Supplemental Ta	able 3: Comparisons of GR ml	RNA levels for eac	h tissue between mid:	shipman reproductive morp
Morph	Breeding Season Tissue	Norm. mean	Standard error	ANOVA values
Male Type I		0.0152 * ¹	0.0015	p=0.0001
Male Type II	OB/Tel/POA	0.0353 * ¹	0.0102	dF=2, 11
Female		0.0071	0.0002	Fratio=22.60
Male Type I		0.0131	0.0024	p=0.0020
Male Type II	Mid/Di/Cbl	0.0266 * ²	0.0063	dF=2, 11
Female		0.0065	0.0007	Fratio=11.55
Male Type I		0.007	0.0006	p<0.0001
Male Type II	Vocal Hindbrain – SC	0.042 * 3	0.0091	dF=2, 11
Female		0.0051	0.0005	Fratio=67.79
Male Type I		0.0275 * ⁴	0.0062	p=0.0137
Male Type II	Vocal Muscle	0.0113	0.002	dF=2, 11
Female		0.0133	0.0013	Fratio=6.49
Male Type I		0.0398 * ⁴	0.0081	p=0.0011
Male Type II	Liver	0.0163	0.0026	dF=2, 10
Female		0.0129	0.0013	Fratio=14.62
Male Type I	Testis	0.0191	0.0056	p=0.6453
Male Type II		0.0215	0.006	dF=1, 8
¹ II>I>F, ² II>F, ³ II>I and F, ⁴ I>II and F				Fratio=0.2287
reproductive molisted according for abbreviations	Table 3: Glucocorticoid receptorphs. Mean normalized values to midshipman reproductive ms). ANOVA values (p value, de ach tissue. Asterisks indicate snotes).	s (see Fig. 3 legend norph (column 1) fo egrees of freedom-	d) and standard errors or each tissue sampled dF, and Fratio) are als	for mRNA levels are d (column 2, see Fig. 3 so listed for each analysis
Artorbonyotal	l Cupplemental Table 2			

Arterbery et al., Supplemental Table 3