

ASI Series

Science Institutes Series

*representing the results of activities sponsored by the NATO Science Committee,
at the dissemination of advanced scientific and technological knowledge,
to strengthening links between scientific communities.*

is published by an international board of publishers in conjunction with the
Scientific Affairs Division

ences

Plenum Publishing Corporation
London and New York

ational

ysical Sciences

atural and Social Sciences

l Sciences

Kluwer Academic Publishers
Dordrecht, Boston and London

ter and Systems Sciences

cal Sciences

ology

Springer-Verlag
Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, London,
Paris and Tokyo

Ethoexperimental Approaches to the Study of Behavior

edited by

Robert J. Blanchard

University of Hawaii at Manoa,
Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S.A.

Paul F. Brain

University College of Swansea,
Swansea, United Kingdom

D. Caroline Blanchard

University of Hawaii at Manoa,
Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S.A.

and

Stefano Parmigiani

University of Parma,
Parma, Italy



Kluwer Academic Publishers

Dordrecht / Boston / London

Published in cooperation with NATO Scientific Affairs Division

ail, A. C., Balda, R. P., & Grim, K. (1986). Revisits to emptied the sites by Clark's nutcrackers (*Nucifraga columbiana*). Animal Behaviour, 34, 1289-1298.

lda, R. P., & Kamil, A. C. (1989). A comparative study of cache recovery by three corvid species. Animal Behaviour, in press.

ail, A. C. (1978). Systematic foraging by a nectar-feeding bird, Amakihi (*Loxops virens*). Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 92, 388-396.

terman, M. E. (1960). Toward a comparative psychology of learning. American Psychologist, 15, 704-712.

Macphail, E. M. (1982). Brain and Intelligence in Vertebrates. Oxford:Clarendon Press.

icks, R. A., Kamil, A. C., & Mack, R. (1972). The effects of fixed-ratio sample requirements on matching-to-sample in the pigeon. Ethonomic Science, 17, 483-488.

Roberts, W. A. (1972). Short-term memory in the pigeon: Effects of repetition and spacing. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes, 6, 17-237.

lda, R. P., & Kamil, A. C. (1988). The spatial memory of Clark's nutcrackers (*Nucifraga columbiana*) in an analog of the radial-arm maze. Animal Learning and Behavior, 16, 116-122.

atty, W. W., & Shavalia, D. A. (1980). Spatial memory in rats: The course of working memory and effect of anesthetics. Behavioral and Neural Biology, 28, 454-462.

etch, M. L., & Edwards, C. A. (1986). Spatial memory in pigeons (*Columba livia*) in an "open-field" feeding environment. Journal of Comparative Psychology, 100, 279-284.

Spetch, M. L., & Honig, W. (1988). Characteristics of pigeons' spatial working memory in an open-field task. Animal Learning and Behavior, 16, 123-131.

LABORATORY STUDIES OF NATURALLY-OCCURRING FEEDING BEHAVIORS: PITFALLS, PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS IN ETHOEXPERIMENTAL ANALYSIS

B.G. GALEF, JR.
Department of Psychology, McMaster University,
Hamilton, Ontario L8S 4K1, Canada

1. INTRODUCTION

Nineteenth-century naturalists, the intellectual forebears of today's ethologists and experimental, animal psychologists, worked in one of two very different settings. Field naturalists, as the name implies, studied the behavior of free-living animals in natural habitat. Closet naturalists, working within the walls of the museum or 'closet', dissected dead organisms and attempted to find order in similarities and differences in the morphologies of the specimens they examined.

Although those laboring indoors depended on field workers to forward new material for dissection and analysis, there was little additional contact between field and closet. Because field workers wrote largely for lay audiences, closet naturalists, often suspicious of the public acclaim some field workers enjoyed, paid almost no attention to field publications. Unhappily for field workers, closet naturalists controlled the academic positions and prestigious scientific posts of the day. In consequence, many field naturalists came to resent "the tyranny of the closet", the domination of biology by practitioners of a "science of dead things" (Gosse, 1851, p.v).

The near-complete separation of laboratory and field research in biology that occurred in Nineteenth-century England was detrimental to both endeavors. There was little lasting value in the work of field naturalists unable (or unwilling) to identify scientifically the species they were observing. For example, the eccentric, explorer-naturalist Charles Waterton (1825) provided idiosyncratic transcriptions of local Arawak names, rather than Linnean names, of the mammals and birds whose behavior he described in his journal of South America travels. Consequently, many of Waterton's otherwise-informative observations proved of little scientific worth; the various animals and plants that Waterton discussed often could not be identified by later workers (Matthews, 1973).

On the other hand, lack of experience of animals in nature led closet naturalists, sometimes unable even to recognize living examples of animals they knew only as specimens for dissection, into embarrassing errors. The first straw-stuffed specimens of birds of paradise sent by field naturalists to England from New Guinea had had their legs removed to facilitate packing. Leglessness was assumed by closet men to be characteristic of the Paradiseidae and led some to conclude that birds of paradise spent their entire lives airborne. Only subsequent shipments of specimens complete with legs brought the misunderstanding to an end.¹

¹ I have depended heavily on Barber's (1980) characterization of natural history during the period 1820-1870 in preceding paragraphs.

During the first 70 years of the present century, the situation in North American study of animal learning was little better than it had been in English naturalism of the preceding century. Although there were, in the late 1800's, those who, like Willard Small (1900a, 1900b) and Linus Kline (1898, 1899), strongly advocated integration of field and laboratory studies of animal learning, those thinking in ethological terms failed to carry the day. For half a century and more, study of animal learning by experimental psychologists was dominated by others (Hull, 1943; Thorndike, 1898; Tolman, 1938; Watson, 1914) who felt strongly that animal learning or, perhaps more precisely, "the nature of the process of association in the animal mind" (Thorndike, 1911, p. 20) was best studied in situations as different as possible from those one might expect members of each species of animal to encounter in their respective, ecological situations. As Seligman (1970, p. 406) accurately observed many years later, "What captured the interest of the psychological world was the possibility that laws of behavior deduced from the study of animals in arbitrary situations might describe the general characteristics of behavior acquired as the result of pairing one event with another."

The behavior of a rat at the junction of a T-maze and of the eyelid of a rabbit in response to a puff of air were to serve learning theorists (as the inheritance of traits in fruit flies served geneticists) as model systems where association formation could be easily explored and quantified. Knowledge of special abilities to learn, exhibited by members of particular species in their respective natural habitats, was useful only as a guide to situations to avoid studying in the laboratory. What was of interest was the formation of associations "free from the helping hand of instinct" (Thorndike, 1911, p. 30), not specialized associative abilities exhibited by members of particular species.

During the past decade, it has become fashionable to question the usefulness of such 'closet', psychological studies of learning processes. It should, however, be kept in mind that one of the more-exciting, contemporary developments at the interface between psychology and biology, exploration of the cellular and molecular processes responsible for behavioral plasticity in animals with simple nervous systems (Hawkins & Kandel, 1984), has as its basis just this closet approach to animal learning, currently out of favor among behavioral scientists.

Hence, the point at which I would like to begin discussion of ethological and experimental contributions to the study of feeding behavior in animals, the main topic of the present chapter, is with the understanding that there is nothing intellectually inherently good or bad about the integration of 'field' and 'closet' approaches to the study of behavior. All depends on the questions one is trying to answer.

2. THE STUDY OF FEEDING BEHAVIOR

In one sense, the history of the study of feeding behavior is relatively unusual among areas of closet, behavioral research; study of feeding behavior has been characterized since its very inception by the attempt to capture, in the laboratory, behaviors presumed to occur in nature. However, in other important ways, the history of the study of feeding behavior has much in common with more typical areas of closet, behavioral research. In study of feeding behavior, as in many other areas, no one has looked to see how similar the behavior of animals outside the laboratory is to that of their captive brethren.

It is, I suppose, reasonable to assume that feeding in the field, like feeding in the laboratory, tends to occur in bouts interspersed with

periods of other activities (Le Magnen, 1985) or that the signals, external and internal, that cause an animal to initiate, sustain, and terminate each of its feeding bouts are the same in field and closet. However, it is probably equally reasonable to speculate that the details of meal patterns in the laboratory reflect, at least in part, the ease with which food is acquired by captive animals and the absence of a need for caged animals to engage in many of the activities required for survival outside the laboratory. Similarly, satiety signals may be far more commonly experienced by those animals whose feeding schedules are controlled by the dictates of animal care committees than by those animals exposed to the vagaries of the natural world.

In general, the details of feeding probably depend on the circumstances in which it is observed. Thus, although animals outside the laboratory like captive individuals, are probably selective feeders, eagerly ingesting some substances and avoiding others, it is not obvious that individuals that have had to compete for limited food resources throughout their lives would be so finicky as those used to life in cages providing ad lib access to food. Body weight regulation in free-living animals may depend more on variation in energy expenditure than is the case in relatively-immobile, caged animals (See Keesey, 1986, for relevant discussion). In sum, although closet study of the processes - neural, hormonal, physiological and behavioral - that control feeding behavior has been influenced for more than 50 years by a desire to understand feeding and body weight regulation as they occur in nature, there is little evidence that would convince the cynical that one can extrapolate with confidence from laboratory analogues of feeding behavior in the field to feeding behavior in natural habitat.

Study of food intake is, of course, much too large a field to be reviewed, even in cursory fashion, in a single chapter. Therefore instead of attempting a general review of the history of the study of feeding behavior, I have elected to discuss below the interplay of field and laboratory research in the development of two relatively-small areas of investigation -- self-selection of nutrients and poison avoidance -- chosen from within the broader area of feeding behavior. I have two reasons for choosing these particular areas to discuss. First, neither area is particularly technical and, consequently, both are relatively accessible to non-specialists. Second, studies of both self-selection of diet and poison avoidance provide clear object lessons in the difficulty of successfully integrating ethological and experimental analyses of feeding behavior.

2.1 Self-selection of diet by animals

The outcomes of early studies of the ability of animals (usually Norway rats or domesticated chickens) to select a balanced diet from among an array of foods, each of which contained different nutrients, were contradictory. Some rats or chickens faced with a cafeteria of foods to choose among ate a mix of foods that promoted rapid growth. Others elected to eat foods in proportions that led to abnormally slow growth and vitamin deficiency diseases (see for example, Dove, 1935; Harris, Clay Hargreaves & Ward, 1933).

It became clear early in the study of food selection that the success of subjects in selecting an adequate diet from an array of foods depended on the parameters of the test situation: the number of foods offered for choice (Harris et al., 1933), the relative palatabilities of the particular foods available (Kon, 1931), the sensory discriminability of

food that contained a nutrient that would redress a dietary deficiency, and the rapidity with which the nutrients in various foods relieved symptoms of deficiency (Harris *et al.*, 1933). It also became obvious early on that differences among individuals in both flavor preferences and sampling strategies influenced their relative success in self-selecting adequate diets in cafeteria-feeding situations (Dove, 1935). Indeed, by 1935, understanding of the processes involved in self-selection of foods by animals was not markedly different from modern interpretations (Rozin, 1976).

Five years later, in 1938, both interpretation of the abilities of animals to construct a balanced diet and speculation as to how they did so had been radically altered. These changes, not all desirable, had occurred as the direct result of introduction of ecological considerations into discussions of diet choice by animals.

It was proposed by Curt Richter, the major figure in the early study of behavioral homeostasis, that;

"The survival of animals and humans in the wild state in which the diet has to be selected from a great variety of beneficial, useless, and even harmful substances is proof of this ability [...]"To make dietary selections which are conducive to normal growth and reproduction"]... In the wild state, quantitative studies of the food intake of animals and humans would be impractical. It is necessary, therefore, to try to reproduce the essential features of field conditions in the laboratory." (Richter, Holt, & Barelare, 1938, p. 734).

To Richter and his co-workers, reproduction "of the essential features of field conditions in the laboratory" meant offering rats in captivity a choice among eleven 'purified' dietary constituents (Casein, yeast, sucrose, olive oil, cod liver oil, wheat germ oil, NaCl, KCl, Na₂ HPO₄, Ca-lactate) and H₂O. The success of subjects feeding from this particular array of foods was consistent with Richter's expectations based on his interpretation of the behavior of animals in the 'wild state'. Rats offered Richter's selection of purified dietary constituents selected substances to eat and drink with remarkable efficiency; they grew both faster and with lower caloric intake than did control subjects eating the McCullom Diet, compounded by nutritionists.

As already mentioned, there were, even in the 1930's and 40's, clear indications in the literature that rats (and chickens) did not always do so well when self-selecting a diet (Dove, 1935; Harris *et al.*, 1933; Kon, 1931; Scott, 1946; Pilgrim & Patton, 1947; see Epstein, 1967; and Lát, 1967 for reviews). Such failures to self-select adequately among foods, found in the majority of studies of self-selection in cafeteria situations (Lát, 1967), were explained away by Richter and his associates as the result of one kind of laboratory artifact or another: (a) the use of complex, natural foods in choice tests (Richter, 1942-1943; Richter, Holt, & Barelare, 1938), (b) inherited defects in the sensory systems of some subjects, (c) breakdown in subjects' homeostatic systems due to aging or environmental stress, and (d) the effects, in humans, of perverse cultural influences on behavior (Richter, 1942-1943).

In retrospect, these explanations are obviously inadequate. They offer no compelling rationale for why subjects in Richter's laboratory self-

selected an adequate diet, while those in the laboratory of Kon or of Scott or of Tribe, etc. failed to do so. The first of the four explanations even places Richter in the awkward position of arguing that the "use of natural foods instead of purified chemical substances will certainly frequently confuse the choices" (Richter, 1942-1943, p. 223), when all researchers in the area were trying to capture in the laboratory processes analogous to those permitting "animals and humans to make dietary selection... conducive to normal growth and reproduction... in the wild state." (Richter, Holt, & Barelare, 1938, p. 734).

Richter's success in demonstrating total self-selection of diets by rats, when many others failed to do so, was probably the result both of his idiosyncratic method for selecting the particular macronutrients in his cafeteria (Richter, Holt & Barelare, 1938) and of chance. Richter's method for selecting macronutrients guaranteed that he would chose the least pure carbohydrate, fat, and protein from among those he considered for use. Happenstantially, his choices also resulted in a cafeteria with both multiple sources of protein and a relatively-unpalatable carbohydrate, a combination that seems to promote success by rats when self-selecting diets (Epstein, 1967).

Why devote so much attention to an unsatisfactory, 50-year-old approach to the study of self-selection of diet? Because, even today, Richter's proposition that the simple existence of omnivores in natural environments provides evidence of their very considerable ability to self-select balanced diets influences both design of experiments and interpretation of data.

Everyone in the field of psychobiology knows that Richter's rats thrived in his cafeteria-feeding situation. Most believe that Clara Davis (during the 1930's, a student of self-selection of diet by children) showed that human children, like Richter's rats, can self-select balanced, nutritious diets. Only relative experts in the area of diet selection know that Richter's cafeteria was unusual in allowing rats to self-select adequate diets and that Davis neither showed, nor claimed to show, that children were particularly clever at selecting foods to eat (Rozin, 1976; Story & Brown, 1987). Indeed, Davis (1939, p. 261) concluded her classic paper on self-selection of foods by children with the statement "the results of the experiment...leave the selection of foods to be made available to young children in the hands of their elders, where everyone has always known it belongs."

Richter's overdrawn, ecologically-derived conclusion, that the survival of animals and humans in nature provides evidence of their abilities to self-select adequate diets in the laboratory, distorted the field for a half-century. Results of laboratory studies that showed that animals could self-select adequate diets were widely cited. Experiments that failed to produce the desired result were either ignored or treated as unnatural laboratory artifacts. Researchers were led to ask how omnivores self-select balanced diets before they knew much about whether (or under what conditions) omnivores were able to self-select balanced diets. The result was a failure to appreciate the complexity of natural environments and the insurmountable challenge that some natural situations may pose.

Rather than assume that animals can compose an adequate diet under any circumstance where it is theoretically possible to do so, it seems more reasonable to consider the possibility that members of any species, even those as cosmopolitan in distribution as Norway rats or 'primitive' *H. sapiens* are not able to survive everywhere within their respective species' ranges. By definition, individuals can survive only in those

portions of the environment that both provide all resources necessary for life and lack insurmountable threats. An area would be devoid of rats if it contained either lethal substances that rats could not learn to avoid eating or a necessary nutrient that was available only in a form that rats could not learn to eat.

Contrary to Richter's assertion, existence of an omnivorous species in nature tells us little about the range of environments in which species members have the ability to self-select nutritionally-adequate, safe diets. Persistence of omnivores outside the laboratory shows only that there exist portions of the environment where the behavioral capacities of species members are sufficient to permit them to develop dietary repertoires adequate for self-maintenance, growth, and reproduction. Both those laboratory situations in which rats self-select foods adequately and those in which they fail to do so are probably informative analogues of situations in the real world. Armchair naturalism, of the sort practiced by Richter, though often powerful in its historical effects on the development of an area of laboratory research, is not necessarily beneficial.

2.2 Poison avoidance by animals

Like laboratory study of diet-selection by animals, laboratory investigation of the learning of aversions to toxic substances has been profoundly influenced by reference to ecological scenarios. For the past two decades, interpretation of taste-aversion learning by rats as a form of adaptively-specialized learning, evolved in response to selective pressures provided by naturally-occurring toxins, has served as a paradigmatic case of the utility of ecological perspectives in discussion of ingestive behavior. Following Rozin and Kalat's (1971) forceful presentation of taste-aversion learning as a major factor in the ability of rats to select nutrients when vitamin deficient, it became easy to forget that the ability of rats to learn association between tastes and toxicosis is not necessarily an important component of their response to naturally-occurring toxins.

John Garcia did not come to the study of taste-aversion learning as the result of field observations indicating that rats in nature learn to avoid ingesting naturally-occurring, palatable-but-toxic foods that induce illness some hours after they are ingested. Rather, the ability to learn taste-aversions over long delays was a serendipitous discovery in the course of explorations of the unconditioned effects of X-irradiation. Adaptive functions of the special properties of taste aversion learning were proposed post hoc.

2.2.1. Long-delay learning. Rats tolerate very long intervals between experience of a novel flavor and subsequent illness and still learn an aversion to the novel flavor (Garcia, Ervin & Koelling, 1966). In the laboratory, the novel flavorants used as conditional stimuli in taste-aversion-learning experiments are usually palatable substances such as sodium saccharin. If unpalatable flavorants, like quinine hydrochloride, were used as conditional stimuli, even naive subjects would be reluctant to ingest them and evidence of aversion learning would be more difficult to produce. Although it is convenient to study the acquisition of aversions to palatable foods by rats, it is not obvious that rats need to learn such aversions outside the laboratory. There is no evidence of which I know either that rats encounter palatable, toxic foods in their natural habitats or that such palatable, toxic foods have effects delayed by many minutes or hours. There are reasons to believe, to the contrary,

that palatable toxins with delayed effects are less likely to exist than vile-tasting, fast-acting poisons.

Prey species that evolve means to manufacture or sequester toxins do so at least in part, to deter potential predators. Immediately perceived unpalatability and rapid induction of pain or illness, are more reliable deterrents to ingestion than is palatability coupled with long-delayed, negative after-effects (Domjan & Galef, 1983). The burden of proof of the existence of palatable toxins with delayed postingestional consequences, that rats in natural ecosystems have had to learn to avoid for millennia, rests with those who hypothesize the existence of such "cryptic toxins". Surely, human progress in the control of commensal rodent pests would benefit immensely from discovery and use of cryptic toxins in concentrated form in poison baits.

It has become standard practice to accept as demonstrated an unproved (in fact, an unexamined) hypothesis about the properties of naturally-occurring toxins and their impact, via natural selection, on the learning of flavor aversions. If there were palatable, toxic foods in the environment in which rats evolved and if the onset of illness resulting from the ingestion of such toxins was delayed by many hours, then the ability to learn aversions to palatable flavors over long delays might have evolved in response to the selective pressures exerted by such toxic foods. However, we do not know that such cryptic toxins are present in the natural environments of rats. Hence, appeal to the selective pressure they would provide to explain the evolution of rat behavior is pure speculation. It is, for example, possible that a system permitting the association of tastes with long-delayed consequences of ingestion evolved to permit rats to identify beneficial foods, not toxic substances. On this hypothesis, the capacity of a system shaped by natural selection to permit rats to identify nutrients to respond to the negative postingestional consequences of toxins would be largely epiphenomenal.

2.2.2. Cue-to-consequence specificity. It is frequently asserted (Rozin & Kalat, 1971) that the tendency of rats to learn to avoid the taste rather than the visual or auditory properties of the things that they eat (Garcia & Koelling, 1966) is adaptive. However, if, as has also been argued (Wilcoxon, Dragoin, & Kral, 1971), it is adaptive for birds to be able to learn to avoid foods that cause illness on the basis of the visual properties of those foods, it is hard to understand why it would be disadvantageous for rats to do so as well (Galef & Osborne, 1978).

The assertion that organisms more readily learn aversions to foods using the sensory modalities that dominate in their selection of substances to eat and drink (Rozin & Kalat, 1971) has not held up well as evidence has accumulated. Buteo hawks, surely at least as visually guided in their food selection as chickens or quail (species that tend to form aversions to the visual properties of foods), develop stronger aversions to the taste than to the visual properties of toxic prey (Brett, Hankins, & Garcia, 1976). The guinea pig, like the rat crepuscular in its daily activity rhythm, forms aversions to both the tastes and the visual properties of fluids (Braveman, 1974). Chickens tend to learn aversions to the tastes of fluids and to the visual properties of foods (Gillette, Martin, & Bellingham, 1980). While I do not doubt that it is possible, after the fact, to compose adaptive explanations for the tendencies of members of each of these species to form aversions to one or another sensory characteristic of the solids or fluids they ingest, I do not believe that such explanations could have been constructed before the facts were known.

The post hoc development of adaptive explanations for each feature of poison-avoidance learning is not only intellectually irritating. Once such explanations are widely accepted, they can come to serve as "filters", determining whether new findings are treated as important. Data compatible with a prevailing functional interpretation are accepted; data incompatible with an accepted functional explanation are either ignored or explained away. If such functional explanations of laboratory phenomena are based on field data, rather than on extrapolations from the results of the laboratory experiments themselves, then the functional explanations can be valuable in understanding laboratory findings. However, when field data are lacking, the influence of functional speculations can be pernicious.

2.2.3. Adaptive patterns of diet sampling. As discussed above, Richter's assertions about the ability of individual omnivores to self-select balanced diets in the wild led the unwary to ignore situations in which omnivores failed to select foods wisely. Similarly, post hoc functional explanations of the special features of taste-aversion learning may have persuaded some to ignore data that are inconsistent with the prevailing interpretation. For example, as Zahorik and Houpt (1981) have made clear, the usefulness of the ability of rats to form aversions to the taste of unfamiliar, toxic foods, when adverse effects of ingesting those foods are delayed for hours, depends on the sampling strategy that rats employ when they encounter unfamiliar, potentially-dangerous foods.

Rats should eat relatively-small, initial meals of unfamiliar foods. They should also eat only one unfamiliar food at a time. If a rat gorged on each unfamiliar food that it encountered, the ability to learn rapidly to associate the taste of an unfamiliar food with toxicosis would sometimes be of little use; at least some unfamiliar, toxic substances would prove fatal following a first, large meal. Obviously, if a rat were to sample several unfamiliar foods in rapid succession and become ill, it would have difficulty identifying the particular unfamiliar food that was toxic. The sick individual might develop a strong aversion to the most salient (Kalat & Rozin, 1970) or, perhaps, the last-eaten, unfamiliar food, but, unfortunately, neither salience nor order of ingestion are reliable guides to toxicity. Cautious ingestion of one unfamiliar food at a time would appear to maximize an individual's chances of both surviving initial encounters with unfamiliar foods and associating a poisonous food with its consequences.

Rozin and Kalat (1971, p.465), in discussing the acquisition of learned preferences, proposed that "The rat's feeding pattern maximizes the possibility of associating each diet with its appropriate consequences, since meals tend to be isolated in time and consist of a single food." Similar assertions have been made subsequently by others (Shettleworth, 1984; Zahorik & Houpt, 1981). Although there is general agreement in the published literature concerning the behavior of rats sampling among unfamiliar foods, the evidence contradicts the consensus. Adaptive sampling among novel foods by rats, leading to ready identification of toxins is accepted as true, not because there is adequate evidence of such sampling, but because it appears to be required by prevailing functional interpretations of the results of laboratory studies of taste-aversion learning.

Many investigators have described the hesitancy of wild rats to begin eating unfamiliar foods (Barnett, 1958; Barnett & Cowan, 1975; Galef, 1970; Mitchell, 1976; Rozin, 1968; Rzoska, 1953; Chitty & Shorten, 1946). However, evidence of reluctance to start eating an unfamiliar food or

foods does not bear directly on the issue of whether rats sample among several unfamiliar foods so as to be able to associate each food with its postingestive consequences. Hesitancy to begin eating unfamiliar foods only delays the moment of truth.

Rozin (1969) is most frequently cited as having provided evidence that rats sample unfamiliar foods one at a time so as to facilitate identification of any toxins they ingest. However, Rozin demonstrated only that, over a period of several days, 4 of 10 thiamine-deficient, rats came to prefer the thiamine-rich alternative as a result of their sampling behavior. Rozin's (1969) data do not show (and Rozin has not claimed that they do show) that rats encountering several unfamiliar, potentially-dangerous foods sample among them so as to facilitate identification of a toxic food should one be present. To the contrary, Rozin's (1969) data indicated that most of his subjects ate two or three unfamiliar foods during the first 1/2 hour that those foods were available.

Promiscuous sampling of unfamiliar foods is not restricted to domesticated rats. Barnett (1956, p.30) found that when four unfamiliar foods were offered to first-generation, laboratory-bred, wild rats for the first time "It was usual for all four foods to be eaten within the first feeding period." Absence of sampling of one unfamiliar food at a time is obvious in each of several descriptions of the behavior of individual wild rats facing a choice among four unfamiliar foods (flour, sugar, liver, and wheat). For instance,

"Eating begins with 15 minutes' intermittent consumption of flour with some sniffing of the other foods. Liver is eaten for 2 min., then still holding a piece of liver, leans into sugar box and eats sugar, leaves piece of liver at back of cage, returns to liver tin and eats liver for 1 min. Eats sugar for 5 min. Restless interval of 4 min. followed by picking up bits of liver and dropping them; eats wheat for 1 min, then snuffles in the wheat tin. Followed by 42 min of restlessness with some sampling of wheat, flour and sugar, before settling to sleep..." (Barnett, 1956, p.32).

It is difficult to see how a rat that suffered toxicosis after sampling among four unfamiliar foods in this way would know which food to avoid in future. Similarly, in a more recent study of sampling among unfamiliar foods, Beck, Hitchcock, and Galef (1988) found that wild rats did not tend to eat one unfamiliar food at a time and did not wait an unusually long time after eating one unfamiliar food before eating another.

2.2.4. Summary. My reason for discussing at some length the use of functional arguments to provide frameworks for discussion both of dietary self-selection and poison avoidance is that review of both these bodies of literature suggests that an ethological approach to the discussion and interpretation of laboratory data can have costs as well as benefits. The benefits are obvious. A functional framework provides means both of integrating diverse findings into a coherent story and of identifying significant findings. Indeed, when an explanation of the function of some behavior is based on data, it is likely to be helpful. When functional explanation is based on speculation, it is likely to be costly.

Coherent stories about the functions of behavior take on a life of their own and become filters, determining which facts will be incorporated into

organized knowledge and which facts will be rejected. In the case of self-selection of diet, data indicating that omnivores can have difficulty in composing balanced diets were ignored and data on diet choice were sometimes stretched to be consistent with the prevailing functional story, when they were, in fact, neutral or even negative (Brown & Story, 1987). Similarly, in discussion of poison avoidance, evidence that rats and other omnivores are not particularly adept at learning to avoid toxins (Chitty, 1954) was overlooked and data on diet sampling was assumed to be consistent with the prevailing ecological interpretation, when it was not. The message in all this is that functional interpretation is not necessarily the golden road to success. There are pitfalls as well as opportunities in using ethological perspectives to provide a framework to interpret data collected in laboratory situations.

3. SOCIAL INFLUENCES ON FOOD CHOICE AND FORAGING

The problems discussed in the preceding section should come as no surprise to those familiar with the history of the study of behavior. Field naturalists and closet naturalists have both made substantial contributions to our understanding of the biosphere. On the other hand, armchair naturalists, no matter how well-intentioned, have been a constant source of trouble. Guesses about the functional significance of laboratory findings, originally intended as working hypotheses or tentative explanations, become reified and exert an undeserved influence on research. In the absence of relevant field observations, visions of the natural world that make ecological sense of laboratory findings take a tenacious hold on the scientific imagination and distort interpretation of data.

On the other hand, without controlled experiments, field workers propose unlikely behavioral processes to explain the occurrence of behaviors they have observed in the field (Sherry & Galef, 1984). There is abroad in the land an unwillingness to confess ignorance as to whether or how an ability demonstrated in the laboratory enhances survival or reproduction in the field or to admit to lack of knowledge about how, in a mechanistic sense, an organism might be able to achieve the impressive performances it exhibits in its natural habitat. In such a climate, Just so stories about mechanism or function can come to pass for synthesis of field and closet approaches.

The present section is, I hope, about alternatives to Just so stories in integrating field and laboratory approaches to the study of feeding behavior. The two general strategies discussed below are surely not new. Each has been used countless times, by countless investigators, for more than 100 years. Each involves collection of data in both laboratory and field so as to be able to provide mechanistic analyses of behavioral phenomena observed in the uncontrolled world outside the confines of the closet where mechanistic analyses are often impractical. The examples I will discuss in detail are taken from my own studies of social influences on feeding behavior, both because it is the research with which I am most familiar and because it is the work that I am most free to criticize.

3.1 Using field data to pose questions for laboratory analyses of feeding behaviors

One of the more important grounds on which ethologists rejected the approach of experimental psychologists to the analysis of behavior was the failure of psychologists to observe the behavior of members of their subject species in the environments in which they normally lived.

Description of behavior in the natural environment was to Lorenz, Tinbergen, and other classic ethologists the obvious starting point for analyses of the causes of behavior. It is surely reasonable to find out what an animal does before you try to figure out how it does it.

Although the logic of the ethological approach to problem definition appears compelling to those with an evolutionary or ecological background, it has been slow to penetrate fields dominated by closet workers. Johnston (1981) proposed, for example, that the study of association formation in the abstract be abandoned in favor of an ethological strategy for the study of animal learning that began with a "task description" of naturally-occurring instances of learning that could then be analyzed in the laboratory. There has, however, been little movement in the direction Johnston suggested. More often, those laboratory workers interested in an ethological approach to behavior, instead of initiating their own field studies, have taken advantage of field descriptions of behavior already in the literature as starting points for analyses. It is this latter strategy, recourse to the literature, that my students and I have employed in the 20-year study of social influences on feeding behavior in Norway rats with which I will be concerned in the present section. My coworkers and I started with field observations that suggested that some aspect of the feeding behavior of our subject species might be socially mediated, brought the phenomenon into the laboratory, and then attempted to analyze the behavior under controlled conditions.

3.1.1. Field observation. Some years ago, Fritz Steiniger, an ecologist working in the field of rodent control, discovered that, if a poison bait were employed in an area for an extended period of time, despite initial success, with the rats eating lots of poison and dying in large numbers, later acceptance of the poison bait was very poor. Steiniger (1950) noted, in particular, that young rats, born to those adults that had survived poisoning, rejected the poison bait without ever even tasting it themselves. Steiniger attributed such poison avoidance by the young to the effects of urine and feces deposited on poison baits as a warning signal by surviving adults that had learned to avoid eating the poison.

3.1.2. Laboratory analogue. The phenomenon described by Steiniger, avoidance by young rats of a food that the adults of their colony have learned to avoid, is easily observed in small colonies of wild rats living in captivity (Galef & Clark, 1971a). My coworker, Mertice Clark, and I introduced nausea-inducing concentrations of poison (Lithium chloride) into one of the two very different foods (Diets A and B) that we presented to each of our colonies for 3 hr/day. Soon, colony members would not eat the poisoned food even when we offered them uncontaminated samples of it. We then had to wait until one of the females in each colony became pregnant, gave birth to a litter, and reared her litter to weaning age. Finally, we could observe the pattern of diet selection exhibited by those weanlings reared in colonies whose adult members had learned to eat either only Diet A or only Diet B when uncontaminated samples of both diets were available to them.

Just as Steiniger had observed in free-living colonies of wild Norway rats, young wild rats weaned in our captive colonies totally avoided whichever of the two foods the adults of their colony had learned to avoid. They ate only the food that the adults were eating. Over the years, we have observed 247 wild rat pups in our laboratory situation during their first 10 days of eating solid food and only one ate so much as a single bite of whichever food the adults of its colony had been trained to avoid.

As the result of his field observations, Steiniger proposed that urine and feces deposited by adult rats in or near a poisoned food dissuaded young rats from eating that food. In the laboratory, we found that wild rat pups, reared by adults fed only Diet B and never exposed to Diet A, preferred Diet B as strongly as did those wild rat pups reared by adults that had learned to avoid Diet A and, therefore, ate only Diet B (Galef & Clark, 1971a). These data suggest that the 247 rat pups in our first experiments were not avoiding a diet because the adults of their colony were marking that diet. Rather, pups raised by colonies trained to avoid Diet A were learning to eat Diet B, the food that adults of their colony were eating, and were avoiding Diet A for reasons that had nothing to do with the fact that adults were avoiding that food.

It is well known that wild Norway rats are very hesitant to eat a food that they haven't previously eaten (Barnett, 1958; Galef, 1970). Consequently, biasing young rats to start feeding on one diet could greatly reduce the probability they would feed on available alternatives. In fact, the results of a number of experiments have been consistent with the hypothesis that young wild rats learn from adults only about what foods to eat and avoid alternatives as a result of their tendency to avoid unfamiliar foods (Galef & Clark, 1971a; Galef & Clark, 1972; see Galef, 1985a for review).

3.1.3. Interpretation. At this point, it might be worth considering some conclusions that can be reached from the two laboratory studies described above considered together with Steiniger's (1950) field work. First, Steiniger's (1950) observation, that adult wild rats in uncontrolled environments can lead their offspring to eat only safe foods when a food that the adults have learned is toxic is present, is repeatable under controlled conditions. In the laboratory, rats behave as Steiniger observed them behave in a variety of natural circumstances. Second, Steiniger's attempt to deduce mechanism from simple observation in the field was unsuccessful. Not only have controlled experiments repeatedly failed to confirm Steiniger's suggestion that rats that have learned to avoid a food mark that food so as to make it unattractive to conspecifics (Galef & Clark, 1971a; Galef & Beck, 1985), 20 years of study in the laboratory have failed to reveal any way in which rats can directly lead their colleagues away from a food. One rat can induce others to eat one of several available foods and, thus, lower the probability that they will eat available alternatives, but the avoidance of alternatives is an indirect, not a direct result of social interaction (Galef, 1985a).

In retrospect, it is not difficult to understand both the failure of rats to directly dissuade conspecifics from eating a known toxin and their ability to lead conspecifics directly to a safe food. After all, for one rat to mark a food that it has learned to avoid so as to reduce the probability that others would eat that food involves a complex of behaviors that would evolve only if close relatives of a knowledgeable rat benefited more from the warning than did the knowledgeable rat's evolutionary competitors. Once an individual has learned to avoid a food, that individual has no reason to approach the noxious food again. It surely has no interest in making the food unattractive to unrelated conspecifics.

On the other hand, an individual that has learned that a food is safe has reason to continue to exploit the safe food. Exploitation of a food requires returning to the place where that food is to be found. Exploitation of a food also requires introduction of the exploited food into one's own digestive tract. Pursuing one's own interests may, thus,

provide sources of useful information to others as to where and what one is eating, without the evolution of patterns of behavior specifically evolved for purposes of communication (Galef, 1986a). For example, hungry rats might follow a successful forager to food (Galef, Mischinger & Malenfant, 1987) or learn what a successful forager has eaten by smelling its breath (Galef & Wigmore, 1983). Hence, communication of information among rats about what foods they are eating seems, *a priori*, more likely than communication of information about potential foods they are not eating.

3.1.4. Redundant processes. Over the years, analyses of the behavioral processes involved in social influence on diet selection by rats has revealed a number of redundant, possibly-mutually-reinforcing ways in which a young rat can be influenced in its choice of diet by an adult. First, the simple physical presence of adults at a potential feeding site attracts pups to that site and greatly increases the probability that young rats will wean to the particular food located there. For example, in an experiment (Galef, 1981) in which an anesthetized, adult, female rat was draped across one of two bowls containing the same food and located less than a meter apart, pups took 80 to 90 percent of the food that they ate from the bowl draped with the female. Similarly, when Clark and I (Galef & Clark, 1971b) watched nine individually-marked pups from three litters take their very first meals of solid food, each of the nine ate its first meal from a food bowl at which an adult was eating and while the adult was eating there.

Second, adult rats deposit residual, olfactory cues both in the areas that they visit (Galef & Heiber, 1976) and in the foods that they eat (Galef & Beck, 1985). These residual cues are attractive to pups (not aversive as Steiniger, 1950, proposed) and can bias pups' choices both of areas to explore and feeding sites to exploit. Galef and Heiber (1976) found that individual rat pups preferred to eat and to explore in the end of an enclosure that had been soiled during its previous occupancy by conspecifics, rather than in the clean end of the enclosure. Galef and Beck (1985) found that rats offered two samples of a diet preferred the sample from which conspecifics had eaten to a previously-untouched sample.

Third, both Sherry (Galef & Sherry, 1973) and Henderson (Galef & Henderson, 1972) and I have provided evidence that the milk of a lactating female rat contains cues directly reflecting the flavor of her diet. Galef and Sherry (1973) took rat pups that were nursing from a female rat eating Diet A, hand-fed them a 1/2-cc of milk manually expressed from another lactating female rat eating Diet B, and then made the pups ill by injecting them with lithium chloride. At weaning, in comparison with a number of relevant controls, these experimental pups exhibited a strong aversion to Diet B. Cues in mother's milk allowed pups to identify their mother's diet. Comparison of the food preferences at weaning of rat pups raised by mothers eating Diet B and fostered daily (6 hr/day for 18 days) either to a lactating female eating Diet A or to a maternal, non-lactating female eating Diet A (Galef & Henderson, 1972) showed that cues in mother's milk influenced diet choice by pups. When tested for diet preference at weaning, pups fostered daily to lactating females eating Diet A, but not pups fostered daily to maternal, non-lactating females eating Diet A, showed an enhanced preference for Diet A, the diet eaten by their foster mothers.

3.1.5. Interpretation. Redundancy in the ways in which social influences can affect the diet preferences of rat pups at weaning, like redundancy in the processes underlying other behavioral capacities of

animals, poses problems for the application of laboratory data to analyses of behavioral events occurring in nature. The results of laboratory studies can convincingly demonstrate behavioral capacities of animals that might enable them to behave as they do in natural settings. However, as discussed in more detail in Section 4 below, because of potential or actual redundancy in the behavioral capacities underlying particular performances in nature, it may be very difficult to determine if or when a particular capacity is actually being used in natural circumstances.

Existence in animals with complex nervous systems of redundant pathways subserving a single, final, common, behavioral outcome may, in general, make it difficult to achieve the most obvious potential contribution of laboratory research to the understanding of behavioral phenomena observed in the field, analysis of the processes responsible for the behavior exhibited by free-living animals. Living systems are complex. Redundancy in the mechanisms underlying the expression of behavior is one facet of that complexity. The resulting ambiguity in the applicability of laboratory findings to the analysis of behavior observed in the field is something with which we will have to learn to live. As discussed further in Section 4, laboratory investigation for the purpose of reductionist analysis of phenomena observed in nature will not invariably result in logically-compelling results.

3.2 Using field theories to deduce the existence of behavioral capacities that may be demonstrable only in the laboratory

Use of field observations to discover that the members of some species exhibit interesting patterns of behavior, suitable for analysis in the laboratory, is not the only way in which closet workers can make use of the labors of their field colleagues. Sometimes, generalizations derived from observation of the behavior of many different species or logical deductions from evolutionary theory can lead to predictions about behavior, the details of which are more convincingly tested in the laboratory than in the field.

3.2.1. Ecological hypothesis. Several behavioral ecologists have suggested that in environments where food is distributed both unpredictably and unevenly, social animals foraging from a central site (for instance, birds foraging from a roost) could acquire useful information at the central site concerning the locations where foods are to be found (Bertram, 1978; DeGroot, 1980; Erwin, 1977; Waltz, 1982). An unsuccessful forager might, for example, spot a successful forager in an aggregation and then follow the successful individual when it left in search of food (Brown, 1986). Although use of aggregation sites as information centers was originally proposed to explain the evolution of bird roosts (Ward & Zahavi, 1973) and following of one individual by another was proposed as the means by which the unsuccessful exploited the successful in order to find food (Ward & Zahari, 1973), aggregations other than roosts could function as information centers, organisms other than birds could benefit from their use, and behavioral interactions other than following of one individual by another could mediate exchange of information. It has, for example, long been known that the hives of honeybees serve as information centers where returning foragers provide nestmates with both olfactory and dance information that directs nestmates' later flights to the patchy, ephemeral sources of nectar and pollen upon which honeybees feed (Gould, 1976; Von Frisch, 1967; Wenner, 1971).

Although the hypothesis that aggregation sites of birds and mammals might serve as information centers is an attractive one, evidence sufficient to establish such a function of sociality in vertebrates has proven difficult to collect in field situations. Supporting evidence from uncontrolled situations is largely circumstantial rather than direct (De Groot, 1980; Wittenberger & Hunt, 1985). As we shall see below, laboratory studies provide the opportunity to determine whether vertebrates (in the present case, Norway rats) have the ability to exploit conspecifics as sources of information about which foods are available and where those foods are to be found. The results of laboratory studies can not, of course, tell us if or when animals outside the laboratory use socially-acquired information to find food. However, the results of laboratory studies can demonstrate an ability of animals to use aggregation sites as information centers.

Outside the laboratory, Norway rats are social animals that forage from a central site (a burrow) as bees forage from a hive or herons from a roost. Each rat lives as a member of a colony that inhabits a burrow; when foraging, colony members disperse from the burrow, feed, and then return to it (Calhoun, 1962; Telle, 1966). In principle, rat burrows, like bird roosts or bee hives, could function as information centers. Hence, *Rattus norvegicus* might prove to be a species in which members exchange information at a central site concerning the availability of foods in the larger environment.

3.2.2. Laboratory studies. The results of numerous studies conducted both in my laboratory (for review, see Galef, in press a) and elsewhere (Strupp & Levitsky, 1984; Posadas-Andrews & Roper, 1983) leave little doubt that, at least in the laboratory, Norway rats exchange information concerning foods they have eaten far from the place where information exchange occurs.

Below, I first briefly review some results of my own laboratory work on information exchange in Norway rats. I then turn to the question of what, if anything, such laboratory findings can tell us about the ways in which rats come to forage effectively in the complex environments in which they normally live.

The procedures that my coworkers and I used throughout the series of studies I'll describe below was designed as a laboratory analogue of a natural situation in which a foraging rat eats a food at some distance from its burrow, returns to its burrow, and then interacts with a burrow-mate that, sometime later, selects something to eat. In most of our experiments, a pair of rats (a 'demonstrator' and an 'observer') first lived together for a day or two. (b) Second, the demonstrator was moved to a room separate from its observer and fed a food unfamiliar to the observer. (c) Third, the demonstrator was returned to the cage containing its observer and was allowed to interact with the observer for a few minutes before the demonstrator was removed permanently from the experiment. (d) Finally, the observer was allowed to choose between two unfamiliar foods, one of which was the food its demonstrator had eaten during its removal to a separate room (Step b).

Results of many experiments of the general design outlined above have shown that an observer rat that has interacted with a conspecific demonstrator will, when choosing between two otherwise roughly-equipalatable diets, exhibit a substantial enhancement of its preference for whichever of the two diets its demonstrator ate before it interacted with the observer (Galef, 1983; Galef, Kennett, & Wigmore, 1984; Galef & Wigmore, 1983; Posadas-Andrews & Roper, 1983).

Analyses of the causes of the effects of demonstrators on their observers' food preferences have shown that olfactory cues passing from demonstrator to observer both allow an observer to identify its demonstrator's diet and provide a context within which exposure of observers to diet-identifying cues enhances observers' subsequent preferences for the diets eaten by their respective demonstrators (Galef, Kennett, & Stein, 1985; Galef & Stein, 1985; Galef, Mason, Preti, & Bean, 1988). Effects of demonstrators on the diet preferences of their respective observers are to be seen in a broad range of experimental circumstances (Galef, Wigmore, & Kennett, 1985; Posadas-Andrews & Roper, 1983) and could reasonably be expected to guide the feeding and foraging of naive individuals in natural settings. Because I have recently reviewed this research several times (Galef, 1986, 1988, in press a, in press b), I will not repeat that effort here. Rather, I will concentrate on those findings that seem particularly relevant to understanding how animals find nutritive foods, avoid poisons, and forage efficiently in the world outside the laboratory.

3.2.3. Selection of food. As discussed in Section 2 above, study of the behavioral processes that allow omnivorous mammals to select a nutritionally adequate diet from among myriad ingestible substances is a classic problem area in biopsychology. To summarize material in that section, it is frequently asserted in the secondary literature that individual rats have the ability to self-select nutritious foods to eat (for discussion see Galef & Beck, in press). However, except in special situations (Epstein, 1967), the ability of rats to identify nutritious foods is quite limited (Lát, 1967). If the number of foods that a rat has to choose among is more than two or three (Rozin, 1969; Harris, *et al.*, 1933), if a nutritionally-adequate diet is less palatable than deficient alternatives (Kon, 1931; Scott & Quint, 1946), or if relief of symptoms of deficiency is considerably delayed after eating an adequate diet (Young & Wittenborn, 1940; Harriman, 1955), rats do poorly in selecting an adequate food to eat, even if one is continuously present.

In a recent experiment, Beck and Galef (1988) presented individual weanling rats with an ad lib choice among four distinctively-flavored diets. Three of these diets contained inadequate levels (5%) of protein and one diet (the least palatable of the four) contained ample protein (20%) for the support of normal growth. Beck and I found, as had others before us (Kon, 1931; Scott, Smith & Verney, 1948; Scott & Quint, 1946; Tribe, 1954, 1955) that individual weanling rats, choosing among four foods, did very poorly. Even after 6 days of continuous exposure to the foods, no weanling had developed a preference for the protein-adequate diet; all had lost weight and all appeared well on their way to premature death, if the experiment had not been terminated. Weanling rats faced with the same diet-selection problem, while in the presence of adults that had previously been trained to eat the protein-rich food, fared far better in the experimental situation. All developed a preference for the protein-rich diet; all gained weight in the experimental situation and all appeared to be in good health when the experiment was terminated. Patterns of food selection exhibited by adults served as a useful source of information to naive juveniles.

3.2.4. Poison avoidance. New recruits to a population must learn not only to select a balanced, nutritious diet, but also to avoid eating any toxic substances that are present in their home ranges. A naive weanling, selecting its first solid foods to eat, could 'assume' that adult conspecifics that it might meet had not eaten a lethal quantity of any

poison in their shared environment. A weanling could also 'assume', with reasonable confidence, that senior members of its colony would be less likely to be eating non-lethal noxious foods than safe ones, that adults would have learned to avoid eating any noxious foods to which they were exposed (Garcia & Hankins, 1976). Thus, an ability to identify the foods that others in one's social group had eaten could be used by the naive to facilitate both poison identification and poison-avoidance learning.

For example, a naive rat that ate two unfamiliar foods in rapid succession, as rats are liable to do (Barnett, 1956; Beck, Hitchcock & Galef, 1988), and then became ill, might be well advised to behave as though its illness was attributable to whichever unfamiliar food it had eaten that others of its social group had not. In a series of recent laboratory studies, we have found that rats behaved just as one might expect on the hypothesis that rats tend to treat as 'safe' those foods that others have eaten (Galef, 1986b, 1987). Each observer rat first interacted with a demonstrator that had been fed either Diet A or Diet B, then ate samples of both Diets A and B, and was then made nauseous by intraperitoneal injection of lithium chloride solution. Twenty-four hr later, when offered a choice between Diet A and Diet B, those observers whose demonstrators had eaten Diet A strongly preferred Diet A, while those observers whose demonstrators had eaten Diet B strongly preferred that diet. When naive rats fall ill, they are less likely to form an aversion to an unfamiliar food eaten by others with whom they have interacted than to form an aversion to a totally unfamiliar food.

Social interaction can also protect a naive individual against learning maladaptive food-phobias. If for example, a naive animal should happen to eat a spoiled sample of a normally-safe, unfamiliar, food, it should develop a profound aversion to the unfamiliar food. The sick animal would develop a 'food phobia', temporarily foreclosing its exploitation of a possibly valuable source of nutrients. If the phobic individual could make use of socially-acquired information indicating that others were eating the food that the naive individual had, unfortunately, learned to avoid, it might ignore its own experience of toxicosis and eat the food its fellows were eating. We found that half of the rats that had learned a toxicosis-induced aversion to a palatable, unfamiliar diet, abandoned that aversion after a 15-min period of interaction with two conspecific demonstrators each of which had previously eaten the averted, unfamiliar diet (Galef, 1985b; Galef, 1986c). Thus, rats can be rescued from fortuitously-acquired, learned aversions to foods by information acquired from their fellows about the diets that they are eating.

3.2.5. Effective foraging. In the introduction to the present section, I mentioned the possibility that the burrows of rats might serve as information centers (Ward & Zahavi, 1973) where unsuccessful foragers could extract information from more-successful foragers about where to find food. A successfully-functioning information center requires not only that unsuccessful foragers discriminate successful from unsuccessful others (otherwise an information center might become a misinformation center), but also that unsuccessful foragers exploit more-successful others as sources of information about where food is to be found.

In a recent study (Galef, Mischinger, & Malenfant, 1987), my coworkers and I found that rats that had experience in traversing a maze would, without any special training, spontaneously follow other rats through the maze to a goal-box where the other rats had been trained to go to eat. We also found that hungry rats, experienced in following conspecifics through a maze to food, were more likely to follow those conspecifics that had

just eaten a safe food than to follow those conspecifics that had just eaten a food that the potential followers had been trained to avoid eating. Thus, rats in the laboratory exhibited both a readiness to follow conspecifics to feeding sites and an ability to select conspecifics to follow on the basis of the desirability of the foods those conspecifics had been eating.

Less complex sorts of information transmission could also suffice to establish a rat burrow as an information center (Galef, 1983; Galef & Wigmore, 1983). Imagine, if you will, a rat burrow with various foods available intermittently and unpredictably around it at fixed locations. Chicken scratch is sometimes to be found in the hen house, oats in the stable, table scraps on the compost heap, etc. Over time, each resident of the burrow could discover for itself where each type of food was to be found on those occasions when it was available. However, before departing the burrow on its first foraging expedition of an evening, an individual rat would not know whether it would find anything to eat by visiting stable, hen house, or compost heap. If, before leaving its burrow, the departing individual were to interact with a fellow burrow-resident that had just returned from eating oats, the departing forager might be able to figure out for itself where it should go to find food. Food eaten by a successfully-foraging conspecific might serve as a conditional stimulus directing an unsuccessful individual to the particular location where a food was available (Wenner, 1971).

Galef and Wigmore (1983) introduced individual rats into a 3-arm maze where three flavors of food were available, each at a different, fixed location: cheese-flavored food was available in the central arm of the maze, cocoa-flavored food in the right arm, and cinnamon-flavored food in the left. Only one of the three foods was accessible to a subject on any given day and the particular food available to a subject on any day was randomly selected.

Each subject was run four trials/day using a correction procedure. On the first trial of each day, subjects had no information as to which of the three foods was available and, therefore, had only one chance in three of selecting the arm of the maze containing food. If a subject happened to choose the rewarded arm, it got to eat for a few minutes. If a subject failed to choose the rewarded arm of the maze, it was locked in the arm of the maze it had chosen for a few minutes and the first trial was then repeated until the subject found the food. The second, third, and fourth trials of each day were run just as the first trial had been.

A subject could, effectively, tell the experimenter when it understood the rules operating in the maze by exhibiting near-perfect performance on its first choices on trials 2, 3 and 4 of successive days. Once a subject had achieved a criterial level of correct performance on trials 2, 3, and 4, we began testing that subject.

For 15 minutes before trial 1 on each test day, a subject was allowed to interact with a demonstrator that had eaten the food that was going to be available to that subject on that day. So, for example, if cocoa-flavored food was going to be available to a subject on April 4th, a demonstrator rat was fed cocoa-flavored food for 30 min and then allowed to interact with the subject for 15 min before beginning testing of that subject on the morning of April 4th.

To determine whether subjects were using information acquired from their demonstrators to enhance their foraging efficiency on test days, we compared each subject's probability of making a rewarded response on its first choices on the first trial of each test day (when that subject had

access to information about the food a demonstrator was eating) with its probability of making a rewarded response on its first choices on the first trial of each of the last days of training (when no information was available to that subject from a demonstrator). Seven of the 10 subjects we observed in this labor-intensive experiment gave clear evidence of an ability to use information garnered from their respective demonstrators as a cue to direct their own foraging in rewarding directions (Galef, 1983; Galef, Mischinger, & Malenfant, 1987; Galef & Wigmore, 1983). Each of these seven subjects was significantly more likely to enter the rewarded arm of the maze on the first choice of the first trial of testing days than on the first choice of the first trial of training days.

3.2.6. Interpretation. Taken together, the results of the studies described in the present section could be interpreted as showing that rats in nature use information acquired from conspecifics to find nutrient-rich foods and to avoid poisons. The data can also be interpreted as showing that rat burrows outside the laboratory serve as information centers, where temporarily-unsuccessful foragers can exploit their more-successful fellows as sources of cues about where to go to find food.

However, if one begins to examine critically the possibility of extrapolating from the laboratory data to the behavior of free-living, wild Norway rats, foraging and selecting food in the natural environment, many questions arise as to the legitimacy of the extrapolation. Some of these questions can be satisfactorily addressed in the laboratory. For example, in most of our laboratory studies, observer and demonstrator interacted immediately after the demonstrator had eaten a novel diet and the observer had the opportunity to start to choose between novel diets immediately following receipt of information from its demonstrator. Free-living rats must spend time returning from a feeding site to their home burrow. Foragers departing from their home burrow must expend further time in reaching a feeding site. If the ability of rats to acquire information from conspecifics as to the food that they have eaten far from a burrow is to influence the feeding behavior of those at the burrow, a returning forager must emit diet-identifying cues for some time after eating a food. Those at the burrow that interact with returning foragers must be able to remember socially-acquired information until they are in a position to use it. The results of laboratory studies (Galef, 1983; Galef & Kennett, 1985) indicate that, for at least 4 hr after eating a food, a rat will continue to emit olfactory cues allowing those conspecifics with whom the fed individual interacts to identify the food that it ate. Our data also indicate that once a demonstrator and observer rat have interacted, the observer is influenced in its food choice for at least 8 days thereafter (Galef, 1987). Both the observed time course of emission of diet-identifying cues by demonstrators and the temporal pattern of their use by observers seem consistent with the hypothesis that the behavioral process we have studied in the laboratory could function in the outside world. Wild rats are likely to return to their burrows within 4 hr of eating a food; rats foraging after interacting with a returning forager will probably encounter whatever food the forager ate within 8 days, if they are going to encounter that food at all.

Other problems with extrapolating from our laboratory experiments to the larger world are not dealt with so easily. For example, in all of the experiments described above and, for that matter, in all the experiments we have published on transmission of information concerning distant diets, each demonstrator has been fed only a single diet before interacting with an observer. In a series of unpublished studies (Galef, unpublished), I

have found that demonstrator rats fed two different diets before they interacted with an observer did not always influence their respective observers' later diet preferences in predictable ways. Sometimes the second of two foods eaten by a demonstrator influenced an observer's later diet preference. Sometimes the more salient of two foods had such influence, regardless of the order in which foods were eaten. Sometimes neither food eaten by a demonstrator appeared to influence its observer's later diet choice. The pattern of results didn't make a tremendous amount of sense. Unfortunately, it seems likely to me that, before returning to their burrows to interact with their fellows, foraging rats in the natural world might eat several different foods on a single foraging trip. Of what use is our beautiful laboratory data if, in the world outside the laboratory, the signal passing from demonstrator to observer is muddled. But, then, perhaps rats in the wild often eat only a single food at a time and return to the safety of their burrows between meals. Who knows?

Similarly, the usefulness of information centers to social foragers depends very much on the distribution of foods and on the schedule of availability of foods in the larger environment. Are foods in the natural habitat of Norway rats (wherever that may be) patchily distributed? Are the natural foods of rats intermittently available? Do successful foragers allow themselves to be exploited as sources of information by their less-successful colony-mates or do successful foragers lead potential followers on a wild-goose chase before sneaking off to feed? We do not know.

What happens in the world outside the laboratory can be known only by observation of behavior in that world. Armchair naturalism, even my own, is no substitute for careful field studies. It's too easy to construct imaginary scenarios that either make one's laboratory data relevant to real-world behavior or render laboratory data ecologically meaningless for such armchair speculation to be of much scientific value.

4. CONCLUSIONS

I take two general messages from consideration of the results of my laboratory experiments analyzing social effects on feeding, a phenomenon that was first observed by field workers. First, although field observation can result in accurate descriptions of what animals eat in unrestrained circumstances, such observations provide little information as to the behavioral processes resulting in the observed behavior. Steiniger (1950) correctly noted that young rats can avoid eating those poison foods that adults of their colony have learned to avoid; Steiniger appears, however, to have been entirely mistaken in his deductions as to how diet choice was transmitted from one rat to another.

On the other hand, laboratory experiments that provide unequivocal evidence of behavioral capacities in an animal do not provide equally-convincing evidence that those capacities are used by free-living individuals to solve the problems that they are known to solve in natural circumstances. Field observations can provide evidence that members of a species can solve some problem; laboratory studies can demonstrate behavioral abilities that would permit solution. However, in general it may be very difficult, perhaps even impossible, to determine if or when a given ability is actually being used in nature to solve a particular problem.

An observer might see members of a litter of weanling rats eating the foods their mother was eating and avoiding the foods that their mother was avoiding. The observer might know that the results of laboratory studies

had shown that young rats could be influenced in their diet choice in each of the four ways described in Sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.2 of the present chapter. Yet how could the observer of the free-living rats know, in any particular case, which of the several available behavioral mechanisms were responsible for the pattern of food choice that the weanling rats were exhibiting? Perhaps more disconcerting, if laboratory study of the behavioral processes that support social influence on food choice had proceeded only to the point where a single process for social influence had been identified, then any observed social effects on food choice would be attributed to the known process both with confidence and without justification. Just because we have found in the laboratory that A can affect B, that does not mean that every time we see variation in B in the field it is due to the effects of A. Indeed, just how we can know whether processes we have discovered in controlled situations are acting in uncontrolled circumstances is a considerable conundrum, given that a single behavioral outcome can be produced by diverse behavioral processes.

Analysis of the behavioral mechanisms responsible for the emergence of a pattern of food choice, or for that matter of any other pattern of behavior, requires considerable control over the behavior of subjects. In order to gain such control, the natural situation must be manipulated and, consequently, distorted. Distortion of the natural environment means that an observer can never be sure that he or she is actually analyzing the same phenomenon observed in undisturbed habitat.

Such uncomfortable thoughts bring me to the proposition I think of as 'Galef's uncertainty principle', an ethological analogue of Heisenberg's uncertainty principle in quantum mechanics. With behavior, as with subatomic particles, the attempt to measure the properties of a system may so perturb that system that it is no longer the system one initially set out to examine. Controlled observation can be a self-defeating process. A second reason I think of the above proposition as my uncertainty principle is that I, unlike Heisenberg, am uncertain as to when and where it applies. One can rarely know what the effects of intrusion into a behavioral system have been.

The difficulties inherent in attempts to apply the results of laboratory analyses to the understanding of field observations may lead the cynical to conclude that our Nineteenth-century forebears were basically right, that the study of natural, behavioral phenomena does not require communication between closet and field. I think, to the contrary, that such communication is essential to those of us seeking to identify the behavioral processes underlying adaptive behaviors observed in natural settings, but that we have yet to discover logically-satisfying ways in which to conduct the needed dialogue.

Continued and expanded interchange between field and closet workers is the only possible catalyst for progress in understanding when and how animals deploy the behavioral abilities they have revealed in the laboratory to solve the problems they face in the field. So long as closet workers must resort to armchair naturalism to discuss the functional significance of the behavioral processes they discover in the laboratory, the ethoexperimental analysis of feeding behavior will remain in its infancy. So long as field workers depend upon speculation, unbridled by experiment, to explain how animals accomplish apparent miracles of adaptive adjustment to conditions prevailing in the field, the ethoexperimental analysis of behavior is but a possibility. Understanding of the adaptive functions of the behaviors of complex organisms with flexible behavioral repertoires and multiple pathways to common behavioral

outcomes is a major challenge facing students of animal behavior in the coming century. It will require a complete break with the tradition established by our Nineteenth-century, naturalist forebears and a far more intimate integration of field and closet research than has yet been achieved.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Preparation of the present manuscript was facilitated by grants from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada and the McMaster University Research Board. I thank Mertice Clark, Harvey Weingarten and Laurel McQuoid for thoughtful critiques of earlier drafts.

REFERENCES

1. Barber L: The Heyday of Natural History. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co, 1980.
2. Barnett SA: Behaviour components in the feeding of wild and laboratory rats. Behaviour, 9, 24-42, 1956.
3. Barnett SA: Experiments on "neophobia" in wild and laboratory rats. British Journal of Psychology, 49, 195-201, 1958.
4. Beck M, Hitchcock C, and Galef BG Jr: Diet sampling by wild Norway rats (Rattus norvegicus) offered several unfamiliar foods. Animal Learning and Behavior, 16, 224-230, 1988.
5. Bertram BCR: Living in groups: Predators and prey. Krebs JR and Davies NB(eds): Behavioral Ecology. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer, 1978.
6. Braveman NS: Poison-based avoidance learning with flavored or colored water in guinea pigs. Learning and Motivation, 5, 182-194, 1974.
7. Brett LP, Hankins WG, and Garcia J: Pre-lithium aversions: III. Buteo hawks. Behavioral Biology, 17, 87-98, 1976.
8. Brown CRK: Cliff swallow colonies as information centers. Science, 234, 83-85, 1986.
9. Calhoun JB: The Ecology and Sociology of the Norway Rat. Bethesda: US Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1962.
10. Chitty D: The study of the brown rat and its control by poison. Chitty D(ed): Control of Rats and Mice (Vol. 1). London: Oxford University Press (Clarendon), 1954.
11. Chitty D, and Shorten M: Techniques for the study of the Norway rat (Rattus norvegicus), Journal of Mammalogy, 27, 63-78, 1946.
12. Cowan PE, and Barnett SA: The new-object and new-place reactions of Rattus rattus L., Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society, 56, 219-234, 1975.
13. Davis CM: Results of the self-selection of diets by young children. Canadian Medical Association Journal, 41, 257-261, 1939.
14. DeGroot P: Information transfer in a socially roosting weaver bird (Quelea quelea: Ploceinae): An experimental study. Animal Behaviour, 28, 1249-1254, 1980.
15. Domjan M, and Galef BG Jr: Biological constraints on instrumental and classical conditioning: Retrospect and prospect. Animal Learning and Behavior, 11, 151-161, 1983.
16. Epstein AN: Oropharyngeal factors in feeding and drinking. Code CF(ed): Handbook of Physiology (Vol. 1: Alimentary Canal), Washington, DC: American Physiological Society, 1967.
17. Erwin MR: Foraging and breeding adaptations to different food regimes in three seabirds: The common tern, Sterna hirundo, Royal tern, Sterna maxima, and black skimmer, Rynchops niger, Ecology, 58, 389-397, 1977.
18. Galef BG Jr: Aggression and timidity: Responses to novelty in feral Norway rats. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 71, 370-381, 1970.
19. Galef BG Jr: The development of olfactory control of feeding site selection in rat pups. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 95, 615-622, 1981.
20. Galef BG Jr: Utilization by Norway rats (R. norvegicus) of multiple messages concerning distant foods. Journal of Comparative Psychology, 97, 364-371, 1983.
21. Galef BG Jr: Direct and indirect behavioral processes for the social transmission of food avoidance. Bronstein P and Braveman NS(eds), Experimental Assessments and Clinical Applications of Conditioned Food Aversions. New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1985a.
22. Galef BG Jr: Socially induced diet preference can partially reverse a LiCl induced diet aversion. Animal Learning and Behavior, 13, 415-418, 1985b.
23. Galef BG Jr: Olfactory communication among rats of information concerning distant diets. Duvall D, Muller-Schwarz D and Silverstein RM(eds): Chemical Signals in Vertebrates, vol. IV: Ecology, Evolution, and Comparative Biology. New York: Plenum Press, 1986a.
24. Galef BG Jr: Social identification of toxic diets by Norway rats (R. norvegicus). Journal of Comparative Psychology, 100, 331-334, 1986b.
25. Galef BG Jr: Social interaction substantially modifies learned aversions, sodium appetite, and both palatability and handling-time induced dietary preference in rats (R. norvegicus). Journal of Comparative Psychology, 100, 432-439, 1986c.
26. Galef BG Jr: Social influences on the identification of toxic foods by Norway rats. Animal Learning and Behavior, 15, 327-332, 1987.
27. Galef BG Jr: Communication of information concerning distant diets in a social, central-plate foraging species: Rattus norvegicus. Zentall T and Galef BG Jr(eds): Social Learning: Psychological and Biological Perspectives. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1988.
28. Galef BG Jr: An adaptationist perspective on social learning, social feeding and social foraging in Norway rats. Dewsbury DA(ed): Contemporary Issues in Comparative Psychology. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates, in press(a).
29. Galef BG Jr: Innovations in the study of social learning in animals: A developmental perspective. Shair HN, Barr GA and Hofer MA(eds): Methodological and Conceptual Issues in Developmental Psychobiology. New York: Oxford University Press, in press(b).
30. Galef BG Jr and Beck M: Aversive and attractive marking of toxic and safe foods by Norway rats. Behavioral and Neural Biology, 43, 298-310, 1985.

31. Galef BG Jr and Beck M: Diet selection and poison avoidance by mammals individually and in social groups. Stricker EM(ed): Handbook of Neurobiology, Vol. 11. New York; Plenum Press, in press.
32. Galef BG Jr and Clark MM: Social factors in the poison avoidance and feeding behavior of wild and domesticated rat pups. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 75, 341-357, 1971a.
33. Galef BG Jr and Clark MM: Parent-offspring interactions determine time and place of first ingestion of solid food by wild rat pups. Psychonomic Science, 25, 15-16, 1971b.
34. Galef BG Jr and Clark MM: Mother's milk and adult presence: Two factors determining initial dietary selection by weaning rats. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 78, 220-25, 1972.
35. Galef BG Jr and Heiber L: The role of residual olfactory cues in the determination of feeding site selection and exploration patterns of domestic rats. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 90, 727-739, 1976.
36. Galef BG Jr and Henderson PW: Mother's milk: A determinant of the feeding preferences of weaning rat pups. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 78, 213-219, 1972.
37. Galef BG Jr and Kennett DJ: Delays after eating: Effects on transmission of diet preferences and aversions. Animal Learning and Behavior, 13, 39-43, 1985.
38. Galef BG Jr, Kennett DJ and Stein M: Demonstrator influence on observer diet preference: Effects of simple exposure and the presence of a demonstrator. Animal Learning and Behavior, 13, 25-30, 1985.
39. Galef BG Jr, Kennett DJ and Wigmore SW: Transfer of information concerning distant food in rats: A robust phenomenon. Animal Learning and Behavior, 12, 292-296, 1984.
40. Galef BG Jr, Mason JR, Preti G and Bean NJ: Carbon disulfide: A semiochemical mediating socially-induced diet choice in rats. Physiology and Behavior, 42, 119-124, 1988.
41. Galef BG Jr, Mischinger A and Malenfant SA: Further evidence of an information centre in Norway rats. Animal Behaviour, 35, 1234-1239, 1987.
42. Galef BG Jr and Osborne B: Novel taste facilitation of the association of visual cues with toxicosis in rats. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 92, 907-916, 1978.
43. Galef BG Jr and Sherry DF: Mother's milk: A medium for the transmission of cues reflecting the flavor of mother's diet. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 83, 374-378, 1973.
44. Galef BG Jr and Stein M: Demonstrator influence on observer diet preference: Analysis of critical social interactions and olfactory signals. Animal Learning and Behavior, 13, 31-38, 1985.
45. Galef BG Jr and Wigmore SW: Transfer of information concerning distant food in rats: A laboratory investigation of the 'information centre' hypothesis. Animal Behaviour, 31, 748-758, 1983.
46. Garcia J, Ervin FR and Koelling RA: Learning with prolonged delay of reinforcement. Psychonomic Science, 5, 121-122, 1966.
47. Garcia J and Hankins WG: On the origin of food aversive paradigms. Barker LM, Best R and Domjan M(eds): Learning mechanisms in food selection. Austin, TX: Baylor University Press, 1976.
48. Garcia J and Koelling RA: Relation of cue to consequence in avoidance learning. Psychonomic Science, 4, 123-124, 1966.
49. Gillette K, Martin GM and Bellingham WP: Differential use of food and water cues in the formation of conditioned aversions in domestic chicks (*Gallus gallus*). Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes, 6, 99-111, 1980.
50. Gosse PH: A Naturalist's Sojourn in Jamaica. London, 1851.
51. Gould JL: The dance-language controversy. Quarterly Review of Biology, 51, 211-244, 1976.
52. Harriman A: Provitamin A selection by Vitamin A depleted rats. Journal of Physiology, 86, 45-50, 1955.
53. Harris L, Clay J, Hargreaves F and Ward A: The ability of Vitamin B deficient rats to discriminate between diets containing and lacking the vitamin. Proceedings of the Royal Society (Section B), 113, 161-190, 1933.
54. Hawkins RD and Kandel ER: Is there a cell-biological alphabet for simple forms of learning? Psychological Review, 91, 375-391, 1984.
55. Hull CL: Principles of behavior. New York: Appleton, 1943.
56. Johnston TD: Contrasting approaches to a theory of learning. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 4, 125-173, 1981.
57. Kalat JW and Rozin P: "Learned safety" as a mechanism in long delay taste-aversion learning in the rat. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 83, 198-207, 1973.
58. Keesey RE: A set-point theory of obesity. Bownell KD and Forey JP(eds): Handbook of Eating Disorders. New York: Basic Books, 1986.
59. Kline LW: Methods in animal psychology. American Journal of Psychology, 10, 256-279, 1898.
60. Kline LW: Suggestions toward a laboratory course in comparative psychology. American Journal of Psychology, 10, 399-430, 1899.
61. Kon SK: LVIII. The self-selection of food constituents by the rat. Biochemical Journal, 25, 473-481, 1931.
62. Lat J: Self-selection of dietary components. Code CF(ed): Handbook of Physiology (Vol. 1: Alimentary canal). Washington, DC: American Physiological Society, 1967.
63. Le Magnen J: Hunger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
64. Mathews LH: Introduction. Waterton C(ed): Wanderings in South America, London: Oxford University Press, 1973.
65. Mitchell D: Experiments on neophobia in wild and laboratory rats: A reevaluation. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 90, 190-197, 1976.
66. Pilgrim FJ and Patton RA: Patterns of self-selection of purified dietary components by the rat. Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 40, 343-348, 1947.
67. Posadas-Andrews A and Roper TJ: Social transmission of food preferences in adult rats. Animal Behaviour, 31, 265-271, 1983.
68. Richter CP: Total self regulatory functions in animals and human beings. Harvey Lecture Series, 38, 63-103, 1942-1943.
69. Richter CP, Holt L and Barelare B: Nutritional requirements for normal growth and reproduction in rats studied by the self-selection method. American Journal of Physiology, 122, 734-744, 1938.

70. Rozin P: Specific aversions and neophobia resulting from vitamin deficiency or poisoning in half-wild and domestic rats. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology*, 66, 126-132, 1968.
71. Rozin P Adaptive food sampling patterns in vitamin deficient rats. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology*, 69, 126-132, 1969.
72. Rozin P: The selection of foods by rats, humans and other animals. Rosenblatt JS, Hinde RA, Shaw E and Beer C(eds): *Advances in the Study of Behavior*, Vol. 6. New York: Academic Press, 1976.
73. Rozin P and Kalat JW: Specific hungers and poison avoidance as adaptive specializations of learning. *Psychological Review*, 78, 459-486, 1971.
74. Rzoska J: Bait shyness, a study in rat behaviour. *British Journal of Animal Behaviour*, 1, 128-135, 1953.
75. Scott EM: Self-selection of diet. I. Selection of purified components. *Journal of Nutrition*, 31, 397-406, 1946.
76. Scott EM, and Quint E: Self-selection of diet. IV. Appetite for protein. *Journal of Nutrition*, 32, 293-301, 1946.
77. Scott EM, Smith S and Verney E: Self-selection of diet. VII. The effect of age and pregnancy on selection. *Journal of Nutrition*, 35, 281-286, 1948.
78. Seligman MEP: On the generality of the laws of learning. *Psychological Review*, 77, 406-418, 1970.
79. Sherry DF and Galef BG Jr: Cultural transmission without imitation: Milk bottle opening by birds. *Animal Behaviour*, 32, 937-938, 1984.
80. Shettleworth SJ: Learning and behavioural ecology. Krebs JR and Davies NB(eds): *Behavioural Ecology*, 2nd Ed., Sinauer: Sunderland, MA: 1984.
81. Small WS: An experimental study of the mental processes of the rat. *American Journal of Psychology*, 11, 133-165, 1900a.
82. Small WS: Experimental study of the mental processes of the rat. II. *American Journal of Psychology*, 12, 206-239, 1900b.
83. Steiniger von F: Beitrage zur Soziologie und sonstigen Biologie der Wanderratte. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie*, 7, 356-379, 1950.
84. Story M and Brown JE: Do young children instinctively know what to eat? The studies of Clara Davis revisited. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 316, 103-106, 1987.
85. Telle HJ: Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Verhaltensweise von Ratten, vergleichend dargestellt bei *Rattus norvegicus* und *Rattus rattus*. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Zoologie*, 53, 129-196, 1966.
86. Thorndike EL: Animal intelligence: An experimental study of associative processes in animals. *Psychological Review Monograph Supplement*. 2(8), 1898.
87. Thorndike EL: *Animal Intelligence*. New York: Macmillan Co, 1911.
88. Tolman EC: The determiners of behavior at a choice point. *Psychological Review*, 45, 1-34, 1938.
89. Tribe D: The self-selection of purified food constituents by the rat during growth, pregnancy and lactation. *Journal of Physiology*, 124, 64, 1954.
90. Tribe D: Choice of diets by rats: The choice of purified food constituents during growth, pregnancy, and lactation. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 9, 103-109, 1955.
91. Von Frisch K: *The Dance Language and Orientation of Bees*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1967.
92. Waltz EC: Resource characteristics and the evolution of information centers. *American Naturalist*, 119, 73-90, 1982.
93. Ward P and Zahavi A: The importance of certain assemblages of birds as 'information-centres' for food finding. *Ibis*, 115, 517-534, 1973.
94. Waterton C: *Wanderings in South America, the north-west of the United States, and the Antilles in the years 1812, 1816, 1820, and 1824 with original instructions for the perfect preservation of birds and for cabinets of natural history*. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.
95. Watson JB: *Behavior: An Introduction to Comparative Psychology*. New York: Holt, 1914.
96. Wenner AM: *The Bee Language Controversy*. Boulder, CO: Educational Programs Improvement Corp, 1971.
97. Wilcoxon HC, Dragoin WB and Kral PA: Illness-induced aversion in rat and quail: Relative salience of visual and gustatory cues. *Science*, 171, 826-828, 1971.
98. Wittenberger YF and Hunt GL Jr: The adaptive significance of coloniality in birds. Farner DS, King JR and Parkes KC(eds) *Avian Biology*, Volume VIII. New York: Academic Press, pp. 1-78, 1985.
99. Young PT and Wittenborn J: Food preferences of normal and rachitic rats. *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, 30, 261-275, 1940.
100. Zahorik DM and Houpt KA: Species differences in feeding strategies, food hazards, and ability to learn food aversions. Kamil AC and Sargent TD(eds): *Foraging Behavior*. New York: Garland STPM Press, 1981.