

Multi-level selection in biology

George F R Ellis

Mathematics Department University of Cape Town

Abstract: It is proposed that Okasha's Multi Level Selection-1 concept be split in two, representing Multi Level Selection based in environmental properties, and in group properties. This enables a characterisation of how emergent properties can affect group selection.

Keywords: Selection, Multi-level, Emergence

This note is a response to Massimo Pigliucci's review (Pigliucci 2010) of Samir Okasha's book *Evolution and the Levels of Selection* (Okasha 2006). In that review it is pointed out that an important feature of the book is the distinction between Multi Level Selection-1 (MSL1), concerned with the evolution of particle-level traits, where the collective can be thought of as part of the environment that influences such evolution, and Multi Level Selection-2 (MLS2), concerned with the collectives themselves and their evolution. The new suggestion made in this note is that it may be useful to split multilevel selection MLS1 into $MLS1_G$, being such selection of individuals due to the group context, and $MLS1_E$, being such selection due to the broader environmental context.

To make the situation specific, consider the case of why people, say Bushmen in the Kalahari, or animals, say buffalo on the Serengeti plains, find it important to group together in tribes or herds. The key point is that a collection of buffalo wandering around on their own is not a herd; it is an aggregation (the whole is just the sum of its parts). The same is true for a group of Bushmen living isolated lives. If they band together on the other hand they act collectively to protect young, detect dangers, ward off predators, and share food, skills, resources, and information. The whole is more than the sum of its parts; the young are much more likely to survive. Such banding together probably played a key role in the evolution of intelligence (Pringle 2013).

The dynamic is shown in diagram 1.

Context			Environment	
			↓ $MLS2$	↓
Species	Trait2	Collective	fitness-2	↓ $MLS1_E$
	↑ Emergence	↓ $MLS1_G$		↓
Individual	↑ Trait1 _G ↑ Trait1 _E	fitness-1_G		↓ fitness-1_E

Diagram 1: Multilevel selection: selection effects between the environment, the collective, and the individual.

In the case of the buffalo, the group level trait Trait2 is the buffalo being together as a herd. It obviously can't be a trait of the individuals (one buffalo is not a herd, which by definition will require

at least 5 members). This confers fitness-2 due to the overall environment (which includes lions on the plain), and is selected for by MLS2.

The individual level trait Trait1_E is an individual trait that gives an advantage relative to the environment, such as being able to run very fast. This confers individual fitness-1_E in regard to the overall environment, which is selected for by MLS1_E.

The individual level Trait1_G is an individual trait that give an advantage relative to the environment because of the existence of the group, such as the individual having a propensity to join the group. This confers individual fitness fitness-1_G in regard to the overall environment because of the existence of the group, and is selected for by MLS1_G. Individuals who do not have this propensity (they like to keep away from the group and go off on their own) are not so likely to survive. It is because of this sociable propensity at the individual level that the group emerges from the individuals.

The emergent trait Trait2 results from the effects of Trait1_E and Trait1_G in the context of group emergence. Now one might ask if one should distinguish two kinds of Trait2, namely Trait2_G resulting from the combination of Trait1_G effects in the components and Trait2_E resulting from the combination of Trait1_E effects in the components. However any such Trait2_E would not be a genuine emergent trait: it is just the sum of the properties of the components (if all the antelope in a herd are fast runners, the ability of the herd to run fast does not result from any specific property of the herd as such; they would run just as fast if they were not in the herd). Thus it should not be allocated as a group property; it's just an aggregate, and will not be selected for as a group property. Hence I refer only to Trait2, with no Trait2_E component.

Given this understanding, Trait2 depends essentially on group properties (you can't learn from other herd members what is safe to eat and what not, if you don't belong to a herd). Probably in most cases it would be independent of Trait1_E but this is not obviously necessarily so. Nevertheless it may often be the case that Trait2 would be dependent only on Trait1_G plus the nature of the group structure (a higher level variable, for example what kind of teaching mechanisms exist in the group; they can't exist if the group does not exist).

What is the payoff of this proposal of distinguishing MLS1_G and MLS1_E?

1: Linear regression models consider a collective-level trait as part of the "context" relevant to each particle within that collective according to the equation (Pigliucci 2010).

$$w = \beta_1 z + \beta_2 Z + e \quad (1)$$

where w is the particle's fitness, z is the particle-level trait, Z is the collective-level trait, β_1 , β_2 are regression coefficients, and e is the error term. According to the present view, β_1 represents MLS1_E and β_2 represents MLS1_G. It is a pragmatic contextual issue as to which of these two selection effects is more important in a specific context.

This identification may possibly help ameliorate the problems with collective level selection identified in (Okasha 2006) and (Pigliucci 2010).

2: Okasha (2006) and Pigliucci (2010) claim there is no relation between emergent properties and group selection. However the set of effects identified in Diagram 1 gives a route whereby emergent structures can act down on member 'particles' and thereby affect group selection. Multilevel selection MLS2 combined with MLS1_G gives a route

$$MLS1_T = MLS1_G \circ MLS2 \quad (2)$$

whereby the environment constrains the particle properties in virtue of the combination of selection criteria fitness-2 and fitness-1_G; they then act up to the emergent level to give the required traits Trait₂ at the group level in virtue of the lower level traits Trait_{1G}. The way this happens depends on whether we are concerned with evolutionary (diachronic), developmental, or functional (synchronic) timescales.

3: There is a plausible biological mechanism underlying the formation of such emergent groups. It lies in the innate primordial emotional systems shared by humans and all higher animals (Panksepp 1998). In particular there are two such systems that have evolved to create and protect emergent social groups: namely an affiliation system (needed to create such groups) and a ranking/territorial system (needed to protect them) (Stevens and Price 2000, Toronchuk and Ellis 2013).

These primary emotional systems have evolved over evolutionary times precisely in order to ensure that the social groups will come into existence. Thus they are key examples of Trait_{1G} that have been selected for via MLS_{1T}, given by equation (2). They both enable the group to come into being, and would not exist if there was no major benefit provided by existence of social groups.

Putting these together, the implication is that in equation (1), $\beta_2 \neq 0$.

This note has used the specific example of existence of social groups to propose the usefulness of the distinction between MLS_{1G} and MLS_{1E}. Clearly there will be other contexts where it might be useful.

References

Okasha, S. 2006. *Evolution and the levels of selection: toward a broader conception of theoretical biology*. Oxford University Press.

Panksepp, J. 1998. *Affective Neuroscience: The Foundations of Human and Animal Emotions*. Oxford University Press.

Pigliucci, M. 2010. Okasha's evolution and the levels of selection: toward a broader conception of theoretical biology. *Biol Philos* 25:405–415 [<http://philpapers.org/archive/PIGOEA.1.pdf>]

Pringle, H. 2013. The Roots of Human Genius Are Deeper Than Expected. *Scientific American* March 2013 [<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=the-origin-human-creativity-suprisingly-complex>]

Stevens, A. and Price, J. 2000. *Evolutionary Psychiatry: A New Beginning*. Routledge.

Toronchuk, J.A. and Ellis, G. F. R. 2013. Affective neuronal selection: the nature of the primordial emotion systems. *Front. Psychology* 3:589 [http://www.frontiersin.org/Emotion_Science/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00589/abstract].