Insectes Sociaux

Behavioural response of workers to repeated intergroup encounters in the harvester ant Messor barbarus
--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	INSO-D-18-00142R2
Full Title:	Behavioural response of workers to repeated intergroup encounters in the harvester ant Messor barbarus
Article Type:	Research Article
Corresponding Author:	Faye Thompson, Ph.D University of Exeter Penryn, Cornwall UNITED KINGDOM
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	University of Exeter
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Graham Birch, MSci
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Graham Birch, MSci
	Michael Cant, PhD
	Faye Thompson, Ph.D
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Funding Information:	Natural Environment Research Council (NE/S000046/1) — Prof Michael Cant / Dr. Faye Thompson
Abstract:	The evolution of cooperation in animal societies is often associated with the evolution of hostility towards members of other groups. It is usually predicted that groups under attack from outsiders should respond by becoming more cohesive or cooperative. However, the responses of individuals to real or simulated intergroup encounters vary widely, for reasons that are poorly understood. We tested how groups of workers of the harvester ant, Messor barbarus, responded to exposure to members of a different colony versus members of their own colony, and how previous exposure to an intruder affected the intensity of the within-group response. We found that workers increased in activity and had more contact with one another immediately following exposure to an ant from a different colony, but also showed a similar behavioural response to presentations involving an ant from their own colony. However, exposure to an intruder from a different colony resulted in much stronger behavioural responses to a second intruder, encountered shortly afterwards. Our results are consistent with studies of social vertebrates which suggest that exposure to intruders results in increased social cohesion. Our results also show that exposure to an intruder primes group members to respond more strongly to future intrusions. Our findings highlight a disconnect between the assumptions of theoretical models which study the effect of intergroup conflict on social evolution over many generations, and the short-term behavioural responses that are the usual focus of studies of intergroup conflict in insects and vertebrates.
Response to Reviewers:	Details of revisions can be found in the document entitled "Revisions to final manuscript".

1   **Behavioural response of workers to repeated intergroup encounters in the**

2   **harvester ant *Messor barbarus***

3   Graham Birch[a], Michael A. Cant[a] & Faye J. Thompson[a*]

4

5   [a] Centre for Ecology and Conservation, University of Exeter, Penryn Campus, Penryn,

6   Cornwall TR10 9FE

7

8   *Corresponding author:

9   Faye J. Thompson

10   Centre for Ecology and Conservation, University of Exeter, Penryn Campus, Penryn, Cornwall

11   TR10 9FE

12   +44 (0) 1326 253716

13   F.J.Thompson@exeter.ac.uk

14   **Abstract**

15   The evolution of cooperation in animal societies is often associated with the evolution of hostility

16   towards members of other groups. It is usually predicted that groups under attack from outsiders

17   should respond by becoming more cohesive or cooperative. However, the responses of individuals

18   to real or simulated intergroup encounters vary widely, for reasons that are poorly understood. We

19   tested how groups of workers of the harvester ant, *Messor barbarus*, responded to exposure to

20   members of a different colony versus members of their own colony, and how previous exposure to

21   an intruder affected the intensity of the within-group response. We found that workers increased in

22   activity and had more contact with one another immediately following exposure to an ant from a

23   different colony, but also showed a similar behavioural response to presentations involving an ant

24   from their own colony. However, exposure to an intruder from a different colony resulted in much

25   stronger behavioural responses to a second intruder, encountered shortly afterwards. Our results

26   are consistent with studies of social vertebrates which suggest that exposure to intruders results in

27   increased social cohesion. Our results also show that exposure to an intruder primes group members

28   to respond more strongly to future intrusions. Our findings highlight a disconnect between the

29   assumptions of theoretical models which study the effect of intergroup conflict on social evolution

30   over many generations, and the short-term behavioural responses that are the usual focus of studies

31   of intergroup conflict in insects and vertebrates.

32

33   **Keywords:** intergroup conflict, social evolution, cohesion, affiliation, priming

Introduction

Intergroup conflict is recognised as a major force influencing selection on social traits in organisms ranging from insects to humans (Darwin 1871; Reeve and Holldobler 2007; Bowles and Gintis 2011; Radford et al. 2016). Theoretical population genetic models have shown how intergroup conflict can favour the spread of altruistic alleles that increase between-group variation in fitness (and hence the strength of between-group selection) relative to within-group variation in fitness (Choi and Bowles 2007; Lehmann and Feldman 2008; Lehmann 2011). In addition, it is widely expected (largely on the basis of empirical studies) that groups under attack from other groups should pull together and become more cooperative (e.g. Radford 2008; Burton-Chellew et al. 2010). Thus conflict between groups is predicted to influence selection for altruism and cooperation within groups on an evolutionary timescale (i.e. over many generations), but is also predicted to affect the immediate, short-term behavioural responses of individuals to each other and to outsiders.

Empirical tests of the prediction that groups under attack from competitors should become more cohesive and cooperative have yielded conflicting results (Radford et al. 2016). For example, several primate species show an increase in grooming following group conflict (Cords 2002; Schino 2007; Majolo et al. 2016), and similar patterns have been observed in green woodhoopoes, *Phoeniculus purpureus* (Radford 2011) and laboratory groups of cooperative cichlids, *Neolamprologus pulcher* (Bruintjes et al. 2015). By contrast, in other species such as tufted capuchins, *Cebus apella* (Polizzi di Sorrentino et al. 2012), vervet monkeys, *Chlorocebus aethiops pygerythrus* (Arseneau et al. 2015), and bonnet macaques, *Macaca radiata* (Cooper et al. 2004), intergroup conflict has been shown to lead to an increase in within-group aggression.

The wide variation in observed behavioural responses to intergroup conflict may be linked to the inherent heterogeneity of groups in nature (Thompson and Cant 2018). Groups vary in their composition, and group members vary in status and incentive, which can alter decisions of when to

60 fight and the level of response to group conflict (Wilson et al. 2001; Cassidy et al. 2015; Arseneau-

61 Robar et al. 2016). Individuals and groups can also vary in their past experience of conflict, which

62 may differentially change individual responses to threats from competitors (Hsu et al. 2006; Esponda

63 and Gordon 2015; Christensen and Radford 2018).

64

65 The ubiquity and intensity of between-group competition in ants makes them well suited to testing

66 the effect of past experience on behavioural responses to intergroup conflict (Hölldobler and Wilson

67 1990; Bourke and Franks 1995; Adams 2016). Previous experimental studies in these systems have

68 focussed on aggressive responses to conflict, with contrasting results. In some species, exposure to

69 other groups resulted in a 'priming' response, where individuals in groups reacted more strongly to

70 future encounters, or underwent developmental changes which increased their ability to fight or

71 defend resources in future. For example, in Argentine ants, *Linepithema humile* (Van Wilgenburg et

72 al. 2010), workers that were exposed to a non-colony member displayed increased aggression in

73 subsequent encounters, and in interactions with ants from a colony that they had not previously

74 encountered. In the ant *Pheidole pallidula,* exposure to intergroup conflict led to an increased

75 production of soldiers (Passera et al. 1996). Theoretical and empirical work has shown that past

76 experience can shape individual ants' criteria for non-nestmate recognition which collectively

77 produces an aggressive colony-level response (Newey et al. 2010; Esponda and Gordon 2015). By

78 contrast, some ant species have shown evidence of acclimatisation to the presence of neighbouring

79 competitors, and a reduced aggressive response (*Pheidole* ants, Langen et al. 2000; *Streblognathus*

80 *peetersi* and *Plectroctena mandibularis*, Tanner and Keller 2012). The causes of these varying

81 responses to recent exposure are unclear. Moreover, in ants, little is known about the effect of

82 exposure to intergroup conflict on social cohesion and within-group affiliation, the types of

83 behaviour on which studies of primates and other vertebrates typically focus.

84

85 Here we test how simulated intergroup conflict affects affiliative behaviour and social cohesion in

86 the harvester ant, *Messor barbarus*, and whether past experience affects the intensity of conflict

87 responses. Specifically, we test the 'primed response' hypothesis which suggests that recent

88 encounters with intruders reflect a high probability of subsequent, potentially costly, encounters.

89 This hypothesis predicts that individuals that are exposed to intruders will exhibit elevated sensitivity

90 and responsiveness to future intrusions, and higher levels of affiliation and social cohesion. We

91 tested these predictions through an experiment in which we repeatedly exposed a group of workers

92 to an individual from their own or an unfamiliar colony.

93

94 **Methods**

95 **Colony maintenance**

96 Twenty *M. barbarus* colonies were sourced from commercial suppliers in Spain and the Netherlands

97 (AntHouse, Ants Kalytta, and Ant's Kingdom). Colonies were founded by multiple independent

98 nuptial flights, meaning that relatedness between colonies was unlikely to be high. Colonies were

99 kept in separate darkened nests made of 20 x 20 x 3 cm moulds of plaster of Paris, connected by a

100 tube to a separate clear-plastic foraging area, in incubators kept at 25°C and with a day-night light

101 regime. Colonies were checked 3 times a week, and water and food were added when necessary.

102 Colonies contained a queen and individuals belonging to a major caste (the larger size class in the

103 colony) and a minor caste (the smaller size class in the colony). Of the 20 colonies, 16 were used as

104 experimental colonies (average colony size ± SE = 20.4 individuals ± 1.1; average ratio of minor to

105 major caste individuals ± SE = 14.6 ± 0.7). Ants from the remaining 4 colonies (non-experimental

106 colonies) were used as intruder ants in staged encounters with experimental colonies.

107

108 **Staged experimental encounters**

109 The behaviour of the 16 experimental colonies was analysed in response to experimental encounters

110 with an intruder individual. Eight ants (1 major and 7 minors) were randomly selected from the

111   experimental colony and placed into a petri dish. Ants were recorded from above using a Canon

112   DSLR camera and a Panasonic HC-VX980EB-K camcorder in a dark room under red light. Ants were

113   left for 2 minutes to acclimatise before the start of the exposure experiment protocol.

114

115   After the 2 minute acclimatisation period, the ants were recorded for 10 minutes to generate

116   baseline measurements of behaviour (the 'before' exposure phase). Ants were then given one of

117   two exposure treatments: exposure to an 'intruder' ant (a randomly selected minor caste ant from

118   one of the non-experimental colonies), or exposure to a 'home' ant (a randomly selected minor

119   caste ant from their own colony). Ants were video recorded for a 10 minute period (the 'during'

120   exposure phase). Exposure to a 'home' ant acted as a matched control to enable us to rule out the

121   possibility that any changes in observed behaviour were the result of an increase in the number of

122   ants in the petri dish, rather than the identity of the presented ant. We did not simultaneously

123   expose experimental colonies to multiple presented individuals due to logistical constraints on the

124   size of non-experimental colonies. The presented ant was marked with a small dot of white enamel

125   paint applied to its head for identification during video analysis.

126

127   After 10 minutes of exposure, the presented ant was removed from the petri dish and ants were

128   video recorded for a further 10 minute period (the 'after' exposure phase). After a 20 minute rest

129   interval, the experiment was repeated to allow us to measure behavioural responses to a second,

130   subsequent intruder. Similarly, the presented ant was either a 'home' ant or an 'intruder' ant. Again,

131   there was a 10 minute period of video recording before, during and after the second exposure. Each

132   experimental colony was exposed to four treatments in total: Intruder-Intruder (II), Intruder-Home

133   (IH), Home-Home (HH), and Home-Intruder (HI). Each experimental colony received the four

134   treatments on separate days and in a randomised order.

135

Video analysis

Video footage of behaviour was analysed using PotPlayer version 1.7.13622. We recorded three

separate behaviours among ants in the experimental colony: time to first contact, activity, and social

contacts. Time to first contact between the presented ant and an ant from the experimental colony

(in seconds) was recorded in the 'during' exposure phase as a measure of the strength of response

to intruders. We recorded the caste (major or minor) of the ant to make the first contact with the

intruder. Activity was measured as the proportion of ants observed moving in the first 20 seconds of

each minute of the 'before', 'during' and 'after' exposure phases. The number of social contacts was

measured as the number of times two ants from the experimental colony touched heads or body

parts and was recorded during each minute of the 'before', 'during' and 'after' exposure phases.

Cases of grappling (when two ants bite and hold each other with the mandibles) between ants in the

experimental colony, and with presented ants were also recorded. However, since grappling was

very rare (21 observations in 8 out of 16 colonies), it was left out of formal statistical analysis.

Observations were not blind to treatment or phase.

Statistical analyses

Statistical analyses were performed in R version 3.5.1 (R Development Core Team 2016) using linear

mixed effects models (LMMs) and generalized linear mixed effects models (GLMMs), with binomial

and Poisson error structures and logit and log link functions respectively, using the 'lme4' package

(Bates et al. 2015). The residuals of LMMs were checked to confirm they were normally distributed

with constant variance. For analyses in which the response variable was overdispersed, we used

GLMMs fitted with an observational level random effect (Harrison 2014, 2015). In each analysis, we

fitted the maximal model including all fixed effects and biologically relevant interactions, along with

a random effect of colony ID to account for repeated measures of behaviours from the same

experimental colonies. We used likelihood ratio tests to assess the significance of each fixed effect

(Bates et al. 2015) and present parameter estimates and standard errors from the maximal model.

162   We did not perform stepwise model reduction by removing non-significant fixed effects from the

163   model due to problems associated with such techniques (Whittingham et al. 2006; Mundry and

164   Nunn 2009; Forstmeier and Schielzeth 2011). However, we did remove non-significant interactions

165   to allow the significance of main effects to be tested (Engqvist 2005). Separate analyses were

166   conducted on behavioural responses to first and second exposures to test for differences in

167   response to intruders compared to home ants (on first exposure), and then for differences in

168   response dependent on the first exposure. Post hoc Tukey's all-pairwise comparisons of means were

169   conducted using the 'glht' function in the 'multcomp' package (Hothorn et al. 2008, 2016) to test for

170   differences between levels of significant main effects of phase ('before', 'during' and 'after'), and

171   treatment in the second exposure (II, IH, HH, HI).

172

173   *Time to first contact*

174   In 7 out of 64 cases in the first exposure, and 6 out of 64 cases in the second exposure, contact

175   between an ant from the experimental colony and the presented ant did not occur during the 10

176   minute exposure period. We therefore removed these trials from our analysis and fitted the log-

177   transformed time to first contact as the response variable in two LMMs (one analysing data from the

178   first exposure, and one analysing data from the second exposure). Time to first contact was log-

179   transformed to meet the assumption of normal distribution of residuals. We included treatment (I or

180   H in the first exposure; II, IH, HH or HI in the second exposure), the caste of the ant that made the

181   first contact (minor or major), and the interaction between these variables as fixed effects. One trial

182   in the first exposure resulted in contact between a major and minor ant and the presented ant at

183   exactly the same time, and for two trials in the second exposure we were unable to observe the

184   moment of first contact accurately. These trials were subsequently removed from their respective

185   analyses. We fitted these models to data on 56 and 58 trials (for the first and second exposure

186   respectively) in 16 colonies.

187

188   *Activity*

189   We fitted the proportion of ants from the experimental colony that were active in the first 20

190   seconds after each minute of recording as the response variable in two GLMMs (one analysing data

191   from the first exposure, and one analysing data from the second exposure). We fitted the models

192   using a binomial error structure with an observational level random effect to correct for

193   overdispersion of our response variable (Harrison 2015). We included treatment (I or H in the first

194   exposure; II, IH, HH or HI in the second exposure), phase (before, during or after), and the

195   interaction between treatment and phase as fixed effects. To test whether activity changed at a

196   different rate between different treatments, we also included time (the minute of recording) and the

197   interaction between time and treatment as additional fixed effects. We fitted these models to data

198   on 1920 minutes of video recordings in 64 trials in 16 colonies (for both the first and second

199   exposure).

200

201   *Number of social contacts*

202   We fitted the number of social contacts occurring between ants in the experimental colony during

203   each minute of recording as the response variable in two GLMMs (one analysing data from the first

204   exposure, and one analysing data from the second exposure). We fitted the models using a Poisson

205   error structure with an observational level random effect to correct for overdispersion of our

206   response variable (Harrison 2014). We included treatment (I or H in the first exposure; II, IH, HH or

207   HI in the second exposure), phase (before, during or after), time (the minute of recording), and the

208   interaction between treatment and phase, and treatment and time as fixed effects. We fitted these

209   models to data on 1920 minutes of video recordings in 64 trials in 16 colonies (for both the first and

210   second exposure).

211

Results

Time to first contact

We found no evidence that ants responded more quickly to intruder ants than home ants. On first exposure, there was no difference in the time that ants from the experimental colony took to make contact with an intruder ant (mean ± SE = 36.9 ± 19.4 seconds) compared to a home ant (mean ± SE = 62.8 ± 42.4 seconds). Nor was there any difference in the reaction of minor ants (mean ± SE = 39.7 ± 20.0 seconds) and major ants (mean ± SE = 74.6 ± 63.4 seconds) to the presented ant (GLMM, treatment x caste: χ^2_1 = 0.25, P = 0.62; treatment: χ^2_1 = 0.63, P = 0.43; caste: χ^2_1 = 0.43, P = 0.51; model intercept ± SE = 3.35 ± 0.38). We also found no evidence that ants reacted differently to a second intruder ant depending on their previous experience. During the second exposure, there was no difference in time to first contact with the presented ant for castes in different treatments (GLMM, treatment x caste: β ± SE = -1.92 ± 1.45, χ^2_1 = 1.71, P = 0.19). Ants did not react differently depending on whether they had previously been exposed to an intruder or a home ant (mean ± SE seconds for treatments: II = 25.7 ± 17.9; HI = 23.5 ± 8.3; IH = 51.4 ± 36.6; HH = 95.5 ± 81.0; GLMM, treatment: χ^2_1 = 7.06, P = 0.07). There was also no difference in response time of minor ants (mean ± SE = 51.4 ± 25.9 seconds) and major ants (mean ± SE = 29.3 ± 28.5 seconds; GLMM, caste: β ± SE = 0.60 ± 0.66, χ^2_1 = 0.81, P = 0.37).

Activity

In the first exposure, ants from the experimental colony were significantly more active when presented with an intruder ant compared to a home ant (GLMM, β ± SE = 0.26 ± 0.04, χ^2_1 = 37.24, P < 0.001; Figure 1). Phase of exposure also had a significant effect on ant activity (χ^2_2 = 178.74, P < 0.001; Figure 1) but this effect was independent of treatment (treatment x phase: χ^2_2 = 4.68, P = 0.097; Figure 1). Ants were significantly more active during exposure to the presented ant than in the 'before' or 'after' phases (post hoc Tukey's test, 'before' vs 'during': 0.27 ± 0.052, z = 5.14, P < 0.001; 'during' vs 'after': -0.70 ± 0.052, z = -13.39, P < 0.001; 'before' vs 'after': -0.43 ± 0.051, z = -

10

238   8.36, P < 0.001; Figure 1). Ant activity decreased significantly during each trial ($\beta \pm$ SE = -0.071 $\pm$

239   0.007, χ^2_1 = 91.97, P < 0.001), but this effect was independent of treatment (treatment x time: χ^2_1 =

240   0.027, P = 0.87).

241

242   In the second exposure, we found evidence of a primed response in the activity of experimental ants

243   (GLMM, treatment: χ^2_3 = 46.11, P < 0.001). Ants that had previously been exposed to an intruder ant

244   were significantly more active than ants that had been previously exposed to a home ant, although

245   the comparison between IH and HI treatments was not significant (post hoc Tukey's test, HI vs II: $\beta \pm$

246   SE = 0.31 $\pm$ 0.061, z = 5.086, P < 0.001; HH vs II: $\beta \pm$ SE = 0.39 $\pm$ 0.061, z = 6.41, P < 0.001; HH vs IH: β

247    $\pm$ SE = 0.20 $\pm$ 0.061, z = 3.29, P = 0.0054; HI vs IH: $\beta \pm$ SE = 0.12 $\pm$ 0.061, z = 1.95, P = 0.21; Figure 2).

248   Ants that had been previously exposed to an intruder ant were also significantly more active when

249   subsequently presented with an intruder compared to a home ant (IH vs II: 0.19 $\pm$ 0.06, z = 3.17, P =

250   0.0087; Figure 2), but not when they were previously exposed to a home ant (HH vs HI: 0.081 $\pm$

251   0.061, z = 1.33, P = 0.54; Figure 2). Consistent with the first exposure, ants were also significantly

252   more active in the 'during' phase than in the 'before' or 'after' phase (χ^2_2 = 337.38, P < 0.001; post

253   hoc Tukey's test, 'before' vs 'during': $\beta \pm$ SE = 0.99 $\pm$ 0.053, z = 18.72, P < 0.001; 'during' vs 'after': $\beta \pm$

254   SE = -0.58 $\pm$ 0.052, z = -11.16, P < 0.001; 'before' vs 'after': $\beta \pm$ SE = 0.41 $\pm$ 0.053, z = 7.76, P < 0.001;

255   Figure 3). However, the effect of treatment and phase were independent of one another (treatment

256   x phase: χ^2_6 = 11.22, P = 0.082). Similar to the first exposure, ant activity decreased significantly

257   during each trial of the second exposure ($\beta \pm$ SE = -0.065 $\pm$ 0.007, χ^2_1 = 73.94, P < 0.001), and this

258   effect was independent of treatment (treatment x time: χ^2_3 = 2.97, P = 0.40).

259

260   *Number of social contacts*

261   In the first exposure, we observed significantly more social contacts between ants from the

262   experimental colony when they were exposed to an intruder ant compared to a home ant (GLMM, β

263    $\pm$ SE = 0.18 $\pm$ 0.02, χ^2_1 = 59.26, P < 0.001; Figure 4), but there was no significant difference between

264   treatments across phases (treatment x phase: χ^2_2 = 1.52, P = 0.47; Figure 4). Independent of

265   treatment, phase had a significant effect on the number of social contacts (χ^2_2 = 20.49, P < 0.001)

266   with significantly fewer contacts after exposure compared to before and during exposure (post hoc

267   Tukey's test, 'before' vs 'during': 0.047 ± 0.028, z = 1.71, P = 0.20; 'during' vs 'after': -0.13 ± 0.028, z =

268   -4.53, P < 0.001; 'before' vs 'after': -0.079 ± 0.028, z = -2.82, P = 0.013; Figure 4). Ants made

269   significantly fewer social contacts through the course of each trial, but this effect was not dependent

270   on treatment (treatment x time: χ^2_1 = 1.70, P = 0.19; time: β ± SE = -0.063 ± 0.004, χ^2_1 = 236.44, P <

271   0.0001).

272

273   Consistent with our findings of a primed response in the activity of experimental ants, we also found

274   that the number of social contacts between ants was significantly different depending on whether

275   they had previously been exposed to an intruder or a home ant (GLMM, treatment: χ^2_3 = 72.31, P <

276   0.0001). Ants that had previously been presented with an intruder ant made significantly more social

277   contacts than ants that had been exposed to a home ant (post hoc Tukey's test, HI vs II: β ± SE = 0.24

278   ± 0.04, z = 6.03, P < 0.001; HH vs II: β ± SE = 0.33 ± 0.041, z = 8.21, P < 0.001; HH vs IH: β ± SE = 0.20 ±

279   0.041, z = 4.81, P < 0.001; HI vs IH: β ± SE = 0.11 ± 0.041, z = 2.60, P = 0.046; Figure 5). Ants that had

280   been exposed to an intruder ant in the first exposure made significantly more social contacts when

281   they were subsequently presented with an intruder compared to a home ant (IH vs II: 0.14 ± 0.039, z

282   = 3.43, P = 0.0034; Figure 5), but this difference was not observed when the first exposure was to a

283   home ant (HH vs HI: 0.093 ± 0.042, z = 2.21, P = 0.12; Figure 5). Phase had a significant effect on the

284   number of social contacts (χ^2_2 = 195.31, P < 0.001), but this was not dependent on treatment

285   (treatment x phase: χ^2_6 = 3.98, P = 0.68). Ants made significantly more contacts during exposure to

286   the presented ant compared to before, and this effect lasted throughout the 'after' exposure phase

287   (post hoc Tukey's test, 'before' vs 'during': β ± SE = 0.51 ± 0.036, z = 14.35, P < 0.001; 'during' vs

288   'after': β ± SE = -0.19 ± 0.034, z = -5.67, P < 0.001; 'before' vs 'after': β ± SE = 0.32 ± 0.037, z = 8.78, P

289   < 0.001; Figure 6). Ants made significantly fewer social contacts through each trial of the second

290   exposure ($\beta \pm SE = -0.083 \pm 0.005$, $\chi^2_1 = 247.67$, P <0.001), and this effect was independent of

291   treatment (treatment x time: $\chi^2_3 = 0.39$, P = 0.94).

292

293   **Discussion**

294   Our study shows that workers of the harvester ant *M. barbarus* respond to the presence of an

295   intruder by increasing their activity patterns overall, and in particular by increasing the rate at which

296   they make contact with other colony members. This is consistent with the hypothesis that individual

297   workers act to increase coordination or cohesiveness among members of their own group when

298   confronted by members of a different group, which may serve as an indicator of invasion or attack

299   by another colony. However, the behavioural response was statistically similar regardless of whether

300   the presented ant was from their own colony or from a different colony, suggesting that when the

301   ants first encountered an unfamiliar individual, they made no obvious distinction between members

302   of their own or other colonies. Nevertheless, exposure to an unfamiliar intruder did have a large

303   influence on the response of ants to a second intruder encountered shortly afterwards. Specifically,

304   an encounter with an intruder from a different colony primed the ants to respond more strongly to a

305   second intruder, particularly when the second intruder was also from a different colony. Thus our

306   results suggest that recent previous experience of potential intergroup conflict increases the within-

307   group response to a simulated intrusion, in line with the 'primed response' hypothesis.

308

309   These findings in a eusocial insect offer a complement to research on the behavioural responses of

310   some social vertebrates to simulated intrusions. For example, in cooperative cichlids, *N. pulcher*,

311   laboratory groups that are exposed to intruders subsequently engage in elevated rates of affiliative

312   behaviour (e.g. soft touching and following; Bruintjes et al. 2015). Similar increases in affiliative

313   behaviour following exposure to experimental intruders have been shown in green woodhoopoes

314   (Radford 2008). In both cases the increase in affiliative behaviour is interpreted as an adaptive

315   response which increases group cohesion, protecting the group from future attacks. These systems

316   differ from our ants in that group members each have the potential to reproduce, either currently or

317   in the future, whereas the ant workers are selected to behave in a way that maximises their indirect

318   component of fitness, realised via the assistance they can provide to the colony production of

319   reproductives. The fact that similar behavioural responses to intruders are seen in such different

320   systems is consistent with the hypothesis that increased contact or affiliation among group members

321   serves to prepare or strengthen the group against future attacks, and is therefore favoured by both

322   selection acting at the level of the individual and the level of the group (Okasha 2006; Robinson and

323   Barker 2017). Unlike the findings on cooperative vertebrates, however, our study suggests that

324   harvester ants respond to their first encounter with an unexpected individual in a similar way,

325   without making distinctions based on colony-of-origin.

326

327   We found evidence that the response to intruders in *M. barbarus,* in the form of social contacts and

328   activity, was enhanced by previous experience of an encounter with a non-colony intruder. This

329   result suggests that *M. barbarus* workers utilise experience of past enemy encounters to calibrate

330   future behavioural responses, in line with previous evidence in a variety of taxa (Rose and Brenowitz

331   1997; Monclús et al. 2014), including other ant species (Thomas et al. 2007; Newey et al. 2010; Van

332   Wilgenburg et al. 2010; Adams 2016). This result also provides support for predictions of recent

333   theory which shows that individual past experience results in quicker and more accurate recognition

334   of non-nestmates at the colony (Esponda and Gordon 2015). Ants could collectively gain experience

335   of enemy cuticular hydrocarbons (CHCs) used in nestmate discrimination during first exposure which

336   primes them to respond more intensely to non-nestmates on subsequent exposure (Guerrieri et al.

337   2009; Newey et al. 2010). Initial exposure to an intruder ant could affect patterns of movement (e.g.

338   by eliciting a patrolling response) and the structure of social networks, such that subsequent

339   encounters between ants in the colony are more likely. For example, an intruder ant could represent

340   a pathogenic threat to the colony that stimulates a change in within-colony social dynamics

341   (Stroeymeyt et al. 2018). Encounters with an intruder, even a single intruder as in our experiment,

342 may result in a step-change in the perceived level of risk of intergroup competition or attack. In

343 addition, the response of individuals to simulated intrusion may depend on the number of intruders

344 or the perceived strength or composition of a group of intruders (Roulston et al. 2003). Similarly,

345 intruders could represent a larger threat if they are more likely to be of a more aggressive

346 phenotype (Sturgis and Gordon 2013). The question of how groups assess each other's relative

347 strength and motivation has been little explored theoretically or empirically. In contrast to dyadic

348 animal contest theory, signals of resource holding potential (RHP) of groups depend on the

349 individual and combined signalling effort of individual group members, which may vary in complex

350 (non-linear) ways with group size and composition. Experimental approaches in ant systems such as

351 ours could be a powerful tool to elucidate some of the principles of intergroup signalling and

352 conflict, and how group size and individual RHP combine to determine group RHP (e.g. Batchelor et

353 al. 2012).

354

355 There are some limitations to our study which should be considered when interpreting our results.

356 Firstly, we observed fewer social contacts and a lower proportion of active ants in the 'before' phase

357 of the second exposure compared to the 'before' phase of the first exposure. This unexpected

358 difference in behaviour could reflect a lack of acclimatisation to the assay arena (itself an artificial

359 environment) before the first exposure, or fatigue from responding to the previously presented ant

360 before the second exposure. Fatigue in response to stimuli makes direct comparisons between initial

361 and subsequent exposures more difficult to interpret, but does not detract from our observed effect

362 of a primed response to an intruder. In fact, we might have observed an even stronger primed

363 response in the second exposure had ants not been fatigued. Secondly, colony sizes used in our

364 experiments were small. This may have affected colony response behaviour to intruders and could

365 go some way to explaining the lack of observed aggression to presented ants, particularly in light of

366 evidence that colony-level responses to non-nestmates are highly dependent on combined

367 individual-level experience and behaviour (Guerrieri et al. 2009; Newey et al. 2010; Esponda and

368   Gordon 2015). Similarly, we cannot rule out that the presentation of a single intruder may not elicit a

369   behavioural response that accurately reflects the response of the colony as a whole (Roulston et al.

370   2003). Finally, we did not conduct behavioural assays blind to treatment. Non-blind studies are

371   exposed to potentially inflated effect sizes (van Wilgenburg and Elgar 2013) and, as such, although

372   our results provide evidence in support of a primed response to intruders, we should exercise some

373   care when determining the certainty of our results.

374

375   Studies that show increased affiliative behaviour in response to simulated or real intergroup

376   encounters are often taken as consistent with the predictions of theoretical models of the role of

377   intergroup conflict as a promoter of cooperation and altruism within groups. However, there is

378   currently a disconnect between theory and data on this point. Most formal population genetic and

379   game theoretical models of intergroup conflict examine changes in the frequency, over many

380   generations, of fixed genetic traits that influence behaviour toward members of a different group

381   versus members of the own group (e.g. 'parochialism' and 'altruism', Choi and Bowles 2007; or

382   'belligerence' and 'bravery', Lehmann and Feldman 2008). These models do not analyse how

383   individuals should respond plastically to changes in their social environment. The expectation that

384   groups under attack should pull together and behave more cohesively is derived largely from verbal

385   reasoning (starting with Darwin 1871), or empirical observations in humans and non-human animals

386   (Radford et al. 2016; Kavaliers and Choleris 2017). Our findings are consistent with this expectation,

387   but also draw further attention to this current disconnect between the assumptions of current

388   theory and the types of behavioural responses that are measured in empirical studies. In particular,

389   our behavioural results highlight the need for models which specify precisely what fitness benefit

390   individuals and groups derive from behaviour that is determined to be affiliative (such as grooming

391   or allopreening), and how this fitness benefit is realised. For example, does increased grooming

392   among members of a primate group increase group cohesion through a process of reciprocity? Does

393   increased social contact among worker ants communicate information on group strength, or

394   motivation and readiness to fight? New theoretical models which make explicit assumptions about

395   the nature of intergroup competition and the function of within-group affiliation may help to explain

396   why, in some circumstances, intergroup conflict (whether real or simulated) leads to increased social

397   cohesion (this study; Cords 2002; Bruintjes et al. 2015), whereas in others it appears to exacerbate

398   internal tensions (Cooper et al. 2004; Polizzi di Sorrentino et al. 2012; Arseneau et al. 2015).

399

405

406   **References**

407   Adams ES (2016) Territoriality in ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae): a review. Myrmecological News

408   23:101–118. doi: 10.1016/0095-8956(72)90015-9

409   Arseneau-Robar TJM, Taucher AL, Müller E, et al (2016) Female monkeys use both the carrot and the

410   stick to promote male participation in intergroup fights. Proc R Soc London B Biol Sci 283:. doi:

411   http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.1817

412   Arseneau TJM, Taucher AL, van Schaik CP, Willems EP (2015) Male monkeys fight in between-group

413   conflicts as protective parents and reluctant recruits. Anim Behav 110:39–50. doi:

414   10.1016/j.anbehav.2015.09.006

415   Batchelor TP, Santini G, Briffa M (2012) Size distribution and battles in wood ants: Group resource-

416   holding potential is the sum of the individual parts. Anim Behav 83:111–117. doi:

417   10.1016/j.anbehav.2011.10.014

418   Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S (2015) Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. J Stat

419   Softw 67:1–48. doi: 10.18637/jss.v067.i01

420   Bourke AFG, Franks NR (1995) Social Evolution in Ants. Princeton University Press, Princeton

421   Bowles S, Gintis H (2011) A Cooperative Species: Human reciprocity and its evolution. Princeton

422   University Press, Princeton

423   Bruintjes R, Lynton-Jenkins J, Jones JW, Radford AN (2015) Out-group threat promotes within-group

424   affiliation in a cooperative fish. Am Nat 187:274–282. doi: 10.1086/684411

425   Burton-Chellew MN, Ross-Gillespie A, West SA (2010) Cooperation in humans: competition between

426   groups and proximate emotions. Evol Hum Behav 31:104–108. doi:

427   10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2009.07.005

428   Cassidy KA, MacNulty DR, Stahler DR, et al (2015) Group composition effects on aggressive interpack

429   interactions of gray wolves in Yellowstone National Park. Behav Ecol 26:1352–1360. doi:

430   10.1093/beheco/arv081

431   Choi J, Bowles S (2007) The coevolution of parochial altruism and war. Science (80-) 318:636–640.

432   doi: 10.1126/science.1144237

433   Christensen C, Radford AN (2018) Dear enemies or nasty neighbors? Causes and consequences of

434   variation in the responses of group-living species to territorial intrusions. Behav Ecol 29:1004–

435   1013. doi: 10.1093/beheco/ary010

436   Cooper MA, Aureli F, Singh M (2004) Between-group encounters among bonnet macaques (Macaca

437   radiata). Behav Ecol Sociobiol 56:217–227. doi: 10.1007/s00265-004-0779-4

438   Cords M (2002) Friendship among adult female blue monkeys (Cercopithecus mitis). Behaviour

439   139:291–314. doi: 10.1163/156853902760102681

440   Darwin C (1871) The descent of man and selection in relation to sex. John Murray, London

441   Engqvist L (2005) The mistreatment of covariate interaction terms in linear model analyses of

442   behavioural and evolutionary ecology studies. Anim Behav 70:967–971. doi:

443   10.1016/j.anbehav.2005.01.016

444   Esponda F, Gordon DM (2015) Distributed nestmate recognition in ants. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci 282:.

445   doi: 10.1098/rspb.2014.2838

446   Forstmeier W, Schielzeth H (2011) Cryptic multiple hypotheses testing in linear models:

447   Overestimated effect sizes and the winner's curse. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 65:47–55. doi:

448   10.1007/s00265-010-1038-5

449   Guerrieri FJ, Nehring V, Jørgensen CG, et al (2009) Ants recognize foes and not friends. Proc R Soc B

450   Biol Sci 276:2461–2468. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2008.1860

451   Harrison XA (2014) Using observation-level random effects to model overdispersion in count data in

452   ecology and evolution. PeerJ 2:e616. doi: 10.7717/peerj.616

453   Harrison XA (2015) A comparison of observation-level random effect and Beta-Binomial models for

454   modelling overdispersion in Binomial data in ecology & evolution. PeerJ 3:e1114. doi:

455   10.7717/peerj.1114

456   Hölldobler B, Wilson EO (1990) The ants. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA

457   Hothorn T, Bretz F, Westfall P (2008) Simultaneous inference in general parametric models.

458   Biometrical J 50:346–363. doi: 10.1002/bimj.200810425

459   Hothorn T, Bretz F, Westfall P, et al (2016) multcomp: Simultaneous inference in general parametric

460   models. R package version 1.4-4

461   Hsu Y, Earley RL, Wolf LL (2006) Modulation of aggressive behaviour by fighting experience:

462   Mechanisms and contest outcomes. Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc 81:33–74. doi:

463   10.1017/S146479310500686X

464   Kavaliers M, Choleris E (2017) Out-Group Threat Responses, In-Group Bias, and Nonapeptide

465   Involvement Are Conserved across Vertebrates: (A Comment on Bruintjes et al., "Out-Group

466   Threat Promotes Within-Group Affiliation in a Cooperative Fish"). Am Nat 189:000–000. doi:

467   10.1086/690838

468   Langen TA, Tripet F, Nonacs P (2000) The red and the black: Habituation and the dear-enemy

469   phenomenon in two desert Pheidole ants. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 48:285–292. doi:

470   10.1007/s002650000223

471   Lehmann L (2011) The demographic benefits of belligerence and bravery: defeated group

472   repopulation or victorious group size expansion? PLoS One 6:e21437. doi:

473   10.1371/journal.pone.0021437

474 Lehmann L, Feldman MW (2008) War and the evolution of belligerence and bravery. Proc R Soc B

475   Biol Sci 275:2877–2885. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2008.0842

476 Majolo B, de Bortoli Vizioli A, Lehmann J (2016) The effect of intergroup competition on intragroup

477   affiliation in primates. Anim Behav 114:13–19. doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.01.009

478 Monclús R, Saavedra I, de Miguel J (2014) Context-dependent responses to neighbours and strangers

479   in wild European rabbits (Oryctolagus cuniculus). Behav Processes 106:17–21. doi:

480   10.1016/j.beproc.2014.04.004

481 Mundry R, Nunn CL (2009) Stepwise model fitting and statistical inference: turning noise into signal

482   pollution. Am Nat 173:119–123. doi: 10.1086/593303

483 Newey PS, Robson SKA, Crozier RH (2010) Know thine enemy: Why some weaver ants do but others

484   do not. Behav Ecol 21:381–386. doi: 10.1093/beheco/arp201

485 Okasha S (2006) Evolution and the levels of selection. Oxford University Press, Oxford

486 Passera L, Roncin E, Kaufmann B, Keller L (1996) Increased soldier production in ant colonies exposed

487   to intraspecific competition. Nature 379:630–631

488 Polizzi di Sorrentino E, Schino G, Massaro L, et al (2012) Between-group hostility affects within-group

489   interactions in tufted capuchin monkeys. Anim Behav 83:445–451. doi:

490   10.1016/j.anbehav.2011.11.016

491 R Development Core Team (2016) R: A language and environment for statistical computing

492 Radford A (2011) Preparing for battle? Potential intergroup conflict promotes current intragroup

493   affiliation. Biol Lett 7:26–29. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2010.0507

494 Radford AN (2008) Type of threat influences postconflict allopreening in a social bird. Curr Biol

495   18:114–115. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2007.12.025

496 Radford AN, Majolo B, Aureli F (2016) Within-group behavioural consequences of between-group

497   conflict: a prospective review. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci 283:20161567. doi:

498   http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.1567

499   Reeve HK, Holldobler B (2007) The emergence of a superorganism through intergroup competition.

500   Proc Natl Acad Sci 104:9736–9740. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0703466104

501   Robinson EJH, Barker JL (2017) Inter-group cooperation in humans and other animals. Biol Lett

502   13:20160793. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2016.0793

503   Rose GJ, Brenowitz EA (1997) Plasticity of aggressive thresholds in Hyla regilla: Discrete

504   accommodation to encounter calls. Anim Behav 53:353–361. doi: Article

505   Roulston TH, Buczkowski G, Silverman J (2003) Nestmate discrimination in ants: Effect of bioassay on

506   aggressive behavior. Insectes Soc 50:151–159. doi: 10.1007/s00040-003-0624-1

507   Schino G (2007) Grooming and agonistic support: A meta-analysis of primate reciprocal altruism.

508   Behav Ecol 18:115–120. doi: 10.1093/beheco/arl045

509   Stroeymeyt N, Grasse A V., Crespi A, et al (2018) Social network plasticity decreases disease

510   transmission in a eusocial insect. Science (80-) 362:941–945. doi: 10.1126/science.aat4793

511   Sturgis SJ, Gordon DM (2013) Aggression is task dependent in the red harvester ant (Pogonomyrmex

512   barbatus). Behav Ecol 24:532–539. doi: 10.1093/beheco/ars194

513   Tanner CJ, Keller L (2012) Nest distribution varies with dispersal method and familiarity-mediated

514   aggression for two sympatric ants. Anim Behav 84:1151–1158. doi:

515   10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.08.018

516   Thomas ML, Payne-Makrisâ CM, Suarez A V., et al (2007) Contact between supercolonies elevates

517   aggression in Argentine ants. Insectes Soc 54:225–233. doi: 10.1007/s00040-007-0935-8

518   Thompson FJ, Cant MA (2018) Dynamic conflict among heterogeneous groups: a comment on

519   Christensen and Radford. Behav Ecol 00:1–2. doi: 10.1093/beheco/art055

520   Van Wilgenburg E, Clémencet J, Tsutsui ND (2010) Experience influences aggressive behaviour in the

521   Argentine ant. Biol Lett 6:152–155. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2009.0616

522   van Wilgenburg E, Elgar MA (2013) Confirmation Bias in Studies of Nestmate Recognition: A

523   Cautionary Note for Research into the Behaviour of Animals. PLoS One 8:1–8. doi:

524   10.1371/journal.pone.0053548

525   Whittingham MJ, Stephens PA, Bradbury RB, Freckleton RP (2006) Why do we still use stepwise

526   modelling in ecology and behaviour? J Anim Ecol 75:1182–1189. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-

527   2656.2006.01141.x

528   Wilson ML, Hauser MD, Wrangham RW (2001) Does participation in intergroup conflict depend on

529   numerical assessment, range location, or rank for wild chimpanzees? Anim Behav 61:1203–

530   1216. doi: 10.1006/anbe.2000.1706

531

532   **Figure legends**

533   **Figure 1.** The effect of treatment on the proportion of ants active during the first 20 seconds of each

534   minute in each phase of the first exposure (N = 1920 minutes in 64 trials in 16 colonies). Points show

535   predicted means from a GLMM ± SE. In the first exposure, ants significantly increased in activity

536   when presented with an intruder ant (I), but they also showed a similar behavioural response when

537   presented with a home ant (H). Asterisks refer to post hoc Tukey's all-pairwise comparisons of

538   means. *** $P < 0.001$.

539

540   **Figure 2.** The effect of treatment on the proportion of ants active during the first 20 seconds of each

541   minute in each phase of the second exposure (N = 1920 minutes in 64 trials in 16 colonies). Points

542   show predicted means from a GLMM ± SE. In the second exposure, ants showed a primed response

543   if they had been exposed to an intruder ant in the first exposure (IH, II) compared to a home ant (HI,

544   HH). Asterisks refer to post hoc Tukey's all-pairwise comparisons of means. *** $P < 0.001$, ** $P <$

545   0.01. Non-significant pairwise comparisons are not labelled.

546

547   **Figure 3.** The effect of phase on the proportion of ants active during the first 20 seconds of each

548   minute (N = 1920 minutes in 64 trials in 16 colonies for both the first and second exposure). Points

549   show predicted means from a GLMM ± SE. Activity peaked during exposure to the presented ant in

550   both the first and second exposure. Asterisks refer to post hoc Tukey's all-pairwise comparisons of

551   means. *** $P < 0.001$.

552

553   **Figure 4.** The effect of treatment on the number of social contacts between ants in the experimental

554   colony during each minute of each phase of the first exposure (N = 1920 minutes in 64 trials in 16

555   colonies). Points show predicted means from a GLMM ± SE. In the first exposure, ants performed

556   significantly more social contacts when presented with an intruder ant (I), but they also showed a

557   similar behavioural response when presented with a home ant (H). Asterisks refer to post hoc

558   Tukey's all-pairwise comparisons of means. *** $P < 0.001$, * $P < 0.05$. Non-significant pairwise

559   comparisons are not labelled.

560

561   **Figure 5.** The effect of treatment on the number of social contacts between ants in the experimental

562   colony during each minute of each phase of the second exposure (N = 1920 minutes in 64 trials in 16

563   colonies). Points show predicted means from a GLMM ± SE. In the second exposure, ants showed a

564   primed response if they had been exposed to an intruder ant in the first exposure (IH, II) compared

565   to a home ant (HI, HH). Asterisks refer to post hoc Tukey's all-pairwise comparisons of means. *** P

566   < 0.001, ** $P < 0.01$, * $P < 0.05$. Non-significant pairwise comparisons are not labelled.

567

568   **Figure 6.** The effect of phase on the number of social contacts between ants during each minute (N =

569   1920 minutes in 64 trials in 16 colonies for both the first and second exposure). Points show

570   predicted means from a GLMM ± SE. The number of social contacts was not different during

571   exposure to the presented ant compared to before exposure in the first exposure, but peaked during

572   exposure to the presented ant in the second exposure. Asterisks refer to post hoc Tukey's all-

573   pairwise comparisons of means. *** $P < 0.001$, * $P < 0.05$. Non-significant pairwise comparisons are

574   not labelled.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6