

Experimental disturbances reveal group-level costs of social instability

Maldonado-Chaparro, A.A.^{1,2}, Alarcón-Nieto, G.^{1,2}, Klarevas-Irby, J.A.^{1,2}, Farine, D.R.^{1,2,3}

¹ Department of Collective Behaviour, Max Planck Institute for Ornithology, 78457 Konstanz, Germany.

² Chair of Biodiversity and Collective Behaviour, Department of Biology, University of Konstanz, Universitätsstrasse 10, 78457 Konstanz, Germany.

³ Edward Grey Institute of Field Ornithology, Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PS, United Kingdom.

Corresponding authors:

Damien R. Farine

e-mail: dfarine@orn.mpg.de

Adriana A. Maldonado-Chaparro

e-mail: amaldonado@orn.mpg.de

ABSTRACT

In group-living species, social stability is an important trait associated with the evolution of complex behaviours such as cooperation. While the drivers of stability in small groups are relatively well studied, little is known about the potential impacts of unstable states on animal societies. Temporary changes in group composition, such as a social group splitting and recombining (i.e. a disturbance event), can result in individuals having to re-establish their social relationships, thus taking time away from other tasks such as foraging or vigilance. Here, we experimentally split socially stable groups of captive zebra finches (*Taeniopygia guttata*), and quantified the effects of repeated disturbance events on 1) group foraging efficiency, and 2) co-feeding associations when subgroups were recombined. We found that the efficiency of groups to deplete a rich, but ephemeral, resource patch decreased after just a single short disturbance event. Automated tracking of individuals showed that repeated disturbances reduced efficiency by causing social relationships to become more differentiated and weaker, resulting in fewer individuals simultaneously accessing the patch. Our experiment highlights how short-term disturbances can severely disrupt social structure and group functionality, revealing potential costs associated with group instability that can have consequences for the evolution of animal societies.

KEYWORDS

Collective behaviour, Foraging efficiency, Group dynamics, Resilience, Social disturbance, Social instability, Zebra finch

INTRODUCTION

Social stability is an important facet of the social structure of animal populations [1] and plays a key role in the evolution of animal societies (e.g. [2, 3]). Characteristics such as cohesion and stable relationships are thought to have underpinned the evolution of group-level traits such as cooperation [4] and collective decision-making [5, 6]. Recent evidence from group-living animals has also highlighted the benefits of stable social relationships for reproductive success [7, 8], offspring survival [9-11], and longevity [12-15] (reviewed in [16]). Although groups naturally change over time (e.g. due to immigration or mortality), transitory states of instability—when groups experience reversible changes in size and composition—can be caused by extrinsic factors such as human disturbance (e.g. [17]) or unsuccessful predator attacks that cause group members to become temporarily separated. Studies on the effects of permanent changes in group membership support the idea that social instability may yield individual-level costs. For example, free-ranging mares that have been transferred into a new group have higher stress levels [18] and vampire bats that have been transferred to a new group receive less food donations than those that stayed in their original groups [19]. However, little is known about how temporary disturbances affect group dynamics in animal societies, and whether these effects translate to changes in group functionality.

Coordination and synchronisation can benefit members of a social group [20, 21]. Groups that coordinate their foraging by matching activities such as spacing, vigilance bouts, or communication signals should be able to more efficiently deplete ephemeral resources, and thus should have higher average food intake rates than otherwise groups of identical characteristics in which individuals are unable to coordinate their actions. Thus, individuals in groups that perform most efficiently— for example, through mechanisms such as

cooperative foraging [22]—should have the highest average fitness [23]. Competition between group members when foraging at food patches could limit the number of individuals that can forage simultaneously, which would reduce the rate at which the group depletes resources [24]. If periods of instability disrupt the consistency of social relationships among individuals, then we expect a negative effect on tasks in which group members benefit from social coordination: reduced tolerance among group members foraging on a clumped resource patch would reduce the ability for that group to efficiently extract resources from the environment. Should this be the case, then it would raise questions about how resilient animal societies that feature stable group membership are to increasing disturbances.

To determine whether social instability shapes group-level performance, and therefore can act as an agent of selection on behaviours that promote stable group-living, we experimentally manipulated the stability of two replicated colonies of zebra finches (*Taeniopygia guttata*). Zebra finches live in relatively compact [25] and stable colonies [26], in which males and females form life-long pair bonds and maintain these bonds even when they are not breeding. In the wild, zebra finch colonies consisting of many male-female pairs can persist for several years, despite experiencing annual changes in size and composition related to breeding activity [27]. This makes them a suitable biological system for quantifying the costs associated with social instability.

Our colonies were kept in stable social environments for six months prior to the start of the experiment. We then subjected colonies to temporary disturbances by splitting them into three sub-colonies for two days. When the colonies were recombined, we provided them with an ephemeral high-quality resource to forage from. As outlined above, we predicted that disturbance events would lead colonies to become less efficient at depleting the food patch.

Using fine-scale simultaneous tracking of all colony members [28], we then quantified changes in group-level social behaviours during foraging to identify mechanisms that could be responsible for a reduction in foraging efficiency. If social instability disrupts the social relationships among individuals (i.e. outside of the male-female pair bonds), then social instability should lead to a reduction in social tolerance (here, the propensity for individuals to forage with other group members in a competitive setting). Specifically, we predicted that disturbance events can cause a reduction in social tolerance among individuals that forage simultaneously, leading to smaller foraging group sizes. We also predicted that disturbance could increase the skew in access to resources, for example if patches are more often monopolised by dominant individuals (following [29, 30]). Finally, we predicted that disturbance might reduce individuals' propensity to feed with less preferred group members, which should be reflected in the structure of social relationships, or more specifically the exclusivity of social relationships in the social foraging network [31].

METHODS

Study system and experimental manipulations

This study was conducted at the Max Planck Institute for Ornithology in Radolfzell, Germany. Zebra finch colonies ($n_1 = 28$ individuals and $n_2 = 30$ individuals) were housed in 2 x 2 x 2 m indoor aviaries with a fixed day-night cycle for the course of the experiment. Colonies were composed of an equal sex ratio and had previously reproduced with the same colony composition. We gave birds the opportunity to breed (by providing nesting material) for 1 month, 3 months prior the start of the experiment to allow us to identify and later control for male-female pair bonds. Each bird in the study was individually identified with a unique combination of colour leg bands, and a visual-based recognition marker (2D tag;

dimensions 1 x 1 cm; weight: ~ 0.2 g) that can be automatically recognised in digital images [32, 33]. 2D tags were attached to birds using a small backpack (following [28]; Figure S1).

The experiment consisted of four phases (Figure 1A): (i) the pre-treatment phase, the 14 days immediately prior to the first disturbance event; (ii) the treatment phase, which includes three disturbance events (splitting the colony in three subcolonies for 2 days and recombining them for 3 days, three times over a period of 15 days); (iii) the post-treatment phase, 13-days after the last disturbance event, and (iv) the recovery phase, a 5-day period three weeks after the last disturbance event. In all phases of the experiment, colonies were kept in, or returned to, their original state (the pre-disturbance size and composition of the colony).

During the treatment phase, we split each colony into three subcolonies as follows: we first removed all birds from the main aviary, assigning half the birds to be placed back into it. We then divided the other half into two subcolonies of six or eight birds each, which we kept in separated aviaries (of smaller size compared to the main aviary) with no visual contact and minimum acoustic contact. We randomly picked different individuals to allocate into each subcolony in each disturbance event, meaning that subcolony membership, and which aviary each bird experienced, varied from one disturbance event to another. However, we always kept mated pairs together to avoid effects of our experimental treatment on pair re-formation that would have been caused by splitting established male-female pairs that had previously bred with each other (as shown in [34, 35]). That is, our focus was on studying the effects of instability at the colony level, while maintaining male-female pairs stable.

Foraging efficiency

To first determine whether disturbance events affect group performance, we measured and compared the foraging efficiency of the colony before any disturbance (pre-treatment phase) and after each subsequent phase of the experiment by presenting colonies with an ephemeral high-quality food patch. We conducted feeding trials only when colonies were returned to their original composition (see Figure 1A). This process involved fasting colonies for one hour prior to the trial to ensure they were motivated to feed, and then providing each colony with one slice of zucchini (equating to one feeding trial). Feeding trials were run once in the morning ~ 9:00 and once in the afternoon ~14:30, and ran for 45 minutes. We measured foraging efficiency as total weight of the zucchini slice eaten by each colony during each trial by weighing the zucchini slice before and after each trial (to 1/100th of a gram). We gave colonies a piece of zucchini (similar to the ones used in the experimental phase) every day for several weeks prior to the experiment to avoid any novelty effects. We also controlled for water loss by measuring the change in weight of an extra identical piece of zucchini placed into the aviary room during each trial, and subtracted the average amount of weight lost due to water evaporation from the total amount of zucchini eaten each day.

Co-feeding dynamics

To investigate the social factors that could explain a reduction in foraging efficiency, we video recorded and tracked individuals at and around the zucchini during each feeding trial using a GoPro Hero 4 camera fitted 50 cm above the feeding area (Figure S2). We used software [33] to extract the position (coordinates) and orientation of each bird by automatically detecting its 2D tag, in each frame of the video. We also marked the centre of the zucchini with a 2D tag, allowing us to identify which individuals were feeding at the zucchini in each frame; defined as individuals detected within one body length (8-cm) of the centre of the zucchini and oriented to face the zucchini. Although we recorded data from

every trial, 9 video recordings were lost due to camera failure or file corruption, resulting in total of 133 (out of 142) trials with recordings.

Foraging group size

To determine whether a reduction in foraging efficiency was caused by decrease in the number of individuals foraging simultaneously, we extracted the median number of individuals co-feeding in each video frame (when at least one individual was feeding), which we defined as *foraging group size*. We used only frames in the video that had at least one individual present at the zucchini because our hypothesis is based on the dynamics between individuals, to which frames with no individuals would be uninformative. Finally, we summarised the foraging group size data for a given trial as the median number of individuals simultaneously present at the food in 3-minute bins (15 per 45-minute trial)

Skewed access to food

To determine whether reduced foraging efficiency could be explained by an increase in the skew in who accesses the resource, we calculated the amount of time (number of video frames) each individual spent (was detected) at the food patch for each trial. Using these data, we calculated the binomial skew index (B index) [36], defined as:

$$B = \sum_{i=1}^N (p_i - \frac{1}{N})^2 - (1 - \frac{1}{N})/K, \quad \text{equation 1}$$

where N is the total number of individuals that were colony members, and p_i is the proportion of the total group benefit (K; measured as time spent at the zucchini) gained by the i th individual. We also kept track of which subcolony each individual had been allocated to

during each disturbance event in order to test for any residence effects, where individuals might have benefited from having remained in the main aviary.

Social dynamics

To test whether the disturbance events altered the social structure of colonies, we calculated the propensity for each dyadic pair of individuals to synchronise their feeding bouts. That is, we generated a social network for each colony for each phase of the experiment. We defined the edge weight (association strength) connecting each dyadic pair of individuals as the probability of observing individuals i and j feeding together given that either i or j was detected feeding (the Simple Ratio Index, SRI [31]). An SRI_{ij} value of 1 represents two individuals always observed feeding together, whereas an SRI_{ij} of 0 represents birds always feeding separately. We then quantified changes in the social structure by calculating the mean association strength (mean SRI_{ij} values) and the coefficient of variation of each individuals' SRI_{ij} , which we defined as the *exclusivity of their social bonds*. To test for broader network-level changes in social structure, we measured the correlation between the network from the pre-treatment phase to the networks from all the subsequent phases of the experiment.

STATISTICAL ANALYSES

Foraging efficiency – We constructed a linear mixed model with amount of zucchini eaten as the response variable, phase of the experiment (i.e. pre-treatment, disturbance event 1 to 3, post-treatment, recovery period) and time of the day (i.e. morning vs afternoon trial) as fixed effects, and colony number (ID) as random effects. Because for a few days we had a larger (wider diameter) zucchini from which we cut our slices, we also included a random effect of zucchini type (large or small). We used a Gaussian model (identity link error structure) from the lme4 package version 1.1.12 [37] in R 3.3.1 [38].

210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233

Co-feeding dynamics

Foraging group size – To evaluate the effects of social instability on foraging group size we constructed a linear mixed model with median number of individuals as the response variable, phase of the experiment, time of the day and zucchini type as fixed effects, and colony number (ID) as random effects. We fitted a Gaussian model in the lme4 package version 1.1.12 [37] in R version 3.3.1 [38].

Skewed access to food – To determine if disturbance events resulted in an increase in the skew, we calculated the B index for each trial, and then calculated the difference in the mean B indices between the pre-treatment phase and each subsequent phase. Because skew data represent non-independent social data, we used a simple randomisation test (see [39]) to confirm whether there was a significant effect of experimental phase on the skew in the access to the food resource. To do this, we permuted the B-index values within each flock across trials and phases, and recalculated the difference in mean B indices for the current pair of phases. We calculated statistical significance (P_{rand}) by comparing the observed mean to 9999 randomly-generated differences in means.

To test whether the birds that remained in the main aviary (i.e. residents) outcompeted those that were moved into external aviaries (i.e. non-residents) during the disturbance event (*Residence effect*). For each treatment phase, we used the difference between the mean number of frames in which residents were detected and the mean number of frames that non-residents were detected as the test statistics. We then implemented another simple randomisation test to recalculate this difference by randomly re-assigning the resident and

non-resident category in the data from that phase. We calculated statistical significance (P_{rand}) by repeating the randomisation process 9999 times.

Social dynamics – To determine if disturbance events affected co-feeding associations, we calculated the mean strength of the co-feeding associations and the coefficient of variation of the co-feeding association strengths for each individual in each of the phases of the experiment. We fit these phase-level network metrics to test for a quadratic effect using a linear mixed model, with phase number (1 to 6) and its square as fixed effects, and colony number as a random effect. Because each network, and subsequent metric, was measured identically, we interpreted the model output directly. We fitted a Gaussian model in the lme4 package version 1.1.12 [37] in R version 3.3.1 [38]. As the mean strength data largely replicates the mean foraging group size data, we report those results in the supplementary materials.

To test whether the structure of the co-feeding networks were stable over time, we used a Mantel test (vegan package [40] in R [38]) to compare the network from the pre-disturbance phase to the networks in each of the subsequent phases (pre vs. dis 1, vs. dis 2, vs. dis 3, vs. post and vs. rec). Statistical significance of the Mantel test (P_{rand}) was calculated using 9999 node permutations.

RESULTS

Colonies foraged less efficiently after disturbance events

We found that birds in both colonies foraged significantly less efficiently on days following disturbance events (i.e. when subgroups were recombined; $N = 142$ trials; Table 1). The

reduction in foraging efficiency continued through the post-treatment and the recovery phases, indicating a slow recovery period for group functionality (Figure 1B).

Foraging group size decreased after disturbance events

Foraging group size decreased as the number of disturbance events increased (N=133 trials; Table 2; Figure 1C). This effect lasted until the recovery phase, although the number of individuals feeding simultaneously did not fully return to pre-treatment levels, suggesting a slow recovery of group coordination.

Foraging did not become more skewed after disturbance events

The reduction in foraging group size was not caused by individuals becoming more competitive about accessing the resource. Our data did not show any evidence for significant changes in skewed access to the food (Table S1). We also found no residence effect favouring birds that remained in the main aviary during disturbances (Phase 1: $P_{\text{rand}}=0.592$; Phase 2: $P_{\text{rand}}=0.832$; Phase 3: $P_{\text{rand}}=0.923$).

Social dynamics were affected by disturbance events

The mean association strength cumulatively decreased (Figure S3). Our general linear model suggested significant linear and quadratic terms, suggesting a significant decrease during experimental phases was followed by a slight recovery (Table S2). Relationships also became more exclusive (Figure 2), with significant linear and quadratic terms in the general linear model suggesting that the initial increase in the coefficient of variation was followed by a recovery (Table 3). Thus, relationships among group members became weaker, corroborating the data on reduction in the size of foraging groups. Changes in co-feeding relationships among individuals also had a global impact on social dynamics. The correlation to the pre-

treatment network decreased throughout the subsequent treatment phases (Table S3), indicating that the social structure of foraging groups is not resilient to repeated disturbances.

DISCUSSION

Our results support our hypothesis that temporary social instability can affect the benefits gained through coordinated actions, and thus reduced group performance. Previous studies have shown that social instability can negatively affect cooperative activities such as allo-parental care [41, 42], group hunting [43], and reciprocal food sharing [44]; however, most of these studies focused on permanent changes in group membership. Our study shows that temporary changes in group size and composition, resulting from repeated short-term disturbance events, can reduce the ability of groups to forage efficiently. Further, by tracking in detail how groups foraged when re-united, we have identified potential social mechanisms underlying the effects of disturbances on foraging efficiency. Disturbances can disrupt the social relationships among members of the group, subsequently reducing the coordination and synchronisation of foraging groups.

Benefits of social tolerance while co-feeding at monopolizable resources facilitate cooperation (e.g. bonobos (*Pan paniscus*), [45]). In our system, social tolerance in a collective task was negatively affected by repeated disturbance events, indicated by a decrease in foraging group size. This effect could have arisen because of differences in competitive abilities when accessing the food resource, resulting in dominant individuals monopolising the resource. However, our data provides little evidence for competitive dynamics among colony members (no skewed access to the resource nor any resident effects), which is consistent with zebra finches having relatively shallow dominance hierarchies [46].

308

309 Coordinated actions are important for group living species. To remain cohesive, groups must
310 be able to collectively decide when to move or where to forage [21]. Our results suggest that
311 social instability can affect coordination and synchronisation in otherwise stable groups by
312 reshaping social relationships among individuals. These findings support previous evidence
313 that social instability can drive reconfiguration of social systems. For example, changes in
314 social relationships resulting from removal of key individual(s) has been previously reported
315 in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops spp.*) [47] and pigtailed macaques (*Macaca nemestrina*)
316 [48]. However, our results extend the findings of these studies by demonstrating that even
317 temporary disturbance events can have relatively permanent consequences on group-level
318 functions without any permanent changes in group membership.

319

320 We have shown, for the first time, that social instability poses a measurable cost to group-
321 living individuals. Temporary changes in group membership generated significant costs in
322 terms of performance at a task in which individuals benefit from coordinated action. By
323 reducing the ability for individuals living in social groups to coordinate and synchronise their
324 actions, disturbance events could negatively impact their survival and reproduction. Our
325 study therefore suggests that instability can act as an agent of selection, acting on social traits
326 that facilitate stable social relationships. This largely unexplored impact could have
327 widespread significance on the evolution and maintenance of social complexity in animal
328 societies faced with increasingly disturbed environments.

329

330 **ETHICS**

331 This study was conducted under permit 35-9185.81/G16/73 approved by Ethical Committee
332 of Baden-Wurttemberg.

DATA ACCESSIBILITY

We provide the complete code and data to replicate the results described in this study. These are available for download from:

<https://edmond.mpdl.mpg.de/imeji/collection/bcVWl9YKhHcPvwh9>

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTIONS

DRF and AAM-C designed the experiment; GA-N and JK-I collected the data; AAM-C and DRF. analysed the data and wrote the manuscript. All authors contributed to the developing the experiment and its methodology, and to the revision and editing of the final paper.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing interests.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Alex Bruttel, Daniel Zuñiga, and the animal caretaker team at the Max Planck Institute for Ornithology in Radolfzell for assistance with data collection and the outstanding monitoring animal health each day. We thank J. Graving for providing the processing software to decode the 2D barcodes and assistance with setting up the tracking procedure. We also thank Dr. N. Boogert, Dr. G. Carter, and members of the Farine lab for useful criticisms to the manuscript.

FUNDING

This work was funded by the Max Planck Society and the German Research Foundation (DFG grant FA 1420/4-1 awarded to D.R.F.).

358

359

360 REFERENCES

- 361 1. Hinde R.A. 1976 Interactions, Relationships and Social-Structure. *Man* **11**(1), 1-17.
362 (doi:Doi 10.2307/2800384).
- 363 2. Shultz S., Opie C., Atkinson Q.D. 2011 Stepwise evolution of stable sociality in
364 primates. *Nature* **479**(7372), 219-222. (doi:10.1038/nature10601).
- 365 3. Kappeler P.M. 2018 A framework for studying social complexity. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol*
366 **in press**.
- 367 4. Nowak M.A., Tarnita C.E., Antal T. 2010 Evolutionary dynamics in structured
368 populations. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* **365**(1537), 19-30.
369 (doi:10.1098/rstb.2009.0215).
- 370 5. Strandburg-Peshkin A., Farine D.R., Couzin I.D., Crofoot M.C. 2015 Shared decision-
371 making drives collective movement in wild baboons. *Science* **348**(6241), 1358-1361.
372 (doi:10.1126/science.aaa5099).
- 373 6. Sueur C., King A.J., Conradt L., Kerth G., Lusseau D., Mettke-Hofmann C., Schaffner
374 C.M., Williams L., Zinner D., Aureli F. 2011 Collective decision-making and fission–fusion
375 dynamics: a conceptual framework. *Oikos* **120**(11), 1608-1617.
- 376 7. McDonald D.B. 2007 Predicting fate from early connectivity in a social network. *Proc*
377 *Natl Acad Sci U S A* **104**(26), 10910-10914. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0701159104).
- 378 8. Schulke O., Bhagavatula J., Vigilant L., Ostner J. 2010 Social bonds enhance
379 reproductive success in male macaques. *Curr Biol* **20**(24), 2207-2210.
380 (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2010.10.058).
- 381 9. Cameron E.Z., Setsaas T.H., Linklater W.L. 2009 Social bonds between unrelated
382 females increase reproductive success in feral horses. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **106**(33),
383 13850-13853. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0900639106).
- 384 10. Silk J.B., Alberts S.C., Altmann J. 2003 Social bonds of female baboons enhance infant
385 survival. *Science* **302**(5648), 1231-1234. (doi:10.1126/science.1088580).
- 386 11. Silk J.B., Beehner J.C., Bergman T.J., Crockford C., Engh A.L., Moscovice L.R., Wittig
387 R.M., Seyfarth R.M., Cheney D.L. 2009 The benefits of social capital: close social bonds
388 among female baboons enhance offspring survival. *Proc Biol Sci* **276**(1670), 3099-3104.
389 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.0681).
- 390 12. Archie E.A., Tung J., Clark M., Altmann J., Alberts S.C. 2014 Social affiliation matters:
391 both same-sex and opposite-sex relationships predict survival in wild female baboons. *Proc*
392 *Biol Sci* **281**(1793). (doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.1261).
- 393 13. Brent L.J.N., Ruiz-Lambides A., Platt M.L. 2017 Family network size and survival
394 across the lifespan of female macaques. *Proc Biol Sci* **284**(1854), 20170515.
395 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2017.0515).
- 396 14. Lehmann J., Majolo B., McFarland R. 2016 The effects of social network position on the
397 survival of wild Barbary macaques, *Macaca sylvanus*. *Behav Ecol* **27**(1), 20-28.
398 (doi:10.1093/beheco/arv169).
- 399 15. Silk J.B., Beehner J.C., Bergman T.J., Crockford C., Engh A.L., Moscovice L.R., Wittig
400 R.M., Seyfarth R.M., Cheney D.L. 2010 Strong and consistent social bonds enhance the
401 longevity of female baboons. *Curr Biol* **20**(15), 1359-1361. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2010.05.067).
- 402 16. Silk J. 2014 Evolutionary perspectives on the links between close social bonds, health,
403 and fitness. In *Sociality, hierarchy, health: comparative biodemography: a collection of*
404 *papers* (eds. Weinstein M., Lane M.A.), pp. 121-144. Washington D. C., National Academies
405 Press.

17. Shannon G., Slotow R., Durant S.M., Sayialel K.N., Poole J., Moss C., McComb K. 2013 Effects of social disruption in elephants persist decades after culling. *Front Zool* **10**(1), 62. (doi:10.1186/1742-9994-10-62).
18. Nunez C.M., Adelman J.S., Smith J., Gesquiere L.R., Rubenstein D.I. 2014 Linking social environment and stress physiology in feral mares (*Equus caballus*): group transfers elevate fecal cortisol levels. *Gen Comp Endocrinol* **196**, 26-33. (doi:10.1016/j.ygcen.2013.11.012).
19. Carter G., Wilkinson G. 2013 Does food sharing in vampire bats demonstrate reciprocity? *Commun Integr Biol* **6**(6), e25783. (doi:10.4161/cib.25783).
20. Biro D., Sasaki T., Portugal S.J. 2016 Bringing a Time-Depth Perspective to Collective Animal Behaviour. *Trends Ecol Evol* **31**(7), 550-562. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2016.03.018).
21. King A.J., Sueur C. 2011 Where Next? Group Coordination and Collective Decision Making by Primates. *Int J Primatol* **32**(6), 1245-1267. (doi:10.1007/s10764-011-9526-7).
22. Suchak M., Eppley T.M., Campbell M.W., Feldman R.A., Quarles L.F., de Waal F.B. 2016 How chimpanzees cooperate in a competitive world. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **113**(36), 10215-10220. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1611826113).
23. Farine D.R., Montiglio P.O., Spiegel O. 2015 From Individuals to Groups and Back: The Evolutionary Implications of Group Phenotypic Composition. *Trends Ecol Evol* **30**(10), 609-621. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2015.07.005).
24. Beauchamp G. 2014 *Social predation: How group living benefits predators and prey*. USA, Academic Press.
25. Dunn A.M., Zann R.A. 1996 Undirected song encourages the breeding female zebra finch to remain in the nest. *Ethology* **102**(7), 540-548.
26. Zann R. 1990 Social and call learning in wild zebra finches in south-east Australia. *Anim Behav* **40**, 811-828.
27. Zann R. 1996 *The zebra finch: A synthesis of field and laboratory studies*. USA, Oxford University Press.
28. Alarcon-Nieto G., Graving J., Klarevas-Irby J.A., Maldonado-Chaparro A., Mueller I., Farine D.R. 2018 An automated barcode tracking system for behavioural studies in birds. *Methods Ecol Evol*, 1-12. (doi:10.1101/201590).
29. Maynard Smith J., Parker G.A. 1976 The logic of assymetric contests. *Anim Behav* **24**, 159-175.
30. Davies N.B. 1978 Territorial defence in the speckled wood butterfly (*Pararge aegeria*): the resident always wins. *Anim Behav* **26**, 138-147.
31. Farine D.R., Whitehead H. 2015 Constructing, conducting and interpreting animal social network analysis. *J Anim Ecol* **84**(5), 1144-1163. (doi:10.1111/1365-2656.12418).
32. Crall J.D., Gravish N., Mountcastle A.M., Combes S.A. 2015 BEETag: A Low-Cost, Image-Based Tracking System for the Study of Animal Behavior and Locomotion. *PLoS One* **10**(9), e0136487. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136487).
33. Graving J.M. 2017 pinpoint: behavioral tracking using 2D barcode tags v0.0.1-alpha. (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1008969>, Zenodo).
34. Wiley E.M., Ridley A.R. 2018 The benefits of pair bond tenure in the cooperatively breeding pied babbler (*Turdoides bicolor*). *Ecol Evol*, 1-8. (doi:10.1002/ece3.4243).
35. Dunn A.M., Zann R.A. 1996 Undirected song in wild zebra finch flocks: Contexts and effects of mate removal. *Ethology* **102**(7), 529-539.
36. Nonacs P. 2000 Measuring and Using Skew in the Study of Social Behavior and Evolution. *Am Nat* **156**(6), 577-589. (doi:10.1086/316995).
37. Bates D., Machler M., Bolker B.M., Walker S.C. 2015 Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* **67**(1), 1-48. (doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01).

38. R Core Team. 2016 R: A language and environment for statistical computing (Vienna, Austria, R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
39. Farine D.R. 2017 A guide to null models for animal social network analysis. *Methods Ecol Evol* **8**(10), 1309-1320. (doi:10.1111/2041-210x.12772).
40. Oksanen J., Guillaume Blanchet F., Friendly M., Kindt R., Legendre P., McGlinn D., Minchin P.R., O'Hara R.B., Simpson G.L., Solymos P., et al. 2017 vegan: Community Ecology Package. (
41. Ebensperger L.A., Aracena S., Avendano N., Toro A., Leon C., Ramirez-Estrada J., Abades S. 2017 Social instability decreases alloparental care and quality of weaned offspring in a communally rearing rodent. *Anim Behav* **133**, 195-205. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2017.09.021).
42. Ebensperger L.A., Correa L.A., Leon C., Ramirez-Estrada J., Abades S., Villegas A., Hayes L.D. 2016 The modulating role of group stability on fitness effects of group size is different in females and males of a communally rearing rodent. *J Anim Ecol* **85**(6), 1502-1515. (doi:10.1111/1365-2656.12566).
43. Gazda S.K., Connor R.C., Edgar R.K., Cox F. 2005 A division of labour with role specialization in group-hunting bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) off Cedar Key, Florida. *Proc Biol Sci* **272**(1559), 135-140. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2004.2937).
44. Carter G.G., Wilkinson G.S. 2015 Social benefits of non-kin food sharing by female vampire bats. *Proc Biol Sci* **282**(1819). (doi:10.1098/rspb.2015.2524).
45. Hare B., Melis A.P., Woods V., Hastings S., Wrangham R. 2007 Tolerance allows bonobos to outperform chimpanzees on a cooperative task. *Curr Biol* **17**(7), 619-623. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2007.02.040).
46. Bonoan R., Clodius F., Dawson A., Caetano S., Yeung E., Paz-y-Miño-C G. 2013 Dominance hierarchy formation in a model organism, the zebra finch (*Taeniopygia guttata*), and its potential application to laboratory research. *Bios* **84**(4), 201-209. (doi:10.1893/0005-3155-84.4.201).
47. Lusseau D., Newman M.E. 2004 Identifying the role that animals play in their social networks. *Proc Biol Sci* **271 Suppl 6**, S477-481. (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2004.0225).
48. Flack J.C., Girvan M., de Waal F.B., Krakauer D.C. 2006 Policing stabilizes construction of social niches in primates. *Nature* **439**(7075), 426-429. (doi:10.1038/nature04326).

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Reduced foraging efficiency and social tolerance during treatment phases of

the experiment. A. Timeline of the experiment with coloured circles corresponding to

phases, and numbers representing days since the start of the experiment. Double lines

correspond to days in which the colonies were split to simulate a temporary disturbance

event, with colonies being in their normal state at all other times (solid lines). The solid

arrows show the periods during which the feeding trial data were collected. There were no

manipulations from day 30 onwards, but data were collected on days 65 to 70. The embedded

photo shows an individual feeding at the zucchini, the number corresponding to its ID

detected from the 2D tag on its back using automated tracking software. **B.** Foraging

efficiency (amount of zucchini eaten in 45-min trial) reduced significantly after the first

treatment phase (between Pre and Dis 1; reference level is Pre), remaining significantly lower

during the following treatment phases and the post-treatment phase (reference level is Pre).

Model results are in Table 1. **C.** The number of individuals simultaneously foraging dropped

significantly during the second treatment phase (reference level is Pre). Fewer individuals

were simultaneously present at the resource during the last disturbance phase and the post-

treatment phase, but numbers increased slightly during the recovery phase. Model results are

in Table 2. Panels B and C show the medians (black line inside the box), with boxes showing

the lower and upper quartile, black vertical bars showing the full range of the data, and dots

showing the raw data. Numbers inside the box indicate the number of trials. Phases of the


experiment correspond to: pre-treatment (Pre), disturbance event 1 (Dis1), disturbance event

2 (Dis2), disturbance event 3 (Dis3), post-treatment (Post), and recovery (Rec).

Figure 2. Increased social exclusivity during treatment phases of the experiment. The co-feeding relationships among individuals in the colony became more exclusive (i.e. increased coefficient of variation together with reduced mean association strengths (Fig S3) suggest that weaker relationships became weaker) during the treatment phases, and showed a tendency to stabilise during the post-treatment (Post) and the recovery (Rec) phases. Model results are in Table 3. Colours represent the phases of the experiment. Abbreviations correspond to: pre-treatment (Pre), disturbance event 1 (Dis1), disturbance event 2 (Dis2), disturbance event 3 (Dis3), post-treatment (Post), and recovery (Rec). Solid and dashed lines represent colony 1 and 2 respectively. Thicker line shows the fit of the linear mixed models.

524 **FIGURES**


525 **Figure 1.**



526

527

528 **Figure 2.**



529

530

TABLES

Table 1. Reduced foraging efficiency after disturbance events. The *foraging efficiency* model describes the effect of treatment phase on the amount of zucchini consumed by colonies (in grams) per 45-minute trial. The model estimates are relative to trial data from the pre-treatment phase, and the effect of time is relative to morning trials.

	Estimate	SE	t-value	P-value
Intercept	2.420	0.254	9.541	< 0.0001
Disturbance event 1	-0.951	0.180	-5.291	< 0.0001
Disturbance event 2	-0.761	0.186	-4.086	0.0002
Disturbance event 3	-1.206	0.188	-6.399	< 0.0001
Post-treatment	-1.161	0.124	-9.375	< 0.0001
Recovery phase	-0.664	0.160	-4.155	0.0001
Time (afternoon trial)	-0.390	0.095	-4.096	0.0001
Initial zucchini weight	0.061	0.024	2.489	0.0109
<i>Random effects</i>				
	Variance	SD		
Colony	0	0		
Zucchini slice size (normal/large)	0	0		

Table 2. Reduced foraging group sizes after disturbance events. The *foraging group size* model describes the effect of treatment phase on the number of individuals foraging simultaneously (median per 3-minute bin per trial). The estimates are relative to data collected in the pre-treatment phase. The effects of time and zucchini type are relative to morning trials and normally-sized zucchinis, respectively.

	Estimate	SE	t-value	P-value
Disturbance event 1	0.131	0.471	0.278	0.781
Disturbance event 2	-1.099	0.523	-2.102	0.038
Disturbance event 3	-2.486	0.701	-3.548	0.001
Post-treatment	-1.848	0.360	-5.130	< 0.0001
Recovery phase	-1.2413	0.439	-2.824	0.006
Time (afternoon trial)	-0.272	0.262	-1.037	0.302
Zucchini size (large)	1.197	0.474	2.523	0.013
<i>Random effects</i>				
	<i>Variance</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Colony	1.188	1.090		

Table 3. Non-linear dynamics of network properties over the course of the experiment.

The models describe the effect of phase on the coefficient of variation of the association strength of individuals in the colonies. The estimates indicate the direction of the change in each of the network metrics analysed.

	Coefficient of variation			
	Estimate	SE	t-value	P-value
Intercept	43.068	26.880	1.602	0.143
Phase	54.513	17.586	3.100	0.013
Phase ²	-7.009	2.459	-2.806	0.020
<i>Random effects</i>				
	<i>Variance</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Colony	0	0		