

1 **To be or not to be social: Foraging associations of free-ranging dogs in an urban ecosystem**

2 Sreejani Sen Majumder<sup>1</sup>, Anandarup Bhadra<sup>1</sup>, Arjun Ghosh<sup>1</sup>, Soumitra Mitra<sup>1</sup>, Debottam  
3 Bhattacharjee<sup>1</sup>, Jit Chatterjee<sup>1</sup>, Anjan K. Nandi<sup>2</sup> and Anindita Bhadra<sup>1\*</sup>

4

5 <sup>1</sup> Behaviour and Ecology Lab, Department of Biological Sciences,

6 Indian Institute of Science Education and Research – Kolkata, India

7 <sup>2</sup> Centre for Ecological Sciences,

8 Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India

9

10 **\* Address for Correspondence:**

11 Behaviour and Ecology Lab, Department of Biological Sciences,

12 Indian Institute of Science Education and Research – Kolkata

13 P.O. BCKV Main Campus, Mohanpur,

14 Nadia, PIN 741252, West Bengal, INDIA

15 *tel.* 91-33-25873119

16 *fax* +91-33-25873020

17 *e-mail:* [abhadra@iiserkol.ac.in](mailto:abhadra@iiserkol.ac.in)

18 **Abstract**

19 Canids display a wide diversity of social systems, from solitary to pairs to packs, and hence they  
20 have been extensively used as model systems to understand social dynamics in natural systems.  
21 Among canids, the dog can show various levels of social organization due to the influence of  
22 humans on their lives. Though the dog is known as man's best friend and has been studied  
23 extensively as a pet, studies on the natural history, ecology and behaviour of dogs in a natural  
24 habitat are rare. Here we report results of an extensive population-level study conducted through  
25 one-time censuses in urban India to understand the ecoethology of free-ranging dogs. We built a  
26 model to test if the observed groups could have been formed through random associations while  
27 foraging. Our modeling results suggest that the dogs, like all efficient scavengers, tend to forage  
28 singly but also form random uncorrelated groups. A closer inspection of the group compositions  
29 however reveals that the foraging associations are non-random events. The tendency of adults to  
30 associate with the opposite sex in the mating season and of juveniles to stay close to adults in the  
31 non-mating season drives the population towards aggregation, in spite of the apparently random  
32 nature of the group size distribution. Hence we conclude that to be or not to be social is a matter  
33 of choice for the free-ranging dogs, and not a matter of chance.

34 **Keywords:** foraging association; urban ecosystem; free-ranging dogs; census; ecoethology;  
35 model

36 **Introduction**

37 The canids are a fascinating family of carnivores that are highly diverse in their morphology,  
38 geographic distribution and behavioural patterns. They are the most widespread family of extant  
39 carnivora with at least one species inhabiting every continent except Antarctica, and some  
40 species spread over entire continents (Sillero-Zubiri et al. 2004). They display a wide range of  
41 social organization, from solitary living like the maned wolf (*Chrysocyon brachyurus*) to living  
42 in monogamous pairs and family units like the red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) and arctic fox (*Alopex*  
43 *lagopus*) to large stable packs showing cooperative hunting and cooperative breeding behaviour  
44 like the wolves (*Canis lupus*) (Macdonald 1979; Philips et al. 2003; Sillero-Zubiri et al. 2004).  
45 Among canids, domestic dogs (*Canis lupus familiaris*) can live at diverse levels of social  
46 organization, from singly in households as pets, small groups in farms to packs in undisturbed  
47 habitats like islands (Serpell 1995), thus spanning nearly the entire range of social organization  
48 seen in canids. Though the domestic dog is known to have descended from the pack living  
49 wolves, sociality in domestic dogs has long been a matter of debate (Scott and Fuller 1965; Beck  
50 1975; Fox et al. 1975; Kleiman and Brady 1978; Berman and Dunbar 1983; Daniels 1983; Font  
51 1987). In fact, recent research suggests that dogs can be domesticated while wolves continuously  
52 escape attempts of domestication because of inherent differences of behaviour during early  
53 development in the two sub species (Lord 2013).

54 Domestic dogs that are not under direct human supervision and whose activities and movements  
55 are not restricted by human activities are termed as free-ranging dogs (Caffazo et al. 2010).  
56 Studies on populations of free-ranging dogs are widely scattered and sparse because in most  
57 developed countries dogs are not allowed to roam free on streets. In the recent years it has  
58 become quite evident that the social organization of free-ranging dogs is regulated by ecological

59 factors that also affect other canid social systems (Macdonald and Carr 1995). In India, as in  
60 several other developing countries, dogs are commonly seen on the streets, especially in urban  
61 areas. These dogs are called strays in general, and are not under any human supervision, hence  
62 they are more aptly called free-ranging dogs (Serpell 1995). They spend their entire lives on the  
63 streets as scavengers, and though they are not owned by humans, they are dependent on humans  
64 for their sustenance (Vanak and Gompper 2009). These dogs typically have mongrel  
65 characteristics, with pointed ears, very short fur, wolf-like pointed faces and often have patch  
66 baldness in their coats (OSM Figure 1). They are an important component of the urban ecology  
67 of India, and can be found in not only cities but in towns, villages and even in forest fringes (Pal  
68 et al. 1998, Vanak and Gompper 2009). Hence they are a very good model system for studies of  
69 urban ecology and ethology and for testing models of social organization.

70  
71 Urban free-ranging dogs have been studied to understand their distribution in cities, towns and  
72 fringe areas mostly in order to address the problem of strays. Jackman and Rowan (2007) has  
73 compiled several studies from developing nations in a report on the status of free-roaming dogs  
74 and methods of effective control. While some studies report that these dogs are unable to form  
75 stable social groups (Beck 1973, Berman and Dunbar 1983; Daniels 1983), others report stable  
76 social structures in the free-ranging dogs (Fox et al. 1975; Font 1987; Pal et al. 1998, Bonanni et  
77 al. 2010, Cafazzo et al. 2010). It has been argued by Beck (1973) that free-ranging dogs are  
78 asocial because the distribution of group sizes in their data matched that of a Zero-Truncated  
79 Poisson distribution (ZTP), as expected in case of a random distribution. Font (1987) made a  
80 case against this by stating that matching of the data with a ZTP distribution alone cannot be  
81 considered as proof for the dogs not forming stable social groups, and more knowledge of their

82 behaviour is necessary to substantiate this claim. In this paper we build a model based on  
83 Poisson distribution for an expected random distribution of free-ranging dogs in space and test it  
84 with field data from dog censuses conducted in and around Kolkata, India (22°34' N; 88°22' E).  
85 Our results substantiate some of the arguments put forth by Font (1987). We also use the census  
86 data to build an understanding of the social tendencies of the free-ranging dogs in the urban  
87 environment.

88

## 89 **Methods**

90 **(i) Sampling:** We carried out one-time censuses of free-ranging dogs at various urban localities  
91 in and around Kolkata (22° 34' N, 88° 24' E), West Bengal, India during the summer (May-June)  
92 and autumn (August-September) of 2010 and 2012. We sampled from 44 localities in the  
93 summer and from 30 localities in the autumn. The autumn months were selected for the census  
94 as this is typically the mating season for the dogs in West Bengal (Pal 2011; Sen Majumder et al,  
95 in preparation) and the summer was chosen as the non-mating season when juveniles are present.  
96 The localities were selected arbitrarily, based on convenience of sampling, and taking care that  
97 they were comparable in terms of human habitation. All localities sampled were residential or a  
98 combination of residential and business areas, because we were interested in urban dogs that live  
99 around human habitation. The absolute areas of the localities were quite variable, because the  
100 time of the census was fixed between 1600-1800 h and the observers had to cover the entire area  
101 within this time. This time was chosen as we had observed that dogs are active at this time of the  
102 day, and are typically out foraging (unpublished data), and daylight was available at this time,  
103 enabling recording of the dogs from a distance. The areas selected typically were well defined  
104 municipal blocks, or were part of a larger block bounded by arterial roads.

105 Each census was carried out in a single day. The day before the actual census a map of the  
106 locality was prepared with all roads and streets in the area using Google maps  
107 (<http://maps.google.co.in/>). Then the observer visited the concerned area and walked on these  
108 roads, marking the positions of the following as and when these were seen: i) waste bins ii) vats  
109 and dumps iii) food stalls (typically open roadside shanties and small shops) iv) food shops and  
110 restaurants v) markets vi) water sources like open taps, open tanks etc. The map thus prepared  
111 was used for the sampling of dogs the next day (OSM Table 1), when the observer walked along  
112 the roads and recorded any dog that was sighted, marking its approximate position on the map  
113 (Figure 1). For each dog, we recorded the time of sighting, the sex (by observing the genitalia),  
114 age class (pups, juveniles or adults, based on size and genital structures) of the dog, and whether  
115 it was single or in a group. If the dog was in a group, we also noted the group size (including the  
116 concerned dog). Groups are defined as two or more dogs that were seen to show affiliative  
117 interactions like allogrooming, nuzzling, playing, walking together, sharing food etc, or dogs that  
118 were resting peacefully within about three feet of each other. Several roads had to be walked  
119 multiple times in order to cover the entire area, but we recorded dogs on a road only the first time  
120 we walked on it, in order to avoid re-sampling. For a subset of the data we calculated the area of  
121 each locality using Google maps ([http://www.daftlogic.com/projects-google-maps-area-  
122 calculator-tool.htm](http://www.daftlogic.com/projects-google-maps-area-calculator-tool.htm) ) by selecting the boundaries of the locality. This could not be done for some  
123 areas as a clear area map was not available through google-maps, and the maps had been drawn  
124 manually. StatisticXL version 1.8, STATISTICA release 7.0 and the statistical environment R  
125 (R 2008) were used for the statistical analysis.

126 **(ii) Modeling:** We built a model for the random distribution of the dogs in space and checked the  
127 model with our data. Let us assume  $X_i$  is the number of dogs in a group,  $O_i$  is the frequency with

128 which  $X_i$  dogs are observed in a group, and  $P(x)$  is the probability of  $x$  dogs to be found in a  
 129 group if dogs are distributed randomly over space. Then the probability distribution  $P(x)$  is  
 130 expected to follow a Poisson distribution, under which, the occurrence of any dog in a group  
 131 does not depend on the occurrences of the other dogs in that group, thus the numbers of dogs  
 132 found in the groups are uncorrelated. Since the dogs were sampled randomly over an area and  
 133 whenever a dog or a group of dogs were sighted it was noted down, so the situation of getting  
 134 data of group size zero never arose, hence the 'zero' event is missing from the distribution.  
 135 Therefore, we use the Zero-Truncated Poisson (ZTP) distribution which is of the form

$$P(x) = \frac{e^{-\lambda} \cdot \lambda^x}{x!} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\lambda}}$$

136  
 137  
 138 where  $\lambda$  is the single parameter characterizing the distribution. The mean of the distribution is  
 139  $\mu = \lambda / (1 - e^{-\lambda})$ , and the parameter  $\lambda$  can be estimated from the equation  $\mu = \langle X_i \rangle$ , thereby equating the  
 140 sample mean  $\langle X_i \rangle$  with the population mean (Cohen 1960). If  $E_i$  is the expected frequency of  
 141 groups containing  $X_i$  dogs, then  $E_i = N \cdot P(X_i)$ , where  $N = \sum_i X_i O_i$ , i.e. the total frequency of the  
 142 dogs.

143  
 144 In order to test the goodness of the fit of the data with the ZTP distribution, we used the  $\chi^2$  test.  
 145 The test does not work well when expected frequencies are very small (Cochran 1952; Cochran  
 146 1954) and when testing at  $\alpha=0.05$ , the acceptable frequency level is 1.0 (Roscoe and Byars  
 147 1971). So, the last few minimum categories of the tail of the distribution were pooled together in  
 148 order to obtain the tabulation having all expected frequencies greater than 1.0 (Cochran 1952;  
 149 Zar 1999). Now if the new number of categories becomes  $k$ , the degrees of freedom for the

150 statistical test consequently becomes  $\nu=k-1-1$ , an extra  $df$  is lost due to the estimation of the  
151 parameter of the distribution from the data.

152

## 153 **Results**

### 154 **i) Natural history**

155 A total of 655 dogs were sampled from the 44 locations in the summer of which 305 were males,  
156 331 females, and 19 were of unknown sex. In the autumn 360 dogs were sampled from the 28  
157 locations, of which 163 were males, 189 were females and 8 were of unknown sex. Sexes could  
158 not be determined for a few pups and for a small number of adults that were found to be  
159 squatting. The sex ratio in our sample did not deviate from 1:1 in either season (t-test;  $t = -1.120$ ,  
160  $df = 43$ ,  $p = 0.269$  for the summer and  $t = -2.019$ ,  $df = 27$ ,  $p = 0.053$  for the autumn). We pooled  
161 the pups (0-3 months) and juveniles (3-9 months) into the category of juveniles as the real ages  
162 of the dogs were not known, and we only had eye estimation records. The population comprised  
163 of  $24 \pm 19\%$  juveniles in the summer, which was significantly higher than the proportion of  
164 juveniles ( $18 \pm 19\%$ ) in the autumn (Mann Whitney U test,  $U = 880.00$ ,  $df = 44, 28$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ).  
165 The total area covered in a census was quite variable as some areas were denser, with more  
166 streets and alleys than others. The mean area covered in a census was  $0.09 \pm 0.04$  sq.km ( $N = 28$ )  
167 in the summer, with a mean dog density of  $0.77 \pm 0.42$  dogs per acre and  $0.16 \pm 0.09$  sq.km ( $N =$   
168  $22$ ) in the autumn, with a mean dog density of  $0.34 \pm 0.20$  per acre. While the average area  
169 covered in a census was significantly higher in the autumn (Mann-Whitney U test,  $U = 477.0$ ,  $df$   
170  $= 22, 28$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), the density of dogs was significantly higher in the summer (Mann-Whitney  
171 U test,  $U = 518.5$ ,  $df = 22, 28$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). This is probably because there were more dogs in the



172 summer due to the births in the winter, and by the autumn, the population had stabilized after the  
173 initial stage of high mortality of juveniles. The mean number of fixed resources present in an  
174 area, including open and closed dust bins, dumps, food stalls, restaurants and water sources was  
175 comparable between the summer and the autumn censuses (Mann-Whitney U test,  $U = 685.0$ ,  $df =$   
176  $43, 28$ ,  $p = 0.334$ ). 11 of the sampled sites did not have a market within it, but the number of  
177 dogs in areas with and without markets were comparable (Mann-Whitney U test,  $U = 200.5$ ,  $df =$   
178  $11, 32$ ,  $p = 0.501$ ). In the summer, the number of dogs in an area did not scale with the number of  
179 resources present in it (simple linear regression,  $R^2 = 0.030$ ,  $F_{1,41} = 1.276$ ,  $p = 0.265$ ), unlike in  
180 the autumn (simple linear regression,  $R^2 = 0.155$ ,  $F_{1,26} = 4.771$ ,  $p = 0.038$ ) (Figure 2).

## 181 **ii) Groups**

182 We counted the number of times  $O_i$  that the dogs were observed in a group of size  $X_i$  and named  
183 the dogs of various group sizes as solitary (size 1), paired (size 2), triad (size 3) and groups (size  
184 4 or more). For both the seasons, we considered the proportions of dogs present in each of the  
185 groups and also in the pooled group of size four or more.  $47.78 \pm 18.63\%$  of the individuals were  
186 sighted as solitary during the summer, while  $40.28 \pm 20.75\%$  of the population was found to be  
187 solitary in the autumn. While there were significantly more dogs in group size 1 as compared to  
188 the other group sizes in the summer, in the autumn, the proportion of singles and pairs were  
189 comparable, and significantly higher than both the triads and higher groups (Table 1). We  
190 repeated the analysis by removing the juveniles from the data set, thereby considering only the  
191 adults, for both the seasons. We found that, by removing the juveniles from the data set, the  
192 percentage of solitary dogs changed to  $57.85 \pm 26.28\%$  in the summer and  $41.40 \pm 21.49$  in the  
193 autumn. In the summer, the removal of the juveniles from the data set caused a significant  
194 change in the proportion of solitary dogs (Wilcoxon matched pairs test,  $T = 144.0$ ,  $N = 44$ ,  $p <$

195 0.0001) and triads (Wilcoxon matched pairs test,  $T = 198.0$ ,  $N = 44$ ,  $p = 0.017$ ). There was no  
196 significant change in the proportions of dogs in any of the other categories, either in the summer  
197 or the autumn when the juveniles were removed (Figure 3; OSM Table 2).

198

199 Since the removal of the juveniles from the population was leading to significant changes in part  
200 of the grouping pattern, we looked at the composition of the groups in both the seasons for the  
201 entire data set. Juveniles were most often present with adults, and it was interesting to note that  
202 though 20% of the pairs were of the adult-juvenile category in the summer, there was not a single  
203 pair in this category sighted in the autumn. The proportion of pairs sighted as adult-juvenile in  
204 the autumn was significantly lower than the summer (Fisher's exact test,  $p = 0.0002$ ). The adult  
205 only pairs could be male-male, female-female or male-female. The proportion of male-female  
206 pairs was 0.67 in the autumn and significantly higher than 0.32 of the summer (Fisher's exact  
207 test,  $p = 0.0006$ ). The proportions of male only pairs and female only pairs did not vary in the  
208 two seasons (Fisher's exact test,  $p = 0.563$  and  $0.425$  respectively; Fig. 4a). Interestingly, 47% of  
209 the juveniles were sighted as singles in the autumn, which was significantly higher than the  
210 proportion of juveniles sighted as singles (28%) in the summer (Fisher's exact test,  $p = 0.004$ ).  
211 Juveniles present with males did not vary in proportion between the seasons (Fisher's exact test,  
212  $p = 0.082$ ), but the proportion of juveniles with females was higher in the summer (Fisher's exact  
213 test,  $p = 0.024$ ). In both the seasons, about one third of the juveniles were sighted in juveniles-  
214 only groups, unaccompanied by any adults. Juveniles present in mixed sex groups of adults did  
215 not vary significantly in proportion between the two seasons (Fisher's exact test,  $p = 0.380$ ; Fig.  
216 4b).

217 **(iii) The model**

218 The modeling exercise yielded dog distributions in the above grouping categories for the summer  
219 and autumn, both with and without the juveniles. For the summer data, the distribution of dogs in  
220 different grouping categories did not fit the Zero-Truncated Poisson distribution when we  
221 considered the entire data set ( $\chi^2 = 29.528$ ,  $df = 3$ ,  $\chi^2_{0.05,3} = 7.815$ ), but was found to agree with  
222 the expected ZTP distribution when the juveniles were removed from the data set ( $\chi^2 = 4.414$ ,  $df$   
223  $= 2$ ,  $\chi^2_{0.05,2} = 5.991$ ). When we carried out similar operations on the autumn data, the distribution  
224 fitted well into the ZTP distribution for both the whole data set ( $\chi^2 = 3.470$ ,  $df = 3$ ,  $\chi^2_{0.05,3} =$   
225  $7.815$ ) and the one with the juveniles removed ( $\chi^2 = 2.064$ ,  $df = 3$ ,  $\chi^2_{0.05,3} = 7.815$ ). Thus the dogs  
226 appeared to be randomly distributed in space at the time of foraging, unless they were with  
227 juveniles.

228

229 **Discussion**

230 Free-ranging dogs have been reported to have a male biased sex ratio in the USA and Europe  
231 (Beck 1973, Daniels 1983, Daniels and Bekoff 1989). Beck (1973) suggested that males are taken more  
232 often as pets, and since most urban feral dogs are those that have been abandoned or have run away from  
233 domestication, the sex ratio in the feral population is biased. Moreover, females might be killed in order  
234 to reduce breeding, or may be selectively abandoned as pups. However, these results pertain to “feral”  
235 dogs with an immediate history of domestication, and could be quite different behaviourally from the  
236 Indian free-ranging dogs. Pal (2008) reported a male biased sex ratio of the free-ranging dogs in Katwa,  
237 West Bengal, India, both at birth and among the adult population from a study conducted on six bitches  
238 and their pups. However, in our population level study conducted over 71 localities, the sex ratio did not  
239 deviate significantly from 1:1 in a total sample size of 1015 dogs. It is possible that male pups are indeed

240 adopted as pets preferentially, and this leads to the evening out of the sexes in the population, in spite of  
241 the male biased sex ratio at birth.

242

243 Dogs are known to breed twice a year (Morris 1987), though an individual bitch usually comes  
244 into heat once every year. The free-ranging dogs in West Bengal primarily mate in the autumn  
245 (Pal 2011) but we have also observed some matings in the late spring (April-May, unpublished  
246 data). The gestation period in dogs is approximately two months (Morris 1987), and thus when  
247 they mate in the autumn, the pups are born in the winter, resulting in a large number of juveniles  
248 in the population during the summer. The juveniles are typically in the post-weaning phase (3-9  
249 months), and are not restricted to the shelters. Since this study was conducted in May-June and  
250 August-September, it was unlikely that pups born due to matings in the spring would have been  
251 present in the summer data. In the autumn, such pups, if any, would also be close to the weaning  
252 stage of 10 weeks (Paul et al, under review), and would not be restricted to the shelters (Pal  
253 2008). Hence at the time of our census, we were likely to find them on the streets with the adults,  
254 and chances of missing them were low.

255

256 We were primarily interested in studying the distribution of the dogs during their active period,  
257 i.e., when they are likely to forage. The urban free-ranging dogs are scavengers living in a highly  
258 competitive environment, where resources can be quite diffused and unstable. It is known that  
259 the spatial distribution and social organization of animals are affected by the distribution of key  
260 resources (Macdonald 1983, Johnson et al 2003). In our study, the dog numbers in an area were  
261 not dependent on the number of available resources in the summer, but scaled with the number

262 of resources in the autumn. This difference in the relationship between dog numbers and  
263 resource availability between the two seasons could be attributed to the higher proportion of  
264 juveniles in the summer and the fact that reproduction in an unstable environment is not expected  
265 to scale with resource availability. However, since the resources that the dogs depend on range  
266 from large dumping sites to friendly humans, number alone is perhaps not a very good estimate  
267 of resource abundance and richness of an area. Currently we are carrying out detailed  
268 observations of dog behaviour at feeding sites to better understand the pattern of resource  
269 utilization by the free-ranging dogs and how this affects their social behaviour. Such data, in  
270 combination with data from censuses carried out over large areas would not only provide an  
271 insight into the resource utilization pattern and social organization of the free-ranging dogs, but  
272 will also allow us to use the dogs as a model system to test theories like the resource dispersion  
273 hypothesis (Macdonald 1983, Johnson et al 2002) with field data.

274

275 Dogs are known to have descended from wolves that live and hunt in packs (Mech 1970), and  
276 have been shown to be social in several studies (Font 1987; Pal et al. 1998, Cafazzo et al 2010).  
277 In our model, the distribution of the dogs in space fitted the ZTP distribution for the autumn data  
278 when the entire data set was considered, as well as when the juveniles were removed from the  
279 population. For the summer the distribution fitted the ZTP only when the juveniles were  
280 removed from the data set. These results suggest that the dogs form random uncorrelated groups  
281 at the time of foraging, as reported earlier by Beck (1973), so that the probability of a new dog  
282 joining a group is independent of the presence of the existing dogs in that group. An alternative  
283 to this could only be one of the following two situations. The distribution can be biased towards  
284 uniformity, such that the occurrence of one dog in a group impedes that of the second dog in that

285 group. In this case we would obtain repulsed, and thus, negatively correlated groups of dogs and  
286 thereby could call them asocial. The second alternative is that the population is biased towards  
287 aggregation or clustering. Here the probability of the occurrence of the first dog in a group  
288 enhances the probability of occurrence of the second one in that group, therefore developing a  
289 positive correlation among the dogs. The second case is indeed what is observed in the summer  
290 data when juveniles are present – they prefer to stay with the adults, thus making the distribution  
291 contagiously non-random.

292

293 On closer examination of the group compositions, we realized that though the global nature of  
294 the distribution appeared to be random, the composition of the groups were not so random after  
295 all. There was a clear preference for adult male-female pairs in the mating season and a  
296 preference for foraging singly in the non-mating season, suggesting that the dogs try to avoid  
297 competition over foraging, but also may choose to forage in association with preferred partners  
298 in certain contexts, like mating and parental care. This is borne out by the fact that though nearly  
299 half of the dogs were sighted as solitary, this fraction was not constant in the two seasons. The  
300 proportion of solitary dogs was higher than all the other categories in the summer, but in the  
301 autumn this proportion, though still nearly 40%, was comparable to that of the pairs. Hence  
302 during the mating season the dogs tended to be together more often than during the non-mating  
303 season, even at the cost of facing competition over food. This intriguing pattern in group  
304 dynamics suggests that the distribution of resources and competition over them might be playing  
305 key roles in determining the social interactions that shape groups in the free-ranging dogs. We  
306 should remember that the study was conducted during the time of day when the dogs are usually  
307 active, and the distribution studied here refers only to the associations during foraging, which

308 might be very different from the grouping at the time of resting or territory defense, as suggested  
309 by Font (1987). In fact, our observations suggest that the dogs tend to defend territories in groups  
310 which they also adhere to during resting, but tend to forage in smaller subgroups or singly (Das  
311 and Bhadra, in preparation). Hence we can be all the more certain that the associations seen  
312 during foraging are a result of the choices of the individuals, and not random associations of  
313 unfamiliar dogs, as the case might be if the dogs are indeed randomly distributed in space. We  
314 confirm through our model that the distribution of the free-ranging dogs in space during foraging  
315 has a globally random nature, but local associations are indeed an outcome of individual  
316 preferences to accept competition and yet stay in a group or to be solitary to avoid competition  
317 and thereby also give up the advantages of being social.

318

### 319 **Acknowledgements**

320 This work was supported by grants from the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, India  
321 and the Indian National Science Academy to AB, and by IISER-Kolkata. AKN carried out the  
322 modeling and all the remaining authors conducted spot censuses in different locations and times,  
323 and appear in the list of authors according to the volume of work done in the field. AB  
324 supervised the work and co-wrote the paper with AKN. AKN wishes to thank Dr. Kunal  
325 Bhattacharya, Birla Institute of Technology and Science, Pilani, India for his valuable feedback  
326 on the modeling part. The authors are grateful to Prof. Raghavendra Gadagkar, Indian Institute of  
327 Science, Bangalore, India and three anonymous referees for their inputs on earlier versions of  
328 this manuscript.

329 **References**

330 Beck AM (1973) The ecology of stray dogs: A study of free-ranging urban animals. Baltimore,  
331 York Press.

332

333 Beck AM (1975) The ecology of “feral” and free-roving dogs in Baltimora. In: Fox MW,  
334 editor. The wild canids. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold 380-390

335

336 Berman M, Dunbar I (1983). The social behavior of free-ranging suburban dogs. Applied Animal  
337 Ethology, 10:5-17

338

339 Bonanni R, Cafazzo S, Valsecchi P and Natoli E (2010). Effect of affiliative and agonistic  
340 relationships on leadership behaviour in free-ranging dogs. Anim. Behav, 79:981-991

341

342 Cochran WG (1952) The  $\chi^2$  test for goodness of fit. Ann. Math. Statist. 23:315-345

343

344 Cochran WG (1954) Some methods for strengthening the common  $\chi^2$  test. Biometrics 10:417-  
345 451

346

347 Cohen AC (1960) Estimating the Parameter in a Conditional Poisson Distribution. Biometrics  
348 16:203-211



349

350 Cafazzo S, Valsecchi P, Bonanni R, Natoli E (2010) Dominance in relation to age, sex, and  
351 competitive contexts in a group of free-ranging domestic dogs 21(3): 443-455

352

353 Daniels TJ (1983) The social organization of free-ranging urban dogs. I. Non-estrous behaviour.  
354 Appl. Anim. Ethol. 10:341-363

355

356 Daniels TJ, Bekoff M (1989) Population and social biology of free-ranging dogs, *Canis*  
357 *familiaris*. J. Mammal. 70(4): 754-762.

358

359 Font E (1987) Spacing and social organization: Urban stray dogs revisited. Appl. Anim. Ethol.  
360 17:319-328

361

362 Fox MW, Beck AM, Blackman E (1975) Behavior and ecology of a small group of urban dogs  
363 (*Canis familiaris*). Applied Animal Ethology 1: 119-137

364

365 Jackman J, Rowan A (2007). "Free-Roaming Dogs in Developing Countries: The Public Health  
366 and Animal Welfare Benefits of Capture, Neuter, and Return Programs." In *State of the Animals*  
367 *IV : 2007*, eds. Deborah Salem and Andrew Rowan. Washington, D.C.: Humane Society Press  
368 55-78

369

370 Johnson DDP, Kays R, Blackwell PG, Macdonald DW (2003) Does the resource dispersion  
371 hypothesis explain group living? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 17(12): 563–570  
372

373 Kleiman DG, Brady CA (1978) Coyote behaviour in the context of recent canid research.  
374 Coyotes. In: Bekoff M, editor. New York: Academic Press 163-188  
375

376 Lord K (2013) A Comparison of the Sensory Development of Wolves (*Canis lupus lupus*)  
377 and Dogs (*Canis lupus familiaris*) *Ethology* 119(2):110–120  
378

379 Macdonald DW, Carr GM (1995) Variation in dog society: between resource dispersion and  
380 social flux. In: Serpell J, editor. *The domestic dog: its evolution, behaviour and interactions with*  
381 *people*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press 199-216  
382

383 Macdonald DW (1979) The flexible social system of the golden jackal (*Canis aureus*). *Behav*  
384 *Ecol Sociobiol* 5: 17–38  
385

386 Macdonald DW (1983) The Ecology of Carnivore Social Behaviour. *Nature* 301:379-384  
387

388 Morris D (1987) *Dogwatching*. Three Rivers Press, New York.  
389

390 Pal SK, Ghosh B, Roy S (1998) Agonistic behaviour of free-ranging dogs (*Canis familiaris*) in  
391 relation to season, sex and age. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sc.* 59:331-348  
392

393 Pal SK (2008) Maturation and development of social behaviour during early ontogeny in free-  
394 ranging dog puppies in West Bengal, India. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sc.* 111: 95-107  
395  
396 Pal SK (2011) Mating System of Free-Ranging Dogs (*Canis familiaris*). *Intl. J. Zool.* 2011:1-10  
397  
398 Phillips M, Henry VG, Kelly BT (2003) Restoration of the Red Wolf In L.D. Mech and L.  
399 Boitani (Eds.). *Wolves: Behavior, Ecology, and Conservation*. University of Chicago Press,  
400 Chicago IL 272–288  
401  
402 R Development Core Team (2008) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R  
403 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0, URL:  
404 <http://www.R-project.org>  
405  
406 Roscoe JT, Byars JA (1971) Sample size restraints commonly imposed on the use of the chi-  
407 square statistics. *J. Ame. Statist. Assoc.* 66:755-759  
408  
409 Scott JP, Fuller JL (1965) *Genetics and the Social Behavior of the Dog* Chicago:  
410 University of Chicago Press  
411  
412 Serpell J (1995) *The domestic dog: its evolution, behavior, and interaction with people*.  
413 Cambridge: Cambridge UP

414

415 Sillero-Zubiri C, Hoffmann M, and Macdonald DW (Eds.). (2004) Canids: foxes, wolves, jackals  
416 and dogs: status survey and conservation action plan, second edition IUCN Canid Specialist  
417 Group, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge UK

418

419 Vanak AT, Gompper ME (2010). Dietary niche separation between sympatric free-ranging  
420 domestic dogs and Indian foxes in central India. J. Mamm. 90: 1058–1065

421

422 Zar JH (2009) Biostatistical Analysis. Fourth Edition. Pearson Education, Inc. NJ and Dorling  
423 Kindersley Publishing Inc. London

424

425 <http://maps.google.co.in/>

426 <http://www.daftlogic.com/projects-google-maps-area-calculator-tool.htm>


427

Comparisons	Summer (N = 44)		Autumn (N = 28)	
	T	p	T	p
<b>Solitary vs Paired</b>	124	< 0.0001	163.50	0.4740
<b>Solitary vs Triad</b>	84	< 0.0001	81.00	0.0070
<b>Solitary vs Grouped</b>	47.50	< 0.0001	11.00	< 0.0001
<b>Paired vs Triad</b>	366.50	0.1510	106.50	0.0270
<b>Paired vs Grouped</b>	224.50	0.0020	10.00	< 0.0001
<b>Triad vs Grouped</b>	304.50	0.0740	64.00	0.0030

429


430 **Table 1:** Summary of the comparisons between the four kinds of group sizes in the two seasons  
 431 using Wilcoxon matched-pairs test. All comparisons are within a season between group sizes.

432



433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438


**Figure 1:** An example of a map used for sampling (part of B-6 block of Kalyani). The arrows show the path followed for conducting the census, and various resources are marked using the index given at the bottom of the map.



439

440 **Figure 2:** A scatter plot showing the number of resources and the number of dogs recorded in  
 441 each census in both the seasons (summer: circles and autumn: triangles). The linear regression  
 442 lines for both seasons are also given.

443




444

445 **Figure 3:** Mean and S.D. of the proportion of adult dogs found as solitary, in pairs, triads and in  
 446 groups of 4 or more in the two seasons. Comparisons are between categories, within a season,  
 447 using Wilcoxon matched-pairs test (significance at  $p < 0.05$ ).

448





449

450 **Figure 4:** (a) The distribution of the proportions of the different kinds of pairs observed in the  
 451 summer (gray bars) and autumn (black bars). (b) The distribution of the proportions of different  
 452 group compositions (all group sizes other than single combined together) in which the juveniles  
 453 are distributed in the summer (gray bars) and autumn (black bars). A: adults, J: juveniles, M:  
 454 males, F: females. Statistically significant differences are indicated by asterisk (\*).

455 **Supplementary Material**



456



457

458 **SM Figure 1:** Free-ranging dogs in India have pointed ears, short fur and pie baldness. They live  
459 among humans, spending most of the time on streets. They depend on garbage and human  
460 generosity for their sustenance, and are rarely seen to hunt.

461

462

463 **Methods**

464

SI No	Observer	Date	Time	Group size	Age Class	Sex
C-0022/001	SOUMITRA	27.06.10	16:26	1	A	M
C-0022/002	SOUMITRA	27.06.10	16:29	1	A	F
C-0022/003	SOUMITRA	27.06.10	16:40	1	A	M
C-0022/004	SOUMITRA	27.06.10	16:42	1	A	F
C-0022/005	SOUMITRA	27.06.10	16:50	1	A	M
C-0022/006	SOUMITRA	27.06.10	16:54	1	A	M
C-0022/007	SOUMITRA	27.06.10	16:17	1	A	F
C-0022/008	SOUMITRA	27.06.10	16:39	2	A	M
C-0022/009	SOUMITRA	27.06.10	16:39	2	A	M
C-0022/001	SOUMITRA	27.06.10	16:26	1	A	M
C-0022/002	SOUMITRA	27.06.10	16:29	1	A	F
C-0022/003	SOUMITRA	27.06.10	16:40	1	A	M
C-0022/004	SOUMITRA	27.06.10	16:42	1	A	F

465

466 **SM Table 1:** Sample data from one census in Bankura conducted in the summer of 2010.

467

468

469

470 **Results**

471

	<b>Summer (N = 44)</b>		<b>Autumn (N = 28)</b>	
<b>Comparisons</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>Solitary</b>	144.00	< 0.0001	26.00	0.250
<b>Paired</b>	349.50	0.2740	27.00	0.313
<b>Triad</b>	198.00	0.0170	51.00	0.750
<b>Grouped</b>	135.00	0.0930	27.00	1.00

472

473 **SM Table 2:** Comparisons between the adult-only data set and the entire data set in the four  
474 group sizes in the two seasons. All comparisons are within a group size in a season using  
475 Wilcoxon matched-pairs test.