



Original Article

Perturbations highlight importance of social history in parakeet rank dynamics

Annemarie van der Marel^{a,b,○}, Xavier Francis^{a,○}, Claire L. O'Connell^{a,○}, Cesar O. Estien^{a,c,○}, Chelsea Carminito^{a,○}, Virginia Darby Moore[○], Nickolas Lormand[○], Bryan M. Kluever^{d,○}, and Elizabeth A. Hobson^{a,○}

^aDepartment of Biological Sciences, University of Cincinnati, 614 Rieveschl Hall, PO Box 210006, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0006, USA, ^bDepartamento de Ecología, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Avda. Libertador Bernardo O'Higgins 340, Santiago, Chile, ^cDepartment of Environmental Science, Policy, and Management, University of California–Berkeley, Mulford Hall, 130 Hilgard Way, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA, and ^dUnited States Department of Agriculture, Wildlife Services, National Wildlife Research Center, Florida Field Station, 2820 E. University Ave. Gainesville, FL 32641, USA

Received 24 November 2022; revised 14 February 2023; editorial decision 23 February 2023; accepted 27 February 2023

Dominance hierarchies can provide many benefits to individuals, such as access to resources or mates, depending on their ranks. In some species, rank can emerge as a product of a group's history of social interactions. However, it can be difficult to determine whether social history is critical to rank in observation-based studies. Here, we investigated rank dynamics in three captive groups of monk parakeets (*Myiopsitta monachus*). We used experimental social perturbations to test whether social history shapes rank emergence in these groups. Using targeted removals and reintroductions, we tested whether differently ranked individuals could re-take their ranks in hierarchies after reintroduction following their removal period from the group. We performed perturbations that consisted of an 8-day removal and an 8-day reintroduction period of 15 differently ranked focal birds. We found that no focal birds could regain their previous rank immediately following reintroduction and that the top-ranked birds showed greater relative rank loss than middle/low-ranked birds. We also found that morphology, specifically bodyweight, was unassociated with rank. Combined with previous results, this experiment supports the hypothesis that rank in monk parakeet dominance hierarchies is more likely to be an emergent outcome of past interactions and memory rather than based on individual characteristics. Gaining a better understanding of how individuals achieve and maintain rank can give insight into the role of cognition on rank acquisition, as rank position can have significant biological effects on individuals in hierarchically structured groups.

Key words: animal aggression, dominance hierarchy, dominance rank, monk parakeet, *Myiopsitta monachus*, parrot, sociality, social manipulation.

INTRODUCTION

Dominance hierarchies structure aggression in many social groups across the animal kingdom (Shizuka and McDonald 2012; Holekamp and Strauss 2016; Hobson et al. 2021). The ranks that individuals hold in these hierarchies, and the aggression one receives based on rank, can affect their access to resources (Pizzari and McDonald 2019), health (Cavigelli and Caruso 2015; Simons et al. 2022), and reproductive success (Hodge et al. 2008; Sukmak et al. 2014). These effects demonstrate that rank can have significant biological consequences on individuals in social groups.

Understanding how and why individuals achieve high rank has been an area of active research (Strauss et al. 2022). In some species, rank may be a product of *social history*, where memory of past interactions is critical in structuring rank. Rank then becomes an emergent property of group interactions (Chase et al. 2002; Hotta et al. 2014; Massen et al. 2014; Hobson and DeDeo 2015; Tibbetts et al. 2019). We refer to this process as the social history hypothesis. Estimation of rank can be based solely on memory of direct interactions (lower cognitive skills) or on inference based on the rank of other individuals, which requires individual recognition (higher cognitive skills). For example, memory of social history can be encoded via shifts in neural and physiological mechanisms (Dwartz et al. 2022) or general behavior following wins and losses in fights, and does not necessarily require high cognitive skills (Korzan et

Address correspondence to A. van der Marel. E-mail: avdmarel@outlook.com.

al. 2007; Hotta et al. 2014). Alternatively, rank may be based off a combination of experiences and observations of interactions among individuals where the outcomes and types of interactions serve to structure future behaviors (Hobson and DeDeo 2015; Tibbetts et al. 2019; Hobson et al. 2021). In this case, individuals may need to rely on their cognitive abilities to achieve and maintain rank as it requires individual recognition and memory (Kogan et al. 2000; Tibbetts 2002). Greater cognitive processing is likely necessary in these systems as decisions on who to fight at the individual level are made using emergent rank information by observing the interactions among other individuals (Chase and Seitz 2011; Massen et al. 2014; Hobson and DeDeo 2015; Reichert and Quinn 2017; Hobson et al. 2021). Individuals in these systems may use perception, recognition of group members, memory of past interactions, and transitive inference, i.e., when an individual uses known relationships to understand the dynamics of unknown relationships, to infer the rank of others. The use of social history to track social standing is hypothesized to be primarily present in species that have small, stable social groups as individuals would not require as much cognitive processing to recognize their group members due to interacting repeatedly with one another (Sheehan and Bergman 2016). However, social history can also be an important factor in groups that have high fission–fusion dynamics or multilevel societies where group membership and group size are fluid (Shultz and Gersick 2016; Chaîne et al. 2018; Boucherie et al. 2022). To better understand the factors that underlie rank in a particular species, we need to investigate the relative importance of how social history may affect an individual's rank.

Different methods exist to understand the relative importance of social history in structuring rank emergence and maintenance. In most social species, it is more feasible and straightforward to measure an individual-level characteristic and quantify its association with rank compared to trying to determine the effect of social history on rank. Rank can be strongly correlated with an *individual characteristic*, such as body size, weapon or ornament size, age, motivation, or maternal inheritance (Engh et al. 2000; Chase and Seitz 2011; Reddon et al. 2011; Santos et al. 2011; O'Connor et al. 2015). We refer to this process as the individual characteristics hypothesis. An absence of a strong correlation could then signify that social history, particularly memory of more current social interactions (short-term social history), may shape rank supporting the social history hypothesis, but it could also mean that the salient characteristic that affects rank was not identified, measured, and tested (Chase and Seitz 2011). Additional methods are needed to reach a conclusion in support of social history. For example, observational studies and natural perturbations to social groups could identify the effect of social history on rank (Strauss and Holekamp 2019; Boucherie et al. 2022). However, this observational approach generally requires long-term study and still cannot definitively separate individual characteristics that may change over an individual's lifetime from the effects of long-term social history (memory of social interactions over a long time span).

Other approaches to identifying the potential for social history's importance in rank emergence have used computational methods. For example, using observations of agonistic interactions in monk parakeet groups, Hobson and DeDeo (2015) organized agonistic relationships into “chains” of aggression and then used computational methods to test whether the parakeets could benefit from incorporating information about the relationships of others into their aggression decision-making. Hobson and DeDeo found that this information was present and used by the parakeets to structure

aggression. However, because their 2015 study was conducted only while the hierarchy was stable, they could not test whether disruption to the information in the group could cause changes in the social ordering.

Experimental tests of the social history hypothesis can be used to parse apart short- and long-term social history and individual characteristics as potential drivers structuring rank. Experimental perturbations allow for an examination of, for example, the type of information individuals use, how rank is inferred, and how social groups respond to changes in their group composition (Flack et al. 2005; Barrett et al. 2012; Hellmann et al. 2015; Kubitza et al. 2015). Here, we test the social history hypothesis using a series of social manipulations to experimentally perturb the social history of individuals in groups and investigate the changes in individuals' ranks.

We used experimental perturbations of social groups that show the potential for social and cognitive complexity and that exhibit dominance hierarchies to better clarify whether social history shapes rank. We tested this idea in monk parakeets (*Myiopsitta monachus*), a small neotropical, parrot native to South America with a global distribution that readily forms dominance hierarchies in captivity (Hobson et al. 2013, 2014, 2015; Hobson and DeDeo 2015). Monk parakeets live in fission–fusion societies with pairs as their primary social unit and show the potential for social and cognitive complexity (Hobson et al. 2013, 2014; Hobson and DeDeo 2015). As summarized above, previous work has indicated that social history is likely important in the emergence of rank in this species (Hobson and DeDeo 2015; Hobson et al. 2021), but experimental manipulation would provide additional support to this hypothesis.

We tested the social history hypothesis in three groups of monk parakeets. In each trial, we identified an individual according to their rank, removed it from the group, and reintroduced it after an 8-day absence. We hypothesized that if shorter-term social history (remembering the more current interactions during the removal period when the focal was absent) was important in achieving and maintaining rank, the removed individuals would not immediately be able to re-take their previous ranks upon reintroduction because the remaining group members would have shifted in rank during the removed bird's absence and would defend their new ranks against the reintroduced bird. In contrast, if longer-term social history (remembering the interactions with the focal bird prior its removal) was important in rank dynamics, we predicted that these removed birds would be able to re-take their ranks immediately on re-joining the group as all the birds would remember these individuals and their agonistic relationships. To differentiate the effect of longer-term social history and the effect of individual characteristics that might determine rank, we also measured the bodyweight of the birds at each capture event. If the bodyweight of the birds determined their ranks, we predicted we would find a significant association between bodyweight and rank. Across all removal trials, we also predicted that the effect of social history would be most pronounced for top-ranked individuals and less pronounced for middle/low-ranked birds because all group members would benefit from the removal of a top-ranked bird. This finding would provide more support for social history as the remaining group members could adjust their behavior according to the previous social standing of the removed birds. This experimental approach combined with a lack of association between individual characteristics and rank, can provide stronger indications that social history is important to rank in this species.

METHODS

The social experiments and observations took place at the United States Department of Agriculture, Wildlife Services, National Wildlife Research Center (USDA WS NWRC), Florida Field Station, in Gainesville, FL, USA. We performed the experiments on monk parakeets that were captured by the USDA WS NWRC from four feral populations in southern Florida ($n = 33$ birds) in February 2021. All animal-related research activities were approved by the University of Cincinnati (IACUC protocol #AM02-19-11-19-01) and the USDA NWRC (Quality Assurance #3203).

Social groups

We performed the social experiments in 2021 and 2022. In both years, we used the same experimental timeline but the number of social groups, group sizes, the size of the flight pens, the time of year, the number of trials, and the ranks of removed individuals differed.

In 2021, we experimentally perturbed a single large group of 20 parakeets. Observations took place from April through July 2021 with a group of 7 females and 13 males (sexes were unknown prior to the field season and the observers were blind to sexes throughout the field season). This large group was housed in a 45×45 m semi-natural outdoor flight pen (hereafter “large flight pen”). We allowed the large group to interact and the social structure to stabilize in the large flight pen for 44 days prior to starting our perturbation experiments. We conducted three social perturbations of three top-ranked birds in the large group between 16 May and 5 July 2021. A team of four observers collected parakeet behaviors between 08:00 and 19:00 from blinds arrayed around the flight pen (see below for data collection methods).

In 2022, we perturbed two medium groups of eleven parakeets each. Each group contained five females and six males. Of these 22 birds, 14 birds were ones that had participated in our 2021 experiment in the large group; 8 birds were new to the experiments and were not involved in the 2021 experiment (Supplementary Material 1). These social groups were housed in two medium-sized $10 \times 4.5 \times 3$ m flight pens (hereafter “medium flight pen”). We allowed these groups 8 days to interact and form their social structure before starting the social perturbations. We performed six perturbation trials (three top-ranked, two middle-ranked, and one bottom-ranked bird) in each of the medium social groups between 26 January and 5 May 2022. We randomized the order of the rank removals prior to the start of the social perturbation experiment and performed the same type of rank removal on both social groups. A team of two observers collected parakeet behaviors between 09:00 and 18:00 from blinds located outside each medium flight pen, with 4 observers rotating between the two medium social groups.

Social interaction data collection

To facilitate individual identification, we marked each parakeet on the head, cheeks, and neck with a unique color combination using nontoxic, permanent markers (Sharpie, Inc.®) (Hobson et al. 2013). This unique color combination represented a unique letter ID for each bird combining the three different colors chosen from blue, green, orange, and purple. Color combinations were randomly assigned to each individual within years and individuals that participated in both 2021 and 2022 were given new randomly assigned color combinations in the second year. All marks were re-applied

at each capture event, when necessary (see section below for more detail on capture events).

Observers recorded all dyadic agonistic interactions using all-occurrence sampling (Altmann 1974). We entered the data directly into electronic format using an iPad and the Animal Observer application (Diane Fossey Gorilla Fund v1.0), which we customized to record all-occurrence observations (van der Marel, O’Connell, et al. 2022). We recorded two types of directed agonistic interactions: *crowding events*, where the actor approached a target, but the target moved away before the actor was within striking range, and *displacement events*, where the actor aggressively approached another bird within striking distance and supplanted it from its location with a strike. From these observations, we excluded any interaction where either of the two interactants was unknown (keeping only interactions where the actor and the target were positively identified).

We then filtered the data to exclude duplicate observations. Because we had more than one observer simultaneously monitoring each group to better capture the entire interaction history, different observers could record the same aggressive event. To remove duplicate observations, we determined the maximum number of aggressive interactions (including both crowds and displacements) between each pair of individuals (dyads) recorded by each observer during each minute of observation. Combining both crowds and displacements was a more conservative method to remove duplicates as it resulted in fewer interactions but excluded the instances where two observers observed the same interaction but one coded it as a “crowd” and the other as “displacement.” For any minute of observation where aggression between a particular dyad was recorded by more than one observer, we retained the observations of aggression from the observer that observed and recorded the most aggressive events for that dyad in that minute (see van der Marel et al. 2021). The prevalence of duplicated (and subsequently removed) agonistic events are summarized in Supplementary Table SM2.1.

Rank-based removals

For all groups, we used a consistent experimental timeline. Each perturbation cycle lasted 17 days, including a day where we captured the group and removed the focal bird, followed by an 8-day removal and an 8-day reintroduction period (Supplementary Material 2). We pooled aggression data into a series of 3-day bins (i.e., rank assessment periods, Supplementary Material 1). Each perturbation cycle consisted of four 3-day rank assessment periods.

To find the dominance rank of each bird, we used both crowd and displacement aggression events collected for each rank assessment period. We included both crowd and displacement interactions in our rank calculation because our analyses indicated that we could treat these two behaviors as interchangeable (see Supplementary Material 3, using methods in van der Marel et al. 2021). We quantified rank for each individual using power, which is an interval measure bounded between 0 and 1 (Hobson and DeDeo 2015; Hobson et al. 2021). We calculated each individual’s power score using a modified version of PageRank centrality implemented in the “Domstruc” package (Hobson et al. 2021; Mønster et al. 2021). We created directed aggression networks for each assessment period. From these aggression networks, we used the function “dom_ec” to calculate a centrality score ranging from 0 to 1 that included both direct and indirect aggressive interactions for each bird to all other birds in the network. A high centrality score (closer to 1) translates to a low power score (closer to

0), which could be interpreted that a bird with a low power score (low-ranking bird) receives aggression from other birds, whereas a bird with a high power score (high-ranking bird) is the instigator of agonistic interactions with other birds. We used the continuous power score measure instead of ordinal rank measures because in an ordinal ranking method, each individual is ranked in a linear order, which would not allow us to discern between cases where individuals have similar power scores. For example, individuals with rank positions 1 and 2 could have very similar or dissimilar power scores. For the analyses, we primarily used the continuous measure, power score, but we also incorporated ordinal ranking to highlight rank positions.

We used rank and power score information from the 3-day rank assessment period just prior to a removal day to determine which individual to remove. On each removal day, we trapped all the parakeets in the large and medium flight pens using mist nets, removed the focal parakeet for the current perturbation trial, and released the remaining birds back into the flight pen. As we caught and handled all birds on capture days, which is potentially stressful for the birds, we allowed the birds to recover in the afternoon after trapping and excluded the interactions recorded on capture days from our analyses. The removed focal bird was housed in its standard housing cage during the removal period (2 × 2 m wire cage within an aviary), which is where the parakeets normally reside when they are not in the flight pen. The removed bird was housed near other parakeets (not involved in the social experiment) but away from the

social group remaining in the flight pen. After 8 days, we reintroduced the removed bird by releasing it back into the social group.

Testing whether social history underlies rank

We quantified all birds' rank and power score dynamics in the group throughout our social experiments. To test whether individuals could re-take their previous rank position in the dominance hierarchy following an absence, we quantified all parakeets' ranks and power scores in the group prior to each removal and following each reintroduction (e.g., rank assessment periods 2 and 5, **Figures 1 and 2**). The timing of the power score, relative rank, and weight recovery measurements of the focal bird of trial three in 2021 (rank assessment period 14) was slightly delayed by a tropical storm (see **Figure 1** for timeline visualization and **Supplementary Material 1** for additional timeline details). Before the storm, we moved all birds to their holding cages after rank assessment period 13 and released them back into the flight pen after 2 days. We calculated the focal bird's recovery using a 2-day observation period (rank assessment period 14). We excluded rank assessment period 14 from the rest of our analyses, but we included the power score assessment for this period in **Figure 1**.

For all trials, we compared the focal birds' absolute power score changes to the remaining group members using a generalized linear mixed model (glmm) for a beta distribution. We used the absolute power score change as our dependent variable and an interaction between focal rank (either top-ranked or middle/




Figure 1.

Dominance rank changes over time for the group of 20 monk parakeets in 2021. Each rank assessment period includes power score assessments calculated over 3 days of observations. Three perturbation trials are shown where a top-ranked focal was removed and reintroduced. Each focal bird is highlighted with bolder power score lines and the insets represent the change in ordinal rank positions. Circles show the power scores (i.e., modified PageRank score) of focal birds prior to removals; diamonds show the power scores following reintroductions; colored dashed lines show the change in power score for each focal prior to removal compared to following their reintroduction to the group; gray dashed lines show removal points; solid gray lines show reintroduction points.




Figure 2.

Dominance rank changes over time for the two medium groups of 11 birds in 2022. Each rank assessment period includes power score assessments calculated over 3 days of observations. Six perturbation trials are shown for each group where three top-ranked focal birds (“top”) and three differently ranked focal birds (2 “middle” and 1 “bottom”-ranked) were removed and reintroduced. Each focal bird is highlighted with bolder power score lines and the insets represent the change in ordinal rank positions. Circles show the power scores (i.e., modified PageRank score) of focal birds prior to removals; diamonds show the power scores following reintroductions; colored dashed lines show the change in power score for each focal prior to removal compared to following their reintroduction to the group; gray dashed lines show removal points; solid gray lines show reintroduction points.

low-ranked) and subject (either focal or remaining group member) as fixed factors. For our random term, we performed model selection to select the best random term as we had three different social groups, where some group members were used in different years. We included both a crossed term to account for birds that were used in both years ($n = 14$ birds) and a nested random term to account for the variation of birds within each group, only the crossed, and only the nested term. We found that the model with the crossed random term showed the lowest Akaike’s Information Criterion (AIC_c; Supplementary Table SM4). We then selected whether the model with an interaction or without an interaction between focal rank and subject was best using AIC_c (Supplementary Table SM4). Model selection was performed

using the package “AICcmodavg” (Mazerolle 2020). We used the package “glmmTMB” (Brooks et al. 2017) and we checked the model fit using the “Dharma” package (Hartig 2022). We then tested for significance for each fixed factor using the likelihood ratio test (Zeileis 2002).

Ruling out the effects of individual characteristics on rank

We compared our results for the importance of social history on rank to additionally test for the effect of individual characteristics on rank. We used bodyweight as an individual characteristic for two analyses (see Supplementary Material 5 for justification of

bodyweight). First, we tested whether bodyweight was correlated with rank in these groups of monk parakeets. Second, we compared bodyweight changes of the focal birds across the trials to those of the remaining group members.

On removal days when all individuals were captured, we measured the bodyweight of each bird in grams using a digital scale. We excluded seven data points in 2021 and three data points in 2022 with incorrectly recorded bodyweights (Supplementary Material 5). We calculated the mean of each bird's bodyweight across the capture events each year (mean \pm SD = 110.1 \pm 6.8 g in 2021, and 113.5 \pm 7.9 g in 2022). We used a *t*-test to test for a sex difference in mean bodyweight as bodyweight was normally distributed. We tested for sex differences in bodyweight by genetically sexing all individuals with feather samples (IQGenetics, Inc., Miami, FL, USA) because monk parakeets are sexually monomorphic. Bodyweight did not differ between females (110.6 \pm 1.2 [SE], n = 12) and males (112.8 \pm 1.1, n = 16; *T* test: T = -0.99, P = 0.32), therefore we excluded sex from further analyses.

If individual characteristics underlie rank in the parakeets, then rank should be associated with individual characteristics and the birds that were used in both years should obtain similar power scores and relative rank positions in both years. To test this, we correlated power score and bodyweight just prior to removals per trial and per group using Kendall's correlation because this correlation measure is robust for small sample sizes (Bonett and Wright 2000). We also used a Kendall's correlation to test for a correlation in power scores and rank position that were standardized to account for the different group sizes (n = 20 and n = 11 birds) at the start of the social experiment in 2021 and 2022 of the 14 repeat birds. If bodyweight determines rank, we should see a change in bodyweight if rank is not correlated, therefore, to control for the effect of bodyweight on rank, we correlated bodyweight for the birds that were used in both 2021 and 2022. We performed a Pearson's correlation at two timepoints: 1) on the days that the birds were released into the flight pens, and 2) at the start of the social experiments.

We investigated the dynamics of rank with changes in bodyweight because removal/reintroductions could be stressful to the birds and could result in bodyweight changes. If bodyweight contributed to rank and power, a change in bodyweight could then result in a change to that bird's power score. To investigate the relationship between changes in bodyweight of the focal birds, we measured the bodyweight of all removed focal birds at several time points per trial: 1) at each group capture event (removal days), 2) just prior to reintroduction to the group, and 3) at the following group capture event (normally 8 days after reintroductions, except for trial 3 in 2021, see above). This method allowed us to detect changes in bodyweight that occurred during the removal phase, during the reintroduction phase, and across the entire 17-day trial. Due to a mistake during data collection, we had to exclude the bodyweights of the two focal birds of trial 3 in 2022 (Supplementary Material 5).

We tested for a difference in the percent bodyweight change during removal and reintroduction of the focal birds and between top-ranked and middle/low-ranked focal birds. We had one bird that was a focal bird both in 2021 and 2022 but testing the bodyweight change difference using group and ID as random factors resulted in a singular fit of the model. Therefore, we used an ANOVA with an interaction term between perturbation type (removal or reintroduction) and focal rank (top-ranked or middle/low-ranked). As a comparison to the weight change of the focal birds, we quantified the percent weight change (difference between

weight at capture event 1 and 2, etc.) across all the birds in the group, with bodyweights measured at each group capture event for both focal birds and remaining group members. We used percent weight change as our dependent variable and an interaction term between subject (focal bird or remaining group member) and focal rank as our independent variables. We used trial as a fixed factor to account for bodyweight changes over time, with group and ID as a crossed random factor design as we had multiple weight measures per bird and we had multiple birds that were used in both years. We used "fitDist" function in the "gamlss" package (Rigby and Stasinopoulos 2005) to fit the best distribution of percent bodyweight change. We fitted our model in *gamlss* with a normal exponential *t* distribution. We visually inspected model fit and tested for significance using a likelihood ratio test.

Data availability

We performed all analyses in R version 4.1.2 (R Core Team 2021) and created the figures using ggplot2 (Wickham 2016). The data and code are available on the GitHub repository (annemarievdmarel/ Monk_rank_socialVSchar; van der Marel and Hobson 2023).

RESULTS

We performed removal/reintroduction trials for a total of nine unique top-ranked birds, four unique middle-ranked birds, and two unique bottom-ranked birds. After data cleaning, we used over 100,000 aggressive events to quantify rank. In 2021, in our group of 20 birds, we perturbed three top-ranked birds and quantified rank and power scores using 24,317 agonistic interactions across 13 3-day bins, with 21.3 \pm 2.3 (SD) hours of observation effort per rank assessment period. In 2022, in our two groups of 11 birds, we perturbed three top-ranked birds and three middle/low ranked birds in each social group and quantified rank and power scores using 42,280, and 42,402, interactions for group 1 and 2, respectively (Supplementary Material 2), over 18.5 \pm 4.4 (SD, n = 26 bins) observation hours per rank assessment period.

Across all 15 trials and in all three of our social groups, none of the removed birds were able to re-take their previous rank immediately after reintroduction (Figures 1 and 2, Table 1a). During the 8 days after reintroduction, 13 focal birds (87%) increased their power scores but of these birds only five (38%) also gained rank positions (Table 1b, Figures 1 and 2). The model that best explained absolute power score changes after removal (the lowest AIC value) was explained by an interaction between focal rank and subject (Table SM5). The results for removed/reintroduced focal birds differed from the rank dynamics of other birds that remained within the social groups. The focal birds (n = 15) dropped much more in power score and showed greater absolute power score changes (mean \pm SD = 0.15 \pm 0.09, range [0.03–0.32]) than the birds that remained in the flight pen for the duration of the 17-day trial (0.04 \pm 0.04, range [0.00005–0.37]; LR test: λ = 51.51, P < 0.001; Figure 3). The interaction between focal rank and subject was not significant (LR test: λ = 0.51, P = 0.5).

We also found an effect of the removed parakeet's (focal bird's) rank on its power score immediately after reintroduction. Removal and reintroduction of top-ranked parakeets resulted in a greater absolute power score change (0.05 \pm 0.06, range [0.0002–0.32]) compared to the middle/low-ranked removal trials (0.04 \pm 0.05, range [0.00003–0.28]); LR test: λ = 18.07, P < 0.001; Figure 3).

Table 1.

Change in measured variables between different timepoints for each focal bird for (a) changes between removal and reintroduction (e.g., difference between rank assessment periods 5 and 2, Figure 1) and (b) changes between reintroduction and the next focal removal (e.g., difference between rank assessment periods 6 and 5). Columns show changes in power score, ordinal rank, and weight (negative values indicate losses, positive values indicate gains and are highlighted in bold, 0 indicates no change).

Group	Trial	Focal rank	ID	(a)			(b)		
				Power score	Rank	Weight	Power score	Rank	Weight
2021	1	Top	BBB	-0.16	-20	0.4	0.01	0	-6.6
2021	2	Top	GPGa	-0.05	-16	-2.3	0.03	7	0.2
2021	3	Top	OPP	-0.16	-20	0.57	0.02 ^b	1	-7.37 ^b
2022-1	1	Top	PBOa	-0.08	-7	-8.19	-0.03	-1	-3.7
2022-1	2	Middle	OOO	-0.06	-4	2.9	0.03	0	-1.74
2022-1	3	Middle	PGG	-0.11	-4	1.46	0.03	1	NAc
2022-1	4	Top	GPO	-0.22	-10	4.8	0.16	4	-6.47
2022-1	5	Bottom	OPP	-0.03	0	3.93	0.05	1	-1.03
2022-1	6	Top	BBB	-0.28	-10	-4.71	0.13	0	1.82
2022-2	1	Top	BBO	-0.19	-8	-6.68	-0.02	-1	-6.02
2022-2	2	Middle	OBB	-0.09	-3	-1.19	0.01	0	-1.76
2022-2	3	Middle	PBP	-0.2	-5	6.58	0.14	1	NAc
2022-2	4	Top	GOO	-0.19	-10	0.8	0.05	0	-1.77
2022-2	5	Bottom	OGO	-0.08	-1	-5.5	0.05	0	2.61
2022-2	6	Top	GOP	-0.32	-10	-3.66	0.1	0	-1.78

aThis bird was the same bird that was a top-ranked focal in 2021 and in 2022. None of the other 14 repeat birds were a focal in both years.

bThe recovery values were calculated using a 2-day observation period (rank assessment period 14, Figure 1) collected after the birds were placed back into their holding cages for 2 days due to a tropical storm.

cWe excluded an erroneous weight measure which did not allow us to measure the weight change after reintroduction.




Figure 3.

A raincloud plot of the change in absolute power score for focal birds and the remaining group members (nonfocal) by focal rank (top-ranked and middle/low-ranked). Absolute power score changes represent the power score change between the rank assessment periods upon reintroduction and the period just prior to removals (e.g., rank assessment periods 5 and 2).

We found no consistent evidence that the individual characteristic, bodyweight, influenced rank. First, we rarely found a correlation between power score and bodyweight; birds in only one trial (trial 1 in 2021) out of 15 trials showed a significant correlation between bodyweight and power score (Supplementary Material 6). Second, for the birds that were used in both experimental years ($n = 14$ birds), we found that the power score or rank at the start of the experiment (3-day period prior to first removal;

bin 2) did not correlate between the experimental years (power score: $\tau = -0.23$, $P = 0.28$; rank: $R = -0.26$, $P = 0.37$), nor did it correlate during the period with the same number of days after initial introduction into the flight pens (power score: $\tau = 0.19$, $P = 0.39$; rank: $R = 0.21$, $P = 0.48$), but that bodyweights on the day that the birds were introduced into the flight pens and on the start date of the social experiment were significantly correlated between the experimental years ($R = 0.79$, $P = 0.002$ and $R =$




Figure 4.

Bodyweight changes across time of the focal birds and across all individuals in the group. Panel (a) shows the percent bodyweight change for each focal following the removal period, comparing bodyweight at reintroduction to bodyweight on removal, and following the reintroduction period, comparing bodyweight at the next capture event to bodyweight on reintroduction. The shaded quadrants reflect where individuals either lost or gained weight after both removals and reintroductions. Panel (b) shows the percent weight change across capture events for the focal birds and all remaining group members (“nonfocal,” excluding the focal birds). A positive weight change indicates weight gain, and a negative weight change indicates weight loss. Top-ranked trials are indicated in orange, the control trials in blue, and the nonfocals in gray for both trials.

0.62, $P = 0.02$, respectively). Thus, power score changes occurred without changes in bodyweight. Both results indicate that rank is not correlated with bodyweight in these captive groups of monk parakeets.

When we tested whether bodyweight changed over time in the focal birds, we found no difference in percent weight change during the 8-day removal (mean \pm SE = $-0.61 \pm 0.96\%$) nor during the 8-day reintroduction period ($-2.22 \pm 0.76\%$; $F_{1,24} = 1.9$, $P = 0.2$; Figure 4a). We did find an effect of the rank position of the focal birds on bodyweight change ($F_{1,24} = 5.4$, $P = 0.03$; Figure 4a), where the perturbation of a previously top-ranked focal bird resulted in a greater bodyweight loss ($-2.42 \pm 0.74\%$) than of the middle/low-ranked focal birds ($0.55 \pm 0.92\%$); However, we found no interaction between removal or reintroduction period and focal rank ($F_{1,24} = 0.1$, $P = 0.8$; Figure 4a).

When we compared the percent weight change across all the remaining group members (nonfocal birds in the group) across the 17-day trials to the weight change of the focal birds, we found a significant interaction in percent bodyweight change between focal rank and subjects (LR test: $\lambda = 8.22$, $P = 0.006$). The focal birds lost 1.36 ± 0.93 (SE) percent of their bodyweight during their respective trials, while the remaining group members (excluding focal birds for their respective trial) gained on average 0.31 ± 0.21 (SE) percent bodyweight per trial. Top-ranked focal birds had a significant decrease in percent bodyweight (mean \pm SE = $-2.96 \pm 0.91\%$) compared to increases for middle/low-ranked focal birds ($1.04 \pm 1.48\%$) and remaining group members in a top-ranked trial ($0.36 \pm 0.25\%$) or control trial ($0.23 \pm 0.39\%$; Table 1; Figure 4b). Trial number did not have a significant effect on percent bodyweight changes (LR test: $\lambda = -0.48$, $P = 1$), and, therefore, bodyweight for all birds did not significantly change during the social experiment. The random factors group and bird ID explained a significant amount of variation in the bodyweight data (LR test: $\lambda = 5.75$, $P = 0.047$ and $\lambda = 0.0$, $P < 0.001$, respectively), which suggest that group and individual variation existed. Overall, the perturbation trials influenced the bodyweight of the top-ranked

focal birds, but not the middle/low-ranked focal birds nor the remaining group members for both focal rank perturbations.

DISCUSSION

Using a social perturbation experiment, we show strong support that social history (the memory of past interactions) shapes rank in captive monk parakeets. We conducted two kinds of removal experiments. In 2021, we removed and consequently reintroduced only top-ranked focal birds and quantified the resulting rank dynamics. To differentiate between rank dynamics caused by the social perturbations from those caused by removing birds of high rank, we repeated the experiment in 2022, this time randomly selecting whether to remove a top-ranked or middle/low ranked bird during each removal. None of the removed birds could re-take their previous rank and all focal birds dropped significantly in power score immediately upon reintroduction. We also found that bodyweight was generally not associated with rank. These results are consistent with previous observational and computational studies in this species (Hobson and DeDeo 2015; Hobson et al. 2021). Our 2022 experiment, in which we removed individuals of different ranks in multiple groups, showed that all focal birds suffered rank loss and a drop in power score, which indicates that it was not the perturbation of only top-ranked birds that caused these changes. However, we found that these changes were more extreme for previously top-ranked birds. Top-ranked birds also lost significantly more percent bodyweight than control birds and the remaining group members. Focal birds eventually regained power score and rank over time despite not re-taking their previous rank position immediately upon reintroduction. The regaining of rank and power score by focal birds could indicate that social ascent and aggressive interactions may be costly (Fialkowski et al. 2021; Humphries et al. 2021; Milewski et al. 2022), take time to accomplish, and involve an understanding of current social dynamics and connections. Together, these findings provide strong support for the importance of social history in monk parakeets.

Another line of evidence, besides the perturbation trials, shows support for the social history hypothesis in the three monk parakeet groups. As we used 14 birds in both experimental years, we were able to follow their rank dynamics over a longer time frame and within different social group compositions. We did not find that power score and rank correlated between the 2 years, while bodyweight was correlated. As an illustration of year-to-year rank effects, the bottom-ranked bird in 2021 became the top-ranked bird in trial 1 in the next year (in group 2022-2). It is possible that another unmeasured individual characteristic, such as age, could have influenced these rank dynamics. However, we were unable to include chronological age in our analytical approach because the monk parakeets were captured from feral populations as adults (i.e., exact age unknown). Moreover, if other unmeasured individual characteristics influenced rank, our perturbation experiments should have shown that removed individuals could more easily and quickly re-take their ranks and we should have found a correlation between year 1 and year 2 ranks.

Additional factors could explain the rank dynamics we observed during the perturbation trial. The first potential mechanism is stress experienced during the removal and/or the reintroduction period. Focal birds might not re-take their rank position immediately if the removal period was stressful because of the potential separation from the social group. A response to a stressor (in this case, the removal from or reintroduction into the social group) could be decreased food intake or increased heat production and activity (Harris 2015), leading to changes in bodyweight. However, we found bodyweight of the removed birds did not decrease when we compared the focal bird's bodyweights on removal and at reintroduction. Experimental manipulation of bodyweight, for example, by artificial mass loading or by adding satellite tags, can affect dominance rank in some (Portugal et al. 2020) but not other species (Sergio et al. 2015). In our study, the loss in rank upon reintroduction is more likely due to the focal bird's history with its group members than bodyweight alone because half of the focal birds gained weight during removal and, thus, were heavier upon reintroduction. Birds may have gained weight during removal because the focal birds were not involved in intense movement (e.g., flight) and had more direct access to food than while in a flight pen with conspecifics. This lack of consistent bodyweight loss during the removals may indicate that removed birds were not overly stressed or negatively affected by the removal period itself. It is possible that some other unmeasured stress mechanism such as hormone levels could have changed over the 8-day removal period, but in that case, rank and power score loss for both top-ranked and middle/low-ranked removed birds should have been equally affected. In contrast, we found a stronger effect of removals on power score and rank in reintroduced top-ranked birds, which supports the effect of social history rather than a generalized effect across all perturbed focal birds.

Stress could also have influenced the rank and power score dynamics of focal birds in the period after reintroduction. However, only two (both top-ranked focal birds) out of 15 focal birds also lost power score during their reintroduction period, indicating that the majority of the focal birds could regain some amount of power after reintroduction. Top-ranked focal birds did lose significantly more weight during their reintroduction period than middle/low-ranked birds, but this may have occurred primarily because of the high physical activity due to displacement from the feeders in the first couple of days upon reintroduction as we found that the group focused their aggression on the reintroduced top-ranked focal bird

in the first 3 days after reintroduction (van der Marel, Francis, et al. 2022). Increased aggression following reintroduction did not result in physical injury to any of the reintroduced birds (van der Marel, personal observation). Future studies could test whether this loss in bodyweight is more due to the remaining group members preventing focal birds from feeding when they are first reintroduced. Similar to the results during removal, we found a differential response to the reintroduction for top-ranked and middle/low-ranked birds, suggesting that our results support the effect of social history rather than a generalized effect across all perturbed focal birds. Overall, in combination with previous results showing that the outcomes of experienced and observed fights contained information about rank (Hobson and DeDeo 2015; Hobson et al. 2021), these results suggest that our measured individual characteristic was not the main driving factor of rank in captive monk parakeets.

A second potential mechanism that could explain the rank dynamics we observed during the perturbation trial is the role of social support. Having social support in the form of affiliative partnerships could buffer negative and stressful events (Cohen and Wills 1985; Seeman and McEwen 1996), such as perturbations (Testard et al. 2021), and could improve rank and fitness (e.g., spotted hyenas, *Crocuta crocuta*, Strauss and Holekamp 2019). In the parakeet groups, relationships between the focal and the remaining group members may have affected the removed individual's ability to re-take rank. Individuals that had strong and stable partnerships before removal and that can re-join on reintroduction may be able to reintegrate at a similar rank position in the hierarchy when they return from an absence. Further research is needed on the role that social support may play in the rank dynamics upon reintroduction.

By performing controlled experiments in captivity, we found that social history shapes rank, but we do not know to what extent captivity influenced our results (Webster and Rutz 2020). We do not think that captivity influenced bird behavior in our study as our results within our three captive groups were consistent with each other and with the results from two groups of long-term captives in 2015 (Hobson and DeDeo 2015). Additionally, dominance structure and social dominance patterns across species show no evidence that they are consistently affected by captivity (Shizuka and McDonald 2015; Hobson et al. 2021). Thus, the observed patterns consistently emerge despite changes in group size, cage size, habitat complexity, and the origins of the birds (long-term captives in 2015 and newly caught birds in this study). The captive experiments indicate that the parakeets have the capability of using social history and information about each other to make their aggression decisions and structure their groups, but whether they use these same behaviors to structure wild groups is still an open question. Social history might be important in shaping rank in wild groups of monk parakeets as it would allow faster formation of dominance hierarchies during integration of immigrants in species with fission-fusion dynamics (Hobson and DeDeo 2015; Shultz and Gersick 2016; Hobson et al. 2021), but this requires further investigation.

Using experimental social perturbations, we found that shorter-term social history matters in this potentially cognitively complex species. We found that interactions that occurred during the removal period had a greater effect on rank dynamics than interactions that occurred prior to removals. Yet, we do not know to what extent cognitive processing is required to respond to these perturbations or the duration that the birds were able to infer the rank of their group members. For example, even in systems where rank is based on individual characteristics (e.g., cichlid fish, *Astatotilapia burtoni*; Fernald 1977), cognitive ability and performance can vary with rank position

(Wallace et al. 2022), suggesting that throughout the rank continuum, i.e., the various determinants that can influence rank from individual characteristics to social history (Holekamp and Strauss 2016), cognitive abilities may play an important role in rank acquisition and retention. A better understanding of the mechanisms that influence rank may provide insight into the role of cognitive processes and social systems on rank acquisition and maintenance.

We thank the USDA staff at the Florida Field Station, especially Eric Tillman, John Humphrey, Danyelle Sherman, Genesis Castillo Torres, and Palmer Harrell, for their assistance and support. The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the US Department of Agriculture. We acknowledge the fieldwork was conducted on the unceded lands of the Seminole and Timucua people and the analyses and writing work on the native homeland of the Indigenous Algonquian speaking tribes, including the Delaware, Miami, and Shawnee tribes. We thank the editors and anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Annemarie van der Marel (Formal analysis-Lead, Investigation-Lead, Methodology-Supporting, Supervision-Supporting, Visualization-Lead, Writing – original draft-Lead, Writing – review & editing-Lead), Xavier Francis (Formal analysis-Supporting, Investigation-Equal, Writing – original draft-Supporting, Writing – review & editing-Supporting), Claire L. O’Connell (Investigation-Equal, Writing – original draft-Supporting, Writing – review & editing-Supporting), Cesar O. Estien (Investigation-Supporting, Writing – original draft-Supporting, Writing – review & editing-Supporting), Chelsea Carminito (Investigation-Supporting, Writing – original draft-Supporting, Writing – review & editing-Supporting), Virginia Darby Moore (Investigation-Supporting, Writing – review & editing-Supporting), Nickolas Lormand (Investigation-Supporting, Writing – review & editing-Supporting), Bryan M. Kluever (Funding acquisition-Supporting, Project administration-Supporting, Resources-Supporting, Writing – original draft-Supporting, Writing – review & editing-Supporting), Elizabeth A. Hobson (Conceptualization-Lead, Formal analysis-Supporting, Funding acquisition-Lead, Investigation-Supporting, Methodology-Lead, Resources-Lead, Supervision-Lead, Visualization-Supporting, Writing – original draft-Supporting, Writing – review & editing-Supporting)

FUNDING

During preparation of this work, E.A.H., C.C., and X.F. were supported by National Science Foundation Division of Integrative Organismal Systems Core Program (NSF IOS) 2015932, and the research was supported in part by the US Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Wildlife Services, National Wildlife Research Center. C.O.E. was supported by University of California, Berkeley’s Chancellor Fellowship and the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship (NSF GRFP) under Grant No. 2146752. A.M. was in part supported during the writing process by Fondo Nacional de Desarrollo Científico y Tecnológico (FONDECYT) Postdoctorado 2022 (3220742).

Data Availability: Analyses reported in this article can be reproduced using the data provided by van der Marel & Hobson 2023.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interests.

Handling Editor: Mark Briffa

REFERENCES

- Altmann J. 1974. Observational study of behavior: sampling methods. *Behaviour*. 49:227–267.
- Barrett L, Peter Henzi S, Lusseau D. 2012. Taking sociality seriously: the structure of multi-dimensional social networks as a source of information for individuals. *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci*. 367(1599):2108–2118.
- Bonett DG, Wright TA. 2000. Sample size requirements for estimating Pearson, Kendall and Spearman correlations. *Psychometrika*. 65(1):23–28.
- Boucherie PH, Gallego-Abenza M, Massen JJM, Bugnyar T. 2022. Dominance in a socially dynamic setting: hierarchical structure and conflict dynamics in ravens’ foraging groups. *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci*. 377(1845):20200446. doi:10.1098/rstb.2020.0446
- Brooks ME, Kristensen K, van Benthem KJ, Magnusson A, Berg CW, Nielsen A, Skaug HJ, Mächler M, Bolker BM. 2017. glmmTMB balances speed and flexibility among packages for zero-inflated generalized linear mixed modeling. *R.J.* 9(2):378–400.
- Cavigelli SA, Caruso MJ. 2015. Sex, social status and physiological stress in primates: the importance of social and glucocorticoid dynamics. *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci*. 370(1669):20140103. doi:10.1098/rstb.2014.0103
- Chaine AS, Shizuka D, Block TA, Zhang L, Lyon BE. 2018. Manipulating badges of status only fools strangers. *Ecol Lett*. 21(10):1477–1485.
- Chase ID, Seitz K. 2011. Chapter 4 - Self-Structuring Properties of Dominance Hierarchies: A New Perspective. In: Huber R, Bannasch DL, Brennan P, editors. *Advances in Genetics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA: Academic Press. 75:51–81. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-380858-5.00001-0
- Chase ID, Tovey C, Spangler-Martin D, Manfredonia M. 2002. Individual differences versus social dynamics in the formation of animal dominance hierarchies. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 99(8):5744–5749.
- Cohen S, Wills TA. 1985. Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychol Bull*. 98(2):310–357.
- Dwortz MF, Curley JP, Tye KM, Padilla-Coreano N. 2022. Neural systems that facilitate the representation of social rank. *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci*. 377(1845):20200444. doi:10.1098/rstb.2020.0444
- Engh AL, Esch K, Smale L, Holekamp KE. 2000. Mechanisms of maternal rank “inheritance” in the spotted hyaena, *Crocuta crocuta*. *Anim Behav*. 60(3):323–332.
- Fernald RD. 1977. Quantitative behavioural observations of *Haplochromis burtoni* under semi-natural conditions. *Anim Behav*. 25:643–653.
- Fialkowski R, Aufdemberge P, Wright V, Dijkstra P. 2021. Radical change: temporal patterns of oxidative stress during social ascent in a dominance hierarchy. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol*. 75(2):43. doi:10.1007/s00265-021-02981-x
- Flack JC, Krakauer DC, De Waal FBM. 2005. Robustness mechanisms in primate societies: a perturbation study. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci*. 272(1568):1091–1099.
- Harris RBS. 2015. Chronic and acute effects of stress on energy balance: are there appropriate animal models? *Am J Physiol Integr Comp Physiol*. 308(4):R250–R265.
- Hartig F. 2022. DHARMA: Residual diagnostics for hierarchical (multi-level/mixed) regression models. R Packag ver 0.4.6. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DHARMA>.
- Hellmann JK, Reddon AR, Ligoeki IY, O’Connor CM, Garvy KA, Marsh-Rollo SE, Hamilton IM, Balshine S. 2015. Group response to social perturbation: impacts of isotocin and the social landscape. *Anim Behav*. 105:55–62.
- Hobson EA, Avery ML, Wright TF. 2013. An analytical framework for quantifying and testing patterns of temporal dynamics in social networks. *Anim Behav*. 85(1):83–96.
- Hobson EA, Avery ML, Wright TF. 2014. The socioecology of monk parakeets: insights into parrot social complexity. *Auk*. 131(4):756–775.
- Hobson EA, DeDeo S. 2015. Social feedback and the emergence of rank in animal society. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 11(9):e1004411–e10044120.
- Hobson EA, John DJ, McIntosh TL, Avery ML, Wright TF. 2015. The effect of social context and social scale on the perception of relationships in monk parakeets. *Curr Zool*. 61(1):55–69.
- Hobson EA, Mønster D, DeDeo S. 2021. Aggression heuristics underlie animal dominance hierarchies and provide evidence of group-level social information. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 118(10):e2022912118. doi:10.1073/pnas.2022912118
- Hodge SJ, Manica A, Flower TP, Clutton-Brock TH. 2008. Determinants of reproductive success in dominant female meerkats. *J Anim Ecol*. 77(1):92–102.
- Holekamp KE, Strauss ED. 2016. Aggression and dominance: an interdisciplinary overview. *Curr Opin Behav Sci*. 12:44–51.
- Hotta T, Takeyama T, Jordan LA, Kohda M. 2014. Duration of memory of dominance relationships in a group living cichlid. *Naturwissenschaften*. 101(9):745–751.
- Humphries DJ, Nelson-Flower MJ, Bell MV, Finch FM, Ridley AR. 2021. Kinship, dear enemies, and costly combat: the effects of relatedness on territorial overlap and aggression in a cooperative breeder. *Ecol Evol*. 11(23):17031–17042.

