

# Ant Collective Behavior Is Heritable and Shaped by Selection

Justin T. Walsh,<sup>1,\*</sup> Simon Garnier,<sup>2</sup> and Timothy A. Linksvayer<sup>1</sup>

1. Department of Biology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104; 2. Department of Biology, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark, New Jersey 07102

Submitted January 6, 2020; Accepted May 19, 2020; Electronically published September 14, 2020

Online enhancements: supplemental tables and figures. Dryad data: <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.931zcrjh3>.

**ABSTRACT:** Collective behaviors are widespread in nature and usually assumed to be strongly shaped by natural selection. However, the degree to which variation in collective behavior is heritable and has fitness consequences—the two prerequisites for evolution by natural selection—is largely unknown. We used a new pharaoh ant (*Monomorium pharaonis*) mapping population to estimate the heritability, genetic correlations, and fitness consequences of three collective behaviors (foraging, aggression, and exploration), as well as of body size, sex ratio, and caste ratio. Heritability estimates for the collective behaviors were moderate, ranging from 0.17 to 0.32, but lower than our estimates for the heritability of caste ratio, sex ratio, and body size of new workers, queens, and males. Moreover, variation in collective behaviors among colonies was phenotypically correlated, suggesting that selection may shape multiple colony collective behaviors simultaneously. Finally, we found evidence for directional selection that was similar in strength to estimates of selection in natural populations. Altogether, our study begins to elucidate the genetic architecture of collective behavior and is one of the first studies to demonstrate that it is shaped by selection.

**Keywords:** collective behavior, animal personality, genetic correlation, heritability, selection, caste ratio.

## Introduction

Collective behavior, defined as behaviors of groups of individuals that operate without central control (Gordon 2014, 2016), is ubiquitous in nature. Examples include predator avoidance in schools of fish, migration of flocks of birds, and nest building in social insects. Increasingly, researchers have documented patterns of variation in collective behavior between groups (i.e., describing collective or group personality; Gordon 1991; Gordon et al. 2011; Bengtson and Jandt 2014; Jandt et al. 2014; Wright et al. 2019) with a goal of understanding the evolutionary

causes and consequences of variation in collective behavior. However, the degree to which collective behaviors are heritable and how genetic variation contributes to population-level variation in individual and collective behaviors remain largely unknown. Furthermore, it is often assumed that collective behavior and other group-level traits, like individual behavior and other individual-level traits, are strongly shaped by natural selection. However, little is actually known about the fitness consequences of variation in collective behaviors or group-level traits more generally (Gordon 2013, 2016; Wright et al. 2019).

Given that trait variation must be heritable in order for the trait to respond to selection and evolve over time, quantifying heritability is a crucial first step in studying trait evolution (Falconer and Mackay 1996; Lynch and Walsh 1998). Previous studies in ants, honey bees, and sticklebacks suggest that collective behaviors and other group-level traits are heritable (Linksvayer 2006; Hunt et al. 2007; Wark et al. 2011; Gordon 2013; Greenwood et al. 2015; Friedman and Gordon 2016). Additionally, candidate gene studies have linked allelic variation to variation in collective behavior, providing further evidence that collective behavior is heritable (Krieger 2005; Wang et al. 2008; Wang et al. 2013; Tang et al. 2018). Although numerous studies have examined the genetic architecture of group-level traits in honey bees (Rinderer et al. 1983; Collins et al. 1984; Milne 1985; Moritz et al. 1987; Bienefeld and Pirchner 1990; Pirchner and Bienefeld 1991; Harris and Harbo 1999; Boecking et al. 2000; Hunt et al. 2007), we know little about the genetic architecture or the evolution of collective behavior and other group-level traits in other group-living species.

Another key factor affecting the relationship between genotype, phenotype, and evolutionary response to selection is the pattern of genetic correlations (i.e., the proportion of variance that two traits share as a result of genetic causes). Genetic correlations can either accelerate or slow down the rate of evolutionary response to selection, depending on the direction of the correlation relative to the direction of selection on the traits (Lynch and Walsh 1998; Wilson et al. 2010). Understanding genetic

\* Corresponding author; email: [juswalsh@sas.upenn.edu](mailto:juswalsh@sas.upenn.edu).

**ORCID:** Walsh, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9989-7089>; Garnier, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3886-3974>; Linksvayer, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7034-1546>.

Am. Nat. 2020. Vol. 196, pp. 000–000. © 2020 by The University of Chicago. 0003-0147/2020/19605-59692\$15.00. All rights reserved.  
DOI: 10.1086/710709

correlations is especially important for the study of behavioral evolution, since behaviors are often thought to be correlated with one another, forming sets of tightly linked traits that are often described as behavioral syndromes (Sih et al. 2004; Dochtermann and Dingemanse 2013). Although genetic correlations have been estimated for individual-level behaviors (reviewed by van Oers et al. 2005), few studies have examined genetic correlations between collective behaviors or other group-level traits in social insects (except for honey bees; Milne 1985; Bienefeld and Pirchner 1990; Boecking et al. 2000).

The genetic architecture of group-level traits such as collective behavior is likely more complex than the genetic architecture of individual-level traits because variation in group-level traits arises from phenotypic and genotypic variation within and among groups (Linksvayer 2006, 2015; Bijma et al. 2007a, 2007b; McGlothlin et al. 2010; Gempe et al. 2012). For example, the genotype of each individual may influence its activity rate, which in turn may affect interactions among group members and the collective performance of the group. Thus, group-level traits depend on the genotypes of multiple interacting individuals just as individual-level traits are affected by social interactions, as considered in the interacting-phenotypes framework (Moore et al. 1997; McGlothlin et al. 2010). Indeed, previous honey bee studies quantifying heritability for colony-level performance traits, such as honey yield, have treated colony performance as a worker trait that is influenced by the expected genotype of workers and also potentially influenced by the genotype of the queen (i.e., through a maternal genetic effect; Bienefeld and Pirchner 1990; Pirchner and Bienefeld 1991; Bienefeld et al. 2007; Brascamp et al. 2016).

The rate and direction of a trait's potential evolutionary response to selection also depend on the pattern of natural selection acting on the trait. Knowledge of the fitness consequences of trait variation allows researchers to characterize the type (e.g., directional, stabilizing, or disruptive) and strength of natural selection acting on a trait (Lande and Arnold 1983; Arnold and Wade 1984; Janzen and Stern 1998; Morrissey and Sakrejda 2013). Many studies have estimated the fitness consequences of individual-level behavioral variation (reviewed by Smith and Blumstein 2008), but the consequences of group-level variation have received relatively little attention (but see Wray et al. 2011; Modlmeier et al. 2012; Gordon 2013; Blight et al. 2016a, 2016b).

Social insects are well-established models for studying collective behavior. Well-studied collective behaviors include nest choice in acorn ants (*Temnothorax* spp.; Möglich 1978; Franks et al. 2003; Pratt 2017), nest defense and hygienic behavior in honey bees (*Apis mellifera*; Spivak 1996; Breed et al. 2004; Evans and Spivak 2010),

and regulation of foraging in pharaoh ants (*Monomorium pharaonis*; e.g., Beekman et al. 2001; Sumpter and Beekman 2003; Robinson et al. 2005) and harvester ants (*Pogonomyrmex barbatus*; e.g., Gordon 2002, 2013; Greene and Gordon 2007; Gordon et al. 2007, 2011). The collective behavior of colony members also shapes colony productivity and the relative investment in workers versus reproductives (i.e., caste ratio) and reproductive males versus queens (i.e., sex ratio). Social insect sex ratio and caste ratio have long served as important models for empirically testing predictions from inclusive fitness theory regarding predicted conflicts between queens and workers over sex ratio and caste ratio (Trivers and Hare 1976; Reuter and Keller 2001; Mehdiabadi et al. 2003; Linksvayer 2008; Bourke 2015). However, despite this long-term, intense interest in the evolution of colony-level traits, empirical evidence is scarce about the key parameters governing the evolution of these traits, especially for ants. Indeed, while recent molecular studies have begun to characterize the genomic, transcriptomic, and epigenetic differences between species, between castes within a species, and between individual workers (Friedman and Gordon 2016; Gospcic et al. 2017; Warner et al. 2017; Chandra et al. 2018; Walsh et al. 2018), little is known about the genetic architecture of collective behavior, caste ratio, and sex ratio (Linksvayer 2006). Similarly, while it is clear that colony-level phenotypes can be shaped by patterns of selection within and between colonies (Owen 1986; Moritz 1989; Ratnieks and Reeve 1992; Tsuji 1994, 1995; Banschbach and Herbers 1996; Tarpay et al. 2004; Gordon 2013), few studies have attempted to empirically quantify patterns of selection acting on social insect traits.

In this study, we used a genetically and phenotypically variable laboratory population of pharaoh ants (*M. pharaonis*). Such a mapping population has proven powerful to elucidate the genetic architecture of a range of traits, including behavioral traits, in mice, rats, and fruit flies (Hansen and Spuhler 1984; Mott et al. 2000; Valdar et al. 2006; King et al. 2012). We first assayed colony-level foraging, aggression, and three measures of exploration using three replicate subcolonies of 81 distinct colony genotypes of known pedigree (243 replicate subcolonies total). Collective behaviors are defined as emergent behaviors of groups of individuals that operate without central control through local interactions (Gordon 2014, 2016). We consider the behaviors of foraging, exploration, and aggression to be collective because all three consist of emergent patterns of workers operating at least in part through local interactions, either through direct antennal contact with other workers or through the influence of pheromones (Adler and Gordon 1992; Gordon and Mehdiabadi 1999; Gordon 2002, 2010; Greene and Gordon 2007; Pinter-Wollman et al. 2013; Kleineidam

et al. 2017). In many social insects, foragers are stimulated to begin foraging through interactions with other foragers/scouts returning to the nest (e.g., Gordon 2002; Fernández et al. 2003; Pinter-Wollman et al. 2013). Both foraging and exploratory behavior are often regulated through the use of trail pheromones (e.g., Fourcassie and Deneubourg 1994; Jackson and Châline 2007). During aggressive responses to threats, workers are often recruited via the use of alarm pheromones (Löfqvist 1976; Blum 1996) or through social interactions with other workers (Kleineidam et al. 2017). We also chose these collective behaviors because they are linked to colony success in other social insects, including other species of ants (Wray et al. 2011; Modlmeier et al. 2012; Blight et al. 2016a, 2016b). Furthermore, we measured colony productivity; caste and sex ratios; and worker, gyne, and male body size. We used the known pedigree of colonies in our mapping population, together with trait measurements in an animal-model framework, to estimate the heritability of and genetic correlations between all traits. Finally, we estimated the strength and pattern of selection acting on all of the measured phenotypes in the laboratory.

## Material and Methods

### *Background and Overall Design*

All *Monomorium pharaonis* colonies used in this study were reared in the lab and derived from eight initial lab stocks collected from eight different locations across Africa, Asia, Europe, and North America (Schmidt 2010; Schmidt et al. 2010). Specifically, the eight initial stocks were systematically intercrossed for nine generations in order to create a mapping population that was initially designed to be analogous to the mouse heterogeneous stock (Mott et al. 2000; Valdar et al. 2006). After nine generations of intercrossing, each colony in the resulting mapping population is expected to contain a unique mixture of alleles from the eight initial stocks (Pontieri et al. 2017; fig. S1; figs. S1–S3 are available online). We maintained all colonies at  $27^{\circ} \pm 1^{\circ}\text{C}$  and 50% relative humidity on a 12L:12D cycle. We split each colony (henceforth, “colony genotype”) into three equally sized replicates (henceforth, “colony replicate”) by emptying the colony genotypes into plastic bowls; gently mixing the queens, workers, and brood; and using teaspoons to scoop them into three new colony containers. Next, we manually counted all individuals within the colony replicates and adjusted the individuals accordingly so that all colony replicates initially consisted of 4 queens,  $400 \pm 40$  workers,  $60 \pm 6$  eggs,  $50 \pm 5$  first-instar larvae,  $20 \pm 2$  second-instar larvae,  $70 \pm 7$  third-instar larvae,  $20 \pm 2$  prepupae, and  $60 \pm 6$  worker pupae. These numbers represent a typical distribu-

tion of developmental stages in a relatively small *M. pharaonis* colony (Warner et al. 2018). Except when starving the colony replicates (see below), we fed all colony replicates twice per week with an agar-based synthetic diet (Dussutour and Simpson 2008) and dried mealworms. The colony replicates always had access to water via water tubes plugged with cotton and nested between two glass slides (5 cm  $\times$  10 cm). We kept all colony replicates in a plastic colony container (18.5 cm  $\times$  10.5 cm  $\times$  10.5 cm) lined with fluon and surrounded by a moat of oil to prevent the workers from escaping the box.

After setting up the colony replicates, we gave them 2 weeks to acclimate to the new conditions before conducting behavioral assays. We fed the colony replicates twice per week except for the week before the exploratory and foraging assays, when we starved the colony replicates so that they would be motivated to explore and forage. We conducted the exploratory and foraging assays during the third week and the aggression assays during the fourth week after setting up the replicate colonies.

### *Behavioral Observations*

*Exploratory Assay.* We conducted the exploratory assay after the colony replicates had been starved for 6 days. We assayed the exploratory behavior of both entire colony replicates and groups of five foragers. We conducted the assay inside a filming box with white LED lights arranged along the walls and a camera mounted on the top to film the arena from above (fig. S2A). To remove trail pheromones between assays, we covered the floor of the box with white poster board that we replaced between each assay. We first collected five foragers, defined as any worker outside the nest, from inside the colony container and placed them in a large petri dish. We placed the petri dish upside down in the middle of a circular arena in the center of the filming box and waited 5 min to give the workers time to settle down after being handled. After the 5 min, we gently removed the petri dish so that the workers were free to move around the arena, and we filmed the workers exploring the arena for 15 min.

Next, we replaced the poster board inside the filming box and placed the five foragers, all remaining foragers from inside the colony container, and the nest containing the rest of the workers, queens, and brood inside a petri dish. We placed the petri dish containing the entire colony upside down in the center of the arena and waited 5 min before lifting the petri dish and filming for 15 min.

We analyzed the videos of the five foragers using custom-made tracking software (<https://github.com/swarm-lab/trackR>; accessed 2017) to track the location of each ant in each frame of the video. To avoid the effect of the arena wall on ant trajectories, we removed all tracks where the

ants were within 3 mm of the wall, resulting in many separate trajectories within each video for each ant. Next, for each subtrajectory, we calculated the net squared displacement (NSD) by taking the square of the distance traveled by each ant between the starting location and each successive location along the rest of the trajectory. To calculate the diffusion coefficient, we took the slope of the plot of NSD over time and fit the equation

$$\text{MSD} = 4Dt,$$

where mean squared displacement (MSD) is the slope of NSD over time,  $D$  is the diffusion coefficient, and  $t$  is time (Börger and Fryxell 2012). The diffusion coefficient served as a measure of how quickly the ants collectively explored a novel space.


In addition, for both the five-forager and the entire-colony videos, we calculated the arena coverage and coverage redundancy over time. First, we computed the absolute difference between each frame of the recorded video and a background image of the experimental setup without ants in it. When a pixel had a large absolute difference, it meant an ant was present on that pixel in a given frame. We then applied a threshold to the difference image and classified all of the pixels with a difference value above the threshold as ant-covered pixels and gave them a value of 1, and we classified all of the pixels with a difference value below the threshold as background pixels and gave them a value of 0. Finally, we computed the cumulative sum of the segmented images over time and, for each, calculated the arena coverage as the percentage of the pixels with a value of at least 1 (i.e., what fraction of pixels have been visited by ants at least once; fig. 1).

We refer to three exploratory behaviors as “exploratory rate,” “group exploration,” and “colony exploration.” “Exploratory rate” refers to the diffusion coefficient of groups

of five ants, “group exploration” refers to the percentage of the arena covered by the groups of five foragers, and “colony exploration” refers to the percentage of the arena covered by the entire colony.

*Foraging Assay.* We conducted the foraging assay on each colony replicate the day after the exploratory assay and after the colony replicates had been starved for a week. We melted the agar-based synthetic diet and soaked a cotton ball in the liquid. When the cotton ball solidified, we placed it on the plateau of a 3D-printed ramp and placed the ramp inside a colony container on the opposite site of the nest (fig. S2B). Once an ant first discovered the food, we started filming and filmed for 1 h. If no ant discovered the food after 30 min, we started the recording. We calculated the foraging rate by manually counting the number of ant visits to the plateau of the ramp in each video. Because many ants went back and forth from the food to the nest, we counted many ants more than once.

*Aggression Assay.* Like other unicolonial ant species, *M. pharaonis* workers show little to no aggression toward *M. pharaonis* workers from other colonies (Schmidt et al. 2010). To get *M. pharaonis* workers to act aggressively and to be able to quantify aggression against a constant “enemy” for all of our experimental colonies, we used workers from a single *Monomorium dichroum* colony that had been kept in the lab under the same conditions as the *M. pharaonis* colonies for 5 years. We conducted the aggression assays a week after the foraging assays. We first collected 20 foragers of both species and placed them in separate small petri dishes (fig. S3). We placed both small petri dishes upside down in a large petri dish for 5 min before lifting both petri dishes and allowing the workers of both species to interact. Every 5 min for 1 h, we manually



**Figure 1:** Nine representative plots showing variation among colony genotypes in the exploratory patterns of groups of five foragers. The plots show the tracks (white pixels) of the ants as they explore a novel arena.



counted and recorded the number of *M. pharaonis* workers that were biting *M. dichroum* workers. We defined aggression as the average number of *M. pharaonis* workers biting *M. dichroum* workers across all observations within an hour. We froze all of the ants used in the aggression assay so that we did not reuse *M. dichroum* workers in more than one assay.

#### Colony Productivity and Body Mass Measurements

To measure colony productivity, we surveyed each colony replicate once per week and counted the number of workers and brood at all developmental stages. *Monomorium pharaonis* colonies usually produce new gynes (virgin queens) and males only in the absence of fertile queens (Edwards 1991; Warner et al. 2018). Therefore, in order to induce the production of new gynes and males, we removed queens at the start of the fifth week, after the aggression assay. We conducted weekly surveys until all brood matured into worker, gyne, or male pupae. In addition to colony productivity data for the total number of workers, gynes, and males produced, the weekly surveys also allowed us to calculate colony caste and sex ratios. We defined caste ratio as the number of gynes relative to the total number of females produced, and we defined sex ratio as the number of gynes relative to the total number of reproductives (gynes and males) produced. To measure body size, we collected 15 worker pupae, 10 gyne pupae, and 10 male pupae from each colony replicate. We dried the pupae in a drying oven for 24 h before weighing.

#### Heritability and Genetic Correlation Analysis

We performed all statistical analyses in R version 3.4.1 (R Development Core Team 2014). We estimated the repeatability of all measured phenotypes across colony replicates using a generalized linear mixed model approach in the R package MCMCglmm (Hadfield 2010). We included block as a random factor to account for the fact that the samples were collected at different time points from the replicate colonies, colony identity as a random effect, and *Wolbachia* infection status as a fixed effect (two of the original eight lineages included in the heterogeneous stock were infected with *Wolbachia*; Schmidt et al. 2010; Pontieri et al. 2017).

To estimate the heritability of and genetic correlations between all measured phenotypes, we used an animal-model approach. Animal models are used to estimate genetic parameters of traits by evaluating how patterns of observed phenotypic covariance between all pairs of individual “animals” are predicted by the expected genetic relatedness between individuals according to pedigree (Kruuk 2004; de Villemereuil 2012). For our study, indi-

vidual animals were replicate colonies, the pedigree was the known pedigree across nine generations of the *M. pharaonis* colonies in our mapping population, and the pedigree specifically represented genealogical relationships among the workers (i.e., the worker offspring of queen and male parents) that make up the replicate colonies of the mapping population. We thus assessed the degree to which the expected genotype of workers predicted the observed collective behavior or group-level phenotype measured for groups of workers from replicate colonies. Note that while we focused only on how expected worker genotype was associated with variation in worker collective behavior and colony-level traits, it is certainly possible that the genotypes of other types of colony members (i.e., queens or sibling larvae) also contribute to variation in the group-level traits we measured. Such effects can be independently estimated, as described above, if very large data sets are available (e.g., Brascamp et al. [2016] used a honey bee data set with 15,000 colonies), or alternatively, these effects can be experimentally teased apart with cross-fostering (Linksvayer 2006, 2007; Linksvayer et al. 2009). However, we did not have enough power in our data set to separately estimate potential queen genetic effects, and effects of larval genotype are always completely confounded with worker genotype unless experimental cross-fostering is used.

Specifically, we used the R package MCMCglmm to run animal models using a Bayesian Markov chain Monte Carlo approach (de Villemereuil 2012). We accounted for the fact that ants are haplodiploid (males are haploid, females are diploid) by constructing the pedigree as if the traits were all sex linked (Hedrick and Parker 1997). We used weakly informative priors for 1,000,000 iterations, with a burn-in period of 10,000 iterations, and stored estimates every 500 iterations (full R script included in the Dryad Digital Repository [<https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.931zcrjh3>; Walsh et al. 2020]; following de Villemereuil 2012). We assessed convergence of the models by visually inspecting estimate plots and assessing the autocorrelation values (de Villemereuil 2012). We analyzed whether behaviors were phenotypically correlated with one another (i.e., behavioral syndromes) using Spearman rank correlations and corrected for multiple comparisons by using the false discovery rate method in the R function p.adjust.

In our initial heritability estimates, we ignored two complications in our pedigree. First, between our conducting new crosses to produce new generations, our colonies went through multiple rounds of intranidal mating: when the fecundity of current queens declines, *M. pharaonis* colonies produce new gynes and males that stay in the nest and mate with each other (Berndt and Eichler 1987). Second, when a colony was the mother/father colony to multiple offspring colonies, we initially treated

those offspring colonies as half siblings. However, because *M. pharaonis* colonies contain multiple queens, the new gynes and males they produce may be better thought of as cousins. To test whether either of these complications would affect our heritability estimates, we constructed multiple pedigrees and reran the heritability analyses. We constructed pedigrees in which one or two generations contained two rounds of intranidal mating, one or two generations considered reproductives from the same colony as cousins, and two generations of both intranidal mating and considering reproductives from the same colony as cousins.

### Selection Analysis

We defined fitness in two ways—as either the production of new reproductives (gynes or males) or the production of new workers—and ran separate models for each fitness definition. In nature, *M. pharaonis* colonies reproduce by budding (i.e., new colonies are not founded independently by queens [Buczkowski and Bennett 2009], but instead, a number of queens and workers disperse with brood to form a new colony). Both new reproductives and new workers determine the growth rate and potential to bud for existing colonies and hence are appropriate measures of colony fitness. We estimated the strength of selection using a multivariate standardized selection gradient approach as described by Morrissey and Sakrejda (2013). This method is similar to the approach outlined by Lande and Arnold (1983) and uses spline-based generalized additive models to model the relationship between fitness and traits.


We normalized all behaviors to a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 so that the selection estimates represent standardized values (Lande and Arnold 1983; Morrissey and Sakrejda 2013). We included all five behaviors and block in all models and estimated selection gradients and prediction intervals after 1,000 bootstrap replicates (Morrissey and Sakrejda 2013).

## Results


### Repeatability and Heritability Estimates

Data underlying all analyses have been deposited in the Dryad Digital Repository (<https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.931zcrjh3>; Walsh et al. 2020). All five behaviors, caste and sex ratios, and worker, gyne, and male body mass were significantly repeatable across replicate colonies (table S1; tables S1–S6 are available online). We estimated the heritability of the five collective behaviors to be between 0.17 and 0.32, with a median value of 0.21 (fig. 2). We estimated the heritability of worker body mass to be 0.34, the heritability of gyne body mass to be 0.46, and the heritability of male body mass to be 0.53 (fig. 2). We estimated the heritability of five colony-productivity measures to be between 0.001 and 0.46, with a median value of 0.24 (fig. 2). Finally, we estimated the heritability of colony caste and sex ratios to be 0.26 and 0.23, respectively (fig. 2).

We compared our initial heritability estimates with heritability estimates using five different modified pedigrees that considered intranidal mating and/or considering offspring colonies as cousins rather than half siblings. The



**Figure 2:** Caterpillar plot of heritability estimates with 95% confidence intervals grouped by category. Collective behaviors (red), body mass (blue), colony productivity (black), and caste and sex ratios (purple) are designated by different colors.



**Figure 3:** Heat maps showing phenotypic (A) and genetic (B) correlations between collective behaviors. For the phenotypic correlations, asterisks within cells correspond to  $P$  values (adjusted for multiple comparisons; \* $P < .05$ ; \*\* $P < .01$ ; \*\*\* $P < .001$ ; no symbol indicates  $P > .05$ ), and colors correspond to the magnitude and sign of the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. None of the genetic correlations were significant (all 95% confidence intervals overlapped with zero).

difference between the initial heritability estimates and the estimates when using the five modified pedigrees was small, less than 0.1 for all phenotypes except sex ratio, which differed by up to 0.24 (table S5).

*Phenotypic and Genetic Correlation Estimates*

We found phenotypic correlations among the five measured collective behaviors (fig. 3). Foraging rate was negatively correlated with aggression and positively correlated with both group exploration and colony exploration. Aggression was negatively correlated with exploratory rate. Group exploration and colony exploration were positively correlated. The genetic correlation estimates ranged


from  $-0.05$  to  $0.17$ , but the 95% confidence intervals (CIs) all overlapped with zero (for estimates and 95% CIs, see fig. 3; table S2). The genetic correlation estimates between behaviors and all other traits and among all other traits were mostly small, and all had 95% CIs that overlapped with zero (table S6).

*Selection Gradients*

When defining fitness as the number of reproductives (gynes and males) produced by the colony, we found evidence for positive linear selection on foraging and negative linear selection on exploratory rate (table 1; fig. 4). We found no evidence for quadratic selection. When

**Table 1:** Linear and quadratic selection estimates for behaviors using either reproductive (R) or worker (W) production as the measurement of fitness

Trait	Estimate (R)	SE	$P$	Estimate (W)	SE	$P$
Linear:						
Foraging	.245	.071	<.001	.122	.047	.008
Aggression	-.054	.070	.446	.007	.048	.916
Exploratory rate	-.088	.052	.048	-.022	.041	.586
Group exploration	-.033	.051	.498	.027	.047	.788
Colony exploration	-.014	.063	.810	.015	.049	.788
Quadratic:						
Foraging	.025	.059	.576	.019	.022	.130
Aggression	.003	.010	.248	.00005	.049	.412
Exploratory rate	.008	.010	.106	.050	.051	.206
Group exploration	.001	.005	.258	.085	.078	.116
Colony exploration	.0002	.006	.306	.0002	.004	.266



**Figure 4:** Caterpillar plot showing linear selection gradients with standard errors. Asterisks indicate estimates that are significant. Positive values indicate directional selection for increased trait values (e.g., there is directional selection for increased foraging rate when fitness is measured by the number of reproductives or workers produced), and negative values indicate directional selection for decreased trait values (e.g., there is directional selection for decreased exploratory rate when fitness is measured as the number of reproductives produced).

defining fitness as the number of workers produced by a colony, we found evidence for positive linear selection on foraging and no evidence for quadratic selection (table 1; fig. 4). When defining fitness as the production of either new reproductives or workers, we found no evidence for correlational selection between any of the five behaviors. Finally, we found no evidence for linear or quadratic selection on worker, gyne, or male body mass (table S3).

To further put our results into context, we estimated the proportion of variance among our colonies for both measures of fitness (production of new reproductives and production of new workers) that was explained by variation in any of our five behavioral variables, experimental block, or *Wolbachia* infection status. For the production of new reproductives, we found that aggression explained the largest amount of the variance (5.29%), followed by foraging (2.29%), group exploration (1.94%), exploratory rate (0.52%), and colony exploration (0.33%; table S4). For the production of new workers, we found that foraging explained the largest amount of the variance (1.29%), followed by aggression (0.53%), colony exploration (0.34%), group exploration (0.27%), and exploratory rate (0.08%; table S4).

### Discussion

Collective behavior is ubiquitous in nature and presumed to have strong fitness consequences for group members. Moreover, repeatable variation in collective behavior (often described as collective or group-level personality)

has been commonly observed (Bengston and Jandt 2014; Planas-Sitjà et al. 2015; Jolles et al. 2017; Wright et al. 2019). However, little is known about the heritability or genetic architecture of collective behavior and how collective behavior is shaped by selection. A major difficulty for elucidating the genetic basis of collective behavior is that, unlike individual-level behavior, collective behavior by definition depends on social interactions among members of the group. As a result, the genetic architecture of collective behavior fundamentally depends on the collective genetic makeup of these individuals (Linksvayer 2006, 2015; McGlothlin et al. 2010). Quantifying patterns of selection on group-level traits also has an added level of difficulty because the level of replication is the group (e.g., colony) and not the individual. Here, we begin to elucidate the genetic architecture underlying collective behavior and other group-level traits and to characterize how selection acts on these traits in a laboratory population of the ant *Monomorium pharaonis* that we created for this purpose. We provide evidence that variation in collective behaviors, including foraging, aggression, exploratory rate, group and colony exploration, and other group-level traits measured in the laboratory is heritable, phenotypically and genetically correlated, and shaped by selection.

We estimated the heritability of collective behaviors to be between 0.22 and 0.40, which was generally lower than the heritability estimates for body size (0.38–0.58), colony productivity (0.14–0.75), caste ratio (0.42), and sex ratio (0.49; fig. 2; for heritability estimates using more complex pedigrees, also see table S5). These heritability estimates



demonstrate that all of the phenotypes we measured, including collective behaviors, have the ability to respond to short-term selection on standing genetic variation. Although numerous studies have examined the genetic architecture of group-level traits in honey bees (Rinderer et al. 1983; Collins et al. 1984; Milne 1985; Moritz et al. 1987; Bienefeld and Pirchner 1990; Pirchner and Bienefeld 1991; Harris and Harbo 1999; Boecking et al. 2000; Hunt et al. 2007), this is one of the first studies to examine the genetic architecture or the evolution of collective behavior and other group-level traits in an ant species.

Although our heritability estimates are somewhat higher than other estimates of heritability across animal taxa (e.g., the heritability of individual-level behaviors was on average 0.14; Dochtermann et al. 2015), heritability estimates can vary widely, and all else being equal, they are expected to be higher in animals bred in captivity than in those bred in nature because environmental conditions in the laboratory are controlled (Simons and Roff 1994). Furthermore, the heritability estimates for all of our measured group-level phenotypes may be higher than those for individual-level behaviors because the heritability of traits influenced by social interactions includes the contribution of heritable components of the social environment (Linksvayer 2006; Bijma et al. 2007a, 2007b; Linksvayer et al. 2009; McGlothlin et al. 2010; Bijma 2011). There is ample empirical and theoretical evidence that this form of hidden heritability contributes to the heritable variation and evolutionary response to selection for social traits (Wade 1976; Moore 1990; Muir 2005; Linksvayer 2006; Bijma et al. 2007b; Bergsma et al. 2008; Wade et al. 2010; Bijma 2011). Because we kept all components of the social environment intact across replicate subcolonies of each colony genotype (i.e., the workers, queens, and brood were all from the same parent colony), our heritability estimates do not partition out the relative contributions of variation in the workers' own genomes from variation in the genomes of other colony members (Linksvayer 2006; Linksvayer et al. 2009).

We found evidence for both phenotypic and genetic correlations between collective behaviors. Suites of phenotypically correlated behaviors are termed "behavioral syndromes" and have been documented throughout the animal kingdom, including in social insects (Sih et al. 2004; Jandt et al. 2014). The behavioral syndrome we found in *M. pharaonis* consisted of a positive correlation between foraging and exploration, which were both negatively correlated with aggression. Our phenotypic and genetic correlation estimates were generally similar. For example, the four strongest genetic correlation estimates (foraging and aggression, foraging and forager coverage, foraging and colony coverage, forager coverage and colony coverage; fig. 3) were also four of the five significant phenotypic correlations and were all in the same direc-

tion. However, our genetic correlation estimates were generally very weak (i.e., not significantly different from zero), and only one of our genetic correlation estimates was bound away from zero (the correlation between foraging and colony exploration).

Traditionally, behavioral ecologists relied on the assumptions that all behavioral traits were heritable, not strongly genetically correlated, and thus free to evolve independently from other traits in response to patterns of selection on each trait. This approach was termed the "phenotypic gambit" (Grafen 1984). Our results generally support these assumptions, as we found moderate estimates of heritability for all five behavioral variables and relatively weak genetic correlation estimates. These results suggest that collective behaviors are free to respond to selection and that the underlying genetic architecture will not constrain long-term optimization by natural selection (Lynch and Walsh 1998; Wilson et al. 2010).

We calculated the strength and direction of selection acting on collective behavior and found evidence for both positive and negative linear selection (fig. 4; table 1). The absolute values of our estimates of the strength of linear and quadratic selection are similar or slightly smaller than estimates of selection in wild populations (Kingsolver et al. 2001). The strongest pattern of linear selection that we found was for foraging, indicating that colonies with higher foraging rates produced more reproductives as well as more workers. A higher foraging rate is presumably associated with higher input of resources for the colony, allowing colonies to be more productive.

We conducted the current study in a laboratory environment, which enabled us to strictly control the demographic makeup (i.e., queen number, worker number, etc.) and precise environmental conditions experienced by the three colony replicates for each of our 81 colony genotypes. Such control in particular is valuable given the complexity of social insect colonies (Linksvayer 2006; Kronauer and Libbrecht 2018). However, we also acknowledge the caveat that our choice to conduct our study in a controlled laboratory environment likely had strong effects on our estimates of both heritability and genetic correlations, as well as on our estimates of the pattern and magnitude of selection. In particular, it is difficult to know how the fitness consequences of variation in collective behavior that we observed would change in a more natural setting. One possibility is that we might observe positive linear selection for aggression, since aggression has no obvious benefit in the lab but may have benefits in nature. Laboratory-based estimates of natural selection are commonly used to test predictions of evolutionary theory (Fuller et al. 2005). For example, researchers used lab-based manipulations to test predictions of density-dependent selection theory in

*Drosophila melanogaster* (e.g., Mueller 1997; Dasgupta et al. 2019). Our study provides some of the first evidence that natural selection can shape collective phenotypes, an assumption that is rarely tested, on a scale that is likely not feasible in a field study. Furthermore, because *M. pharaonis* tends to be found in association with humans, both in the tropics in their presumed native range (Wetterer 2010) and in heated buildings in introduced temperate regions, the laboratory conditions of our study might be more similar to the “natural” conditions experienced by our study species than to the conditions experienced by other non-synanthropic species.

Overall, this study increases our understanding of the genetic architecture of collective behavior and demonstrates that it is strongly shaped by natural selection. Future studies should focus on identifying the mechanisms by which genes function to influence collective behavior and how variation in these genes affects patterns of variation for collective behavior within populations. Candidate-gene approaches have been used successfully to demonstrate the roles of the ant ortholog of the foraging gene (Ingram et al. 2005; Lucas and Sokolowski 2009; Ingram et al. 2016; Bockoven et al. 2017; Page et al. 2018) and dopamine (Friedman et al. 2018). In addition to candidate-gene approaches, future studies should utilize unbiased approaches such as quantitative trait locus mapping in mapping populations (e.g., Hunt et al. 1998, 2007) such as ours and association mapping in natural populations (e.g., Kocher et al. 2018). Additionally, future research should aim to understand the mechanisms underlying the expression of collective behavior (Friedman et al. 2020). For example, chemical communication (e.g., cuticular hydrocarbons, pheromones) likely plays a large role in regulating collective behavior in social insects. Finally, future studies should seek to disentangle the contribution of workers’ own genomes and the composite sociogenome of their nestmates (including other workers, queens, and brood) by using cross-fostering approaches and experimentally setting up mixed worker groups (Moritz and Southwick 1987; Calderone and Page 1992; Linksvayer 2006; Linksvayer et al. 2009; Gempe et al. 2012).

#### Acknowledgments

Adrian Kase, Ben Cushing, Luigi Pontieri, and Isaac Planas-Sitjà helped design and conduct the behavioral assays. Adrian Kase helped collect and weigh pupae. Rohini Singh and Michael Warner provided invaluable feedback at all stages of the project. Deborah Gordon, Daniel Friedman, and Tali Reiner Brodetzki provided comments on the manuscript that helped improve it. This work was supported by National Science Foundation grant IOS-1452520 awarded to T.A.L.

#### Statement of Authorship

T.A.L. and J.T.W. were responsible for conceptualization; T.A.L., J.T.W., and S.G. were responsible for the experimental design and methodology; J.T.W. was responsible for experimentation; J.T.W. and S.G. were responsible for data analysis; J.T.W. wrote the original draft; J.T.W., T.A.L., and S.G. reviewed and edited the manuscript; and T.A.L. was responsible for project supervision and funding acquisition.

#### Literature Cited

- Adler, F. R., and D. M. Gordon. 1992. Information collection and spread by networks of patrolling ants. *American Naturalist* 140:373–400.
- Arnold, S. J., and M. J. Wade. 1984. On the measurement of natural and sexual selection: theory. *Evolution* 38:709–719.
- Bansbach, V. S., and J. M. Herbers. 1996. Complex colony structure in social insects. II. Reproduction, queen-worker conflict, and levels of selection. *Evolution* 50:298–307.
- Beekman, M., D. J. T. Sumpter, and F. L. W. Ratnieks. 2001. Phase transition between disordered and ordered foraging in Pharaoh’s ants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* 98:9703–9706.
- Bengston, S. E., and J. M. Jandt. 2014. The development of collective personality: the ontogenetic drivers of behavioral variation across groups. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 2:81.
- Bergsma, R., E. Kanis, E. F. Knol, and P. Bijma. 2008. The contribution of social effects to heritable variation in finishing traits of domestic pigs (*Sus scrofa*). *Genetics* 178:1559–1570.
- Berndt, K.-P., and W. Eichler. 1987. Die Pharaoameise, *Monomorium pharaonis* (L.) (Hym., Myrmicidae). *Mitteilungen aus dem Museum für Naturkunde in Berlin. Zoologisches Museum und Institut für Spezielle Zoologie* 63:3–186.
- Bienefeld, K., K. Ehrhardt, and F. Reinhardt. 2007. Genetic evaluation in the honey bee considering queen and worker effects—a BLUP-animal model approach. *Apidologie* 38:77–85.
- Bienefeld, K., and F. Pirchner. 1990. Heritabilities for several colony traits in the honey bee (*Apis mellifera carnica*). *Apidologie* 21:175–183.
- Bijma, P. 2011. A general definition of the heritable variation that determines the potential of a population to respond to selection. *Genetics* 189:1347–1359.
- Bijma, P., W. M. Muir, E. D. Ellen, J. B. Wolf, and J. A. M. Van Arendonk. 2007a. Multilevel selection 2: estimating the genetic parameters determining inheritance and response to selection. *Genetics* 175:289–299.
- Bijma, P., W. M. Muir, and J. A. M. Van Arendonk. 2007b. Multilevel selection 1: quantitative genetics of inheritance and response to selection. *Genetics* 175:277–288.
- Blight, O., G. Albet Diaz-Mariblanca, X. Cerdá, and R. Boulay. 2016a. A proactive-reactive syndrome affects group success in an ant species. *Behavioral Ecology* 27:118–125.
- Blight, O., I. Villalta, X. Cerdá, and R. Boulay. 2016b. Personality traits are associated with colony productivity in the gypsy ant *Aphaenogaster senilis*. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 70:2203–2209.

- Blum, M. S. 1996. Semiochemical parsimony in the Arthropoda. *Annual Review of Entomology* 41:353–374.
- Bockoven, A. A., C. J. Coates, and M. D. Eubanks. 2017. Colony-level behavioural variation correlates with differences in expression of the foraging gene in red imported fire ants. *Molecular Ecology* 26:5953–5960.
- Boecking, O., K. Bienefeld, and W. Drescher. 2000. Heritability of the *Varroa*-specific hygienic behaviour in honey bees (Hymenoptera: Apidae). *Journal of Animal Breeding and Genetics* 117:417–424.
- Börger, L., and J. Fryxell. 2012. Quantifying individual differences in dispersal using net squared displacement. *Dispersal Ecology and Evolution* 30:222–230.
- Bourke, A. F. G. 2015. Sex investment ratios in eusocial *Hymenoptera* support inclusive fitness theory. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 28:2106–2111.
- Brascamp, E. W., A. Willam, C. Boigenzahn, P. Bijma, and R. F. Veerkamp. 2016. Heritabilities and genetic correlations for honey yield, gentleness, calmness and swarming behaviour in Austrian honey bees. *Apidologie* 47:739–748.
- Breed, M. D., P. H. Diaz, and K. D. Lucero. 2004. Olfactory information processing in honeybee, *Apis mellifera*, nestmate recognition. *Animal Behaviour* 68:921–928.
- Buczkowski, G., and G. Bennett. 2009. Colony budding and its effects on food allocation in the highly polygynous ant, *Monomorium pharaonis*. *Ethology* 115:1091–1099.
- Calderone, N. W., and R. E. Page. 1992. Effects of interactions among genotypically diverse nestmates on task specialization by foraging honey bees (*Apis mellifera*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 30:219–226.
- Chandra, V., I. Fetter-Pruneda, P. R. Oxley, A. L. Ritger, S. K. McKenzie, R. Libbrecht, and D. J. C. Kronauer. 2018. Social regulation of insulin signaling and the evolution of eusociality in ants. *Science* 361:398–402.
- Collins, A. M., T. E. Rinderer, J. R. Harbo, and M. A. Brown. 1984. Heritabilities and correlations for several characters in the honey bee. *Journal of Heredity* 75:135–140.
- Dasgupta, P., S. Sarkar, A. A. Das, T. Verma, and B. Nandy. 2019. Intergenerational paternal effect of adult density in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Ecology and Evolution* 9:3553–3563.
- de Villemereuil, P. 2012. Tutorial estimation of a biological trait heritability using the animal model: how to use the MCMCglmm R package. [https://devillemereuil.legtx.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/tuto\\_en.pdf](https://devillemereuil.legtx.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/tuto_en.pdf)
- Dochtermann, N. A., and N. J. Dingemans. 2013. Behavioral syndromes as evolutionary constraints. *Behavioral Ecology* 24:806–811.
- Dochtermann, N. A., T. Schwab, and A. Sih. 2015. The contribution of additive genetic variation to personality variation: heritability of personality. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 282:20142201.
- Dussutour, A., and S. J. Simpson. 2008. Description of a simple synthetic diet for studying nutritional responses in ants. *Insectes Sociaux* 55:329–333.
- Edwards, J. P. 1991. Caste regulation in the pharaohs ant *Monomorium pharaonis*: recognition and cannibalism of sexual brood by workers. *Physiological Entomology* 16:263–271.
- Evans, J. D., and M. Spivak. 2010. Socialized medicine: individual and communal disease barriers in honey bees. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology* 103:S62–S72.
- Falconer, D. S., and T. F. C. Mackay. 1996. Introduction to quantitative genetics. 4th ed. Prentice Hall, Essex.
- Fernández, P. C., M. Gil, and W. M. Farina. 2003. Reward rate and forager activation in honeybees: recruiting mechanisms and temporal distribution of arrivals. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 54:80–87.
- Fourcassie, V., and J. L. Deneubourg. 1994. The dynamics of collective exploration and trail-formation in *Monomorium pharaonis*: experiments and model. *Physiological Entomology* 19:291–300.
- Franks, N. R., A. Dornhaus, J. P. Fitzsimmons, and M. Stevens. 2003. Speed versus accuracy in collective decision making. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 270:2457–2463.
- Friedman, D. A., and D. M. Gordon. 2016. Ant genetics: reproductive physiology, worker morphology, and behavior. *Annual Review of Neuroscience* 39:41–56.
- Friedman, D. A., B. R. Johnson, and T. A. Linksvayer. 2020. Distributed physiology and the molecular basis of social life in eusocial insects. *Hormones and Behavior* 122:104757.
- Friedman, D. A., A. Pilko, D. Skowronska-Krawczyk, K. Krasinska, J. W. Parker, J. Hirsh, and D. M. Gordon. 2018. The role of dopamine in the collective regulation of foraging in harvester ants. *iScience* 8:283–294.
- Fuller, R. C., C. F. Baer, and J. Travis. 2005. How and when selection experiments might actually be useful. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* 45:391–404.
- Gempe, T., S. Stach, K. Bienefeld, and M. Beye. 2012. Mixing of honeybees with different genotypes affects individual worker behavior and transcription of genes in the neuronal substrate. *PLoS ONE* 7:e31653.
- Gordon, D. M. 1991. Behavioral flexibility and the foraging ecology of seed-eating ants. *American Naturalist* 138:379–411.
- . 2002. The regulation of foraging activity in red harvester ant colonies. *American Naturalist* 159:509–518.
- . 2010. Ant encounters: interaction networks and colony behavior. Vol. 1. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- . 2013. The rewards of restraint in the collective regulation of foraging by harvester ant colonies. *Nature* 498:91–93.
- . 2014. The ecology of collective behavior. *PLoS Biology* 12:e1001805.
- . 2016. The evolution of the algorithms for collective behavior. *Cell Systems* 3:514–520.
- Gordon, D. M., A. Guetz, M. J. Greene, and S. Holmes. 2011. Colony variation in the collective regulation of foraging by harvester ants. *Behavioral Ecology* 22:429–435.
- Gordon, D. M., S. Holmes, and S. Nacu. 2007. The short-term regulation of foraging in harvester ants. *Behavioral Ecology* 19:217–222.
- Gordon, D. M., and N. J. Mehdiabadi. 1999. Encounter rate and task allocation in harvester ants. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 45:370–377.
- Gospocic, J., E. J. Shields, K. M. Glastad, Y. Lin, C. A. Penick, H. Yan, A. S. Mikhayev, et al. 2017. The neuropeptide corazonin controls social behavior and caste identity in ants. *Cell* 170:748–759.
- Grafen, A. 1984. Natural selection, kin selection and group selection. Pages 62–84 in J. R. Krebs and N. B. Davies, eds. *Behavioral Ecology*. 2nd ed. Blackwell Scientific, Oxford.
- Greene, M. J., and D. M. Gordon. 2007. Interaction rate informs harvester ant task decisions. *Behavioral Ecology* 18:451–455.
- Greenwood, A. K., R. Ardekani, S. R. McCann, M. E. Dubin, A. Sullivan, S. Bensussen, S. Tavaré, and C. L. Peichel. 2015. Genetic mapping of natural variation in schooling tendency in the

- threespine stickleback. *G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics* 5:761–769.
- Hadfield, J. D. 2010. MCMC methods for multi-response generalized linear mixed models: the MCMCglmm R package. *Journal of Statistical Software* 33:1–22.
- Hansen, C., and K. Spuhler. 1984. Development of the National Institutes of Health genetically heterogeneous rat stock. *Alcoholism Clinical and Experimental Research* 8:477–479.
- Harris, J. W., and J. R. Harbo. 1999. Heritability in honey bees (Hymenoptera: Apidae) of characteristics associated with resistance to *Varroa jacobsoni* (Mesostigmata: Varroidae). *Journal of Economic Entomology* 92:261–265.
- Hedrick, P. W., and J. D. Parker. 1997. Evolutionary genetics and genetic variation of haplodiploids and X-linked genes. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 28:55–83.
- Hunt, G. J., G. V. Amdam, D. Schlipalius, C. Emore, N. Sardesai, C. E. Williams, O. Rueppell, et al. 2007. Behavioral genomics of honeybee foraging and nest defense. *Naturwissenschaften* 94:247–267.
- Hunt, G. J., E. Guzmán-Novoa, M. K. Fondrk, and R. E. Page Jr. 1998. Quantitative trait loci for honey bee stinging behavior and body size. *Genetics* 148:1203–1213.
- Ingram, K. K., D. M. Gordon, D. A. Friedman, M. Greene, J. Kahler, and S. Peteru. 2016. Context-dependent expression of the foraging gene in field colonies of ants: the interacting roles of age, environment and task. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 283:20160841.
- Ingram, K. K., P. Oefner, and D. M. Gordon. 2005. Task-specific expression of the foraging gene in harvester ants. *Molecular Ecology* 14:813–818.
- Jackson, D. E., and N. Châline. 2007. Modulation of pheromone trail strength with food quality in Pharaoh's ant, *Monomorium pharaonis*. *Animal Behaviour* 74:463–470.
- Jandt, J. M., S. Bengston, N. Pinter-Wollman, J. N. Pruitt, N. E. Raine, A. Dornhaus, and A. Sih. 2014. Behavioural syndromes and social insects: personality at multiple levels. *Biological Reviews* 89:48–67.
- Janzen, F. J., and H. S. Stern. 1998. Logistic regression for empirical studies of multivariate selection. *Evolution* 52:1564–1571.
- Jolles, J. W., N. J. Boogert, V. H. Sridhar, I. D. Couzin, and A. Manica. 2017. Consistent individual differences drive collective behavior and group functioning of schooling fish. *Current Biology* 27:2862–2868.
- King, E. G., C. M. Merkes, C. L. McNeil, S. R. Hooper, S. Sen, K. W. Broman, A. D. Long, and S. J. Macdonald. 2012. Genetic dissection of a model complex trait using the *Drosophila* Synthetic Population Resource. *Genome Research* 22:1558–1566.
- Kingsolver, J. G., H. E. Hoekstra, J. M. Hoekstra, D. Berrigan, S. N. Vignieri, C. E. Hill, A. Hoang, P. Gibert, and P. Beerli. 2001. The strength of phenotypic selection in natural populations. *American Naturalist* 157:245–261.
- Kleineidam, C. J., E. L. Heeb, and S. Neupert. 2017. Social interactions promote adaptive resource defense in ants. *PLoS ONE* 12: e0183872.
- Kocher, S. D., R. Mallarino, B. E. R. Rubin, D. W. Yu, H. E. Hoekstra, and N. E. Pierce. 2018. The genetic basis of a social polymorphism in halictid bees. *Nature Communications* 9:4338.
- Krieger, M. J. 2005. To b or not to b: a pheromone-binding protein regulates colony social organization in fire ants. *Bioessays* 27:91–99.
- Kronauer, D. J. C., and R. Libbrecht. 2018. Back to the roots: the importance of using simple insect societies to understand the molecular basis of complex social life. *Current Opinion in Insect Science* 28:33–39.
- Kruuk, L. E. B. 2004. Estimating genetic parameters in natural populations using the “animal model.” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 359:873–890.
- Lande, R., and S. J. Arnold. 1983. The measurement of selection on correlated characters. *Evolution* 37:1210–1226.
- Linksvayer, T. A. 2006. Direct, maternal, and subsocial genetic effects on individual and colony traits in an ant. *Evolution* 60:2552–2561.
- . 2007. Queen-worker-brood coadaptation rather than conflict may drive colony resource allocation in the ant *Temnothorax curvispinosus*. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 62:647–657.
- . 2015. The molecular and evolutionary genetic implications of being truly social for the social insects. Pages 271–292 in A. Zayed and C. F. Kent, eds. *Genomics, physiology and behaviour of social insects*. Vol. 48. *Advances in Insect Physiology*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Linksvayer, T. A., M. K. Fondrk, and R. E. Page Jr. 2009. Honeybee social regulatory networks are shaped by colony-level selection. *American Naturalist* 173:E99–E107.
- Löfqvist, J. 1976. Formic acid and saturated hydrocarbons as alarm pheromones for the ant *Formica rufa*. *Journal of Insect Physiology* 22:1331–1346.
- Lucas, C., and M. B. Sokolowski. 2009. Molecular basis for changes in behavioral state in ant social behaviors. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* 106:6351–6356.
- Lynch, M., and B. Walsh. 1998. *Genetics and analysis of quantitative traits*. Sinauer, Sunderland, MA.
- McGlothlin, J. W., A. J. Moore, J. B. Wolf, and E. D. Brodie III. 2010. Interacting phenotypes and the evolutionary process. III. Social evolution. *Evolution* 64:2558–2574.
- Mehdiabadi, N. J., H. K. Reeve, and U. G. Mueller. 2003. Queens versus workers: sex-ratio conflict in eusocial Hymenoptera. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 18:88–93.
- Milne, C. P., Jr. 1985. Estimates of the heritabilities of and genetic correlation between two components of honey bee (Hymenoptera: Apidae) hygienic behavior: uncapping and removing. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America* 78:841–844.
- Modlmeier, A. P., J. E. Liebmann, and S. Foitzik. 2012. Diverse societies are more productive: a lesson from ants. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 279:2142–2150.
- Möglich, M. 1978. Social organization of nest emigration in *Leptothorax* (Hym., Form.). *Insectes Sociaux* 25:205–225.
- Moore, A. J. 1990. The inheritance of social dominance, mating behaviour and attractiveness to mates in male *Nauphoeta cinerea*. *Animal Behaviour* 39:388–397.
- Moore, A. J., E. D. Brodie III, and J. B. Wolf. 1997. Interacting phenotypes and the evolutionary process. I. Direct and indirect genetic effects of social interactions. *Evolution* 51:1352–1362.
- Moritz, R. F. A. 1989. Colony Level and within colony level selection in honeybees: a two allele population model for *Apis mellifera capensis*. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 25:437–444.
- Moritz, R. F. A., and E. E. Southwick. 1987. Phenotype interactions in group behavior of honey bee workers (*Apis mellifera* L.). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 21:53–57.



- Moritz, R. F. A., E. E. Southwick, and J. B. Harbo. 1987. Genetic analysis of defensive behavior of honeybee colonies (*Apis mellifera* L.) in a field test. *Apidologie* 18:27–42.
- Morrissey, M. B., and K. Sakrejsda. 2013. Unification of regression-based methods for the analysis of natural selection. *Evolution* 67:2094–2100.
- Mott, R., C. J. Talbot, M. G. Turri, A. C. Collins, and J. Flint. 2000. A method for fine mapping quantitative trait loci in outbred animal stocks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* 97:12649–12654.
- Mueller, L. D. 1997. Theoretical and empirical examination of density-dependent selection. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 28:269–288.
- Muir, W. M. 2005. Incorporation of competitive effects in forest tree or animal breeding programs. *Genetics* 170:1247–1259.
- Owen, R. E. 1986. Colony-level selection in the social insects: single locus additive and nonadditive models. *Theoretical Population Biology* 29:198–234.
- Page, H., A. Sweeney, A. Pilko, and N. Pinter-Wollman. 2018. Underlying mechanisms and ecological context of variation in exploratory behavior of the Argentine ant, *Linepithema humile*. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 221:jeb188722.
- Pinter-Wollman, N., A. Bala, A. Merrell, J. Queirolo, M. C. Stumpe, S. Holmes, and D. M. Gordon. 2013. Harvester ants use interactions to regulate forager activation and availability. *Animal Behaviour* 86:197–207.
- Pirchner, F., and K. Bienefeld. 1991. Genetic correlations among several colony characters in the honey bee (Hymenoptera: Apidae) taking queen and worker effects into account. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America* 84:324–331.
- Planas-Sitjà, I., J.-L. Deneubourg, C. Gibon, and G. Sempo. 2015. Group personality during collective decision-making: a multi-level approach. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 282:20142515.
- Pontieri, L., A. M. Schmidt, R. Singh, J. S. Pedersen, and T. A. Linksvayer. 2017. Artificial selection on ant female caste ratio uncovers a link between female-biased sex ratios and infection by *Wolbachia* endosymbionts. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 30:225–234.
- Pratt, S. C. 2017. Nest site choice in social insects. *Encyclopedia of Animal Behavior* 2:534–540.
- Ratnieks, F. L. W., and H. K. Reeve. 1992. Conflict in single-queen hymenopteran societies: the structure of conflict and processes that reduce conflict in advanced eusocial species. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 158:33–65.
- R Development Core Team. 2014. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna. <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- Reuter, M., and L. Keller. 2001. Sex ratio conflict and worker production in eusocial Hymenoptera. *American Naturalist* 158:166–177.
- Rinderer, T. E., A. M. Collins, and M. A. Brown. 1983. Heritabilities and correlations of the honey bee: response to *Nosema apis*, longevity, and alarm response to isopentyl acetate. *Apidologie* 14:79–85.
- Robinson, E. J. H., D. E. Jackson, M. Holcombe, and F. L. W. Ratnieks. 2005. “No entry” signal in ant foraging. *Nature* 438:442.
- Schmidt, A. M. 2010. The invasion biology and sociogenetics of pharaoh ants. *Museum Tusulanum, Copenhagen*.
- Schmidt, A. M., P. d’Ettore, and J. S. Pedersen. 2010. Low levels of nestmate discrimination despite high genetic differentiation in the invasive pharaoh ant. *Frontiers in Zoology* 7:20.
- Sih, A., A. Bell, and J. C. Johnson. 2004. Behavioral syndromes: an ecological and evolutionary overview. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 19:372–378.
- Simons, A. M., and D. A. Roff. 1994. The effect of environmental variability on the heritabilities of traits of a field cricket. *Evolution* 48:1637–1649.
- Smith, B. R., and D. T. Blumstein. 2008. Fitness consequences of personality: a meta-analysis. *Behavioral Ecology* 19:448–455.
- Spivak, M. 1996. Honey bee hygienic behavior and defense against *Varroa jacobsoni*. *Apidologie* 27:245–260.
- Sumpter, D. J. T., and M. Beekman. 2003. From nonlinearity to optimality: pheromone trail foraging by ants. *Animal Behaviour* 66:273–280.
- Tang, W., G. Zhang, F. Serluca, J. Li, X. Xiong, M. Coble, T. Tsai, et al. 2018. Genetic architecture of collective behaviors in zebrafish. *bioRxiv*, <https://doi.org/10.1101/350314>.
- Tarpy, D. R., D. C. Gilley, and T. D. Seeley. 2004. Levels of selection in a social insect: a review of conflict and cooperation during honey bee (*Apis mellifera*) queen replacement. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 55:513–523.
- Trivers, R. L., and H. Hare. 1976. Haplodiploidy and the evolution of the social insect. *Science* 191:249–263.
- Tsuji, K. 1994. Inter-colonial selection for the maintenance of cooperative breeding in the ant *Pristomyrmex pungens*: a laboratory experiment. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 35:109–113.
- . 1995. Reproductive conflicts and levels of selection in the ant *Pristomyrmex pungens*: contextual analysis and partitioning of covariance. *American Naturalist* 146:586–607.
- Valdar, W., L. C. Solberg, D. Gauguier, S. Burnett, P. Klenerman, W. O. Cookson, M. S. Taylor, J. N. Rawlins, R. Mott, and J. Flint. 2006. Genome-wide genetic association of complex traits in heterogeneous stock mice. *Nature Genetics* 38:879–887.
- van Oers, K., G. de Jong, A. J. van Noordwijk, B. Kempnaers, and P. J. Drent. 2005. Contribution of genetics to the study of animal personalities: a review of case studies. *Behaviour* 142:1185–1206.
- Wade, M. J. 1976. Group selections among laboratory populations of *Tribolium*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* 73:4604–4607.
- Wade, M. J., P. Bijma, E. D. Ellen, and W. Muir. 2010. Group selection and social evolution in domesticated animals. *Evolutionary Applications* 3:453–465.
- Walsh, J. T., S. Garnier, and T. A. Linksvayer. 2020. Data from: Ant collective behavior is heritable and shaped by selection. *American Naturalist*, Dryad Digital Repository, <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.931zcrjh3>.
- Walsh, J. T., M. R. Warner, A. Kase, B. J. Cushing, and T. A. Linksvayer. 2018. Ant nurse workers exhibit behavioural and transcriptomic signatures of specialization on larval stage. *Animal Behaviour* 141:161–169.
- Wang, J., K. G. Ross, and L. Keller. 2008. Genome-wide expression patterns and the genetic architecture of a fundamental social trait. *PLoS Genetics* 4:e1000127.
- Wang, J., Y. Wurm, M. Nipitwattanaphon, O. Riba-Grognuz, Y.-C. Huang, D. Shoemaker, and L. Keller. 2013. A Y-like social chromosome causes alternative colony organization in fire ants. *Nature* 493:664–668.
- Wark, A. R., A. K. Greenwood, E. M. Taylor, K. Yoshida, and C. L. Peichel. 2011. Heritable differences in schooling behavior among threespine stickleback populations revealed by a novel assay. *PLoS ONE* 6:e18316.

- Warner, M. R., J. Lipponen, and T. A. Linksvayer. 2018. Pharaoh ant colonies dynamically regulate reproductive allocation based on colony demography. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 72:31.
- Warner, M. R., A. S. Mikheyev, and T. A. Linksvayer. 2017. Genomic signature of kin selection in an ant with obligately sterile workers. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 34:1780–1787.
- Wetterer, J. 2010. Worldwide spread of the pharaoh ant, *Monomorium pharaonis* (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). *Myrmecological News* 13:115–129.
- Wilson, A. J., D. Reale, M. N. Clements, M. M. Morrissey, E. Postma, C. A. Walling, L. E. Kruuk, and D. H. Nussey. 2010. An ecologist's guide to the animal model. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 79:13–26.
- Wray, M. K., H. R. Mattila, and T. D. Seeley. 2011. Collective personalities in honeybee colonies are linked to colony fitness. *Animal Behaviour* 81:559–568.
- Wright, C. M., J. L. L. Lichtenstein, G. N. Doering, J. Pretorius, J. Meunier, and J. N. Pruitt. 2019. Collective personalities: present knowledge and new frontiers. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 73:31.
- Associate Editor: Sarah D. Kocher  
Editor: Daniel I. Bolnick



“The nature of lava overflows and the causes of the differences in their rate of motion are well discussed. The accompanying illustration . . . of a lava stream which, from its imperfect fluidity in flowing over the edge of a precipice, forms heavy pendant masses like a ‘guttering’ candle, is a fair example of the quality of the woodcuts.” Figured: “Cascade of lava tumbling over a cliff in the Island of Bourbon.” From the review of John W. Judd’s *Volcanoes* (*The American Naturalist*, 1882, 16:492–496).