1 *Short report*

2 **Chimpanzees communicate to coordinate a cultural practice**

3 Zoë Goldsborough^{1,2†}, Anne Marijke Schel¹, Edwin J. C. van Leeuwen^{3,4†*}

4

5 ¹ Animal Ecology, Department of Biology, Utrecht University, Padualaan 8, 3584 CA
6 Utrecht, The Netherlands (ZG: zgoldsborough@outlook.com; AMS: A.M.Schel@uu.nl)

7 ² Department for the Ecology of Animal Societies, Max Planck of Animal Behavior,
8 Bücklestraße 5a, 78467, Konstanz, Germany

9 ³ Behavioral Ecology and Ecophysiology Group, Department of Biology, University of
10 Antwerp, Universiteitsplein 1, 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium

11 ⁴ Centre for Research and Conservation, Royal Zoological Society of Antwerp, K. Astridplein
12 26, B 2018 Antwerp, Belgium

13

14 [†]contributed equally

15

16 *Corresponding author: ejcvanleeuwen@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7729-2182>

17

18 Key words: grooming handclasp, *Pan troglodytes*, communication, culture, coordination

19 **Abstract**

20 Human culture is considered to differ from animal culture due to its interactive nature built
 21 on shared intentionality and cognitive flexibility. Here, we investigated whether chimpanzees
 22 use communication to engage in cultural practices by analyzing grooming handclasp (GHC)
 23 interactions – a socio-cultural behavior requiring coordination. Previous accounts attributed
 24 GHC initiations to behavioral shaping whereby the initiator physically molds the partner’s
 25 arm into the GHC posture. Using frame-by-frame analysis and matched-control methodology,
 26 we find that chimpanzees use gestural communication to initiate GHC, which requires an
 27 active and synchronized response from the partner. This showcases a behavioral expression
 28 of joint commitment to engage in this shared cultural practice. Moreover, we show that GHC
 29 initiators used various initiation strategies, attesting to situation-contingent interactional
 30 flexibility. We conclude that chimpanzees can be jointly committed to a cultural practice,
 31 which suggests that culture predicated on shared intentionality and flexible communication
 32 may not be unique to the human species.

33 **Introduction**

34 Culture – the inheritance of behavioral phenotypes through social learning (Laland and Janik,
35 2006) – lies at the heart of the biological success of the human species (Henrich, 2016). It is
36 thought to qualitatively differ from culture in non-human animals (henceforth ‘animals’) by
37 its communicative nature reflecting both shared intentionality and cognitive flexibility
38 (Enfield and Levinson, 2006; Tomasello, 2019). Shared intentionality is present in
39 collaborative interactions in which participants share psychological states with one another
40 (Tomasello and Carpenter, 2007). It facilitates mutual engagement and commitment from the
41 collaborators by synchronizing their attention and attuning their actions into adequate and
42 complementary action-response sequences. In human culture, two individuals may thus enter
43 a state of shared commitment to engage in a cultural ritual together (e.g., shaking hands when
44 meeting each other (Oxlund, 2020)), which allows for the coordination of the required actions
45 to pursue and complete the shared ritual (Bratman 1992; Enfield and Levinson 2006).

46 According to an influential view in developmental psychology, animals lack the
47 prerequisites for shared intentionality (Tomasello, 2019; Tomasello et al., 2012; Tomasello
48 and Carpenter, 2007; Tomasello and Moll, 2010). Series of experiments showed that
49 chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) are equivalent to humans when it comes to cognitive skills for
50 dealing with the physical world (e.g., space, causal reasoning), but lag behind substantially in
51 the social realm (e.g., high-fidelity imitative learning, cooperative communication; Herrmann
52 et al. 2007; Tomasello and Moll 2010). In turn, it has been suggested that these reduced
53 socio-cultural capacities preclude chimpanzees from understanding the roles of joint activities
54 and sharing joint goals, the prerequisites for shared intentionality (see (Tomasello and Moll,
55 2010)).

56 Recent work, however, has challenged this view and proposed to seek for
57 evolutionary precursors of human shared intentionality not with experimental designs but

58 within naturally occurring contexts of interacting animals (Genty et al., 2020; Heesen et al.,
59 2020, 2017). From an interactional perspective, correlates of shared intentionality could
60 manifest in the establishment of joint attention, joint commitment and joint actions, given
61 their requisite functions for sharing psychological states (Enfield and Levinson, 2006; Genty
62 et al., 2020). Bonobos, for example, have been observed to use communication to facilitate
63 re-engagement of the partner during social games (Pika and Zuberbühler, 2008), and
64 naturally occurring interactions (Heesen et al., 2020), which attests to their commitment to
65 joint activities (Genty et al., 2020). Given the interactional nature of human culture (Enfield
66 and Levinson, 2006; Tomasello, 2019) and the quest for what makes human culture unique
67 (Boyd et al., 2011; Ramsey, 2013; Richerson and Boyd, 2005), an important outstanding
68 question is whether great apes similarly display (correlates of) shared intentionality during
69 the execution of their joint cultural practices.

70 Here, we investigate whether chimpanzees communicate their desire to engage
71 partners in a joint cultural practice requiring the coordination of actions – the grooming
72 handclasp (McGrew and Tutin, 1978). The grooming handclasp (henceforth “GHC”) is a
73 cultural social-grooming variant defined as a symmetrical postural configuration in which
74 two partners simultaneously extend one of their arms overhead and clasp each other’s
75 extended hand at the palm, wrist or forearm, while grooming each other with the other arm
76 (McGrew and Tutin, 1978; Nakamura and Uehara, 2004; van Leeuwen et al., 2012). While
77 the cultural nature of GHC has been firmly established (McGrew et al., 2001; Nakamura,
78 2002; van Leeuwen et al., 2017, 2012; Wrangham et al., 2016), little is known about the ways
79 in which chimpanzees (or bonobos: (Fruth et al., 2006)) coordinate the execution of the GHC,
80 other than one individual (i.e., the initiator) physically shaping the body of the envisioned
81 partner into the GHC posture (De Waal and Seres, 1997). To learn more about this
82 coordination process, we studied the onset of GHCs with frame-by-frame analysis and

83 compared the observed behaviors with matched-control windows (i.e., social grooming
84 events of the same partners without GHC) (*sensu* De Waal and Yoshihara 1983).
85 Furthermore, we examined whether chimpanzees initiated GHCs flexibly or in ritualized
86 sequences to shed light on their interactional versatility. Lastly, we inspected whether
87 chimpanzees showed signs of determination/goal-directedness to perform this joint action
88 together with their allocated partner, by identifying the use of persistence and/or elaboration
89 of initial initiation strategies when the desired response (i.e., the partner's commitment to
90 GHC) remained absent. In conjunction, these investigations may illuminate if great apes have
91 the capacity and motivation to engage in socio-cultural practices by means of (correlates of)
92 shared intentionality.

93 **Results**

94 *GHC initiations*

95 We examined GHC initiations in a group of 52 semi-wild chimpanzees (Table S1). To
 96 determine the mechanisms underlying GHC initiation, we investigated the occurrences of ten
 97 selected chimpanzee behaviors (Table S2 and Table S3) in a comparison between *i*) GHC
 98 initiations and initiations of regular grooming bouts, and *ii*) pre-handclasp (PH) periods and
 99 their matched-control (MC) windows (see Methods and Figure 1). Four behaviors (“head
 100 touch”, “nosewipe”, “self-scratch” and “torso”) occurred both during GHC initiations and
 101 initiations of regular grooming bouts (>15% of the bouts; see Table S3), and were thus not
 102 considered unique to GHC initiations. Six behaviors were observed infrequently during
 103 initiations of regular grooming bouts (<15%) and more frequently in the PH compared to the
 104 MC context (Wilcoxon signed-rank: all $p < 0.04$, Holm-corrected; $n_{\text{ph-mc}}=94$; $n_{\text{ind}}=33$; see
 105 Table S4). These behaviors were thus considered specific to GHC initiations. Two of these
 106 behaviors (“elbow hold” and “hand grab”) corresponded to the practice of shaping (De Waal
 107 and Seres 1997; e.g., Video S11), while the remaining behaviors (“elbow touch”, “hand
 108 touch”, “head move”, and “hold”) did not involve any/prolonged physical contact with the
 109 partner. These latter behaviors were considered to be potentially communicative, i.e., in the
 110 form of gestures (Liebal and Call 2012; e.g., Video S12).

Figure 1. GHC bout including the identified pre-handclasp (PH) and matched-control period (MC). The PHs and MCs were chosen to exactly match in terms of individuals, bodily positioning and activities (grooming) in order to identify mechanisms specific to the initiation of GHC.

Gestures are defined as bodily actions that are mechanically ineffective and recipient-directed, and result in a voluntary response from the recipient (Pika, 2008; Liebal and Call 2012). The four potentially communicative GHC-initiation behaviors followed this definition – they were mechanically ineffective bodily actions resulting in voluntary GHC responses. Only for “head move” we could envision partly non-intentional co-variation with other behaviors like changing grooming posture or redirecting attention. “Elbow touch” and “hand touch” involved targeted physical contact from actor to recipient and were thus recipient-directed, and during “hold” and “head move” signalers faced their recipient in 100% of observed instances ($n=31$ and $n=18$, respectively). These gestures were produced flexibly, with 14 of 15 individuals with more than one GHC initiation showing variation in the start behavior (only counting the 6 GHC-specific behaviors determined above) of their initiation sequences (Binomial test: $p<0.001$; also see Figure 2 and associated R-code). The gestures were also produced in a goal-directed way, as indicated by the occurrence of *elaboration* (i.e., the use of additional behavior: Leavens et al., 2005) in 31% of the cases where an initial gesture failed to initiate a GHC ($n=10$ out of the 32 instances where gestures were used as an initiation strategy, see Figure 2 and details below). Elaboration occurred after an average

response waiting time of 0.5s and took the form of another gesture ($n=4$), a shaping behavior ($n=2$), or a combination of both another gesture and a shaping behavior ($n=4$) before the GHC finally commenced. Taken together, these observations show that chimpanzees are flexibly capable and determined to (re-)transmit their motivation to engage in GHC when needed.

In general, of the 94 PH/MC comparison bouts, 21 (22%) contained either or both shaping behaviors (“elbow hold”, “hand grab”), 32 (34%) contained one or more of the four communicative gestures (“elbow touch”, “hand touch”, “hold”, “head move”) and no shaping, and 41 (44%) contained neither shaping nor potentially communicative behaviors. We labeled the third type of GHC initiation as “synchronous”, as the individuals appeared to commit to the GHC near-simultaneously. Moreover, if any behavior was scored during the PH window in the synchronous GHCs aside from the raising of the arms (which by definition occurs before every GHC), these were behaviors common to the initiation of regular grooming bouts (“head touch”, “nosewipe”, “self-scratch”, “torso”, see Table S3).

Figure 2*. Behavioral sequences by the initiator leading to GHC ($n=110$). Starting behaviors are depicted in the inner colored circle, with the grey outer circle being the endpoint of the sequence (i.e., GHC). In order to consider the full flexibility of all types of GHC initiations, we included the four “synchrony” behaviors that are also common to the initiation of regular grooming bouts (“head touch”, “nosewipe”, “self-scratch”, and “torso”). * Interactive version available as Figure S13.

Discussion

Our findings show that chimpanzees communicate to engage in one of their most enigmatic socio-cultural practices, the grooming handclasp (McGrew and Tutin, 1978). To date, the mechanism underlying the emergence and stability of the GHC culture in chimpanzees has been described in terms of physical shaping (De Waal and Seres, 1997). By applying matched-control methodologies (De Waal and Yoshihara, 1983) and following established criteria in the field of communication (Leavens et al., 2005; Liebal and Call, 2012; Pika, 2008), we identify flexible and goal-directed gestural communication as an additional mechanism by which chimpanzees initiate and coordinate their grooming handclasps.

The grooming handclasp is a cooperative activity that requires coordination for successful execution. Chimpanzees cooperate (Mitani, 2009), but not much is known about the ways in which they coordinate their joint efforts. In experimental settings, some chimpanzees used location enhancing behaviors (e.g., bodily positioning, touching, peering) (Melis and Tomasello, 2019), or generic gestures (e.g., arm fling, clapping, banging on panels; Voinov et al. 2020) to entice their conspecific partners into a joint action. In natural contexts, chimpanzees and bonobos communicate to coordinate joint actions like joint travel (Fröhlich et al., 2016) and social play (Heesen et al., 2017; Hobaiter and Byrne, 2014), yet “... the degree to which these actions are joint in terms of whether or not partners aim to achieve shared goals together, or whether partners have shared intentions, remains unknown.” (Genty et al., 2020). Moreover, none of these examples pertain to cultural practices, while joint and shared intentionality (Koreň, 2016; Tomasello and Carpenter, 2007) conducive to joint action are so central to human accounts of culture (Enfield and Levinson, 2006; Tomasello, 2019).

Our findings identify chimpanzees to use gestural communication in a natural context to overcome a coordination challenge in the socio-cultural domain (McGrew and Tutin, 1978;

Nakamura and Uehara, 2004; van Leeuwen et al., 2012). The socio-cultural interaction was not just shaped by one invested individual (De Waal and Seres, 1997), but when the initiator communicated its desire to engage in the GHC (e.g., by holding out its flexed arm at face level in front of the desired partner), an active commitment in the form of a complementary action by the partner was required to accomplish the interaction. As such, when communicated, the cultural GHC practice appeared to ensue with a degree of joint commitment regulating the coordination of the required actions, similar to the handshake example in humans. We conclude that chimpanzees synchronize their attention to a joint cultural action to which they are both committed, which suggests that chimpanzee social culture, like human culture, may be founded on (correlates of) shared intentionality (cf. (Tomasello et al., 2012; Tomasello and Carpenter, 2007; Tomasello and Moll, 2010)).

Reflecting on these findings, we posit that also for animals the socio-cultural context *i*) facilitates and shapes mechanisms conducive to coordinating joint actions (also see (Genty et al., 2020)), and *ii*) provides the adequate breeding ground for the transformation of individualistic to collaborative predispositions and capacities – a transformation thought to be unique to the evolution of the human species (Tomasello and Carpenter, 2007). Regarding *i*), the socio-cultural property of the GHC (McGrew et al., 2001; Nakamura, 2002; van Leeuwen et al., 2012) entails a group-level engagement which spurs in individuals both the motivation to instigate and be susceptible to requests for interaction and, in the case of initiating GHC, solve a coordination challenge. Whereas at first this context may produce overzealous individuals who physically shape their naïve partners into GHC (De Waal and Seres, 1997), in a later stage, the shared readiness to coordinate this joint cultural practice may catalyze the transformation of one-sided shaping (only one actor) into two-sided communication (two committed actors). This hypothesis would *a*) explain why communication for coordination purposes has not been readily observed in chimpanzees (i.e., cultural contexts have been

overlooked) (Duguid et al., 2020a, 2020b), and *b*) predict more communication and seamless coordination in more experienced dyads as focus for future research. Regarding *ii*), it has been posited that humans are unique in their cooperative engagement owing to their capacities for shared intentionality (Tomasello, 2019). Humans are thought to transform individualistic activities into joint, collaborative activities during ontogeny and especially throughout socio-cultural immersion – a process presumably absent in chimpanzees (Tomasello and Carpenter, 2007). It may thus be no coincidence that exactly in this socio-cultural GHC-context we observed capacities for joint attention and commitment in chimpanzees, similar to the ones ascribed to young children engaging in joint activities (Tomasello, 2019). The ontogeny of chimpanzees’ cultural engagement with a specific focus on elements of shared intentionality may provide exciting insights for theories on the evolution of human thinking (Heyes, 2018; Tomasello, 2019).

Methods

Subjects

Subject were 52 chimpanzees (Table S1) at the Chimfunshi Wildlife Orphanage, Zambia. GHC has been a customary behavior in the group for over 15 years, and 39 individuals (including all 32 adults) were observed to GHC at least once. The study was approved by the Chimfunshi Research Advisory Board (permit: CWOT_ 2019C039), and conformed to the nationwide legal requirements. Chimfunshi is accredited by PASA and adheres to the rules and regulations with respect to animal care and management as stipulated by the Zambia Wildlife Authority.

Collection & Coding

Data were collected by ZG from 23-03-2019 to 04-06-2019 between 8am-4pm with handheld digital video cameras (Panasonic HDC-HS100). To capture GHC initiations, filming commenced as soon as two individuals approached one another. Filming continued if the individuals started social grooming and lasted until they (a) had stopped grooming for over 30 seconds, (b) started grooming another individual, or (c) physically separated. A grooming bout was defined as running from the start of grooming until the moment one of the aforementioned ending conditions was met. A bout was considered a GHC-bout if it contained one or multiple GHCs, and a regular grooming bout if no GHCs occurred.

GHC-bouts had either a *side* or *back* view and were analyzed for initiation behaviors if a 10 sec pre-handclasp (PH) social grooming window was available before the first GHC in the bout. We only analyzed the initiation of the first GHC in GHC-bouts, because previous GHCs could possibly function as signals for subsequent GHCs. The start of a GHC was defined as the instance of handclasp above face level; the end as the instance that physical

contact of the palms/wrists was broken. Moreover, a Matched-Control (MC) period was recorded to enable comparison of individual initiation behaviors across conditions (De Waal and Yoshihara, 1983). The MC-period was defined as a 10sec-window minimally 10sec after the last GHC occurrence in the GHC bout, in which the individuals had to be positioned in the same relative positions as during the GHC, while still engaging in social grooming (Figure 1). Additionally, initiations of regular, non-GHC-bouts were opportunistically recorded ($n_{side\ and\ back}=23$, Table S3) to identify behaviors used in the initiation of regular grooming bouts.

Videos were scored in ELAN (Wittenburg et al., 2006), behaviors were coded based on preliminary screening of the videos and established chimpanzee ethograms (Nishida et al., 1999) (see Table S2 and SI videos). An individual was considered the initiator of a GHC bout when they were either a) the first one to produce a GHC-specific initiation behavior or b) in the absence of these behaviors, the first to raise their arm for the GHC. A subset of 20% of the data was coded by two further observers to establish IRR. Mean dyadic agreement was 0.833 for coding behaviors (range 0.81-0.89), and 0.973 for identifying the initiating individual (range 0.89-1; see SI for details).

Analyses

Analyses were done in R 3.6.1. Non-parametric statistics were applied, including Bonferroni-Holm corrections for multiple testing (Holm, 1979). For the PH-MC comparison, we analyzed those behaviors that *i*) occurred ≥ 5 times in GHC-bouts, and *ii*) did not also frequently ($>15\%$ of bouts) occur during initiations of regular grooming bouts (see Table S3). Given that social grooming occurred in both PH and MC windows by definition (see Figure 1 and “Collection & Coding”), we did not consider the grooming behaviours (see Table S3) as

possible signals for GHC initiation. We only used GHC-bouts with a *side-view* (optimal vantage point) and a Matched Control period ($n=94$). Auxiliary analysis including also *back-view* observations ($n_{\text{total}}=133$) supported our main analyses (all 6 behaviors $p<0.02$, Holm corrected; see Tables S3 & S4). When assessing flexibility and elaboration in GHC initiations (Figure 2), we used all *side-view* bouts regardless of the presence of MCs ($n=110$).

Data availability statement

The code and data used for analyses are available via <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4616274>.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the Chimfunshi Wildlife Orphanage Trust for their ongoing support of our research endeavors. In particular we wish to thank the staff of Chimfunshi, in particular manager Innocent Mulenga, as well as Jake Brooker for his assistance during data collection and inter-rater-reliability.

Competing interests

The authors declare to have no competing interests.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

The authors declare no conflict of interests to exist. The research on chimpanzees was strictly non-invasive/observational and adhered to the ethical guidelines provided by the Chimfunshi

285 Research Advisory Board. All applicable international, national, and/or institutional
286 guidelines for the care and use of animals were followed.

287

288 **Funding**

289 EJCvL was funded by a Postdoctoral Fellowship (12W5318N) awarded by the Research
290 Foundation Flanders (FWO). ZG was supported by the ABS Student Grant from the Animal
291 Behavior Society. The authors declare no competing interests.

292

References

- Boyd R, Richerson PJ, Henrich J. 2011. The cultural niche: Why social learning is essential for human adaptation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **108**:10918–10925. doi:10.1073/Pnas.1100290108
- De Waal FBM, Seres M. 1997. Propagation of handclasp grooming among captive chimpanzees. *Am J Primatol* **43**:339–346. doi:10.1002/1098-2345
- De Waal FBM, Yoshihara D. 1983. Reconciliation and Redirected Affection in Rhesus Monkeys. *Behaviour* **85**:224–241. doi:10.1163/156853983X00237
- Duguid S, Allritz M, de las Heras A, Nolte S, Call J. 2020a. Cooperation and communication in great apes In: Hopper LM, Ross SR, editors. *Chimpanzees in Context*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp. 305–329.
- Duguid S, Wyman E, Grueneisen S, Tomasello M. 2020b. The Strategies Used by Chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) and Children (*Homo sapiens*) to Solve a Simple Coordination Problem. *J Comp Psychol* **134**:401–411. doi:10.1037/com0000220
- Enfield NJ, Levinson SC. 2006. *Roots of human sociality: culture, cognition and interaction*. Berg.
- Fröhlich M, Kuchenbuch P, Müller G, Fruth B, Furuichi T, Wittig RM, Pika S. 2016. Unpeeling the layers of language: Bonobos and chimpanzees engage in cooperative turn-taking sequences. *Sci Rep* **6**:25887. doi:10.1038/srep25887
- Fruth BI, Hohmann G, Beuerlein MM, McGrew WC. 2006. Grooming Hand Clasp by Bonobos of Lui Kotale, Democratic Republic of Congo. *Pan Africa News* **13**:6–8.
- Genty E, Heesen R, Guery J-P, Rossano F, Zuberbühler K, Bangerter A. 2020. How apes get into and out of joint actions: Shared intentionality as an interactional achievement.

316 *Interact Stud* **21**.

317 Heesen R, Bangerter A, Zuberbühler K, Rossano F, Iglesias K, Guéry J-P, Genty E. 2020.

318 Bonobos engage in joint commitment. *Sci Adv* **6**:eabd1306. doi:10.1126/sciadv.abd1306

319 Heesen R, Genty E, Rossano F, Zuberbühler K, Bangerter A. 2017. Social play as joint

320 action: A framework to study the evolution of shared intentionality as an interactional

321 achievement. *Learn Behav* **45**:390–405. doi:10.3758/s13420-017-0287-9

322 Henrich J. 2016. The Secret Of Our Success: How Culture Is Driving Human Evolution,

323 Domesticating Our Species, and Making Us Smarter. Princeton University Press.

324 Herrmann E, Call J, Hernandez-Lloreda M V, Hare B, Tomasello M. 2007. Humans have

325 evolved specialized skills of social cognition: The cultural intelligence hypothesis.

326 *Science (80-)* **317**:1360–1366. doi:Doi 10.1126/Science.1146282

327 Heyes CM. 2018. Cognitive gadgets□: the cultural evolution of thinking. Belknap Press.

328 Hobaiter C, Byrne RW. 2014. The Meanings of Chimpanzee Gestures. *Curr Biol* **24**:1596–

329 1600. doi:10.1016/J.CUB.2014.05.066

330 Holm S. 1979. A Simple Sequentially Rejective Multiple Test Procedure. *Scand J Stat* **6**:65–

331 70.

332 Koreň L. 2016. Joint intentionality: From thin to thick. *J Soc Ontol* **2**:75–85. doi:10.1515/jso-

333 2015-0047

334 Laland KN, Janik VM. 2006. The animal cultures debate. *Trends Ecol Evol* **21**:542–547.

335 doi:Doi 10.1016/J.Tree.2006.06.005

336 Leavens DA, Russell JL, Hopkins WD. 2005. Intentionality as measured in the persistence

337 and elaboration of communication by chimpanzees (Pan troglodytes). *Child Dev*

338 **76**:291–306. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00845.x

339 Liebal K, Call J. 2012. The origins of non-human primates' manual gestures. *Philos Trans R*
340 *Soc Lond B Biol Sci* **367**:118–28. doi:10.1098/rstb.2011.0044

341 McGrew WC, Marchant LF, Scott SE, Tutin CEG. 2001. Intergroup differences in a social
342 custom of wild chimpanzees: The grooming hand-clasp of the Mahale Mountains. *Curr*
343 *Anthropol* **42**:148–153.

344 McGrew WC, Tutin CEG. 1978. Evidence for a Social Custom in Wild Chimpanzees? *Man*
345 **13**:234–251.

346 Melis AP, Tomasello M. 2019. Chimpanzees (Pan troglodytes) coordinate by communicating
347 in a collaborative problem-solving task. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* **286**:20190408.
348 doi:10.1098/rspb.2019.0408

349 Mitani JC. 2009. Cooperation and competition in chimpanzees: Current understanding and
350 future challenges. *Evol Anthropol* **18**:215–227. doi:10.1002/evan.20229

351 Nakamura M. 2002. Grooming-hand-clasp in Mahale M Group chimpanzees: implications for
352 culture in social behaviours In: Boesch C, Hohmann G, Marchant LF, editors.
353 Behavioural Diversity in Chimpanzees and Bonobos. Cambridge: Cambridge University
354 Press. pp. 71–83.

355 Nakamura M, Uehara S. 2004. Proximate factors of different types of grooming hand-clasp in
356 mahale chimpanzees: Implications for chimpanzee social customs. *Curr Anthropol*
357 **45**:108–114.

358 Nishida T, Kano T, Goodall J, McGrew WC, Nakamura M. 1999. Ethogram and
359 Ethnography of Mahale Chimpanzees. *Anthropol Sci* **107**:141–188.
360 doi:10.1537/ase.107.141

- 361 Oxlund B. 2020. An Anthropology of the Handshake. *Anthropol Now* **12**:39–44.
362 doi:10.1080/19428200.2020.1761216
- 363 Pika S. 2008. Gestures of apes and pre-linguistic human children: Similar or different? *First*
364 *Lang* **28**:116–140. doi:10.1177/0142723707080966
- 365 Pika S, Zuberbühler K. 2008. Social games between bonobos and humans: Evidence for
366 shared intentionality?, *American Journal of Primatology*. doi:10.1002/ajp.20469
- 367 Ramsey G. 2013. Culture in humans and other animals. *Biol Philos* **28**:457–479.
368 doi:10.1007/s10539-012-9347-x
- 369 Richerson PJ, Boyd R. 2005. Not by genes alone: how culture transformed human evolution.
370 Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- 371 Tomasello M. 2019. *Becoming human: A theory of ontogeny*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard
372 University Press.
- 373 Tomasello M, Carpenter M. 2007. Shared intentionality. *Dev Sci* **10**:121–125.
374 doi:10.1111/j.1467-7687.2007.00573.x
- 375 Tomasello M, Melis AP, Tennie C, Wyman E, Herrmann E. 2012. Two key steps in the
376 evolution of human cooperation. *Curr Anthropol* **53**:673–692. doi:10.1086/668207
- 377 Tomasello M, Moll H. 2010. The gap is social: Human shared intentionality and culture In:
378 Kappeler PM, Silk JB, editors. *Mind the Gap: Tracing the Origins of Human Universals*.
379 Berlin: Springer. pp. 331–349. doi:10.1007/978
- 380 van Leeuwen EJC, Cronin KA, Haun DBM, Mundry R, Bodamer MD. 2012. Neighbouring
381 chimpanzee communities show different preferences in social grooming behaviour. *Proc*
382 *Biol Sci* **279**:4362–7.

383 van Leeuwen EJC, Mundry R, Cronin KA, Bodamer M, Haun DBM. 2017. Chimpanzee
384 culture extends beyond matrilineal family units. *Curr Biol* **27**:588–590.
385 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2017.05.003

386 Voinov P V., Call J, Knoblich G, Oshkina M, Allritz M. 2020. Chimpanzee Coordination and
387 Potential Communication in a Two-touchscreen Turn-taking Game. *Sci Rep* **10**:3400.
388 doi:10.1038/s41598-020-60307-9

389 Wittenburg P, Brugman H, Russel A, Klassmann A, Sloetjes H. 2006. ELAN: a Professional
390 Framework for Multimodality Research Proceedings of the 5th International Conference
391 on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC).

392 Wrangham RW, Koops K, Machanda ZP, Worthington S, Bernard AB, Brazeau NF,
393 Donovan R, Rosen J, Wilke C, Otali E, Muller MN. 2016. Distribution of a Chimpanzee
394 Social Custom Is Explained by Matrilineal Relationship Rather Than Conformity. *Curr*
395 *Biol* **26**:3033–3037. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2016.09.005

396

397

398 **Supplementary Information captions**

399 **SI_1.** Supplementary information and tables, including subject demographics, the behavioral
400 ethogram, frequency table of behavior, outcomes of the Wilcoxon-signed rank tests,
401 and details on the inter-rater reliability calculation.

402 **Video S1.** Elbow hold.

403 **Video S2.** Elbow touch.

404 **Video S3.** Hand grab.

405 **Video S4.** Hand touch.

406 **Video S5.** Head move.

407 **Video S6.** Head touch.

408 **Video S7.** Hold.

409 **Video S8.** Nosewipe.

410 **Video S9.** Self-scratch.

411 **Video S10.** Torso.

412 **Video S11.** Video example of a grooming handclasp initiated with shaping behavior.

413 **Video S12.** Video example of a grooming handclasp initiated with gestural communication.

414 **Interactive Figure S13.** Interactive version of Figure 2.

Supplementary Information

Chimpanzees communicate to coordinate a cultural practice

Zoë Goldsborough^{1,2}, Anne Marijke Schel, Edwin J. C. van Leeuwen*

¹ Animal Ecology, Department of Biology, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

² Department for the Ecology of Animal Societies, Max Planck of Animal Behavior, Konstanz, Germany

* Corresponding author: ejcvanleeuwen@gmail.com

Table S1. Subject demography of Group 2 at Chimfunshi Wildlife Orphanage on 01-07-2019.

	Male	Female	Total
Adult (> 12 years)	8	24	32
Juvenile (3-11 years)	7	5	12
Infant (< 3 years)	3	5	8

Table S2. Ethogram of behavior, with reference to supplementary videos of behaviors.

Behavior	Video	Definition
Elbow Hold	S1	Places own hand on elbow or arm of other, maintaining physical contact as arm of other moves
Elbow Touch	S2	Briefly touches elbow or arm of other with own hand
Hand Grab	S3	Grabs hand of other with own hand, maintaining contact as arm or hand of other moves
Hand Touch	S4	Briefly touches hand of other with own hand
Head Move	S5	Tilts head up or downwards
Head Touch	S6	Touches (side of) head of other with hand, brief or prolonged contact
Hold	S7	Holds arm up in the air at peak of arm-raise movement, i.e., the raising of the upper arm with some flexion in the elbow
Nosewipe	S8	Swipes hand across or underneath nose in quick motion
Self-scratch	S9	Drags hand across body in long rough strokes
Torso	S10	Turns torso towards or away from other

Table S3. Occurrence of all ethogram behaviors in pre-handclasp (PH) and matched-control (MC) periods, as well as initiation of regular grooming bouts (IRG). Reported is the total number of instances and between brackets the number of instances divided by the number of bouts.

Behavior	Side view			Side and back view		
	PH (n = 94)	MC (n = 94)	IRG (n = 17)	PH (n = 133)	MC (n = 133)	IRG (n = 23)
Elbow hold	18 (0.19)	1 (0.01)	0 (0)	25 (0.19)	1 (0.01)	0 (0)
Elbow touch	14 (0.15)	0 (0)	0 (0)	16 (0.12)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Groom face	29 (0.31)	44 (0.47)	7 (0.41)	41 (0.31)	63 (0.47)	8 (0.35)
Groom hand/arm	24 (0.26)	25 (0.27)	5 (0.29)	28 (0.21)	32 (0.24)	6 (0.26)
Groom other	53 (0.56)	70 (0.74)	8 (0.47)	79 (0.59)	95 (0.71)	14 (0.61)
Hand grab	5 (0.05)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0.06)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Hand touch	6 (0.06)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0.05)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Head move	11 (0.12)	1 (0.01)	0 (0)	17 (0.12)	1 (0.01)	1 (0.04)
Head touch	14 (0.15)	3 (0.03)	3 (0.18)	18 (0.14)	3 (0.03)	4 (0.17)
Hold	14 (0.15)	1 (0.01)	1 (0.06)	16 (0.12)	1 (0.01)	1 (0.04)
Nosewipe	12 (0.13)	2 (0.02)	6 (0.35)	16 (0.12)	2 (0.02)	7 (0.30)
Self-scratch	25 (0.27)	9 (0.10)	3 (0.18)	31 (0.23)	13 (0.10)	5 (0.22)
Torso	30 (0.32)	0 (0)	10 (0.59)	44 (0.33)	0 (0)	11 (0.48)

Table S4. Results of the paired Wilcoxon signed rank test of behavior frequency between the PH and MC periods.

Behavior	Side view (n = 94)			Side and back view (n = 133)		
	V	P-value (raw)	P-value (adjusted Holm)	V	P-value (raw)	P-value (adjusted Holm)
Elbow hold**	10	<0.001	0.001	13.5	<0.001	<0.001
Elbow touch*	0	<0.001	0.001	0	<0.001	<0.001
Hand grab*	0	0.037	0.039	0	0.006	0.012
Hand touch*	0	0.020	0.039	0	0.020	0.020
Head move**	6.5	0.004	0.013	8.5	<0.001	0.001
Hold**	0	<0.001	0.001	0	<0.001	<0.001

* indicates $p < 0.05$, ** indicates $p < 0.01$

Inter-rater reliability assessment

To establish inter-rater reliability, two additional coders (JB and AM) analyzed the PHs and MCs of 20% (N = 19) of the GHC bouts. Additionally, ZG coded this subset for a second time to compare to her first coding one year prior.

Due to the continuous nature of the behavioral scoring and the importance of observers not only agreeing on the presence of (often rare) behaviors but also the order in which they occurred, the usual Cohen's Kappa approach was not feasible. We calculated inter-rater reliability as follows (see also attached data for each rater's coding and an overview):

If raters both scored the same behavior in the same order at the same time (within 1 second) it was noted as an "agree", if either of the raters scored a behavior the other one did not score it was a "disagree". As an informed estimation for the total amount of behaviors per video we used the sum of the instances of agree and disagree. To correct for the probability of two raters agreeing on a behavior by chance, we multiplied the probability of scoring a particular behavior (1/11, the amount of different behaviors) by the probability of scoring it for a certain individual (0.5).

The final calculation of the reliability score combined this probability of agreement based on chance (POA) with the relative observer agreement (ROA, defined as agreed behaviors/total amount of behaviors), in the form of $\frac{ROA-POA}{1-POA}$. For instance, 50 agrees out of

70 total behaviors leads to a reliability score of $\frac{(\frac{50}{70})-(0.5*\frac{1}{11})}{1-(0.5*\frac{1}{11})} = 0.70$. For this study, all dyads

showed inter-rater reliability scores above 0.80 (ZG_2-ZG_1 = 0.89; JB-ZG_1 = 0.81; AM-ZG_1 = 0.82; JB-AM = 0.81). Furthermore, each rater also coded who they thought initiated the bout, and inter-rater reliability on initiator was calculated in a similar manner (with POA being 0.5) and was above 0.90 for all raters (JB-ZG_1 = 0.89; all other dyads = 1).