Split between two worlds: automated sensing reveals links between above- and belowground social networks in a free-living mammal
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Many animals socialize in two or more major ecological contexts. In nature, these contexts often involve one situation in which space is more constrained (e.g. shared refuges, sleeping cliffs, nests, dens or burrows) and another situation in which animal movements are relatively free (e.g. in open spaces lacking architectural constraints). Although it is widely recognized that an individual’s characteristics may shape its social life, the extent to which architecture constrains social decisions within and between habitats remains poorly understood. Here we developed a novel, automated-monitoring system to study the effects of personality, life-history stage and sex on the social network structure of a facultatively social mammal, the California ground squirrel (Otospermophilus beecheyi) in two distinct contexts: aboveground where space is relatively open and belowground where it is relatively constrained by burrow architecture. Aboveground networks reflected affiliative social interactions whereas belowground networks reflected burrow associations. Network structure in one context (belowground), along with preferential juvenile–adult associations, predicted structure in a second context (aboveground). Network positions of individuals were generally consistent across years (within contexts) and between ecological contexts (within years), suggesting that individual personalities and behavioural syndromes, respectively, contribute to the social network structure of these free-living mammals. Direct ties (strength) tended to be stronger in belowground networks whereas more indirect paths (betweenness centrality) flowed through individuals in aboveground networks. Belowground, females fostered significantly more indirect paths than did males. Our findings have important potential implications for disease and information transmission, offering new insights into the multiple factors contributing to social structures across ecological contexts.

This article is part of the theme issue ‘Interdisciplinary approaches for uncovering the impacts of architecture on collective behaviour’.

1. Introduction

Behavioural ecologists have long understood that social decisions have important fitness consequences for individuals, shaping key processes including foraging decisions, information flow, disease transmission and reproduction [1]. It has become increasingly clear that who-meets-whom within animal societies is rarely random [2] and that social structure is often produced by individual variation in social preferences within groups [3,4]. Social network theory offers useful tools for quantifying and understanding how this variation contributes to social structure [5–7]. This framework formalizes the classical
view that repeated pairwise interactions give rise to social relationships that in turn contribute to emergent social structures [8]. Importantly, network analysis extends traditional approaches by offering well-defined, standardized metrics for characterizing the effect of an individual’s characteristics on direct and indirect social connections [9–11]. Network metrics are, therefore, offering new insights into the ways that individual characteristics (e.g. life-history stage, sex), preferential relationships (e.g. coalition partners) and the presence of key individuals shape group stability and structure [3,12–18].

A parallel, but largely distinct, literature has emerged showing that many animals exhibit ‘personality’ [19], defined as consistent individual differences in behaviour; e.g. in aggressiveness, boldness or sociability. Only a handful of studies have explicitly linked personality traits to animal social networks [20–24]. A closely related literature examines behavioural syndromes, defined as consistent and/or correlated behaviour across two or more situations [19,25,26]. In nature, the two situations for animals often involve one situation where space is more constrained (e.g. shared use of refuges, sleeping cliffs, nests, or burrows) and another situation in which movements are relatively free (e.g. in open spaces lacking architectural constraints). The latter may, therefore, permit a richer range of social behaviours and interactions.

Interestingly, although most animals live in two or more distinct habitats or major situations, most social network studies are limited to a single context or rely upon combined data without explicit considerations of ecological context [27]. Thus, despite definitive evidence that individuals in different situations often differ in their patterns of space use [28,29] and sociality [30], and this notion being discussed extensively in review articles [7,10,31], very few empirical studies explicitly examine links between social networks derived from different situations [27]. This is unfortunate because connectivity may contribute to important processes such as disease and information transfer [32–34]. For example, understanding whether networks are more connected in one habitat than the other may offer insights into contexts as a ‘hot spot’ of transmission [35–37]. Moreover, partitioning the differences in social network metrics between contexts for individuals of different life-history stages and sexes will likely provide insights into how social roles (e.g. for juveniles versus adults [3,38]) vary or remain consistent across situations. Thus, although data collected using different sampling methods are inherently challenging to compare [39], efforts to assess the effects of life-history stage and sex on context-specific social metrics for individuals should provide an enhanced understanding of mechanisms contributing to social structure [2].

Within a social network framework, three major, non-mutually-exclusive mechanisms may generate social structure: ‘movement rules’, ‘social interaction rules’ and ‘individual characteristics’ [3,6,40]. First, movement rules refer to the ways that daily patterns of travel to and from limited resources, such as a shared refuge or a clumped food source, can produce repeated spatial associations even in the absence of social preference [41]. For individuals that travel away from refuges each day to search for food, movement rules predict that animals sharing similar refuges will be most likely to socialize due to increased encounter rates. Second, social interaction rules describe the extent to which social partner choice drives social structure [6]. These rules emphasize factors such as homophily [42], the tendency for similar individuals (e.g. same life-history stage, same sex) to preferentially interact. For example, homophily occurs among juveniles during play [43,44] or among adult females with enduring social bonds [45]. Finally, individual characteristics, such as personality, life-history stage or sex of an individual may predict social network metrics within a context [3,31,38]. An individual’s network position may also remain consistent across contexts, indicating a behavioural syndrome, or vary between contexts if individuals engage in context-specific social roles.

Here we studied a semi-fossorial mammal, the California ground squirrel, Otospermophilus beecheyi, to gain insights into the factors contributing to social network structures of free-living mammals who split their lives between two major contexts: above- and belowground. This is important because very few studies simultaneously seek to explain the ecological aspects of above- and belowground behaviours in semi-fossorial mammals; for notable exceptions, see [46,47]. California ground squirrels are facultatively social rodents that offer an interesting mammalian system for elucidating the extent to which movement rules, social interaction rules, and/or individual characteristics (e.g. personality, behavioural syndromes, life stage, sex) predict social structure. Individuals reside at distinct geographical sites, called colonies, at which group members regularly socialize, forage and collectively mob predators aboveground, but also seek refuge belowground in communal burrow systems for protection from predation and harsh weather [48–50].

Our current study capitalized upon the natural history of these animals to examine the mechanisms promoting social structure in two distinct contexts: above- and belowground. First, movement rules predict that because burrows are refuges limited in their size capacity as well as in their spatial distribution and abundance across the landscape, individuals that share burrows may also socialize to the greatest extent aboveground due to their increased tendency to interact as they travel to and from the same location (burrow) each day to forage aboveground. Specifically, if movements away from refuges spatially constrain opportunities for aboveground social exchanges, then social network structure in one context (belowground) should predict that in a second context (aboveground). Second, social interaction rules predict that if individuals exhibit social preferences based on homophily, then they should associate most often with others of the same stage and sex. Finally, we investigated how individual characteristics shape direct and indirect social connectivity within above- and belowground social networks. If networks reflect animal personalities and/or behavioural syndromes, then the relative network positions of individuals should be consistent over time (between years) and between contexts (aboveground versus belowground), respectively [31,51]. Beyond the effects of individual identity, we also predicted that juveniles of both sexes and adult females should be the most connected within their social networks. Although surprisingly little is known about kinship and dispersal patterns for the California ground squirrel [50], groups are likely matrilineal (female-based kin structure) with male-biased dispersal, as seen across the ground squirrel lineage [52]. If this is the case, then adult females and their immature offspring should promote connectivity, as seen in other matrilineal mammals [3,53,54].
2. Material and methods

(a) Field site and study subjects
We studied free-living California ground squirrels at Briones Regional Park in Contra Costa County, California (37.9377014 N, 122.1388542 W). At this field site, at least some members of the population remain active aboveground all year [55]. Breeding largely occurs from mid-February to April, with females typically only producing a single litter per year [55]. Adult females rear young in burrows until offspring emerge as fully weaned young (age: 45–60 days), after which young of the year spend the remainder of their first year as juveniles (61–364 days) before maturing into reproductive adults (older than 364 days) [55,56]. We focused on juveniles and adults in the current study because these individuals are regularly observed socializing aboveground and, thus, have ample opportunities to visit burrows belowground and to affiliate with colony members aboveground.

The precise connectivity of California ground squirrel burrow complexes is largely unknown [50]. Although most burrows are presumed to lack connections with multiple openings (e.g. 6–20 openings) at the surface [55]. Most tunnels are 4.6 m long, but extreme cases report tunnels of up to 70 m [55,57]. Regardless of the precise interconnectivity or length of burrow systems, individuals that share any burrow opening on a given day have opportunities to socialize, share space and exchange parasites [58].

(b) Live trapping of free-living individuals
The current study was part of a long-term study at our main colony site (Crow). Since 2013, we have live-trapped, marked and released California ground squirrels using squirrel traps (Tomahawk Live-Trap Company, Hazelhurst, Wisconsin, USA) baited with black oil sunflower seeds and peanut butter at and around burrow entrances. This is primarily done during the summer months, from late May to early August (figure 1a). Traps were covered with pieces of cardboard for shade and checked at intervals of \(\leq 30\) min. While safely contained in a cone-shaped, cloth handling bag [59], we noted the individual’s weight, sex, anogenital distance and reproductive status and then released each individual at its site of capture. We used this information to assign the life-history stage and sex to each individual for each year of the study.

Upon first capture, individuals were given three types of identification (figure 1). First, a Monel metal ear tag (National Band and Tag Co., Newport, Kentucky, USA) was attached to one pinna for permanent identification. Second, a unique Nyanzol cattle dye mark (Greenville colorants: New Jersey) was applied to the back for visual identification during social observations. Third, we inserted a unique passive integrated transponder (PIT) tag (Biomark, Inc., Boise Idaho) beneath the skin as a reliable ‘lifetime’ barcode [60]. In 2016 and 2017, respectively, we live-trapped and monitored a total of 131 and 158 marked individuals across the entire colony site.

(c) Automated sensing of belowground activity
Automated tracking offers exciting opportunities for the study of animal social networks [61]. Because the social lives of subterranean animals are largely hidden from researchers due to the small size of the openings to belowground refuges [62,63], we developed a new method for monitoring belowground activity of burrowing animals reliant upon radio-frequency identification to detect small (less than 1 g) and inexpensive PIT tags. We stored information from each burrow complex on an external data logger powered by a single 6 V rechargeable battery (Model DC224-6 AGM, Full River Battery, USA). A single battery powered each system for two weeks. This approach offers advantages over other reality-mining approaches because of its low cost, extended battery life and low disturbance to subjects [61].
Starting April 2016, we deployed data loggers (Biomark, Inc., Boise Idaho, figure 1a–c) at two distinct data monitoring stations within the colony site. The first was the active colony with a monitored area of 15.0 × 14.8 m² (‘Logs’ area), whereas the second station covered an area of 17.8 × 7.7 m² (‘580’ area). The two areas were separated by 86 m and squirrels were regularly observed travelling aboveground between them. A total of 12 antennae loops were attached to each data logger at each station. Each loop was placed at an active burrow entrance and detected movements by scanning the unique PIT tags of visitors (figure 1b). We validated that each loop accurately detected PIT tags by scanning tags in and out of loops and confirming that their time–date stamps were accurately stored on the SD card at each station. These 12 loops provided substantial coverage of active openings, covering roughly 90% of active burrow entrances at each burrow complex. We secured each antennae loop at a single burrow entrance with 10 cm × 2.5 cm Fabric & Garden Staples (Easy Gardener Products, Inc., Waco, TX). Staples were placed into the dirt using a mallet without damaging the burrow architecture, obstructing the ability for the antenna to effectively read the PIT tag, or jeopardizing animal safety as squirrels passed through the antenna (figure 1b).

The data logger recorded the specific time, date and unique PIT tag number each time a tagged individual passed in or out of an antenna’s loop (figure 1c). Each data logger and battery were hidden under their own 24" × 12" × 13" artificial rocks (Orbit granite valve box cover, Model # 53016) to protect equipment from weather and other disturbances. Squirrels adjusted quickly to the equipment; we detected the first squirrel entering a loop within 20 min. of deploying it. The automated-sensing system remains on-site and currently records data year-round. Loops are monitored weekly and reinforced with additional staples or repaired with electrical tape as needed. On rare occasions, we moved antennae from previously active burrows to newly active ones to ensure continuous coverage of most burrows; most changes occurred outside of our summer sampling periods, such as after a winter rainstorm or juveniles emerged travelling aboveground.

We recorded all occurrences [64] of affiliative behaviours (socio-positive interactions) including greetings, proximity maintenance, social foraging and playing (for details, see ethogram [48,50]) using 10 × 14 binoculars (Eagle Optics Ranger Extra-Low Dispersion Middleton, WI). Briefly, greetings involved two individuals meeting head-on and touching noses, one individual rubbing its cheek on that of another squirrel, or one individual approaching a second head-on and rubbing its nose near the corner of the receiver’s mouth [48,50]. Proximity maintenance occurred when one individual approached a second and sat in direct body contact or within less than 1 m of the second individual [50]. Individuals foraged socially when they consumed seeds, grass or other forage within less than 1 m [50]. Each unique play bout started with one individual initiating play slapping, boxing, chasing, mounting, pouncing or wrestling with a second individual and ended when one of the two individuals moved apart from the other [50].

### (e) Above- and belowground social network parameters

Networks are comprised of individuals (nodes) connected to each other (by ‘ties’ or ‘edges’). In this study, nodes represented individual squirrels and ties represented weighted, symmetric connections between them. We selected colony-year as the unit of analysis to account for annual changes in colony composition attributed to births, deaths and dispersal [65]. We therefore constructed a total of four separate networks—one belowground network and one aboveground network for each year.

Ties within a network reflected the proportion of days each pair, A and B, were detected at the same burrow reader (belowground) or exchanged affiliative behaviours (aboveground). We elected to use the same sampling period (day) for both contexts to minimize differences in network construction. Day was used as the sampling period for two reasons. First, although recording the precise amount of time pairs of semi-fossorial rodents are simultaneously aboveground is challenging, measures of daily rates of behaviour offer robust measures of affiliation [65]. Second, because the precise connectivity of burrow entrances and exits is unknown, this measure captures daily overlap within a burrow opening regardless of whether pairs shared the burrow at the same time for a given day. We calculated simple association indices to measure the daily rates of pairwise associations in each context [2,66]. This index was appropriate for our study because all subjects in the current study were equally likely to be detected in both contexts [2,66].

Belowground associations were calculated as: (the number of days A and B were detected using the same burrow)/(the number of days A and/or B were detected at one or more burrows). Aboveground associations were also calculated as: (the number of days A and B exchanged affiliative interactions)/(the number of days A and/or B were observed engaging in at least one affiliative interaction). Because even weak associations are potentially important for the maintenance of social structure, we analysed weighted, unfiltered networks based on all associations [67]. However, an individual had to be logged (via its PIT tag) at least once and observed engaging in at least one affiliative interaction aboveground to be included in the final aboveground and belowground networks for a given year. This was done to avoid spurious correlations between empty cells and to ensure that each pair had the opportunity to associate in both contexts [68].

We constructed each of the four networks using the package ‘igraph’ [69]. For each network, we calculated two different node-based metrics. First, we calculated the ‘strength’, the weighted equivalent to degree in binary networks, as the sum of its association indices with all colony-mates divided by the number of other potential actors (minus the focal individual) [70]. This standardized metric corrects for the number of nodes in the network to measure the extent to which each individual node directly associates with all potential actors in the network. Second, we calculated ‘betweenness centrality’, defined as a count of the
number of shortest paths through a node. This indirect metric reflects how important a node is for connecting disparate parts of the network, offering insights into the roles that key individuals may play in the spread of disease or information transmission across networks [6,31,32]. Because investigating the distributions of metrics (e.g., degree distribution for binary networks) is the preferred method for comparing node-based metrics between networks [2], we plotted cumulative distributions for metrics derived from above- and belowground networks to describe their relative properties.

(f) Statistical analyses

All statistical tests were conducted in R v. 3.4.1 [71]. To account for the non-independence in our data, we implemented permutation tests when using relational data (dyads within social networks) to test hypotheses [67,72] and included random effects in generalized linear mixed effects models (GLMMs) to account for repeated measures [3].

First, to test the predictions of movement and social interaction rules, we implemented multiple regression quadric assignment procedures (MRQAPs) to assess the extent to which belowground network structure (predicted by movement constraints) and/or trait similarity (predicted by the social interaction rule of homophily) predicted aboveground network structure. This regression framework was superior to the univariate quadric assignment procedure (QAP) because it allowed us to simultaneously test for the effects of multiple predictor matrices on the aboveground affiliative association matrix. For each year, we constructed a model in which we regressed three predictor matrices: (i) belowground association matrix, (ii) stage similarity (juvenile–juvenile = 1, juvenile–adult = 0, adult–adult = 1), (iii) sex similarity (male–male = 1, female–male = 0, female–female = 1) on the response matrix: aboveground affiliative associations. Permutation tests used the ‘double-semi-partialling’ method [73] developed in the mrqap.dsp function from the R package ‘asnipe’, each with 10,000 permutations [74]. We deemed P-values of less than 0.05 to be statistically significant.

Second, we tested for the effects of individual characteristics. To examine the potential for individual consistency in network position across contexts and years, we implemented consistency tests designed to compare the ranks of node-based metrics derived from different networks [51]. We therefore compared ranked values for a single metric (e.g., strength, betweenness) for each test [51]. First, to examine the effects of individual identity across contexts, we conducted a single test for individual consistency of each node-based metric (strength or betweenness) between ecological contexts (above- or belowground network) within a year. Second, we evaluated individual consistency across time by comparing each node-based metric (strength or betweenness) within an ecological context (above- or belowground network) between the two years of study.

We also tested whether the fixed effects of an individual’s life-history stage and sex were significantly associated with the node-based metrics (strength or betweenness) within each ecological context using randomized network permutations. To account for the non-independence of relational data, we permuted the nodes (individuals) of networks (while holding the edges constant) to create a set of 10,000 randomized networks for each year within each ecological context [72,75]. We then calculated the node-based metrics based on each of the four sets of permuted data. From the observed data, we constructed separate models to explain the following predictor variables: (i) strength belowground, (ii) strength aboveground, (iii) betweenness belowground and (iv) betweenness aboveground. That is, we calculated the estimates (slopes) for the fixed effects of stage and sex on each context-specific node-based metric using GLMMs in lme4 [76] with a restricted maximum likelihood method, Gaussian distributions and the random effects of identity and year for the observed data. We also extracted 10,000 model estimates from GLMMs run on the 10,000 permuted values of the fixed effects of stage or sex on each metric within an ecological context. We tested the statistical significance of the effects of stage and sex for each model by comparing the parameter estimates from the observed data to randomizations of each dependent variable. In electronic supplementary material, S1, we compared the estimates from our observed dataset (blue lines) to the distribution of randomly generated estimates and considered those effects falling outside of the 95% confidence interval (within the areas with red bars at the tails of each distribution) to be statistically significant.

3. Results

From 27 May to 27 July, we monitored a total of 101 (2016) and 119 (2017) individuals aboveground during social observations and 98 (2016) and 89 (2017) individuals belowground. Aboveground, we recorded a total of 10,975 affiliative social interactions over 297 observation hours (2016: N = 5662; 2017: N = 5313 affiliative interactions). Of these, both identities were known for 8754 affiliative interactions (table 1). We also collected 17,726 recordings of individuals moving in or out of burrows. On average, each loop detected 2.0 ± 0.3 (2016) and 2.3 ± 0.1 (2017) unique squirrel visitors per day (range: 0 to 16 squirrels per loop per day). We detected belowground movements for juveniles (2016: N_F = 28; N_M = 28; 2017: N_F = 22, N_M = 15) and adults (2016: N_F = 29, N_M = 13; 2017: N_F = 35, N_M = 17). In 2016 and 2017, only 16% (N = 16) and 18% (N = 16) of these individuals, respectively, were detected at both monitoring stations within the same summer; this suggests that a small proportion of individuals bridged connections in belowground networks.

| Table 1. All occurrences of pair-wise affiliative behaviours aboveground.* |
|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|
|                  | Sitting < 1 m   | Collective foraging | Sitting in body contact |
| a)                | (N = 3373)      | (N = 1727)         | (N = 326) |
| b)                | Nose to Nose    | Nose to Cheek      | Following       |
| c)                | (N = 720)       | (N = 508)          | (N = 129) |
| e)                | Play Slap (N = 227) | Play Mount (N = 85) | Play Grab  |
| f)                | Play Push (N = 28) | Play Bite (N = 12) | Play Mount |
| g)                | Play Mount      | Play Push          | Play Bite    |
| h)                | Play Bite       | Play Mount         | Play Push   |

Overall, the direct metric of network connections (strength) was generally higher for nodes within below- (figure 2a,b) than aboveground networks (figure 2c,d), a pattern reflected by comparing the cumulative distributions of strength for each network (figure 3a). In 2016, strength belowground was roughly twice as high (mean ± s.e.: 0.039 ± 0.004, range: 0.00 to 0.137) as aboveground (0.020 ± 0.002, range: 0.00 to 0.060, N = 60 individuals). In 2017, strength was roughly four times higher below- (0.063 ± 0.006, range: 0.016 to 0.241) than aboveground (0.017 ± 0.003, range: 0.00 to 0.075, N = 60 individuals).
0.000 to 0.187) than aboveground (0.016 ± 0.001, range: 0.000 to 0.047, N = 61 individuals). By contrast, the indirect metric (betweenness), defined as the number of shortest paths that pass through an individual, was consistently higher for aboveground networks (2016: 67 ± 11 paths, range: 0 to 378 paths; 2017: 79 ± 15 paths, range: 0 to 517 paths, figure 2a,d) than for belowground networks (2016: 35 ± 8 paths, range: 0 to 284; 2017: 33 ± 5 paths, range: 0–174 paths, figure 2a,b). The cumulative distributions reflect these patterns (figure 3b).

(b) Belowground networks, but not homophily, predict aboveground social networks

For both years, the full models including all three predictor matrices (belowground associations, stage similarity and sex similarity) captured a statistically significant amount of variation contributing to aboveground affiliative networks (MRQAP: 2016: F3,1766 = 58.37, p < 0.0001; 2017: F3,1825 = 55.78, p < 0.0001). Despite their statistical significance and, thus, statistical support of our predictions, these models only captured a small portion of the variability of the aboveground networks (adjusted R² = 0.089 in 2016 and 0.082 in 2017).

As predicted by movement rules, the structure of belowground networks (figure 2a,b) was positively correlated with that of aboveground affiliative networks (MRQAP: R = 0.228 in 2016; R = 0.130 in 2017; p < 0.0001 for both years, figure 2c,d). That is, pairs that occupied burrows at the same location on the same days were significantly more likely to exchange affiliative behaviours aboveground than were pairs that rarely visited similar burrows. This finding is consistent with the notion of movement rules because individuals seeking safety at similar burrow complexes (home bases) were presumably also most likely to encounter each other aboveground as they moved towards or away from these refuges. Beyond these effects, stage similarity negatively predicted aboveground networks such that juvenile–adult dyads tended to socialize most often aboveground (figure 2). These effects were statistically significant in 2016 (R = −0.008, p = 0.001) but not in 2017 (R = −0.003, p = 0.184). Although consistent with the notion that social interaction rules matter, our finding that individuals tended to associate most often with individuals belonging to a life-history stage different from their own is in direct contrast to the prediction of homophily. Sex similarity, however, failed to predict aboveground networks (2016: R = −0.001, p = 0.807; 2017: R = −0.001, p = 0.836).

(c) Node-based metrics consistent for individuals between contexts

Within a year, an individual’s strength in its social network was consistent between above- and belowground ecological contexts (consistency permutation tests: 2016: N = 60, p = 0.001; 2017: N = 61, p < 0.0001). This confirms that individuals highly connected belowground are also the most socially connected aboveground. Moreover, an individual’s metric of betweenness within a year was generally consistent between above- and belowground contexts; betweenness was significantly consistent for individuals between contexts during the summer with typical rainfall (2017: N = 61, p = 0.031) but not in the summer during a drought year (2016: N = 60, p = 0.311).

(d) Node-based metrics only consistent between years belowground

To test for consistency between years, we applied consistency tests to data for the subset of individuals (N = 19) monitored in both years. Belowground, an individual’s strength (p = 0.033) and betweenness (p = 0.033) were consistent between years. However, individuals were not statistically consistent across years in their aboveground strength (p = 0.073) or betweenness (p = 0.098).

(e) Females important in fostering indirect connectivity belowground

After accounting for variation attributed to the random effects of individual identity and year, life-history stage and sex had limited effects on node-based metrics (see electronic supplementary material, S1). Life-history stage failed to significantly predict either the direct metric of strength or indirect metric of betweenness above- or belowground (p > 0.05 for all comparisons with null models; for details, see
females (betweenness: 44.7 paths) as through males (9.4 paths; figure 2).

4. Discussion
(a) Social selectivity in networks across ecological contexts
Our study uncovers new linkages between belowground architecture and the patterns of aboveground sociality for subterranean mammals, suggesting that social interactions belowground indeed are correlated with (and likely constrain) those occurring aboveground. Consistent with movement constraints, belowground associations predicted aboveground affiliative networks, but social interaction rules were also important because we found preferential juvenile–adult associations (regardless of the sexes involved). These relationships persist despite the inherent challenges of comparing data collected using different methods. The unexplained variation between our networks might be attributed to methodological and/or ecological differences. Individual characteristics also contributed to social structure. Although the explanatory value of life-history stage and sex on social structure was generally low, females had the highest betweenness belowground, fostering more indirect connections than males. Beyond this, social metrics were generally consistent for individuals over time (suggesting personalities) and between two major ecological contexts (suggesting behavioural syndromes) [51,77]. Both of these final findings contradict the common simplifying assumption of random mixing within populations made by traditional game-theoretic models [31].

(b) Movement rules and social partner choice influence network structure
Although aboveground networks are relatively open and free compared to those occurring inside the confines of belowground tunnels, our finding of correlated network structures is consistent with the notion that movements away from burrows influence aboveground behaviours. Access to limited refuges is likely a major factor shaping movements, and thus, patterns of social behaviour, as occurs in other species of mammals [14,78,79] as well as in birds [17,80], reptiles [40] and insects [81,82]. Ground squirrel burrows are limited refuges that offer protection from weather, safety from predators, and a place for hoarding food or rearing offspring [50,57,83]. Whereas social partners may simply interact most often with those they encounter near shared burrows, individuals may alternatively actively seek associations with the same partners aboveground independent of burrow preferences [84,85]. Distinguishing between these factors is important because models of social evolution, regardless of whether behaviours are favoured by direct or indirect fitness benefits, often require viscosity, defined as environmental restrictions on movements [4,86,87]. Empirical data such as ours are important because game-theoretic models often make opposing predictions, predicting that spatial constraints may either promote [88,89] or inhibit [90] the emergence of socio-positive behaviours, both of which may be shaped by the animal’s built environment [62,91].

Social interaction rules explained network structure. We documented preferential direct associations between juveniles and adults as well as the importance of indirect connectivity by females in belowground networks. These findings are consistent with the presumed matrilineal structure for this species [50] and what is known about other mammalian species living in matrilineal societies [18,92,93]. First, preferential aboveground connections between juveniles and adults suggest that parent–offspring bonds likely persist after weaning; pedigree information is required to confirm this and is not yet established for our subjects. Second, juvenile–adult preferential connections are also largely expected; juveniles often associate with adults to reduce predation risk [65] and sometimes initiate play with adults [43,44]. Finally, females likely reside at their natal burrows, fostering indirect links with other members of the social group. Kinship explains social network structures in many mammalian societies (e.g. [3,14,94–96]). Studying its effects on California ground squirrel networks should prove fruitful after a pedigree is established.

(c) Individual consistency in network position
Our finding that some individuals consistently occupied key positions in social networks across time (personalities) and major ecological contexts (behavioural syndromes) extends previous studies documenting consistent personality traits across time, seasons and/or behavioural categories [22,97]. These traits likely have fitness consequences for individuals [51] and may predict patterns of group-level behaviour [31], such as mobbing of predators [98] or policing of social conflicts [12]. Our results should inform our understanding of how connectivity by key individuals shapes the transmission of disease, information and genetic material within animal populations [51].

Despite our general finding of individual consistency in network metrics, betweenness was consistent between contexts in the summer with typical rainfall (2017), but not in the summer during a drought year (2016). Several other mammalian species [54,99,100] vary the strength of their direct associations in response to rainfall. Future studies spanning additional years should, therefore, conclusively elucidate whether ecological perturbations associated with drought disrupted otherwise consistent network positions in the California ground squirrel.

(d) Implications for understanding flow across dynamic networks
Our finding that individuals tend to occupy consistent network positions from one ecological context to another has important implications for understanding transmission networks. Within the context of disease, heterogeneity in contact rates may determine whether a disease dies out or becomes epidemic [36,101,102]. Parasites may be directly transmitted from one individual to the next (e.g. via direct social interactions) or transferred indirectly when potential hosts visit locations used earlier by infected hosts (e.g. via
space-use overlap [103]). This may produce time-lagged interactions [104]. Modelling pathways for parasite (disease) transmission in the ground squirrel system should prove particularly useful; these hosts may carry fleas and ticks that transmit zoonotic diseases (e.g., plague, Lyme disease, tularemia and relapsing fever [50,105]). Flea density varies among burrows [58] and flea abundance on hosts varies with microhabitat use by hosts [106]. Study of individual differences in social personalities should thus offer additional insights into parasite transmission.

Applications of automated technologies are also revealing how social information spreads across animal groups [107]. For example, these technologies offer a rare glimpse into how social innovations spread across foragers [108]. Network structure also has implications for prey species, fostering the detection of and cooperative protection against predators [109]. Because California ground squirrels rely upon multiple modes of communication to locate food and cope with intense predation via the production of alarm calls [50], studies of communication networks may similarly explain the extent to which acoustic and/or olfactory information about food sources and predation risk flows across the social networks of ground squirrels.

(e) Conceptual framework for uncovering animal social networks

Our research establishes a novel approach for future studies aiming to understand how interactions in constrained spaces (that may or may not involve direct contact) and those occurring in relatively unconstrained spaces (e.g., aboveground, in the air, or in open aquatic environments) contribute to social structure. First, we offer a dependable, inexpensive alternative to heavier and more expensive proximity collars [47,110,111] and extend previous network studies that capture activity in other closed spaces, such as at nests and roosts [85,108,112], by capturing belowground activity. Second, we establish a conceptual framework for combining the use of two straightforward methods—direct social observations and passive data logging—to study networks in multiple contexts and across time. Automated measures should, therefore, complement insights gained from direct observations. Going forward, integration of both approaches should offer new insights into social structures for animals that socialize in easily observable, open spaces but that also visit relatively hidden architectural structures at fixed spatial locations for which direct observation is prohibitive, such as occurs in fishes [113], birds [108,114], bats [85,95] and other semi-fossorial mammals [63,110]. Comparing networks should prove particularly useful for understanding how heterogeneities in node connectivity may affect disease [36,37,115] and information [116,117] transmission (flow) dynamics across contexts. Further investigations into the processes producing social structures and the role of key individuals across multiple habitats or major situations should, therefore, elucidate the ecological rules that generate and maintain social structures across animal societies more broadly.
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