

Group Selection of Handicap Signaling*

Ethan Holdahl[†] Jiabin Wu[‡]

May 17, 2022

Abstract

This paper proposes a group selection model to explain the rise and fall of handicap signaling. In one population, assortative matching according to types is sustained by handicap signaling. In the other population, individuals do not signal and they are randomly matched. Types evolve within each population. At the same time, the two populations may engage in competition. Due to assortative matching, high types grow faster in the population with signaling, yet they bear the cost of signaling, which lowers their population's fitness in the long run. We show that the survival of the signaling population depends crucially on the timing and the intensity of inter-population competition.

Keywords: Group Selection, Handicap Principle, Costly Signaling, Assortative Matching, Lanchester's Law

*We thank Jonathan Newton and Van Kolpin for their comments.

[†]Department of Economics, University of Oregon, eholdahl@uoregon.edu

[‡]Department of Economics, University of Oregon, jwu5@uoregon.edu

1 Introduction

The “handicap principle” proposed by [Zahavi \[1975\]](#), and later formalized by [Grafen \[1990\]](#), is a prominent theory of costly signaling in biology, which shares the same mechanism with the parallel job signaling model by [Spence \[1973\]](#) in information economics. Also See [Maynard Smith and Harper \[1995\]](#), [Johnstone \[1997\]](#) and [Getty \[2006\]](#) for further clarifications and generalizations of the theory. The theory has been applied to model time extended courtship [[Seymour and Sozou, 2009](#)], nestling begging calls [[Godfray, 1991](#)], predator-deterrent signals [[Yachi, 1995](#)], threat-displays [[Adams and Mesterton-Gibbons, 1995](#), [Kim, 1995](#)], and cooperation [[Gintis et al., 2001](#), [Roberts, 2020](#)]. In addition, see [Zahavi and Zahavi \[1997\]](#), [Maynard Smith and Harper \[2003\]](#) and [Searcy and Nowicki \[2005\]](#) for book and chapter length treatments of the subject; [Grose \[2011\]](#) and [Számadó \[2012\]](#) for excellent discussions of the literature. The intuition of the handicap principle is perhaps best illustrated by the example of the peacock’s tail. The peacock’s tail is an extravagant trait that increases the owner’s risk of predation, because of this, it serves as an honesty signal of the quality of a peacock to the peahens as only the ones with high quality can manage to survive while carrying it.

Many empirical phenomena in the nature can be explained by the handicap principle. For example, tail length of barn swallows [[Møller and de Lope, 1994](#)], tail length of long-tailed widowbirds [[Andersson, 1982](#)], stalk length of stalk-eyed flies [[David et al., 2000](#)], “badges of status” in Harris sparrows [[Searcy and Nowicki, 2005](#)], “drumming” of wolf spiders [[Kotiaho, 2000](#)], stotting in gazelles [[Zahavi and Zahavi, 1997](#)], lark singing [[Cresswell, 1994](#)], among others. Nevertheless, despite its prominence, the theory is not a universal law in the nature as claimed by [Zahavi and Zahavi \[1997\]](#). Indeed, there are several underlying conditions behind the handicap principle. If at least one condition is violated, it fails to work. For example, it can only be invoked in situations where organisms have conflict of interests. If

interests are aligned, there is no need for handicap signaling [Searcy and Nowicki, 2005].

A more subtle yet important question is, when all the underlying conditions for the handicap principle are satisfied and nonsignaling is presumably the ancestral condition, what are the evolutionary determinants of the emergence of handicap signaling? To our knowledge, this question is understudied in the literature. One exception is Rodfriguez-Girones et al. [1996], who find that in Godfray [1991]’s model of nestling begging calls, besides the signaling equilibrium, there is another no signaling equilibrium and they conjecture that sibling competition is the key for the transition from the no signaling equilibrium to the signaling equilibrium.

In this paper, we attempt to use a group selection model to formally investigate the role of competition in determining the rise and fall of handicap signaling. In the model, there are two populations. In each population, there are two types of individuals: high and low. The types are genetically determined and the high type has some hidden fitness advantages over the low type. The individuals need to match in pairs to obtain payoffs (forming a mating or foraging pair for example), which in turn determine their reproduction rates. However, the individuals cannot directly observe others’ types. Assume that one population is equipped with signaling technology, while the other is not. In the population without signaling technology, the individuals are randomly matched in pairs because they cannot assort according to types. In the population with signaling technology, the high type individuals may adopt the signal to differentiate themselves from the low type individuals so that they can identify one another and avoid being matched with the low type individuals. As long as doing so is beneficial to the high type individuals; and at the same time, the cost of signaling is sufficiently high to deter the low type individuals to mimic the high type individuals, a separating equilibrium can be sustained in the population. Note that we treat signaling as a behavioral trait instead of a genetic trait, so the individuals can choose whether to adopt it in the behavioral timescale. Our model thus better applies to behavioral

signaling such as stotting/singing rather than genetic signaling such as trail/stalk length.

The assortative benefit to high types in the signaling population allows them to evolve faster than they would without signaling. However, even absent signaling, high types would eventually prevail given their fitness advantage. When both populations are homogeneously high type, the assortative advantage the signaling population had over the non-signaling population disappears leaving the signaling population with a cost but no comparative benefit. This means the signaling population's fitness is lower in the long run. Therefore, there is a trade-off in utilizing signaling and it becomes crucial if the two populations engage in competition. We show that the timing and the intensity of inter-population competition play an essential role in determining the survival of the signaling population. In particular, the signaling population has a higher chance to survive through group selection in the early stage when it still has a fitness advantage if the period of isolation before competition is shorter and the competition is fiercer.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the model, analyze how types evolve within a population and how competition works between the two populations. Section 3 conducts comparative statics on the timing and the intensity of inter-population competition. Section 4 discusses alternative modelling choices and implications of the model.

2 The Model and Analysis

In this section we outline how populations evolve in our model. We are interested in the effect that signaling has on the evolution of a population so we consider two populations: one with signaling technology and the other without signaling technology. Both populations are endowed with high type individuals who are better suited to their environment and thus have a higher fitness, and low type individuals who are not as adapted to the current environment and thus have a lower fitness. The types are genetically determined, meaning that the

individuals cannot change their own types and the distribution of types in a population evolves through reproduction. We use a discrete generational model where in each generation (period) individuals match with another individual in their population. This matching can be interpreted as a mating relationship, a foraging relationship, or any other social relationship. The type of each individual is not observable to the other members of the population, so where there is no signaling, individuals match randomly with another individual in their population. However, when signaling is present individuals are able to discriminate. As a result, signalers randomly match with another signaling individual in their population leaving the non-signalers in that population to randomly match with each other. After matching, they reproduce according to the payoffs in the table below minus the cost of signaling if applicable. Table 1 reports the payoffs. An individual of type i , who is matched with an individual of type j , obtains a payoff of $V(i, j)$, for $i, j \in \{H, L\}$. Note that since these payoffs determine the individuals' life long reproductive rates, the length of each discrete period can be thought of as the amount of time needed for a given organism to reach adulthood.

Table 1: Payoffs: Reproduction Rates

	H	L
H	$V(H, H)$	$V(H, L)$
L	$V(L, H)$	$V(L, L)$

We impose the following relation on the payoffs:

$$V(H, H) > V(H, L) > V(L, H) > V(L, L). \quad (1)$$

Viewing the matching as a mating relationship, we have a model where there are no hybrids, only high or low type offspring can be produced. High types produce $V(H, *)$ high type offspring which depend on who they match with. Likewise, low types produce $V(L, *)$ low type offspring which depend on who they match with. Then two high types will together

produce $2V(H, H)$ high types, a low and high type pairing will produce $V(H, L)$ high types and $V(L, H)$ low types, and a 2 low type pairing will produce $2V(L, L)$ low types.

Alternatively, we can think of $V(*, *)$ as the amount of offspring per parent that makes it to reproduction. Since high types are more fit than low types, high types will be more successful than low types in making it to adulthood thus explaining $V(H, L) > V(L, H)$, even if we expect high and low types to be born in equal proportion in a mixed parent situation. Additionally, we can think that the parents provide for their offspring in some capacity before they reach adulthood. It is likely that high type parents are better providers than low type parents which explains $V(H, H) > V(L, H)$, $V(H, H) > V(H, L)$, $V(H, L) > V(L, L)$, and $V(L, H) > V(L, L)$. In other words, one's reproductive rate is increasing both in one's type and in its matched partner's type.

An analogous story can be told in a foraging relationship. Matched individuals share some, but not all of their foraged goods together. Here, high types are more successful than low types in procuring food. Since the amount of food is directly related to reproductive rate, Inequality (1) follows. Here, high types produce only high type offspring and low types produce only low type offspring either asexually or otherwise.

In addition, we want to ensure that populations will not die out. Hence, we require $V(H, H) > 1$.

2.1 A Population without Signaling

In a population without signaling technology, the individuals cannot observe others' types. As such they are randomly matched with another individual in their population. We define the non-signaling population at time t as N_t where $N_t = N_t^H + N_t^L$. Here, N_t^H and N_t^L are the amount of high types and low types, respectively, in the non-signaling population at time t .

Assuming a large N_t , the law of large numbers implies that N_t^H and N_t^L evolve according

to their expected payoffs from Table 1. So we have:

$$N_{t+1}^H = \left[\frac{N_t^H}{N_t} * V(H, H) + \frac{N_t^L}{N_t} * V(H, L) \right] * N_t^H, \quad (2)$$

$$N_{t+1}^L = \left[\frac{N_t^H}{N_t} * V(L, H) + \frac{N_t^L}{N_t} * V(L, L) \right] * N_t^L. \quad (3)$$


We simulate the dynamics described by Equations (2) and (3) in Figure 1. The first graph shows the evolution of the average reproductive rate for each type as well as for the population as a whole and the second shows the evolution of the sizes of high and low type sub-populations as well as the population as a whole. Note that the starting population has been normalized to 1 with high types initially making up 20% of the population. The final graph shows the raw growth ($N_t - N_{t-1}$) of the population as well as the raw growth of each sub-population within the population.

Inequality (1) implies $V(H, H) > V(L, H)$ and $V(H, L) > V(L, L)$. Hence, in the absence of signaling, high types are able to evolve within the population because they realize higher payoffs than low types i.e. survival of the fittest. As the proportion of high types increases in the population, the average reproductive rate of the population will converge to the reproductive rate of the high types. Note that there is a secondary effect here. Inequality (1) also implies $V(H, H) > V(H, L)$ and $V(L, H) > V(L, L)$. Hence, as high types make up a greater proportion of the population, individuals become more likely to match with high types, thus the reproductive rates of both low types and high types increase as high types come to make up a greater proportion of the population, which can be seen in the first graph of Figure (1).

2.2 A Population with Signaling

In this section we consider a population that has signaling technology. We should emphasize that here we examine behavioral signaling that individuals can choose whether to opt into.

Figure 1: Population Dynamics Without Signaling



Parameters:

$$N_0^H = .2$$

$$N_0^L = .8$$

	H	L
H	1.15	0.90
L	0.85	0.80

Hence, the individuals make their decisions on signaling within each generation, while the genetically determined types evolve across generations. Let K be the cost of signaling. Consistent with the handicap principle [Zahavi \[1975\]](#) we assume that the cost of signaling, K , is sufficiently costly such that that only high types can afford it. Formally, we require:

$$V(L, L) > V(L, H) - K. \tag{4}$$

We also only want to consider signals that are potentially incentive compatible for high types. That is, a high type receives a higher payoff by being matched with another high type even after paying the cost of signaling than it does by being matched with a low type:

$$V(H, H) - K > V(H, L). \tag{5}$$

Combining the two inequalities, we know that for a viable signal of cost K to exist it must be the case that:

$$V(H, H) + V(L, L) > V(L, H) + V(H, L). \tag{6}$$

This is known as the single crossing property [[Zahavi, 1975](#), [Spence, 1973](#)]. We enforce these conditions on the reproductive rates $V(., .)$ and the cost of signaling K .

Since we consider behavioral signaling, we assume that the individuals reach an equilibrium on their decisions on adopting the signal within each generation before reproduction. In an equilibrium, each individual has no incentive to deviate from its current choice of whether to signal. As shown in [Spence \[1973\]](#), given the incentive compatibility conditions (4) and (5), there exists a separating equilibrium in which only high types signal. Moreover, all high types are matched with one another, and low types are matched with one another, resulting in perfectly assortative matching in types. The high types earn a payoff of $V(H, H) - K$ and

the low types earn a payoff of $V(L, L)$ in equilibrium. Note that the separating equilibrium is independent of the distribution of types in the population. Even when the group of low types is vanishingly small, the high types would still pay the cost of signaling to segregate themselves from the low types.

We define the population with signaling at time t as S_t where $S_t = S_t^H + S_t^L$. Here, S_t^H and S_t^L are the amount of high types and low types, respectively, in the signaling population at time t . Because of signaling, the individuals are only matched with their own types. Hence, S_t^H and S_t^L experience a constant growth rate over time. Their evolutionary dynamics are as follows:

$$S_{t+1}^H = [V(H, H) - K] * S_t^H, \quad (7)$$




$$S_{t+1}^L = V(L, L) * S_t^L. \quad (8)$$

We simulate the dynamics described by Equations (7) and (8) in Figure 2. We have three similar graphs as in Figure (1) and use the same parameters. Note that in the top graph, the reproductive rate of the high types and low types are not influenced by the relative size of each sub-population since they always match with their own types. This can be seen in Equations (7) and (8), where the coefficients on S_t^H and S_t^L , do not depend on the population composition. As a result, the growth rate of the population increases only because high types evolve to make up a greater proportion of the population. It can not be seen in the graphs here, but it should be clear that as K , the cost of signaling, decreases the speed of evolution increases.

2.3 Comparing Signaling and Non-Signaling Populations

Figure 3 shows the overlap of Figure 1 and Figure 2, both of which have the same parameters. Looking at the first graph of Figure 3, we can see that while N_t^H/N_t is sufficiently small,

Figure 2: Population Dynamics Where High Types Signal



Parameters: $S_0^H = .2$ $S_0^L = .8$ $K = .1$


	H	L
H	1.15	0.90
L	0.85	0.80

the reproductive rate for the signaling high types is greater than the reproductive rate for the high types in the non-signaling population. This is because $V(H, H) - K > V(H, L)$. As a result, high types evolve faster within the signaling population compared to the high types in the non-signaling population. In the first graph of Figure 3, we can see that it takes until period 10 before the high types in the non-signaling population reach the same reproductive rate of their counterparts in the signaling population. Because of this and because low types in the signaling population have a lower reproductive rate than low types in the non-signaling population, high types make up a larger proportion of the signaling population compared to the non-signaling population. Therefore, it takes a few more periods until the average reproductive rate across the non-signaling population surpasses that of the signaling population. Looking at the second graph in Figure 3, we can see that although the reproductive rate of the non-signaling population surpasses that of the signaling population around period 13, the signaling population retains a population advantage until around period 21. This is because the signaling population builds a significant population advantage in the initial periods. However, once sufficient time has passed and both populations are essentially homogeneous with only high types left, the non-signaling population realizes a reproductive rate that is K greater than that of the signaling population.

2.4 Competition between the Two Populations

Assume that in period T the non-signaling population and the signaling population engage in competition. In periods $t \in [0, T)$ the populations evolve according to the dynamics in the above sections, but starting at period T they start to eliminate the other population according to the Lanchester's square law, a dynamic which has been applied to a variety of human and non-human conflicts Clifton [2020]. In each period, before reproduction, each member of a population kills β members of the other population, independent of its type.

Figure 3: Comparison of Population Dynamics Between Signaling and Non-Signaling Populations



Parameters: $N_0^H = S_0^H = .2$
 $N_0^L = S_0^L = .8$
 $K = .1$

	H	L
H	1.15	0.90
L	0.85	0.80

Hence, the dynamics for N^H , N^L , S^H , and S^L are now given as:

$$N_{t+1}^H = \left[\frac{N_t^H}{N_t} * V(H, H) + \frac{N_t^L}{N_t} * V(H, L) \right] * \max\{[N_t^H - \beta \frac{N_t^H}{N_t} I_{t \geq T} S_t], 0\}, \quad (9)$$

$$N_{t+1}^L = \left[\frac{N_t^H}{N_t} * V(L, H) + \frac{N_t^L}{N_t} * V(L, L) \right] * \max\{[N_t^L - \beta \frac{N_t^L}{N_t} I_{t \geq T} S_t], 0\}, \quad (10)$$


$$S_{t+1}^H = [V(H, H) - K] * \max\{[S_t^H - \beta \frac{S_t^H}{S_t} I_{t \geq T} N_t], 0\}, \quad (11)$$

$$S_{t+1}^L = V(L, L) * \max\{[S_t^L - \beta \frac{S_t^L}{S_t} I_{t \geq T} N_t], 0\}. \quad (12)$$

In the equations above, $I_{t \geq T}$ is an indicator that the groups are engaging in group competition and the max argument simply ensures that the populations would not reach a negative number. Note that we specify that competition takes place before reproduction in each period in this model. It is clear that when applying this model to a species, the time between each discrete period would simply be the amount of time it takes for a generation to reproduce. While competition may run at a different time scale, we can force competition into the reproduction time scale by adjusting the value of β .

Figure 4 provides three examples of outcomes when competition occurs in our model. In the top graph, the non-signaling population enters the periods of competition with a population advantage. Because they do not need to pay the cost of signaling, the fact that they have a population advantage indicates that they also have a superior reproductive rate. As a result, the non-signaling population always wins. In the second graph, the signaling population enters the competition with a population advantage. At this point the signaling population doesn't necessarily have a higher reproductive rate, however, if the competition is fierce enough (β is sufficiently large), the signaling population will be able to eliminate the non-signaling population before the non-signaling population can catch up with their superior long run reproductive rate. The third graph is a special case. Although the signaling population enters the competing with a slightly larger population, because β is sufficiently

Figure 4: Competition Between Signaling and Non-Signaling Populations After a Period of Peace



Parameters:
 $N_0^H = S_0^H = .2$
 $N_0^L = S_0^L = .8$
 $K = .1$
 $\beta = .2$

	H	L
H	1.15	0.90
L	0.85	0.80

The vertical lines indicate the last period before competition begins ($T - 1$).


small, the non-signaling population is able to overcome the signaling population during the competition.

3 Comparative Statics

We have shown that costly signaling in a population may be competitively advantageous in inter-population competition in our model. The viability of signaling depends largely on three different factors: the period that competition starts (T), the cost of signaling (K), and the intensity of competition (β). Here, we argue that the signaling population benefits from a shorter period of isolation before competition, a smaller cost of signaling, and a higher intensity of competition. To clearly see the effects of these three factors, we run the model thousands of different times, varying the key parameters: T , K and, β and indicate the outcomes of the competition. The results are reported in Figure 5. In areas colored orange, the non-signaling population wins the competition and in the blue area the signaling population wins. The white intercept lines indicate where the model is evaluated in the last graph of Figure 4.

The first graph in Figure 5 shows the result of the competition between the signaling population and the non-signaling population as we vary the period that competition starts and the intensity of the competition. As we can see, beyond a certain period the non-signaling population will always win no matter what the value of β is. This is because the non-signaling population is both greater and growing faster beyond that period. One can verify this by looking at Figure 3. It is also necessary for β to be sufficiently large for the signaling population to possibly win the competition. As we can see, when β is sufficiently small, the non-signaling population always wins. Looking at the second graph of Figure 5, we can see that a smaller signaling cost benefits the signaling population. The third graph of Figure 5 shows the interaction between the cost of signaling and the intensity of competition

Figure 5: Competition Between Signaling and Non-Signaling Populations After a Period of Peace: Comparative Statics



Parameters: $N_0^H = S_0^H = .2$
 $N_0^L = S_0^L = .8$
 $K = .1$
 $\beta = .2$
 $T = 20$


	H	L
H	1.15	0.90
L	0.85	0.80

The white intercept lines indicate the current parameters values.

at $T = 20$. The non-signaling population always wins when $K > .1$ because the non-signaling would have a larger population than the signaling population at $T = 20$. Before that point, higher intensity of competition can compensate for a higher cost of signaling for the signaling population.

Please note that thus far we have used $N_0^H = .2$ and $N_0^L = .8$ and $S_0^H = .2$ and $S_0^L = .8$. Recall that high types are the individuals that are better suited to their current environment and thus have a higher fitness than low types. With this in mind, it is useful to think about the initial values of N_0^H, N_0^L, S_0^H , and S_0^L as being related to the speed at which the environment is changing around the organism. The faster the environment changes, the less time passes before a new mutation is considered the high type which would essentially restart our model with a small proportion of high types. So, a faster changing environment would translate to a smaller initial proportion of high types. With that in mind, Figure 6 shows the results of the competition when we vary the initial proportion of high types in each population, N_0^H and S_0^H , while keeping them consistent across populations, $N_0^H = S_0^H$, and maintaining $N_0 = S_0 = 1$ so that N_0^H and S_0^H is simply the initial proportion of high types in each population. The results are clear: The smaller the initial proportion of high types, the more likely it is that the signaling population will win the competition. This is because the assortative advantage is largest when the proportion of high types is smallest which further exaggerates the speed at which the makeup of the population changes from low type to high type. Hence, giving the populations more room to evolve naturally favors the signaling population. Abstracting from the model, this implies that signaling is more advantageous the quicker one's environment changes. In a rapidly changing environment, the amount of high types at any given time is expected to be lower than in a slow changing environment since we define high types as those best adapted to the current environment. As can be seen in the graphs, the smaller the initial proportion of high types, the wider the range of T, K and β values that result in a competition that favors the signaling population.

Figure 6: Competition Between Signaling and Non-Signaling Populations After a Period of Peace: Initial Conditions Comparative Statics



Parameters: $N_0^H = S_0^H = .2$
 $N_0^L = S_0^L = .8$
 $K = .1$
 $\beta = .2$
 $T = 20$

	H	L
H	1.15	0.90
L	0.85	0.80

The white intercept lines indicate the current parameters values.

4 Discussions

4.1 Alternative Modeling Choices


In our model we assume that in the signaling population only high types transmit a signal and as a result, the signal enforces perfect assortative matching within the signaling population. One may question what if the signal is ubiquitous across the signaling population such that low types as well as high types transmit the signal. In this case, the signal would not be a signal at all but just a costly trait since no one would be able to distinguish one type from another. As a result, the once difference between the evolutionary dynamics of the signaling and non-signaling population would be that the signaling population experiences a level decrease in their reproductive rate with no functional assortativity advantage. The only scenarios where the signaling population is able to beat the non-signaling population in competition in this setup are with extreme parameter values where the signaling cost and the expression $V(H, H) - V(H, L)$ are so large that the low types in the signaling population are effectively eliminated by the signaling cost immediately, thus effectively giving the high types assortative matching which, if the initial proportion of high types in each population is low enough, may allow for a very narrow window under which the signaling population will realize a population advantage.

Another question one may have is what if there are both signalers and non-signalers in the same population. In this case, so long as the signaling high types are able to gain an assortative advantage over the non-signaling high types in the population, then that may be enough to offset the signal cost and realize a higher reproductive rate for them in the short run even in the absence of inter-population competition? We demonstrate that this is not the case in a one-population model with four types (signaling high type, non-signaling high type, signaling low type, non-signaling low type) as shown in Figure 7. The rationale is as follows. In our settings, high types evolve to make up an increasing proportion of the

population with certainty as time increases until there are only high types remaining. As a result, at some point the relative difference in assortativity between the signaling high types and the non-signaling high types will not be big enough to offset the cost of signaling. Therefore, absent competition between the signalers and non-signalers, non-signaling high types will dominate the entire population with certainty in the long run.

The above discussions on alternative modelling choices suggest that signalling being behavioral (only high types choose to adopt it) and competition between the signaling population and the non-signaling population are prerequisites for signaling to survive.

Figure 7: One Population Where Some High Types Signal and Some Don't



Parameters:

$N_0^H = S_0^H = .1$	H	L	
$N_0^L = .8$	H	1.15	0.90
$S_0^L = 0$	L	0.85	0.80
$K = .1$			

4.2 Concluding Remarks

It has been well understood that costly signaling can provide a competitive advantage at the intragroup level, however, to our knowledge the effects of signaling has not been examined at the intergroup level of competition. We consider a model in which the same individuals (high types) that benefit from signaling would evolve even in the absence of signaling. Thus, when

there are two populations, one with and one without signaling, it follows that they would both eventually evolve to be homogeneously high type. At that point, if the two populations were to compete, the population without signaling would have a competitive advantage because they do not need to pay the cost of signaling. However, we argue that there can be an advantage to signaling in intergroup competition: that the group with signaling evolves faster than the group without signaling. As a result, if competition occurs, the prevailing population is largely a question of how long the populations evolve in isolation before they compete. Our model predicts that species that have shorter periods of isolation before competition, and competition that is more intense may favor the signaling population. We propose that this dynamic may account for the prevalence in signaling among birds [Møller and de Lope \[1994\]](#) [Andersson \[1982\]](#) [Searcy and Nowicki \[2005\]](#) [Cresswell \[1994\]](#) [Zahavi \[1975\]](#), which would likely experience shorter periods of isolation between competing groups than other animals.

We also conjecture that signaling may be more prevalent in biodiverse areas such as rainforests and coral reefs. According to the competitive exclusion principle [[Hardin, 1960](#)], the weaker competitor in a competition would either go extinct or displaced to a different ecological niche through evolutionary/behavioral drift. In areas rich with biodiversity, there is less likely to be an open niche that the weaker competitor could be displaced to, implying that inter-population competition is fiercer. According to our comparative statics, the signaling population is thus more likely to win the competition.

References

- E. Adams and M. Mesterton-Gibbons. The cost of threat displays and the stability of deceptive communication. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 175:405–421, 1995.
- M. Andersson. Female choice selects for extreme tail length in a widowbird. *Nature*, 299

- (5886):818–820, 1982.
- E. Clifton. A brief review on the application of lanchester’s models of combat in nonhuman animals. *Ecological Psychology*, 32(4):181–191, 2020.
- W. Cresswell. Song as a pursuit-deterrent signal, and its occurrence relative to other anti-predation behaviours of skylark (*alauda arvensis*) on attack by merlins (*falco columbarius*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 34:217–223, 1994.
- P. David, T. Bjorksten, K. Fowler, and A. Pomiankowski. Condition-dependent signalling of genetic variation in stalk-eyed flies. *Nature*, 406:186–188, 2000.
- T. Getty. Sexually selected signals are not similar to sports handicaps. *Trends in ecology and evolution*, 21:83–88, 2006.
- H. Gintis, E. Alden Smith, and S. Bowles. Costly signaling and cooperation. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 213:103–119, 2001.
- H. Godfray. Signalling of need by offspring to their parents. *Nature*, 352:328–330, 1991.
- A. Grafen. Biological signals as handicaps. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 144:517–546, 1990.
- J. Grose. Modelling and the fall and rise of the handicap principle. *Biology & Philosophy*, 26:677–696, 2011.
- G. Hardin. The competitive exclusion principle. *Science*, 131(3409):1292–1297, 1960.
- R. Johnstone. The evolution of animal signals. In J. Krebs and N. Davies, editors, *Behavioral ecology, an evolutionary approach*, pages 465–485. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford, 4 edition, 1997.

- Y.-G. Kim. Status signalling games in animal contests. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 176: 221–231, 1995.
- J. Kotiaho. Testing the assumptions of conditional handicap theory: costs and condition dependence of a sexually selected trait. *Behavioral ecology and sociobiology*, 48:188–194, 2000.
- J. Maynard Smith and D. Harper. Animal signals: models and terminology. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 177:305–311, 1995.
- J. Maynard Smith and D. Harper. *Animal Signals*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003.
- A. Møller and F. de Lope. Differential costs of a secondary sexual character; an experimental test of the handicap principle. *Evolution*, 48:1676–1683, 1994.
- G. Roberts. Honest signaling of cooperative intentions. *Behavioral Ecology*, page forthcoming, 2020.
- M. Rodríguez-Girones, P. Cotton, and A. Kacelnik. The evolution of begging: signaling and sibling competition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 93:14637–14641, 1996.
- W. Searcy and S. Nowicki. *The evolution of animal communication. Reliability and deception in signalling systems*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2005.
- R. Seymour and P. Sozou. Duration of courtship effort as a costly signal. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 256:1–13, 2009.
- A. Spence. Job market signaling. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87:355–374, 1973.
- S. Számadó. The rise and fall of the handicap principle: a commentary on the “modelling and the fall and rise of the handicap principle. *Biology & Philosophy*, 27:279–286, 2012.

- S. Yachi. How can honest signalling evolve? the role of the handicap principle. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 262:283–288, 1995.
- A. Zahavi. Mate selection: a selection for a handicap. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 53: 205–214, 1975.
- A. Zahavi and A. Zahavi. *The handicap principle*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997.