

The effect of age, environment and management on social contact patterns in sheep



Laura Ozella^{a,b,*}, Joss Langford^{b,c}, Laetitia Gauvin^a, Emily Price^b, Ciro Cattuto^{a,d}, Darren P. Croft^b

^a ISI Foundation, Turin, Italy

^b Centre for Research in Animal Behaviour, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK

^c Activinsights Ltd., Cambridgeshire, UK

^d Department of Computer Science, University of Turin, Turin, Italy

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Contact patterns

Sheep

Proximity sensors

Social behaviour

Assortment

Environmental conditions

ABSTRACT

Social structures of group-living farm animals can have important implications for animal welfare and productivity. Understanding which factors can have an effect on social behaviour is thus important in order to develop the best management strategies in livestock industries. Here, we studied the social network structure of a flock of 84 Poll Dorset ewes and collecting dyadic associations data through the use of proximity sensors during two study periods. First, we analysed the social structure of ewes at a group-level, by analysing the community structure, and at individual-level, by determining whether the ewes showed social differentiation in their association patterns. Second, we measured for the contribution of genetic relatedness, age, weight, reproductive status and previous management sub grouping on social associations to test for homophily effects. Lastly, we evaluated whether social clustering was influenced by the stocking density of individuals in a field, and by weather parameters, through the use of two climatic indices, the Temperature-Humidity Index (THI) and the Wind Chill Index (WCI). Our results showed that the pairwise associations between ewes are not-random and highly heterogeneous, both in total time spent in contact and in contacts duration. There was no evidence that ewes were subdivided into social communities, and at individual level, they showed markedly differentiated social relationships, demonstrating preferences in social ties. However, the factors that influenced the preferred social interactions between individuals changed over time. In the first study period ewes tended to maintain the social bonds formed in previous management sub grouping, most likely due to a social familiarization resulting from repeated interactions with the same individuals. In the second study period similarity in age influenced the strength of associations among ewes. We found no significant influence of reproductive status, weight (as an indicator of body size) and genetic relatedness on proximity associations in either study period. Moreover, our results showed the tendency of the ewes to form social clusters varied in relation to animals' density, and Wind Chill Index (WCI). The identification of conditions that modify the social behaviour of sheep is critically important in order to implement management and productivity strategies and our results highlight how flock social structure can change depending on environmental and social contexts.

1. Introduction

Gregarious animals form social relationships with group members, and there is growing evidence that social behaviours are positively correlated with the survival and reproductive success of individuals (Silk, 2007). In production settings, management practices can modify the social interactions of group-living farm animals, depending on group composition and available space (Keeling, 2001). Nevertheless, the social behaviour of farm animals is plastic and dynamic, and allows

animals to adapt to varying environmental and social conditions within a confined group (Estevez et al., 2007). In recent years the livestock production industry has intensified efforts to improve animal health and well-being due to increasing ethical issues and public concern about animal welfare. Animal welfare is influenced by the social environment and by the opportunity to express certain social behaviours despite the limitations due to bounded space and management practices (Sevi et al., 2001).

Domestic sheep display an intensely gregarious social behaviour,

* Corresponding author at: ISI Foundation, Turin, Italy.

E-mail address: laura.ozella@isi.it (L. Ozella).

and develop stable social relationships with other members of the flock (Veissier et al., 1998; Fisher and Matthews, 2001). Adult sheep are able to recognise their group members, and under free ranging conditions, they avoid unfamiliar animals (Lawrence and Wood-Gush, 1988; Keller et al., 2011). Sociality of sheep is influenced by a variety of factors including breeding period (Norton et al., 2012), age of animals (Lawrence, 1990; Doyle et al., 2016), and environmental and management factors such as group size (Michelena et al., 2008; Jørgensen et al., 2009), shelter type (Broster et al., 2010), weather conditions (Champion et al., 1994; Doyle et al., 2016), and individual characteristics such as temperament or personality (Michelena et al., 2008; Doyle et al., 2016). One increasingly popular method to assess the contact patterns between animals is the use of proximity sensors (Krause et al., 2013), which allow for automated collection of contact data 24 h a day. To date, proximity sensors have been used on domestic sheep to assess the interactions between ewes and lambs in relation to the shelter type (Broster et al., 2010), to evaluate the relationship between social cohesion of ewes and their feeding motivation (Freire et al., 2012), and association patterns (Doyle et al., 2016).

Here, we studied the social relationships between pedigree, performance-recorded Poll Dorset ewes, collecting dyadic associations data through the use of proximity sensors on a commercial farm, during two sampling periods. The main aim of our study was to evaluate which factors could affect the social bonds in a flock of adult female sheep (ewes) and whether these factors changed over time. First, we described the social network of ewes, and we analysed the social structure of ewes at a group-level, by analysing the community structure, and at individual-level, by determining whether the ewes showed social differentiation in their relationships. Second, we tested the influence of relatedness, age, weight, reproductive status, and previous management sub grouping on total time in proximity between pairs of ewes for each sampling period. Specifically, we hypothesised that: i. related ewes will be more likely to interact than unrelated ewes due to the inclusive fitness benefits of interacting with kin (Griffin and West, 2002; West et al., 2002); ii. that individuals of similar age will be more familiar with each other and thus more likely to interact; iii. that individuals of similar weight (i.e., body mass) will interact more with each other given that body mass is an important determinant of social rank in ungulates (McElligott et al., 2001; Holand et al., 2004); iv. individuals would assort based on lambing date (i.e., reproductive status) due to the potential anti-predator benefits that lactating ewes may gain by associating together (Beauchamp, 2003; Rieucan and Martin, 2008); v. individuals belonging to the same mating group will be more familiar with each other and maintain the social bonds formed in the sub-group (Keller et al., 2011). Lastly, we evaluated the effect of environmental conditions on patterns of social contact. In particular, we assessed if two climatic indices, namely the THI (Temperature-Humidity Index) and WCI (Wind Chill Index), and the density of the animals are related with the clustering coefficient of the network.

2. Methods

2.1. Data collection

The study was carried out on a commercial sheep farm in Devon, UK. Generally, most sheep are short-day seasonal breeders, and the breeding season starts in autumn or winter, whereas, Poll Dorset have strong aseasonal capabilities and they can breed at any time during the year. The breeding techniques on study farm are common to Poll Dorset breeders, and the breeding cycle starts in mid-March, as shown in the flow-chart of flock breeding management (Fig. 1) with vasectomised rams being introduced to a single, massed group of ewes for 4 weeks to help stimulate oestrus. In mid-April the ewes are separated into mating sub-groups with one fertile ram per sub-group (indicated as R1 to R5) for 5 weeks (two oestrus cycles). The mating subgroups of ewes were 25, 25, 24, 24 and 21 in size, from R1 to R5 respectively. Subsequently,

the ewes are aggregated into a single flock (119 ewes) for 7 weeks and assessed for pregnancy by ultra-sound scanning. Non-pregnant ewes (35 ewes) are removed to a separate group and the flock of ewes were 84 in size during the further phases of management. The sheep were kept outdoors on permanent grass leys with no supplementary feeding. The field enclosure size for the groups ranged between 1.15 and 2.13 ha. In this study, data collection from the group of pregnant ewes took place in summer 2018, during two sampling periods of 15 consecutive days in July, and 14 consecutive days in August. The flock moved between fields during the study and the area of each field was recorded to examine the effect of flock density on contact patterns. Lambing followed in September through to early October, and lambing dates were recorded.

During each study period, proximity sensors were deployed on 84 ewes to record patterns of social contact between individuals. Sensors were fixed to a freely-rotating neck collar with a total weight of ~100 g. At the time of the study ewes were aged from 2 years to 9 years old, and all ewes were weighed before the start of the deployments. The complete pedigree of the flock is known (for both maternal and paternal pedigree) and the pedigree was used to compute the pairwise coefficient of relatedness among all individuals. The coefficient ranged between 0 (no relatives) and 0.5 (mother–daughter or full siblings).

During the deployment in August daily meteorological data were recorded via a weather station (Davis Vantage Pro2 Plus). In particular, 24 h mean temperature (°C), 24 h mean relative humidity (%), 24 h mean wind speed (m/s) were recorded. From these measures we calculated two climatic indices, the THI (Temperature-Humidity Index) (Thom, 1959) and the WCI (Wind Chill Index) (Tucker et al., 2007). The Temperature Humidity Index (THI) is a measure that accounts for the combined effects of environmental temperature and relative humidity to assess the risk of heat stress (Segnolini et al., 2011):

$$THI = 0.8 \times T + [RH \times (T - 14.4)] + 46.4$$

where T is air temperature in °C and RH is the relative humidity in decimal form.

Cold stress was most often quantified by means of the Wind Chill Index (WCI) (Tucker et al., 2007), that relates ambient temperature and wind speed:

$$WCI = 13.12 + 0.62 \times T - 13.17 \times [WS]^{0.16} + 0.40 \times T \times [WS]^{0.16}$$

where T is air temperature in °C and WS is wind speed in km/h.

2.2. Proximity sensors

The proximity sensing platform has been designed by the SocioPatterns collaboration consortium (<http://www.sociopatterns.org>). The hardware is open-source and based on the design developed by the OpenBeacon project (<http://www.openbeacon.org>). The proximity sensors used in this study have been previously deployed in social network studies on animals (Wilson-Aggarwal et al., 2019). The devices measure 3 cm in diameter and weight 2.7 g, are powered by a lithium coin battery (3 g CR2032), leading to a final weight < 6 g. Sensors in close proximity exchange with one another a maximum of about 1 power packet per second, and the exchange of low-power radio-packets is used as a proxy for the spatial proximity of the animals wearing the sensors (Cattuto et al., 2010). In particular, close proximity is measured by the attenuation, defined as the difference between the received and transmitted power. In this study we set the attenuation threshold at -75 dB m to detect proximity events between devices situated within 1–1.5 m of one another. This distance between ewes allows detection of a close-contact situation, during which social interactions between animals might occur. We defined that a contact occurs between two animals during a time slice duration of 20 s if the proximity devices exchanged at least 1 radio packet during that interval and the median




Fig. 1. Flow-chart of flock management. Data collection periods took place in July and August.

attenuation of received packets exceeds the attenuation threshold. The output from each proximity sensor provides a record of the date and time of the start of every contact with any of the other proximity sensors, each of which has its own individual identification number, and the duration of each contact.

2.3. Pattern of social association

2.3.1. Contact data and network analysis

We computed the number of contact events recorded for each ewe and the statistical distribution of the duration of contact events. We also generated aggregated contact networks for the two experimental time periods (July and August). We considered ewes as nodes of the network, while the edges represented the presence of at least one recorded contact event between two individuals during the aggregation time window. Given a contact network, we defined the weight w_{ij} of an edge between nodes i and j the cumulative duration of the contact events recorded between two individuals. Network edges are undirected and the weights on the edges are symmetric ($w_{ij} = w_{ji}$). We studied the statistical distributions of weights of the contact networks.

2.3.2. Modular structure of aggregated networks

We used the Newman's modularity clustering algorithm (Newman, 2006), which is an eigenvector-based method that uses permutation to find optimal community division (Newman, 2006; Whitehead, 2008). We computed the modularity coefficient Q for each aggregated network, that measures the strength of division of a network into modules communities.

2.3.3. Social differentiation

To assess whether associations between ewes were more heterogeneous than we would expect given a null hypothesis that all animals associate uniformly, we computed the statistic of social differentiation using the following equation (Whitehead, 2008):

$$S = \frac{\sqrt{\text{Variance}(w_{ij}) - \text{Mean}(w_{ij})}}{\text{Mean}(w_{ij})}$$

Where w_{ij} of an edge between nodes i and j is the cumulative time in contact between two individuals.

We compared the observed social differentiation value for each deployment, with a suite of values generated by 10,000 null networks. Each null network was made by randomizing the nodes of the temporal network obtained from the output of sensors and then by computing null aggregated networks.

2.4. Pattern of social assortment

We tested the influence of genetic relatedness, age, weight, reproductive status, and mating group on total time in proximity between pairs of ewes for each deployment. We used multiple regression with matrices (MRM) implemented in the R (R Development core team 2014) package *ecodist* (Goslee and Urban, 2007). MRM involves a multiple regression of a response matrix on any number of explanatory matrices, and it tests the significance of explanatory variables by permutation.

In this study, the matrix of associations (total time spent in proximity by each pair of ewes) is the response variable, while explanatory

variables are represented as distance matrices measuring the extent of similarity between dyads. We included a relatedness matrix and other variables of interest into dissimilarity matrices. For age and weight, we computed the absolute difference in age and weight for each dyad. For reproductive status we computed the absolute difference of lambing dates for each dyad. We coded similarity of mating group as 1 if the ewes belonged to the same mating group, and 0 if they belonged to another group. All p-values for MRM analyses were calculated based on 10,000 permutations. In order to evaluate and select which variables should be included in MRM, we used a backward selection procedure (Crawley, 1993) with least significant variables being removed sequentially, until a minimum adequate model (MAM) was reached in which all variables were retained at $p\text{-value} \leq 0.05$.

2.5. Impact of the environment on social network

In order to analyse how the ewes are associated with each other to form clusters, and how this varies over time depending on environmental conditions, we computed the daily average clustering coefficient. Clustering coefficient ranges from 0 to 1, and it is higher in a group of animals containing tight and closed social units. Then, we quantified the influence of environmental parameters (i.e., climatic indices and density of ewes in the field) on daily clustering coefficient for the August deployment using a General Linear Model with THI, WCI and field size included as explanatory variables. Table S4 (see Supplementary Material) shows the environmental data (total space area, ewes per ha) and weather parameters (24 h mean temperature, 24 h mean relative humidity, 24 h mean wind speed) in the August deployment.

3. Results

3.1. Pattern of social association

3.1.1. Contact data and network analysis

In July a total of 146,861 contacts between ewes were recorded over 15 days; in August a total of 95,618 contacts were recorded over 14 days. Aggregated contact networks were formed by 84 nodes and 3471 edges for July and 3483 edges for August. The distribution of the weights was heterogeneous as shown in Fig. 2, both for July aggregated network (panel A), and August aggregated network (panel B). Moreover, Fig. 2 shows the probability of distribution of ewe-to-ewe contact durations; there were comparable distributions for July (panel C) and August (panel D). The contact duration distribution shows a highly heterogeneous distribution and decay as a power law: most of the contacts were short, and there were few long-lasting contacts. The mean contact duration measured over all contact events was 48 s for July and 45 s for August and with 1.4 % of contact exceeding 5 min in July, and 1.1 % in August.

Fig. 3 shows the temporal patterns of the hourly number of contacts over July (A) and August (B) experimental periods. In July, the number of contacts were significantly higher during the first six days of deployments (see Supplementary Material, Fig. S1, panel A). Overall, contacts were numerous in the late morning and in the early noon, and decline after 3 pm, and a peak of number contact occurred at 12 pm and markedly decreased at 1 pm, for both study periods (see Supplementary Material, Fig. S2). The number of contacts decreased during the night for both deployments.

3.1.2. Modular structure of aggregated networks

In July the modularity coefficient Q was 0.06, and in August was 0.08. The Q coefficient range from 0 (random associations) to 1 (no association between closed units or communities), and, as suggested by Newman (2004), non-zero values indicate deviations from randomness, and Q values ≥ 0.3 usually indicate good clusters divisions.

3.1.3. Social differentiation

The social differentiation measured in July and August deployment were 0.84 and 0.93, and the median values of social differentiation of null networks were 0.71 and 0.73. There was significant social differentiation in both deployments ($p\text{-values} < 0.001$).

3.2. Pattern of social assortment

Results from the multiple regression matrices showed that ewes did not significantly associate together with respect to genetic relatedness, reproductive status, and weight in either deployment. In the July deployment ewes tended to spend more time with ewes belonging to the same mating group (regression coefficient = 7.18, $p\text{-value} = 0.033$), where as in the August deployment ewes tended to associate with others of a similar age (regression coefficient = -3.10 , $p\text{-value} = 0.026$).

3.3. Impact of the environment on social network

The results showed that ewes tended to cluster together when the WCI increased, and when field sizes were smaller in the August deployment (i.e., when the density of ewes increased) (Table 1).

4. Discussion

Overall, our results showed that the dyadic associations between ewes are not-random, and the individuals had differentiated social relationships based on characteristic similarity. Nevertheless, the attributes that influence the social interactions between individuals change over time. Furthermore, environmental and microclimate parameters were identified as predictors for the tendency of ewes to associate to each other to form clusters.

We found a difference in the total number of proximity events between deployments. Despite the higher number of proximity events were registered in July, the distributions of total time spent in contact by two ewes and of contact durations are very similar for both deployments. Though, within each study period, our analysis revealed large heterogeneities in the social contact behaviour between ewes. Even though some ewes formed strong social bonds, most individuals showed weak associations. Individual heterogeneity in social relationships, both in number and in strength of associations, has been previously reported in several species, including farm animals (Gygax et al., 2010; Norton et al., 2012; Boyland et al., 2016). The timeline of hourly number of contacts showed some peaks in both deployments, suggesting coordinate behaviours among ewes. Moreover, the density of animals positively affects the number of proximity events among ewes. High densities have been reported to increase social conflict and aggressive behaviours in farm animals (Estevez et al., 2007; Rodenburg and Koene, 2007), and in particular, aggression in ewes is sensitive to changes in space allowance (Jørgensen et al., 2009).

Our analysis revealed no evidence of community structure at any study period, indicating the absence of distinct social groups within the flock. Previous works have found that the existence of sub-groups within an established flock, with larger groups tending to split into sub-groups (Kawai, 1989; Micheleno et al., 2008), and this varies with different breeds (Arnold et al., 1981). Nevertheless, Kawai (1989) showed that the size and the composition of sub-groups was not stable, and individuals did not have significant subgrouping partners.

At an individual level, the ewes showed highly differentiated social relationships and preferred association with the same individuals more often than would be expected if associations occurred at random. Social interactions among animals rarely are random, and individuals tend to associate with others that share their characteristics such as age, social rank, reproductive status, genetic relatedness and behavioural specialization (e.g. Vander Wal et al., 2015; Sosa, 2016; Machado et al., 2019). In our study, we found that ewes were associated with




Fig. 2. Distributions of the weights of the aggregated contact networks in July (panel A) and August (panel B); distributions of contact durations measured over July (panel C), and August (panel D) experimental periods.

individuals with whom they shared similar attributes (i.e. homophily), however, these attributes were different depending on deployment, demonstrating that the social structure of the flock changed over time.

In July, ewes maintained the social bonds formed in the subgroups for breeding. Social recognition of individuals plays an important role in development of social familiarization in sheep (Keller et al., 2011). Previous studies provided evidence that adult sheep can discriminate between familiar and unfamiliar conspecifics through the visual channel (Kendrick et al., 2001; Ferreira et al., 2004), and through olfactory and auditory signals (Keller et al., 2011). In our study, social familiarity, resulting from repeated interactions between ewes, may be an important factor influencing associations among individuals in this species.

The strength of associations in August's social network was significantly affected by the tendency of the ewes to associate with individuals of similar age. Age homophily has previously been reported in many species, including primates (Carter et al., 2015; Sosa, 2016), dolphins (Lusseau and Newman, 2004), and marmots (Wey and Blumstein, 2010). Our results agreed with those obtained in previous studies on domestic sheep: Lawrence (1990) showed that juvenile ewes spend more time in contact with each other, and in a more recent study, Doyle et al. (2016) found that similarity in age is associated with strong social bonds in adult ewes. Our findings indicate that the ties that were formed among sheep in the early stages of ontogenetic development have been maintained over time, and in our study these relationships were reasserted after five weeks of separation.

We found no significant influence of reproductive status, weight (as an indicator of body size) and genetic relatedness on strength of

associations in both deployments. Reproductive status is an important factor influencing association patterns between females in Grevy's zebra (Sundaresan et al., 2007), and feral horses (Heitor and Vicente, 2010; Bouskila et al., 2015). The association of individuals with similar reproductive status may reflect a tendency of females for the protection of the offspring by improving the vigilance tactics as a mean of reducing predation risk (Heitor and Vicente, 2010). We suggest that a change in ecological pressures associated with domestication, such as the reduction of predatory pressure, may have reduced the need of ewes to associate assortatively by reproductive status.

Our results showed that dyadic associations were not more likely to occur among ewes of similar body size, in agreement with those obtained by Doyle et al. (2016) in a domestic flock. In ungulates, body size is commonly correlated with social rank (e.g., McElligott et al., 2001), and, although we did not directly measure the social rank, our results also agreed with those obtained by Vander Wal et al. (2015) that found no effect of social status on proximal associations in bighorn ewes.

The influence of relatedness on social relationships in gregarious animals is very varied. Relatedness has an effect on the strength of social bonds in macaques (Widdig et al., 2001; Schülke et al., 2013), and marmots (Wey and Blumstein, 2010), and in these species, kinship is an important factor to maintain social cohesion. However, in other species, association strength of individuals is not correlated to their genetic relatedness (bighorn sheep: Vander Wal et al., 2015; feral horses: Cameron et al., 2009; Bouskila et al., 2015; racoon: Hirsch et al., 2013), and contact patterns between animals are influenced by other factors. We did not find any effect of relatedness on contact patterns in the current study.




Fig. 3. Timeline of hourly contact activities by day of experiment in July (A) and August (B).

Table 1

General Linear Model results predicting the effects of Wind Chill Index, Temperature Humidity index and field areas on daily clustering coefficient.

Variable	Estimate	Standard error	t-value	p-value
WCI	0.101	0.041	2.469	0.033
THI	-0.055	0.029	-1.838	0.096
area	-0.198	0.079	-2.486	0.032

Our findings showed daily variation in clustering of ewes during the August's data collection period, in relation to environmental factors and microclimatic condition. As we expected, changes in clustering of individuals occurred in relation to animals' density. Very few studies have examined the relationship between climatic parameters and contact networks in sheep. Influences of daily temperatures and rainfall was found in time spent in contact among ewes (Doyle et al., 2016), and it was observed that clustering under the shaded areas of the shelter increased during the hottest part of the day (Broster and Doyle, 2013). However, the weather parameters do not act separately and interact in a very complex way. To account for this, weather factors have been combined into single measures, called climatic indices, previously used to assess the thermal stress in farm animals and its consequences on production traits (Van laer et al., 2014). Our results showed that the tendency of the ewes to form clusters varied in relation to the Wind Chill Index. We suppose that the clustering behaviour reflected the strategy of ewes to coalesce around a scarce resource (i.e. the windward field hedge) in case of thermal discomfort. Specifically, our results are related to the oceanic climate of Devon in south-west England, and we cannot generalize our findings for different climatic zones. In particular our deployment took place during the summer, the daily mean

temperatures ranged from 12 °C to 19 °C and the relative humidity ranged from 70 % to 95 %.

In conclusion, our study has shown that monitoring of social behaviour of sheep through the use of proximity sensors is a valuable tool for advancing our understanding of social system of this species, which has the potential to enhance management practices in production settings. Our results indicate that the social bonds between ewes were dynamic and evolved over time, and factors influencing proximity events were social familiarity and similarity in age. Moreover, clustering behaviour was influenced by microclimatic and environmental conditions. We speculate that the social structure of the flock can change with environmental and social conditions, and the identification of circumstances that modify the social behaviour of sheep is critically important in order to implement management and productivity strategies. However, the proximity sensors do not provide information about the behavioural context of the contacts. An exciting area for future research is to combine proximity sensors with other sensors such as accelerometers to infer not just who is interacting but also the nature of the interaction. Finally, we suggest that studying the social organization over the annual productivity cycle will lead to better understanding of the factors shaping domestic sheep social structure.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare there was no conflict of interest. All data was collected under ethics approval from the University of Exeter (application number: eCLESPsy000541).

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Graham and Anne Langford of the

Blackdown Flock, Centurion Group of Poll Dorset Breeders, and Sam Boon of AHDB Signet. We are very grateful to Destiny Bradley who assisted with the data collection. EP was supported by a BBSRC studentship and LO, LG and CC acknowledge support from the Lagrange Project funded by the CRT Foundation.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary material related to this article can be found, in the online version, at doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2020.104964>.

References

- Arnold, G.W., Wallace, S.R., Rea, W.A., 1981. Associations between individuals and home-range behaviour in natural flocks of three breeds of domestic sheep. *Appl. Anim. Ethol.* 7 (3), 239–257. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3762\(81\)90081-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3762(81)90081-X).
- Beauchamp, G., 2003. Group-size effects on vigilance: a search for mechanisms. *Behav. Processes* 63 (3), 111–121. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-6357\(03\)00002-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-6357(03)00002-0).
- Bouskila, A., Lourie, E., Sommer, S., de Vries, H., Hermans, Z.M., van Dierendonck, M., 2015. Similarity in sex and reproductive state, but not relatedness, influence the strength of association in the social network of feral horses in the Blauwe Kamer Nature Reserve. *Isr. J. Ecol. Evol.* 61 (2), 106–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15659801.2016.1149921>.
- Boyland, N.K., Mlynski, D.T., James, R., Brent, L.J., Croft, D.P., 2016. The social network structure of a dynamic group of dairy cows: from individual to group level patterns. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 174, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2015.11.016>.
- Broster, J., Doyle, R., 2013. Measuring resource use in sheep with proximity logger technology. In *New Zealand Spatially Enabled Livestock Management Symposium 13*.
- Broster, J.C., Dehaan, R.L., Swain, D.L., Friend, M.A., 2010. Ewe and lamb contact at lambing is influenced by both shelter type and birth number. *Animals* 4 (5), 796–803. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731110000030>.
- Cameron, E.Z., Setsaas, T.H., Linklater, W.L., 2009. Social bonds between unrelated females increase reproductive success in feral horses. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 106 (33), 13850–13853. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0900639106>.
- Carter, A.J., Lee, A.E., Marshall, H.H., Ticó, M.T., Cowlshaw, G., 2015. Phenotypic assortment in wild primate networks: implications for the dissemination of information. *Royal Soc. Open Sci.* 2 (5), 140444. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.140444>.
- Cattuto, C., Van den Broeck, W., Barrat, A., Colizza, V., Pinton, J.F., Vespignani, A., 2010. Dynamics of person-to-person interactions from distributed RFID sensor networks. *PLoS One* 5 (7), e11596.
- Champion, R.A., Rutter, S.M., Penning, P.D., Rook, A.J., 1994. Temporal variation in grazing behaviour of sheep and the reliability of sampling periods. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 42 (2), 99–108. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1591\(94\)90150-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1591(94)90150-3).
- Crawley, M.J., 1993. *GLIM for ecologists*. 1993. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford, UK.
- Doyle, R.E., Broster, J.C., Barnes, K., Browne, W.J., 2016. Temperament, age and weather predict social interaction in the sheep flock. *Behav. Processes* 131, 53–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2016.08.004>.
- Estevez, I., Andersen, I.L., Nævdal, E., 2007. Group size, density and social dynamics in farm animals. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 103 (3–4), 185–204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2006.05.025>.
- Ferreira, G., Keller, M., Saint-Dizier, H., Perrin, G., Lévy, F., 2004. Transfer between views of conspecific faces at different ages or in different orientations by sheep. *Behav. Processes* 67 (3), 491–499. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2004.08.005>.
- Fisher, A., Matthews, L., 2001. *The social behaviour of sheep*. Social Behaviour in Farm Animals. CAB International, Wallingford, UK, pp. 211–245.
- Freire, R., Swain, D.L., Friend, M.A., 2012. Spatial distribution patterns of sheep following manipulation of feeding motivation and food availability. *Animals* 6 (5), 846–851. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731111002126>.
- Goslee, S.C., Urban, D.L., 2007. The ecodist package for dissimilarity-based analysis of ecological data. *J. Stat. Softw.* 22 (7), 1–19.
- Griffin, A.S., West, S.A., 2002. Kin selection: fact and fiction. *Trends Ecol. Evol. (Amst.)* 17 (1), 15–21. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(01\)02355-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(01)02355-2).
- Gygax, L., Neisen, G., Wechsler, B., 2010. Socio-spatial relationships in dairy cows. *Ethology* 116 (1), 10–23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0310.2009.01708.x>.
- Heitor, F., Vicente, L., 2010. Affiliative relationships among Sorraia mares: influence of age, dominance, kinship and reproductive state. *J. Ethol.* 28 (1), 133–140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10164-009-0165-9>.
- Hirsch, B.T., Prange, S., Hauver, S.A., Gehrt, S.D., 2013. Genetic relatedness does not predict racoon social network structure. *Animal Behav.* 85 (2), 463–470. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.12.011>.
- Holand, Ø., Gjøstein, H., Losvar, A., Kumpula, J., Smith, M.E., Røed, K.H., Nieminen, M., Weladji, R.B., 2004. Social rank in female reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus*): effects of body mass, antler size and age. *J. Zool.* 263 (4), 365–372. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0952836904005382>.
- Jørgensen, G.H.M., Andersen, I.L., Berg, S., Bøe, K.E., 2009. Feeding, resting and social behaviour in ewes housed in two different group sizes. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 116 (2–4), 198–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2008.08.014>.
- Kawai, K., 1989. The flexible grouping and behavioral character of a flock of Suffolk ewes (Ovis aries). *J. Ethol.* 7 (1), 41–51. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02350581>.
- Keeling, J.L., 2001. *Social Behavior in Farm Animals*. CAB.
- Keller, M., Cornilleau, F., Archer, E., Lévy, F., 2011. Development of social familiarity in ewes. *Physiol. Behav.* 104 (3), 392–397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2011.04.030>.
- Kendrick, K.M., da Costa, A.P., Leigh, A.E., Hinton, M.R., Peirce, J.W., 2001. Sheep don't forget a face. *Nature* 414 (6860), 165.
- Krause, J., Krause, S., Arlinghaus, R., Psorakis, I., Roberts, S., Rutz, C., 2013. Reality mining of animal social systems. *Trends Ecol. Evol. (Amst.)* 28 (9), 541–551. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2013.06.002>.
- Lawrence, A.B., 1990. Mother-daughter and peer relationships of Scottish hill sheep. *Animal Behav.* 39 (3), 481–486. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472\(05\)80412-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(05)80412-9).
- Lawrence, A.B., Wood-Gush, D.G.M., 1988. Home-range behaviour and social organization of Scottish blackface sheep. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 25 (1), 25–40. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2403607>.
- Lusseau, D., Newman, M.E., 2004. Identifying the role that animals play in their social networks. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 271 (Suppl. 6), S477–S481. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2004.0225>.
- Machado, A.M.S., Cantor, M., Costa, A.P.B., Righetti, B.P.H., Bezamat, C., Valle-Pereira, J.V.S., Simões-Lopes, P.C., Castilho, P.V., Daura-Jorge, F.G., 2019. Homophily around specialized foraging underlies dolphin social preferences. *Biol. Lett.* 15 (4), 20180909. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2018.0909>.
- McElligott, A.G., Gammell, M.P., Harty, H.C., Paine, D.R., Murphy, D.T., Walsh, J.T., Hayden, T.J., 2001. Sexual size dimorphism in fallow deer (*Dama dama*): do larger, heavier males gain greater mating success? *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol. (Print)* 49 (4), 266–272. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002650000293>.
- Michelena, P., Sibbald, A.M., Erhard, H.W., McLeod, J.E., 2008. Effects of group size and personality on social foraging: the distribution of sheep across patches. *Behav. Ecol.* 20 (1), 145–152. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arn126>.
- Newman, M.E., 2004. Analysis of weighted networks. *Phys. Rev. E* 70 (5), 056131. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.70.056131>.
- Newman, M.E., 2006. Modularity and community structure in networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 103 (23), 8577–8582. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0601602103>.
- Norton, E., Benaben, S., Mbotha, D., Schley, D., 2012. Seasonal variations in physical contact amongst domestic sheep and the implications for disease transmission. *Livest. Sci.* 145 (1–3), 34–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2011.12.017>.
- OpenBeacon. <http://www.openbeacon.org>. (Accessed 4 July 2019).
- R Core Team, 2014. R: a Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- Rieucou, G., Martin, J.G., 2008. Many eyes or many ewes: vigilance tactics in female bighorn sheep *Ovis canadensis* vary according to reproductive status. *Oikos* 117 (4), 501–506. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2007.0030-1299.16274.x>.
- Rodenburg, T.B., Koenig, P., 2007. The impact of group size on damaging behaviours, aggression, fear and stress in farm animals. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 103 (3–4), 205–214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2006.05.024>.
- Schülke, O., Wenzel, S., Ostner, J., 2013. Paternal relatedness predicts the strength of social bonds among female rhesus macaques. *PLoS One* 8 (3), e59789. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0059789>.
- Signalini, M., Nardone, A., Bernabucci, U., Vitali, A., Ronchi, B., Lacetera, N., 2011. Dynamics of the temperature-humidity index in the Mediterranean basin. *Int. J. Biometeorol.* 55 (2), 253–263. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00484-010-0331-3>.
- Sevi, A., Taibi, L., Albenzio, M., Muscio, A., Dell'Aquila, S., Napolitano, F., 2001. Behavioral, adrenal, immune, and productive responses of lactating ewes to re-grouping and relocation. *J. Animal Sci.* 79 (6), 1457–1465. <https://doi.org/10.2527/2001.7961457x>.
- Silk, J.B., 2007. The adaptive value of sociality in mammalian groups. *Philos. Trans. Biol. Sci.* 362 (1480), 539–559. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2006.1994>.
- SocioPatterns. <http://www.sociopatterns.org/>. (Accessed 4 July 2019).
- Sosa, S., 2016. The influence of gender, age, matriline and hierarchical rank on individual social position, role and interactional patterns in *Macaca sylvanus* at 'La Forêt des singes': a multilevel social network approach. *Front. Psychol.* 7, 529. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00529>.
- Sundaresan, S.R., Fischhoff, I.R., Dushoff, J., Rubenstein, D.I., 2007. Network metrics reveal differences in social organization between two fission-fusion species, Grevy's zebra and oranger. *Oecologia* 151 (1), 140–149. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-006-0553-6>.
- Thom, E.C., 1959. The discomfort index. *Weatherwise* 12 (2), 57–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00431672.1959.9926960>.
- Tucker, C.B., Rogers, A.R., Verkerk, G.A., Kendall, P.E., Webster, J.R., Matthews, L.R., 2007. Effects of shelter and body condition on the behaviour and physiology of dairy cattle in winter. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 105 (1–3), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2006.06.009>.
- Van laer, E., Moons, C.P.H., Sonck, B., Tuytens, F.A.M., 2014. Importance of outdoor shelter for cattle in temperate climates. *Livest. Sci.* 159 (1), 87–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2013.11.003>.
- Vander Wal, E., Gagné-Delorme, A., Festa-Bianchet, M., Pelletier, F., 2015. Dyadic associations and individual sociality in bighorn ewes. *Behav. Ecol.* 27 (2), 560–566. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arv193>.
- Veissier, I., Boissy, A., Nowak, R., Orgeur, P., Poindron, P., 1998. Ontogeny of social awareness in domestic herbivores. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sci.* 57 (3–4), 233–245. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591\(98\)00099-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(98)00099-9).
- West, S.A., Pen, I., Griffin, A.S., 2002. Cooperation and competition between relatives. *Science* 296 (5565), 72–75. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1065507>.
- Wey, T.W., Blumstein, D.T., 2010. Social cohesion in yellow-bellied marmosets is established through age and kin structuring. *Animal Behav.* 79 (6), 1343–1352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.03.008>.

- Whitehead, H., 2008. *Analyzing Animal Societies: Quantitative Methods for Vertebrate Social Analysis*. University of Chicago Press.
- Widdig, A., Nürnberg, P., Krawczak, M., Streich, W.J., Bercovitch, F.B., 2001. Paternal relatedness and age proximity regulate social relationships among adult female rhesus macaques. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 98 (24), 13769–13773. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.241210198>.
- Wilson-Aggarwal, J.K., Ozella, L., Tizzoni, M., Cattuto, C., Swan, G.J., Moundai, T., Silk, M., Zingales, J.A., McDonald, R.A., 2019. High-resolution contact networks of free-ranging domestic dogs *Canis familiaris* and implications for transmission of infection. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* 13 (7), e0007565. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0007565>.