

The Humane Society Institute for Science and Policy
Animal Studies Repository

7-2014

Semi-Wild Chimpanzees Open Hard-Shelled Fruits Differently Across Communities

Bruce Rawlings
University of Portsmouth

Marina Davilla-Ross
University of Portsmouth

Sarah T. Boysen
The Ohio State University, emmanharper@aol.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://animalstudiesrepository.org/acwp_ena



Part of the [Animal Studies Commons](#), and the [Comparative Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rawlings, B., Davila-Ross, M., & Boysen, S. T. (2014). Semi-wild chimpanzees open hard-shelled fruits differently across communities. *Animal cognition*, 17(4), 891-899.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Humane Society Institute for Science and Policy. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of the Animal Studies Repository. For more information, please contact eyahner@humanesociety.org.

Semi-Wild Chimpanzees Open Hard-Shelled Fruits Differently Across Communities

Bruce Rawlings¹, Marina Davila-Ross¹, and Sarah T. Boysen²

¹ University of Portsmouth

² The Ohio State University

KEYWORDS

Chimpanzee, extractive foraging, hard-shelled fruits, culture, social learning

ABSTRACT

*Researchers investigating the evolutionary roots of human culture have turned to comparing behaviours across nonhuman primate communities, with tool-based foraging in particular receiving much attention. This study examined whether natural extractive foraging behaviours other than tool selection differed across nonhuman primate colonies that had the same foods available. Specifically, the behaviours applied to open the hard-shelled fruits of *Strychnos* spp. were examined in three socially separate, semi-wild colonies of chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) that lived under shared ecological conditions at Chimfunshi Wildlife Orphanage, and were comparable in their genetic makeup. The chimpanzees ($N = 56$) consistently applied six techniques to open these fruits. GLMM results revealed differences in the number of combined technique types to open fruits across the colonies. They also showed colony differences in the application of three specific techniques. Two techniques (full biting and fruit cracking) were entirely absent in some colonies. This study provides empirical evidence that natural hard-shelled fruit-opening behaviours are distinct across chimpanzee colonies, differences that most likely have not resulted from ecological and genetic reasons.*

Introduction

To augment the understanding of the origins of human culture, scientific research has paid particular attention to wild nonhuman primate communities and their extractive foraging behaviours, such as using tools for cracking nuts or harvesting insects (Whiten et al. 2001; Biro et al. 2003; Schoning et al. 2008). The traditional approach here has been the method of exclusion where specific behaviours present in one primate community, but absent in others, have led researchers to claim socially learned traditions in nonhuman primates (Whiten et al. 2001, 1999; Schoning, et al. 2008; van Schaik et al. 2003; van Schaik

and Knott 2001). Critics, however, argue that such reports of population-specific foraging behaviours remain inconclusive because geographically distinct populations are likely to have different food resources and tools available, making it impossible to fully exclude ecological explanations (see Tennie et al. 2009; Galef 2004; Laland and Janik 2007). While a recent study has reported that chimpanzee communities living in the same area of the Tai Forest in the Ivory Coast selected tools of different materials to open nuts (Luncz et al. 2012), research is still needed to determine whether the actual behaviours underlying natural foraging, other than tool selection, differ across nonhuman primate communities that have the same food available. This study represents an attempt to do so by comparing a range of techniques for opening the hard-shelled fruits of *Strychnos* spp. (commonly called monkey fruit or bush orange) in three socially separate chimpanzee colonies living in a shared environment.

Experimental studies investigating captive nonhuman primates have provided evidence that techniques used to obtain food from artificial feeding devices can be socially transmitted (e.g. Bonnie et al. 2006; Horner et al. 2006; Dindo et al. 2008). Novel techniques that are seeded into social groups have been found to spread with robust fidelity (Horner et al. 2006; Whiten et al. 2007; Hopper et al. 2011; Dindo et al. 2008; Crast et al. 2010; van de Waal et al. 2013). While such behaviours seem to be socially acquired, they may not be representative of foraging in the wild. Field experiments are a recent development, whereby experimental criteria are applied to attempt to control for ecological conditions when studying wild nonhuman primates. Biro et al. (2003) and Gruber et al. (2009) reported socially acquired tool-based foraging techniques in chimpanzee groups for experimentally induced nuts and honey traps, respectively. van de Waal et al. (2010, 2013) and Kendal et al. (2010) found that wild vervet monkeys and lemurs, respectively, showed socially learned solutions to 'two-action' puzzle tasks. While these findings show that neighbouring primate communities can differ in the methods applied to extract the same food, observational studies on semi-free-ranging nonhuman primates are still lacking.

An alternative factor often overlooked in social learning research is the impact of group demographics. Nonhuman primates of different age and sex groups may differ in tool use (Inoue-Nakamura and Matsuzawa 1997; Boesch and Boesch 1984; Lonsdorf 2005; Fessler 2002; Gruber et al. 2010). For example, immature chimpanzees often omit important stages of nut cracking with stones (Inoue-Nakamura and Matsuzawa 1997), and acquisition of expertise is a gradual process of adjusting techniques based on observing adult models (Inoue-Nakamura and Matsuzawa 1997; Lonsdorf et al. 2004; Corp and Byrne 2002; Boesch and Boesch 1984). Furthermore, several reports have documented that female chimpanzees use tools more often and that they forage more efficiently than males (McGrew 1979; Pruetz and Bertolani 2007; Lonsdorf et al. 2004; Gruber et al. 2010). Studies also suggest that primate sex-specific foraging behaviours may both be socially mediated (van de Waal et al. 2010; Agostini and Visalberghi 2005) and offer evolutionary advantages (McGrew 1979; Pruetz and Bertolani 2007; Fessler 2002). Such findings indicate that group demographics may play an important role in the social acquisition of foraging behaviours. Therefore, in the current study, group demographics received particular attention.

Since research on population-specific foraging has focused almost exclusively on tool use (Whiten et al. 2001; Schoning et al. 2008; van Schaik and Knott 2001), a range of naturally challenging foraging tasks has been overlooked. Opening a hard-shelled fruit without a tool, for instance, is of special research interest. It is likely to be a challenging task for primates, as success here depends upon strategies that combine physicality and cognition, in this way sharing features with tool use (Stokes and Byrne 2001). Further, chimpanzee populations from West to East Africa process hard-shelled fruits, as do other wild primates throughout the world (e.g. aye-ayes, sakis, uakaris, capuchins, baboons, orangutans and bonobos: Koops et al. 2010; Matsumoto-Oda and Kasagula 2000; Lucas et al. 2011; van Lawick-Goodall et al. 1973; Mackinnon 2006; Sterling et al. 1994; Rosenberger and Hartwig 2011). This widespread

consumption implies that comprehensive analyses of the opening techniques involving hard-shelled fruits can provide a valuable contribution to the literature spanning primate learning strategies alongside social and physical cognition.

The present study approach was to provide an overall analysis of the techniques chimpanzees use to open the hard-shelled *Strychnos* fruits and how they utilise these techniques, by comparing age and sex groups across three chimpanzee colonies at Chimfunshi Wildlife Orphanage, Zambia. *Strychnos* fruits are among the most shared fruits between female chimpanzees and their infants at some sites in the wild (Nishida and Turner 1996). The current study ruled out potential ecological influences by comparing socially separate colonies with the same specific foods available, living under equal ecological conditions. It is also important to note that the chimpanzee colonies were originally formed of orphans from different places in Africa, housed by arrival date, not (phylo)geographical background. Based on previous findings suggesting some forms of social learning for foraging (Luncz et al. 2012; Gruber et al. 2009; Horner et al. 2006; Whiten et al. 2007), we hypothesised that chimpanzees of different social colonies would apply different feeding behaviours that did not require tools, independent of available resources, group composition and phylogeny.

Methods

Subjects and colonies

Subjects were 56 chimpanzees at Chimfunshi Wildlife Orphanage (CWO), Zambia: 17 adult and adolescent males, 24 adult and adolescent females, 6 juvenile males (4–8 years of age) and 9 juvenile females (5–8 years of age). They were members of three stable, multimale–multifemale colonies with natural fission–fusion dynamics. Colonies 1, 2 and 3 included 27, 18 and 11 subjects, respectively. Table S1 shows the subject representation for age and sex groups per colony, as well as overall colony composition (Colonies 1, 2 and 3 comprised 45–50, 24 and 13–14 chimpanzees, respectively, during the recording periods).

The largest colony (Colony 1) and middle-sized colony (Colony 2) lived in 77 and 65 ha enclosures, respectively. The smallest colony (Colony 3) lived in a 25 ha enclosure from August 2010 and in a 2 ha enclosure before that. Only one subject, an adult male, was recorded opening fruits (6 fruits) in the 2 ha enclosure. The enclosures contained naturally developed fruit groves, grasslands and forests in the miombo woodland. Walls, trees and fencing meant that the subjects could not observe chimpanzees that lived in the other colonies, at any times.

Colony formations took 2–5 years and ended 5–18 years before data collection. Each colony was composed of a mixture of wild-born chimpanzees and chimpanzees born at CWO (see Davila-Ross et al. 2011). The colonies were organised by the arrival dates of the wild-born chimpanzees, not by their (phylo)geographical background. Thirty-eight of the colony chimpanzees were presumably wild born and brought individually or in pairs to CWO, often from African countries that do not have wild chimpanzee populations. Twenty-four of them (Colony 1:13 chimpanzees; Colony 2:6; Colony 3:5) were brought from countries where wild chimpanzees live (e.g. Tanzania, Uganda and Rwanda). If they were born there, then the subspecies representation for these individuals would be 42–65 % for *Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii* and 31–42 % for *P. t. troglodytes* across the three colonies (Wilson et al. 2008; Tutin et al. 2008). As we do not know with certainty whether these chimpanzees were born in these countries, this estimation on subspecies representation was only presented to show that each colony very likely includes a mix of subspecies and that no apparent sign for phylogenetic differences could be found across the colonies.

Strychnos fruits, feeding sessions and data collection

The fruits from *Strychnos* spp. (Figure S1) weighed approximately 335 g (range 200–460 g) and had a diameter of 8.5 cm (range 7.0–9.7 cm), based on means calculated for five fruits. The *Strychnos* plants do not naturally grow in the chimpanzee enclosures (nor have they been planted there). Instead, the fruits were provided to the chimpanzees by their keepers. All fruits were bought from local farmers. Fruits were randomly distributed among the colonies, such that all three groups were provided with quantities of fruits proportional to group size, and were overall comparable in size, firmness, colour and ripeness (some ripe and some less ripe). It is, therefore, unlikely that the hard-shelled fruits differed in ways that could have explained differences in feeding behaviours across colonies. These fruits were being given to the chimpanzees of CWO before the present study began, at least since 2005. To the authors' knowledge, no human had ever shown or taught the subjects how to open hard-shelled fruits on any prior occasions.

In each of the enclosures, feeding took place within an (approximately) 20 square metre area, close to the enclosure fences, which allowed unobstructed viewing from as close as 1–2 m to the chimpanzees. The feeding areas of Colonies 1 and 2 were roughly 200 m from each other, with the miombo woodland separating them, while the feeding area of Colony 3 was about 1.5 km further away. Each feeding area consisted of mainly dried ground, resulting in a hard surface with little grass and sporadic trees. The chimpanzees could, therefore, see their own colony members during feeding.

Feeding sessions were video-recorded with the objective of including as many subjects as possible. Recordings were made in 2007 (June–August) and in 2011 (August). Two subjects were video-recorded both as juveniles and as adolescents during the two recording periods. To avoid pseudoreplications, only the adolescent data were included, as this was the age group from which most data were obtained for both subjects. The chimpanzees were fed *Strychnos* fruits 2–7 times a week during the study period. Feeding sessions took place for all colonies between 11:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. each day, and video recordings were made from just outside the fence at the feeding sites.

Behavioural coding

A fruit-opening technique was defined as a distinct method applied by a chimpanzee to open a fruit using the mouth, hands and/or feet. Subjects may have used the same technique more than once, as well as combined a range of techniques for each fruit. Repeated as well as individually shown behaviours were tallied as fruit-opening events. For example, if a subject hit a fruit twice against the ground and then used a specific biting technique once, three fruit-opening events were counted. The study included a total of 939 fruit-opening events (mean = 17 events per individual) across 219 fruits (mean = 4 fruits per individual).

The behaviours were coded by one researcher using Windows Media Player. Intercoder reliability was evaluated with a second coder, based on 281 fruit-opening events (30 % of all events) for 29 subjects ($\kappa = 0.91$).

Data analysis

This study systematically examined fruit-opening behaviours by first conducting an overall analysis and then specifically compared chimpanzees across age groups, sex groups and the three colonies. As part of the overall analysis, we assessed whether fruit-opening techniques were used in an organised manner. The applications of opening techniques were measured during four consecutive and mutually exclusive stages: initial opening (Stage 1), following initial opening, but before the first eating phase (Stage 2), further opening a partially opened fruit (Stage 3) and following the first further opening technique, but

before additional eating phases (Stage 4). For descriptions and further details on the stages and eating phases, see Table S2.

Age, sex and colony comparisons were primarily conducted using generalised linear mixed models (GLMM). GLMM analysis examines the effects of predictor variables, while controlling for the potential nonindependence of response variables. Response variables were the mean number of combined technique types to completely open a fruit and the per cent number of fruits opened with a specific technique. The predictor variables were age groups, sex groups and colonies. Subject ID was included as a random effect. GLMM analyses were only performed on models where the improvement in the fit between the full and null models showed statistical significance. GLMM analyses were conducted using the programme R version 2.15 (R Development Core Team 2010) with the 'lme4' package (Bates et al. 2010).

Results

Overall analysis of fruit opening

We distinguished eight distinct fruit-opening techniques applied by subjects, including half biting, full biting, fruit cracking, hitting on object, hitting on ground, peeling, stomping and throwing (for further details on the techniques, see Table 1). The first six techniques were found consistently across all age and sex groups. Of the latter two techniques, only four instances of stomping and six instances of throwing were observed, performed by two and one individuals, respectively. It is important to note that fruit cracking was the only technique where fruits were used to open other fruits; specifically, fruits were used as 'hammers' to strike against other fruits (see Fig. 1 and Supplementary video).

In total, 19 subjects put fruits ($N = 26$) aside after applying a fruit-opening technique, to eat in the future (Supplementary video). For eight subjects, it was clearly visible that these fruits were cracked open, with the pulp visible (14 fruits).

Table S3 provides an overview of the six most common techniques applied throughout the four fruit-opening stages. The chimpanzees consistently used biting throughout Stages 1–4 (mean = 2.6–69.3 % of techniques). Fruit cracking was present only in Stages 1–3 (mean = 13.2–19.9 %). Hitting was primarily applied before the first eating phase, in Stages 1–2 (mean = 15.8–21.3 %). In contrast, peeling was most frequently used after the first or any additional eating phase, in Stages 3–4 (mean = 9.7–18.3 %).

Fruit-opening techniques across age, sex and colonies

GLMM analyses were first conducted for combined techniques and then for specific technique types. For combined techniques, collinearity between all GLMM predictor variables was low; the maximum variance inflation factor (VIF) was 1.18. GLMM results showed that the chimpanzee colonies differed significantly in the mean number of technique types combined to completely open a fruit per subject ($P < .001$; see Table 2). Bonferroni-corrected pairwise comparisons revealed that chimpanzees in Colony 3 combined significantly more techniques than chimpanzees in Colony 1 ($P < .001$) and Colony 2 ($P < .001$). No differences between sex and age groups were found for combined techniques ($P > .05$; see Table 2).

For the GLMM analysis on specific techniques, Hommel–Hochberg corrections were applied for repeated comparisons and a levels were adjusted. Results for the frequently used techniques, with the exception of peeling, are presented in Table 3. Peeling showed a nonsignificant improved fit between the full and null models and thus was excluded from GLMM analysis. Collinearity between all GLMM predictor variables was low (maximum VIF = 3.22). GLMM analysis revealed statistically significant differences across age groups for hitting ($P < .001$) and tendencies of differences (Hommel–Hochberg corrections) in full biting

($P = .048$) and fruit cracking ($P = .038$), see Table 3. No age differences were found for half biting ($P > .05$). Bonferroni-corrected pairwise comparisons showed that juveniles used hitting on objects ($P < .001$) and hitting on the ground ($P < .001$) significantly more often than adults and adolescents. GLMM analysis (with Hommel–Hochberg corrections) revealed that the sex groups tended to show differences in half biting ($P = .025$), see Table 3. No differences between sex groups were found for full biting, fruit cracking, hitting on ground or hitting on objects ($P > .05$). See Table S4 for the use of specific techniques across age and sex groups for each colony.

Table 1. Fruit-opening techniques: names, number of opening events and definitions of fruit-opening techniques shown by subjects

Fruit-opening technique	Definition	Image	Fruit-opening technique	Definition	Image
Half bite n = 316	Incomplete biting into the fruit, followed by breaking away part of the fruit with both the mouth and two hands (and sometimes the feet, see image)		Hit on ground n = 136	Striking a fruit against the ground	
Full bite n = 137	Complete biting through part of the fruit while holding it in one hand. Full bites involve a bigger, more powerful bite than half bites		Peel n = 25	Using fingers to peel away the shell pieces of the fruit	
Fruit crack n = 151	Using one fruit as a hammer to strike against another fruit. Fruit is held in one hand or placed on the ground, and another fruit is struck against it. See Fig. 1 and Supplementary video		Stomp n = 4	Raising the foot above a fruit and powerfully bringing it down onto the fruit	
Hit on object n = 164	Striking a fruit against a rock or tree. The subjects always took the fruits to the rock or tree; rocks were never transported to fruit		Throw n = 6	Throwing a fruit with force against the ground to crack	

Eight types of fruit-opening techniques were found in this study. Numbers refer to fruit-opening events.

Fig. 1. Switching fruits while fruit cracking: an adult male chimpanzee used the fruit cracking technique, i.e., used one fruit as a 'hammer' to crack open another fruit (a, b), before visually inspecting it. Then, he put the latter fruit away (c), placed the 'hammer' fruit into his left hand (d), selected another fruit to use as a 'hammer' (e) and continued with the fruit cracking (f)



Table 2. Combined techniques: GLMM results for number of combined techniques to completely open a fruit, across age, sex and colony

Age	0.226	0.209	1.078	0.284
Sex	-0.119	0.164	-0.721	0.473
Colony	0.227	0.053	4.269	<0.001*
(Intercept)	0.712	0.307	2.323	

Statistically significant differences are marked with '**'


In addition, GLMM analysis showed that the colonies differed significantly from each other in the per cent number of fruits the chimpanzees opened by using half biting ($P = .001$), full biting ($P < .001$) and fruit cracking ($P < .001$), see Table 3 and Fig. 2. Two of these techniques were entirely absent in specific colonies. Full biting was not observed in Colony 3, but regularly occurred in Colonies 1 and 2 (produced by 11 and 13 subjects, respectively). Similarly, fruit cracking was absent in Colony 1, but was frequently observed in Colonies 2 and 3 (produced by five and six subjects, respectively). Furthermore, Bonferroni-corrected pairwise comparisons showed that the chimpanzees from Colony 1 opened significantly more fruits with half biting than chimpanzees from Colony 2 ($P = .019$).

Table 3. Specific techniques: GLMM results for per cent number of fruits with technique events across age, sex and colony

Technique	Estimate	SE	t value	P value
<i>Half bite</i>				
Age	10.097	8.748	1.154	0.250
Sex	16.831	7.461	2.256	0.025
Colony	10.486	2.481	4.227	0.001*
(Intercept)	-4.317	22.154	-0.195	
<i>Full bite</i>				
Age	18.473	9.294	1.988	0.048
Sex	-15.975	8.216	-1.944	0.053
Colony	-11.635	2.750	4.231	<0.001*
(Intercept)	45.428	23.322	1.948	
<i>Fruit crack</i>				
Age	15.694	7.640	2.090	0.038
Sex	-12.611	6.792	-1.857	0.065
Colony	7.264	2.273	3.196	<0.001*
(Intercept)	-11.899	19.117	-0.622	
<i>Hit on object</i>				
Age	-40.873	7.459	-5.480	<0.001*
Sex	-0.067	6.661	-0.010	0.992
Colony	-0.303	2.233	-0.136	0.500
(Intercept)	85.486	18.069	4.594	
<i>Hit on ground</i>				
Age	-30.300	6.135	-4.939	<0.001*
Sex	2.312	5.479	-0.422	0.674
Colony	2.830	1.837	1.541	0.125
(Intercept)	51.695	15.304	3.378	

Statistically significant differences are marked with **

Fig. 2. Fruit-opening across colonies: significant differences were found for the number of fruits opened with half biting ($P < .001$), full biting ($P < .001$) and fruit cracking ($P < .001$) events measured for every subject across the three colonies



Discussion

The present study represents a nonexperimental comparative assessment of the application of natural foraging behaviours for opening hard-shell fruits across three chimpanzee colonies. Analyses revealed fruit-opening differences across the three physically and socially separate chimpanzee colonies in the number of combined techniques and the occurrence of three specific techniques (half biting, full biting and fruit cracking). Most strikingly, full biting and fruit cracking were entirely absent in Colonies 3 and 1, respectively, yet present in the other colonies. This study provides empirical evidence that behaviours underlying natural extractive foraging, other than tool selection, can differ across primate colonies that have the same foods available. The current findings thus support previous findings on population-specific foraging behaviours obtained from wild nonhuman primate communities, where different resources were likely available (Whiten et al. 2001; van Schaik et al. 2003) and where foraging behaviours have been measured under experimental conditions (Gruber et al. 2009; Biro et al. 2003; van de Waal et al. 2010).

Establishing whether asocial or social acquisition has occurred remains difficult in field observations (Laland and Janik 2007). Here, the cross-colony differences in technique application could not easily be explained as a result of asocial learning. If such learning had occurred, then given the ecological similarity and comparable genetic composition, all colonies should have exhibited similar fruit-opening behaviours. It is also important to note that the three techniques which differed across colonies only involved the fruits and the subjects' strength and skill. Thus, it appears that ecological factors do not account for the cross-colony findings presented here.

Six opening techniques were used regularly by the chimpanzees. While *Strychnos* fruit-opening behaviours have been reported (Gruber et al. 2010; Nishida and Turner 1996; Boesch and Boesch 1990; McGrew 1999), the present work describes three techniques that, to the authors' knowledge, not been reported previously in chimpanzees, including fruit cracking, stomping and throwing. The latter two strategies appeared to be idiosyncratic techniques, observed only in three individuals (stomping by two and throwing by one). While the chimpanzees were fruit cracking, they were occasionally observed switching the 'hammer fruit' so that it became the fruit to crack open (see Fig. 1 and Supplementary video). Observations also revealed some indication of food preparations, where nineteen subjects put partially opened fruits aside, presumably to eat them later. These behaviours indicate further flexibility in utilising hard-shelled fruits to extract food.

Despite exhibiting a range of flexibility, some of the techniques applied by the subjects unfolded in an organised manner, with all techniques other than biting closely linked to specific stages of the fruit-opening process. Striking techniques (fruit cracking and hitting) were primarily used to penetrate the fruit's outer shell prior to the first eating phase. These powerful techniques gave way to peeling, a finer, dexterous behaviour used almost exclusively after the first eating phase, which seems appropriate for removing the last shell pieces. Previous field reports on primate feeding behaviours, including tool use, have described similarly sophisticated levels of dexterity and organisation (Inoue-Nakamura and Matsuzawa 1997; Russon 1998; Stokes and Byrne 2001; Byrne and Byrne 1991). Our results also suggest that chimpanzees were displaying hierarchical mental construction—the capacity to hold and integrate several cognitive, motoric or perceptual components to achieve the goal (Stokes and Byrne 2001)—when opening hard-shelled fruits.

Interestingly, across all colonies, juvenile chimpanzees opened more fruits with hitting techniques (i.e. on objects or the ground) than adolescent and adult subjects. Perhaps young chimpanzees develop their own feeding methods for these hard-to-process foods to compensate for the lack of adult/adolescent attributes, such as robust mandibular strength, before acquiring adult/adolescent techniques. These findings contribute to the current literature, where research on extractive foraging with tools has shown

that immature chimpanzees acquire feeding behaviours based on observing adult models (Inoue-Nakamura and Matsuzawa 1997; Lonsdorf et al. 2004; Corp and Byrne 2002). Comparisons by sex revealed that females tended to display more half biting than males, especially among the adults and adolescents. These findings are consistent with field research showing sex differences in chimpanzee foraging behaviours (Goodall 1986; Lonsdorf 2005). Consequently, it may be possible that such differences also extend to nontool use foraging conditions.

In summary, the current study examined natural, non-tool extractive foraging across three separate chimpanzee colonies that had the same foods available and shared the same environment conditions, as well as comparable phylogenetic backgrounds. From these findings, we have concluded that chimpanzees may acquire their foraging behaviours from within their social communities. Chimpanzees, like humans, live in complex social systems, and thus, it is possible that learning specific foraging techniques and how to utilise them from within the social group may have had an important role in shaping human culture among early hominids. Previous field and captive studies have shown that primates are capable of socially mediated traditions (Dindo et al. 2008; Whiten et al. 2007; Reader and Biro 2010). While such findings are important for expanding our knowledge of primate tool use and social cognition, the current study, by observing large, semi-wild groups of chimpanzees, provided a unique interface between field research and captive studies. Further, we believe that studies of semi-wild primate groups are a valuable avenue of research to complement existing methods in attempting to understand animal social learning and the evolution of culture.

Acknowledgments

Special thanks go to Hannah Roome for helpful comments about the manuscript, to Daniela Hartmann for the reliability testing, and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments. M.D.-R. was funded by the European Commission's FEELIX GROWING project (EC-FP6-IST-045169) and by the Psychology Department, University of Portsmouth. S.T.B was supported in part by a Leverhulme Trust Visiting Professorship, Department of Psychology, University of Portsmouth. We thank Sylvia Jones, Innocent Mulenga and Mark Bodamer for their hospitality and assistance with transportation while in Zambia, and would like to thank the founders of Chimfunshi, Sheila and David Siddle, for their tireless welfare efforts. M.D.-R. and B.R. designed this study, M.D.-R. collected data at the Chimfunshi Wildlife Orphanage (with help from S.T.B.), B.R. coded the observations and conducted the analysis (with help from M.D.R.), and B.R. and M.D.R. wrote the paper (with help from S.T.B).

References

- Agostini L, Visalberghi E (2005) Social influences on the acquisition of sex-typical foraging patterns by juveniles in a group of wild tufted capuchin monkeys (*Cebus nigrinus*). *Am J Primatol* 65:335–351. doi:10.1002/ajp.20120
- Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B (2010) lme4: linear mixed effects models using Eigen and Eigen4 (R package version 0.999375-35). <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4>
- Biro D, Inoue-Nakamura N, Tonooka R, Yamakoshi G, Sousa C, Matsuzawa T (2003) Cultural innovation and transmission of tool use in wild chimpanzees: evidence from field experiments. *Anim Cogn* 6:213–223. doi:10.1007/s10071-003-0183-x
- Boesch C, Boesch H (1983) Optimisation of nut-cracking with natural hammers by wild chimpanzees. *Behaviour* 83:256–286. doi:1163/156853983X00192
- Boesch C, Boesch H (1984) Possible causes of sex differences in the use of natural hammers by wild chimpanzees. *J Hum Evol* 13:415–440. doi:10.1016/S0047-2484(84)80055-X
- Boesch C, Boesch H (1990) Tool use and tool making in wild chimpanzees. *Folia Primatol* 54:1–15. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0055768

- Bonnie KE, Horner V, Whiten A, de Waal FBM (2006) Spread of arbitrary customs among chimpanzees: a controlled experiment. *Proc Roy Soc B* 274:367–372. doi:10.1098/rspb2006.3733
- Byrne RW, Byrne JM (1991) Hand preferences in the skilled gathering tasks of mountain gorillas (*Gorilla g. berengei*). *Cortex*. 27:521–546. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.31.4.619
- Corp N, Byrne R (2002) The ontogeny of manual skill in wild chimpanzees: evidence from feeding on the fruit of *saba florida*. *Behaviour* 139:137–168
- Crast J, Hardy JM, Fragaszy D (2010) Inducing traditions in captive capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*). *Anim Behav* 80:955–964. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.08.023
- Davila-Ross M, Allcock B, Thomas C, Bard KA (2011) Aping expressions? Chimpanzees produce distinct laugh types when responding to laughter of others. *Emotion* 11:1113–1120. doi:10.1037/a0022594
- Dindo M, Thierry B, Whiten A (2008) Social diffusion of novel foraging methods in brown capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*). *Proc Roy Soc B* 275:187–193. doi:10.1098/rspb2007.1318
- Fessler DM (2002) Dimorphic foraging behaviours and the evolution of hominid hunting. *Riv Biol* 95:429–453
- Galef BG Jr (2004) Approaches to the study of traditional behaviours of free-living animals. *Learn Behav* 32:53–61. doi:10.3758/BF03196006
- Goodall J (1986) *The chimpanzees of Gombe: patterns of behaviour*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge
- Gruber T, Muller M, Strimling P, Wrangham R, Zuberbuhler K (2009) Wild chimpanzees rely on cultural knowledge to solve an experimental honey acquisition task. *Curr Biol* 19:1806–1810. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2009.08.060
- Gruber T, Clay Z, Zuberbuhler K (2010) A comparison of bonobo and chimpanzee tool use; evidence for a female bias in the *Pan* lineage. *Anim Behav* 80:1023–1033. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.09.005
- Hopper LM, Schapiro SJ, Lambeth SP, Brosnan SF (2011) Chimpanzees' socially maintained food preferences indicate both conservatism and conformity. *Anim Behav* 81:1195–1202. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2011.03.002
- Horner V, Whiten A, Flynn E, de Waal FBM (2006) Faithful replication of foraging techniques along cultural transmission chains by chimpanzees and children. *PNAS* 103:13878–13883. doi:pnas.0606015103
- Inoue-Nakamura N, Matsuzawa T (1997) Development of stone tool use by wild chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *J Comp Psychol* 111:159–173. doi:10.1037/0735-7036.111.2.159
- Kendal RL, Custance DM, Kendal JR, Vale G, Stoinski TS, Rakotomalala NL, Rasamimanana H (2010) Evidence for social learning in wild lemurs (*Lemur catta*). *Learn Behav* 38:220–234. doi:10.3758/LB.38.3.220
- Koops K, McGrew WC, Matsuzawa T (2010) Do chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) use cleavers and anvils to fracture *Treculia Africana* fruits? Preliminary data on a new form of percussive technology. *Primates* 51:175–178. doi:10.1007/s10329-009-0178-6
- Laland K, Janik VM (2007) The animal cultures debate. *Trends Ecol Evol* 21:542–547
- Lonsdorf EV (2005) Sex differences in the development of termite fishing in the wild chimpanzees *Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii* of Gombe National Park. *Tanzania Anim Behav* 70:673–683. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2006.06.005
- Lonsdorf EV, Eberly LE, Pusey AE (2004) Sex differences in learning in chimpanzees. *Nature* 428:715–716. doi:10.1038/428715a
- Lucas PW, Gaskins JT, Lowry TK, Harrison ME, Morrogh-Bernard HC, Cheyne SM, Begley MR (2011) Evolutionary optimization of material properties of a tropical seed. *J Roy Soc Interf* 9:34–42. doi:10.1098/rsif.2011.0188
- Luncz LV, Mundry R, Boesch C (2012) Evidence for cultural differences between neighboring chimpanzee communities. *Curr Biol* 22:922–926. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2012.03.031

- Mackinnon KC (2006) Food choice by juvenile capuchin monkeys *Cebus capucinus* in a tropical dry forest. Springer, New York. doi: 10.1007/0-387-25872-8_17
- Matsumoto-Oda A, Kasagula MB (2000) Preliminary study of feeding competition between baboons and chimpanzees in the Mahale Mountains National Park. *Tanzania Af Stud Monogr* 21:147–157
- McGrew WC (1979) Evolutionary implications of sex differences in chimpanzee predation and tool use. In: Hamburg DA, McCown E (eds). *The Great Apes*, Benjamin/Cummings Publishing, California, pp 441–463
- McGrew WC (1999) Manual laterality in anvil use: wild chimpanzees cracking *Strychnos* fruits. *Laterality* 4:79–87. doi:10.1080/03069887600760101
- Nishida T, Turner L (1996) Food transfer between mother and infant chimpanzees of the Mahale Mountains National Park. *Tanzania Int J Primatol* 17:947–968. doi:10.1007/BF02735296
- Pruetz J, Bertolani P (2007) Savanna chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes verus*) hunt with tools. *Curr Biol* 17:412–417. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2006.12.042
- R Development Core Team (2010) R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna
- Reader SM, Biro D (2010) Experimental identification of social learning in wild animals. *Learn Behav* 33:265–283. doi:10.3758/LB.38.3.265
- Rosenberger AL, Hartwig WC (2011) New world monkeys. *Encyclopedia of life sciences*, Nature Publishing Group. Macmillan Reference Ltd. <http://www.els.net>
- Russon AE (1998) The nature and evolution of intelligence in orangutans (*Pongo pygmaeus*). *Primates* 39:485–503. doi:10.1007/BF02557571
- Schoning C, Humle T, Mobius Y, McGrew WC (2008) The nature of culture: technological variation in chimpanzee predation on army ants revisited. *J Hum Evol* 55:48–59. doi:10.1016/j.jhevol.2007.12.002
- Sterling E, Dierenfeld E, Ashborne C, Feistner A (1994) Dietary intake, food consumption and nutrient intake in wild and captive populations of *Daubentonia madagascariensis*. *Folia Primatol* 62:115–124
- Stokes EJ, Byrne RW (2001) Cognitive capacities for behavioural flexibility in wild chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*): the effect of snare injury on complex manual food processing. *Anim Cogn* 4:11–28. doi:10.1007/s100710100082
- Tennie C, Call J, Tomasello M (2009) Ratcheting up the ratchet: on the evolution of cumulative culture. *Philos Trans Roy Soc B* 364:2405–2415. doi:10.1098/rstb2009.0052
- Tutin CEG, Baillie JEM, Dupain J., Gatti S, Maisels F, Stokes EJ, Morgan DB, Walsh PD (2008) *Pan troglodytes ssp. troglodytes*. In: IUCN 2013. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species
- van de Waal E, Renevey N, Favre CM, Bshary R (2010) Selective attention to philopatric models causes directed social learning in wild vervet monkeys. *Proc Roy Soc B*. 277:2105–2111. doi:10.1098/rspb2009.2260
- van de Waal E, Claidièrea N, Whiten A (2013) Social learning and spread of alternative means of opening an artificial fruit in four groups of vervet monkeys. *Anim Behav* 85:71–76. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.10.008
- van Lawick-Goodall J, Van-Lawick H, Packer C (1973) Tool-use in free-living Baboons in the Gombe National Park. *Tanzania Nat* 241:212–213. doi:10.1038/241212a0
- van Schaik CP, Knott CD (2001) Geographic variation in tool use on *Neesia* fruits in orangutans. *Am J Phys Anthropol* 11:331–342. doi:10.1002/ajpa.1045
- van Schaik CP, Ancrenaz M, Borgen G, Galdikas B, Knott CD, Singleton L, Suzuki A, Utami SS, Merrill M (2003) Orangutan cultures and the evolution of material culture. *Science* 299:102–105. doi:10.1126/science.1078004
- Whiten A, Goodall J, McGrew WC, Nishida T, Reynoldsk V, Sugiyama Y (1999) Culture in chimpanzees. *Nature* 399:15–19. doi:10.1038/21415

- Whiten A, Goodall J, McGrew W, Nishida T, Reynolds V, Sugiyama Y, Tutin C, Wrangham R, Boesch C (2001) Charting cultural variation in chimpanzees. *Behaviour*. 138:1481–1516. doi:10.1163/156853901317367717
- Whiten A, Spiteri A, Horner V, Bonnie KE, Lambeth SP, Schapiro SJ, de Waal FBM (2007) Transmission of multiple traditions within and between groups. *Curr Biol* 17:1–6. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2007.05.031
- Wilson ML, Balmforth Z, Cox D, Davenport T, Hart J, Hicks C, Hunt KD, Kamenya S, Mitani JC, Moore J, Nakamura M, Nixon S, Plumptre AJ, Reynolds V (2008). *Pan troglodytes* ssp. *schweinfurthii*. In: IUCN 2013. IUCN red list of threatened species