Published in final edited form as:

Am J Primatol. 2011 August ; 73(8): 720–730. doi:10.1002/ajp.20949.

Social network analysis in the study of nonhuman primates: A historical perspective

Lauren J.N. Brent^{1,*}, Julia Lehmann², and Gabriel Ramos-Fernández³

¹ Center for Cognitive Neuroscience, Duke University, 450 Research Drive, Durham, NC, 27708, United States of America

² Centre for Research in Evolutionary Anthropology, Roehampton University, Holybourne Ave, London SW15 4JD, United Kingdom

³ Instituto Politécnico Nacional, Centro Interdisciplinario de Investigación para el Desarrollo Integral Regional, Unidad Oaxaca, Hornos No. 1003, Col. Noche Buena, Santa Cruz Xoxocotlan, Oaxaca, México

Abstract

Advances over the last fifteen years have made social network analysis (SNA) a powerful tool for the study of nonhuman primate social behavior. Although many SNA-based techniques have been only very recently adopted in primatological research, others have been commonly used by primatologists for decades. The roots of SNA also stem from some of the same conceptual frameworks as the majority of nonhuman primate behavioral research. The rapid development of SNA in recent years has led to questions within the primatological community of where and how SNA fits within this field. We aim to address these questions by providing an overview of the historical relationship between SNA and the study of nonhuman primates. We begin with a brief history of the development of SNA, followed by a detailed description of the network-based visualization techniques, analytical methods and conceptual frameworks which have been employed by primatologists since as early as the 1960s. We also introduce some of the latest advances to SNA, thereby demonstrating that this approach contains novel tools for study of nonhuman primate social behavior which may be used to shed light on questions that cannot be addressed fully using more conventional methods.

Keywords

social network analysis; social behavior; social structure; history of primatology

Introduction

Social network analysis (SNA) is a framework used to study the structure of societies. A social network, in its simplest form, is a set of social units (nodes) and the ties (edges) between them [Wasserman and Faust 1994]. On the whole, SNA is an umbrella term that encompasses a number of different graphical tools to visualize networks (e.g. sociograms), as well as tools for mathematical modelling (e.g. matrix algebra and permutation-based analyses) that allow the detection and quantification of patterns in social networks [Freeman 2004].

*Corresponding author: Dr. Lauren J.N. Brent, Center for Cognitive Neuroscience, Duke University, 450 Research Drive, Durham, NC, 27708, USA, Tel: +1 (919) 668-0333, Fax: +1(919) 681-0815, lauren.brent@duke.edu.

With powerful analytical tools that address a range of commonly investigated aspects of animal social behavior, SNA has become increasingly popular in recent years and has been employed in studies of taxa ranging from insects and fish to birds and mammals [Croft et al. 2008; Krause et al. 2007; Sih et al. 2009; Wey et al. 2008; Whitehead 2008], including many studies of nonhuman primates [e.g. Brent et al. 2011; Flack et al. 2006; Henzi et al. 2009; Lehmann and Boesch 2009; Ramos-Fernández et al. 2009; Sueur and Petit 2008]. The publication of this research has raised important questions within the primatological community pertaining to where and to how SNA fits into this field.

The application of SNA to the study of most animal groups has occurred largely in the last decade [Krause et al. 2009]. In contrast, some of the techniques and conceptual frameworks associated with SNA have been used in primatological research since as early as the 1960s. For example, some of the same techniques for visualizing and analyzing data that have been used commonly by primatologists are associated with SNA (e.g. sociograms). There are also similarities between the main conceptual framework underlying SNA and the framework which has formed the basis of many studies of nonhuman primate sociality [i.e. Hinde 1976]. However, there exist many other SNA-based methods which are unfamiliar to primatologists or which have only very recently been adopted. In particular, the last fifteen years have seen the culmination of an unprecedented number of advances in SNA, resulting in fresh perspectives on the structure of complex networks [e.g. Barabási 2002; Watts and Strogatz 1998], the development of new network metrics [e.g. Barrat et al. 2004; Newman 2005; Newman 2006; Opsahl 2009], and the creation of numerous readily available software packages and scripts for the implementation of network analyses [e.g. Borgatti et al. 2002; Opsahl 2009].

In order to bring these issues to the forefront, we felt an overview of the history of the relationship between SNA and the study of nonhuman primates would be helpful. The origins of the unique relationship between SNA and primatology are rooted in the fact that the history of the study of social behavior in nonhuman primates is extensive compared to that in other taxonomic groups. For many years, nonhuman primates were erroneously believed to be the most, if not the only, socially complex animals other than humans. As a result, much of the detailed research regarding social behavior was until relatively recently (up until the 1980s and 1990s) conducted on this group [Silk 2007; Whitehead 2008]. Studies of nonhuman primates have also traditionally been influenced to a greater extent by human-based disciplines, such as sociology and anthropology, than studies of other taxa because of the close common ancestry between nonhuman primates and humans [Krause et al. 2007; Whitehead 2008]. This, coupled with the ability to collect finely-detailed behavioral data in many species of nonhuman primate, has resulted in a rich and varied repertoire of analytical techniques, including some that are today associated with SNA.

We begin this review by briefly describing the history of SNA, thereby demonstrating that SNA is not a static entity but is instead the result of contributions from a variety of disciplines over the last century. Building on this, we describe the relationship between the study of nonhuman primate social behavior and SNA. We outline in detail the visualization techniques and analytical methods employed traditionally by primatologists that are associated with SNA. We also focus on two network-based conceptual frameworks, sociometry and role theory, that have formed the basis of SNA as well as the study of nonhuman primate behavior. Throughout, we include descriptions of some of the recent advances to SNA, focusing in particular on those that may prove most valuable to the study of nonhuman primates. We propose that many of these more contemporary techniques are useful extensions to conventional methods, which could be used to shed light on questions that previously could not be addressed fully by primatologists.

Overall, we aim to bring to light the complex and perhaps understated historical relationship between SNA and the study of nonhuman primates. In doing so, we hope to foster an appreciation of some of the factors that have shaped primatology over the years. But, perhaps more importantly, we hope to provide primatologists the background required in order to fully evaluate current applications of SNA to the study of nonhuman primates (and other animals), as well as aid in the effective implementation of network-based approaches to the study of nonhuman primate social behavior in the future.

A brief history of social network analysis

From a historical perspective, it is difficult to name any one founder of SNA. In a general sense, the origins of many components of SNA can be traced to the 18th century with the development of graph theory [for a review see Biggs et al. 1986]. It was not until the 1930s, however, with the introduction of an approach to the quantitative analysis of human social data termed ‘sociometry’ [Moreno 1934; Scott 2000; Wasserman and Faust 1994], that the study of social interactions were formalized in a manner that somewhat resembles what to day is considered SNA.

Sociometry is defined as the “...application of quantitative methods...which inquire into the evolution and organization of groups and the position of individuals within them” [Moreno 1934]. According to sociometry, interactions between pairs of individuals are the basis upon which the structure of societies are built and can, as a result, affect society as a whole [Scott 2000]. The notion that social structure emerges from pair wise interactions has formed the main conceptual framework underlying contemporary SNA [Scott 2000] and modern network-research has provided empirical evidence that the patterning of interactions between individuals can impact up on a range of emergent properties of groups, including information flow [Voelkl and Noë 2008; Watts and Strogatz 1998], individual well-being [Fowler and Christakis 2008; Hill et al. 2010; Seeman 1996] and cooperation [Voelkl and Kasper 2009].

The overall performance of the group, e.g. group problem solving, was a particular concern of some of the early sociometric studies [e.g. Bavelas 1950]. These studies developed many of the network metrics that are still commonly used in SNA today. These metrics include measures of overall network structure, such as *density*, a measure of the number of ties present in relation to all possible ties; and *network centralization*, a measure of the extent to which all interactions involve a single individual. Some of the earliest developed network metrics also included individual-based measures of ‘centrality’, or the position of individuals within the network. Early examples of individual-based centrality measures include *degree*, the number of direct connections a node has within the network; and *clustering coefficient*, a measure of the extent to which an individual’s neighbors are directly connected to one another [for overviews of network metrics see: Wasserman and Faust 1994, Wey et al. 2008]. Measures of centrality allowed scientists to identify so-called key-players within networks and also led to the influential concept of weak ties, i.e. acquaintances who are occasionally socially associated but not closely involved and whose ties keep the network together [Granovetter 1973; Granovetter 1983].

In addition to the influence of the social sciences, the development of SNA has also benefited from contributions from the fields of mathematics and physics. After the important methodological development of expressing sociometric data as matrices in the 1940s [Forsyth and Katz 1946], mathematicians and physicists generated much needed computational models to analyze the patterning of links connecting nodes in a network [Freeman 2004]. Mathematicians also continued to develop graph theory, resulting in the production of a number of random network models in the late 1950s [Erdős and Rényi 1959;

Gilbert 1959]. These models, in which the edges between nodes result from random processes, have been hugely influential in SNA as they allow researchers to identify the processes that may cause observed networks to differ from randomly generated networks [Newman et al. 2002].

SNA emerged formally as a field within the social sciences in the 1980s with the creation of the journal *Social Networks* and the establishment of a professional society, the *International Network for Social Network Analysis* [Borgatti 2009]. Since this time, the number of different disciplines applying SNA has increased rapidly [Otte and Rousseau 2002] and what started with the analysis of small groups of humans has since expanded to study phenomena in the fields of anthropology, mathematics, economics, political science, psychology, statistics, ethology, zoology, epidemiology, computer science, and physics [Freeman 2004]. In the last fifteen years in particular, the popularity of SNA has grown steadily, a result almost certainly related to the production of readily available computer programs that allow researchers to calculate a large number of network metrics with relative ease [e.g. UCINET: Borgatti et al. 2002, TNet: Opsahl 2009, Pajek: Batagelj and Mrvar 2003 and SOCPROG: Whitehead 2007]. Today, SNA continues to grow through the incorporation of advances from a wide range of disciplines and current social network-based research continues to increase our understanding of the functions and characteristics of networks [Barabasi 2002].

Social networks in studies of nonhuman primate social behavior

While the idea of social networks in studies of human groups was thriving during the 1960s and 1970s, some primatologists were beginning to recognize the potential this approach may have for explaining social behavior and group dynamics in nonhuman primates [e.g. Fedigan 1972; Hinde 1976; Kummer 1968; Sade 1965]. Even though SNA has formally existed since the 1980s it was not until after the year 2000, following the aforementioned advances in computational power and the development of SNA-specific software programs, that primatologists began to use some of SNA's more computationally complex metrics in earnest and began to regularly use the term SNA to describe their research [e.g. Flack et al. 2006; McCowan et al. 2008; Voelkl and Noë 2008].

We now turn to summarizing the relationship between SNA and the study of nonhuman primate behavior. This relationship includes: i) the use of network-based graphs to visualize networks, ii) the application of social network-derived measures of individual-based sociality, iii) the application of social network-derived measures of social structure, iv) the use of network-based inferential analysis tools, and v) the application of the same conceptual frameworks that underlie SNA. Within each section, we begin by outlining the historical relationship between each approach and the study of nonhuman primate behavior. This is followed by a description of more recent applications of SNA with in this field, as well as suggestions for directions of future research.

i) Network-based graphs

The first study to apply a social network-based technique to the study of nonhuman primates was published in 1965. Donald Stone Sade, arguably the most extensive applicant of a social network approach to the study of nonhuman primates prior to the turn of the century, used a network-based graphing technique (the sociogram, Figure 1a) to visualize the patterning of grooming interactions between the members of a single group of rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*) [Sade 1965].

Sociograms are an attractive graphing technique for the study of animal social behavior because they provide visual representations of large amounts of information that would

otherwise be difficult to represent. By summarising the interactions amongst all members of a group in a single, compact diagram, sociograms put to paper what field researchers may envisage in their minds when they think of the relationships between their study subjects. Sociograms also highlight more subtle information that may not be obvious from looking at numbers on a spread-sheet alone. For instance, sociograms highlight the ties between pairs of individuals that do exist, but also make apparent the absence of ties (that is, the absence of interaction) between certain dyads. Commonalities and differences in social relationships are also made evident; for example, sociograms make readily visible a situation in which individuals A, B and C groom individual D, whilst only individuals B and C also groom individual E. Finally, sociograms provide researchers with a first glimpse at information about the network itself. For instance, sociograms offer insight into which individuals may be particularly important to the cohesion of the network (i.e. which individuals would cause the network to split into unconnected components if removed), as well as the overall pattern or 'structure' of the network.

Since the publication of Sade's work, sociograms have proved popular with primatologists and have been used to visualize a variety of interactions including grooming [Chepko-Sade et al. 1989; Fairbanks 1980; Mitani 1986; Nakagawa 1992; Pearl 1983; Seyfarth 1976; Seyfarth 1977; Soczka 1974], proximity [Fairbanks 1980; Hanby 1980; Koenig and Rothe 1991; Nakagawa 1992; Seyfarth 1980], vocalisations [Mitani 1986; Nakagawa 1992], copulations [Cheney 1978a; Pearl and Schulman 1983], agonism [Keverne 1992; Pearl and Schulman 1983], and play [Cheney 1978b; Pearl and Schulman 1983; Soczka 1974].

In addition to sociograms, hierarchical clustering analysis and multidimensional scaling, both common visualization techniques in SNA, have also been used in order to determine and visualize the division of nonhuman primate groups into sub-groups based on the interactions between pairs of individuals and to graphically represent those divisions [Byrne et al. 1989; Chapman 1990; Chepko-Sade et al. 1989; Corradino 1990; Pearl 1983; Pearl and Schulman 1983; Schulman 1980; Yeager 1990], but their application has been less frequent.

Until very recently, however, primatologists have produced their network-based graphs by hand. This is highly labor intensive, even for groups containing a relatively small number of individuals. Hand-drawn sociograms also require researchers to decide for themselves on the physical positioning of the nodes, which may result in graphs that are not optimized to provide information on the position of individuals in the network or the overall network structure (Figure 1). Computer software programs [e.g. Net draw: Borgatti 2002] are now rapidly able to apply algorithms to interaction matrices in order determine the placement of nodes based on specific criteria; for example, the spring-embedding algorithm places individuals with the highest centrality scores toward the center of the sociogram (individual '1957' in Figure 1b). These programs also allow for the easy application of colors, sizes, and shapes to nodes based on attributes or centrality measures.

ii) Measures of individual-based sociality using networks

Primatologists tend to quantify sociality at the level of the individual (i.e. the extent to which an individual is involved in their social milieu) with one of two measures: an individual's number of sociality partners, and/or an individual's frequency of participation in a given type of interaction. For example, they may ask whether females with larger matrilineal have a greater number of close social ties [Berman 1982], or may examine the endocrine correlates of the frequency at which individuals engage in aggressive interactions [Gust et al. 1993; Sapolsky 1982].

Number of social partners and frequency of interaction are also included as measures under the umbrella of SNA, referred to in network terminology as the centrality measures *degree*

and *strength*, respectively [Croft et al. 2008]. Historically, primatologists have not made explicit links between their use of degree and strength and the use of these measures in human-based social network research. Indeed, it is unclear whether the use of these measures in studies of nonhuman primates was derived from network research conducted on humans, or whether these straightforward means to quantify the extent to which an individual is connected to their social group arose independently in primatology due to their highly intuitive nature.

SNA provides a number of measures of centrality besides degree and strength (e.g. clustering coefficient, eigenvector centrality). Rather than a summary of an individual's direct interactions with others, these measures represent different aspects of the nature of an individual's local network of relationships (see below for a discussion of the usefulness of these measures in recent studies of nonhuman primates). Although many of these other measures were developed more than a decade ago, their use within the study of nonhuman primates (and in other fields) has been restricted by the impracticality of their implementation. Indeed, to our knowledge, there is only one research team that used a social network measure besides degree or strength in the study of nonhuman primates prior to the turn of the last century: Donald Sade and colleagues used the number of paths of length n , to study the grooming networks of rhesus macaques [Chepko-Sade et al. 1989; Sade 1972; Sade 1989; Sade et al. 1988] demonstrating that individuals who are higher in the dominance hierarchy have a greater number of grooming partners up to three path lengths away.

With recent advances in computational power and the development of accessible software, the ease of calculation of network-based measures of sociality besides degree and strength has increased dramatically. Although many of these measures may be correlated with one another, each provides information on a unique aspect of an individual's position in the network. As explained in detail by Sueur et al. (this issue), individuals who have, for example, the same degree (i.e. the same number of social ties) do not necessarily have the same eigenvector centrality; one individual may be partners with n individuals who themselves do not have many partners (low eigenvector centrality), while another may be partners with n individuals who themselves have a large number of partners (high eigenvector centrality).

This may be an important differentiation because while degree and strength reflect connections between pairs of individuals based on their direct interaction with one another, other social network metrics also represent indirect connections within the network. Indirect connections are connections between pairs of individuals which result from their mutual direct connection to a third party, and may be important factors in the lives of social animals, influencing everything from dominance rank [McDonald 2007] and stress-levels [Brent et al. 2011] to general well-being [Fowler and Christakis 2008]. Indirect connections may be especially important to many species of nonhuman primates who form highly differentiated relationships, recognize social bonds between pairs of third parties [Cheney and Seyfarth 1999], and who may understand the perspectives of others [Flombaum and Santos 2005; Hare et al. 2001; Lehmann and Dunbar 2009].

Primatologists represent most of their data on social interactions as continuous variables in interaction matrices. In order to construct a network out of those matrices, and subsequently calculate individual measures of centrality, the choice has to be made whether to filter the network, considering a given dyad as bonded only when the value of their interaction is above a certain threshold, or whether to use the values of the interaction variables as the weights of bonds in the network. While some studies advocate filtering as a way to remove spurious relationships that might not be significant [e.g. James et al. 2009], others have

developed techniques that allow for the estimation of statistical significance of SNA metrics using weighted networks [Lusseau et al. 2008; Opsahl 2009].

The use of weighted over binary network metrics may make particular sense in studies of small groups of nonhuman primates, in which all individuals may interact at least once with all others. For example, each individual may be found in spatial proximity to all other individual at some point in the course of a study. In these cases, the amount of time spent with each potential partner may be where the meaningful variation lies and may be used to distinguish pairs of individuals who are 'bonded' from those who are not. Thus, the use of weighted network metrics may somewhat circumvent the issue of filtering [Croft et al. 2008]. Nevertheless, primatologists should carefully consider which metrics are the most appropriate for their research questions, and should be aware of the fact that weighted versions of some network metrics do not yet exist. In their analysis of nonhuman primate social networks, Kasper & Voelkl [2009] used only weighted metrics, but acknowledged that using binary indices may be potentially very useful to determine which individuals are central in the network -not by virtue of their own direct relationships with others, but through their associates' relationships with others.

iii) Network-based measures of social structure

Social structure, or the level of social organization that emerges from the patterning of relationships between all pairs of individuals [Hinde 1976, and see Figure 2], plays a critical role in shaping some of the emergent properties of groups, such as the rate at which information can spread [Watts and Strogatz 1998]. Thus, studies of nonhuman primates have also often examined sociality beyond the level of the individual to that of social structure. Primatologists interested in social structure may ask, for example, whether the average number of grooming partners of individuals within their group changes along with changes to group size [Henzi et al. 1997], or whether the average rate at which group members groom one another changes along with reproductive season [Cheney and Seyfarth 1990]. Average number of partners and average frequency of interaction are group-level extensions of the individual-based measures degree and strength. However, as with individual-based measures, SNA offers other measures of social structure that contain information extending beyond a summary of the average tendencies of interactions between pairs of dyads.

One example of how a network-based approach can serve to study nonhuman primate social behavior at a level beyond the dyadic is provided by Maryanski [1987]. In a study of African apes, Maryanski used Granovetter's concept of weak ties (see above) to demonstrate that gorillas (*Gorilla gorilla*) and chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) exhibit very similar underlying social network structures, despite obvious differences demonstrated using traditional, dyadic-based methods [Maryanski 1987]. In particular, Maryanski used the frequency of social interaction between individuals to create a gradient of weak to strong social ties. Using the distribution of tie strengths in the two species, she was able to compare how individuals from different age-sex classes are bonded to one another and thereby draw conclusions regarding social structure.

More recently, a small number of studies of nonhuman primates have taken advantage of the technical advances which facilitate the application of social network-based measures of social structure: Flack et al. [2006] examined the impact of removing individual males with 'policing' roles on the social structure derived from socio-positive interactions for captive pigtailed macaques. They found that policing resulted in networks that were less clustered, had a greater number of indirect connections, and a larger average number of social partners per individual, which suggests that policing may control conflict and may have important implications for the emergence of cooperative behavior in this species [Flack et al. 2006]. Similarly, Lehmann et al. [2010] found that simulated removal of individuals identified as

brokers in eleven species of female-bonded Old World monkey resulted in networks that were less well connected. Their results led these authors to suggest that brokers have a considerable impact on the social structure of female-bonded monkey groups.

By allowing researchers to describe social structure in a fully quantitative manner based on a series of continuous, rather than discrete, measures, SNA has opened the door to the study of a wide range of research questions in nonhuman primates that cannot be addressed fully using traditional methods. For example, Kasper & Voelkl (2009) analyzed 70 nonhuman primate groups from 30 species using SNA metrics of social structure and argued that studying the variability of social systems in this way allows for a more objective quantification of the differences and similarities between species, thus avoiding the problems of classifying primate social systems into categories [e.g. Thierry 2008]. As such, SNA has the potential to provide considerable new insight into the patterning and expression of social structure in group-living nonhuman primates.

One SNA measure of social structure that may prove particularly useful in the study of nonhuman primates and which to date has not received much attention is assortativity. Assortativity refers to the tendency of nodes of a given class to connect preferentially to others of the same class. In a random network, where every node has the same probability of being linked to any other, assortativity is null. In nonhuman primate societies, age and sex classes are clear determinants of the quality and frequency of interactions, so in that sense, nonhuman primate social networks are assortative.

Assortative mixing has at least three important consequences for nonhuman primate social structure. First, several studies of evolutionary dynamics of cooperation have shown that cooperative behavior can spread if the assumption of a well-mixed population, normally made in game theoretical models, is changed to a sparsely connected network [Ohtsuki et al. 2006], or to a heterogeneous network with some degree of assortativity and a heterogeneous distribution of node degree [Santos et al. 2006]. Indeed, Voelkl & Kasper [2009] demonstrated that cooperation can spread faster in networks of a size and degree of assortativity similar to those found in real nonhuman primate networks. Second, assortativity affects the way in which information flows among the nodes of a network. This was demonstrated by Voelkl & Noë [2010] in a simulation model of social learning in nonhuman primate networks in which information propagation was hampered in assortative networks compared to random or complete networks. Assortativity in these networks also implied a higher risk of extinction of the learned behaviors. These results have important implications for studies of social learning, in which the assumption of equal mixing is also prevalent. Finally, assortative mixing can lead to the formation of subgroups within the network, as suggested by Lusseau & Newman [2004]. Very high degrees of assortativity, of course, would imply that the network would become fragmented, with clusters corresponding to each class of individual. This is what Ramos-Fernández et al. [2009] found in spider monkeys, with young adult males appearing as brokers between the male and female clusters.

Due to the extraordinary proliferation of techniques and studies of networks in many scientific fields, it is important to distinguish those tools that are biologically meaningful to the study of nonhuman primate social structure from those that are best applicable to other types of networks. For example, in many large and complex networks, such as those formed by collaborating scientists, the internet or interacting proteins, the degree distribution follows a power law [reviewed in Newman 2003]. This implies that most of the nodes have a few connections, but a few nodes contain a large majority of the connections in the network (so-called hubs). While this is an interesting property of some large networks, nonhuman primate social networks are too small [e.g. the largest groups of baboons reported

by Stammers, 1987 contain up to 600 individuals] to allow for a significant test of power law distribution of the degree of their nodes [Clauset et al. 2009].

Nevertheless, it remains true that primate social networks are highly structured, with assortativity and centrality patterns that are quite different from those in random or regular networks [Kasper and Voelkl 2009]. In this respect, one property of networks that has been suggested to have some biological relevance in nonhuman primate social networks is the so-called “small world” effect [Watts and Strogatz 1998], in which the average path length of the network is small compared to a random network, even though the mean clustering coefficient remains as high as in a random network [see Croft et al., 2004 and Lusseau, 2003 for examples in social networks of guppies and dolphins, respectively]. This effect greatly enhances the flow of information, because any two individuals, even if they belong to different clusters, can be linked through a relatively small number of nodes. Information flow through indirect connections might not be so relevant for nonhuman primate species living in stable groups, but in species with fission-fusion dynamics [Aureli et al. 2008], information about the location of feeding sites, for example, could in fact be transmitted through chains of common acquaintances even though the whole group is never found in the same place.

The small world effect also implies that networks are particularly robust against the random loss of nodes [although a targeted removal of highly central nodes could rapidly decrease connectivity and fragment the network: Albert et al. 2000]. Indeed, this is what has been found in the few studies that have addressed this question in nonhuman primate networks, either by natural or artificial removal of random or highly central individuals [Flack et al. 2006; Lehmann & Dunbar 2009; Lusseau, Barrett, & Henzi, in preparation].

iv) Inferential analysis tools: The non-independent nature of relational data

As with studies of human social networks, studies of nonhuman primate behavior nearly always deal with relational data. Unlike data based on attributes, relational data represent interactions or associations between pairs of individuals [Croft et al. 2008]. Relational data collected from multiple members of the same social group violate the assumption of independence required by traditional inferential statistical techniques [Kasper and Voelkl 2009; Krause et al. 2009; Wasserman and Faust 1994]. This is because individuals interact with several members of their group, and interaction partners likewise interact with several other partners [Kasper and Voelkl 2009]. In other words, the interactions of individual A may involve interactions with individuals B and C, while C may interact with B and A [Hanneman and Riddle 2005]. One of the most common ways to deal with this problem is to use permutation-based approaches, in which sampling distributions are calculated directly from the observed datasets [Hanneman and Riddle 2005].

Studies that have examined the exchange of behavioral services among nonhuman primates, e.g. the exchange of grooming for agonistic support, have often used permutation-based techniques, such as matrix correlations, to test their hypotheses [e.g. de Waal and Luttrell 1986; Hemelrijk 1994; Seyfarth 1980; Silk 1992]. Beyond these examples, however, the application of permutation-based statistics has been rare in primatology. SNA uses a host of permutation-based statistical techniques. These include the applications of bootstraps to generate confidence intervals for network-based data [e.g. Lusseau et al. 2008] and to perform inferential tests able to deal with the non-independent nature of relational data [Hanneman and Riddle 2005]. The application of many of these approaches may now be carried out within some of the recently developed SNA-specific software programs (e.g. UCINET).

v) Conceptual frameworks used in SNA and in primatology: sociometry and role theory

In the study of nonhuman primate social behavior, one conceptual framework has arguably formed the basis of the vast majority of research. In 1976, Robert Hinde proposed that nonhuman primate societies are organized according to the patterning of interactions between pairs of individuals, from which relationships, and consequently social structure, emerge (Figure 2). With interactions between dyads at its core, Hinde's framework is fundamentally sociometric in nature (see above for a detailed description of sociometry). Although Hinde [1976] did not discuss sociometry explicitly, he was almost certainly influenced by it. For example, he acknowledged similarities between his framework and those used by social anthropologists, and referenced the work of anthropologists who were at the time actively involved in sociometric research [e.g. Barnes 1972; Mitchell 1969]. Hinde also referred to the studies by Sade [1972] and Kummer [1968] as rare examples of primatological research that integrate data on interactions in a manner that could lead to a greater understanding of social structure [Hinde 1976, pp 1, paragraph 1]. Given that sociometry represents a major precursor to contemporary SNA, the sociometric nature of Hinde's framework highlights the similar origins of SNA and nonhuman primate behavioral research.

In spite of wide-spread acceptance in studies of nonhuman primate social behavior, Hinde's framework has been difficult to implement in reality. This is especially true with regards to the abstraction from the overall patterning of relationships to the level of social structure. For instance, for a social network to be considered an accurate representation of social structure each link should represent the social relationship between two individuals. However, most networks studied so far by primatologists really consist of a single dimension (e.g. grooming). Multiplex networks, i.e. those that integrate multiple (behavioral) dimensions, have been used by sociologists since at least the 1970s, mostly for the purposes of finding meaningful subgroups [e.g. White et al. 1976]. Also, most of the computer programs used for representing and analyzing networks can deal with multiple dimensions in social interactions by generating aggregate indices or by performing Boolean multiplication on binary data (e.g. 'multiplex' function in UCINET). However, the use of multiplex networks in primatology is rare.

In studies of nonhuman primates, Silk et al. [2006, 2010] defined a composite sociality index which linearly combines the behaviors that are most correlated in their study of chacma baboons (*Papio ursinus*): hourly rates of approaches, presents for grooming, grooming initiations, and the number of minutes of grooming per hour. Although not specifically aimed at studying social structure, these indices show wide variability across dyads and could be used to construct and analyze social networks of affiliation defined by several interaction types. Recently, Lusseau, Barrett, & Henzi [in preparation] argued that because the different interactions constituting relationships are not independent (e.g. two individuals cannot groom if they are not in proximity), the value of a tie cannot consist of a linear combination of different interactions, and networks should really be multidimensional objects (tensors, in mathematical terms). These authors develop methods to construct these objects and calculate the mean clustering coefficient and average path length in all dimensions. As such, we believe that SNA represents a promising way to truly study social structure in nonhuman primates as the overall patterning of social relationships.

Another influential frame work in primatology is role theory, which originated in social psychology and anthropology in the 1920s and 1930s [Mead 1934, for an overview see: Roney and Maestripieri 2003]. According to role theory, roles are the basic units of the social system, relationships are defined according to the respective roles of the individuals involved (e.g. mother-daughter), and social structure emerges from the cumulative outcome of individuals acting in various social roles [Fedigan 1992]. Role theory was first adopted by

primatologists in the 1960s. While human roles were understood in the context of societal norms and expectations, roles in primates were defined as ‘statistically probable behaviors in a given interactional and ecological setting’ [Reynolds 1970]. Under the framework of role theory, primate researchers explored the roles of adult males [Fedigan 1972], juveniles [Bernstein and Sharpe 1966], and aged individuals [Pavelka 1990], while other studies focused on what they called the control animal role [Bernstein 1964; Smith 1973]. Control animals were individuals who mediated intra-group conflict and led defensive attacks against external threats. Usually performed by the most dominant adult male, this role was immediately adopted by another male if the previous control animal was removed from the group [Bernstein 1966, reviewed by Reynolds 1970].

Around the same time that role theory gained popularity in primatology, aspects of this theory were incorporated into human-based network research [Scott 2000]. Even though these studies saw social structure emerging from the patterning of interactions between individuals, and not roles, the concept that individuals could be reduced to a given role was adopted. This subsequently drove methodological advances in SNA and spawned considerable research efforts, investigating topics as diverse as traditional family roles to the impact of roles on the structure of the American economy [reviewed in Borgatti 2009; Burt 1987].

In the 1980s, role theory research largely fell out of favor with primatologists. This was due, in part, to criticisms that these studies produced little more than descriptions of the general activity patterns of members of given age, sex and dominance classes [Roney and Maestripietri 2003], which was further fuelled by accusations, probably based on misunderstandings of the theory and its implications [Fedigan 1992], that role theory was necessarily connected to group selection [Wilson 1975], and that social roles lacked clear operational definitions [Hinde 1974].

Interestingly, recent years have seen renewed interest in social roles in primate behavior [e.g. Flack et al. 2005; Flack et al. 2006]. Conducted under the framework of SNA, this new research uses network-based metrics of individual centrality to define social roles quantitatively and to determine the individuals who occupy them. Individuals occupying particular roles may have a disproportionate influence on social structure, either because they act as brokers between otherwise isolated clusters [Ramos-Fernández et al. 2009], because they may have more knowledge about their environment and can act as leaders in coordinated group movements [Lusseau 2006] or because they serve a policing function, intervening to prevent escalation of conflicts among others [Flack et al. 2006]. The investigation of social roles under the framework of SNA could potentially form an important area of future nonhuman primate research.

Conclusions

Social network analysis is a framework for the study of complex societies that owes its existence and continued development to the contributions of a wide-range of fields. The last fifteen years have seen considerable advances in SNA-related analytical tools and computer software, resulting in a rapid expansion of the scope of application of SNA. Consequently, SNA has recently been used in a number of studies of animal behavior, including many on nonhuman primates. Although the rich history of nonhuman primate behavioral research includes the application of some of the techniques and concepts currently associated with SNA, there are also many social network-based methods that are novel and valuable extensions to those traditionally used by primatologists. In this review we have demonstrated that there is a complex and perhaps understated historical relationship between SNA and nonhuman primate behavioral research. We also hope to have identified areas in

the study of nonhuman primate behavior in which a fresh perspective, using SNA, might prove fruitful.

Acknowledgments

We were motivated to write this review by stimulating conversations with colleagues, in particular the participants of the symposium on social networks at the XXIII Congress of the International Primatological Society in Kyoto, Japan, to whom we wish to extend our great appreciation and thanks. Many thanks also to Cédric Sueur and Andrew King for their efforts producing this special issue and for allowing us to contribute. Drew Marticorena and two anonymous reviewers provided helpful and much appreciated comments on the manuscript. LJNB is supported by the NIH (grant no. 3034755) and would like to thank Michael Platt, Stuart Semple and Ann MacLarnon for their support. GRF is supported by CONACYT grant J51278 and by the Instituto Politécnico Nacional. The production of this manuscript adhered to the American Society of Primatologists' principles for the ethical treatment of primates

References

- Albert R, Jeong H, Barabasi AL. Error and attack tolerance of complex networks. *Nature*. 2000; 406:378–382. [PubMed: 10935628]
- Aureli F, Schaffner CM, Boesch C, Bearder SK, Call J, Chapman CA, Connor R, Di Fiore A, Dunbar RIM, Henzi SP, et al. Fission-Fusion Dynamics New Research Frameworks. *Current Anthropology*. 2008; 49:627–654.
- Barabasi, AL. *Linked: How Everything Is Connected to Everything Else and What It Means for Business, Science and Everyday Life*. New York: Penguin Group; 2002. p. 238
- Barnes, JA. *Module in Anthropology*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison- Wesley; 1972. Social Networks; p. 1-29.
- Barrat A, Barthelemy M, Pastor-Satorras R, Vespignani A. The architecture of complex weighted networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2004; 101:3747–3752.
- Batagelj, V.; Mrvar, A. Pajek - Analysis and visualization of large networks. In: Jünger, M.; Mutzel, P., editors. *Graph Drawing Software*. Berlin: Springer; 2003. p. 77-103.
- Bavelas A. Communication patterns in task oriented groups. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*. 1950; 22:725–730.
- Berman CM. The ontogeny of social relationships with group companions among free-ranging infant rhesus monkeys I. Social networks and differentiation. *Animal Behaviour*. 1982; 30:149–162.
- Bernstein IS. Role of the dominant male rhesus monkey in response to external challenges to the group. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology*. 1964; 57:404–406. [PubMed: 14155378]
- Bernstein IS, Sharpe LG. Social roles in a rhesus monkey group. *Behaviour*. 1966; 26:91–104. [PubMed: 4955110]
- Biggs, N.; Lloyd, E.; Wilson, R. *Graph Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1986. p. 1736-1936.
- Borgatti, SP. *Netdraw Network Visualization*. Harvard, MA: Analytic Technologies; 2002.
- Borgatti, SP.; Everett, MG.; Freeman, LC. *UCINET for Windows: Software for Social Network Analysis*. Harvard, Massachusetts: Analytic Technologies; 2002.
- Borgatti SP, Mehra A, Brass DJ, Labianca G. Network analysis in the social sciences. *Science*. 2009; 323:892–895. [PubMed: 19213908]
- Brent LJN, Semple S, Dubuc C, Heistermann M, MacLarnon A. Social capital and physiological stress levels in free-ranging adult female rhesus macaques. *Physiology and Behavior*. 2011; 102:76–83. [PubMed: 20933532]
- Burt RS. A note on strangers, friends and happiness. *Social Networks*. 1987; 9:311–331.
- Byrne RW, Whiten A, Henzi SP. Social relationships of mountain baboons: Leadership and affiliation in a non-female-bonded monkey. *American Journal of Primatology*. 1989; 18:191–207.
- Chapman CA. Association patterns of spider monkeys: The influence of ecology and sex on social organization. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*. 1990; 26:409–414.
- Cheney DL. Interactions of immature male and female baboons with adult females. *Animal Behaviour*. 1978a; 26:389–408.

- Cheney DL. The play partners of immature baboons. *Animal Behaviour*. 1978b; 26:1038–1050.
- Cheney, DL.; Seyfarth, RM. *How Monkeys See the World: Inside the Mind of Another Species*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1990. p. 388
- Cheney DL, Seyfarth RM. Recognition of other individuals' social relationships by female baboons. *Animal Behaviour*. 1999; 58:67–75. [PubMed: 10413542]
- Chepko-Sade BD, Reitz KP, Sade DS. Sociometrics of *Macaca mulatta* IV: Network analysis of social structure of a pre-fission group. *Social Networks*. 1989; 11:293–314.
- Clauset A, Shalizi CR, Newman MEJ. Power-Law Distributions in Empirical Data. *Siam Review*. 2009; 51:661–703.
- Corradino C. Proximity structure in a captive colony of Japanese monkeys (*Macaca fuscata fuscata*): An application of multidimensional scaling. *Primates*. 1990; 31:351–362.
- Croft, DP.; James, R.; Krause, J. *Exploring Animal Social Networks*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press; 2008. p. 192
- Croft DP, Krause J, James R. Social networks in the guppy (*Poecilia reticulata*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences*. 2004; 271:S516–S519.
- de Waal FBM, Luttrell LM. The similarity principle underlying social bonding among female rhesus monkeys. *Folia Primatologica*. 1986; 46:215–234.
- Erdős P, Rényi A. On random graphs. *Public Mathematics Debrecen*. 1959; 6:290–297.
- Fairbanks LA. Relationships among adult females in captive vervet monkeys: Testing a model of rank-related attractiveness. *Animal Behaviour*. 1980; 28:853–859.
- Fedigan LM. Roles and activities of male geladas (*Theropithecus gelada*). *Behaviour*. 1972; 41:82–90.
- Fedigan, LM. *Primate Paradigms: Sex Roles and Social Bonds*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1992. p. 386
- Flack JC, de Waal FBM, Krakauer DC. Social structure, robustness, and policing cost in a cognitively sophisticated species. *American naturalist*. 2005; 165:E126–E139.
- Flack JC, Girvan M, de Waal FBM, Krakauer DC. Policing stabilizes construction of social niches in primates. *Nature*. 2006; 439:426–429. [PubMed: 16437106]
- Flombaum JI, Santos LR. Rhesus monkeys attribute perceptions to others. *Current Biology*. 2005; 15:447–452. [PubMed: 15753039]
- Forsyth E, Katz L. A matrix approach to the analysis of sociometric data: Preliminary report. *Sociometry*. 1946; 9:340–347.
- Fowler JH, Christakis NA. Dynamic spread of happiness in a large social network: longitudinal analysis over 20 years in the Framingham Heart Study. *British Medical Journal*. 2008; 337:9.
- Freeman, LC. *The Development of Social Network Analysis*. Vancouver, C: SP Empirical Press; 2004.
- Gilbert EN. Random graphs. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*. 1959; 30:1141–1144.
- Granovetter M. The strength of weak ties. *The American Journal of Sociology*. 1973; 78:1360–1380.
- Granovetter M. The strength of weak ties: a network theory revisited. *Sociological Theory*. 1983; 1:201–233.
- Gust DA, Gordon TP, Hambright K, Wilson ME. Relationship between social factors and pituitary-adrenocortical activity in female rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*). *Hormones and Behavior*. 1993; 27:318–331. [PubMed: 8225256]
- Hanby JP. Relationships in six groups of rhesus monkeys II: Dyads. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 1980; 52:565–575.
- Hanneman, RA.; Riddle, M. *Introduction to Social Network Methods*. Riverside, CA: University of California; 2005.
- Hare B, Call J, Tomasello M. Do chimpanzees know what conspecifics know? *Animal Behaviour*. 2001; 61:139–151. [PubMed: 11170704]
- Hemelrijk CK. Support for being groomed in long-tailed macaques, *Macaca fascicularis*. *Animal Behaviour*. 1994; 48:479–481.
- Henzi PS, Lycett JE, Weingrill T. Cohort size and the allocation of social effort by female mountain baboons. *Animal Behaviour*. 1997; 54:1235–1243. [PubMed: 9398376]

- Henzi SP, Lusseau D, Weingrill T, van Schaik CP, Barrett L. Cyclicity in the structure of female baboon social networks. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*. 2009; 63:1015–1021.
- Hill AL, Rand DG, Nowak MA, Christakis NA. Emotions as infectious diseases in a large social network: the SISa model. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*. 2010;1098/rspb.2010.1217
- Hinde, RA. *Biological Bases of Human Social Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company; 1974.
- Hinde RA. Interactions, relationships and social structure. *Man*. 1976; 11:1–17.
- James R, Croft DP, Krause J. Potential banana skins in animal social network analysis. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*. 2009; 63:989–997.
- Kasper C, Voelkl B. A social network analysis of primate groups. *Primates*. 2009; 50:343–356. [PubMed: 19533270]
- Keverne EB. Primate social relationships: Their determinants and consequences. *Advances in the Study of Behavior*. 1992; 21:1–37.
- Koenig A, Rothe H. Social relationships and individual contribution to cooperative behavior in captive common marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*). *Primates*. 1991; 32:183–195.
- Krause J, Croft DP, James R. Social network theory in the behavioural sciences: potential applications. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology*. 2007; 62:15–27.
- Krause J, James R, Lusseau D. Animal social networks: an introduction. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*. 2009; 63:967–973.
- Kummer, H. *Social Organization of Hamadryas Baboons: A Field Study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1968.
- Lehmann, J.; Andrews, K.; Dunbar, RIM. Social networks and social complexity in female-bonded primates. In: Dunbar, RIM.; Gamble, C.; Gowlett, JA., editors. *Social brain, distributed mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2010.
- Lehmann J, Boesch C. Sociality of the dispersing sex: the nature of social bonds in West African female chimpanzees, *Pan troglodytes*. *Animal Behaviour*. 2009; 77:377–387.
- Lehmann J, Dunbar RIM. Network cohesion, group size and neocortex size in female-bonded Old World primates. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*. 2009; 276:4417–4422.
- Lusseau D. The emergent properties of a dolphin social network. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B*. 2003; 270:S186–S188. [PubMed: 14667378]
- Lusseau D. Evidence for a social role in a dolphin social network. *Evolutionary Ecology*. 2006; 21:357–366.
- Lusseau D, Newman MEJ. Identifying the role that animals play in their social networks. *Biology Letters*. 2004; 271:S477–S481.
- Lusseau D, Whitehead H, Gero S. Incorporating uncertainty into the study of animal social networks. *Animal Behaviour*. 2008; 75:1809–1815.
- Maryanski AR. African ape social structure: Is there strength in weak ties? *Social Networks*. 1987; 9:191–215.
- McCowan B, Anderson K, Heagarty A, Cameron A. Utility of social network analysis for primate behavioral management and well-being. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*. 2008; 109:396–405.
- McDonald DB. Predicting fate from early connectivity in a social network. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2007; 104:10910–10914.
- Mead, GH. *The Mind, Self and Society*. Morris, CW., editor. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1934. p. 400
- Mitani M. Voiceprint identification and its application to sociological studies of wild Japanese monkeys (*Macaca fuscata yakui*). *Primates*. 1986; 27:397–412.
- Mitchell, JC. *Social Networks in Urban Situations*. Manchester: Manchester University Press; 1969.
- Moreno, JL. *Who shall survive?: A new approach to the problem of human interrelations*. Washington, DC: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Co; 1934. p. 441
- Nakagawa N. Distribution of affiliative behaviors among adult females within a group of wild patas monkeys in a nonmating, nonbirth season. *International Journal of Primatology*. 1992; 13:73–96.
- Newman MEJ. The structure and function of complex networks. *Siam Review*. 2003; 45:167–256.

- Newman MEJ. A measure of betweenness centrality based on random walks. *Social Networks*. 2005; 27:39–54.
- Newman MEJ. Modularity and community structure in networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2006; 103:8577–8582.
- Newman MEJ, Watts DJ, Strogatz SH. Random graph models of social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2002; 99:2566–2572. [PubMed: 11875211]
- Ohtsuki H, Hauert C, Lieberman E, Nowak MA. A simple rule for the evolution of cooperation on graphs and social networks. *Nature*. 2006; 441:502–505. [PubMed: 16724065]
- Opsahl, T. *Structure and Evolution of Weighted Networks*. London: University of London; 2009.
- Otte E, Rousseau R. Social network analysis: A powerful strategy, also for the information sciences. *Journal of Information Science*. 2002; 28:441–453.
- Pavelka MSM. Do old female monkeys have a specific social role? *Primates*. 1990; 31:363–373.
- Pearl, MC. *Networks of social relations among Himalayan rhesus monkeys (Macaca mulatta)*. Yale University; 1983. p. 222
- Pearl MC, Schulman RS. Techniques for the analysis of social structure in animal societies. *Advances in the Study of Behavior*. 1983; 13:107–146.
- Ramos-Fernández G, Boyer G, Aureli F, Vick LG. Association networks in spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*. 2009; 63:999–1013.
- Reynolds V. Roles and role change in monkey society: The consort relationship of rhesus monkeys. *Man*. 1970; 5:449–465.
- Roney, JR.; Maestripieri, D. Social development and affiliation. In: Maestripieri, D., editor. *Primate Psychology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 2003. p. 619
- Sade DS. Some aspects of parent-offspring and sibling relations in a group of rhesus monkeys, with a discussion of grooming. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 1965; 23:1–17. [PubMed: 14326951]
- Sade DS. Sociometrics of *Macaca mulatta* I: Linkages and cliques in grooming matrices. *Folia Primatologica*. 1972; 18:196–223.
- Sade DS. Sociometrics of *Macaca mulatta* III: n-path centrality in grooming networks. *Social Networks*. 1989; 11:273–292.
- Sade DS, Altmann M, Loy J, Hausfater G, Breuggeman JA. Sociometrics of *Macaca mulatta*: II. Decoupling centrality and dominance in rhesus monkey social networks. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 1988; 77:409–425. [PubMed: 3223514]
- Santos FC, Rodrigues JF, Pacheco JM. Graph topology plays a determinant role in the evolution of cooperation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*. 2006; 273:51–55.
- Sapolsky RM. The endocrine stress-response and social status in the wild baboon. *Hormones and Behavior*. 1982; 16:279–292. [PubMed: 6890939]
- Schulman, RS. *Intra group spacing and multiple social networks in Macaca mulatta*. Yale University; 1980. p. 187
- Scott, J. *Social Network Analysis: A Handbook*. London: Sage Publications; 2000. p. 208
- Seeman TE. Social ties and health: The benefits of social integration. *Annals of Epidemiology*. 1996; 6:442–451. [PubMed: 8915476]
- Seyfarth RM. Social relationships among adult female baboons. *Animal Behaviour*. 1976; 24:917–938.
- Seyfarth RM. A model of social grooming among adult female monkeys. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*. 1977; 65:671–698. [PubMed: 406485]
- Seyfarth RM. The distribution of grooming and related behaviours among adult female vervet monkeys. *Animal Behaviour*. 1980; 28:798–813.
- Sih A, Hanser SF, McHugh KA. Social network theory: New insights and issues for behavioral ecologists. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*. 2009; 63:975–988.
- Silk JB. The patterning of intervention among male bonnet macaques: Reciprocity, revenge, and loyalty. *Current Anthropology*. 1992; 33:318–325.
- Silk JB. The adaptive value of sociality in mammalian groups. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*. 2007; 362:539–559.

- Silk JB, Altmann J, Alberts SC. Social relationships among adult female baboons (*Papio cynocephalus*) I. Variation in the strength of social bonds. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*. 2006; 61:183–195.
- Silk JB, Beehner JC, Bergman TJ, Crockford C, Engh AL, Moscovice LR, Wittig RM, Seyfarth RM, Cheney DL. Strong and consistent social bonds enhance the longevity of female baboons. *Current Biology*. 2010; 20:1359–1361. [PubMed: 20598541]
- Smith EO. A further description of the control role in pigtail macaques, *Macaca nemestrina*. *Primates*. 1973; 14:413–419.
- Soczka L. Ethologie sociale et sociometrie: Analyse de la structure d'un group de singes crabiers (*Macaca fascicularis = irus*) en captivite. *Behaviour*. 1974; 50:254–269.
- Stammach, E. Desert, forest and montane baboons: multilevel societies. In: Smuts, B.; Cheney, DL.; Seyfarth, RM.; Wrangham, RW.; Struhsaker, T., editors. *Primate Societies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1987. p. 112–120.
- Sueur C, Petit O. Organization of group members at departure is driven by social structure in *Macaca*. *International Journal of Primatology*. 2008; 29:1085–1098.
- Thierry B. Primate socioecology, the lost dream of ecological determinism. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News and Reviews*. 2008; 17:93–96.
- Voelkl B, Kasper C. Social structure of primate interaction networks facilitates the emergence of cooperation. *Biology Letters*. 2009; 5:462–464. [PubMed: 19443505]
- Voelkl B, Noë R. The influence of social structure on the propagation of social information in artificial primate groups: A graph-based simulation approach. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*. 2008; 252:77–86. [PubMed: 18342891]
- Voelkl B, Noë R. Simulation of information propagation in real-life primate networks: longevity, fecundity, fidelity. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*. 2010; 64:1449–1459.
- Wasserman, S.; Faust, K. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Granovetter, M., editor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1994. p. 825
- Watts DJ, Strogatz SH. Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks. *Nature*. 1998; 393:440–442. [PubMed: 9623998]
- Wey T, Blumstein DT, Shen W, Jordan F. Social network analysis of animal behaviour: a promising tool for the study of sociality. *Animal Behaviour*. 2008; 75:333–344.
- White H, Boorman S, Breiger R. Social structure from multiple networks I. Blockmodels of roles and positions. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1976; 81:730–780.
- Whitehead, H. Socprog 2.3 (for MATLAB 7.4). Halifax, Canada: Dalhousie University; 2007.
- Whitehead, H. *Analyzing Animal Societies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2008. p. 336
- Wilson, EO. *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press; 1975.
- Yeager CP. Proboscis monkey (*Nasalis larvatus*) social organization: Group structure. *American Journal of Primatology*. 1990; 20:95–106.

Figure 1.

a. Sociogram of a rhesus macaques grooming network, reproduced following Sade (1965, Figure 3), b. Spring-embedded version of Sade's sociogram generated in Netdraw. The individual with the highest centrality ('1957') is placed in the center of the spring-embedded graph. In both sociograms, circles represent females, triangles males. Lines between nodes represent the presence of a grooming tie. Arrows indicate the direction of grooming (i.e. given or received) and the weight of lines indicate the relative frequency at which grooming occurred.

Figure 2.

Schematic representation of Hinde's conceptual framework for the study of nonhuman primate social behavior, reproduced following Hinde (1976, Figure 1). Relationships between individuals emerge from the patterning of their interactions, and social structure emerges from the patterning of relationships. Social structure consequently feeds back to influence relationships and interactions, and relationships feedback to influence interactions. In this schematic, interactions are grouped according to type; for example, affiliative, agonistic and sexual interactions, while relationships are grouped according to the types of individuals involved; for example, mother-infant, male-female and kin-based relationships.