physiology, vol. VII (W.S.
15 Hoar & D.J. Randall, eds). Academic Press, New York. P. 101-187.

16 Bumann, D., Krause, J. & Rubenstein, D. (1997) Mortality risk of spatial positions in
17 animal groups: the danger of being in the front. *Behaviour* **134** 1063-1074.

18 DeBlois EM & Rose GA (1996) Cross-shoal variability in the feeding habits of
19 migrating Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) *Oecologia* **108** 192-196

- 1 Godin, J-G., J. & Morgan, M.J. (1985) Predator avoidance and shoal size in a
2 cyprinodontid fish, the banded killifish (*Fundulus diaphanus*, Lesueur). *Behav.*
3 *Ecol. Sociobiol.* **16** 105-110.
- 4 Krause J & Godin JGJ (1996) Influence of parasitism on shoal choice in the banded
5 killifish (*Fundulus diaphanus*, Teleostei, Cyprinodontidae) *Ethology* **102** 40-49
- 6 Krause, J., Bumann, D. & Todt, D. (1992) Relationship between position preference
7 and nutritional state of individuals in schools of juvenile roach (*Rutilus*
8 *rutilus*).
- 9 *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* **30** 177-180.
- 10 Krause, J., Ruxton, G.D. & Rubenstein, D.I. (1998a) Is there an influence on group
11 size on hunting success? *J Fish Biol* **52** 494-501.
- 12 Krause, J., Reeves, P. & Hoare, D.J. (1998b) Positioning behaviour in roach shoals:
13 the role of body length and nutritional state. *Behaviour* **135** 1031-1039.
- 14 Krause, J., Hoare, D.J., Croft, D.P., Lawrence, J., Ward, A.J.W., Ruxton, G.D.,
15 Godin, J-G. J. & James, R. (2000) Fish shoal composition: mechanisms and
16 constraints. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* **267** 2011-2017.
- 17 Lafferty, K.D. (1999) The evolution of trophic transmission. *Parasitology Today* **15**,
18 111-115
- 19 Lafferty, K.D. & Morris, A.K. (1996) Altered behaviour of parasitised killifish
20 increases susceptibility to predation by bird hosts *Ecology*
- 21 Lester, R.J.G. (1971) The influence of *Schistocephalus* plerocercoids on the
22 respiration of *Gasterosteus* and a possible resulting effect on the behaviour of
23 the fish. *Can J Zool* **49** 361-366.
- 24 Major, P. (1978) Predator-prey interactions in two schooling fishes, *Caranx ignobilis*
25 and *Stolephorus purpureus*. *Anim Behav* **26** 760-777.

- 1 O'Connell, C.P. (1972) The interrelation of biting and filtering in the feeding activity
2 of the northern anchovy (Engraulis mordax) *J Fish Res Board Can* **33**, 1964-
3 1971.
- 4 Olsen, O.W. (1974) *Animal parasites: their life cycles and ecology*. University Park
5 Press, Baltimore, Md..
- 6 Poulin, R. (2000) Manipulation of host behaviour by parasites: a weakening
7 paradigm?
8 *Proc Roy Soc Lond Ser B* **267** 787-792.
- 9 Romey, W.L. (1985) Position preferences within groups: do whirligigs select
10 positions
11 which balance feeding opportunities with predator avoidance? *Behav Ecol*
12 *Sociobiol* **37** 195-200
- 13 Wootton (1994) Energy allocation in the three-spine stickleback. In: Bell MA, Foster
14 SA (eds) *The evolutionary biology of the threespine stickleback*. Science
15 Publications, Oxford, pp 116-143.
- 16

1 *Figure 1: Illustration of variability in shoal geometry. Fig 3a shows small angle x*
2 *between direction of travel (—) and linear regression trendline (—) denoting*
3 *a characteristically processional shoal. Fig 3b shows a large angle between direction*
4 *of travel and a linear regression trendline characteristic of a phallanx-type shoal*
5 *formation. Circular filled symbols (●) indicate positions of shoal members recorded*
6 *on the grid-net.*

7
8 *Figure 2: Comparison of median body lengths between fish in the front and rear of a*
9 *shoal. Error bars show quartiles. $N = 21$ shoals.*

10

11 *Figure 3: Comparison of parasite prevalence between fish in the front and rear of a*
12 *shoal. Error bars show quartiles. $N = 21$.*

13

14

15

1

2



