

1 **Also available at [www.brill.nl/beh](http://www.brill.nl/beh)**

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 **Group movement decisions in capuchin monkeys: the utility of an experimental study**  
9 **and a mathematical model to explore the relationship between individual and collective**  
10 **behaviours**

11

12 Short title: Group movement decision in capuchin monkeys

13

14 H. Meunier<sup>1,2</sup>, J.-B. Leca<sup>1</sup>, J.-L. Deneubourg<sup>2</sup> & O. Petit<sup>1</sup>

15

16 <sup>1</sup>Ethologie des Primates, IPHC, Département Ecologie Physiologie et Ethologie, UMR 7178

17 CNRS-ULP, 67087 Strasbourg Cedex 2, France

18 <sup>2</sup>Service d'Ecologie Sociale, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

19

20

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author's e-mail address: [helene.meunier@c-strasbourg.fr](mailto:helene.meunier@c-strasbourg.fr)

21 **Summary**

22 In primate groups, collective movements are typically described as processes dependent on  
23 leadership mechanisms. However, in some species, decision-making includes negotiations  
24 and distributed leadership. These facts suggest that simple underlying processes may explain  
25 certain decision mechanisms during collective movements. To study such processes, we have  
26 designed experiments on white-faced capuchin monkeys (*Cebus capucinus*) during which we  
27 provoked collective movements involving a binary choice. These experiments enabled us to  
28 analyse the spatial decisions of individuals in the group. We found that the underlying  
29 process includes anonymous mimetism, which means that each individual may influence all  
30 members of the group. To support this result, we created a mathematical model issued from  
31 our experimental data. A totally anonymous model does not fit perfectly with our  
32 experimental distribution. A more individualised model, which takes into account the  
33 specific behaviour of social peripheral individuals, revealed the validity of the mimetism  
34 hypothesis. Even though white-faced capuchins have complex cognitive abilities, a  
35 coexistence of anonymous and social mechanisms appears to influence their choice of  
36 direction during collective movements. The present approach may offer vital insights into the  
37 relationships between individual behaviours and their emergent collective acts.

38

39 **Keywords:** animal societies; collective decision-making; primates; group movement;  
40 mathematical modelling

## 41 **Introduction**

42 In group-living animals, a wide range of behaviours like resting, foraging or moving may be  
43 performed collectively. The functions of such groupings are diverse: antipredation (van  
44 Schaik, 1983; Sterck *et al.*, 1997; Isbell, 1994), foraging benefits (Wrangham, 1980;  
45 Terborgh, 1983) and energy saving (Weimerskirch *et al.*, 2001). In a social group, animals  
46 have different motivations and have to compromise between their own interests and the costs  
47 of a collective choice which could differ from their own needs. In the case of group  
48 movement, if all members choose different directions, the group will split and its members  
49 may lose many of the advantages of group living (Krause & Ruxton, 2002). Observational  
50 and empirical evidence shows that animal groups move across the landscape quite cohesively  
51 (Stewart & Harcourt, 1994; Boinski & Campbell, 1995; Boinski, 1996, 2000; Byrne, 2000;  
52 Parrish *et al.*, 2002; Conradt & Roper, 2003), which strongly suggests that a collective  
53 decision has been taken. Thus it could be assumed that individual decisions lead to a common  
54 decision, allowing the group to remain cohesive (Conradt & Roper, 2005).

55 Classically, collective movements in primate groups are described as processes  
56 dependent on leadership mechanisms where a single individual initiates a group movement  
57 and is followed by other individuals (Boinski & Garber, 2000). Mountain gorillas (*Gorilla*  
58 *gorilla beringei*) are the best known example of such leadership concentrated on a single  
59 individual (Schaller, 1963). However, it has been suggested that instead of one individual  
60 being responsible for a decision, a division of roles among an initiator and other decision-  
61 making individuals may exist (Byrne, 2000). In Drakensberg mountain baboons (*Papio*  
62 *ursinus*), Byrne *et al.* (1990) have described several scenarios ranging from a single  
63 individual who initiates and determines the direction and the departure time, to the case where  
64 the initiator seems to be ineffective alone and needs the adhesion of a first follower to  
65 influence the group. In white-faced capuchins (*Cebus capucinus*), Leca *et al.* (2003) showed

66 that: (1) several individuals, not necessarily the most dominant ones, can initiate movements,  
67 and (2) the spatial and temporal distribution of the group affects the probability that other  
68 group members respond positively to an initiation.

69         These observations lead us to consider alternative mechanisms which may help us to  
70 understand exactly how a collective decision is reached. Mimetic interactions between group  
71 members could play a key role in collective movements. Mimetic behaviour, where animals  
72 act like their conspecifics, is widespread in animal societies and is an example of positive  
73 behavioural feedback (Sumpter, 2006). Distributing the team within the environment and  
74 introducing positive feedback among animals allows amplification of the decision taken by a  
75 few individuals. Through competition among different amplifications, all individuals reach a  
76 consensus decision and maintain group cohesion (Deneubourg & Goss, 1989; Bonabeau *et*  
77 *al.*, 1997; Detrain *et al.*, 1999; Camazine *et al.*, 2001; Deneubourg *et al.*, 2002; Jeanson *et al.*,  
78 2004; Couzin *et al.*, 2005; Amé *et al.*, 2006). Such self-organized processes allow groups to  
79 carry out collective actions in various environments without any lead, external control or  
80 central coordination. They are used by many species living in large societies (Conradt &  
81 Roper, 2005) with low individual levels of cognition but also by vertebrates, including  
82 primates, living in small or large groups (Parrish & Edelstein-Keshet, 1999; Hemelrijk, 2002;  
83 Couzin & Krause, 2003).

84         Our objective was to test whether anonymous or social processes govern the choice of  
85 a given direction for collective movements in a white-faced capuchin monkey group. In order  
86 to assess the mechanisms of the collective movements and their dynamics, we have designed  
87 experiments where we provoked collective movements to explore the process in a purest  
88 form, which is practically impossible to achieve in a natural environment. Based on these  
89 experiments, we analysed spatial decisions within the group. Our hypothesis is that the nature  
90 of the underlying processes concerns mimetism (acting as a catalyst for the collective

91 decision) combined with individualities. To validate this hypothesis, we use a mathematical  
92 model to explore the relation between individual behaviour and collective phenomena.

93

## 94 **Material and methods**

### 95 *Subjects and environment*

96 The group of white-faced capuchins was established in 1989 at the Louis Pasteur University  
97 Primate Centre, Strasbourg, France. During our study, the group contained 13 individuals of  
98 three separate lineages: Five males (aged 2, 4, 8, 9 and 20 years or more) and eight females  
99 (2, 2, 2, 7, 8, 9 years old, and two individuals aged 20 years or more).

100 The group was kept in a one-acre outdoor enclosure with natural vegetation and  
101 uneven ground with free access to an indoor shelter. Commercial primate pellets and water  
102 were available *ad libitum*. Fresh fruits and vegetables were provided once a week but not  
103 during testing.

104

### 105 *Observation procedure*

106 Observations took place between 0900 and 1200 hours and between 1400 and 1800 hours  
107 from May to August 2001. Three observers collected data with video and tape recorders and  
108 communicated using walkie-talkies.

109 The first phase of the experiment consisted in training the capuchins to move to the  
110 sound of a whistle. The sound of the whistle was gradually associated with the subsequent  
111 presentation of food located further and further away from the starting point where the sound  
112 was emitted. At the end of the training period, the blast of the whistle was perceived as a  
113 food-anticipatory signal leading to the possible presence of food in a remote location. The  
114 second phase of the experiment consisted of 108 tests during which the capuchins had the  
115 opportunity to choose between two opposite directions leading to two distinct areas in the

116 park. In non-experimental baseline context, animals spontaneously used a particular zone of  
117 the enclosure for social and resting activities. This zone is referred to as the “departure zone”.  
118 The two areas to choose from are natural foraging areas situated 60 meters away from the  
119 departure zone. A manger was placed in each of the areas but was not visible from the  
120 departure zone.

121 During each test, only one randomly selected manger contained figs. The other one  
122 was left empty. The same manger could not be filled more than three times successively to  
123 prevent learning of reward position. Each manger was 2 meters long thus all monkeys could  
124 feed simultaneously from the same manger. When all animals were grouped in the departure  
125 zone, the whistle was sounded, and the mangers were opened. The choice for left or right  
126 manger was made from the very beginning. The initial direction taken by the animals from the  
127 departure zone was systematically maintained until the chosen manger was reached. The  
128 direction taken by each monkey was recorded for each test and coded by an “L” when animals  
129 chose to go left and by an “R” when they chose to go right.

130

### 131 ***Social relationships***

132 To establish the dominance hierarchy, we ranked individuals over 1 year of age in a matrix  
133 according to the direction of avoidances and unidirectional aggressions. We used data from  
134 two contexts: (1) spontaneous events and (2) drinking competition around a single source of  
135 orange juice (three series of nine 2-h tests). We carried out hierarchical rank order analysis  
136 using Matman, (de Vries *et al.*, 1993). We verified the linearity of the dominance hierarchy,  
137  $h'=0.91$  ( $P<0.001$ ; de Vries, 1995). The dominance scores ranged from one for the most  
138 dominant individual to thirteen for the most subordinate one.

139 Affiliation was quantified by the frequency of body contacts among all identified  
140 group members, recorded by using instantaneous sampling every 5 minutes (Altmann, 1974).

141 We collected 728 scans, but not during fruit provisioning. The affiliation score within each  
142 dyad was assessed by the number of scans during which the two partners were in body  
143 contact.

144

#### 145 ***Data analysis***

146 For each individual, we obtained a total of spatial association, defined as the total number of  
147 group members that chose the same direction as this individual across all tests. Several  
148 matrices were built to analyse the effect of socio-demographic variables on spatial  
149 association. We firstly reported in a symmetrical matrix when one animal chose the same  
150 direction as another one, i.e. the frequency of spatial association choice for each dyad. We  
151 also reported the affiliation scores in a symmetrical matrix. Finally, we assessed the degree of  
152 closeness in maternal kin relationships by distinguishing three types of dyads: non-kin, far-kin  
153 (siblings, half siblings, grandmother-grandchildren, aunt-nephew/niece), and close-kin  
154 (mother-offspring) dyads. We implemented the degree of kinship in the three types of kin  
155 dyads in a matrix. Matrix correlations were tested by using Matman (de Vries *et al.*, 1993).  
156 We set the number of automatic permutations of matrices at 10000 and used Pearson's  
157 correlation coefficient.

158 Non-parametric statistical tests used were the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, Kruskal-  
159 Wallis test, Spearman rank correlation test and the chi-square test (Siegel & Castellan, 1988).  
160 All tests were two-tailed and the significance level was fixed at 0.01.

161 For decision analysis, only 64 tests were used because of missing data on individual  
162 direction choice in the other tests.

163

#### 164 **Results**

##### 165 ***Description of the experiment***

166 At the sound of the whistle, individuals started to move, one after one. The mean starting time  
167 was  $7.5 \pm 0.6$  sec for the first individual and  $170.2 \pm 16.5$  sec for the whole group to have  
168 moved. When leaving the departure zone, the monkeys chose between the two directions  
169 leading to the two mangers one after one. All decisions were made prior to vocalizations from  
170 travelling individuals who had already arrived at the manger. Before reaching the manger  
171 corresponding to the initial direction chosen, no animal was observed returning to the  
172 departure zone or going towards the opposite manger.

173

#### 174 *Independency of the tests*

175 The localisation of the reward in a given test (in the left or the right manger) did not affect the  
176 choice of the animals in the subsequent test: the majority of the group chose 50 times the  
177 manger filled previously in the following test (out of 107 subsequent choices). This result  
178 suggests that reward-reinforcement bias should not be invoked in our study.

179

#### 180 *Individualities and relationships*

181 During collective movements, capuchins were not significantly associated according to sex  
182 (Kruskal-Wallis test:  $\chi^2=3.45$ ,  $N_{\text{male-male}}=10$ ,  $N_{\text{female-female}}=28$ ,  $N_{\text{male-female}}=40$ ,  $p=0.178$ ) or  
183 dominance rank (Spearman rank correlation test:  $r_s = -0.110$ ;  $N = 13$ ;  $p = 0.721$  ) regarding  
184 direction choice. Moreover, matrix correlations revealed that kinship (Pearson's correlation  
185 coefficient  $r = -0.027$ ;  $p = 0.506$ ) and affiliation (Pearson's correlation coefficient  $r = 0.236$ ;  $p$   
186  $= 0.054$ ) did not influence the spatial associations of capuchins.

187 Twelve out of thirteen individuals started to move first at least once. First position  
188 frequency was not significantly correlated with dominance rank (Spearman rank correlation  
189 test:  $r_s=0.397$ ,  $N=13$ ,  $p=0.180$ ).

190



191 ***Decision Analysis***

192 We tested whether the monkeys followed their conspecifics or if they chose a direction  
193 independently of other group members. Of the 64 tests, the total number of choices was 832  
194 (13 individuals x 64 tests), and the proportions were respectively 0.4 for the L side and 0.6 for  
195 the R side. This asymmetry suggests a weak preference for the right side and was taken into  
196 account in the subsequent analysis.

197 The frequency of tests where  $i$  individuals ( $i = 0, \dots, 13$ ) chose the same direction was  
198 measured. Assuming that the individuals selected their side independently with the  
199 probabilities  $P_L = 0.4$  and  $P_R = 0.6$ , the theoretical distribution of the tests as a function of the  
200 number of individuals choosing the L or R is a binomial distribution (Figure 1a). However,  
201 our experimental distribution is bimodal, a characteristic of a collective choice (Camazine *et*  
202 *al.*, 2001), and differs from the binomial theoretical one (Chi-square test:  $\chi^2=37.067$ ,  $df=13$ ,  
203  $p=0.004$ , Figure 1). To test the process of collective choice and inter-individual influence, we  
204 made a further analysis by considering the directions taken by the  $n$  first individuals  
205 ( $n=2, \dots, 13$ ). If the  $n$  first individuals chose their direction independently, the probability ( $P_n$ )  
206 that they chose L (R) is  $P_L^n$  ( $P_R^n$ ). We compared the number of tests where at least  $n$  first  
207 individuals have taken the same direction to the theoretical ones ( $64 \times (P_L^n + P_R^n)$ ). The  
208 experimental distribution was statistically different and higher than the theoretical one and the  
209 maximum difference was observed for the six first individuals (Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-  
210 sample test:  $D=0.67$ ,  $N1=N2=13$ ,  $p=0.015$ ). The ratio between  $P_n/P_{n-1}$  increases with  $n$ ,  
211 showing that the larger the number of individuals having chosen one side, the higher the  
212 probability is that the following individuals will also choose this side. The experimental  
213 probabilities are always higher than the theoretical ones.

214 This result shows a correlation between the choices of the individuals, which probably  
215 results from a mimetic effect: each individual seems to be both influenced by the choice of the  
216 others and have a tendency to follow the direction taken by the previous one(s).

217

### 218 ***Independent Individuals***

219 In this experimental group, individuals have two different profiles. For each individual, we  
220 compare the distribution of the number of tests in which it has taken the same direction as 0,  
221 1, 2, ..., 12 of its groupmates, with a distribution calculated from the mean of the  
222 corresponding values of all the other individuals (number of times that 0,...,12 individuals  
223 take the same direction). Ten individuals have similar profiles (their individual distributions  
224 do not show significant differences to the calculated one), and they present a tendency to  
225 follow other group members ('dependent' individuals). The three other individuals  
226 (subordinate females) behave differently from the other groupmates (chi-square test:  
227  $\chi^2=44.26, 85.66$  and  $86.39$  for those three animals,  $df=12, p=0.010$ ). These 'independent'  
228 individuals tended to choose a side independently of others and thereby move either to the  
229 side mainly chosen by group members or to the other side.

230

### 231 ***Anonymous model: all individuals identical***

232 Here we test the mimetic hypothesis to explain the collective mechanisms involved in the  
233 group choice. In this model, all individuals ( $N$ ) are identical. Any individual has the  
234 probabilities  $P_L$  to go L and  $P_R$  to go R that depend on its intrinsic preference to choose the  
235 left ( $\alpha_L$ ) or right ( $\alpha_R$ ) side and on the decision of the previous individuals.

236 The first decision is the choice of the first individual to take the left or the right path.

237 In this case,  $P_R = \alpha_R$  and  $P_L = \alpha_L$ .

238 Similarly we simulate the decision of the second,..., thirteen individual. To take into  
 239 account the mimetic behaviour,  $P_L$  ( $P_R$ ) must increase with  $N_L$  ( $N_R$ ) and decrease with  $N_R$  ( $N_L$ ).  
 240  $N_L$  and  $N_R$  are the number of individuals having chosen the left and right side and  $N_L + N_R$  are  
 241 the individuals having moved before the individual. The simplest form of  $P_R$  or  $P_L$  is:

$$P_L = \frac{\alpha_L + \beta N_L}{1 + \beta(N_L + N_R)} \quad (1,a)$$

$$P_R = \frac{\alpha_R + \beta N_R}{1 + \beta(N_L + N_R)} \quad (1,b)$$

$$P_R + P_L = 1 \quad \alpha_R + \alpha_L = 1$$

243  $\beta$  is the mimetic coefficient that takes account of the influence of the individual having  
 244 previously moved and decided. If  $\beta = 0$ , there is no mimetic behaviour and the individuals act  
 245 independently of each other. The greater the value of  $\beta$  the greater the mimetism.

246 In order to establish the main factors causing the fluctuations of the experimental  
 247 results, we used Monte Carlo simulations. In such a numerical simulation, the random aspects  
 248 of the process are thus automatically incorporated.

249 We can summarize the different steps as follows:

250 - Initial condition: At the beginning of the simulation, all the individuals are at rest, ( $N_R = N_L$   
 251  $= 0$ ).

252 - Decision process: The decisions of the N individuals are tested.

253 To determine the choice of an individual, the value of a random number is compared to  $P_L$   
 254 (equation 1,a) , depending on the choice of the previous individuals. For each monkey, the  
 255 random number is drawn from a uniform distribution between 0 and 1. If its value is less than  
 256 or equal to  $P_L$  the monkey chooses the left side and if the number is greater than  $P_L$ , it chooses  
 257 the right side. The delay between two departures was not considered.

258           The simulations are run 1000 times for the  $N$  animals and we calculate the distribution  
259 of the simulations as a function of the number of individuals having chosen the left side.

260           We let the  $\beta$  mimetic parameter vary and run simulations for frequency of choices for  
261 the same side. The case  $\beta = 0$  corresponds to individuals acting independently and the  
262 distribution is binomial (Figure 1a). For very low values of  $\beta$ , the model also exhibits  
263 unimodal distributions. Three simulations with three different  $\beta \geq 1$  are presented in Figure 2.  
264 A strong bimodal distribution is only observed for large values of  $\beta$  ( $\beta \geq 3$ ) but the fraction of  
265 the simulations characterized by most of the individuals having chosen the same side is much  
266 greater than the corresponding experimental ones (Figure 2b & 2c).

267

### 268 ***Individualised Model***

269           We modified the previous model by individualising the process of directional choice. In this  
270 model, each individual is characterized by a specific function  $P_{Li}$  and  $P_{Ri}$ .

271           We assume two categories of individuals: (1) mimetic individuals having the same  
272 behaviour as in the previous models, (2) independent subjects that are not influenced by and  
273 reciprocally do not influence the other individuals (no mimetic process for direction choice  
274 process). The behaviour of these independent subjects corresponds to the behaviour of the  
275 three experimental peripheral females.

$$P_{Li} = \frac{\alpha_{Li} + \beta_i \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{ij} L_j}{1 + \beta_i \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{ij} (R_j + L_j)} \quad (2, a)$$

$$P_{Ri} = \frac{\alpha_{Ri} + \beta_i \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{ij} R_j}{1 + \beta_i \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{ij} (R_j + L_j)} \quad (2, b)$$

$$P_{Ri} + P_{Li} = 1 \quad \alpha_{Ri} + \alpha_{Li} = 1$$

277  $\beta_i = 0$  corresponds to an independent individual not influenced by the others.  $\delta_{ij} = 1$  if the  
 278 individual  $j$  could influence the individual  $i$ .  $\delta_{ij} = 0$  if the individual  $j$  could not influence the  
 279 individual  $i$ .  $L_j = 1$  and  $R_j = 0$  ( $L_j = 0$  and  $R_j = 1$ ) if the individual  $j$  has previously chosen the  
 280 left side (right side).  $L_j = 0$  and  $R_j = 0$  if the individual  $j$  has not yet moved. We can note that  
 281 if all the dependent individuals present the same mimetic behaviour ( $\beta_1 = \dots = \beta_N$ ,  $\delta_{ij} = 1$ ),  
 282 equations 2 are equal to equations 1. We have performed simulations based on our  
 283 experimental observations with three independent individuals and ten mimetic individuals.

284 We plot the same distribution as for the anonymous model: the distribution of the  
 285 simulations as a function of the number of individuals having chosen the left side for three  
 286 mimetic coefficients (Figure 3). The results taking into account the two types of individuals  
 287 were similar to the experimental distributions: the obtained distribution was bimodal and the  
 288 maximum values of the two modes were very close to those of the experimental distribution.

289

## 290 **Discussion**

291 In this study we have demonstrated that most capuchin monkeys tend to follow the travel  
 292 route previously taken by their groupmates when given a binary choice, but that a minority of  
 293 individuals consistently decides their route independently from their groupmates behaviour.

294

295 *Experimental spatial decisions*

296 The experimental distributions of the number of individuals moving in the same direction are  
297 bimodal, which is the signature of a phenomenon involving interactions between individuals  
298 (Camazine *et al.* 2001). At departure time, all group members were grouped together in the  
299 departure area, where each capuchin had the opportunity to observe the behaviour of other  
300 group members. One can propose facilitation of the response in this case. In such a process,  
301 the presence of a group member performing an act already within the observer's repertoire  
302 increases the probability of the observer reproducing that act (Byrne 1994). In our study, the  
303 facilitated response was the directional choice. The departure of one or more individuals to a  
304 given side can draw the attention of the others. This would involve a facilitation of the  
305 moving of individuals still present in the departure zone, in the same direction. This  
306 phenomenon could also be interpreted from the perspective of group cohesion in relation to  
307 predation risk. As more individuals have left the departure area, the chance for a capuchin to  
308 be left alone in this area increases. In many cases, such situation is potentially hazardous in  
309 terms of predation for an individual living in a wild primate group. This may account for a  
310 natural tendency to grouped departures in travelling primates.

311 We found that this collective pattern is not a consequence of demographic and social  
312 relationships between group members. Indeed, during movements, capuchins do not follow  
313 their groupmates according to their sex, dominance rank, kin or affiliative relationships. It  
314 seems that this phenomenon is anonymous from a social point of view, i.e. does not depend  
315 on individualities or social relationships. Moreover, no vocalization was emitted by capuchins  
316 en route for the arrival area. The environmental differences between our captive conditions  
317 and the wild may partly explain the absence of trill vocalizations in this specific experimental  
318 context, where the locations of the mangers were well known by the monkeys. Conversely,

319 trills have been emitted by the same group members in the context of spontaneous moves  
320 where only the initiator took the lead (Leca *et al.*, 2003). In the wild, where food sources are  
321 more dispersed and less limited, white-faced capuchins also use trill vocalizations to  
322 coordination troop movements (Boinski & Campbell, 1995).

323 Distributions observed experimentally also show that the group was split into two  
324 subgroups. Subgroup sizes were asymmetrical with generally one sub-group of ten or eleven  
325 individuals and the other of two or three. This supports the hypothesis of a collective  
326 movement and discredits the hypothesis proposing that all individuals should behave  
327 independently of each other. In the case of truly independent individuals, the distribution  
328 obtained would have been of a binomial type.

329 This result however gives no indication of the underlying mechanisms of the  
330 asymmetrical division of the group. A finer analysis of spatial decisions whatever the identity  
331 of the individuals reveals that the greater the number of individuals choosing one side, the  
332 greater the probability that the other remaining individuals will choose the same side. This  
333 behaviour has been described by the concept of contagion (Thorpe 1963), which is realised  
334 through mimetic processes. However our results show that not all group individuals are  
335 involved in the chain of contagion or display mimetic behaviour.

336

### 337 ***Modelling***

338 To validate our hypothesis of mimetic processes, it was important to draw up models  
339 (Deneubourg & Goss 1989; Camazine *et al.* 2001; Sumpter 2006). This approach enables the  
340 simulation of a large number of events starting from a model. We could implement  
341 mechanisms deduced from our decision analysis. In the anonymous model, all individuals  
342 were considered as identical entities. Regarding non-human primates, it is clear that the  
343 hypothesis of equal individuals is coarse (Stevenson-Hinde 1983) but this simple formulation

344 remains an important first step. It is a traditional approach in modelling which shows the role  
345 of anonymous processes in the phenomenon studied (Camazine *et al.* 2001). The response of  
346 the first model supports our hypothesis of an anonymous process but cannot account for all  
347 the observations. The distributions obtained from this simple model are bimodal like  
348 experimental ones and confirm the hypothesis of subjacent mimetism for the movements,  
349 making it possible to seize the logic behind the phenomenon. However, the quantitative  
350 responses of the model are not satisfying enough because they are too pronounced.

351 In the individualised model, we retain the basic structure (the same mechanisms are  
352 implemented) but we take some independent individuals into consideration. Concerning  
353 directional decisions, three individuals present differences in their behaviour and are qualified  
354 as independent. It can be mentioned that these three individuals are subordinate and  
355 frequently peripheral individuals (socially and spatially). Such peripheral positions have been  
356 described in groups of wild white-faced capuchins (Perry 1996, 1997, 1998; Rose 1994) and  
357 other primate species during collective movements (baboons: Rhine 1975; Rhine & Westlund  
358 1981; lemurs: Kappeler 2000). This could be explained by the fact that subordinate  
359 individuals suffer the most feeding competition (Whiten, 1983; Saito, 1996; Sterck *et al.*,  
360 1997; Wittig & Boesch, 2003 ) and may adopt particular strategies, such as moving alone in  
361 the outskirts of the group, which could be beneficial when food competition is too important.  
362 Moreover, spatial separation may also enhance individual opportunities for feeding  
363 innovation (e.g., Leca *et al.*, in press). The independent individuals are taken into account in  
364 the model by assigning them a mimetic coefficient of zero. With inclusion of such parameters,  
365 the model produces distributions very similar to the experimental one and reproduces the  
366 majority of our collective movements.

367 These results enable us to conclude the coexistence of different individual profiles  
368 (dependent or independent) in collective movements of white-faced capuchin monkeys. We



369 are fully aware that our results are limited to one social group and supplementary data from  
370 additional groups are required for our conclusions to be generalized. Nevertheless, our  
371 approach, based on experimental testing and modelling of the experimental results, allows us  
372 to reveal for the first time that part of primates collective behaviour could be anonymous. This  
373 goes against some generally accepted ideas on primate societies and the mechanisms  
374 underlying collective phenomena in such groups. Because of the developed cognitive  
375 capacities and complex social systems of primates, collective phenomena are generally  
376 perceived as being based on multiple interactions, communication and negotiation and are  
377 therefore difficult to model. Our approach was relatively simple. It models catalytic  
378 mechanisms and basic mimetic process and allows us to reproduce the collective choice of  
379 our group. To draw more general conclusions concerning group movement decision process  
380 in primates, this type of study should to be conducted in other groups of white-faced capuchins  
381 and in other species, and ultimately our results should be verified in more natural conditions.

382

### 383 **Acknowledgements**

384 We are grateful to the Louis Pasteur University Primate Centre, Strasbourg, France and to P.  
385 Uhlrich for technical support for the experiments. J.L.D. is research associate from the  
386 Belgian national Funds for Scientific Research. We also thank the two anonymous reviewers  
387 for insightful comments on the manuscript.

388

### 389 **References**

390 Altmann, J. (1974). Observational study of behaviour: Sampling methods - Behaviour 49:  
391 227-266.

392 Ame, J.M., Halloy, J., Rivault, C., Detrain, C. & Deneubourg, J.-L. (2006). Collegial decision  
393 making based on social amplification leads to optimal group formation. - Proc. Natl Acad.  
394 Sci. USA 103: 5835-5840.

395 Boinski, S. (1996). Vocal coordination of troop movement in squirrel monkeys (*Saimiri*  
396 *oerstedii* and *S. sciureus*) and white-faced capuchins (*Cebus capucinus*). - In: Adaptive  
397 radiation of Neotropical primates. (Norconk, M., Rosenberger, A.L. & Garber, P.A., eds).  
398 New York, Plenum Press, p. 251-269.

399 Boinski, S. (2000). Social manipulation within and between troops mediates primate group  
400 movement. - In: On the move (Boinski, S. & Garber, P.A., eds). Chicago and London, The  
401 University of Chicago Press, p. 421-469.

402 Boinski, S. & Campbell, A.F. (1995). Use of trill vocalizations to coordinate troop movement  
403 among white-faced capuchins: a second field test - Behaviour 132: 875-901.

404 Boinski, S. & Garber, P.A. (2000). On the Move: How and why animals travel in groups. -  
405 Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

406 Bonabeau, E., Théraulaz, G., Deneubourg, J.-L., Aron, S. & Camazine, S. (1997). Self-  
407 organization in social insects - Trends Ecol. Evolut. 12: 188-193.

408 Byrne, R.W. (1994). The evolution of intelligence. - In: Behaviour and Evolution (Halliday,  
409 P.J.B.S.T.R., ed.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 223-265.

410 Byrne, R.W. (2000). How monkeys find their way: Leadership, coordination, and cognitive  
411 maps of African baboons. - In: On the Move (Boinski, S. & Garber, P.A., eds). Chicago,  
412 University of Chicago Press, p. 491-518.

413 Byrne, R.W., Whiten, A. & Henzi, S.P. (1990). Social relationships of mountain baboons:  
414 Leadership and affiliation in a non-female-bonded monkey - Am. J. Primatol. 20: 313-329.

415 Camazine, S., Deneubourg, J.-L., Franks, N.R., Sneyd, J., Bonabeau, E. & Theraulaz, G.  
416 (2001). *Self-Organization in Biological Systems*. - Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton  
417 University Press.

418 Conradt, L. & Roper, T.J. (2003). Group decision-making in animals - *Nature* 42: 155-158.

419 Conradt, L. & Roper, T.J. (2005). Consensus decision-making in animals. - *Trends Ecol.*  
420 *Evolut.* 20: 449-456.

421 Couzin, I.D. & Krause, J. (2003). Self-organization and collective behavior in vertebrates. -  
422 *Adv. Study Behav.* 32: 1-75.

423 Couzin, I.D., Krause, J., Franks, N.R. & Levin, S.A. (2005). Effective leadership and  
424 decision-making in animal groups on the move. *Nature*, 433: 513-516.

425 Detrain, C., Deneubourg, J.-L. & Pasteels, J.M. (1999). Decision-making in foraging by social  
426 insects. - In: *Information processing in social insects* (Detrain, C., Deneubourg, J.-L. &  
427 Pasteels, J.M. eds). Birkhauser Verlag, Basel, p. 331-354.

428 Deneubourg, J.-L. & Goss, S. (1989). Collective patterns and decision-making. - *Ethology*  
429 *Ecol. Evol.* 1: 295-311.

430 Deneubourg, J.-L., Lioni, A. & Detrain, C. (2002). Dynamics of aggregation and emergence  
431 of cooperation. - *Biol. Bull.* 202: 262-267.

432 Hemelrijk, C.K. (2002). Understanding of social behaviour with the help of complexity  
433 science. - *Ethol.* 108: 655-671.

434 Isbell, L.A. (1994). Predation on primates: Ecological patterns and evolutionary  
435 consequences. - *Evol. Anthropol.* 3: 61-71.

436 Jeanson, R., Deneubourg, J.-L. & Theraulaz, G. (2004). Discrete dragline attachment induces  
437 aggregation in spiderlings of a solitary species. - *Anim. Behav.* 67: 531-537.

438 Kappeler, P.M. (2000). Grouping and movement patterns in Malagasy primates. - In: *On the*  
439 *Move* (Boinski, S. & Garber, P.A., eds). Chicago, University of Chicago Press, p. 470-490.

440 Krause, J. & Ruxton, G. 2002. Living in Groups. - Oxford University press.

441 Leca, J.-B., Gunst, N., Thierry, B. & Petit, O. (2003). Distributed leadership in semifree-  
442 ranging white-faced capuchin monkeys. - Anim. Behav. 66: 1045-1052.

443 Leca, J.-B., Gunst, N., Watanabe, K., & Huffman, M.A. (in press). A new case of fish-eating  
444 in Japanese macaques: Implications for social constraints on the diffusion of feeding  
445 innovation. - Am. J. Primatol.

446 Parrish, J.K. & Edelman-Keshet, L. (1999). Complexity, Pattern, and Evolutionary trade-offs  
447 in animal aggregation. - Science 284: 99-101.

448 Parrish, J.K., Viscido, S.V. & Grünbaum, D. (2002). Self-organized fish schools: an  
449 examination of emergent properties. - Biol. Bull. 202: 296-305.

450 Perry, S. (1996). Female-female social relationships in wild white-faced capuchin monkeys,  
451 *Cebus capucinus*. - Am. J. Primatol. 40: 167-182.

452 Perry, S. (1997). Male-female social relationships in wild white-faced capuchins (*Cebus*  
453 *capucinus*). - Behaviour 134: 477-510.

454 Perry, S. (1998). Male-male social relationships in wild white-faced capuchins, *Cebus*  
455 *capucinus*. - Behaviour 135: 139-172.

456 Rhine, R.J. (1975). The order of movement of yellow baboons (*Papio cynocephalus*). - Folia  
457 Primatol. 23: 72-104.

458 Rhine, R.J. & Westlund, B.J. (1981). Adult male positioning in baboon progressions: Order  
459 and chaos revisited. - Folia Primatol. 35: 77-116.

460 Rose, L.M. (1994). Benefits and costs of resident males to females in white-faced capuchins,  
461 *Cebus capucinus*. - Am. J. Primatol. 32: 235-248.

462 Saito, C. (1996). Dominance and feeding success in female Japanese macaques, *Macaca*  
463 *fuscata*: effects of food patch size and inter-patch distance. - Anim. Behav. 51: 967-980.

464 van Schaik, C.P. (1983). Why are diurnal primates living in groups? - Behaviour 87: 120-144.

465 Schaller, G.B. (1963). *The mountain Gorilla: Ecology and Behavior*. - Chicago, University of  
466 Chicago Press.

467 Siegel, S. & Castellan, N. J. (1988). *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. -  
468 Singapore, McGraw-Hill.

469 Sterck, E.H.M., Watts, D.P. & van Schaik, C.P. (1997). The evolution of female social  
470 relationships in nonhuman primates. - *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 4: 291-309.

471 Stevenson-Hinde, J. (1983). Individual characteristics of mothers and their infants. - In:  
472 *Primate Social Relationships* (Hinde, R.A., ed). Sunderland, MA, Sinauer Associates Inc., p.  
473 122-127.

474 Stewart, K.J. & Harcourt, A.H. (1994). Gorilla's vocalizations during rest periods: signals of  
475 impending departure? - *Behaviour* 130: 29-40.

476 Sumpter, D.J.T. (2006). The principles of collective animal behaviour. - *Philos. Trans. R. Soc.*  
477 *London [Biol.]* 361: 5-22.

478 Terborgh, J. (1983). *Five New World primates: A study in comparative ecology*. - Princeton,  
479 New Jersey, Princeton University Press.

480 Thorpe, W.H. (1963). *Learning and instinct in animals*. - Cambridge, MA, Harvard University  
481 Press.

482 Théraulaz, G., Gautrais, J., Blanco, S., Fournier, R. & Deneubourg, J.-L. (2003). Le  
483 comportement collectif des insectes. - *Pour la Science* 314: 116-121.

484 de Vries, H. (1995). An improved test of linearity in dominance hierarchies containing  
485 unknown or tied relationships. - *Anim. Behav.* 50: 1375-1389.

486 de Vries, H., Netto, W. J. & Hanegraaf, P. L. H. (1993). Matman : A program for the analysis  
487 of sociometric matrices and behavioural transition matrices. – *Behaviour* 125: 157-175.



- 488 Weimerskirch, H., Martin, J., Clerquin, Y., Alexandre, P. & Jiraskova, S. (2001). Energy  
489 saving in flight formation - pelicans flying in a "V" can glide for extended periods using the  
490 other birds' air streams. - *Nature* 413: 697-698.
- 491 Whitten, P.L. (1983). Diet and dominance among female vervet monkeys *Cercopithecus*  
492 *aethiops*. - *Am. J. Primatol.* 5: 139-159.
- 493 Wittig, R. M. & Boesch, C. (2003). Food competition and linear dominance hierarchy among  
494 female chimpanzees of the Taï National Park. - *Int. J. Prim.* 24: 847-867.
- 495 Wrangham, R.W. (1980). An ecological model of female-bonded primate groups. - *Behaviour*  
496 75: 262-299.

497 **Figures**

498

499 Figure 1

500




501 a


b

502 Figure 2


503



504 a



505 b




506 c




507 Figure 3


508



509 a



510 b



511 c

512 **Legends for figures**

513

514

515 Figure 1

516 Theoretical distribution (a) and experimental distribution (b) of the number of tests where  $i$  ( $i$   
517 = 0,...,13) individuals have chosen the left side. The theoretical distribution simulates the  
518 choices of individuals behaving independently.

519

520

521 Figure 2

522 Anonymous model: Individuals influenced by the animals which have already gone:  
523 Distribution of the simulations (1000 replications) as a function of the number of individuals  
524 having chosen the left side with three different mimetic coefficients  $\beta = 1$  (a), 3 (b) and 10 (c).

525

526

527 Figure 3

528 Individualised model: Distribution of the simulations (1000 replications) as a function of the  
529 number of individuals having chosen the left side with three different mimetic coefficients  $\beta =$   
530 1 (a), 3 (b) and 10 (c).

531