

Research



Cite this article: Bracken AM, Christensen C, O’Riain MJ, Fürtbauer I, King AJ. 2022 Flexible group cohesion and coordination, but robust leader–follower roles, in a wild social primate using urban space. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **289**: 20212141.
<https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2021.2141>

Received: 29 September 2021

Accepted: 10 December 2021

Subject Category:

Global change and conservation

Subject Areas:

behaviour, ecology

Keywords:

cohesion, coordination, urban space-use, leadership, flexibility

Author for correspondence:

Anna M. Bracken

e-mail: a.m.bracken.967936@swansea.ac.uk

Electronic supplementary material is available online at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.5762484>.

Flexible group cohesion and coordination, but robust leader–follower roles, in a wild social primate using urban space

Anna M. Bracken¹, Charlotte Christensen¹, M. Justin O’Riain², Ines Fürtbauer¹ and Andrew J. King¹

¹Department of Biosciences, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Swansea University, Swansea, UK

²Institute for Communities and Wildlife in Africa, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

AMB, 0000-0002-5183-3139; CC, 0000-0001-7697-9903; MJO, 0000-0001-5233-8327; IF, 0000-0003-1404-6280; AJK, 0000-0002-6870-9767

Collective behaviour has a critical influence on group social structure and organization, individual fitness and social evolution, but we know little about whether and how it changes in anthropogenic environments. Here, we show multiple and varying effects of urban space-use upon group-level processes in a primate generalist—the chacma baboon (*Papio ursinus*)—within a managed wild population living at the urban edge in the City of Cape Town, South Africa. In natural space, we observe baboon-typical patterns of collective behaviour. By contrast, in urban space (where there are increased risks, but increased potential for high-quality food rewards), baboons show extreme flexibility in collective behaviour, with changes in spatial cohesion and association networks, travel speeds and group coordination. However, leader–follower roles remain robust across natural and urban space, with adult males having a disproportionate influence on the movement of group members. Their important role in the group’s collective behaviour complements existing research and supports the management tactic employed by field rangers of curbing the movements of adult males, which indirectly deters the majority of the group from urban space. Our findings highlight both flexibility and robustness in collective behaviour when groups are presented with novel resources and heightened risks.

1. Introduction

Owing to the challenges involved in tracking the behaviours of many individuals simultaneously, we are only just beginning to understand the collective behaviour of wild social groups [1–3] and know little about whether and how it changes in anthropogenic environments. This is an important gap in knowledge given the critical influence collective behaviours exert on group dynamics, individual fitness and social evolution [4–6] and the increasing spatial overlap between wildlife and humans worldwide [7].

Here, we present a detailed field study of whether, and how, collective behaviour changes for a primate generalist when in urban space. We studied a group of chacma baboons (*Papio ursinus*) living at the urban edge in the City of Cape Town. The group’s home-range includes natural space within Table Mountain National Park which is dominated by indigenous fynbos vegetation [8,9], and urban space comprising residential suburbs. Urban spaces are established at lower altitudes with more productive soils and hence higher primary productivity [10] and include access to high-energy anthropogenic food sources [11]. Together these attractants provide a strong motivation for baboons to urban-forage [12], which can result in negative interactions between baboons and people [13–16].

The City of Cape Town contracts a private company that deploys field rangers whose objective is to deter baboons’ from urban space using aversive conditioning

[9,15]. This management effort reduces the time the baboons spend in urban space [9,17], but can contribute to significant within-group variation in behaviour and space-use [9,13]. For example, in the group we study here, a combination of management effort and socioecological factors creates opportunities for individuals and small groups to break away from the main group and move into urban space [18]. However, the whole group does occasionally use urban space together, and these occasions offer the opportunity to directly compare baboon collective behaviour in natural and urban space.

Previous research on chacma baboon collective behaviour has shown that individuals have strong and differentiated associations [19,20] and high social cohesion [4,21]. Groups also show high synchrony in activities [22] and high-ranking socially connected individuals (in particular adult males) have a large influence on group movement decisions [13,23–26]. We therefore expected to see similar patterns of behaviour for our study group when in natural space but anticipated these patterns would alter when in urban space, for the following interconnected reasons.

First, urban space presents a fundamentally different resource and risk distribution compared to natural space [7,27–30]. This affects individuals differently depending on their phenotype (e.g. sex and age: [31–33]), with consequences for group-level patterns of behaviour. For example, changes in resources and risks can prevent individuals from foraging together at specific locations [27,34,35], exaggerating differences in motivation or hunger among individuals and creating conflicts of interest [7,36]. Specific to the Cape baboons, field rangers are also more likely to herd baboons in urban space [9,12] with a focus on the core of the group, providing opportunities for more peripheral individuals to use urban space [18]. Second, urban space is both noisier and more fragmented (e.g. roads, buildings [37–39]) than natural space, which results in group members becoming visually and acoustically isolated, increasing inter-neighbour distances [40,41]. Third, urban space can have reduced predation pressure (predators often avoid these environments: [42]) and provide opportunistic access to high-quality human food rewards [7] which can cause increased within-group competition [43,44], with implications for group cohesion and stability [45]. Together, these factors can increase the costs for individuals achieving collective behaviour in urban space [1] forcing changes in social structure, organization and functioning of groups [1,46–48]. We therefore tested three connected hypotheses with respect to baboon collective behaviour in urban space using high-resolution GPS collar data that we collected for the majority of adults in the group.

We expected the baboons to show decreased social cohesion in urban space compared to natural space (hypothesis 1) [46,48,49], owing to high fission–fusion dynamics [18] along with a lack of natural predators [50], which we anticipated would heighten inter-individual conflicts of interest [51]. We predicted the group would be spread over a larger area when in urban space compared to natural space, resulting in increased modularity (i.e. greater clustering) of association networks [46]. To test these predictions, we examined the area [52,53], shape [54,55] and spread [56–58] of the group when in natural and urban space, and built networks describing patterns of spatial associations among individuals [46,59]. If association networks are interrupted and modular then we expected poorer whole group coordination [24,56,60] in urban space compared to natural space (hypothesis 2), as

alignment in travel speed and direction would be difficult for individuals to maintain over large distances (though coordination among local neighbours in clusters may be increased). We therefore predicted more variable group travel speeds, turning angles and alignment across all individuals [56,61–63] in urban space compared to natural space. Finally, we expected the influence of certain individuals on group members' movement to be reduced in urban space compared to natural space (hypothesis 3). Specifically, previous studies of chacma baboon groups in this and other populations have highlighted the importance of adult males in influencing the movement patterns of group members [13,23,25,26]. Here, we expected male leadership to be reduced in urban space because of a limited opportunity to influence neighbour behaviour. To test this prediction, we used an automated procedure that quantifies local leadership events [64]. This is based on the relative movements of pairs of individuals where a successful 'leader' initiates movement away from, and is followed by, another individual. An aggregation of all leader–follower events across dyads therefore represents each individual's relative 'influence' over group member movement patterns at a defined spatial scale.

2. Methods

(a) Study site and subjects

We studied the 'Da Gama group', in the City of Cape Town, South Africa. The group comprised two adult males, 19 adult females and approximately 30 subadults, juveniles and infants. The group was studied from July to November 2018, and for this study, we use data collected mainly during the austral winter (July–September) when our GPS collars were active (see GPS data) and when the Peninsula baboons tend to use urban spaces more frequently [65]. Details on how we defined urban and natural space, and the time baboons spent within these are provided in the electronic supplementary material, methods. Dominance ranks for all adult individuals were calculated from direct observations of aggressive interactions (displacements, chases and aggressive displays), following the clear submission of one individual, collected *ad libitum* over 78 days of group follows, as described in previous works [18,66] and in the electronic supplementary material, methods.

(b) GPS data

We fitted $n = 16$ adult baboons with SHOAL group in-house constructed collars (F2HKv3), recording GPS positions at 1 fix s^{-1} between 8.00–20.00 local time (GiPSy 5 tags, TechnoS-mArt, Italy). One collar was not found after automatic release and two collars failed to record GPS data, resulting in data for $n = 13$ baboons (electronic supplementary material, table S1). To test our hypotheses, we used GPS data collected between 8.00–18.00 local time, when 10 or more collars were recording. Further details on why these criteria were used, and the accuracy and post-processing of GPS data, are provided in the electronic supplementary material, methods.

(c) Social cohesion (hypothesis 1)

To test for differences in social cohesion when baboons were in urban and natural space we calculated: (i) convex hull area and perimeter; (ii) mean nearest neighbour distance; (iii) mean distance to the group centroid; and (iv) group stretch and sphericity, using the package 'swaRm' in R [67]. Convex hull area may be particularly sensitive to missing individuals [68]. To test for differences in spatial association networks, we

extracted two commonly used metrics: eigenvector centrality and strength [46,59], calculated based upon baboon associations in urban and natural space. Association networks were constructed using the 'SpatSoc' package in R [69]. Baboon GPS fixes were grouped spatio-temporally, where individuals within 5 m and 1 min of one another were assumed to be in association using the 'chain rule' [70]. Network edges were weighted using the simple ratio index. We also used the walktrap community algorithm ('cluster_walktrap', 'igraph' package, R [71]) to identify clusters of densely connected individuals in the networks using random walks, where individuals within a cluster have stronger ties than between clusters [46]. A modularity score, Q , is given for each cluster. Additionally, to identify the times when the baboons were commonly within the vicinity of one another (or in discrete groups), we created spatio-temporal groupings within 1 min and 150 m, using the 'SpatSoc' package in R [69]. A spatial threshold of 150 m was chosen as it is larger than common group spread on the Cape Peninsula [10].

(d) Group coordination (hypothesis 2)

To test for differences in group coordination in urban and natural space we calculated: (i) speed of the group centroid; (ii) mean linear speed across individuals; (iii) standard error in linear speed; (iv) standard error in heading angle; and (v) polarization of the group (alignment of individuals in direction of travel, going from 0: not aligned to 1: aligned), using the package 'swaRm' in R [67]. We also calculated polarization of identified subgroups (less than 150 m; electronic supplementary material, figure S4) in urban space.

(e) Leadership (hypothesis 3)

To investigate the influence of certain individuals on group members' movement we calculated leader–follower networks by identifying 'pulls' between baboon dyads, using functions as developed in [64] and made available at: <http://crofoot.ucdavis.edu>. These functions identify sequences in which one individual (the 'leader') initiates movement away from another individual (the potential 'follower'), who then either joins the first individual (this would be a successful 'pull') or remains where they are and the leader returns (an unsuccessful 'anchor'), within a predetermined distance threshold (figure 2*i*). The 'disparity' and 'strength' thresholds were set at 0.1, as used in Strandburg-Peshkin *et al.* [64]. In our main results, we present analyses using 5 m thresholds, as used in [64], but also tested different distance thresholds; these results are presented in the electronic supplementary material, tables S2 and S3. For each distance threshold, we created $N \times N$ matrices (using successful 'pulls' in natural and urban space), where 'leaders' are rows and 'followers' are columns, with the frequency of dyadic pulls in a cell, for natural and urban data. We then created directed leader–follower networks using the package 'igraph' in R [71] and extracted directed eigenvector centrality in the network as a measure of the relative importance of individuals in influencing others movements and leading groups: a measure used previously in studies investigating leader–follower dynamics [72,73].

(f) Statistical analyses

To examine differences in collective properties between urban and natural space (see parameters above), we fitted linear models using generalized least squares ('gls' function in 'nlme' package, R [74]), while fitting a temporal autocorrelation structure to account for the high resolution of the data. Because of the difference in sample sizes between urban space and natural space (the natural dataset was 48× larger than the urban dataset; see the electronic supplementary material, methods), we bootstrapped all models with 48 repetitions, randomly sampling from the natural dataset for the number of minutes recorded in

the urban dataset. We extracted model coefficients at each iteration, averaged each coefficient (across iterations) and calculated 95% confidence intervals for the bootstrapped data. We log-transformed (using the natural log) the following variables to meet normality criteria: convex hull area, convex hull perimeter, mean nearest neighbour distance, mean distance to the group centroid, speed of the group centroid and mean linear speed, which was assessed using graphical procedures (Q–Q plots and standardized residuals versus predicted values).

To examine differences between urban and natural space in association and leader–follower networks, we used generalized linear mixed models (GLMMs) ('lmer' function in 'lme4' package, R [75]) and fitted network strength (association networks) and eigenvector centrality (both association and leader–follower networks) as response variables. We fitted individual baboon identity as a random effect, and standardized dominance rank as a fixed effect to control respectively for repeated values of individual and the effect of dominance rank (which is strongly correlated with association network metrics in natural space: [18], and leader–follower network metrics in both settings: figure 2*h*). Best-performing models were selected by Akaike information criteria. Model fit was checked using graphical procedures (Q–Q plot and standardized residuals versus predicted values). We tested for correlations between variables using Spearman's rank correlation, and tested for correlations among dyadic associations or interactions in urban and natural space using matrix correlations (Spearman's rank).

3. Results

(a) Social cohesion (hypothesis 1)

Baboons were farther apart from one another in urban compared to natural space (nearest neighbour distance: urban: 30.47 ± 1.21 m, natural: 11.96 ± 0.21 m (hereafter median \pm s.e.), $p < 0.001$; table 1 and figure 1*a*) resulting in greater average distance to the group centroid (urban: 129.15 ± 3.63 m, natural: 36.11 ± 1.47 m, $p < 0.001$; table 1), and increased group spread when in urban space (convex hull area: urban: 38379.36 ± 2511.88 m², natural: 3733.90 ± 233.68 m², $p < 0.001$; convex hull perimeter: urban: 947.26 ± 23.57 m, natural: 282.95 ± 7.74 m, $p < 0.001$; table 1 and figure 1*c*). In urban space baboons were rarely all found within 150 m of each other (figure 1*b*) and were often in dispersed subgroups (figure 1*d*; electronic supplementary material, video S1). By contrast, in natural space baboons were often found within 150 m of each other and rarely in dispersed subgroups (figure 1*b,e*; electronic supplementary material, video S1). Moreover, where small subgroups or single individuals were identified within 150 m in natural space, this was probably owing to baboons travelling alone or in small groups in and out of urban space (electronic supplementary material, figure S2). The group split into a maximum of five subgroups at any one time point in urban space (electronic supplementary material, figure S4). Despite differences in group cohesion, group shape did not differ between urban and natural space, with the group having similar 'sphericity' (i.e. closer to circle shape) (urban: 0.449 ± 0.010 , natural: 0.382 ± 0.001 , $p = 0.098$; table 1), and 'stretch' (urban: -0.344 ± 0.049 , natural: -0.308 ± 0.007 , $p = 0.698$; table 1) in both spaces. Full model outputs are provided in table 1.

Spatial association networks differed between urban and natural space (figure 2*a,c*) with the network in urban space displaying lower density and higher modularity (density = 0.718; $Q = 0.429$) compared to the network in natural space (density = 1; $Q = 0.118$), reflecting lower cohesion in urban space (figure 1) where baboons are further apart (figure 1*a*,

Table 1. Results of a non-parametric bootstrap (48 iterations) of a generalized least-squares model for the effect of space (urban, natural) on each of 11 collective parameters of a baboon group living on the urban edge in Cape Town, South Africa. (Estimates, *t*-values and *p*-values are the mean average taken across bootstrap iterations, 95% confidence intervals (CI) indicate the 95% distribution of the estimates, and standard errors represent the error around the estimates. 'Log' indicates the natural log scale. With the exception of 'stretch', positive estimates indicate a parameter increase in urban space and negative estimates indicate a parameter decrease in urban space. 'Stretch' decreases in urban space despite a positive estimate. Significant terms are given in italics (*p*-values below 0.05).)

model	estimate	s.e.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> -value	95% CI	
<i>social cohesion parameters</i>						
convex hull area (log)	2.295	0.015	17.262	<0.001	2.108	2.481
convex hull perimeter (log)	1.085	0.008	15.042	<0.001	0.986	1.191
mean nearest neighbour distance (log)	0.846	0.007	8.481	<0.001	0.773	0.937
mean distance to group centroid (log)	1.083	0.007	14.132	<0.001	0.972	1.192
sphericity	0.046	0.001	1.886	0.098	0.019	0.070
stretch	0.036	0.006	0.316	0.698	-0.039	0.118
<i>group coordination parameters</i>						
speed of group centroid (log)	0.426	0.132	3.636	0.005	0.252	0.588
mean speed (log)	0.655	0.007	7.712	<0.001	0.567	0.746
standard error in speed (log)	0.796	0.007	9.195	<0.001	0.720	0.913
standard error in heading	0.035	0.001	3.152	0.009	0.020	0.049
polarization	-0.124	0.001	-6.353	<0.001	-0.146	-0.108

c) and more frequently in subgroups (figure 1*b,d*). These network differences result in different individual-level network statistics. Individuals' association network strength was significantly lower in urban space (median: 0.108, range: 0.048–0.245) compared to natural space (median: 0.339, range: 0.228–0.545) (GLMM: estimate \pm s.e. = -0.214 ± 0.023 , $p < 0.001$). While individual eigenvector centrality scores for the association network were similar in both urban and natural space (GLMM: estimate \pm s.e. = -0.055 ± 0.080 , $p = 0.504$), the positive correlation between eigenvector centrality and dominance rank was absent in urban space (Spearman's rank correlation: natural: $\rho = 0.481$, $p = 0.096$; urban: $\rho = 0.160$, $p = 0.603$). Additionally, dyadic relationships present in natural space were retained in urban space (Spearman's rank correlation: $\rho = 0.445$, $p < 0.001$).

(b) Coordination (hypothesis 2)

The speed of the group centroid was higher in urban space compared to natural space (urban: $0.08 \pm 0.01 \text{ m s}^{-1}$, natural: $0.05 \pm 0.00 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ (hereafter median \pm s.e.), $p = 0.005$; table 1). The group mean speed was also higher in urban space compared to natural space (urban: $0.16 \pm 0.01 \text{ m s}^{-1}$, natural: $0.09 \pm 0.00 \text{ m s}^{-1}$, $p < 0.001$; table 1), and was more variable (urban: 0.07 ± 0.00 , natural: 0.03 ± 0.00 , $p < 0.001$; table 1). Variation in baboons' headings was greater in urban space compared to natural space (urban: 0.533 ± 0.006 , natural: 0.505 ± 0.001 , $p = 0.009$; table 1) resulting in reduced polarization in urban space (urban: 0.290 ± 0.010 , natural: 0.401 ± 0.002 , $p < 0.001$; table 1). The positive relationship between polarization and speed—where polarization increases when the group travels quickly towards a shared destination—was present in urban and natural space (electronic supplementary material, figure S3*a,b*) but this relationship was weaker in urban space (mean speed \times urban space: estimate \pm s.e. = -0.837 ± 0.108 , $t = -7.751$, $p < 0.001$; electronic supplementary material, figure S3*a*). Similarly, polarization increased with increasing standard error in speed (electronic

supplementary material, figure S3*c,d*), but this relationship was weaker in urban space (standard error in speed \times urban space: estimate \pm s.e. = -2.631 ± 0.502 , $t = -5.204$, $p < 0.001$; electronic supplementary material, figure S3*c*). Finally, the increasing number of subgroups in urban space had no effect on whole group polarization (estimate \pm s.e. = -0.002 ± 0.013 , $t = -0.168$, $p = 0.867$), though polarization within subgroups was greater than whole group polarization (electronic supplementary material, figure S4). This was attributed to greater coordination between dyads (electronic supplementary material, figures S5 and S6), rather than an artefact of calculating polarization over fewer individuals.

(c) Leadership (hypothesis 3)

Leader–follower networks differed between urban and natural space (figure 2*b,d*) with the network in urban space displaying a lower density (density = 0.942) than the network in natural space (density = 1). Leadership eigenvector centrality was significantly correlated with dominance rank in natural space (Spearman's rank correlation: $\rho = 0.724$, $p = 0.005$, $n = 13$; figure 2*h*), and this relationship was maintained in urban space (Spearman's rank correlation: $\rho = 0.751$, $p = 0.003$, $n = 13$; figure 2*h*). Leadership eigenvector centrality scores were significantly lower in urban space (median: 0.677, range: 0.163–1.000) compared to natural space (median: 0.853, range: 0.412–1.000) (GLMM: estimate \pm s.e. = -0.143 ± 0.029 , $p < 0.001$). Dyads with many leader–follower events in natural space (figure 2*b*) also had more frequent leader–follower events in urban space (figure 2*d*) (Spearman's rank correlation: $\rho = 0.788$, $p < 0.001$), and leader–follower networks (figure 2*b,d*) were correlated with spatial association networks (figure 2*a,c*) (Spearman's rank correlation: natural: $\rho = 0.436$, $p < 0.001$; urban: $\rho = 0.191$, $p = 0.010$). However, individual eigenvector centrality values in association and leadership networks were not correlated (Spearman's rank correlation: natural: $\rho = 0.538$, $p = 0.061$; urban: $\rho = 0.032$, $p = 0.921$).




Figure 1. Reduced baboon group cohesion in urban compared to natural space. (a) Frequency density plot for mean inter-baboon distances (natural log scale); (b) frequency density plot for number of baboons observed within 150 m of each other; (c) frequency density plot for baboon group convex hull perimeter (natural log scale). In (a–c), data are shown for baboons in natural (green) and urban (grey) space. Panels (d) and (e) show satellite images of baboons in a suburb of Cape Town, and in the natural space surrounding this suburb, respectively. Baboon locations (identified by coloured dots) are overlaid, and white circles of 150 m diameter (as shown in (b)) illustrate differences in group cohesion at these example moments. (Online version in colour.)

4. Discussion

We provide evidence that chacma baboon social cohesion and coordination breaks down in urban space. Although the collared individuals of the Da Gama group only spend 2% of their daytime as a group in the urban space, their social behaviour is significantly altered when compared with their behaviour in natural space. In particular, the group was more spread out, less cohesive, with a higher clustering into subgroups when in urban space. The group also attained higher speeds, had a greater error in heading, and were less polarized in urban space. These findings therefore support our first two hypotheses regarding association networks being interrupted and interactions among individuals being constrained. However, we found only partial support for our third hypothesis regarding the disruption of leadership roles: though leader–follower networks were interrupted in urban space, dominance related leader–follower roles were retained. We discuss each of our findings in turn.

Baboon social cohesion and association networks were significantly reduced in urban space, supporting our first hypothesis. This finding is in line with recent research

examining the influence of human proximity on social and spatial relationships in moor macaques [46], where groups are less cohesive, and individual social relationships constrained, when near to humans. Urban environments are heterogeneous and unpredictable [76], with patchy food sources and high levels of contact with humans (in our group, this includes both residents and rangers). Previous research indicates that when there is high spatial variability in the environment (for example, in food patches or predation risks), there is a greater scope for inter-individual conflicts of interest, and groups are predicted to fission into subgroups of individuals with similar requirements [13,60]. It is likely that this is what we are seeing for the Da Gama group: conflicts in motivation between individuals when in the urban space cause a splitting of the group into subgroups and, with a lack of natural predators, this is preferable to social cohesion [7]. Indeed, we found greater inter-baboon distances, greater individual distances to the group centre, and a larger group spread in the urban space, as well as a retention of spatial associations and leader–follower interactions at the dyadic level in urban space. Moreover, the spread of the group in urban space had an uneven distribution. Individuals were often seen in dispersed subgroups,




Figure 2. Interrupted networks in urban space, but retention of leader–follower roles. (a) Baboon association network (undirected) and (b) leader–follower network (directed) in natural space. (c) Baboon association network (undirected) and (d) leadership network (directed) in urban space. In (a–d), high to low eigenvector centrality is represented by large to small circle sizes, and high to low dominance rank from dark to light colours. (e) Relationship (not statistically significant) between association network eigenvector centrality (undirected) for baboons when in natural and urban space. (f) Relationship (statistically significant) between leadership network eigenvector centrality (directed) for baboons when in natural and urban space. (g) Trend for higher dominance-ranked baboons being more central in the association network (undirected) in natural space, but not in urban space. (h) Higher-ranked baboons are more central in the leadership network (directed) in both urban and natural space. (i) Five baboons: the orange baboon is the blue baboon's closest spatial neighbour, within a 5 m radius (shown by the light blue circle). If two baboons are often observed within 5 m of each other they will have a strong link in (a) and (c). If the blue baboon (initiator) moves greater than 5 m away from a group member who then follows by greater than 5 m (orange baboon, follower), then this is considered a local leadership event, where one baboon influences the movement of another. Baboons with greatest influence on others' movements will have high eigenvector centrality in (b) and (d). (Online version in colour.)

which translated into sparser urban spatial networks (network 'strength' was significantly reduced in urban space) with a higher cluster modularity score than natural spatial networks. This is further evidenced by the multi-modal distribution of urban inter-individual distances, which has recently been used to determine 'units' in multi-level societies [77], and here represents a greater clustering of individuals in urban space.

Baboon group coordination was disrupted because of fragmentation of the collective structure in urban space, providing support for our second hypothesis. The group was observed travelling at higher speeds and group members were more variable in their speed and heading, resulting in a less polarized group in urban as opposed to natural space. Because the group is spread out and clustered into subgroups in the urban space, it follows that travel direction and speed are highly variable across individuals. Previous research on the Cape baboons has found that, when using urban space, adult males adopt a 'sit and wait strategy', spending a lot of time close to the urban edge and then making high-activity forays into urban space [11]. High speed in urban space is presumably indicative of high risk, and is probably the result of individuals

quickly monopolizing patchy high caloric food sources and subsequently being exposed to risks from residents, dogs, rangers, etc. Indeed, the relationship between speed and polarization (as group speed increases, so does group polarization: [78]), was significantly reduced in comparison to natural space (electronic supplementary material, figure S3ab). This indicates that individuals are less polarized in travel direction while travelling at high speeds in urban space compared to natural space. This is probably owing to group fragmentation in the urban space; here, within-subgroup polarization was greater than whole group polarization (electronic supplementary material, figure S4), indicating that while subgroups align in collective motion, whole group alignment is reduced. Polarization also increased with increasing error in speed in natural space (electronic supplementary material, figure S3d) and this relationship was reduced in urban space (electronic supplementary material, figure S3c); higher values of standard error in speed were associated with lower values of polarization more commonly than in natural space. Together these results may be indicative of subgroups aligning in travel direction when moving off independently of one another—resulting in low whole group coordination in movement.

In the case of our third hypothesis, we found that, though leader–follower networks were interrupted, and leadership eigenvector centrality was significantly reduced in urban space, leadership roles as predicted by dominance rank remained stable. This finding therefore offers partial support for our final hypothesis. The retention of dominance-related leadership in urban space—where the group tended to be fragmented and poorly coordinated—is surprising but highlights the importance of high-ranked, socially-connected individuals upon the movement patterns of group members, which is seen throughout the species range. Indeed, in other populations, dominant individuals (namely, high-ranking adult males) have a strong influence on group movement, and therefore collective movement decisions [13,23,25,26,72,79]. However, because our study troop has just two adult males, they may be afforded more opportunity to elicit followers.

High-ranking individuals are more successful than other group members at making movement initiations across both natural and urban space. Movement initiations are extracted regardless of inter-individual distance within a dyad (see the electronic supplementary material, methods), which means that even if the group is fragmented and poorly coordinated, fine-scale movement is still captured. In this way, we see that leadership is robust to other social changes seen in urban space; or, put another way, leader–follower dynamics are density independent [5,51,60]. However, using different spatial criteria for identifying leadership ‘pulls’ did reveal that in urban space, the greater influence on group movements by dominant individuals is present for movement initiations at up to 20 m, whereas in natural space they only occur for movements of up to 5 m (electronic supplementary material, table S3). This shows that group members tend to follow high-ranking individuals in urban space at a more global scale. In both cases group members are responding to initiations, but in urban space other individuals tend to be further away (mean nearest-neighbour distances are more than doubled in urban space, and baboons tend to only have a few neighbours even at distances of 20 m: electronic supplementary material, figure S8).

Our finding that this chacma baboon group exhibits leader–follower dynamics structured by dominance rank differs to the findings in olive baboons (*Papio anubis*), where dominant individuals do not strongly influence group movement decisions [64]. However, it is important to note that we use the leader–follower data in a different way to the Strandburg-Peshkin *et al.* [64] study. There, the authors took the leader–follower information and used this to explore collective movement decisions when baboons were faced with different options regarding where to travel. Here, we examined an individual’s influence on other baboons’ behaviour by creating leader–follower networks based upon pulls across the whole dataset. It would therefore be informative to compare both datasets at different scales (i.e. different threshold distances

with shorter or longer lag times between movement) and for different types of movement events, to examine how collective movement is shaped by differences in context or species.

Together, our results demonstrate how chacma baboons in the Cape Peninsula have adapted to exploit urban space, adopting lower group cohesion and smaller group sizes, which we expect reduces competition for high-quality, patchy food resources [27] and increases their chance of evading rangers who attempt to deter them from urban space (A.M. Bracken, C. Christensen 2018, personal observation). The current work therefore provides further evidence of how social flexibility allows animals to cope with accelerated human-induced changes to their environment [27,46], and provides a basis for understanding these responses in other species. Future work could further examine leader–follower dynamics in wildlife groups inhabiting urban space, identifying when key decisions are made and how and when groups split and reform [80]. Alongside this, a more in-depth investigation into inter-individual differences in movement in urban environments may uncover how predictable individuals are when using these landscapes [81].

Ethics. To fit collars, a veterinarian anesthetized baboons after cage trapping, in accordance with local protocols. Collars were approved by Swansea University’s Ethics Committee (IP-1314-5), weighed a mean of 2.2% baboon body mass (range 1.2%–2.6%), and were fitted with a drop-off mechanism (version CR-7, Telonics, Inc.) to reduce the need for recapture.

Data accessibility. All data and code required to reproduce analyses are included with the paper.

Authors’ contributions. A.M.B.: conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, visualization, writing—original draft; C.C.: data curation, investigation, methodology, writing—review and editing; M.J.O.: project administration, writing—review and editing; I.F.: funding acquisition, methodology, project administration, resources, supervision, writing—review and editing; A.J.K.: conceptualization, funding acquisition, methodology, project administration, resources, supervision, visualization, writing—review and editing. All authors gave final approval for publication and agreed to be held accountable for the work performed therein.

Competing interests. We declare we have no competing interests.

Funding. This research was supported by grants (awarded to A.J.K.) from Swansea University’s College of Science and the Association for the Study of Animal Behaviour (ASAB). M.J.O. was supported by NRF incentive funding. A.M.B. and C.C. were supported by College of Science/Swansea University PhD scholarships.

Acknowledgements. Fieldwork was approved by the Baboon Technical Team (BTT) in the Cape Peninsula and by a Research Agreement with South African National Parks (SANParks). We thank Gaëlle Fehlmann, Phil Hopkins and Mark Holton for help and advice with building the tracking collars. We thank Human Wildlife Solutions and their rangers, veterinarian Dorothy Breed, Gary Buhrman and Esme Beamish for their assistance in the field; and Lucy Robertson, Charlotte Solman and Francesca Marshall-Stochmal for assistance with fieldwork. A.M.B. thanks Alexis Malagnino for his help and advice with GPS processing, A.J.K. and I.F. thank Layla King for her support. Thanks to two anonymous referees and editors for their constructive feedback which improved the manuscript.

References

1. King AJ, Fehlmann G, Biro D, Ward AJ, Fürtbauer I. 2018 Re-wilding collective behaviour: an ecological perspective. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **33**, 347–357. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2018.03.004)
2. Hughey LF, Hein AM, Strandburg-Peshkin A, Jensen FH. 2018 Challenges and solutions for studying collective animal behaviour in the wild. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **373**, 20170005. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2017.0005)
3. Kays R, Crofoot MC, Jetz W, Wikelski M. 2015 Terrestrial animal tracking as an eye on life and planet. *Science* **348**, 6240. (doi:10.1126/science.aaa2478)

4. Kappeler PM, van Schaik CP. 2002 Evolution of primate social systems. *Int. J. Primatol.* **23**, 707–740. (doi:10.1023/A:1015520830318)
5. King AJ, Johnson DD, Van Vugt M. 2009 The origins and evolution of leadership. *Curr. Biol.* **19**, 911–916. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2009.07.027)
6. Kerth G. 2010 Group decision-making in animal societies. In *Animal behaviour: evolution and mechanisms* (ed. P Kappeler), pp. 241–265. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
7. Fehlmann G, O'Riain MJ, Fürtbauer I, King AJ. 2021 Behavioral causes, ecological consequences, and management challenges associated with wildlife foraging in human-modified landscapes. *Bioscience* **71**, 40–54. (doi:10.1093/biosci/biaa129)
8. Hoffman TS, O'Riain MJ. 2011 The spatial ecology of chacma baboons (*Papio ursinus*) in a human-modified environment. *Int. J. Primatol.* **32**, 308–328. (doi:10.1007/s10764-010-9467-6)
9. van Doorn AC, O'Riain MJ. 2020 Nonlethal management of baboons on the urban edge of a large metropole. *Am. J. Primatol.* **82**, e23164. (doi:10.1002/ajp.23164)
10. Hoffman TS, O'Riain MJ. 2012 Landscape requirements of a primate population in a human-dominated environment. *Front. Zool.* **9**, 1. (doi:10.1186/1742-9994-9-1)
11. Fehlmann G, O'Riain MJ, Kerr-Smith C, Hailes S, Luckman A, Shepard ELC, King AJ. 2017 Extreme behavioural shifts by baboons exploiting risky, resource-rich, human-modified environments. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 15057. (doi:10.1038/s41598-017-14871-2)
12. Fehlmann G, O'Riain MJ, Kerr-Smith C, King AJ. 2017 Adaptive space use by baboons (*Papio ursinus*) in response to management interventions in a human-changed landscape. *Anim. Conserv.* **20**, 101–109. (doi:10.1111/acv.12293)
13. Kaplan BS, O'Riain MJ, van Eeden R, King AJ. 2011 A low-cost manipulation of food resources reduces spatial overlap between baboons (*Papio ursinus*) and humans in conflict. *Int. J. Primatol.* **32**, 1397–1412. (doi:10.1007/s10764-011-9541-8)
14. Hoffman TS. 2011 The spatial ecology of chacma baboons (*Papio ursinus*) in the Cape Peninsula, South Africa: towards improved management and conservation strategies. Doctoral thesis, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa.
15. Hoffman TS, O'Riain MJ. 2012 Monkey management: using spatial ecology to understand the extent and severity of human–baboon conflict in the Cape Peninsula, South Africa. *Ecol. Soc.* **17**, 13. (doi:10.5751/ES-04882-170313)
16. Beamish EK, O'Riain MJ. 2014 The effects of permanent injury on the behavior and diet of commensal chacma baboons (*Papio ursinus*) in the Cape Peninsula, South Africa. *Int. J. Primatol.* **35**, 1004–1020. (doi:10.1007/s10764-014-9779-z)
17. Fehlmann G, O'Riain MJ, Kerr-Smith C, Hailes AL, Holton M, Hopkins P, Shepard ELC, King AJ. 2017 The application of behavioural studies for the effective management of Cape Peninsula baboons in conflict with people. PhD thesis, Swansea University, Swansea, UK.
18. Bracken AM, Christensen C, O'Riain MJ, Fehlmann G, Holton MD, Hopkins PW, Fürtbauer I, King AJ. In press. Socioecology explains individual variation in urban space use in response to management in Cape Chacma Baboons (*Papio ursinus*). *Int. J. Primatol.* (doi:10.1007/s10764-021-00247-x)
19. Silk JB, Beehner JC, Bergman TJ, Crockford C, Eng AL, Moscovice LR, Wittig RM, Seyfarth RM, Cheney DL. 2010 Strong and consistent social bonds enhance the longevity of female baboons. *Curr. Biol.* **20**, 1359–1361. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2010.05.067)
20. Cheney DL, Silk JB, Seyfarth RM. 2016 Network connections, dyadic bonds and fitness in wild female baboons. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* **3**, 160255. (doi:10.1098/rsos.160255)
21. Lehmann J, Korstjens A, Dunbar R. 2007 Group size, grooming and social cohesion in primates. *Anim. Behav.* **74**, 1617–1629. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2006.10.025)
22. King AJ, Cowlshaw G. 2009 All together now: behavioural synchrony in baboons. *Anim. Behav.* **78**, 1381–1387. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2009.09.009)
23. King AJ, Douglas CMS, Huchard E, Isaac NJB, Cowlshaw G. 2008 Dominance and affiliation mediate despotism in a social primate. *Curr. Biol.* **18**, 1833–1838. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2008.10.048)
24. King AJ, Sueur C. 2011 Where next? Group coordination and collective decision making by primates. *Int. J. Primatol.* **32**, 1245–1267. (doi:10.1007/s10764-011-9526-7)
25. Stueckle S, Zinner D. 2008 To follow or not to follow: decision making and leadership during the morning departure in chacma baboons. *Anim. Behav.* **75**, 1995–2004. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2007.12.012)
26. Sueur C. 2011 Group decision-making in chacma baboons: leadership, order and communication during movement. *BMC Ecol.* **11**, 1–14. (doi:10.1186/1472-6785-11-26)
27. Lowry H, Lill A, Wong BBM. 2013 Behavioural responses of wildlife to urban environments. *Biol. Rev.* **88**, 537–549. (doi:10.1111/bvr.12012)
28. McKinney ML. 2002 Urbanization, biodiversity, and conservation: the impacts of urbanization on native species are poorly studied, but educating a highly urbanized human population about these impacts can greatly improve species conservation in all ecosystems. *Bioscience* **52**, 883–890. (doi:10.1641/0006-3568(2002)052[0883:UBAC]2.0.CO;2)
29. Shochat E, Warren PS, Faeth SH, McIntyre NE, Hope D. 2006 From patterns to emerging processes in mechanistic urban ecology. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **21**, 186–191. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2005.11.019)
30. Prange S, Gehrt SD, Wiggers EP. 2004 Influences of anthropogenic resources on raccoon (*Procyon lotor*) movements and spatial distribution. *J. Mammal.* **85**, 483–490. (doi:10.1644/1383946)
31. Dowding CV, Harris S, Poulton S, Baker PJ. 2010 Nocturnal ranging behaviour of urban hedgehogs, *Erinaceus europaeus*, in relation to risk and reward. *Anim. Behav.* **80**, 13–21. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.04.007)
32. Merkle JA, Robinson HS, Krausman PR, Alaback P. 2013 Food availability and foraging near human developments by black bears. *J. Mammal.* **94**, 378–385. (doi:10.1644/12-MAMM-A-002.1)
33. Maibeche Y, Moali A, Yahi N, Menard N. 2015 Is diet flexibility an adaptive life trait for relic and peri-urban populations of the endangered primate *Macaca sylvanus*? *PLoS ONE* **10**, e0118596. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0118596)
34. Nonaka E, Holme P. 2007 Agent-based model approach to optimal foraging in heterogeneous landscapes: effects of patch clumpiness. *Ecography* **30**, 777–788. (doi:10.1111/j.2007.0906-7590.05148.x)
35. Kazahari N, Agetsuma N. 2008 Social factors enhancing foraging success of a wild group of Japanese macaques (*Macaca fuscata*) in a patchy food environment. *Behaviour* **145**, 843–860. (doi:10.1163/156853908783929188)
36. Jolles JW, King AJ, Killen SS. 2019 The role of individual heterogeneity in collective animal behaviour. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **35**, 278–291. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2019.11.001)
37. Lister N-M, Brocki M, Ament R. 2015 Integrated adaptive design for wildlife movement under climate change. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* **13**, 493–502. (doi:10.1890/150080)
38. Taylor BD, Goldingay RL. 2010 Roads and wildlife: impacts, mitigation and implications for wildlife management in Australia. *Wildlife Res.* **37**, 320–331. (doi:10.1071/WR09171)
39. Rondinini C, Doncaster C. 2002 Roads as barriers to movement for hedgehogs. *Funct. Ecol.* **16**, 504–509. (doi:10.1046/j.1365-2435.2002.00651.x)
40. He P, Maldonado-Chaparro AA, Farine DR. 2019 The role of habitat configuration in shaping social structure: a gap in studies of animal social complexity. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **73**, 1–14. (doi:10.1007/s00265-018-2602-7)
41. Braune P, Schmidt S, Zimmermann E. 2005 Spacing and group coordination in a nocturnal primate, the golden brown mouse lemur (*Microcebus ravelobensis*): the role of olfactory and acoustic signals. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **58**, 587–596. (doi:10.1007/s00265-005-0944-4)
42. Bateman PW, Fleming PA. 2012 Big city life: carnivores in urban environments. *J. Zool.* **287**, 1–23. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-7998.2011.00887.x)
43. de Souza Lins PGA, Ferreira RG. 2019 Competition during sugarcane crop raiding by blond capuchin monkeys (*Sapajus flavius*). *Primates* **60**, 81–91. (doi:10.1007/s10329-018-0698-z)
44. Altmann J, Muruthi P. 1988 Differences in daily life between semiprovisioned and wild-feeding baboons. *Am. J. Primatol.* **15**, 213–221. (doi:10.1002/ajp.1350150304)
45. Sueur C, Deneubourg J-L, Petit O, Couzin ID. 2011 Group size, grooming and fission in primates: a modeling approach based on group structure. *J. Theor. Biol.* **273**, 156–166. (doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2010.12.035)
46. Morrow KS, Glanz H, Ngakan PO, Riley EP. 2019 Interactions with humans are jointly influenced by life history stage and social network factors and reduce group cohesion in moor macaques (*Macaca*

- maura*. *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 1–12. (doi:10.1038/s41598-019-56288-z)
47. Herbert-Read JE, Kremer L, Bruintjes R, Radford AN, Ioannou CC. 2017 Anthropogenic noise pollution from pile-driving disrupts the structure and dynamics of fish shoals. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **284**, 20171627. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2017.1627)
 48. Marty PR *et al.* 2019 Time constraints imposed by anthropogenic environments alter social behaviour in longtailed macaques. *Anim. Behav.* **150**, 157–165. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2019.02.010)
 49. Kaburu SS, Marty PR, Beisner B, Balasubramaniam K, Bliss-Moreau E, Kaur K, Mohan L, McCowan B. 2019 Rates of human–macaque interactions affect grooming behavior among urban-dwelling rhesus macaques. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* **168**, 92–103. (doi:10.1002/ajpa.23722)
 50. Skead CJ. 1980 *Historical mammal incidence in the Cape Province: the western and northern Cape*. Cape Town, Department of Nature and Environmental Conservation of the Provincial Administration of the Cape of Good Hope.
 51. Conrath L, Krause J, Couzin ID, Roper TJ. 2009 'Leading according to need' in self-organizing groups. *Am. Nat.* **173**, 304–312. (doi:10.1086/596532)
 52. Calvão A, Brigatti E. 2019 Collective movement in alarmed animals groups: a simple model with positional forces and a limited attention field. *Physica A* **520**, 450–457. (doi:10.1016/j.physa.2019.01.029)
 53. Sibbald AM, Erhard HW, McLeod JE, Hooper RJ. 2009 Individual personality and the spatial distribution of groups of grazing animals: an example with sheep. *Behav. Processes* **82**, 319–326. (doi:10.1016/j.beproc.2009.07.011)
 54. Couzin ID, Krause J, Franks NR, Levin SA. 2005 Effective leadership and decision-making in animal groups on the move. *Nature* **433**, 513–516. (doi:10.1038/nature03236)
 55. Gueron S, Levin SA, Rubenstein DI. 1996 The dynamics of herds: from individuals to aggregations. *J. Theor. Biol.* **182**, 85–98. (doi:10.1006/jtbi.1996.0144)
 56. Strandburg-Peshkin A, Farine DR, Crofoot MC, Couzin ID. 2017 Habitat and social factors shape individual decisions and emergent group structure during baboon collective movement. *Elife* **6**, e19505. (doi:10.7554/eLife.19505)
 57. Michelena P, Gautrais J, Gérard J-F, Bon R, Deneubourg J-L. 2008 Social cohesion in groups of sheep: effect of activity level, sex composition and group size. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* **112**, 81–93. (doi:10.1016/j.applanim.2007.06.020)
 58. Shelton DS, Price BC, Ocasio KM, Martins EP. 2015 Density and group size influence shoal cohesion, but not coordination in zebrafish (*Danio rerio*). *J. Comp. Psychol.* **129**, 72. (doi:10.1037/a0038382)
 59. Farine DR, Whitehead H. 2015 Constructing, conducting and interpreting animal social network analysis. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **84**, 1144–1163. (doi:10.1111/1365-2656.12418)
 60. Sueur C *et al.* 2011 Collective decision-making and fission–fusion dynamics: a conceptual framework. *Oikos* **120**, 1608–1617. (doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.19685.x)
 61. Herbert-Read JE. 2016 Understanding how animal groups achieve coordinated movement. *J. Exp. Biol.* **219**, 2971–2983. (doi:10.1242/jeb.129411)
 62. MacGregor HE, Herbert-Read JE, Ioannou CC. 2020 Information can explain the dynamics of group order in animal collective behaviour. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 1–8. (doi:10.1038/s41467-020-16578-x)
 63. Viscido SV, Parrish JK, Grünbaum D. 2004 Individual behavior and emergent properties of fish schools: a comparison of observation and theory. *Marine Ecol. Progress Series* **273**, 239–249. (doi:10.3354/meps273239)
 64. Strandburg-Peshkin A, Farine DR, Couzin ID, Crofoot MC. 2015 Shared decision-making drives collective movement in wild baboons. *Science* **348**, 1358–1361. (doi:10.1126/science.aaa5099)
 65. van Doorn AC, O'Riain MJ, Swedell L. 2010 The effects of extreme seasonality of climate and day length on the activity budget and diet of semi-commensal chacma baboons (*Papio ursinus*) in the Cape Peninsula of South Africa. *Am. J. Primatol.* **72**, 104–112. (doi:10.1002/ajp.20759)
 66. Fürtbauer I, Christensen C, Bracken A, O'Riain MJ, Heistermann M, King AJ. 2020 Energetics at the urban edge: environmental and individual predictors of urinary C-peptide levels in wild chacma baboons (*Papio ursinus*). *Horm. Behav.* **126**, 104846. (doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2020.104846)
 67. Garnier S. 2016 *SwaRm*. See <https://github.com/swarm-lab/swaRm>.
 68. Worton BJ. 1995 A convex hull-based estimator of home-range size. *Biometrics* **51**, 1206–1215. (doi:10.2307/2533254)
 69. Robitaille AL, Webber QMR, Vander Wal E. 2019 Conducting social network analysis with animal telemetry data: applications and methods using spatso. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **10**, 1203–1211. (doi:10.1111/2041-210X.13215)
 70. Castles M, Heinsohn R, Marshall HH, Lee AEG, Cowlshaw G, Carter AJ. 2014 Social networks created with different techniques are not comparable. *Anim. Behav.* **96**, 59–67. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2014.07.023)
 71. Csardi G, Nepusz T. 2006 The igraph software package for complex network research. *InterJournal, Complex Syst.* **1695**, 1–9.
 72. King AJ, Sueur C, Huchard E, Cowlshaw G. 2011 A rule-of-thumb based on social affiliation explains collective movements in desert baboons. *Anim. Behav.* **82**, 1337–1345. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2011.09.017)
 73. Sueur C, Petit O. 2008 Organization of group members at departure is driven by social structure in *Macaca*. *Int. J. Primatol.* **29**, 1085–1098. (doi:10.1007/s10764-008-9262-9)
 74. Pinheiro J, Bates D, DebRoy S, Sarkar D, R Core Team. 2020 Package 'nlme': Linear and nonlinear mixed effects models. R package version 3.1-149, See <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nlme>.
 75. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. 2015 Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *J. Stat. Softw.* **67**, 1–48. (doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01)
 76. Grimm NB, Faeth SH, Golubiewski NE, Redman CL, Wu J, Bai X, Briggs JM. 2008 Global change and the ecology of cities. *Science* **319**, 756–760. (doi:10.1126/science.1150195)
 77. Maeda T, Ochi S, Ringhofer M, Sosa S, Sueur C, Hirata S, Yamamoto S. 2021 Aerial drone observations identified a multilevel society in feral horses. *Sci. Rep.* **11**, 1–12. (doi:10.1038/s41598-020-79790-1)
 78. Parrish JK, Viscido SV, Grünbaum D. 2002 Self-organized fish schools: an examination of emergent properties. *Biol. Bull.* **202**, 296–305. (doi:10.2307/1543482)
 79. Bonnell TR, Clarke PM, Henzi SP, Barrett L. 2017 Individual-level movement bias leads to the formation of higher-order social structure in a mobile group of baboons. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* **4**, 170148. (doi:10.1098/rsos.170148)
 80. King AJ, Cowlshaw G. 2009 Leaders, followers, and group decision-making. *Commun. Integr. Biol.* **2**, 147–150. (doi:10.4161/cib.7562)
 81. Merrick MJ, Koprowski JL. 2017 Should we consider individual behavior differences in applied wildlife conservation studies? *Biol. Conserv.* **209**, 34–44. (doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2017.01.021)