Correlated evolution of personality, morphology, and performance

Elizabeth M.A. Kern^{†a*}, Detric Robinson^{†a}, Erika Gass^a, John Godwin^a, and R. Brian Langerhans^a

^aDepartment of Biological Sciences and W.M. Keck Center for Behavioral Biology,
North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA

*Correspondence: E. Kern. Present address: Department of Life Science, Ewha Womans
University, Ewhayeodae-gil 52, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul, South Korea 120-750

E-mail: ekern@ewha.ac.kr

Phone: +82-02-3277-4038

[†]These authors contributed equally to the paper and their names are given in alphabetical
order.

Word count: 5,040

Abstract

Evolutionary change in one trait can elicit evolutionary changes in other traits due to genetic correlations. This constrains the independent evolution of traits and can lead to unpredicted ecological and evolutionary outcomes. Animals might frequently exhibit genetic associations among behavioral and morphological-physiological traits, because the physiological mechanisms behind animal personality can have broad multi-trait effects and because many selective agents influence the evolution of multiple types of traits. However, we currently know little about genetic correlations between animal personalities and non-behavioral traits. We tested for associations between personality, morphology, and locomotor performance by comparing zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) collected from the wild and then selectively bred for either a proactive or reactive stress coping style (“bold” or “shy” phenotypes). Based on adaptive hypotheses of correlational selection in the wild, we predicted that artificial selection for boldness would produce correlated evolutionary responses of larger caudal regions and higher fast-start escape performance (and the opposite for shyness). After 4–7 generations, morphology and locomotor performance differed between personality lines: bold zebrafish exhibited a larger caudal region and higher fast-start performance than fish in the shy line, matching predictions. Individual-level phenotypic correlations suggested that pleiotropy or physical gene linkage likely explained the correlated response of locomotor performance, while the correlated response of body shape may have reflected linkage disequilibrium, which is breaking down each generation in the lab. Our results indicate that evolution of personality can result in concomitant changes in morphology and whole-organism performance, and vice versa.

Keywords: Behavioural syndromes, morphology, personality, pleiotropy, stress coping style, swimming performance, zebrafish

Introduction

Evolutionary response to selection depends not only on the strength and nature of selection, but also on the heritability of the trait in question and its genetic correlations with other traits (Agrawal & Stinchcombe, 2009; Falconer & MacKay, 1996; Lande, 1979). Because genetic correlations are common, selection on one trait often affects the evolution of other traits (Brodie, 1989; Ketterson, Atwell, & McGlothlin, 2009; Pigliucci & Preston, 2004). Understanding how and why this happens has received considerable attention in animal personalities, where behavioral traits covary to produce consistently distinct “personalities,” “temperaments,” or “behavioral syndromes” (Réale, Dingemanse, Kazem, & Wright, 2010; Réale, Reader, Sol, McDougall, & Dingemanse, 2007; Sih, Bell, & Johnson, 2004). However, we know little about whether animal personalities have genetic associations with non-behavioral traits, even though such associations should be expected and could have major ecological and evolutionary implications (Sih, Cote, Evans, Fogarty, & Pruitt, 2012; Wolf & Weissing, 2012). We suggest that animal personalities may often exhibit genetic correlations (i.e., heritable non-random associations among traits) with seemingly disparate non-behavioral traits due to (1) correlational selection on behavioral and non-behavioral traits or (2) pleiotropic effects of the genes and physiological mechanisms that underlie animal personalities.

First, correlational selection may often occur in nature since selective forces can influence both behavioral traits *and* non-behavioral traits, such as morphology and physiology (Dewitt, Sih, & Hucko, 1999; Endler, 1995; Ketterson et al., 2009; Schluter, 2010; Sinervo & Svensson, 2002; Vervust, Grbac, & Van Damme, 2007). Correlational selection describes cases where the fitness effect of one trait depends on the value of another trait. For instance, certain behaviors may produce high fitness only when combined with specific morphologies. This frequently produces genetic correlations (Cheverud, 1984; Jones, Arnold, & Bürger, 2003; Lande & Arnold, 1983; Lynch & Walsh, 1998; McGlothlin, Parker, Nolan, & Ketterson, 2005; Phillips & Arnold, 1989; Roff & Fairbairn, 2012; Sinervo & Svensson, 2002), as in garter snakes, where correlational selection on color pattern and predator-escape behavior results in covariance among these traits (Brodie, 1992).

Correlational selection on personality traits and non-behavioral traits may be more common than we realize, since certain behaviors should vary in fitness depending on other traits. For instance, risk-prone, aggressive individuals may require great strength, speed, or large size to

74 achieve high fitness. Correlational selection can produce genetic correlations through pleiotropy
75 (where genes affect multiple traits), genetic linkage (where genes are located nearby on a
76 chromosome), or linkage disequilibrium (where separate traits exhibit associations due to
77 correlational selection or non-random mating; Falconer & MacKay, 1996; Lynch & Walsh,
78 1998). Regardless of the source of genetic correlations, understanding the existence and strength
79 of these associations is important for understanding adaptation. In reality, traits do not adapt to
80 environments independently—rather, selection acts on whole-organism phenotypes, resulting in
81 organisms with evolved adaptations that reflect integrated suites of traits (Ghalambor, Walker, &
82 Reznick, 2003; Murren, 2012; Pigliucci & Preston, 2004; Réale, Garant, et al., 2010; Santos &
83 Cannatella, 2011).

84 Second, irrespective of correlational selection, prior work suggests that genes responsible
85 for animal personalities may have widespread pleiotropic effects. The physiological mechanisms
86 underlying animal personalities often pleiotropically affect traits such as dispersal behavior,
87 metabolic rate, immune capacity, lifespan, age at reproduction, and growth rate (Biro & Stamps,
88 2010; Careau, Réale, Humphries, & Thomas, 2010; Réale, Garant, et al., 2010). These same
89 factors could also affect other traits like morphology or whole-organism performance abilities
90 (Bourdeau & Johansson, 2012; Dickey, McCarley, & Shenton, 2002; Johansson & Andersson,
91 2009; Selman, Lumsden, Bünger, Hill, & Speakman, 2001; Swallow & Hayes, 2009), yet few
92 studies have examined whether animal personalities exhibit genetic associations with
93 morphological-physiological traits. Considering what we know about hormone-mediated suites
94 of traits (Adkins-Regan, 2005; McGlothlin & Ketterson, 2008), and given the diverse sets of trait
95 correlations involved in pace-of-life syndromes (Careau et al., 2010; Réale, Garant, et al., 2010),
96 we should expect to find a range of associations between animal personalities and
97 morphological-physiological traits owing to shared genetic or physiological bases. Indeed,
98 artificial selection on behavior, such as during domestication, can result in changes in seemingly
99 disparate traits such as color, skull shape, and seasonal reproductive patterns (Trut, Oskina, &
100 Kharlamova, 2009; Trut, Plyusnina, & Oskina, 2004). Identifying such associations will help us
101 understand the evolution of complex phenotypes and the limitations to adaptive evolution (since
102 trait correlations can present trade-offs that bias the direction of evolution; Pigliucci & Preston,
103 2004; Pruitt & Riechert, 2012; Schluter, 1996). Here we use zebrafish to provide one of the first

tests of the notion that animal personalities might exhibit genetic associations with morphological and performance traits.

Three general types of traits—behavior (animal personality), morphology (body shape), and locomotor ability (fast-start swimming performance)—could frequently show genetic correlation for a number of non-mutually exclusive reasons. First, changes in behavior, metabolism, or hormones might induce changes in morphology (Bourdeau & Johansson, 2012; Johansson & Andersson, 2009). Secondly, morphological changes should affect fast-start locomotor performance via trait codependence (*sensu* Dewitt et al., 1999), because swimming ability partially derives from the thrust generated by the caudal region of a fish (the two traits are mechanically linked). Further, correlational selection might favor particular trait combinations such as (1) trait complementation, where boldness enhances foraging or mating only when combined with high fast-start performance, (2) trait cospecialization, where bold, fast individuals and shy, slow individuals have high fitness because their trait combinations influence different fitness components (e.g., the former may have higher mating success but low longevity, while the latter may have lower mating success but high longevity), or (3) trait compensation, where bold individuals encounter more predatory strikes but compensate with defensive morphologies or rapid locomotor escape abilities. Any combination of these underlying causes could lead to the evolution of genetic correlations among personality, morphology, and performance (Wolf & Werner, 1994).

We investigated whether these three traits evolve independently or in concert using artificial selection with zebrafish (*Danio rerio*). We compared lines selected for bold or shy behavior to determine whether body morphology or locomotor performance exhibited correlated responses to behavioral selection. If genetic correlations exist between animal personalities and these non-behavioral traits, then body morphology and swimming ability should diverge between selection lines and appear as a correlated response to artificial selection (Carere & van Oers, 2004; Houde, 1994; Wilkinson & Reillo, 1994). We specifically predicted that artificial selection for boldness would elicit correlated evolutionary responses of larger caudal regions and higher fast-start escape performance (and the reverse for shyness).

While zebrafish are a well-established model laboratory organism (Norton & Bally-Cuif, 2010; Ribas & Piferrer, 2014; Ruzicka et al., 2015), less is known about their ecology in the wild. Zebrafish tend to inhabit shallow, slow-moving freshwater where they use the entire water

column and occupy both vegetated margins and open areas (Spence et al., 2006). They respond strongly to predator cues (Dill, 1974), and their antipredator behavior is heritable and tends to diminish in lab strains (Robison & Rowland, 2005; Wright, Nakamichi, Krause, & Butlin, 2006). Zebrafish face predation threats from multiple sources in the wild (Engeszer, Patterson, Rao, & Parichy, 2007), and appear to represent a likely candidate for experiencing correlational selection on behaviors and non-behavioral traits in nature.

Materials and Methods

Wild zebrafish from Gaighata, India were selectively bred in captivity for bold or shy personalities on the basis of stationary behavior in a stressful environment (see Wong et al., 2012 for a complete description of the experiment). Briefly, during an open field test zebrafish were introduced to a novel arena for five minutes, and the amount of time they spent stationary was recorded. Fish that exhibited at most 50 seconds of stationary behavior were bred together to generate a bold line, and fish that exhibited at least 200 seconds of stationary behavior were bred together to generate a shy line. The selective breeding program began with F1 fish, and selection was repeated each generation. By the third generation, these two selection lines differed consistently not only in stationary time but also in six different measures of stress and anxiety-related behaviors (Wong et al., 2012). These sets of consistent differences in multiple behavioral stress responses are variously termed either proactive and reactive stress coping styles, or bold and shy behavioral phenotypes (Koolhaas, de Boer, Coppens, & Buwalda, 2010; Øverli et al., 2007; Wong et al., 2012).

We examined body morphology and locomotor escape performance of adult zebrafish from bold and shy lines in the fourth ($n = 29$), fifth ($n = 29$), and seventh ($n = 67$) generations ($n_{\text{total}} = 125$; Table S1). Zebrafish from each generation were age-matched across bold and shy lines and were similar in body size (mean $\pm$ standard error for standard length: bold females 28.32 ± 0.75 mm, shy females 27.23 ± 0.65 mm, bold males 26.62 ± 0.53 mm, shy males 26.52 ± 0.54).

In the fourth and fifth generations, fish were not tracked individually across open field assays and measures of morphology and swimming performance. In the seventh generation, fish were tracked individually across all experimental components, permitting individual-level

correlation analyses among stationary behavior, body shape, and fast-start performance. All fish were reared in a recirculating system at North Carolina State University on a 14:10 light:dark cycle at 27.4 °C and fed dry flakes *ad libitum*.

Morphology

We used geometric morphometrics to measure the body morphology of all fish. We digitized ten anatomical landmarks on lateral photographs of live individuals (Fig. 1a) using tpsDig2 (Rohlf, 2013). Landmarks were located on the anterior tip of the snout on the upper jaw, the back of the head (posterior aspect of the neurocranium), the anterior and posterior insertions of the dorsal fin, the anterior attachments of the dorsal and ventral insertions of the caudal fin, the anterior insertions of the anal and pelvic fins, the insertion of the operculum on the ventral lateral profile, and the center of the eye. We generated shape variables (relative warps) using tpsRelw (Rohlf, 2010). Prior to Generalized Procrustes Analysis in tpsRelw, we used tpsUtil (Rohlf, 2012) to perform the unbend function, which removes postural differences. Landmarks for unbending were located in the center of the eye, the posterior midpoint of the operculum, the center of the body between landmarks 3 and 7, and the base of the caudal fin between landmarks 5 and 6. Except for the eye landmark, these points were excluded from shape analyses because they are not anatomically homologous. We used centroid size (the square root of the summed, squared distances of all landmarks from their centroid) as the estimate for body size.

For analysis we retained 11 relative warps, explaining 95.5% of the shape variance. We tested for morphological differences between bold and shy lines using multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), with 11 shape variables (relative warps) as dependent variables, coping style line, sex, and the interaction of sex and coping style line as independent variables, and generation and centroid size as covariates (the latter controls for multivariate allometry). We initially included all possible interactions, and excluded non-significant interaction terms in the final analysis.

To estimate the overall magnitude of shape differences between lines, we calculated Procrustes distance between line means for each sex using tpsSmall (Rohlf, 2003). Procrustes distance represents the standard metric of shape differences in geometric morphometrics (e.g., Bookstein, 1996), and is closely approximated by Euclidean distance between landmarks after Generalized Procrustes Analysis (Zelditch, Swiderski, & Sheets, 2012). To evaluate the nature of

the shape differences between lines, we calculated a divergence vector (**d**) following Langerhans (2009b) and visualized this axis using thin-plate spline transformations. This divergence vector or “shape index” represents a canonical analysis of the coping style term from the MANCOVA and describes the linear combination of shape variables that exhibits the greatest differences between groups, adjusting for other factors in the model, in Euclidean space.

Performance

Swimming-performance trials took place in a square arena (25.4 cm long $\times$ 25.4 cm wide $\times$ 6 cm deep) with a transparent Plexiglas base and opaque, black sides. Trials were recorded from below using a digital high-speed video camera (Model N4, Integrated Design Tools, Tallahassee, FL, USA) at 600 fps and 1016 $\times$ 1016 pixel resolution. For the seventh generation of zebrafish, we recorded videos at 400 fps. Tests were performed after fish were at least seven months old. Testing order was randomized by individual (fourth and seventh generations) or systematically alternated between bold and shy lines (fifth generation). Water temperature was held constant (27.4 °C) for all trials. We changed the water after each trial to avoid accumulating any alarm cues.

After placing an individual in the arena and allowing it to come to a standstill, we startled each fish by waving a hand over the tank and recorded the fast-start response. In fish, a fast-start is a brief, stereotyped burst of acceleration that enhances survival during predator encounters (Langerhans, 2009a, 2010). We recorded 2–4 responses per fish and selected one for analysis based on a qualitative assessment of the maximal response, as we wished to estimate *maximum* fast-start capacity and avoid inclusion of trials where individuals performed at less than their maximal capabilities (Losos, Creer, & Schulte II, 2002).

We measured fish displacement during the first ~70 ms of the fast-start response by digitizing the center of mass in each video frame using tpsDig. Center of mass was estimated for each individual based on the point along the center longitudinal line of the body (viewed from below) that showed the greatest latency for displacement in space as the fish’s body bent during initiation of the C-start (Tytell & Lauder, 2008). We smoothed displacement data using the mean-squared error quantic spline (Jeffrey A Walker, 1998), and used the smoothed data to calculate maximum velocity, average velocity, maximum acceleration, and average acceleration. We measured turning angle and mean angular velocity during stage one of the fast-start by

digitizing the center of mass and the tip of the snout during the earliest part of the escape response, in which the fish's body bends into a tightly curved "C" before moving forward (this was typically accomplished within the first 12 ms of the response).

In this way we obtained six performance variables from each video sequence: maximum velocity, average velocity, maximum acceleration, average acceleration, turning angle, and mean angular velocity during stage one of the fast-start. We conducted principal components analysis (PCA) on these six performance variables using the correlation matrix in order to reduce data dimensionality, and retained only those PCs that explained more variance than expected by broken stick criterion (three PCs). PC 1 explained over 40% of the variance and captured a major axis ranging from high-performance fish (high values for maximum velocity, maximum acceleration, average velocity, and rotational velocity) to low-performance fish (low values for those four variables). PC 2 described variation in turning angle, and PC 3 captured some of the variation in average acceleration (Table 1).

We tested for differences in fast-start performance between phenotype lines by running three general linear models, with each PC as the dependent variable and with coping style line, sex, and their interaction as independent variables, and centroid size and generation as covariates. We originally tested for all other possible interactions, but excluded them due to non-significance. To provide an assessment of the magnitude of differences between coping style lines, we report standardized effect sizes (Cohen's *d*, describing the difference between means in standard deviation units; Cohen, 1988).

Finally, to examine how the three traits of personality, morphology, and performance might be correlated among individuals raised in a common environment, we conducted two sets of analyses using fish from the seventh lab-raised generation. First, we performed a general linear model with stationary time as the dependent variable and the following as explanatory variables: shape index, the three performance PCs, centroid size, and sex. We excluded all non-significant terms. This model tested for direct associations between stationary behavior and either morphology or performance or both, while controlling (i.e., adjusting) for potentially confounding variables. That is, this analysis tests for behavior-morphology and behavior-performance associations that are independent of any other measured variable (simple correlation if only one term is included; partial correlations if multiple terms are included). Second, we performed three separate general linear models, each model using one performance PC as the

dependent variable and shape index, centroid size, and sex as explanatory variables. We again excluded all non-significant terms. These analyses tested for direct associations between performance and morphology, while again adjusting for possible confounding variables. That is, these analyses test for morphology-performance associations via simple correlation or partial correlation.

Ethical Note

The experiment was approved by the North Carolina State University IACUC (protocol 14-029-0). Fish were maintained in standard aquarium conditions and appeared to recover quickly after handling. No adverse effects on the overall health of the fish as a result of testing were apparent. The animals were later humanely euthanized in accordance with the approved animal care and use protocol (an overdose of tricaine methyl sulfonate).

Results

Body morphology showed statistically significant differences between bold and shy zebrafish lines (Table 2). Average Procrustes distance between bold and shy lines was 0.017 for females and 0.009 for males. Fish from the bold line exhibited a more elongate body with larger caudal regions and shallower mid-bodies than fish from the shy line (Figure 1). The shape index (visualized using thin-plate spline transformations in Figure 1), as well as Procrustes distances, suggested that females showed a greater magnitude of morphological difference between bold and shy coping styles than males (Figure 2), although we cannot reject the null hypothesis of no sex-dependent differences (i.e., non-significant interaction term between sex and coping style). Not surprisingly, we uncovered strong effects of allometry and sexual dimorphism on body shape (Table 2). There were also significant effects of generation; the fifth generation had a relatively longer body with a shallower mid-section, and the seventh generation had a longer anal-fin insertion.

Swimming performance also showed significant differences between bold and shy lines (Table 3; Table S2). Based on standardized effect sizes, females exhibited greater performance differences between lines than males (PC 1: 0.91 vs. 0.23, PC 2: 0.36 vs. 0.27, PC 3: 0.61 vs.

0.27). The bold line had higher fast-start performance (captured by PC 1) than the shy line, and this effect was stronger in females than males (Figure 2). There was also a negative relationship between centroid size and performance (smaller fish had higher PC 1 scores). Generation 4 had highest performance and 5 had lowest. In PC 2, there was only one suggestive trend (nonsignificant), where bold females tended to have higher turning angles than the shy line, while males showed the opposite pattern. Bold females had higher PC 3 scores (average acceleration) than shy females, while males again showed the opposite trend. Generation 4 had lower PC 3 scores than the other two generations.

By explicitly testing direct associations between stationary time, morphology, and performance, we found that behavior was directly correlated only with performance, not morphology or other potentially confounding variables. Thus, we did not find behavior-morphology associations when statistically controlling for performance. Performance PC 1 exhibited a significant association with stationary time ($r = -0.29$, $p = 0.0194$); the other two PCs did not. Only shape index was significantly associated with performance PC 1 ($r = 0.52$, $p < 0.0001$), indicating that fish with more elongate bodies and larger caudal regions exhibited higher fast-start performance. No model terms were significantly related to the other PCs. Based on these findings, we tested for an indirect association between stationary behavior and body shape to quantify the potential strength of association owing to their shared relationships with performance PC 1. Specifically, we calculated an indirect correlation coefficient as the product of the two simple correlation coefficients (correlation between PC 1 and stationary time $\times$ correlation between PC 1 and the shape index; equivalent to indirect effect tests of path models). Using 1000 bootstraps of the dataset, we uncovered a significant indirect association between stationary time and shape index ($r = -0.15$, $p = 0.012$), mediated by their shared association with performance PC 1. This indicated that individuals with more elongate bodies and larger caudal regions tended to exhibit lower stationary time in an open field test owing to the fact that these fish also tended to have higher fast-start performance PC 1 values.

Discussion

Wild-derived zebrafish selectively bred for divergent stress-coping styles did not merely evolve a set of behavioral differences, but also diverged in body morphology and locomotor

performance. The correlated responses of body shape and fast-start performance to artificial selection on an animal personality trait demonstrates underlying genetic associations among the traits in this study. This means these traits probably cannot evolve independently, as the evolution of one can constrain the evolution of the others. Thus, seemingly unrelated traits like locomotor ability and personality can indeed coevolve. Overall, this study represents one of the earliest documentations of correlations between animal personalities and either whole-body morphology or locomotor performance (Ahlgren, Chapman, Nilsson, & Brönmark, 2015; Hulthén, Chapman, Nilsson, Hollander, & Brönmark, 2014; Müller & von Keyserlingk, 2006).

Compared to fish from the shy line, bold fish had enhanced fast-start performance and a more elongate body with a larger caudal region. This matches our *a priori* predictions for the phenotype combinations that should provide high fitness in the wild. The two selection lines examined in this study differed by as much as 2.1 standard deviation units in stationary behavior, up to 0.9 standard deviation units in fast-start performance, and exhibited an average Procrustes distance as high as 0.017. This indicates substantial behavioral divergence, moderate-to-strong divergence in locomotor performance, and moderate shape differences. For comparison, morphological differences between these zebrafish lines were considerably less than observed between populations of *Gambusia* fishes living with or without predatory fish (Procrustes distances 0.030-0.046; Langerhans, Gifford, & Joseph, 2007; Langerhans & Makowicz, 2009; Langerhans, 2009b), but comparable to that seen in the rapid differentiation of a crater lake cichlid, *Amphilophus citrinellus* (Procrustes distance 0.017; Elmer, Lehtonen, Kautt, Harrod, & Meyer, 2010).

Based on work in other systems, we speculate that the genetic correlations in zebrafish stemmed from correlational selection in the wild via predation (Pruitt, Stachowicz, & Sih, 2012; Réale & Festa-Bianchet, 2003). Most natural fish populations are subject to predation, and the limited ecological data on wild zebrafish suggest they regularly encounter avian and fish predators (Bass & Gerlai, 2008; Engeszer, Patterson, Rao, & Parichy, 2007; Spence et al., 2006). In the presence of predation, selection might favor both fast-and-bold phenotypes as well as shy-and-slow phenotypes, leading to correlation in these trait combinations. Bold, exploratory, and risk-taking behaviors might offer a host of fitness advantages only when combined with greater acceleration, maneuverability, and fast-start velocity. Larger caudal regions and increased fast-start performance can enhance survival during predatory encounters in fish (Langerhans, 2009a;

Walker, Ghalambor, Griset, McKenney, & Reznick, 2005). Meanwhile, shy, slow individuals might represent an alternative high-fitness strategy by hiding from predators and experiencing greater longevity (Langerhans, 2006; Smith & Blumstein, 2008). Moreover, because of the physiological tradeoff between fast-start performance and steady-swimming performance known for many fish, and expected in zebrafish, shy-slow individuals might exhibit higher steady-swimming abilities and thus greater energetic efficiency during routine activities such as foraging and station holding (Langerhans & Reznick, 2010; Langerhans, 2009b; Oufiero, Walsh, Reznick, & Garland, 2011; Plaut, 2001).

The responses of morphological and locomotor traits to selection on behavior were particularly strong in female zebrafish: females tended to differ between lines more than males, and in more aspects of fast-start performance (multiple PCs). The cause of this is unclear: perhaps correlational selection in the wild is stronger for females than males (e.g., selection in males may largely favor high fast-start performance regardless of stress coping style), or perhaps genetic and physiological differences between the sexes influence the expression of morphology and performance genes. Male zebrafish in this study and in the wild (Dahlbom, Lagman, Lundstedt-Enkel, Sundström, & Winberg, 2011, Wong et al., 2012) exhibit greater boldness than females, and male zebrafish also exhibit a more elongate body with a larger caudal region than females. It is possible that high fast-start performance phenotypes are more canalized in males compared to females.

The ultimate and proximate causes of genetic associations between personality, morphology, and performance and their prevalence in nature require further study. Our findings not only suggest that correlational selection might ultimately underlie the observed associations, but also that different proximate mechanisms might explain the correlated responses to selection on behavior for the two non-behavioral traits examined here. First, we found that after seven generations in the laboratory, zebrafish exhibited a significant and direct phenotypic correlation between personality (stationary time in an open field test) and locomotor performance (PC 1 of fast-start performance). This is consistent with pleiotropy or physical gene linkage, where either expression of the two traits share some of the same genes or some independent genes that influence the two traits are proximally located on the same chromosome and are thus co-inherited. On the other hand, we found no evidence for a *direct* phenotypic correlation between personality and body shape after seven generations in the lab, even though body shape had

diverged between selection lines. Instead, we only observed a significant indirect association between these two traits: personality was indirectly associated with body shape because (1) body shape and fast-start performance showed a strong phenotypic correlation, apparently reflecting biomechanical relationships where body shape partially causes locomotor performance (Domenici, Turesson, Brodersen, & Brönmark, 2008; Langerhans, 2009a, 2010; Swallow & Hayes, 2009), and (2) fast-start performance was significantly correlated with personality. These results suggest that the correlated response of body shape to selection on behavior may have reflected linkage disequilibrium between genes that influence morphology and behavior, built up by correlational selection in the wild. Without continued correlational selection, this kind of disequilibrium breaks down quickly under random mating, and is consistent with the lack of direct phenotypic correlation observed in the seventh generation of lab-raised fish in this study.

Although our results strongly suggest that genetic correlations among the traits caused correlated evolutionary responses to artificial selection on one trait, an alternative explanation is possible. That is, correlated responses could reflect socially-induced phenotypic changes, where bold fish that only interact with other bold fish develop different body shapes and locomotor capacities than shy fish that interact only with other shy fish. In this scenario, social interactions, and not underlying genes per se, could create correlated responses to selection (Laskowski & Pruitt, 2014). Because the different selection lines were housed separately in this study, we cannot rule out this explanation. However, this interpretation seems less robust in light of the evidence for pleiotropy and in the absence of any previously demonstrated socially-induced responses in zebrafish performance or morphology.

Owing to the rich resources available to zebrafish researchers and the ever-increasing use of zebrafish as physiological and behavioral genetic models, our results point toward promising future work in zebrafish that could provide insights into the genetic mechanisms underlying complex trait associations. Zebrafish research has already yielded information on genes and molecular pathways that influence locomotion, hyperactivity, and morphological traits (Granato et al., 1996; Mabee et al., 2007; Norton & Bally-Cuif, 2010). Interactions among such genes are not well understood. Nor are the interactions among behavioral, physiological, and morphological genes, or the pleiotropic effects of genes across these phenotypic domains. In light of our findings, genotype-phenotype studies focused on behavior-physiology-morphology associations could represent a fruitful area of research. Because correlational selection on animal

personalities and non-behavioral traits might be common in the wild, and because personalities are underlain by mechanisms with broad phenotypic consequences, we might expect personality to often correlate with non-behavioral traits such as morphology and performance (Hulthén et al., 2014; Kim & Velando, 2015; Lacasse & Aubin-horth, 2012; Olmos & Turner, 2008). However, we currently know very little about these associations. If complex behaviors often coevolve with disparate traits like locomotion and morphology, not only will this alter our understanding of whole-organism adaptation and the role of evolutionary constraints among different types of traits, but we might also apply this knowledge to captive and domestic animal breeding, pest management, and understanding associations between human behaviors and other traits (Zilioli, Sell, et al., 2015; Carré & McCormick, 2008). Results of this study suggest genetic associations exist between personality, morphology, and performance; we now need additional research to understand their frequency and importance.

Acknowledgments

We thank Ryan Wong and Heather Hill for experimental assistance, Brad Ring and John Davis for animal husbandry, and the members of the Langerhans Lab for comments on the manuscript. This study was supported by the NCSU Initiative for Maximizing Student Diversity to DR (NIH-GM083242), NIH grant (1R21MH080500) to JG, and NSF grant (DEB-0842364) to RBL.

References

- Adkins-Regan, E. (2005). *Hormones and Animal Social Behavior*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Agrawal, A. F., & Stinchcombe, J. R. (2009). How much do genetic covariances alter the rate of adaptation? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 276(1659), 1183–91. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.1671>
- Ahlgren, J., Chapman, B. B., Nilsson, P. A., & Brönmark, C. (2015). Individual boldness is linked to protective shell shape in aquatic snails. *Biology Letters*, 11(4), 20150029. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2015.0029>

440 Bass, S. L. S., & Gerlai, R. (2008). Zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) responds differentially to stimulus
 441 fish: the effects of sympatric and allopatric predators and harmless fish. *Behavioural Brain*
 442 *Research*, 186(1), 107–17. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2007.07.037>

443 Biro, P. A., & Stamps, J. A. (2010). Do consistent individual differences in metabolic rate
 444 promote consistent individual differences in behavior? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 25,
 445 653–659. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2010.08.003>

446 Bookstein, F. L. (1996). Biometrics, biomathematics and the morphometric synthesis. *Bulletin of*
 447 *Mathematical Biology*, 58(2), 313–365. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF02458311>

448 Bourdeau, P. E., & Johansson, F. (2012). Predator-induced morphological defences as by-
 449 products of prey behaviour: a review and prospectus. *Oikos*, 121, 1175–1190.
 450 <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2012.20235.x>

451 Brodie, E. D. (1989). Genetic correlations between morphology and antipredator behaviour in
 452 natural populations of the garter snake *Thamnophis ordinoides*. *Nature*, 342(6249), 542–3.
 453 <http://doi.org/10.1038/342542a0>

454 Brodie, E. D. (1992). Correlational selection for color pattern and antipredator behavior in the
 455 garter snake *Thamnophis ordinoides*. *Evolution*, 46, 1284–1298.
 456 <http://doi.org/10.2307/2409937>

457 Careau, V., Réale, D., Humphries, M. M., & Thomas, D. W. (2010). The pace of life under
 458 artificial selection: personality, energy expenditure, and longevity are correlated in domestic
 459 dogs. *The American Naturalist*, 175, 753–758. <http://doi.org/10.1086/652435>

460 Carere, C., & van Oers, K. (2004). Shy and bold great tits (*Parus major*): body temperature and
 461 breath rate in response to handling stress. *Physiology & Behavior*, 82, 905–912.
 462 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2004.07.009>

463 Cheverud, J. M. (1984). Quantitative genetics and developmental constraints on evolution by
 464 selection. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 110, 155–171. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193(84)80050-8)
 465 [5193\(84\)80050-8](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193(84)80050-8)

466 Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

467 Dahlbom, S. J., Lagman, D., Lundstedt-Enkel, K., Sundström, L. F., & Winberg, S. (2011).
 468 Boldness predicts social status in zebrafish (*Danio rerio*). *PloS One*, 6(8), e23565.
 469 <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0023565>

470 Dewitt, T. J., Sih, A., & Hucko, J. A. (1999). Trait compensation and cospecialization in a
 471 freshwater snail: size, shape and antipredator behaviour. *Animal Behaviour*, 58, 397–407.
 472 <http://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.1999.1158>

- 473 Dickey, C. C., McCarley, R. W., & Shenton, M. E. (2002). The brain in schizotypal personality
474 disorder: a review of structural MRI and CT findings. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, 10, 1–
475 15.
- 476 Dill, L. M. (1974). The escape response of the zebra danio (*Brachydanio rerio*) I. The stimulus
477 for escape. *Animal Behaviour*, 22(3), 711–722. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(74)80022-9)
478 3472(74)80022-9
- 479 Domenici, P., Turesson, H., Brodersen, J., & Brönmark, C. (2008). Predator-induced
480 morphology enhances escape locomotion in crucian carp. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*
481 *B: Biological Sciences*, 275, 195–201. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2007.1088>
- 482 Elmer, K. R., Lehtonen, T. K., Kautt, A. F., Harrod, C., & Meyer, A. (2010). Rapid sympatric
483 ecological differentiation of crater lake cichlid fishes within historic times. *BMC Biology*,
484 8(1), 60. <http://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7007-8-60>
- 485 Endler, J. A. (1995). Multiple-trait coevolution and environmental gradients in guppies. *Trends*
486 *in Ecology and Evolution*, 10, 22–29. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(00\)88956-9](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(00)88956-9)
- 487 Engeszer, R. E., Patterson, L. B., Rao, A. A., & Parichy, D. M. (2007). Zebrafish in the wild: a
488 review of natural history and new notes from the field. *Zebrafish*, 4, 21–40.
489 <http://doi.org/10.1089/zeb.2006.9997>
- 490 Falconer, D., & MacKay, T. (1996). *Introduction to Quantitative Genetics* (4th ed.). Burnt Mill,
491 Harlow, United Kingdom: Longman Scientific & Technical.
- 492 Ghalambor, C. K., Walker, J. A., & Reznick, D. N. (2003). Multi-trait selection, adaptation, and
493 constraints on the evolution of burst swimming performance. *Integrative and Comparative*
494 *Biology*, 43(3), 431–438. <http://doi.org/10.1093/icb/43.3.431>
- 495 Granato, M., van Eeden, F. J., Schach, U., Trowe, T., Brand, M., Furutani-Seiki, M., ...
496 Nusslein-Volhard, C. (1996). Genes controlling and mediating locomotion behavior of the
497 zebrafish embryo and larva. *Development*, 123(1), 399–413.
- 498 Houde, A. E. (1994). Effect of artificial selection on male colour patterns on mating preference
499 of female guppies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*.
500 <http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1994.0059>
- 501 Hulthén, K., Chapman, B. B., Nilsson, P. A., Hollander, J., & Brönmark, C. (2014). Express
502 yourself: bold individuals induce enhanced morphological defences. *Proceedings of the*
503 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 281(1776), 20132703.
504 <http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.2703>
- 505 Johansson, F., & Andersson, J. (2009). Scared fish get lazy, and lazy fish get fat. *The Journal of*
506 *Animal Ecology*, 78, 772–777. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01530.x>

- 507 Jones, A. G., Arnold, S. J., & Bürger, R. (2003). Stability of the G-matrix in a population
508 experiencing pleiotropic mutation, stabilizing selection, and genetic drift. *Evolution*, 57(8),
509 1747–1760. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.0014-3820.2003.tb00583.x>
- 510 Ketterson, E. D., Atwell, J. W., & McGlothlin, J. W. (2009). Phenotypic integration and
511 independence: hormones, performance, and response to environmental change. *Integrative
512 and Comparative Biology*, 49(4), 365–379. <http://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icp057>
- 513 Kim, S.-Y., & Velando, A. (2015). Phenotypic integration between antipredator behavior and
514 camouflage pattern in juvenile sticklebacks. *Evolution*, 69(3), 830–8.
515 <http://doi.org/10.1111/evo.12600>
- 516 Koolhaas, J. M., de Boer, S. F., Coppens, C. M., & Buwalda, B. (2010). Neuroendocrinology of
517 coping styles: towards understanding the biology of individual variation. *Frontiers in
518 Neuroendocrinology*, 31(3), 307–21. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.yfrne.2010.04.001>
- 519 Lacasse, J., & Aubin-horth, N. (2012). A test of the coupling of predator defense morphology
520 and behavior variation in two threespine stickleback populations. *Current Zoology*, 58, 53–
521 65.
- 522 Lande, R. (1979). Quantitative genetic analysis of multivariate allometry, applied to brain: body
523 size allometry. *Evolution*, 33(1), 402–416.
- 524 Lande, R., & Arnold, S. J. (1983). The measurement of selection on correlated characters.
525 *Evolution*, 37(6), 1210–1226.
- 526 Langerhans, R. B. (2006). Evolutionary consequences of predation: avoidance, escape,
527 reproduction, and diversification. In A. M. T. Elewa (Ed.), *Predation in Organisms: a
528 Distinct Phenomenon* (pp. 177–220). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer-Verlag.
- 529 Langerhans, R. B. (2009a). Morphology, performance, fitness: functional insight into a post-
530 Pleistocene radiation of mosquitofish. *Biology Letters*, 5, 488–491.
531 <http://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2009.0179>
- 532 Langerhans, R. B. (2009b). Trade-off between steady and unsteady swimming underlies
533 predator-driven divergence in *Gambusia affinis*. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 22b,
534 1057–1075. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2009.01716.x>
- 535 Langerhans, R. B. (2010). Predicting evolution with generalized models of divergent selection: a
536 case study with poeciliid fish. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, 50, 1167–1184.
537 <http://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icq117>
- 538 Langerhans, R. B., Gifford, M. E., & Joseph, E. O. (2007). Ecological speciation in *Gambusia*
539 fishes. *Evolution*, 61(9), 2056–74. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2007.00171.x>

- 540 Langerhans, R. B., & Makowicz, A. M. (2009). Shared and unique features of morphological
541 differentiation between predator regimes in *Gambusia caymanensis*. *Journal of*
542 *Evolutionary Biology*, 22(11), 2231–42.
- 543 Langerhans, R. B., & Reznick, D. N. (2010). Ecology and evolution of swimming performance
544 in fishes: predicting evolution with biomechanics. In P. Domenici & B. G. Kapoor (Eds.),
545 *Fish Locomotion: an Eco-ethological Perspective* (pp. 200–248). Enfield, NH: Science
546 Publishers.
- 547 Laskowski, K. L., & Pruitt, J. N. (2014). Evidence of social niche construction: persistent and
548 repeated social interactions generate stronger personalities in a social spider. *Proceedings of*
549 *the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 281(1783), 20133166.
550 <http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.3166>
- 551 Losos, J. B., Creer, D. A., & Schulte II, J. A. (2002). Cautionary comments on the measurement
552 of maximum locomotor capabilities. *Journal of Zoology*, 258(1), 57–61.
553 <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0952836902001206>
- 554 Lynch, M., & Walsh, J. B. (1998). *Genetics and Analysis of Quantitative Traits*. Sunderland,
555 MA: Sinauer.
- 556 Mabee, P. M., Arratia, G., Coburn, M., Haendel, M., Hilton, E. J., Lundberg, J. G., ...
557 Westerfield, M. (2007). Connecting evolutionary morphology to genomics using ontologies:
558 a case study from Cypriniformes including zebrafish. *Journal of Experimental Zoology.*
559 *Part B, Molecular and Developmental Evolution*, 308(5), 655–68.
560 <http://doi.org/10.1002/jez.b.21181>
- 561 McGlothlin, J. W., & Ketterson, E. D. (2008). Hormone-mediated suites as adaptations and
562 evolutionary constraints. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series*
563 *B, Biological Sciences*, 363(1497), 1611–20. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2007.0002>
- 564 McGlothlin, J. W., Parker, P. G., Nolan, V., & Ketterson, E. D. (2005). Correlational selection
565 leads to genetic integration of body size and an attractive plumage trait in dark-eyed juncos.
566 *Evolution*, 59, 658–671. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.0014-3820.2005.tb01024.x>
- 567 Müller, R., & von Keyserlingk, M. A. G. (2006). Consistency of flight speed and its correlation
568 to productivity and to personality in *Bos taurus* beef cattle. *Applied Animal Behaviour*
569 *Science*, 99(3), 193–204.
- 570 Murren, C. J. (2012). The integrated phenotype. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, 52(1),
571 64–76. <http://doi.org/10.1093/icb/ics043>
- 572 Norton, W., & Bally-Cuif, L. (2010). Adult zebrafish as a model organism for behavioural
573 genetics. *BMC Neuroscience*, 11(1), 90. <http://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2202-11-90>

- 574 Olmos, G., & Turner, S. P. (2008). The relationships between temperament during routine
575 handling tasks, weight gain and facial hair whorl position in frequently handled beef cattle.
576 *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 115, 25–36.
577 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2008.05.001>
- 578 Oufiero, C. E., Walsh, M. R., Reznick, D. N., & Garland, T. (2011). Swimming performance
579 trade-offs across a gradient in community composition in Trinidadian killifish (*Rivulus*
580 *hartii*). *Ecology*, 92(1), 170–9.
- 581 Øverli, Ø., Sørensen, C., Pulman, K. G. T., Pottinger, T. G., Korzan, W., Summers, C. H., &
582 Nilsson, G. E. (2007). Evolutionary background for stress-coping styles: relationships
583 between physiological, behavioral, and cognitive traits in non-mammalian vertebrates.
584 *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 31(3), 396–412.
585 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2006.10.006>
- 586 Phillips, P. C., & Arnold, S. J. (1989). Visualizing multivariate selection. *Evolution*, 43, 1209–
587 1222. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2409357>
- 588 Pigliucci, M., & Preston, K. A. (2004). *Phenotypic Integration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 589 Plaut, I. (2001). Critical swimming speed: its ecological relevance. *Comparative Biochemistry*
590 *and Physiology Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology*, 131(1), 41–50.
591 [http://doi.org/10.1016/S1095-6433\(01\)00462-7](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1095-6433(01)00462-7)
- 592 Pruitt, J. N., & Riechert, S. E. (2012). The ecological consequences of temperament in spiders.
593 *Current Zoology*, 58(4), 589–596.
- 594 Pruitt, J. N., Stachowicz, J. J., & Sih, A. (2012). Behavioral types of predator and prey jointly
595 determine prey survival: potential implications for the maintenance of within-species
596 behavioral variation. *The American Naturalist*, 179(2), 217–227.
597 <http://doi.org/10.1086/663680>
- 598 Réale, D., Dingemanse, N. J., Kazem, A. J. N., & Wright, J. (2010). Evolutionary and ecological
599 approaches to the study of personality. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of*
600 *London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 365, 3937–3946.
601 <http://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0222>
- 602 Réale, D., & Festa-Bianchet, M. (2003). Predator-induced natural selection on temperament in
603 bighorn ewes. *Animal Behaviour*, 65(3), 463–470. <http://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2003.2100>
- 604 Réale, D., Garant, D., Humphries, M. M., Bergeron, P., Careau, V., & Montiglio, P.-O. (2010).
605 Personality and the emergence of the pace-of-life syndrome concept at the population level.
606 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*,
607 365, 4051–4063. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0208>

608 Réale, D., Reader, S. M., Sol, D., McDougall, P. T., & Dingemanse, N. J. (2007). Integrating
609 animal temperament within ecology and evolution. *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge*
610 *Philosophical Society*, 82, 291–318. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2007.00010.x>

611 Ribas, L., & Piferrer, F. (2014). The zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) as a model organism, with emphasis
612 on applications for finfish aquaculture research. *Reviews in Aquaculture*, 6(4), 209–240.
613 <http://doi.org/10.1111/raq.12041>

614 Robison, B. D., & Rowland, W. (2005). A potential model system for studying the genetics of
615 domestication: behavioral variation among wild and domesticated strains of zebra danio
616 (*Danio rerio*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 62(9), 2046–2054.
617 <http://doi.org/10.1139/f05-118>

618 Roff, D. A., & Fairbairn, D. J. (2012). A test of the hypothesis that correlational selection
619 generates genetic correlations. *Evolution*, 66(9), 2953–60. [http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-](http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01656.x)
620 [5646.2012.01656.x](http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01656.x)

621 Rohlf, F. J. (2003). TpsSmall, v. 1.20. Stony Brook, NY: State University of New York.

622 Rohlf, F. J. (2010). TpsRelw. Stony Brook, NY: State University of New York.

623 Rohlf, F. J. (2012). TpsUtil. Stony Brook, NY: State University of New York.

624 Rohlf, F. J. (2013). TpsDig. Stony Brook, NY: State University of New York.

625 Ruzicka, L., Bradford, Y. M., Frazer, K., Howe, D. G., Paddock, H., Ramachandran, S., ...
626 Westerfield, M. (2015). ZFIN, The zebrafish model organism database: updates and new
627 directions. *Genesis*, 53(8), 498–509. <http://doi.org/10.1002/dvg.22868>

628 Santos, J. C., & Cannatella, D. C. (2011). Phenotypic integration emerges from aposematism and
629 scale in poison frogs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States*
630 *of America*, 108(15), 6175–80. <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1010952108>

631 Schluter, D. (1996). Ecological causes of adaptive radiation. *The American Naturalist*, 148, S40.
632 <http://doi.org/10.1086/285901>

633 Schluter, D. (2010). Resource competition and coevolution in sticklebacks. *Evolution: Education*
634 *and Outreach*. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s12052-009-0204-6>

635 Selman, C., Lumsden, S., Bünger, L., Hill, W. G., & Speakman, J. R. (2001). Resting metabolic
636 rate and morphology in mice (*Mus musculus*) selected for high and low food intake. *The*
637 *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 204, 777–784.

638 Sih, A., Bell, A., & Johnson, J. C. (2004). Behavioral syndromes: an ecological and evolutionary
639 overview. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 19, 372–378.
640 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2004.04.009>

- 641 Sih, A., Cote, J., Evans, M., Fogarty, S., & Pruitt, J. (2012). Ecological implications of
642 behavioural syndromes. *Ecology Letters*, 15(3), 278–289. [http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-](http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01731.x)
643 0248.2011.01731.x
- 644 Sinervo, B., & Svensson, E. (2002). Correlational selection and the evolution of genomic
645 architecture. *Heredity*, 89(5), 329–38. <http://doi.org/10.1038/sj.hdy.6800148>
- 646 Smith, B. R., & Blumstein, D. T. (2008). Fitness consequences of personality: a meta-analysis.
647 *Behavioral Ecology*, 19, 448–455. <http://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arm144>
- 648 Spence, R., Fatema, M. K., Reichard, M., Huq, K. A., Wahab, M. A., Ahmed, Z. F., & Smith, C.
649 (2006). The distribution and habitat preferences of the zebrafish in Bangladesh. *Journal of*
650 *Fish Biology*, 69(5), 1435–1448. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8649.2006.01206.x>
- 651 Swallow, J., & Hayes, J. (2009). Selection experiments and experimental evolution of
652 performance and physiology. In T. Garland Jr & M. R. Rose (Eds.), *Experimental*
653 *Evolution: Concepts, Methods, and Applications of Selection Experiments* (pp. 301–351).
654 Los Angeles: University of California.
- 655 Trut, L. N., Oskina, I., & Kharlamova, A. (2009). Animal evolution during domestication: the
656 domesticated fox as a model. *BioEssays*: *News and Reviews in Molecular, Cellular and*
657 *Developmental Biology*, 31(3), 349–60. <http://doi.org/10.1002/bies.200800070>
- 658 Trut, L. N., Plyusnina, I. Z., & Oskina, I. N. (2004). An experiment on fox domestication and
659 debatable issues of evolution of the dog. *Russian Journal of Genetics*, 40(6), 644–655.
660 <http://doi.org/10.1023/B:RUGE.0000033312.92773.c1>
- 661 Tytell, E. D., & Lauder, G. V. (2008). Hydrodynamics of the escape response in bluegill sunfish,
662 *Lepomis macrochirus*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 211(Pt 21), 3359–69.
663 <http://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.020917>
- 664 Vervust, B., Grbac, I., & Van Damme, R. (2007). Differences in morphology, performance and
665 behaviour between recently diverged populations of *Podarcis sicula* mirror differences in
666 predation pressure. *Oikos*, 116, 1343–1352. [http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2007.0030-](http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2007.0030-1299.15989.x)
667 1299.15989.x
- 668 Walker, J. A. (1998). Estimating velocities and accelerations of animal locomotion: a simulation
669 experiment comparing numerical differentiation algorithms. *Journal of Experimental*
670 *Biology*, 201, 981–995. <http://doi.org/10.1002/pds.1118>
- 671 Walker, J. A., Ghalambor, C. K., Griset, O. L., McKenney, D., & Reznick, D. N. (2005). Do
672 faster starts increase the probability of evading predators? *Functional Ecology*, 19(5), 808–
673 815. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2005.01033.x>

674 Wilkinson, G. S., & Reillo, P. R. (1994). Female choice response to artificial selection on an
 675 exaggerated male trait in a stalk-eyed fly. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*
 676 *Sciences*, 255, 1–6. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1994.0001>

677 Wolf, M., & Weissing, F. J. (2012). Animal personalities: consequences for ecology and
 678 evolution. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 27(8), 452–461.

679 Wolf, M., & Werner, Y. L. (1994). The striped colour pattern and striped/non-striped
 680 polymorphism in snakes (Reptilia: Ophidia). *Biological Reviews*, 69(4), 599–610.
 681 <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.1994.tb01250.x>

682 Wong, R. Y., Perrin, F., Oxendine, S. E., Kezios, Z. D., Sawyer, S., Zhou, L., ... Godwin, J.
 683 (2012). Comparing behavioral responses across multiple assays of stress and anxiety in
 684 zebrafish (*Danio rerio*). *Behaviour*, 149(10-12), 1205–1240.
 685 <http://doi.org/10.1163/1568539X-00003018>

686 Wright, D., Nakamichi, R., Krause, J., & Butlin, R. K. (2006). QTL analysis of behavioral and
 687 morphological differentiation between wild and laboratory zebrafish (*Danio rerio*).
 688 *Behavior Genetics*, 36(2), 271–84. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-005-9029-4>

689 Zelditch, M. L., Swiderski, D. L., & Sheets, H. D. (2012). *Geometric Morphometrics for*
 690 *Biologists: a Primer*. Waltham, MA: Academic Press.

691

692

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Landmarks used for morphological analysis (*a*), and morphological differences between bold and shy phenotype lines of zebrafish females (*b*) and males (*c*). Body shape variation along the shape index (see text) depicted with thin-plate spline transformation grids (no magnification; solid lines connecting outer landmarks are drawn to aid interpretation). Landmark vectors beneath each set of grids convey the direction and relative magnitude of change in the location of each landmark, pointing toward values characteristic of bold lines.

Figure 2. Variation in body morphology and fast-start performance (captured by PC 1) between bold (filled symbols) and shy (open symbols) coping style lines in female (squares) and male (circles) zebrafish.

705 Table 1. PC loadings for kinematic variables used to measure locomotor performance. PC 1
706 captured most of the variation in velocity and maximum acceleration, PC 2 largely described
707 variation in turning angle, and PC 3 partially captured average acceleration.

Performance variable	PC 1	PC 2	PC 3
Maximum velocity	0.93	-0.13	-0.15
Maximum acceleration	0.67	-0.08	-0.59
Average velocity	0.79	-0.18	0.29
Average acceleration	0.06	-0.57	0.64
Turning angle	0.11	0.83	0.29
Rotational velocity	0.75	0.35	0.31
Variance explained:	41.84%	19.85%	17.59%

708

709

710 Table 2. Results of MANCOVA examining how body shape varies with coping style line
 711 (bold/shy), sex, and size.

Source	<i>F</i>	D.f.	<i>P</i>
Coping style line	2.37	11, 108	0.0115
Sex	7.80	11, 108	< 0.0001
Sex × coping style line	0.73	11, 108	0.7052
Centroid size	4.88	11, 108	< 0.0001
Generation	3.66	22, 216	< 0.0001

712
 713

714

715

716 Table 3. Results of general linear models examining variation in swimming performance
 717 (captured by PCs) between bold and shy zebrafish lines.

Source	D.f.	PC 1		PC 2		PC 3	
		<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
Coping style line	1, 118	10.88	0.0013	0.08	0.7716	1.05	0.3078
Sex	1, 118	4.94	0.0281	1.28	0.2608	1.54	0.2174
Sex × coping style line	1, 118	4.05	0.0464	3.19	0.0768	6.32	0.0133
Centroid size	1, 118	4.76	0.0310	0.09	0.7588	0.03	0.8610
Generation	2, 118	11.46	< 0.0001	1.37	0.2571	25.93	< 0.0001

718

Figure 1

(a)

(b)

Shy

Bold

Females

(c)

Males

Figure 2