

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Koenig, Andreas and Scarry, Clara J. and Wheeler, Brandon C and Borries, Carola (2013) Variation in grouping patterns, mating systems and social structure: what socio-ecological models attempt to explain. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 368 (1618). p. 20120348. ISSN 0962-8436.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2012.0348>

Link to record in KAR

<http://kar.kent.ac.uk/53211/>

Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

1 **VARIATION IN GROUPING PATTERNS, MATING SYSTEMS, AND SOCIAL**
2 **STRUCTURE: WHAT SOCIO-ECOLOGICAL MODELS ATTEMPT TO EXPLAIN**

3 Published in *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 368: 20120348

4 <http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/368/1618/20120348>

5

6 Andreas Koenig¹, Clara J. Scarry^{1,2}, Brandon C. Wheeler^{3,4}, Carola Borries¹

7

8 ¹ Department of Anthropology, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY 11794-4364, USA

9 ² Interdepartmental Doctoral Program in Anthropological Sciences, Stony Brook University,

10 Stony Brook, NY 11794-4364, USA

11 ³ Cognitive Ethology Laboratory, German Primate Center, 37077 Göttingen, Kellnerweg 4,

12 Germany

13 ⁴ Courant Centre “Evolution of Social Behaviour”, University of Göttingen, 37077 Göttingen,

14 Kellnerweg 6, Germany

15

16 Corresponding author:

17 Andreas Koenig, Department of Anthropology, Stony Brook University, Circle Rd, SBS

18 Building S-517, Stony Brook, NY 11794-4364, USA, Email: andreas.koenig@stonybrook.edu,

19 Phone: +1-631-632-1513

20

21 **Running head:** Socio-ecological models

22 **Number of figures:** 5

23 **Word count:** 7,937

24 **Estimated # pages:** 9

25 **Submission:** 11/04/2012; **Resubmission:** 01/21/2013

26

27 **ABSTRACT**

28 Socio-ecological models aim to predict the variation in social systems based on a limited number
29 of ecological parameters. Since the 1960's, the original model has taken two paths: one relating
30 to grouping patterns and mating systems and one relating to grouping patterns and female social
31 structure. Here we review the basic ideas specifically with regard to nonhuman primates, present
32 new results, and point to open questions. While most primates live in permanent groups and
33 exhibit female defence polygyny, recent studies indicate more flexibility with cooperative male
34 resource defence occurring repeatedly in all radiations. In contrast to other animals, the potential
35 link between ecology and these mating systems remains, however, largely unexplored. The
36 model of the ecology of female social structure has often been deemed successful, but has
37 recently been criticized. We show that the predicted association of agonistic rates and despotism
38 (directional consistency of relationships) was not supported in a comparative test. The overall
39 variation in despotism is likely due to phylogenetic grade shifts. At the same time, it varies
40 within clades more or less in the direction predicted by the model. This suggests that the model's
41 utility may lie in predicting social variation within but not across clades.

42

43 **Key words:** nonhuman primates, female defence polygyny, resource defence polygyny, contest
44 competition, rate of agonism, directional consistency

45

46

47 **1. INTRODUCTION**

48 For many animals, particularly humans and other primates, social organisation (i.e. group size,
49 composition, and cohesion), social structure (i.e. patterns of social interactions and relationships
50 among individuals), and mating systems vary widely across species, within species, and even
51 within populations [1,2] with profound consequences for reproductive skew [3,4] and genetic
52 population structure [5,6]. Examining the factors affecting this variation in social systems has
53 been a major focus of ecological research since the 1960's [1,7].

54 Although these ideas have been central to research on nonhuman primates over the past
55 decades, the initial spark goes back to John Crook's early works on birds [7], and was
56 subsequently applied to nonhuman primates in his 1966 work with John Gartlan [1]. This so-
57 called "socio-ecological model" assumed that a limited number of environmental factors affect
58 population characteristics, leading to predictable differences in social systems. The flexibility in
59 primate social systems was, therefore, considered a consequence of the variation in ecology. In
60 the following years, this concept led to a host of tests of relationships between ecology,
61 morphology, and behaviour [8-14]. Although the original idea was intended to explain primate
62 social systems using a single comprehensive (verbal) model, two different paths were
63 subsequently pursued (Figure 1): (i) models that relate to grouping patterns and mating systems
64 [8-11,15] and (ii) models that relate to grouping patterns and female social structure [12-14].
65 Despite occasional calls for considering male and female strategies together, little progress has
66 been made towards such a unified model [16,17]. Therefore, at present it seems justified to speak
67 of at least two models, which are connected through the grouping pattern (Figure 1), but have
68 become essentially independent in their attempt to explain two basic but distinct aspects of social
69 systems. The use of the term "socio-ecological model" to simultaneously refer to both models

70 has led to considerable confusion, however. Therefore, in the following, we will separately
71 describe some core ideas of each model, review historical trends in the results and criticisms,
72 present new results, and point to some open questions. We will focus primarily on ecological
73 factors, although phylogenetic, demographic, and social ones shape social systems as well [18-
74 21].

75

76 **2. ECOLOGY, SOCIAL ORGANISATION, AND MATING SYSTEMS**

77 **(a) *Basic ideas and tests with nonhuman primates***

78 The ecological model of social organisation and mating systems (henceforth EMSOMS)
79 suggests that resources (e.g. food, nest sites) and risks (e.g. predation, disease, infanticide)
80 determine the spatiotemporal distribution of receptive females, which in turn affects the
81 strategies available to males [8-10,15,22,23]. If resources are spatially dispersed, females may,
82 depending on risks, live spatially isolated from other females. For males this opens the options
83 either for scramble competition polygyny, spatial polygyny, or monogamy. Which strategy males
84 pursue should depend on the economic defensibility of females and the requirements of infant
85 care [10,15,22,24]. In contrast, if females form groups either temporarily or permanently, males
86 may attempt to monopolize one or more clusters of females. Here, the monopolisation potential
87 will depend not only on the number of females, but also on the degree of spatial cohesion and/or
88 temporal overlap in their receptive periods ([15,25]; for more details see [10,22]).

89 In contrast to other mammals [8,9,26], in which ecological factors have been linked to
90 grouping patterns and mating systems, studies of nonhuman primates have focussed less on the
91 environmental factors that underpin variation in mating systems (but see [27,28]). Rather they
92 have examined the emergence of fission-fusion sociality [29,30] or constraints of group size,

93 generally focusing on how predation avoidance and scramble competition for food set adaptive
94 limits for minimum and maximum group size, respectively [31-35].

95 More recently, it has been argued that social organisation in primates evolved from a
96 solitary, nocturnal ancestor, but that – following a switch to a diurnal lifestyle – predation
97 avoidance favoured individuals in loose, diurnal aggregations of multiple males and females
98 [36]. These loose aggregates are suggested to have then led to cohesive multimale-multifemale
99 groups, which in turn led to unimale groups and pairs in some taxa. These overarching trends
100 were posited as evidence against the adaptive approach of the “socio-ecological model” and its
101 lack of accounting for phylogenetic history [36]. This criticism, however, is misplaced, as it
102 focussed only on ecological models of female social structure (see below) instead of studies of
103 group formation and mating systems, which would be of more direct relevance to the authors’
104 analysis. Furthermore, the criticism falls short as the study does not incorporate primary factors
105 such as competition for food [13,31] or social risks such as coercion and infanticide [37], even
106 though the latter has been shown to be an especially important factor favouring male-female
107 associations among prosimians [38]. At present, therefore, it remains unclear exactly how
108 resources and risks affect female grouping patterns among nonhuman primates. While predators,
109 food, and infanticide clearly play a role, the relative importance of each factor and their
110 contribution to the flexibility of grouping remain disputed [39].

111 In contrast, it seems clear that the spatiotemporal distribution of females is one of the
112 main aspects underlying variation among primate mating systems, both across populations [e.g.
113 40,41] and across species [42,43], at least among haplorrhines [44]. Additionally, strepsirrhine
114 primates have recently been found to match the general expectations [45] that as the number of
115 females and/or the overlap in sexual receptivity increases, so too does the number of males per

116 group. Overall, therefore, most primates appear to live in a female defence polygyny system,
117 which is likely the reason that little attention has been paid to potential ecological predictors of
118 mating systems in primates.

119

120 **(b) *The roads less travelled***

121 While female defence polygyny appears to be the most common mating system among
122 nonhuman primates, the prevalence of other mating systems and their ecological bases are less
123 clear. This is largely due to the paucity of comparable ecological data on a scale important to a
124 primate [46,47] and the lack of comparable data on predation and social risks.

125 As in other mammals, the occurrence of spatially-dispersed, solitary females seems to be
126 linked to either scramble competition polygyny, as in some lemuroids and possibly orangutans
127 [48,49], or spatial polygyny, as in some strepsirrhines [50,51]. Similarly, as in other mammals,
128 spatial dispersion of females [52] appears to be the best predictor for pair-living in primates, and
129 permanent association and a monogamous mating system are likely related to the necessity for
130 direct paternal care [53] or infanticide avoidance [38,54]. In these cases, the spatial dispersion of
131 females seems to be determined by either the anti-predator benefits of crypsis (as in many small-
132 bodied primates [33]), the dependence on non-divisible resources [55], or a low abundance of
133 large resources [49]. Nevertheless, a comprehensive comparative analysis of the ecological
134 factors affecting female primate distribution in space and time is lacking.

135 Furthermore, in recent years it has become clear that, across the primate order, certain
136 populations or species living in multimale-multifemale groups may not fit the pattern observed in
137 female defence polygyny [56]. Some non-phylogenetic comparative studies suggest that risk of
138 predation and/or infanticide may be associated with the number of males per group [37,57]. In

139 addition, although heavily disputed and long considered absent among primates [58], some
140 multimale primate societies may indeed exhibit mating systems that can be characterized as
141 resource defence (or territorial) polygyny [10,15,26]. In contrast to Emlen and Oring's [15]
142 original idea of solitary females being attracted to individual males that defend territories or
143 resources, however, in nonhuman primates multiple males jointly defend a group's territory, and
144 this may occur both with female dispersal or philopatry [27,59].

145 At present, such a cooperative male resource defence polygyny seems to be the best
146 characterization of the mating system for common chimpanzees, in which males patrol and
147 defend an area [59]. The lethal aggression and intercommunity killings that have been observed
148 at multiple sites [60,61] may ultimately help to expand a group's area [61], which can benefit
149 female reproductive performance [59]. Similarly, cooperative male resource defence polygyny
150 appears to be the mating system of Phayre's leaf monkeys, a mid-sized Asian colobine we
151 studied in Thailand [56,62]. Although it remains unclear whether males benefit reproductively
152 from the size or quality of an area, males jointly defended territories with little overlap between
153 neighbouring groups [56,62]. While home range size generally increased with group size, the
154 multimale group was able to defend and maintain a larger territory than the similarly-sized and
155 even the larger one-male group (Figure 2).

156 More generally, cooperative male resource defence polygyny can be found in platyrrhines
157 (lion tamarins and some tamarins [63,64]; capuchin monkeys [27,65-68]; spider monkeys
158 [69,70]), cercopithecines (mangabeys, guenons [71]), colobines (colobus monkeys [72]; Phayre's
159 leaf monkeys, see above) and hominoids (polyandrous gibbons [73]; chimpanzees, see above).
160 Additional cases in point are male resource defence polygyny in one-male groups of platyrrhines
161 (saki monkeys [74]), monogamous/ polygynous strepsirrhines (bamboo lemurs [75]), and

162 resource defence monogamy in hylobatids ([76], but see [77]). Thus, although less common than
163 female defence polygyny, male resource defence occurs in all major radiations of primates.

164 Among these species, the nature of between-group encounters seems to relate to
165 ecological variables (e.g. the availability of certain foods [78]), although the occurrence and
166 outcome of aggression between groups may be mediated by the numerical asymmetry in male
167 group size or encounter location [78,79]. As in other cases in which individuals benefit through
168 group augmentation [80], multimale groups might be beneficial in these systems if they increase
169 the group's competitive ability. Although some of these additional males are likely to defect
170 during collective aggression against other groups [81], given the indirect nature of the benefits to
171 male reproductive success [17,82]. Moreover, the presence of additional males could increase the
172 frequency or effectiveness of paternal care (including infant protection) and the options for male
173 protectors, decreasing predation and infanticide risk and increasing female mate choice options
174 (discussion in [23]). Thus, while the costs to males of shared reproduction will increase with the
175 presence of additional competitors, both males and females might ultimately benefit from males
176 defending resources. To date, however, the conditions – ecological, demographic, or social – that
177 have led to the evolution of male resource defence among nonhuman primates remain unknown,
178 as are the factors that help overcome the potential collective action problems [82].

179 In sum, the past primary focus on female defence polygyny among nonhuman primates
180 has painted a picture of a rather impoverished and inflexible mating system across the primate
181 order. This has been further exaggerated by the use of simplistic categories when attempting to
182 reconstruct the evolution of primate sociality [36]. In contrast, the more recent results
183 summarized above indicate that primate mating systems are more flexible than has been
184 acknowledged. The EMSOMS provides one framework that, in addition to phylogenetic,

185 demographic, and social factors [18-21], allows for the examination of this flexibility and its
186 underlying ecological factors.

187

188 **3. ECOLOGY, COMPETITION, AND FEMALE SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS**

189 **(a) *Basic ideas and critique of the model***

190 With the ecological model of female social relationships (henceforth EMFSR) a new dimension
191 was introduced to the socio-ecological model [1]. R. W. Wrangham [14] reasoned that food
192 availability and distribution should have major effects not only on the grouping and dispersal
193 patterns of females, but also on their agonistic and affiliative relationships within and between
194 groups. This idea was extended by van Schaik and colleagues to include predation risk as an
195 ecological factor [13] and later infanticide as a social factor favouring grouping [17,38,83]. In
196 the following, we restrict the discussion of the EMFSR to suggestions specifically incorporating
197 cost-benefit approaches, while not considering more qualitative approaches and those based on
198 behavioural indicators of competition [12,84].

199 The EMFSR suggests that ultimately females may form groups due to predation pressure,
200 a defensible distribution of high quality resources, and/or social benefits via infanticide
201 avoidance [13,14,83]. Among group-living females, the availability of high-quality patches that
202 can be monopolised (or usurped) by a subset of residents will affect social relationships. Because
203 these resources may promote within-group contest competition, females may form either
204 despotic-nepotistic or despotic-nepotistic-tolerant relationships to maximize access and inclusive
205 fitness benefits, with tolerance being predicted when between-group competition is strong [83].
206 In case such resources are rare or absent, females should either form egalitarian relationships and

207 disperse or remain philopatric, if strong between-group competition favours kin-based coalitions
208 to defend group-controlled resources [83].

209 Over the past years this verbal model has been criticized for a variety of reasons
210 [18,21,39]. Some critiques have related to re-evaluations of hypotheses and predictions [72,85],
211 incorporating formal (mathematical) modeling [86], incorporating phylogenetic relationships to
212 capture phylogenetic similarity and constraints [87,88], excluding dispersal patterns [18,85], or
213 extending the model to incorporate cooperative actions [89,90]. Others criticized the
214 overemphasis of competition and underemphasis of affiliation and cooperation [91]. Importantly,
215 mismatches between predictions and results have been pointed out [92,93] and the lack of
216 phylogenetic methods and the presence of correlations among social variables [94,95] have
217 resulted in calls to abandon the model altogether [21] or to investigate different components
218 separately [18].

219 The importance of the mismatches is currently difficult to judge because large-scale,
220 cross-species comparisons of wild, unprovisioned primates are lacking [85]. Instead,
221 comparative approaches have used primarily captive or provisioned populations [87,88] or
222 included only a few wild, unprovisioned populations or species [96-98]. To date, only two
223 broader comparisons have been conducted with wild, unprovisioned primates [91,99], and both
224 studies were restricted to agonistic behaviour. Unfortunately, one of these analyses has serious
225 conceptual and analytical flaws [100], and neither directly tested predictions of the model or
226 controlled for phylogeny. As noted previously, the assumption of independence of species'
227 responses to local ecological conditions, which is implicit in the model, is a serious problem that
228 should be incorporated in comparative studies [85]. Nevertheless, given the paucity of data for

229 certain aspects of the model [85], it is clear that a general test is currently unfeasible. It therefore
230 seems that investigating individual aspects of the model is indeed the most viable route [18].

231

232 **(b) *Testing links between agonism and social structure***

233 Central to the EMFSR is the idea that there is a link between 1) the abundance,
234 distribution, size, and quality of resources; 2) the frequency and form of agonistic behaviour and
235 its energetic consequences; and 3) characteristics of the dominance relationships of females
236 (Figure 3). Specifically, if contestable resources predominate, females should exhibit high rates
237 of agonism over food and energy gain should positively correlate with aggression rate in a given
238 patch (i.e. short-term consequence) and be skewed by dominance rank overall (i.e. long-term
239 consequence) [13,83]. If this so-called within-group contest competition prevails, females are
240 expected to form despotic dominance relationships characterised by stable and unidirectional
241 (i.e. consistent) relationships that are strong (i.e. high steepness) and arranged in a transitive
242 pattern (i.e. linear hierarchies). In addition to despotism, the rank order should exhibit a
243 nepotistic pattern (i.e. matrilineal hierarchies [13,83]; see Figure 3).

244 Individual studies of food distribution and agonism have supported parts of these
245 predictions (overview in [86,101]), including widespread evidence that monopolisable resources
246 elicit increased rates of agonism [102-107]. Broader comparisons across a large number of
247 species have been hampered by the paucity of studies that incorporate measures of contestability
248 on a scale that is relevant to the study animals [46,47,108]. Such a “consumer-centred measure”
249 is represented by Lloyd’s Extended Index, which can incorporate data on resource size, quality,
250 and abundance [109]. So far, however, it has been incorporated in only a single study, which
251 facilitated successful prediction of agonistic behaviour in one population of capuchin monkeys

252 [108]. Future progress in testing the link between food and agonism depends on more studies
253 using this method to quantify food distribution. Less direct testing using broad dietary categories
254 (e.g. frugivory or folivory) as proxies for the distribution or contestability of resources [12,13]
255 have proven unsatisfactory, because food categories do not appear to accurately capture the
256 spatiotemporal heterogeneity of food quality [47,84,98]. Nevertheless, the widespread use of
257 dietary categories to make inferences about social relationships (e.g. in a recent review [18]), and
258 the strong link between diet and various aspects of primate behaviour [110] make it important to
259 conduct a comparative study of the presumed link between diet and agonism.

260 Another crucial step in testing the model is to investigate the link between agonism, skew
261 in energy gain or fitness, and social relationships (Figure 3). Unfortunately, relatively few studies
262 have provided data on either energy gain or fitness in relation to agonism or dominance rank
263 [101]. Thus, at present, only the predicted link between rates of agonism and dominance
264 relationships (i.e. higher rates of agonism occur in association with more despotic dominance
265 relationships) can be tested. Here we present such a test using published and unpublished data for
266 22 groups from 19 populations representing 16 primate species, including 2 platyrrhines, 10
267 cercopithecines, 3 colobines, and 1 hominoid (see Figure S1 and Table S2; supplementary
268 electronic material).

269

270 (i) *Data selection and methods*

271 We selected studies that provided data on rates of agonism among adult females that were
272 collected exclusively using focal animal continuous recording [111]. Because we were unable to
273 find sufficient data for agonism over food, we used data from all contexts. We tested the
274 predicted link of these rates to one component of despotism, the directional consistency of

275 dominance relationship, quantified via the “Directional Consistency Index” *DCI* [112]. In
276 contrast to both linearity and steepness [47,113], *DCI* has not been demonstrated to be sensitive
277 to unknown relationships and currently seems to be the most accurate measure of despotism.
278 Data for dominance matrices to characterise *DCI* usually came from the same groups as the
279 agonistic rates (details see Table S2; supplementary electronic material), but were collected via
280 focal and *ad libitum* sampling [111] and included either all types of agonistic behaviours or only
281 submissive behaviours. *DCI* values calculated from dominance matrices using MatMan, Version
282 1.1 [114] or taken from the literature. Because of the effect of small group sizes on dominance
283 characteristics [47], analysis was limited to groups with at least 6 adult females.

284 To test whether rates of agonism predicted *DCI* we used standard least-square regression
285 [115] as well as phylogenetic generalized least squares (PGLS; [116]) based on the consensus of
286 1000 phylogenetic trees obtained from the 10K Trees website [117] and the maximum-likelihood
287 of the phylogenetic signal in the relationship between agonism and despotism, using the “pgls”
288 function in the caper package [118] for the R statistical environment (see Figure S1 and Table
289 S3; supplementary electronic material). As the sample size was small, we repeated the
290 comparison across the component phylogenetic trees to incorporate uncertainty in either the
291 topology or branch lengths of the consensus tree (Nunn, personal communication).

292 Because it is not clear *a priori* whether different clades follow similar scaling rules or are
293 constrained and because grade shifts may occur, a single best fit model might not be appropriate
294 [119]. We, therefore, tested for differences of *DCI* across radiations using a phylogenetic
295 ANCOVA [120] with taxon as an independent variable and agonistic rates as a covariate.
296 Because the sample size was small and data were unevenly distributed across clades, we
297 compared cercopithecines ($N = 13$ populations) against all other taxa combined ($N = 6$). All

298 analyses were conducted with transformed data (agonism: square-root transformation; *DCI*: z-
299 scores [115]).

300

301 (ii) *Results and discussion*

302 In a standard least-square regression, we did not find the expected relationship between
303 rates of agonism and *DCI* ($R^2 = 0.103$, $\beta = 0.91$, $t = 1.52$, $P = 0.144$, $N = 22$; Figure 4). Similarly,
304 for phylogenetic generalized least squares analysis *DCI* was not significantly associated with rate
305 of agonism (adjusted $R^2 = 0.100$, $\beta = 1.08$, $t = 1.73$, $P = 0.101$, $\lambda = 0.650$, $N = 19$; Figure 5). The
306 high value of Pagel's lambda reaffirms the necessity to employ phylogenetic methods [21]. The
307 latter result did not change when we repeated the comparison across 1000 different phylogenetic
308 trees. Except for one tree, in which the P value was marginally below 0.1, all other 999 values
309 were above (see Figure S2 and Table S4; supplementary electronic material). Thus, based upon
310 the data that are currently available, the model's prediction of an association of rates of agonism
311 with despotism would appear unsupported.

312 Yet, inspection of Figure 5 indicates that directional consistency varies tremendously
313 across different primate clades, with the highest values shown by cercopithecines and the lowest
314 for platyrrhines and colobines. Moreover, the relationship between agonism and *DCI* seemed to
315 vary across clades, as well. A phylogenetic ANCOVA revealed that there is no main effect of the
316 rate of agonism (phylogenetic $P = 0.786$) on *DCI*; however, both taxon (phylogenetic $P < 0.001$)
317 and the interaction of agonism and taxon (phylogenetic $P = 0.012$; complete test values in Table
318 S5; supplementary electronic material) significantly affected *DCI*. In both cases (i.e.
319 cercopithecines and other primates), the relationship between rate of agonism and directional
320 consistency was positive (see regression lines in Figure 5), but the slope of the relationship was

321 significantly shallower among cercopithecines, whereas it was much steeper for all other
322 primates combined. Whether the latter is a real effect cannot be addressed at the moment, due to
323 the scarcity of data for non-cercopithecine primates, which prohibits phylogenetic analysis.
324 Nevertheless, we conducted two standard least-square regressions for cercopithecines and other
325 primates and found that in both cases the effect of rate of agonism on *DCI* was marginally
326 significant (cercopithecines: $R^2 = 0.223$, $\beta = 0.71$, $t = 1.86$, $P = 0.087$, $N = 14$; all other primates:
327 $R^2 = 0.477$, $\beta = 2.61$, $t = 2.34$, $P = 0.058$, $N = 8$; see also Figure 5).

328 Pending further data becoming available to permit thorough phylogenetic testing, these
329 results may indicate that the overall variation of directional consistency is linked to phylogenetic
330 grade shifts [119]. Within these grades there is low variation in directional consistency within
331 cercopithecines and rather high variation in other primates. The degree to which this variation is
332 linked to flexibility in rates of agonism is unknown, and may or may not be in support of the
333 predictions of the EMFSR. In either case, the different relationships between agonism and *DCI*
334 seem to mandate not only the use of phylogenetic methods, but also that the predictions need to
335 be tested within and not across clades as suggested earlier [85].

336

337 **4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

338 From this overview and our current analyses three main conclusions emerge:

339 First, past primate behaviour studies of grouping and mating systems (EMSOMS)
340 focussed on how social organisation varies with the number of females and receptivity overlap
341 [42,43,45] as well as the effects of food availability, predation, and infanticide on group size and
342 cohesion [31,35,38]. In contrast to studies in other animals, the association of ecological
343 parameters with group formation and mating systems in primates have received little attention

344 (but see [27,28]). Moreover, nonhuman primates also exhibit more variable mating systems than
345 just female defence polygyny. In all primate radiations males may singly or cooperatively defend
346 resources, in addition to females [59,62,65,68,71,72]. Thus, primate grouping and mating
347 systems are more flexible than some past analyses suggest. Whether this flexibility truly relates
348 to ecological factors and whether the EMSOMS provides the right framework remains to be
349 seen. In any case, studies clarifying the possible relationships of ecology and primate grouping
350 and mating systems would be immensely important for our understanding of the existing
351 variation and potential constraints.

352 Secondly, the EMFSR has been (rightly) criticized for implicitly assuming an
353 independence of trait variation from phylogeny [18,21,36,39]. So far, however, we are not aware
354 of any studies, other than our own, which have used data sets spanning most major primate
355 radiations using wild, unprovisioned populations. In the absence of such studies, calls for
356 abandoning the model would essentially throw out the baby with the bathwater. Before final
357 conclusions can be drawn, better ecological measures are needed [46,47,108]. To our knowledge,
358 Lloyd's extended index [109] currently seems to be the only measure that might capture the
359 ecological components necessary to test the model's prediction. Progress in this area will depend
360 on more researchers adopting this measure.

361 Lastly, we found no evidence for a link between rates of agonism and directional
362 consistency. It is, however, premature to use this result to refute one of the core assumptions of
363 the model. Our analysis clearly showed a complex picture with a strong phylogenetic signal and
364 strong phylogenetic differences across primate clades, while within clades agonism and *DCI*
365 seem to vary more or less in the predicted direction. This may indicate that, because of
366 phylogenetic grade shifts, the EMFSR has limited utility in explaining the overall variation in

367 female social relationships across the primate order or other animals. Clarifying what drives
368 these potential differences across clades seems an important task for the future. At the same time,
369 the model's utility may lie in predicting the variation in social relationships within clades [85].
370 Only additional data will allow testing of this suggestion.

371

372 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

373 We thank the conference organizers in Göttingen (Peter Kappeler and his staff) and the guest
374 editors of this issue (Dan Blumstein, Louise Barrett, Peter Kappeler, and Tim Clutton-Brock) for
375 a marvellous job. The ideas expressed in this paper and the research presented here has been
376 influenced by various colleagues particularly by inspiring discussions with Charles Janson, Carel
377 van Schaik, and Richard Wrangham. We thank Louise Barrett and two anonymous reviewers for
378 their helpful input on a previous draft of the manuscript. We furthermore thank Jennifer Burns
379 for initially collecting data on dominance hierarchies from the literature and Maria van
380 Noordwijk for providing unpublished data. CJS thanks Charlie Nunn and the AnthroTree
381 workshop for training in phylogenetic comparative methods (supported by the NSF (BCS-
382 0923791) and National Evolutionary Synthesis (NSF grant EF-0905606)). During the work on
383 this manuscript CJS was supported by a Graduate Assistantship from the College of Arts and
384 Sciences, Stony Brook University and BCW by a NSF International Research Fellowship (Grant
385 # 965074). AK and CB thank the funding agencies (primarily NSF BCS-0215542 & BCS-
386 0542035) and a whole host of helpers for supporting the work on Phayre's leaf monkeys. The
387 research in Thailand was approved by the IACUC of Stony Brook University (IDs: 20001120 to
388 20081120) and complied with the current laws of Thailand and the USA.

389

390 **REFERENCES**

- 391 1 Crook, JH, Gartlan, JS. 1966. Evolution of primate societies. *Nature* **210**, 1200-1203.
392 (doi:10.1038/2101200a0)
- 393 2 Kappeler, PM, van Schaik, CP. 2002. Evolution of primate social systems. *Int. J. Primatol.*
394 **23**, 707-740. (doi:10.1023/A:1015520830318)
- 395 3 Clutton-Brock, TH, Isvaran, K. 2006. Paternity loss in contrasting mammalian societies.
396 *Biol. Lett.* **2**, 513-516. (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2006.0531)
- 397 4 Isvaran, K, Clutton-Brock, T. 2007. Ecological correlates of extra-group paternity in
398 mammals. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **274**, 219-224. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2006.3723)
- 399 5 Lukas, D, Reynolds, V, Boesch, C, Vigilant, L. 2005. To what extent does living in a group
400 mean living with kin? *Mol. Ecol.* **14**, 2181-2196. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2005.02560.x)
- 401 6 Altmann, J, Alberts, SC, Haines, SA, Dubach, J, Muruthi, P, Coote, T, Geffen, E,
402 Cheesman, DJ, Mututua, RS, Saiyalel, SN, Wayne, RK, Lacy, RC, Bruford, MW. 1996.
403 Behavior predicts genetic structure in a wild primate group. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **93**,
404 5797-5801
- 405 7 Crook, JH. 1965. The adaptive significance of avian social organisations. *Symp. Zool. Soc.*
406 *Lond.* **14**, 181-218
- 407 8 Jarman, PJ. 1974. The social organization of antelope in relation to their ecology.
408 *Behaviour* **48**, 215-267. (doi:10.1163/156853974X00345)
- 409 9 Bradbury, JW, Vehrencamp, SL. 1977. Social organization and foraging in emballonurid
410 bats, III. mating systems. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **2**, 1-17. (doi:10.1007/bf00299284)
- 411 10 Clutton-Brock, TH. 1989. Mammalian mating systems. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **236**, 339-372.
412 (doi:10.1098/rspb.1989.0027)

- 413 11 Clutton-Brock, TH, Harvey, PH. 1978. Mammals, resources and reproductive strategies.
414 *Nature* **273**, 191-195. (doi:10.1038/273191a0)
- 415 12 Isbell, LA. 1991. Contest and scramble competition: patterns of female aggression and
416 ranging behavior among primates. *Behav. Ecol.* **2**, 143-155. (doi:10.1093/beheco/2.2.143)
- 417 13 van Schaik, CP. 1989. The ecology of social relationships amongst female primates. In
418 *Comparative socioecology: the behavioral ecology of humans and other mammals* (eds V.
419 Standen & R. A. Foley), pp. 195-218. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific.
- 420 14 Wrangham, RW. 1980. An ecological model of female-bonded primate groups. *Behaviour*
421 **75**, 262-300. (doi:10.1163/156853980X00447)
- 422 15 Emlen, ST, Oring, LW. 1977. Ecology, sexual selection, and the evolution of mating
423 systems. *Science* **197**, 215-223. (doi:10.1126/science.327542)
- 424 16 van Hooff, JARAM, van Schaik, CP. 1994. Male bonds: affiliative relationships among
425 nonhuman primate males. *Behaviour* **130**, 309-337. (doi:10.1163/156853994X00587)
- 426 17 van Schaik, CP. 1996. Social evolution in primates: the role of ecological factors and male
427 behavior. *Proc. Brit. Acad.* **88**, 9-31
- 428 18 Clutton-Brock, T, Janson, C. 2012. Primate socioecology at the crossroads: past, present,
429 and future. *Evol. Anthropol.* **21**, 136-150. (doi:10.1002/evan.21316)
- 430 19 Port, M, Kappeler, PM, Johnstone, RA. 2011. Communal defense of territories and the
431 evolution of sociality. *Am. Nat.* **178**, 787-800. (doi:10.1086/662672)
- 432 20 Di Fiore, A, Rendall, D. 1994. Evolution of social organization: a reappraisal for primates
433 by using phylogenetic methods. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **91**, 9941-9945
- 434 21 Thierry, B. 2008. Primate socioecology, the lost dream of ecological determinism. *Evol.*
435 *Anthropol.* **17**, 93-96. (doi:10.1002/evan.20168)

- 436 22 Dunbar, RIM. 1988. *Primate social systems*. London: Croom Helm.
- 437 23 Kappeler, PM. 1999. Primate socioecology: new insights from males. *Naturwissenschaften*
438 **86**, 18-29. (doi:10.1007/s001140050563)
- 439 24 Dunbar, RIM. 1995. The mating system of callitrichid primates: 1. Conclusions for the
440 coevolution of pair bonding and twinning. *Anim. Behav.* **50**, 1057-1070. (doi:10.1016/0003-
441 3472(95)80106-5)
- 442 25 Altmann, SA. 1962. A field study of the sociobiology of the rhesus monkey, *Macaca*
443 *mulatta*. *Ann. NY Acad. Sci.* **102**, 338-435
- 444 26 Rubenstein, DI. 1986. Ecology and sociality in horses and zebras. In *Ecological aspects of*
445 *social evolution: birds and mammals* (eds D. I. Rubenstein & R. W. Wrangham), pp. 282-
446 302. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 447 27 Janson, CH. 1986. The mating system as a determinant of social evolution in capuchin
448 monkeys (*Cebus*). In *Primate ecology and conservation* (eds J. G. Else & P. C. Lee), pp.
449 169-179. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 450 28 Goss-Custard, JD, Dunbar, RIM, Aldrich-Blake, FPG. 1972. Survival, mating and rearing
451 strategies in the evolution of primate social structure. *Folia Primatol.* **17**, 1-19.
452 (doi:10.1159/000155414)
- 453 29 Mitani, JC, Watts, DP, Lwanga, JS. 2002. Ecological and social correlates of chimpanzee
454 party size and composition. In *Behavioural diversity in chimpanzees and bonobos* (eds C.
455 Boesch, G. Hohmann & L. F. Marchant), pp. 102-111. Cambridge: Cambridge University
456 Press.

- 457 30 Chapman, CA, Wrangham, RW, Chapman, LJ. 1995. Ecological constraints on group size:
458 an analysis of spider monkey and chimpanzee subgroups. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **36**, 59-
459 70. (doi:10.1007/bf00175729)
- 460 31 Janson, CH. 1992. Evolutionary ecology of primate social structure. In *Evolutionary*
461 *ecology and human behavior* (eds E. A. Smith & B. Winterhalder), pp. 95-130. New York:
462 Aldine de Gruyter.
- 463 32 Janson, CH, Goldsmith, ML. 1995. Predicting group size in primates: foraging costs and
464 predation risks. *Behav. Ecol.* **6**, 326-336
- 465 33 Janson, CH. 1998. Testing the predation hypothesis for vertebrate sociality: prospects and
466 pitfalls. *Behaviour* **135**, 389-410
- 467 34 van Schaik, CP. 1983. Why are diurnal primates living in groups? *Behaviour* **87**, 120-144.
468 (doi:10.1163/156853983X00147)
- 469 35 Terborgh, J, Janson, CH. 1986. The socioecology of primate groups. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*
470 **17**, 111-135. (doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.17.1.111)
- 471 36 Shultz, S, Opie, C, Atkinson, QD. 2011. Stepwise evolution of stable sociality in primates.
472 *Nature* **479**, 219-222. (doi:10.1038/nature10601)
- 473 37 Janson, CH, van Schaik, CP. 2000. The behavioral ecology of infanticide by males. In
474 *Infanticide by males and its implications* (eds C. P. van Schaik & C. H. Janson), pp. 469-
475 494. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 476 38 van Schaik, CP, Kappeler, PM. 1997. Infanticide risk and the evolution of male-female
477 association in primates. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **264**, 1687-1694. (doi:10.1098/rspb.1997.0234)
- 478 39 Janson, CH. 2000. Primate socio-ecology: the end of a golden age. *Evol. Anthropol.* **9**, 73-
479 86. (doi:10.1002/(SICI)1520-6505(2000)9:2<73::AID-EVAN2>3.0.CO;2-X)

- 480 40 Cords, M. 1984. Mating patterns and social structure in redbtail monkeys (*Cercopithecus*
481 *ascanius*). *Z. Tierpsychol.* **64**, 313-329
- 482 41 Altmann, J. 1990. Primate males go where the females are. *Anim. Behav.* **39**, 193-195.
483 (doi:10.1016/S0003-3472(05)80740-7)
- 484 42 Mitani, JC, Gros-Louis, J, Manson, JH. 1996. Number of males in primate groups:
485 comparative tests of competing hypotheses. *Am. J. Primatol.* **38**, 315-332.
486 (doi:10.1002/(SICI)1098-2345(1996)38:4<315::AID-AJP3>3.0.CO;2-1)
- 487 43 Nunn, CL. 1999. The number of males in primate social groups: a comparative test of the
488 socioecological model. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **46**, 1-13. (doi:10.1007/s002650050586)
- 489 44 van Schaik, CP, Kappeler, PM. 1996. The social systems of gregarious lemurs: lack of
490 convergence with anthropoids due to evolutionary disequilibrium? *Ethology* **102**, 915-941.
491 (doi:10.1111/j.1439-0310.1996.tb01171.x)
- 492 45 Carnes, LM, Nunn, CL, Lewis, RJ. 2011. Effects of the distribution of female primates on
493 the number of males. *PLoS One* **6**, e19853. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0019853)
- 494 46 Vogel, ER, Janson, CH. 2007. Predicting the frequency of food-related agonism in white-
495 faced capuchin monkeys (*Cebus capucinus*), using a novel focal-tree method. *Am. J.*
496 *Primatol.* **69**, 533-550. (doi:10.1002/ajp.20368)
- 497 47 Koenig, A, Borries, C. 2006. The predictive power of socioecological models: a
498 reconsideration of resource characteristics, agonism, and dominance hierarchies. In *Feeding*
499 *ecology in apes and other primates: ecological, physiological, and behavioral aspects* (eds
500 G. Hohmann, M. M. Robbins & C. Boesch), pp. 263-284. Cambridge: Cambridge
501 University Press.

- 502 48 Kappeler, PM. 1997. Intrasexual selection and testis size in strepsirhine primates. *Behav.*
503 *Ecol.* **8**, 10-19. (doi:10.1093/beheco/8.1.10)
- 504 49 Delgado, RAJ, van Schaik, CP. 2000. The behavioral ecology and conservation of the
505 orangutan (*Pongo pygmaeus*): a tale of two islands. *Evol. Anthropol.* **9**, 201-218.
506 (doi:10.1002/(SICI)1520-6505(1998)6:4<120::AID-EVAN2>3.0.CO;2-H)
- 507 50 Charles-Dominique, P. 1977. *Ecology and behaviour of nocturnal primates*. New York:
508 Columbia University Press.
- 509 51 Bearder, SK. 1987. Lorises, bushbabies, and tarsiers: diverse societies in solitary foragers.
510 In *Primate societies* (eds B. B. Smuts, D. L. Cheney, R. M. Seyfarth, R. W. Wrangham &
511 T. T. Struhsaker), pp. 11-24. Chicago: The Chicago University Press.
- 512 52 Komers, PE, Brotherton, PNM. 1997. Female space use is the best predictor of monogamy
513 in mammals. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **264**, 1261-1270. (doi:10.1098/rspb.1997.0174)
- 514 53 Fernandez-Duque, E, Valeggia, CR, Mendoza, SP. 2009. The biology of paternal care in
515 human and nonhuman primates. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* **38**, 115-130. (doi:10.1146/annurev-
516 anthro-091908-164334)
- 517 54 Borries, C, Savini, T, Koenig, A. 2011. Social monogamy and the threat of infanticide in
518 larger mammals. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **65**, 685-693. (doi:10.1007/s00265-010-1070-5)
- 519 55 Schülke, O, Kappeler, PM. 2003. So near and yet so far: territorial pairs but low cohesion
520 between pair partners in a nocturnal lemur, *Phaner furcifer*. *Anim. Behav.* **65**, 331-343.
521 (doi:10.1006/anbe.2003.2018)
- 522 56 Koenig, A, Borries, C. 2012. Social organization and male residence patterns in Phayre's
523 leaf monkeys. In *Long-term field studies of primates* (eds P. M. Kappeler & D. P. Watts),
524 pp. 215-236. Berlin: Springer.

- 525 57 van Schaik, CP, Hörstermann, M. 1994. Predation risk and the number of adult males in a
526 primate group: a comparative test. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **35**, 261-272.
527 (doi:10.1007/BF00170707)
- 528 58 van Schaik, CP, van Hooff, JARAM. 1983. On the ultimate causes of primate social
529 systems. *Behaviour* **85**, 91-117
- 530 59 Williams, JM, Oehlert, GW, Carlis, JV, Pusey, AE. 2004. Why do male chimpanzees
531 defend a group range? *Anim. Behav.* **68**, 523-532. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2003.09.015)
- 532 60 Wilson, ML, Wrangham, RW. 2003. Intergroup relations in chimpanzees. *Annu. Rev.*
533 *Anthropol.* **32**, 363-392
- 534 61 Mitani, JC, Watts, DP, Amstler, SJ. 2010. Lethal intergroup aggression leads to territorial
535 expansion in wild chimpanzees. *Curr. Biol.* **20**, R507-R508.
536 (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2010.04.021)
- 537 62 Gibson, L, Koenig, A. 2012. Neighboring groups and habitat edges modulate range use in
538 Phayre's leaf monkeys (*Trachypithecus phayrei crepusculus*). *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **66**,
539 633-643. (doi:10.1007/s00265-011-1311-2)
- 540 63 Peres, CA. 1989. Costs and benefits of territorial defense in wild golden lion tamarins,
541 *Leontopithecus rosalia*. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **25**, 227-233. (doi:10.1007/bf00302922)
- 542 64 Peres, CA. 1992. Consequences of joint-territoriality in a mixed-species group of tamarin
543 monkeys. *Behaviour* **123**, 220-246. (doi:10.1163/156853992x00039)
- 544 65 Crofoot, MC. 2007. Mating and feeding competition in white-faced capuchins (*Cebus*
545 *capucinus*): the importance of short- and long-term strategies. *Behaviour* **144**, 1473-1495.
546 (doi:10.1163/156853907782512119)

- 547 66 Robinson, JG. 1988. Group size in wedge-capped capuchin monkeys *Cebus olivaceus* and
548 the reproductive success of males and females. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **23**, 187-197.
549 (doi:10.1007/BF00300353)
- 550 67 Scarry, CJ, Tujague, MP. 2012. Consequences of lethal intragroup aggression and alpha
551 male replacement on intergroup relations and home range use in tufted capuchin monkeys
552 (*Cebus apella nigrinus*). *Am. J. Primatol.* **74**, 804-810. (doi:10.1002/ajp.22030)
- 553 68 Scarry, CJ. 2012. The functions and consequences of intergroup aggression among
554 Argentine tufted capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella [Sapajus] nigrinus*) [Ph Dissertation].
555 Stony Brook: Stony Brook University.
- 556 69 Aureli, F, Schaffner, CM, Verpooten, J, Slater, K, Ramos-Fernandez, G. 2006. Raiding
557 parties of male spider monkeys: Insights into human warfare? *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* **131**,
558 486-497. (doi:10.1002/ajpa.20451)
- 559 70 Di Fiore, A, Link, A, Campbell, CJ. 2011. The atelines: behavioral and socioecological
560 diversity in a New World monkey radiation. In *Primates in perspective* (eds C. J. Campbell,
561 A. Fuentes, K. C. MacKinnon, S. K. Bearder & R. M. Stumpf), pp. 155-188. New York:
562 Oxford University Press.
- 563 71 Brown, M. 2011. Intergroup encounters in grey-cheeked mangabeys (*Lophocebus*
564 *alibigena*) and redtail monkeys (*Cecopithecus ascanius*): form and function [Ph
565 Dissertation]. New York: Columbia University.
- 566 72 Harris, TR. 2006. Between-group contest competition for food in a highly folivorous
567 population of black and white colobus monkeys (*Colobus guereza*). *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.*
568 **61**, 317-329. (doi:10.1007/s00265-006-0261-6)

- 569 73 Savini, T, Boesch, C, Reichard, UH. 2009. Varying ecological quality influences the
570 probability of polyandry in white-handed gibbons (*Hylobates lar*) in Thailand. *Biotropica*
571 **41**, 503-513. (doi:10.1111/j.1744-7429.2009.00507.x)
- 572 74 Thompson, CL, Norconk, MA, Whitten, PL. 2012. Why fight? Selective forces favoring
573 between-group aggression in a variably pair-living primate, the white-faced saki (*Pithecia*
574 *pithecia*). *Behaviour* **149**, 795-820. (doi:10.1163/1568539x-00003001)
- 575 75 Nievergelt, CM, Mutschler, T, Feistner, ATC. 1998. Group encounters and territoriality in
576 wild Alaotran gentle lemurs (*Hapalemur griseus alaotrensis*). *Am. J. Primatol.* **46**, 251-258.
577 (doi:10.1002/(sici)1098-2345(1998)46:3<251::aid-ajp5>3.0.co;2-h)
- 578 76 Wrangham, RW. 1979. Evolution of ape social systems. *Soc. Sci. Inform.* **18**, 335-368.
579 (doi:10.1177/053901847901800301)
- 580 77 van Schaik, CP, Dunbar, RIM. 1990. The evolution of monogamy in large primates: a new
581 hypothesis and some crucial tests. *Behaviour* **115**, 30-62. (doi:10.1163/156853990x00284)
- 582 78 Wilson, ML, Kahlenberg, SM, Wells, M, Wrangham, RW. 2012. Ecological and social
583 factors affect the occurrence and outcomes of intergroup encounters in chimpanzees. *Anim.*
584 *Behav.* **83**, 277-291. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2011.11.004)
- 585 79 Crofoot, MC, Gilby, IC, Wikelski, MC, Kays, RW. 2008. Interaction location outweighs the
586 competitive advantage of numerical superiority in *Cebus capucinus* intergroup contests.
587 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **105**, 577-581. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0707749105)
- 588 80 Kokko, H, Johnstone, RA, Clutton-Brock, TH. 2001. The evolution of cooperative breeding
589 through group augmentation. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **268**, 187-196. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2000.1349)
- 590 81 Crofoot, MC, Gilby, IC. 2012. Cheating monkeys undermine group strength in enemy
591 territory. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **109**, 501-505. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1115937109)

- 592 82 Nunn, CL. 2000. Collective benefits, free-riders, and male extra-group conflict. In *Primate*
593 *males: causes and consequences of variation in group composition* (ed P. M. Kappeler), pp.
594 192-204. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 595 83 Sterck, EHM, Watts, DP, van Schaik, CP. 1997. The evolution of female social
596 relationships in nonhuman primates. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **41**, 291-309.
597 (doi:10.1007/s002650050390)
- 598 84 Snaith, TV, Chapman, CA. 2007. Primate group size and interpreting socioecological
599 models: do folivores really play by different rules? *Evol. Anthropol.* **16**, 94-106.
600 (doi:10.1002/evan.20132)
- 601 85 Koenig, A, Borries, C. 2009. The lost dream of ecological determinism: time to say
602 goodbye? ... or a white queen's proposal? *Evol. Anthropol.* **18**, 166-174.
603 (doi:10.1002/evan.20225)
- 604 86 Broom, M, Koenig, A, Borries, C. 2009. Variation in dominance hierarchies among group-
605 living animals: modeling stability and the likelihood of coalitions. *Behav. Ecol.* **20**, 844-
606 855. (doi:10.1093/beheco/arp069)
- 607 87 Thierry, B, Aureli, F, Nunn, CL, Petit, O, Abegg, C, de Waal, FBM. 2008. A comparative
608 study of conflict resolution in macaques: insights into the nature of trait covariation. *Anim.*
609 *Behav.* **75**, 847-860. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2007.07.006)
- 610 88 Balasubramaniam, KN, Dittmar, K, Berman, CM, Butovskaya, M, Cooper, MA, Majolo, B,
611 Ogawa, H, Schino, G, Thierry, B, de Waal, FBM. 2012. Hierarchical steepness and
612 phylogenetic models: phylogenetic signals in *Macaca*. *Anim. Behav.* **83**, 1207-1218.
613 (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.02.012)

- 614 89 Henzi, SP, Barrett, L. 2007. Coexistence in female-bonded primate groups. *Adv. Stud.*
615 *Behav.* **37**, 43-81. (doi:10.1016/s0065-3454(07)37002-2)
- 616 90 Barrett, L, Henzi, SP, Weingrill, T, Lycett, JE, Hill, RA. 1999. Market forces predict
617 grooming reciprocity in female baboons. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **266**, 665-670.
618 (doi:10.1098/rspb.1999.0687)
- 619 91 Sussman, RW, Garber, PA, Cheverud, JM. 2005. Importance of cooperation and affiliation
620 in the evolution of primate sociality. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* **128**, 84-97.
621 (doi:10.1002/ajpa.20196)
- 622 92 Ménard, N. 2004. Do ecological factors explain variation in social organization. In
623 *Macaque societies: a model for the study of social organization* (eds B. Thierry, M. Singh
624 & W. Kaumanns), pp. 237-262. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 625 93 Borries, C. 1993. Ecology of female social relationships - Hanuman langurs (*Presbytis*
626 *entellus*) and the van Schaik model. *Folia Primatol.* **61**, 21-30. (doi:10.1159/000156723)
- 627 94 Hemelrijk, CK. 1999. An individual-orientated model of the emergence of despotic and
628 egalitarian societies. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **266**, 361-369
- 629 95 Thierry, B. 2000. Covariation of conflict management patterns across macaque species. In
630 *Natural conflict resolution* (eds F. Aureli & F. B. M. de Waal), pp. 106-128. Berkeley:
631 Univ California Press.
- 632 96 Barton, RA, Byrne, RW, Whiten, A. 1996. Ecology, feeding competition and social
633 structure in baboons. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **38**, 321-329. (doi:10.1007/s002650050248)
- 634 97 Mitchell, CL, Boinski, S, van Schaik, CP. 1991. Competitive regimes and female bonding
635 in two species of squirrel monkeys (*Saimiri oerstedii* and *S. sciureus*). *Behav. Ecol.*
636 *Sociobiol.* **28**, 55-60. (doi:10.1007/BF00172139)

- 637 98 Koenig, A, Beise, J, Chalise, MK, Ganzhorn, JU. 1998. When females should contest for
638 food - testing hypotheses about resource density, distribution, size, and quality with
639 Hanuman langurs (*Presbytis entellus*). *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **42**, 225-237.
640 (doi:10.1007/s002650050434)
- 641 99 Erhart, EM, Overdorff, DJ. 2008. Rates of agonism by diurnal lemuroids: implications for
642 female social relationships. *Int. J. Primatol.* **29**, 1227-1247. (doi:10.1007/s10764-008-9287-
643 0)
- 644 100 Koenig, A, Borries, C, Doran-Sheehy, DM, Janson, CH. 2006. How important are
645 affiliation and cooperation? A reply to Sussman et al. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* **131**, 522-
646 524. (doi:10.1002/ajpa.20466)
- 647 101 Koenig, A. 2002. Competition for resources and its behavioral consequences among female
648 primates. *Int. J. Primatol.* **23**, 759-783. (doi:10.1023/A:1015524931226)
- 649 102 Janson, CH. 1985. Aggressive competition and individual food consumption in wild brown
650 capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*). *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **18**, 125-138.
651 (doi:10.1007/BF00299041)
- 652 103 Vogel, ER. 2005. Rank differences in energy intake rates in white-faced capuchin monkeys,
653 *Cebus capucinus*: the effects of contest competition. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **58**, 333-344.
654 (doi:10.1007/s00265-005-0960-4)
- 655 104 Koenig, A. 2000. Competitive regimes in forest-dwelling Hanuman langur females
656 (*Semnopithecus entellus*). *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **48**, 93-109.
657 (doi:10.1007/s002650000198)

- 658 105 Sterck, EHM, Steenbeek, R. 1997. Female dominance relationships and food competition in
659 the sympatric Thomas langur and long-tailed macaque. *Behaviour* **134**, 749-774.
660 (doi:10.1163/156853997X00052)
- 661 106 Barton, RA, Whiten, A. 1993. Feeding competition among female olive baboons, *Papio*
662 *anubis*. *Anim. Behav.* **46**, 777-789. (doi:10.1006/anbe.1993.1255)
- 663 107 Phillips, KA. 1995. Foraging-related agonism in capuchin monkeys (*Cebus capucinus*).
664 *Folia Primatol.* **65**, 159-162. (doi:10.1159/000156882)
- 665 108 Vogel, ER, Janson, CH. 2011. Quantifying primate food distribution and abundance for
666 socioecological studies: an objective consumer-centered method. *Int. J. Primatol.* **32**, 737-
667 754. (doi:10.1007/s10764-011-9498-7)
- 668 109 Vogel, ER, Dominy, NJ. 2011. Measuring ecological variables for primate field studies. In
669 *Primates in perspectives* (eds C. J. Campbell, A. Fuentes, K. C. MacKinnon, S. K. Bearder
670 & R. M. Stumpf), pp. 367-377. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 671 110 Clutton-Brock, TH, Harvey, PH. 1977. Primate ecology and social organization. *J. Zool.*
672 **183**, 1-39
- 673 111 Martin, P, Bateson, P. 2007. *Measuring behaviour. An introductory guide*, 3rd edn.
674 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 675 112 van Hooff, JARAM, Wensing, JAB. 1987. Dominance and its behavioural measures in a
676 captive wolf pack. In *Man and wolf* (ed H. Frank), pp. 219-252. Dordrecht: Dr. W Junk.
- 677 113 Klass, K, Cords, M. 2011. Effect of unknown relationships on linearity, steepness and rank
678 ordering of dominance hierarchies: simulation studies based on data from wild monkeys.
679 *Behav. Process.* **88**, 168-176. (doi:10.1016/j.beproc.2011.09.003)

- 680 114 Noldus Information Technology. 2003. *MatMan, Reference Manual, Version 1.1.*
681 Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- 682 115 Quinn, GP, Keough, MJ. 2002. *Experimental design and data analysis for biologists.*
683 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 684 116 Felsenstein, J. 1988. Phylogenies from molecular sequences: inference and reliability.
685 *Annu. Rev. Genet.* **22**, 521-565. (doi:10.1146/annurev.genet.22.1.521)
- 686 117 Arnold, C, Matthews, LJ, Nunn, CL. 2010. The 10k trees website: a new online resource for
687 primate phylogeny. *Evol. Anthropol.* **19**, 114-118. (doi:10.1002/evan.20251)
- 688 118 Orme, D, Freckleton, R, Thomas, G, Petzoldt, T, Fritz, S, Nick, I. 2011. Caper: comparative
689 analyses of phylogenetics and evolution in R. R package version 0.4. [http://CRAN.R-](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=caper)
690 [project.org/package=caper](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=caper).
- 691 119 Martin, RD, Genoud, M, Hemelrijk, CK. 2005. Problems of allometric scaling analysis:
692 examples from mammalian reproductive biology. *J. Exp. Biol.* **208**, 1731-1747.
693 (doi:10.1242/jeb.01566)
- 694 120 Garland, T, Dickerman, AW, Janis, CM, Jones, JA. 1993. Phylogenetic analysis of
695 covariance by computer simulation. *Syst. Biol.* **42**, 265-292. (doi:10.2307/2992464)
696
697

698 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

699 **Figure 1.** Flow-diagram of the two main strings of ideas both dubbed the “socio-ecological
700 model”: a model relating to grouping patterns and mating systems [15] and to grouping patterns
701 and female social structure [13].

702

703 **Figure 2.** Home range size of Phayre’s leaf monkeys in relation to group size and number of
704 adult males. Depicted are annual home ranges in 2004, 2005, and 2006 for three groups (two
705 one-male groups, one multimale group). Regression lines added for demonstration purpose only.
706 one-male groups: $y = 0.22 + 0.03 * x$, multimale group: $y = 0.40 + 0.03 * x$.

707

708 **Figure 3.** Ecological conditions for within-group contest competition and predictions for
709 behavioural responses and energetic consequences, as well as their social outcomes for
710 dominance relationships and hierarchies. Predictions do not consider conditions for between-
711 group competition as they concern a separate prediction for tolerance (for details of other
712 competitive regimes see [13,83,85,101]). * - variables used in the current comparative analysis.

713

714 **Figure 4.** Rates of agonism among female nonhuman primates in relation to directional
715 consistency (*DCI*) for standard least-square regression using all 22 groups representing 19
716 populations and 16 species. Note that one triangle (*) represents two cercopithecine groups.
717 Regression line added for demonstration purpose only: $y = -0.79 + 0.87 * x$.

718

719 **Figure 5.** Rates of agonism among female nonhuman primates in relation to directional
720 consistency (*DCI*) for phylogenetic tests with one value per population using a consensus tree

721 (19 populations, 16 species): squares: platyrrhines; circles: cercopithecines; diamonds: colobines;
722 triangles: hominoids. Note that one circle (*) represents two cercopithecine populations.
723 Regressions lines are added for demonstration purpose only and represent all populations (solid
724 line: $y = -1.27 + 1.08 * x$), cercopithecines (dashed line: $y = -0.08 + 0.55 * x$), and non-
725 cercopithecines (mixed-dashed line: $y = -4.27 + 4.10 * x$).
726