Multiple behavioral mechanisms shape social behavioral development in a highly social

cichlid fish

Isabela P. Harmon[1], Emily A. McCabe[1], Hannah L. Graves[3], Maddie R. Vergun[1], Julia

Weinstein[3], Deijah D. Bradley[2], Clare M. Boldt[1], June Lee[3], Jessica M. Maurice[1], Maya Shah[3] &

Tessa K. Solomon-Lane[1-3]*

[1]Scripps College

[2]Pitzer College

[3]Claremont McKenna College

*Corresponding author

Tessa Solomon-Lane

Keck Science Department

Scripps, Pitzer, and Claremont McKenna Colleges

925 N. Mills Ave, Claremont, CA 91711

TSolomonLane@kecksci.claremont.edu

(909) 607-7857

ABSTRACT

Early-life social experiences shape adult phenotype, yet the underlying behavioral mechanisms remain poorly understood. We manipulated early-life social experience in the highly social African cichlid fish *Astatotilapia burtoni* to investigate the effects on behavior and neuroendocrine stress axis function. Juveniles experienced different numbers of early-life social partners in stable pairs (1 partner), stable groups (6 fish; 5 partners), and socialized pairs (a novel fish was exchanged every 5 days; 5 partners). Treatments also differed in group size (groups vs. pairs) and stability (stable vs. socialized). We then measured behavior in multiple contexts and water-borne cortisol. We found effects of treatment on behavior across all assays: open field exploration, social cue investigation, dominant behavior, and subordinate behavior. Cortisol did not differ across treatments. Principle components (PC) analysis revealed robust co-variation of behavior across contexts, including with cortisol, to form behavioral syndromes sensitive to early-life social experience. PC1 (25.1%) differed by numbers of social partners: juveniles with more social partners were more active during the social cue investigation, spent less time in the territory, and were more interactive as dominants. Differences in PC5 (8.5%) were based on stability: socialized pairs were more dominant, spent less time in and around the territory, were more socially investigative, and had lower cortisol than stable groups or pairs. Behavior observations in the home tanks provided further insights into the behavioral mechanisms underlying these effects. These results contribute to our understanding of how early-life social experiences are accrued and exert strong, lasting effects on adult phenotype.

Key words: Cortisol; Early-life experience; Early-life social effects; Ontogeny; Hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis

INTRODUCTION

Early-life social environments and experiences are potent drivers of developmental plasticity for social species and, as a result, can have strong, long-term effects on organismal phenotype (Bateson, 2001; Bateson et al., 2004; Kuijper & Johnstone, 2019; Taborsky, 2017; Weaver, 2009). Early-life social effects have been documented across vertebrate taxa (e.g., (Arnold & Taborsky, 2010; Bölting & von Engelhardt, 2017; Champagne & Curley, 2005; Moretz et al., 2007; Perkeybile & Bales, 2017; White et al., 2010), yet the specific attributes of early social environments and experiences that cause phenotypic changes are often unidentified (Kasumovic, 2013; Taborsky, 2016). Social interactions and stimuli can make up a substantial part of juvenile experience. Depending on the species and group structure, early social interactions can involve parents (maternal, paternal, or biparental care) (Champagne & Curley, 2005; McClelland et al., 2011; Perkeybile et al., 2013), parental helpers (Arnold & Taborsky, 2010; Taborsky et al., 2012), siblings (Branchi et al., 2013; Buist et al., 2013; D'Andrea et al., 2007; Monclús et al., 2012), peers (Ahloy Dallaire & Mason, 2017; Bölting & von Engelhardt, 2017; Förster & Cords, 2005; Moretz et al., 2007; Weinstein et al., 2014), and other members of the group (Bray, Murray, et al., 2021; Förster & Cords, 2005; Jin et al., 2015), as well as observations of others interacting (Clay & de Waal, 2013; Desjardins et al., 2012; Oliveira et al., 1998). Identifying the specific, proximate causes—the behavioral mechanisms—is critical to understanding how gene-by-environment interactions shape processes of developmental plasticity and behavioral developmental trajectories. Given the fitness and health consequences of social behavior (Bennett et al., 2006; Meyer-Lindenberg & Tost, 2012; Silk, 2007; Solomon-Lane et al., 2015; Wilson, 1980), the developmental origins of adult behavioral phenotype are particularly important to understand, including as a target for natural selection (CITATION).

Manipulating the early social environment is a common approach to studying early-life

social effects. For example, rearing animals in groups of different sizes and/or complexities often

has significant effects on development and phenotype (reviewed in (Taborsky, 2016). In ravens

(*Corvus corax*), family size affected social attentiveness (Gallego-Abenza et al., 2022); in zebra

finches (*Taeniopygia guttata*), rearing group size and age diversity of early-life flocks affected

courtship and aggressive behavior, as well as plumage development (Bölting & von Engelhardt,

2017); in mice, communal nesting affected social skills and neuroendocrine function, with

separate effects of maternal care and peer interactions (Branchi et al., 2009, 2013); and in

Daffodil cichlids (*Neolamprologus pulcher*), the presence of parents and brood helpers increased

social competence (Arnold & Taborsky, 2010; Taborsky et al., 2012). In general, larger social

groups are more complex than smaller groups, and early exposure to social complexity tends to

benefit social skills and competence (e.g., (Branchi et al., 2009, 2013; Fischer et al., 2015; White

et al., 2010). However, individuals accrue different social experiences, even within shared

environments. For example, mouse pups in mixed-age, communal nests interact with siblings at

varying rates and receive different levels of maternal care (Branchi et al., 2013); infant blue

monkeys (*Cercopithecus mitis stuhlmanni*) receive varying rates of allomaternal care, and from

different non-mothers in the group (Förster & Cords, 2005); immature male chimpanzees

socially associate with adult males at different rates (Bray, Feldblum, et al., 2021); and young

male long-tailed manakins occupy varied positions in the social network (McDonald, 2007). This

variation can have long-term effects on social behavior (e.g., (Branchi et al., 2013; Bray, Murray,

et al., 2021; McDonald, 2007). Therefore, to identify the behavioral mechanisms underlying

behavioral development, it is necessary to observe individuals in the rearing environment and

test mechanistic hypotheses directly by manipulating the quality and/or quantity of social

experiences (Kasumovic, 2013; Taborsky, 2016).

Early social experiences exert long-term effects on organismal phenotype through

persistent changes in underlying neural and neuroendocrine mechanisms (e.g., (Antunes et al.,

2021; Branchi et al., 2013; Champagne & Curley, 2005; McClelland et al., 2011). The

neuroendocrine stress axis, or hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (interrenal in fish; HPA/I) axis, is a

highly-conserved mechanism underlying early-life effects, including social effects (Banerjee et

al., 2012; Champagne & Curley, 2005; Crespi & Denver, 2005; Ensminger et al., 2018; Francis

et al., 1999; Jonsson & Jonsson, 2014; McClelland et al., 2011; Taborsky, 2016). The HPA/I axis

translates environmental conditions and experiences into coordinated physiological and

behavioral responses through a neuroendocrine cascade that initiates in response to an

environmental stressor. Detection of a stressor, which can include any external condition that

disrupts or threatens to disrupt homeostasis, leads to the release of corticotropin-releasing factor

(CRF) from the hypothalamus. The pituitary responds to CRF with the release of

adrenocorticotropic (ACTH) hormone, which signals for the adrenal (or interrenal) glands to

release glucocorticoids (cortisol in fishes) into circulation (Denver, 2009; Lowry & Moore, 2006;

Wendelaar Bonga, 1997). Early-life social experiences shape HPA/I axis function in multiple

ways (Spencer, 2017; Turecki & Meaney, 2016). For example, peer-reared rhesus macaques

(*Macaca mulatta*) had higher baseline and stress-induced levels of ACTH and cortisol, and the

HPA axis was more reactive, compared to maternal-reared juveniles (Stevens et al., 2009).

Similarly, zebra finch chicks reared with fathers only had hyperresponsive HPA axes, along with

altered levels of neural glucocorticoid (GR) and mineralocorticoid receptor (MR) expression,

compared to biparental rearing (Banerjee et al., 2012). In *N. pulcher* cichlids, rearing with brood

helpers altered neural *crf* and *gr* expression, as well as the ratio of *mr* to *gr1* (Taborsky et al.,

2013). The HPA/I axis is also an important source of individual variation in social behavior

(Boogert et al., 2014; Dettmer et al., 2017; Farine et al., 2015; Freeman et al., 2021; Pryce et al.,

2011; Reyes-Contreras et al., 2019; Sih, 2011) and health (e.g., (Turecki & Meaney, 2016).

In this study, we used Burton's Mouthbrooder (*Astatotilapia burtoni*), a highly social

cichlid fish and model system in social neuroscience (Fernald & Maruska, 2012; Hofmann,

2003; Stevenson et al., 2018), to investigate the behavioral mechanisms of early-life social

effects and the consequences for behavior and HPI axis function. The vast majority of research

on this species has focused on adults, which form mixed-sex, hierarchical social communities.

Dominant males are colorful, territorial, and reproductively active. In contrast, subordinate males

are drab in coloration, shoal with females, and are reproductively suppressed. Social status is

socially-regulated, and individuals regularly transition between dominant and subordinate

positions (Fernald & Maruska, 2012; Hofmann, 2003). Juveniles also form status relationships

(Solomon-Lane et al., 2022), and both juveniles and adults express a suite of highly-conserved

social behaviors, such as aggression, affiliation, courtship, and cooperation (Fernald & Hirata,

1979; Fernald & Maruska, 2012; Solomon-Lane et al., 2022; Weitekamp & Hofmann, 2017).

Although sex and social status have strong effects on adult behavior, individual variation

persists, including in the frequency or quality of behavioral expression, such as aggression,

territoriality, courtship, reproductive behavior, and maternal behavior (Alward et al., 2021;

Friesen et al., 2022; Fulmer et al., 2017; M. R. Kidd et al., 2013; Maruska, Becker, et al., 2013;

Renn et al., 2009); tenure in a dominant vs. subordinate role (Hofmann et al., 1999); female mate

choice (M. R. Kidd et al., 2013); social learning (Rodriguez-Santiago et al., 2020); and cognition

(Wallace & Hofmann, 2021). HPI axis signaling also varies among adults (Alcazar et al., 2016;

Chen & Fernald, 2008; Clement et al., 2005; Dijkstra et al., 2017; Greenwood et al., 2003;

Korzan et al., 2014; Maruska et al., 2022) and is highly responsive to social context, such as

social status and changes in status (Carpenter et al., 2014; Chen & Fernald, 2008; Clement et al.,

2005; Fox et al., 1997; Huffman et al., 2015; Korzan et al., 2014; Maruska et al., 2022; Maruska,

Zhang, et al., 2013; Parikh et al., 2006), group social dynamics (Maguire et al., 2021), social

habituation (Weitekamp & Hofmann, 2017), and in response to an intruder (Alcazar et al., 2016;

Weitekamp et al., 2017).

Developmental plasticity may be an important source of individual variation in behavior

and HPI axis function among adults (Fernald & Hirata, 1979; Fraley & Fernald, 1982; Solomon-

Lane & Hofmann, 2019). We have previously demonstrated early-life social effects in juvenile

A. burtoni in response to early-life social group size. Juveniles reared in social groups (16 fish)

developed to be more active, more socially interactive, and less submissive in a subordinate role

compared to pair-reared juveniles. Whole brain gene expression related to HPI axis function was

also altered, including elevated GR1a expression in group-reared animals and tight co-expression

of candidate genes (including GR1a, GR1b, GR2, MR, and CRF) in pair-reared, but not group-

reared or isolated, juveniles (Solomon-Lane & Hofmann, 2019). Juveniles in this study were not

observed in the rearing environment, and there are multiple, possible behavioral mechanisms

responsible for these effects (Solomon-Lane & Hofmann, 2019; Taborsky, 2016). Individuals

reared in larger and/or more complex groups may interact socially at higher rates, experience a

greater diversity of types of social interaction (e.g., affiliative, aggressive, cooperative, etc.), gain

experience in multiple social roles (e.g., dominant and subordinate, younger and older) (Chase et

al., 2022; Solomon-Lane et al., 2022; Williamson et al., 2016), have more social partners, have

social partners of varied identities / traits (e.g., age, body size, life history stage diversity)

(Arnold & Taborsky, 2010; Bölting & von Engelhardt, 2017; Branchi & Alleva, 2006; Taborsky

et al., 2012; White et al., 2010), experience interactions involving more actors simultaneously

(i.e., 3-way, or more, interactions), and learn indirectly by watching others (e.g., (Desjardins et

al., 2012; Oliveira et al., 1998). For juvenile *A. burtoni*, group size and the relative body sizes of

individuals affects social behavior and group structure. For example, pairs and triads containing

same-sized fish are less hierarchical (Solomon-Lane et al., 2022).

In this study, we tested the hypothesis that the number of social partners experienced by

juvenile *A. burtoni* during early-life is a behavioral mechanism that shapes behavioral phenotype

and HPI axis signaling. The number of social partners is one clear way that groups and pairs

differ (Solomon-Lane & Hofmann, 2019). There is also evidence from other species that this

may be a meaningful attribute of social experience that varies across individuals. Assortative

social interactions have been observed in a variety of species. For example, more socially

interactive juvenile yellow-bellied marmots (*Marmota flaviventris*) had more novel social

partners (Monclús et al., 2012); juvenile male geladas (*Theropithecus gelada*) had more novel

play partners than juvenile females (Barale et al., 2015); there is variation in the number of

friendships initiated and reciprocated by juvenile rhesus macaques (Weinstein et al., 2014); and

bold three-spined sticklebacks (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*) had a larger number of social contacts

compared to shy fish (Pike et al., 2008). For juvenile *A. burtoni* in pairs and triads, individuals

are not equally likely to initiate interactions (Solomon-Lane et al., 2022), suggesting that in

larger, more naturalistic groups, social network connectivity may vary considerably, as it does in

adults (Maguire et al., 2021). Direct manipulations of social partner number can also affect social

behavioral development. For example, juvenile male brown-headed cowbirds reared in dynamic

flocks outcompeted males reared in stable flocks of the same size (White et al., 2010).

To manipulate the number of social partners, we reared juveniles in stable pairs (2 fish,

one partner each), in stable groups (6 fish, 5 partners each), or in socialized pairs, in which one

member of the pair was changed 5 times over the course of the 26 day experiment (2 fish at a

time in the pair, 5 total partners each) (Figure 1). This design also allows us to compare the

effects of group size (pair vs. group) and social stability (stable vs. socialized). We observed

social interactions in the different rearing environments to quantify social experience, and then

we tested the effects on individual social behavior in a series of behavior assays. We

hypothesized that the number of social partners would be the strongest influence on behavioral

phenotype. If the number of early-life social partners was an important behavioral mechanism

underlying development in Solomon-Lane & Hofmann (2019), then in this study, we predict that

juveniles from the stable groups and socialized pairs will be more active and socially interactive

in novel social context, as well as less submissive in a subordinate role. To test the hypothesis

that early-life social experience affects HPI axis signaling, we collected water-borne cortisol

following the individual behavior assays. By investigating specific behavioral mechanisms

underlying behavioral development and neuroendocrine function, this research can provide

insights into processes of developmental plasticity and uncover the origins of adult phenotype.

METHODS

Animals

The juveniles used in this experiment were bred in the laboratory. The breeding adult *A.*

burtoni are a laboratory population that descended ~65-70 generations from a wild caught stock

from Lake Tanganyika (Fernald & Hirata, 1977). In the naturalistic, mixed-sex adult breeding

communities, there are dominant males that are territorial, reproductively active and colorful, as

well as subordinate males that shoal with the females, are reproductively suppressed, and drab in

color. Individual males may transition regularly between statuses, depending on the social

context (Fernald & Maruska, 2012; Hofmann, 2003). Females are courted by dominant males

and lay their eggs in his territory. She then immediately scoops up the eggs into her mouth, and

then male fertilizes them. The developing larvae are then brooded in the female's buccal cavity

for ~14 days. In the wild, and under some laboratory conditions, mothers guard their offspring

for 10 days or more after initially releasing the free-swimming fry from her mouth (Renn et al.,

2009).

In this study, 86 fry were removed from the buccal cavities of seven mothers at

approximately 5-7 days post-fertilization. Individual broods were next placed in shallow water in

a petri dish, and a digital image was taken with a ruler for scale. ImageJ was used to measure

standard length (SL, mm) (Schneider et al., 2012), from the tip of the jaw to the caudal peduncle.

Broods ranged in size from 4-21 fry (mean: 12.43 ± 2.84 fry, median: 15), and fry size ranged

from 4.59-8.13 mm SL (mean: 5.96 ± 0.095 mm, median: 5.81 mm). See Supplemental Table 1

for mean, median, minimum, and maximum SL of fry per brood. Fry from all of the broods were

then placed briefly (~30 min) in a common bucket to intermix. We used a hand net to remove

individuals from the bucket and haphazardly assigned them to different home tanks and

treatment groups, including stable groups, socialized pairs, and stable pairs (see below for

descriptions). We selected fry at this early developmental stage before overt social interactions

occur (Fraley & Fernald, 1982) so that even during the experimental set up, when fry were

briefly placed together in the same bucket, individuals would not gain any experience with social

interactions. During this time, they were briefly exposed to social sensory cues (visual,

chemosensory, tactile). In their experimental tanks, fry were allowed to mature for 7 days, when

visual inspection confirmed their yolks had been fully absorbed and they were mobile.

Methylene blue was added to the water to reduce the incidence of fungal infection during this

time. The experimental timeline started after the 7-day developmental period. The sex ratio of

fish in this experiment is not known because sex cannot be determined anatomically until

reproductive maturation. The sex ratio of *A. burtoni* broods is approximately 1:1 (Heule et al.,

2014). All research was done in compliance with the Institutional Animal Care and use

Committee in the Keck Science Department of Scripps, Pitzer, and Claremont McKenna

Colleges (IACUC Protocol # 19-001).

Early-life social experiences

Fry were reared for 26 days in one of three conditions to manipulate early-life social

experience: stable groups of 6 fish (n=6 groups), stable pairs of 2 fish (n=7 pairs), and socialized

pairs (n=8 pairs) (Figure 1). These treatment groups were designed to manipulate the number of

early-life social partners. In the stable groups, every individual had 5 social partners. In the stable

pairs, every individual had 1 social partner. In the socialized pairs, one individual was removed

from the tank using a hand net every 5 days and was replaced with a novel partner. The fish that

was removed was also transferred to another socialized pair tank with a novel partner. After a

total of 5 transfers, all of the fish in the socialized pairs were exposed to a total of 5 social

partners, the same number as fish in the stable groups. However, the size of the social group for

socialized pairs was always 2 fish, the same as in the stable pairs. As a control, on the day fish in

the socialized pairs were transferred, we used a hand net to remove one fish from each of the

stable pairs and stable groups. The fish was immediately returned to the same home tank so that

group membership in the stable pairs and stable groups was consistent.

Stable and socialized pairs were housed in small acrylic aquaria (23 × 15 × 15 cm), and

the stable groups were housed in larger acrylic aquaria (30 x 20 x 17 cm). One, small terracotta

pot (5 cm at the widest diameter) was placed in each aquarium, and an air stone was used to keep

the water oxygenated. There was no substrate on the bottom of the aquaria. White plastic

dividers were placed to prevent visual contact between aquaria. The fish were maintained on a

12:12 light:dark schedule at 24°C, and they were fed Hikari Middle Larval Stage Plankton

(Pentair Aquatic Eco-Systems, Cary, NC) once a day. We mixed 0.015 g of fish food in 200 mL

of water. The mixture was actively stirred, and a transfer pipette was used to add 1 mL to the

pairs and 3 mL to the groups.

Tagging individual fish

To track individuals as they developed over the course of the experiment, we tagged each

fish, from all treatments, following the first rotation in the socialized pairs. We waited until this

time so the fish would be slightly bigger, as their small size is a challenge for existing tagging

methods (Hill & Grossman, 1987; Lotrich & Meredith, 1974; Solomon-Lane & Hofmann, 2018;

Thresher & Gronell, 1978). We first lightly anesthetized fry in 0.03 g MS-222 / L aquarium

water (buffered with sodium bicarbonate to pH 7.0 –7.5). They were then removed from the

water and placed on a wet paper towel. We placed a small amount of Alcian Blue (Fisher

Scientific, Pittsburgh, PA) powder onto the dorsal muscle of the fish and perforated the surface

of the fish using a pulled capillary tube micropipette. This method of tattooing led the ink to seep

into the tissue of the fish. We used different tag locations (left or right; anterior, middle, or

posterior regions) on the dorsal muscle to differentiate individuals in the same tank. In the

socialized pairs, tagging was sufficient in most tanks to transfer the same individual each time.

The persistence of the tag varied, and in the best cases, it remained visible for 3 weeks. If the

tags were not visible in the socialized pair, the smaller individual was transferred.

Survival and number of early-life social partners

The tagging procedure had an 85% survival rate. For fish that did not survive tagging, or

if a fish died at another point in the experiment, it was replaced with a fish of similar size and

age. The replacement fish were not included in the individual behavior assays conducted at the

end of the experimental rearing period (see below). We tracked the actual number of social

partners for each experimental tank. All fish in the socialized pairs had exactly 5 social partners.

Stable group fish had an average of 6.43 ± 0.14 social partners. Stable pair fish had an average of

1.2 ± 0.13 social partners. In our analyses, we consider the treatment groups as categorical,

although there is limited variation in the number of social partners (Supplemental Figure 1).

Behavioral Observations

Home tanks: We recorded social behavior in the home tanks 2 times during the rearing period.

Cameras (Warrior 4.0, Security Camera Warehouse, Asheville, NC) were positioned above the

tanks, and with the tank lids removed, all areas of the tank were visible except under the

terracotta pot. Using Solomon Coder (www.solomoncoder.com), 10 minutes of video was scored

for approaches and displacements. Approaches were counted anytime one fish swam directly

towards any part of another fish, within 3 body lengths. If the approached fish swam away in any

direction, it was scored as a displacement. Because the identification tags were not visible on the

video, we counted the total number of social interactions (approaches, displacements) for the

group or pair. We also quantified the number of times a fish entered the terracotta pot territory,

defined as at least 50% of a fish's body crossing into / under the pot. Exiting the territory was

highly correlated with entering the territory (p<0.0001, r^2=0.97); therefore, we only present data

for entering. To measure social grouping, we captured screenshots from the video every 30 s for

a total of 20 time points. Distance was measured between every dyad, from a focal point in the

center of the head, using ImageJ (Schneider et al., 2012). The researchers scoring behavior were

unaware of the treatment of the pairs (socialized vs. stable), but the stable groups were easily

recognizable. For behavior and distance, we analyzed the raw values (behaviors per minute and

distance), as well as scaled values to account for differences in group size (behaviors per minute

divided by 2 for the pairs and divided by 6 for the groups) and tank size (distance divided by the

hypotenuse of the tank) among treatments.

Individual Behavior Assays: After the 26-day rearing period (on days 27 and 28), we measured

individual behavior in a series of assays, including for open field exploration, social cue

investigation, dominance behavior, and subordinate behavior. Every fish in the socialized (n=9)

and stable pairs (n=10) was included in the individual assays. Three of the 6 fish from each

stable group was selected randomly to be included in the individual assays using a random

number generator (n=14). The procedures have been described previously in detail (Solomon-

Lane & Hofmann, 2019). Briefly, these assays (or similar) are used across species and assess

different elements of behavioral phenotype, including behaviors affected by early-life social

experience (Solomon-Lane & Hofmann, 2019). The open field exploration is used to assess

locomotion and anxiety-like behaviors (e.g., (Cachat et al., 2010; Prut & Belzung, 2003), and the

social cue investigation is used as a measure of social motivation or preference (e.g., (Bonuti &

Morato, 2018; Moy et al., 2004). The dominant and subordinate behavior assays are used to

assess how the focal fish behaves when in the position to be dominant or subordinate. In social

groups, including for juvenile *A. burtoni* (Solomon-Lane et al., 2022), most individuals will be

both subordinate to some group members and dominant over others at a given time (e.g., (Chase

et al., 2022). Social status also changes over a lifetime (Fernald & Maruska, 2012; Hofmann,

2003).

The behavioral assays took place in novel experimental aquaria, which were the same

size as the pairs' home tanks (3.27 L, 23 × 15 × 15 cm). Cameras recorded behavior from above,

and all areas of the tank were visible except under the terracotta pot. A permanent marker was

used to delineate different zones (Figure 1B): the territory zone contained a small terracotta pot,

close zone, far zone, and investigate zone, where the social cue was placed for the social cue

investigation assay. Each assay lasted for 30 min. The focal fish was alone in the tank for the

open field exploration (minutes 20-30 were analyzed). For the social cue investigation, a novel

cue fish inside of a 20 mL glass vial was placed in the investigate zone (see placement in Figure

1B, minutes 2-12 were analyzed). In the open field and social cue assays, we recorded the

number of times a fish entered a zone, and how long it spent there. After removing the vial and

cue fish, a free-swimming, novel fish that was smaller than the focal was added to the tank to

assess dominant behavior (minutes 2-12 were analyzed). After removing the small fish, a free-

swimming novel fish larger than the focal was added to assess subordinate behavior (minutes 2-

12 were analyzed). In the dominant and subordinate behavior assays, we scored approaches and

displacements. The researchers scoring behavior were unaware of the treatment of the focal fish.

From the approaches and displacements in the dominant and subordinate behavior assays,

we calculated two additional social measures using the *compete* package in R (Curley, 2016).

First, we calculated an adjusted version of David's Score, which is a dominance index. Rather

than categorizing all social interactions as a win or loss, we incorporated both approaches and

displacements, such that the agonistic outcome of individual i in interaction with another

individual j is the number of times that i displaces j, divided by the totalnumber of interactions

(approaches) between i and j (i.e., i displaces j / (i approaches j + j approaches i)). The rest of the

calculations were done as described in (Gammell et al., 2003). See Supplemental Information for

(Solomon-Lane et al., 2022) for the R code. Second, we calculated directional consistency index

(DCI) as a measure of whether patterns of approaching in the dyads is reciprocal, from perfectly

reciprocal (0) to unidirectional (1). We also used the *compete* package to run a randomization

test to determine if the directionality was significantly more asymmetrical (unidirectional) than

expected by chance (Leiva et al., 2008).

Water-borne cortisol

Following the individual behavior assays, we collected water-borne hormone samples.

This is a non-invasive method of quantifying steroid hormones, and values strongly correlate

with circulating hormone levels (C. E. Kidd et al., 2010). We chose cortisol, as HPI axis function

is often affected by early-life experience (e.g., (Champagne & Curley, 2005; Taborsky et al.,

2013) and cortisol can correlate with behavior and behavioral syndromes (e.g., (Koolhaas et al.,

1999). Focal fish were placed individually in clean glass vials filled with 15 mL of clean

aquarium water for 2 hrs. Visual barriers were placed around the vials to limit disturbances to the

fish during the collection. After two hours, fish were removed from the vial using a hand net

rinsed in clean aquarium water, and samples were frozen at 4°C until processing. Hormones were

extracted from the water samples using 3 cc Sep-Pak Vac C18 columns (Water Associates,

Milford, MA). Columns were first primed by passing 2 mL methanol through the columns twice,

being careful not to let the columns run dry. This was followed by 2 mL ultrapure water through

the columns twice. The thawed samples were then passed through the columns from the sample

vials using the vacuum pump. Ultrapure water (2 mL twice) was then passed through the

columns again, followed by 5 min of the vacuum to dry the columns. Finally, the hormone

samples were eluted into 13 x 100 borosilicate test tubes by passing 2 mL methanol through the

columns twice. The vacuum was used again to try the columns. The sample in methanol was then

evaporated under a gentle stream of nitrogen at 37°C and resuspended to a volume of 200 μL per

sample (5% EtOH and 95% ELISA buffer). Resuspended samples were shaken on a multitube

vortex for 1 hr before being stored at -20°C. Before measuring cortisol, samples were thawed

and shaken again on the multitube vortex for 1 hr. ELISAs were completed according to the

supplier's instructions (Cayman Chemical, Ann Arbor, Michigan).

Cortisol data are presented here as pg hormone per mL sample volume per hr sample

collection per g body weight. During hormone collection, fish excrete hormones into the water

through their gills, urine, and feces. The gills of larger fish have a larger surface area, thus body

size can influence hormone levels. Fish size was measured following the collection of water-

borne hormones. Mass was measured on an analytical balance, and SL was measured using

ImageJ (Schneider et al., 2012) from digital images with a rule for scale.

Statistical Analyses

All statistical analyses were conducted using R Studio (R version 4.2.1) (RStudio Team,

2022). Results were considered significant at the $p<0.05$ level, and averages ± standard error of

the mean are included in the text. The box of the box and whisker plots show the median and the

first and third quartiles. The whiskers extend to the largest and smallest observations within or

equal to 1.5 times the interquartile range. To test for the effects of early-life social experience,

we compared body size and condition; behavior in the home tank rearing environments (total

behaviors per minute and behaviors per fish per minute); spatial distancing in the home tank

rearing environments (raw distance and scaled to account for the different sized aquaria for pairs

vs. groups); behavior in the open field exploration and social cue investigation (frequency

entering, and time in, the territory, close, far, and investigate zones); social behavior

(approaches, displacements, approaches received, submissions) and status (David's score, DCI)

in the dominant and subordinate assays; cortisol; and principal components (see below, PCs 1-5)

across fish reared in the stable groups, socialized pairs, or stable pairs. For data that met the

assumptions of parametric statistics, we used one-way ANOVAs. The cortisol data were log

transformed first to meet the assumption of normal distribution. *Post hoc* analysis of significant

ANOVA results was calculated using Tukey HSD tests. For data that did not meet the

assumptions of parametric statistics, we used non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis tests, and Dunn's

tests were used for *post hoc* analysis of significant results. Eta squared is reported for the effect

size of both the one-way ANVOAs and Kruskal-Wallis tests (small effect: $0 < \eta 2 < 0.01$;

moderate: $0.01 < \eta 2 < 0.06$; large: $0.06 < \eta 2$). We used Principal Components Analysis (PCA) to

identify how behavior in the open field exploration, social cue investigation, dominance behavior

assay, and subordinate behavior assay, and cortisol clustered.

RESULTS

Body size and condition

To determine whether rearing experience in a stable group, socialized pair, or stable pair

affected body size and condition, we compared SL, mass, and condition index (Fulton's K),

across treatment groups. We found that mass differed significantly across treatment groups

(Kruskal-Wallis: $\chi^2(2)=6.39$, p=0.041, $\eta^2=0.15$; Supplemental Figure 2A). *Post hoc* analysis

showed juveniles reared in stable pairs were significantly heavier than those from stable groups

(Dunn, Bonferroni correction: p=0.036). There were no significant differences between stable

groups and socialized pairs (p=0.63) or between stable pairs and socialized pairs (p=0.82). There

were no significant treatment differences in SL (ANOVA: $F_{2,30}=2.15$, p=0.14; Supplemental

Figure 2B). Because we found an effect of rearing experience on mass, but not SL, we also asked

whether condition index was affected by treatment. We found no significant treatment

differences in condition index (ANOVA: $F_{2,30}=0.45$, p=0.62, Supplemental Figure 2C). Mass

was also positively correlated with water-borne cortisol levels (p=0.017, $r^2=0.15$, Supplemental

Figure 2D); therefore, we corrected for body size in the cortisol analyses below.

Home tank social behavior

We observed juveniles in the stable groups, socialized pairs, and stable pairs to

understand the differences in social experience and environment among the rearing treatments.

Unsurprisingly, there were significantly more approaches and displacements in groups compared

to pairs, and there were significantly more entrances to the territory in groups compared to stable

pairs (Figure 2A). There were no differences in efficiency (Figure 2B). There were also no

differences in rates of behavioral interactions per fish. Mean dyad distance was significantly

larger in groups than pairs (Figure 2C), but interestingly, the minimum dyad distance was

significantly smaller in groups than socialized pairs (Figure 2D). There were no treatment

differences in mean dyad distance when scaled for tank size. Statistics are reported in Table 1

and Supplemental Table 2.

Open field exploration and social cue investigation

For the open field exploration and social cue investigation, we compared across treatment

groups for the frequency of entering each zone of the tank, as well as time spent in each zone.

Statistics are reported in Table 2 (Supplemental Figure 3). Overall, we found for the open field

exploration that fish from the socialized pairs entered the territory zone significantly more

frequently than stable pair fish, and fish from the stable groups spent significantly more time in

the far zone than stable pair fish. In the social cue investigation, we found that social group fish

entered the far zone significantly more frequently and spent significantly more time in the

territory and far zones, than fish reared in stable pairs.

Dominance and Subordinate Assays

To determine whether rearing experience affected social behavior and status, we

quantified patterns of social interaction between the focal fish and a novel social partner (cue

fish). Because juvenile (and adult, (Alward et al., 2021) a size advantage benefits dominance

(Solomon-Lane et al., 2022), in pairing the focal fish with a smaller cue fish (dominance assay),

the focal fish has the opportunity to express social behaviors as the dominant. In pairing the focal

fish with a larger cue fish (subordinate assay), the focal fish can express social behaviors as the

subordinate. We found significant differences in social behavior and status in both the

dominance and subordinate assays (statistics reported in Table 3, Figure 3). In the dominance

assay, socialized pair fish approached and displaced significantly more than stable pair fish, and

their David's Scores were significantly higher than both stable pair and stable group fish. In the

subordinate assay, socialized pair fish received significantly more approaches than stable pair

fish from the larger cue fish with which they were paired. Socialized pairs with their cue fish also

had significantly lower directional consistency than stable group or stable pair fish.

Cortisol

Following the behavior assays, we collected water-borne cortisol to determine whether

hormone levels were affected by rearing experience and/or associated with behavioral phenotype

(see PCA below). We found there were no significant differences in cortisol across treatments

(ANOVA, log transform: $F_{2,29}=2.30$, p=0.12, Figure 4).

Integrative analysis of behavior, social status, and cortisol

Given the treatment differences we identified across the open field exploration, social cue

investigation, dominance assay, and subordinate assay, we next used PCA to integrate across

assays. This allows us to identify subsets of factors that together contribute to juvenile phenotype

and test if suites of factors (principal components, PCs) differ significantly across treatment

groups. To determine which variables to include from the open field exploration and social cue

investigation (time and frequency in the territory, close, far, and investigate zones), we ran an

initial PCA with just these variables. Examining the vector plot for PC1 with PC2 (Supplemental

Figure 4), we found that nearly all of the open field exploration measures were strongly aligned

with the same measure in the social cue investigation (i.e., the vectors for open field and social

cue time in the territory zone are identical). The exceptions were for time spent in the far and

investigate zones. Therefore, to avoid unnecessary replication, we chose to include all of the

variables from the social cue investigation, in addition to time spent in the far and investigate

zones during the open field exploration. From the dominant and subordinate assays, we included

approaches, displacements, approaches received, submissions, and David's score. Finally, we

included cortisol.

Here, we focused on the first 5 PCs, which together explain 76.6% of the variation in the

data (Figure 5A). We found significant effects of rearing experience on PC1 (25.1%) and PC5

(8.48%). For PC1, stable pairs were significantly higher than stable groups, and there was a trend

for stable pairs to be higher than socialized pairs (p=0.063) (Figure 5B). Behaviors from the

dominance behavior assay and the social cue investigation assay loaded strongly on PC1.

Approaches and displacements as a dominant; time in, and frequency entering, the far and

investigate zones during the social cue investigation; and frequency entering the close zone

during the social cue investigation loaded strongly in the same direction. Time spent in the

territory zone during the social cue investigation loaded strongly in the opposite direction. For

PC5, socialized pairs were significantly higher than both stable groups and stable pairs (Figure

5C). David's Score from the dominance assay and time in the investigate zone during the social

cue investigation loaded strongly together in the same direction. In the opposite direction,

submissions as a dominant; cortisol; time and frequency in the close zone during the social cue

investigation; and the frequency entering the territory zone during the social cue investigation

loaded strongly together. Statistics for the PC1-PC5 treatment comparisons are in Table 4 (also

see Supplemental Figure 5).

DISCUSSION

We investigated the effects of early-life social experience on social behavior and

neuroendocrine stress axis function in juvenile *A. burtoni*. We tested the hypothesis that the

number of novel social partners experienced during early-life is a behavioral mechanism driving

variation in behavioral development. In manipulating the number of social partners, our

experimental treatment groups—stable groups, socialized pairs, and stable pairs—also varied in

social group size (pairs vs. group) and group stability (socialized vs. stable). We present strong

evidence for early-life social effects on juvenile social behavior, consistent with previous studies

in this species (Fernald & Hirata, 1979; Fraley & Fernald, 1982; Solomon-Lane & Hofmann,

2019). In particular, our results support two behavioral mechanisms: the number of social

partners and social stability. Although early-life social effects are widely documented across

social species, the specific attributes of social experience that affect the mechanisms and

trajectory of developmental plasticity are not typically identified (Kasumovic, 2013; Taborsky,

2016). The social interactions and social spacing we observed in the home tanks also provide

insights into how social environments vary within and across treatments and may shape the

experiences individuals accrue during development. Causation at this level is needed because it

is these environmental elements that interact with genes dynamically over development to

influence plasticity and the emergence of adult phenotype (Kasumovic, 2013; Taborsky, 2016,

2017). Overall, it is likely that multiple behavioral mechanisms contribute and interact to shape

behavioral development (e.g., (Branchi et al., 2013).

We found that manipulating early-life social experience affected behavior across multiple

contexts, including the open field exploration, social cue investigation, dominance behavior

assay, and subordinate behavior assay. Principal components analysis revealed that these effects

were correlated across contexts. Principal component 1 (25.1%) and PC5 (8.5%), which both

differed significantly across treatment groups, had behaviors from multiple assays that loaded

strongly. These results support our previous finding that juvenile *A. burtoni* behavior can form a

syndrome, and an individual's position along the syndrome continuum is sensitive to early-life

social experience (Solomon-Lane & Hofmann, 2019). A syndrome is a population-level measure

in which rank-order differences between individuals are correlated across contexts and/or over

time (Bell, 2007). Behavioral syndromes have been identified across species and can indicate

consistency in individual behavior across contexts and/or over time (Bell, 2007; Sih, Bell, &

Johnson, 2004; Sih, Bell, Johnson, et al., 2004). The PC1 syndrome included approaches and

displacements in the dominance assay loading strongly in the same direction with time in and

frequency entering the investigate and far zones, and frequency entering the close zone, during

the social cue investigation. Time in the territory zone during the social cue investigation loaded

in the opposite direction. This is syndrome is highly similar to the one we identified after rearing

juvenile *A. burtoni* in pairs or social groups of 16 fish (Solomon-Lane & Hofmann, 2019).

The treatment differences in PC1 are most consistent with an effect of the number of

social partners. Stable pairs had significantly higher PC1 values compared to stable groups, and

there was a strong trend to be higher than socialized pairs (p=0.063). There were no differences

between stable groups and socialized pairs. Juveniles that experienced more social partners

during early-life were more active during the social cue investigation, spent less time in the

territory in the presence of a social cue, and were more socially interactive in a dominant social

role. The direction of this effect is also the same as in our previous study: group-reared juveniles

were more active and socially interactive than pair-reared juveniles (Solomon-Lane & Hofmann,

2019). This suggests that social experiences resulting from more novel partners may be an

important behavioral mechanism underlying the effect of group size. Syndromes involving

activity and social interaction are common across species (e.g., (Conrad et al., 2011; Näslund &

Johnsson, 2016) and may also be related to bold-shy and proactive-reactive behaviors (Bell,

2007; Conrad et al., 2011; Groothuis & Carere, 2005; Koolhaas et al., 1999; Sih, Bell, Johnson,

et al., 2004).

It is not yet known how variable the number of social partners is for juvenile *A. burtoni* in

the wild or in larger, more naturalistic laboratory social groups. Evidence from a diversity of

other species suggests there can be considerable individual variation. In many species, siblings

(and parents) are the most proximate—and sometimes the only—early-life social contacts. The

number of offspring produced can vary both among individuals and within individuals across

reproductive bouts / over time. Within a group or population, individuals can also vary in the size

and makeup of their social network or niche (Barale et al., 2015; Beirão-Campos et al., 2016;

Branchi et al., 2013; Croft et al., 2005; Förster & Cords, 2005; Maguire et al., 2021; Monclús et

al., 2012; Pike et al., 2008; Saltz et al., 2016; Weinstein et al., 2014; Weinstein & Capitanio,

2008, 2008). For juveniles, this can have long-term, phenotypic effects (Branchi et al., 2013;

Monclús et al., 2012; Weinstein et al., 2014; Weinstein & Capitanio, 2008). Socialization

strategies are also used with animals valuable to humans, such as working dogs (Gfrerer et al.,

2018), family dogs (Howell et al., 2015), and livestock like piglets (Morgan et al., 2014; Salazar

et al., 2018). Although many studies have manipulated the number of early-life social partners as

a consequence of group size, group size could exert independent or interacting effects on

phenotype. In two studies that also controlled for group size, brown-headed cowbirds (*Molothrus*

ater) were housed in stable or dynamic flocks, in which flock members were exchanged multiple

times with novel birds. Dynamic flock males had more variable social networks over time, larger

signing networks, and outcompeted stable flock males in mating opportunities (White et al.,

2010). When housing conditions were later reversed, the new dynamic flock males still had

higher reproductive success, which was achieved via changes in social strategy (Gersick et al.,

2012). For juvenile *A. burtoni* in pairs and triads, individuals are not equally likely to initiate

interactions. Both group size and relative body size influenced social group structure (Solomon-

Lane et al., 2022). This suggests that, like adults (Maguire et al., 2021), social network position

and connectivity may vary considerably across individuals, with consequences for

developmental plasticity and behavioral development.

The treatment differences in PC5 (8.5%) support an effect of early-life social stability.

Socialized pairs had significantly higher PC5 values than stable groups and stable pairs, which

were not different from each other. David's score in the dominance behavior assay loaded in the

same direction as time in the investigate zone during the social cue investigation. Submissions in

the dominance behavior assay, frequency entering the territory zone in the social cue

investigation, time in and frequency entering the close zone in the social cue investigation, and

water-borne cortisol loaded together in the opposite direction. Socialized pairs were more

dominant in the dominance behavior assay, spent less time in and near the territory zone, spent

more time in the investigate zone, and had lower cortisol levels than stable groups or pairs. This

suite of behaviors for PC5 shares multiple similarities with the PC1 syndrome. Dominance

behavior is represented as high rates of approaching and displacing on PC1 and as the opposing

loadings of David's score (indication of dominant status) and submissions (indication of

subordinate status) on PC5. Dominant juvenile *A. burtoni* approach and displace at significantly

higher rates than subordinates (Solomon-Lane et al., 2022). For PC5, being in or near the

territory zone, with less time in the investigate zone, was associated with low status when given

the opportunity to be dominant. This is mirrored on PC1 by the negative association between

being in the territory zone and approaching and displacing in the dominance behavior assay. The

relative dominance of juveniles from the socialized pairs is also consistent with having

significantly lower directional consistency (i.e., more agonistically symmetrical) in the

subordinate behavior assay. In our previous study, group-reared juveniles were less submissive

in a subordinate role than pair-reared juveniles (Solomon-Lane & Hofmann, 2019). It is possible

this was not the case for stable group juveniles in this study due to group size differences (6 fish

vs. 16 fish).

The most striking difference for PC5 and the effect of social stability is the involvement

of cortisol. We found no treatment differences in water-borne cortisol levels, and PC5 was the

only PC on which cortisol loaded strongly. That high cortisol was associated with these

variables—lower social status, less exploratory behavior, and more time in the territory away

from a novel cue—is consistent with numerous other studies. For example, HPA/I axis function

is correlated with social status in many hierarchical species, and elevated cortisol is a

consequence of subordinate in approximately half of species, depending on how status is

established and maintained (Creel, 2001). In adult male *A. burtoni*, the relationship between

status and HPI axis function varies across contexts, but can be elevated in subordinates (Maruska

et al., 2022). In juveniles, we have previously found that group-rearing increases the expression

of whole brain glucocorticoid receptor (GR) 1a, which may increase negative feedback

efficiency and lower cortisol (Solomon-Lane & Hofmann, 2019). Higher GR1a and GR1b

expression, and lower GR2 and mineralocorticoid receptor (MR) expression, is also associated

with higher dominance status (Solomon-Lane et al., 2022). Together, these findings are

consistent with the lower cortisol levels and higher social status we see in socialized pairs.

Coping styles are an example of an integrative phenotype in which a behavioral syndrome aligns

with stress physiology. Proactive copers are more active, aggressive, and less responsive to

stress, including lower baseline glucocorticoid levels and more efficient negative feedback

mechanisms than reactive copers. Coping styles are sensitive to early-life social effects and have

been observed across species (Koolhaas et al., 1999). Our data suggest that juveniles reared in

socialized pairs, and group-reared juveniles in our previous study (Solomon-Lane & Hofmann,

2019), may be proactive copers, a hypothesis that should be tested directly. Adult *A. burtoni* do

not appear to form coping styles (Butler et al., 2018). Early-life social stability is known to affect

HPA/I axis function across species and affect behaviors related to status, activity, boldness-

shyness, and neophobia, which are related to the behavioral variables loading on PC5. In these

cases, however, instability tends to negatively impacts statu and activity and enhance shyness

and neophobia. This is the opposite pattern to our data. An alternative explanation is that

familiarity shaped behavior in the assays. The dominance and subordinate behavior assays were

in a novel tank with a novel conspecific. This is highly similar to the way we socialized the pairs.

Familiarity could lead socialized pairs to appear more active and competent in the assays. A

future study can directly test these potential behavioral mechanisms of stability and familiarity.

In either case, social experience has an important role shaping phenotype.

We observed fish in their rearing environments to gain insights into the specific social

experiences and social sensory cues, or proximate behavioral mechanisms, responsible for the

early-life social effects we observed (Taborsky, 2016). It is logical that with more individuals,

rates of behavior were higher in the stable groups compared to the pairs. Rates of behavior per

fish did not differ across treatment groups, and there were no differences in total agonistic

efficiency. These data confirm that the group social environment has more opportunities for

social experiences, which can include direct involvement in an interaction and observations of

others interacting (Desjardins et al., 2012; Oliveira et al., 1998). The mean distance between

dyads was also significantly larger in stable groups than the pairs, and, interestingly, the smallest

dyad distance was significantly smaller in groups than social pairs. There were no differences

across treatments when scaled for the size of the tank. We were unable to identify and track

individuals because the ink tags were not visible on video. As a result, we could not quantify

individual social experience, social status, social network position, or spatial position, which we

hypothesize are causally related to behavioral development and phenotype (Kasumovic, 2013;

Taborsky, 2016). The evidence that social interactions are assortative within groups is

overwhelming across species (e.g., (Chase et al., 2022; Croft et al., 2005, 2009; Pike et al., 2008;

Williamson et al., 2016), and juvenile *A. burtoni* form social status relationships and nuanced

social structures (Solomon-Lane et al., 2022). Therefore, we expect social status experience and

the degree of agonistic asymmetry across social partners to be particularly important for

behavioral development. In addition to spatial proximity potentially being an indicator of social

relationships, it may also affect social sensory cue perception and communication, for example,

via mechanosensory and chemosensory cues in adult *A. burtoni* (Butler & Maruska, 2016;

Nikonov et al., 2017).

Overall, our work demonstrates that multiple behavioral mechanisms—the number of

early-life social partners and social stability—affect juvenile *A. burtoni* development and

phenotype, including integrated behavioral and neuroendocrine characteristics. In addition to

manipulating social experience directly, we observed juveniles in their rearing environments,

which are necessary steps towards understanding the social experiences accrued during

development and the mechanisms by which early experiences exert long-term and

disproportionately strong effects on adult phenotype (Buist et al., 2013; Jonsson & Jonsson,

2014; Kasumovic, 2013; Taborsky, 2016, 2017). Although the simplistic social contexts we used

in this study are unlikely characteristic of larger, more complex groups found in nature (Chase et

al., 2003), we expect that these behavioral mechanisms, and potentially others—acting additively

or synergistically—will also be influential in more naturalistic contexts. Testing the hypotheses

we generated here will be key to uncovering the behavioral mechanisms of developmental

plasticity and behavioral development, including a role for neuroendocrine stress axis function,

in *A. burtoni* and other social species.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by start-up funds from the W.M. Keck Science Department to TKSL,

W.M. Keck Science Department Summer Fellowships to HG, EAM, IPH, JL, and DDB, as well

as the Claremont Colleges Intercollegiate Neuroscience Summer Research Fellowship to JW.

REFERENCES

Ahloy Dallaire, J., & Mason, G. J. (2017). Juvenile rough-and-tumble play predicts adult sexual behaviour in American mink. *Animal Behaviour*, *123*, 81–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.10.023

Alcazar, R. M., Becker, L., Hilliard, A. T., Kent, K. R., & Fernald, R. D. (2016). Two types of dominant male cichlid fish: Behavioral and hormonal characteristics. *Biology Open*, *5*(8), 1061–1071. https://doi.org/10.1242/bio.017640

Alward, B. A., Cathers, P. H., Blakkan, D. M., Hoadley, A. P., & Fernald, R. D. (2021). A behavioral logic underlying aggression in an African cichlid fish. *Ethology*, *127*(7), 572–581. https://doi.org/10.1111/eth.13164

Antunes, D. F., Teles, M. C., Zuelling, M., Friesen, C. N., Oliveira, R. F., Aubin-Horth, N., & Taborsky, B. (2021). Early social deprivation shapes neuronal programming of the social decision-making network in a cooperatively breeding fish. *Molecular Ecology*, *30*(16), 4118–4132. https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.16019

Arnold, C., & Taborsky, B. (2010). Social experience in early ontogeny has lasting effects on social skills in cooperatively breeding cichlids. *Animal Behaviour*, *79*(3), 621–630. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2009.12.008

Banerjee, S. B., Arterbery, A. S., Fergus, D. J., & Adkins-Regan, E. (2012). Deprivation of maternal care has long-lasting consequences for the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal axis of zebra finches. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *279*(1729), 759–766. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2011.1265

Barale, C. L., Rubenstein, D. I., & Beehner, J. C. (2015). Juvenile social relationships reflect

adult patterns of behavior in wild geladas. *American Journal of Primatology*, *77*(10),

1086–1096. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.22443

Bateson, P. (2001). Fetal experience and good adult design. *International Journal of*

Epidemiology, *30*(5), 928–934. https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/30.5.928

Bateson, P., Barker, D., Clutton-Brock, T., Deb, D., D'Udine, B., Foley, R. A., Gluckman, P.,

Godfrey, K., Kirkwood, T., Lahr, M. M., McNamara, J., Metcalfe, N. B., Monaghan, P.,

Spencer, H. G., & Sultan, S. E. (2004). Developmental plasticity and human health.

Nature, *430*(6998), 419–421. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02725

Beirão-Campos, L., Cantor, M., Flach, L., & Simões-Lopes, P. C. (2016). Guiana dolphins form

social modules in a large population with high ranging overlap and small demographic

changes. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, *70*(11), 1821–1830.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-016-2188-x

Bell, A. M. (2007). Future directions in behavioural syndromes research. *Proceedings of the*

Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, *274*(1611), 755–761.

https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2006.0199

Bennett, D., Schneider, J., Tang, Y., Arnold, S., & Wilson, R. S. (2006). The effect of social

networks on the relation between Alzheimer's disease pathology and level of cognitive

function in old people: A longitudinal cohort study. *The Lancet Neurology*, *5*(5), 406–

412. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(06)70417-3

Bölting, S., & von Engelhardt, N. (2017). Effects of the social environment during adolescence

on the development of social behaviour, hormones and morphology in male zebra finches

(Taeniopygia guttata). *Frontiers in Zoology*, *14*(1), 5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12983-

017-0190-4

Bonuti, R., & Morato, S. (2018). Proximity as a predictor of social behavior in rats. *Journal of*

Neuroscience Methods, *293*, 37–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2017.08.027

Boogert, N. J., Farine, D. R., & Spencer, K. A. (2014). Developmental stress predicts social

network position. *Biology Letters*, *10*, 20140561. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2014.0561

Branchi, I., & Alleva, E. (2006). Communal nesting, an early social enrichment, increases the

adult anxiety-like response and shapes the role of social context in modulating the

emotional behavior. *Behavioural Brain Research*, *172*(2), 299–306.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2006.05.019

Branchi, I., Curley, J. P., D'Andrea, I., Cirulli, F., Champagne, F. A., & Alleva, E. (2013). Early

interactions with mother and peers independently build adult social skills and shape

BDNF and oxytocin receptor brain levels. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, *38*(4), 522–532.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2012.07.010

Branchi, I., D'Andrea, I., Gracci, F., Santucci, D., & Alleva, E. (2009). *Birth spacing in the*

mouse communal nest shapes adult emotional and social behavior.

Bray, J., Feldblum, J. T., & Gilby, I. C. (2021). Social bonds predict dominance trajectories in

adult male chimpanzees. *Animal Behaviour*, *179*, 339–354.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2021.06.031

Bray, J., Murray, C. M., Gilby, I. C., & Stanton, M. A. (2021). Immature Male Chimpanzees'

(Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii) Social Relationships with Adult Males, but Not Peers,

Persist into Adulthood. *International Journal of Primatology*, *42*(5), 701–721.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10764-021-00235-1

Buist, K. L., Deković, M., & Prinzie, P. (2013). Sibling relationship quality and psychopathology

of children and adolescents: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *33*(1), 97–

106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2012.10.007

Butler, J. M., & Maruska, K. P. (2016). Mechanosensory signaling as a potential mode of

communication during social interactions in fishes. *Journal of Experimental Biology*,

219(18), 2781–2789. https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.133801

Butler, J. M., Whitlow, S. M., Roberts, D. A., & Maruska, K. P. (2018). Neural and behavioural

correlates of repeated social defeat. *Scientific Reports*, *8*(1), 6818.

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-25160-x

Cachat, J., Stewart, A., Grossman, L., Gaikwad, S., Kadri, F., Chung, K. M., Wu, N., Wong, K.,

Roy, S., Suciu, C., Goodspeed, J., Elegante, M., Bartels, B., Elkhayat, S., Tien, D., Tan,

J., Denmark, A., Gilder, T., Kyzar, E., … Kalueff, A. V. (2010). Measuring behavioral

and endocrine responses to novelty stress in adult zebrafish. *Nature Protocols*, *5*(11),

1786–1799. https://doi.org/10.1038/nprot.2010.140

Carpenter, R. E., Maruska, K. P., Becker, L., & Fernald, R. D. (2014). Social Opportunity

Rapidly Regulates Expression of CRF and CRF Receptors in the Brain during Social

Ascent of a Teleost Fish, Astatotilapia burtoni. *PLoS ONE*, *9*(5), e96632.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0096632

Champagne, F. A., & Curley, J. P. (2005). How social experiences influence the brain. *Current*

Opinion in Neurobiology, *15*(6), 704–709. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2005.10.001

Chase, I. D., Coelho, D., Lee, W., Mueller, K., & Curley, J. P. (2022). Networks never rest: An

investigation of network evolution in three species of animals. *Social Networks*, *68*, 356–

373. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2021.09.002

Chase, I. D., Tovey, C., & Murch, P. (2003). Two's Company, Three's a Crowd: Differences in

Dominance Relationships in Isolated versus Socially Embedded Pairs of Fish. *Behaviour*,

140(10,), 1193–1217.

Chen, C.-C., & Fernald, R. D. (2008). Sequences, expression patterns and regulation of the

corticotropin-releasing factor system in a teleost. *General and Comparative*

Endocrinology, *157*(2), 148–155. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygcen.2008.04.003

Clay, Z., & de Waal, F. B. M. (2013). Bonobos Respond to Distress in Others: Consolation

across the Age Spectrum. *PLoS ONE*, *8*(1), e55206.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0055206

Clement, T. S., Parikh, V., Schrumpf, M., & Fernald, R. D. (2005). Behavioral coping strategies

in a cichlid fish: The role of social status and acute stress response in direct and displaced

aggression. *Hormones and Behavior*, *47*(3), 336–342.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2004.11.014

Conrad, J. L., Weinersmith, K. L., Brodin, T., Saltz, J. B., & Sih, A. (2011). Behavioural

syndromes in fishes: A review with implications for ecology and fisheries management.

Journal of Fish Biology, *78*(2), 395–435. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-

8649.2010.02874.x

Creel, S. (2001). Social dominance and stress hormones. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *16*(9),

491–497. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(01)02227-3

Crespi, E. J., & Denver, R. J. (2005). Ancient origins of human developmental plasticity.

American Journal of Human Biology, *17*(1), 44–54. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.20098

Croft, D. P., James, R., Ward, A. J. W., Botham, M. S., Mawdsley, D., & Krause, J. (2005).

Assortative interactions and social networks in fish. *Oecologia*, *143*(2), 211–219.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-004-1796-8

Croft, D. P., Krause, J., Darden, S. K., Ramnarine, I. W., Faria, J. J., & James, R. (2009).

Behavioural trait assortment in a social network: Patterns and implications. *Behavioral*

Ecology and Sociobiology, *63*(10), 1495–1503. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-009-0802-

x

Curley, J. P. (2016). *Compete: Analyzing competitive interaction data: R package version 0.1.*

D'Andrea, I., Alleva, E., & Branchi, I. (2007). Communal nesting, an early social enrichment,

affects social competences but not learning and memory abilities at adulthood.

Behavioural Brain Research, *183*(1), 60–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2007.05.029

Denver, R. J. (2009). Stress hormones mediate environment-genotype interactions during

amphibian development. *General and Comparative Endocrinology*, *164*(1), 20–31.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygcen.2009.04.016

Desjardins, J. K., Hofmann, H. A., & Fernald, R. D. (2012). Social Context Influences

Aggressive and Courtship Behavior in a Cichlid Fish. *PLoS ONE*, *7*(7), e32781.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0032781

Dettmer, A. M., Wooddell, L. J., Rosenberg, K. L., Kaburu, S. S. K., Novak, M. A., Meyer, J. S.,

& Suomi, S. J. (2017). Associations between early life experience, chronic HPA axis

activity, and adult social rank in rhesus monkeys. *Social Neuroscience*, *12*(1), 92–101.

https://doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2016.1176952

Dijkstra, P. D., Maguire, S. M., Harris, R. M., Rodriguez, A. A., DeAngelis, R. S., Flores, S. A.,

& Hofmann, H. A. (2017). The melanocortin system regulates body pigmentation and

social behaviour in a colour polymorphic cichlid fish <sup/>. *Proceedings of the Royal*

Society B: Biological Sciences, *284*(1851), 20162838.

https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.2838

Ensminger, D. C., Langkilde, T., Owen, D. A. S., MacLeod, K. J., & Sheriff, M. J. (2018).

Maternal stress alters the phenotype of the mother, her eggs and her offspring in a wild-

caught lizard. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *87*(6), 1685–1697.

https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12891

Farine, D. R., Spencer, K. A., & Boogert, N. J. (2015). Early-Life Stress Triggers Juvenile Zebra

Finches to Switch Social Learning Strategies. *Current Biology*, *25*(16), 2184–2188.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2015.06.071

Fernald, R. D., & Hirata, N. R. (1977). Field study of Haplochromis burtoni: Habitats and co-

habitant. *Environmental Biology Of Fishes*, *2*(3), 299–308.

Fernald, R. D., & Hirata, N. R. (1979). The Ontogeny of Social behavior and body coloration in

the african cichlid fish Haplochromis burtoni. *Zeitschrif Für Tierpsychologie*, *50*, 180–

187.

Fernald, R. D., & Maruska, K. P. (2012). Social information changes the brain. *Proceedings of*

the National Academy of Sciences, *109*(supplement_2), 17194–17199.

https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1202552109

Fischer, S., Bessert-Nettelbeck, M., Kotrschal, A., & Taborsky, B. (2015). Rearing-Group Size

Determines Social Competence and Brain Structure in a Cooperatively Breeding Cichlid.

The American Naturalist, *186*(1). https://doi.org/10.1086/681636

Förster, S., & Cords, M. (2005). Socialization of infant blue monkeys (Cercopithecus mitis

stuhlmanni): Allomaternal interactions and sex differences. *Behaviour*, *142*(7), 869–896.

https://doi.org/10.1163/1568539055010138

Fox, H. E., White, S. A., Kao, M. H. F., & Fernald, R. D. (1997). Stress and Dominance in a

Social Fish. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *17*(16), 6463–6469.

https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.17-16-06463.1997

Fraley, N. B., & Fernald, R. D. (1982). Social control of developmental rate in the African

cichlid, Haplochromis burtoni. *Zeitschrif Für Tierpsychologie*, *60*(1), 66–82.

Francis, D. D., Caldji, C., Champagne, F., Plotsky, P. M., & Meaney, M. J. (1999). The role of

corticotropin-releasing factor–norepinephrine systems in mediating the effects of early

experience on the development of behavioral and endocrine responses to stress.

Biological Psychiatry, *46*(9), 1153–1166. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223(99)00237-

1

Freeman, N. E., Norris, D. R., Sutton, A. O., Strickland, D., Kyser, T. K., & Newman, A. E. M.

(2021). Early-Life Corticosterone Body Condition Influence Social Status and Survival in

a Food-Caching Passerine. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, *61*(1), 9–19.

https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icab038

Friesen, C. N., Maclaine, K. D., & Hofmann, H. A. (2022). Social status mediates behavioral,

endocrine, and neural responses to an intruder challenge in a social cichlid, Astatotilapia

burtoni. *Hormones and Behavior*, *145*, 105241.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2022.105241

Fulmer, A. G., Neumeister, H., & Preuss, T. (2017). Social plasticity in non-territorial male

African cichlid fish Astatotilapia burtoni. *Journal of Ethology*, *35*(1), 109–119.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10164-016-0498-0

Gallego-Abenza, M., Boucherie, P. H., & Bugnyar, T. (2022). Early social environment affects

attention to social cues in juvenile common ravens, Corvus corax. *Royal Society Open*

Science, *9*(6), 220132. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.220132

Gammell, M. P., de Vries, H., Jennings, D. J., Carlin, C. M., & Hayden, T. J. (2003). David's

score: A more appropriate dominance ranking method than Clutton-Brock et al.'s index.

Animal Behaviour, *66*(3), 601–605. https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2003.2226

Gersick, A. S., Snyder-Mackler, N., & White, D. J. (2012). Ontogeny of social skills: Social

complexity improves mating and competitive strategies in male brown-headed cowbirds.

Animal Behaviour, *83*(5), 1171–1177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.02.005

Gfrerer, N., Taborsky, M., & Würbel, H. (2018). Benefits of intraspecific social exposure in

adult Swiss military dogs. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, *201*, 54–60.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2017.12.016

Greenwood, A. K., Butler, P. C., White, R. B., DeMarco, U., Pearce, D., & Fernald, R. D.

(2003). Multiple Corticosteroid Receptors in a Teleost Fish: Distinct Sequences,

Expression Patterns, and Transcriptional Activities. *Endocrinology*, *144*(10), 4226–4236.

https://doi.org/10.1210/en.2003-0566

Groothuis, T. G. G., & Carere, C. (2005). Avian personalities: Characterization and epigenesis.

Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, *29*(1), 137–150.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2004.06.010

Heule, C., Göppert, C., Salzburger, W., & Böhne, A. (2014). Genetics and timing of sex

determination in the East African cichlid fish Astatotilapia burtoni. *BMC Genetics*, *15*,

140. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12863-014-0140-5

Hill, J., & Grossman, G. D. (1987). Effects of Subcutaneous Marking on Stream Fishes. *Copeia*,

1987(2), 492. https://doi.org/10.2307/1445790

Hofmann, H. A. (2003). Functional genomics of neural and behavioral plasticity. *Journal of*

Neurobiology, *54*(1), 272–282. https://doi.org/10.1002/neu.10172

Hofmann, H. A., Benson, M. E., & Fernald, R. D. (1999). Social status regulates growth rate:

Consequences for life-history strategies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*

Sciences of the United States of America, *96*(24), 14171–14176.

Howell, T., King, T., & Bennett, P. (2015). Puppy parties and beyond: The role of early age

socialization practices on adult dog behavior. *Veterinary Medicine: Research and*

Reports, 143. https://doi.org/10.2147/VMRR.S62081

Huffman, L. S., Hinz, F. I., Wojcik, S., Aubin-Horth, N., & Hofmann, H. A. (2015). Arginine

vasotocin regulates social ascent in the African cichlid fish Astatotilapia burtoni. *General*

and Comparative Endocrinology, *212*, 106–113.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygcen.2014.03.004

Jin, T., Wang, D., Pan, W., & Yao, M. (2015). Nonmaternal Infant Handling in Wild White-

Headed Langurs (Trachypithecus leucocephalus). *International Journal of Primatology*,

36(2), 269–287. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10764-015-9823-7

Jonsson, B., & Jonsson, N. (2014). Early environment influences later performance in fishes:

Effects of early experiences. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *85*(2), 151–188.

https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.12432

Kasumovic, M. M. (2013). The multidimensional consequences of the juvenile environment:

Towards an integrative view of the adult phenotype. *Animal Behaviour*, *85*(5), 1049–

1059. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.02.009

Kidd, C. E., Kidd, M. R., & Hofmann, H. A. (2010). Measuring multiple hormones from a single

water sample using enzyme immunoassays. *General and Comparative Endocrinology*,

165(2), 277–285. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygcen.2009.07.008

Kidd, M. R., O'Connell, L. A., Kidd, C. E., Chen, C. W., Fontenot, M. R., Williams, S. J., &

Hofmann, H. A. (2013). Female preference for males depends on reproductive

physiology in the African cichlid fish Astatotilapia burtoni. *General and Comparative*

Endocrinology, *180*, 56–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygcen.2012.10.014

Koolhaas, J. M., Korte, S. M., De Boer, S. F., Van Der Vegt, B. J., Van Reenen, C. G., Hopster,

H., De Jong, I. C., Ruis, M. A. W., & Blokhuis, H. J. (1999). Coping styles in animals:

Current status in behavior and stress-physiology. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral*

Reviews, *23*(7), 925–935. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-7634(99)00026-3

Korzan, W. J., Fernald, R. D., & Grone, B. P. (2014). Social regulation of cortisol receptor gene

expression. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, jeb.104430.

https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.104430

Kuijper, B., & Johnstone, R. A. (2019). The evolution of early-life effects on social behaviour—

Why should social adversity carry over to the future? *Philosophical Transactions of the*

Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, *374*, 20180111.

https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0111

Leiva, D., Solanas, A., & Salafranca, L. (2008). Testing reciprocity in social interactions: A

comparison between the directional consistency and skew-symmetry statistics. *Behavior*

Research Methods, *40*(2), 626–634. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.40.2.626

Lotrich, V. A., & Meredith, W. H. (1974). A Technique and the Effectiveness of Various Acrylic

Colors for Subcutaneous Marking of Fish. *Transactions of the American Fisheries*

Society, *1*, 3.

Lowry, C. A., & Moore, F. L. (2006). Regulation of behavioral responses by corticotropin-

releasing factor. *General and Comparative Endocrinology*, *146*(1), 19–27.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygcen.2005.12.006

Maguire, S. M., DeAngelis, R., Dijkstra, P. D., Jordan, A., & Hofmann, H. A. (2021). Social

network dynamics predict hormone levels and behavior in a highly social cichlid fish.

Hormones and Behavior, *132*, 104994. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2021.104994

Maruska, K. P., Anselmo, C. M., King, T., Mobley, R. B., Ray, E. J., & Wayne, R. (2022).

Endocrine and neuroendocrine regulation of social status in cichlid fishes. *Hormones and*

Behavior, *139*, 105110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2022.105110

Maruska, K. P., Becker, L., Neboori, A., & Fernald, R. D. (2013). Social descent with territory

loss causes rapid behavioral, endocrine, and transcriptional changes in the brain. *Journal*

of Experimental Biology, jeb.088617. https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.088617

Maruska, K. P., Zhang, A., Neboori, A., & Fernald, R. D. (2013). Social Opportunity Causes

Rapid Transcriptional Changes in the Social Behaviour Network of the Brain in an

African Cichlid Fish. *Journal of Neuroendocrinology*, *25*(2), 145–157.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2826.2012.02382.x

McClelland, S., Korosi, A., Cope, J., Ivy, A., & Baram, T. Z. (2011). Emerging roles of

epigenetic mechanisms in the enduring effects of early-life stress and experience on

learning and memory. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, *96*(1), 79–88.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2011.02.008

McDonald, D. B. (2007). Predicting fate from early connectivity in a social network.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, *104*(26), 10910–10914.

https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0701159104

Meyer-Lindenberg, A., & Tost, H. (2012). Neural mechanisms of social risk for psychiatric

disorders. *Nature Neuroscience*, *15*(5), 663–668. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3083

Monclús, R., Cook, T., & Blumstein, D. T. (2012). Masculinized female yellow-bellied marmots

initiate more social interactions. *Biology Letters*, *8*(2), 208–210.

https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2011.0754

Moretz, J. A., Martins, E. P., & Robison, B. D. (2007). The effects of early and adult social

environment on zebrafish (Danio rerio) behavior. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*,

80(1), 91–101. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10641-006-9122-4

Morgan, T., Pluske, J., Miller, D., Collins, T., Barnes, A. L., Wemelsfelder, F., & Fleming, P. A.

(2014). Socialising piglets in lactation positively affects their post-weaning behaviour.

Applied Animal Behaviour Science, *158*, 23–33.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2014.06.001

Moy, S. S., Nadler, J. J., Perez, A., Barbaro, R. P., Johns, J. M., Magnuson, T. R., Piven, J., &

Crawley, J. N. (2004). Sociability and preference for social novelty in five inbred strains:

An approach to assess autistic-like behavior in mice. *Genes, Brain and Behavior*, *3*(5),

287–302. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1601-1848.2004.00076.x

Näslund, J., & Johnsson, J. I. (2016). State-dependent behavior and alternative behavioral

strategies in brown trout (Salmo trutta L.) fry. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*,

70(12), 2111–2125. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-016-2215-y

Nikonov, A. A., Butler, J. M., Field, K. E., Caprio, J., & Maruska, K. P. (2017). Reproductive

and metabolic state differences in olfactory responses to amino acids in a mouth brooding

African cichlid fish. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, jeb.157925.

https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.157925

Oliveira, R. F., McGregor, P. K., & Latru, C. (1998). *Know thine enemy: Fighting fish gather*

information from observing conspecific interactions.

Parikh, V. N., Clement, T., & Fernald, R. D. (2006). Physiological consequences of social

descent: Studies in Astatotilapia burtoni. *Journal of Endocrinology*, *190*(1), 183–190.

https://doi.org/10.1677/joe.1.06755

Perkeybile, A. M., & Bales, K. L. (2017). Intergenerational transmission of sociality: The role of

parents in shaping social behavior in monogamous and non-monogamous species.

Journal of Experimental Biology, *220*(1), 114–123. https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.142182

Perkeybile, A. M., Griffin, L. L., & Bales, K. L. (2013). Natural variation in early parental care

correlates with social behaviors in adolescent prairie voles (Microtus ochrogaster).

Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2013.00021

Pike, T. W., Samanta, M., Lindström, J., & Royle, N. J. (2008). Behavioural phenotype affects

social interactions in an animal network. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*

Sciences, *275*(1650), 2515–2520. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.0744

Prut, L., & Belzung, C. (2003). The open field as a paradigm to measure the effects of drugs on

anxiety-like behaviors: A review. *European Journal of Pharmacology*, *463*(1–3), 3–33.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0014-2999(03)01272-X

Pryce, C. R., Aubert, Y., Maier, C., Pearce, P. C., & Fuchs, E. (2011). The developmental impact

of prenatal stress, prenatal dexamethasone and postnatal social stress on physiology,

behaviour and neuroanatomy of primate offspring: Studies in rhesus macaque and

common marmoset. *Psychopharmacology*, *214*(1), 33–53.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-010-1989-2

Renn, S. C. P., Carleton, J. B., Magee, H., Nguyen, M. L. T., & Tanner, A. C. W. (2009).

Maternal care and altered social phenotype in a recently collected stock of Astatotilapia

burtoni cichlid fish. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, *49*(6), 660–673.

https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icp085

Reyes-Contreras, M., Glauser, G., Rennison, D. J., & Taborsky, B. (2019). Early-life

manipulation of cortisol and its receptor alters stress axis programming and social

competence. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,

374(1770), 20180119. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0119

Rodriguez-Santiago, M., Nührenberg, P., Derry, J., Deussen, O., Francisco, F. A., Garrison, L.

K., Garza, S. F., Hofmann, H. A., & Jordan, A. (2020). Behavioral traits that define social

dominance are the same that reduce social influence in a consensus task. *Proceedings of*

the National Academy of Sciences, *117*(31), 18566–18573.

https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2000158117

Salazar, L. C., Ko, H.-L., Yang, C.-H., Llonch, L., Manteca, X., Camerlink, I., & Llonch, P.

(2018). Early socialisation as a strategy to increase piglets' social skills in intensive

farming conditions. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, *206*, 25–31.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2018.05.033

Saltz, J. B., Geiger, A. P., Anderson, R., Johnson, B., & Marren, R. (2016). What, if anything, is

a social niche? *Evolutionary Ecology*, *30*(2), 349–364. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10682-

015-9792-5

Schneider, C. A., Rasband, W. S., & Eliceiri, K. W. (2012). NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of

image analysis. *Nature Methods*, *9*(7), 671–675. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2089

Sih, A. (2011). Effects of early stress on behavioral syndromes: An integrated adaptive

perspective. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *35*(7), 1452–1465.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.03.015

Sih, A., Bell, A., & Johnson, J. C. (2004). Behavioral syndromes: An ecological and

evolutionary overview. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *19*(7), 372–378.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2004.04.009

Sih, A., Bell, A. M., Johnson, J. C., & Ziemba, R. E. (2004). Behavioral Syndromes: An

Integrative Overview. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, *79*(3), 241–277.

https://doi.org/10.1086/422893

Silk, J. B. (2007). Social Components of Fitness in Primate Groups. *Science*, *317*(5843), 1347–

1351. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1140734

Solomon-Lane, T. K., Butler, R. M., & Hofmann, H. A. (2022). Vasopressin mediates

nonapeptide and glucocorticoid signaling and social dynamics in juvenile dominance

hierarchies of a highly social cichlid fish. *Hormones and Behavior*, *145*, 105238.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2022.105238

Solomon-Lane, T. K., & Hofmann, H. A. (2018). *A tagging method for very small fish* [Preprint].

https://doi.org/10.1101/437772

Solomon-Lane, T. K., & Hofmann, H. A. (2019). Early-life social environment alters juvenile

behavior and neuroendocrine function in a highly social cichlid fish. *Hormones and*

Behavior, *115*, 104552. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2019.06.016

Solomon-Lane, T. K., Pradhan, D. S., Willis, M. C., & Grober, M. S. (2015). Agonistic

reciprocity is associated with reduced male reproductive success within haremic social

networks. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *282*(1811),

20150914. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.0914

Spencer, K. A. (2017). Developmental stress and social phenotypes: Integrating neuroendocrine,

behavioural and evolutionary perspectives. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*

Society B: Biological Sciences, *372*(1727), 20160242.

https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2016.0242

Stevens, H. E., Leckman, J. F., Coplan, J. D., & Suomi, S. J. (2009). Risk and Resilience: Early

Manipulation of Macaque Social Experience and Persistent Behavioral and

Neurophysiological Outcomes. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent*

Psychiatry, *48*(2), 114–127. https://doi.org/10.1097/CHI.0b013e318193064c

Stevenson, T. J., Alward, B. A., Ebling, F. J. P., Fernald, R. D., Kelly, A., & Ophir, A. G.

(2018). The Value of Comparative Animal Research: Krogh's Principle Facilitates

Scientific Discoveries. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *5*(1),

118–125. https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732217745097

Taborsky, B. (2016). Opening the Black Box of Developmental Experiments: Behavioural

Mechanisms Underlying Long-Term Effects of Early Social Experience. *Ethology*,

122(4), 267–283. https://doi.org/10.1111/eth.12473

Taborsky, B. (2017). Developmental Plasticity: Preparing for Life in a Complex World. In

Advances in the Study of Behavior (Vol. 49, pp. 49–99). Elsevier.

https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.asb.2016.12.002

Taborsky, B., Arnold, C., Junker, J., & Tschopp, A. (2012). The early social environment affects

social competence in a cooperative breeder. *Animal Behaviour*, *83*(4), 1067–1074.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.01.037

Taborsky, B., Tschirren, L., Meunier, C., & Aubin-Horth, N. (2013). Stable reprogramming of

brain transcription profiles by the early social environment in a cooperatively breeding

fish. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *280*(1753), 20122605.

https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2012.2605

Thresher, R. E., & Gronell, A. M. (1978). Subcutaneous Tagging of Small Reef Fishes. *Copeia*,

1978(2), 352. https://doi.org/10.2307/1443582

Turecki, G., & Meaney, M. J. (2016). Effects of the Social Environment and Stress on

Glucocorticoid Receptor Gene Methylation: A Systematic Review. *Biological Psychiatry*,

79(2), 87–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2014.11.022

Wallace, K. J., & Hofmann, H. A. (2021). Equal performance but distinct behaviors: Sex

differences in a novel object recognition task and spatial maze in a highly social cichlid

fish. *Animal Cognition*, *24*(5), 1057–1073. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-021-01498-0

Weaver, I. C. G. (2009). Shaping adult phenotypes through early life environments. *Birth*

Defects Research Part C: Embryo Today: Reviews, *87*(4), 314–326.

https://doi.org/10.1002/bdrc.20164

Weinstein, T. A. R., Bales, K. L., Maninger, N., Hostetler, C. M., & Capitanio, J. P. (2014).

Early involvement in friendships predicts later plasma concentrations of oxytocin and

vasopressin in juvenile rhesus macaques (Macaca mulatta). *Frontiers in Behavioral*

Neuroscience, *8*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00295

Weinstein, T. A. R., & Capitanio, J. P. (2008). Individual differences in infant temperament

predict social relationships of yearling rhesus monkeys, Macaca mulatta. *Animal*

Behaviour, *76*(2), 455–465. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2008.01.024

Weitekamp, C. A., & Hofmann, H. A. (2017). Neuromolecular correlates of cooperation and

conflict during territory defense in a cichlid fish. *Hormones and Behavior*, *89*, 145–156.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2017.01.001

Weitekamp, C. A., Nguyen, J., & Hofmann, H. A. (2017). Social context affects behavior,

preoptic area gene expression, and response to D2 receptor manipulation during territorial

defense in a cichlid fish. *Genes, Brain and Behavior*, *16*(6), 601–611.

https://doi.org/10.1111/gbb.12389

Wendelaar Bonga, S. E. (1997). The stress response in fish. *Physiological Reviews*, *77*(3), 591–

625. https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.1997.77.3.591

White, D. J., Gersick, A. S., Freed-Brown, G., & Snyder-Mackler, N. (2010). The ontogeny of

social skills: Experimental increases in social complexity enhance reproductive success in

adult cowbirds. *Animal Behaviour*, *79*(2), 385–390.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2009.11.014

Williamson, C. M., Lee, W., & Curley, J. P. (2016). Temporal dynamics of social hierarchy

formation and maintenance in male mice. *Animal Behaviour*, *115*, 259–272.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.03.004

Wilson, E. O. (1980). *Sociobiology: The Abridged Edition*. The Belknap Press of Harvard

University Press.

1097

1098   **TABLES**

1099   **Table 1:** Treatment differences in social behavior and distances between dyads in the stable

1100   group, socialized pair, and stable pair home tanks.

Behavior / measure	DF	Test Statistic	p-value	Effect size	*Post hoc* / direction of effect
Approaches	2, 38	F=11.46	0.00013	0.38	**Stable group > social. pair: p<0.0001** **Stable group > stable pair: p=0.0061** Social. pair vs. stable pair: p=0.41
Displacements	2, 37	F=11.37	0.00014	0.38	**Stable group > social. pair: p<0.0001** **Stable group > stable pair: p=0.02** Social. pair vs. stable pair: p=0.21
Efficiency	2	χ^2=1.06	0.59		
Into territory	2	χ^2=10.81	0.0045	0.23	**Stable group > stable pair: p=0.0037** Stable group > social. pair: p=0.071 Social. pair vs. stable pair: p=0.75
Mean dyad distance	2, 46	F=13.62	<0.0001	0.37	**Stable group > stable pair: p<0.0001** **Stable group > social. pair: p<0.0001** Social. pair vs. stable pair: p=0.92
Minimum dyad distance	2	χ^2=7.49	0.0025	0.12	**Stable group > social. pair: p=0.021** Stable group > stable pair: p=0.085 Social. pair vs. stable pair: p=1.0

Results of one-way ANOVAs (F) or nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis tests (χ^2). Eta-squared is

reported for effect sizes. Significant results in bold. Tukey HSD tests were used for *post hoc*

analysis of significant ANOVA results. Dunn's tests were used for *post hoc* analysis of

significant Kruskal-Wallis results.

Table 2: Treatment differences in the frequency entering and time spent in tank zones during the

open field exploration and social cue investigation.

Tank Zones / measure	DF	Test Statistic	p-value	Effect size	*Post hoc* / direction of effect
Open Field Exploration					
Territory (Frequency)	**2,30**	**F=3.70**	**0.037**	**0.2**	**Social. pair > stable pair: p=0.037** Social. pair vs. stable group: p=0.1 Stable group vs. stable pair: p=0.77
Close (Frequency)	2,30	F=3.30	0.051		
Far (Frequency)	2	χ^2=4.97	0.083		
Investigate (Frequency)	2	χ^2=3.51	0.17		
Territory (Time)	2	χ^2=4.34	0.11		
Close (Time)	2	χ^2=0.34	0.84		
Far (Time)	**2**	**χ^2=7.47**	**0.024**	**0.18**	**Stable group > stable pair: p=0.032** Stable group vs. social. pair: 0.16 Social. pair vs. stable pair: p=1.0
Investigate (Time)	2	χ^2=2.13	0.35		
Social Cue Investigation					
Territory (Frequency)	2	χ^2=0.76	0.69		
Close (Frequency)	2	χ^2=1.51	0.47		
Far (Frequency)	**2**	**χ^2=6.60**	**0.037**	**0.15**	**Stable group > stable pair: p=0.036** Stable group vs. social. pair: 0.40 Social. pair vs. stable pair: p=1.0
Investigate (Frequency)	2	χ^2=4.49	0.11		
Territory (Time)	**2**	**χ^2=6.36**	**0.042**	**0.15**	**Stable pair > stable group: p=0.042** Stable group vs. social. pair: 0.39 Social. pair vs. stable pair: p=1.0
Close (Time)	2	χ^2=2.19	0.33		
Far (Time)	**2**	**χ^2=7.93**	**0.019**	**0.20**	**Stable group > stable pair: p=0.019** Stable group vs. social. pair: 0.25 Social. pair vs. stable pair: p=1.0
Investigate (Time)	2	χ^2=5.00	0.082		

Results of one-way ANOVAs (F) or nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis tests (χ^2). Eta-squared is

reported for effect sizes. Significant results in bold. Tukey HSD tests were used for *post hoc*

analysis of significant ANOVA results. Dunn's tests were used for *post hoc* analysis of

significant Kruskal-Wallis results.

Table 3: Treatment differences in social behavior and status in the dominant and subordinate

behavior assays.

Assay / Behavior	DF	χ^2	p-value	Effect size	*Post hoc* / direction of effect
Dominant Behavior Assay					
Approaches	**2**	**8.71**	**0.013**	**0.22**	**Social. pair > stable pair: p=0.01** Social. pair vs. stable group: p=0.16 Stable group vs. stable pair: p=0.57
Displacements	**2**	**7.62**	**0.022**	**0.19**	**Social. pair > stable pair: p=0.02** Social. pair vs. stable group: p=0.16 Stable group vs. stable pair: p=0.85
Approaches Received	2	5.44	0.066		
Submissions	2	4.63	0.099		
David's Score	**2**	**8.48**	**0.014**	**0.22**	**Social. pair > stable pair: p=0.043** **Social. pair > stable group: p=0.022** Stable group vs. stable pair: p=1.0
Directional consistency (App.)	2	3.89	0.14		
Subordinate Behavior Assay					
Approaches	2	5.23	0.073		
Displacements	2	2.69	0.26		
Approaches Received	**2**	**6.13**	**0.047**	**0.14**	**Social. pair > stable pair: p=0.042** Social. pair vs. stable group: p=0.73 Stable group vs. stable pair: p=0.38
Submissions	2	4.05	0.13		
Focal efficiency	2	1.38	0.50		
Directional consistency (App.)	**2**	**13.22**	**0.0014**	**0.37**	**Social. pair < stable pair: p=0.0038** **Social. pair < stable group: p=0.004** Stable group vs. stable pair: p=1.0

1113   Results of Kruskal-Wallis tests (χ^2). Eta-squared is reported for effect sizes. Significant results in

1114   bold. Dunn's tests were used for *post hoc* analysis of significant results.

1115   **Table 4:** Treatment differences for principal components (PC) 1-5.

Principal component (% variation)	DF	Test Statistic	p-value	Effect size	*Post hoc* / direction of effect
PC1 (25.1%)	2,28	**F=4.19**	**0.026**	**0.23**	**Stable pair > stable group: p=0.032** Stable pair > social. pair: p=0.063 Stable group vs. social. pair: p=1.0
PC2 (18.2%)	2,28	F=1.82	0.18		
PC3 (14.3%)	2,28	F=0.97	0.39		
PC4 (10.5%)	2	χ^2=2.69	0.26		
PC5 (8.5%)	2,28	**F=6.62**	**0.0044**	**0.32**	**Social. pair > stable group: p=0.0036** **Social. pair > stable pair: p=0.036** Stable group vs. stable pair: p=0.75

1116   Results of one-way ANOVAs (F) or nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis tests (χ^2) for PC1-PC5.

1117   Percentages indicate the variance explained. Eta-squared is reported for effect sizes. Significant

1118   results in bold. Tukey HSD tests were used for *post hoc* analysis of significant ANOVA results.

1119   Dunn's tests were used for *post hoc* analysis of significant Kruskal-Wallis results.

 FIGURES

Figure 1: A) Juvenile fish were reared in stable groups (n=6, 6 fish each), stable pairs (n=6, 2

fish each), or socialized pairs (n=9, 2 fish each). Every 5 days in the socialized pairs, one fish of

the pair was removed, and a novel juvenile was introduced. The novel juvenile came from a

different socialized pair, and the removed juvenile became the novel partner for a socialized pair.

This was repeated 5 times so that socialized fish had a total of 5 social partners – equal to the

stable group fish. One fish per stable group and pair was also removed from their tank with a

hand net as a control. This fish was immediately returned to its home tank. B) After 26 days in

these rearing environments, individual juvenile behavior was quantified in a novel experimental

tank. The tank contained a terracotta pot shard, and black lines (drawn in permanent marker)

divided the tank into four zones: territory, close, far, and investigate. In the open field

exploration, the focal fish was alone in the tank. In the social cue investigation, a small juvenile

cue fish inside of a scintillation vial was placed in the circle in the investigate zone. In the

dominance assay, a freely-swimming novel cue fish (smaller than the focal) was added to the

tank. In the subordinate assay, a freely-swimming novel cue fish (larger than the focal) was

added to the tank. C) In the dominance and subordinate assay, we quantified the number of

approaches, where one fish swims within three body lengths directly towards any part of another

fish. If the approached fish swam away in any direction, it was counted as a displacement.

1158

Figure 2: Social behavior and distances in the stable groups, socialized pairs, and stable pairs.

A) Frequency of social approaches, displacements, and times entering the territory / terracotta

pot in the rearing environments. B) Total agonistic efficiency (total displacements / total

approaches). C) Distance between all dyads of fish was measured twice for each tank (20 time

points each, 40 total time points). Mean distance between dyads was then calculated per tank

(each data point is the mean for one tank). The maximum distance lines are the lengths of the

diagonal along the bottom of the tanks. D) The minimum distance recorded between a dyad

across all time points. $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.01$, $***p<0.001$.

Figure 3: Social measures from the dominant (A-C) and subordinate (D-F) behavior assays. A)

Social approaches (App.), displacements (Displ.), approaches received (App. Rec.), and

submissions (Submit) in the dominance behavior assay. B) Focal fish David's score in the

dominance behavior assay. C) Directional consistency (calculated based on approaches) in the

dominance behavior assay. Filled triangles indicate directionality was significantly greater than

zero. Empty triangles indicate pairs were not significantly directional. D) Social behavior in the

subordinate behavior assay. B) Focal fish David's score in the subordinate behavior assay. C)

Directional consistency (calculated based on approaches) in the subordinate behavior assay.

*p<0.05.

1219

1220   **Figure 4:** Focal fish water-borne cortisol (pg/mL/hr), corrected for body mass (g). Log

1221   transformed data are shown.

1243

Figure 5: Principal components analysis (PCA) of cortisol and behavior—including open field

(OF) time in the far and investigate zones; social cue (SC) time in and frequency entering the

territory, close, far, and investigate zones; and dominant and subordinate behavior assay

approaches (App.), displacements (Displ.), approaches received (App. Rec.), submissions, and

David's Score. A) A heatmap of eigenvalues showing the PCA variables that load on PC1

(25.1%), PC2 (18.2%), PC3 (14.3%), PC4 (10.5%), and PC5 (8.5%). Numerical values are

shown for variables stronger than ±0.25. Rows are hierarchically clustered. B) Treatment

differences in PC1. C) Treatment differences in PC5. Percentages refer to the amount of variance

explained by that PC. *$p<0.05$. **$p<0.01$.