

The organization of work in social insect colonies

Deborah M Gordon
Department of Biological Sciences
Stanford University
Stanford CA 94305-5020

For *Complexity*

A social insect colony operates without any central control; no one is in charge, and no colony member directs the behavior of another. A worker cannot assess the needs of the colony. How do individual workers, using fairly simple, local information, in the aggregate produce the behavior of colonies? The dynamics of colony behavior results in task allocation (Gordon 1996). Colonies perform various tasks, such as foraging, care of the young, and nest construction. As environmental conditions and colony needs change, so do the numbers of workers engaged in each task. For example, when more food is available, or there are more larvae to feed, more foragers may work to collect food. Task allocation is the process that adjusts the numbers of workers engaged in each task in a way appropriate to the current situation.

I study task allocation in the harvester ants (Gordon 1999). Inside the nest ants care for the brood (the pre-adult forms: eggs, larvae and pupae); process and store seeds; construct and maintain chambers; and simply stand around doing nothing. The ants that work outside the nest are a distinct group, apparently older than the interior workers. I divide the behavior I see outside the nest into four tasks: *foraging*, searching for and retrieving food; *patrolling*, assessing food supply and the presence of foragers from neighboring colonies; *midden work*, sorting the colony refuse pile, or midden; and *nest maintenance work*, the construction and clearing of chambers inside the underground nest.

Tasks are interdependent; numbers engaged in one task depend on numbers engaged in another (Gordon 1987, 1989). Ants switch tasks, though not all transitions are possible. In harvester ants, task switching funnels ants into foraging and away from tasks inside the nest (Gordon 1989). An ant's decision whether to perform a task depends, first, on cues about the physical state of the environment: for example, if part of the nest is damaged, more ants do nest maintenance work to repair it. Task decisions also depend on social cues arising from interactions with other ants.

Workers from different task groups meet as they come in and out of the nest. The rate at which one ant encounters others influences its task decisions. The pattern of interactions among ants as they move around can be seen as a kind of ad hoc, dynamical network (Adler & Gordon 1992, Albert & Barabasi 2002).

When ants meet, they touch with their antennae. Antennae are the organs of chemical perception. When an ant uses its antennae to touch the antennae or body of another, it can perceive the colony-specific odor that all nestmates share. We found that in addition to the colony odor, *P. barbatus* ants have an odor specific to their task, because the temperature and humidity conditions in which an ant works alter its cuticular hydrocarbon profile (Wagner et al 1998, 2000, 2001). For example, a forager makes long trips outside the nest in hot, dry air, and this increases the proportion of n-alkanes in its hydrocarbons. An ant may assess the task of an ant it meets using these task-specific odors, so that an ant can evaluate its rate of encounter with ants of a certain task.

We are investigating how patterns of interaction among workers contribute to the dynamics of task allocation in harvester ants. In laboratory studies, we found that an ant's decision whether to perform midden work depends on its recent rate of brief antennal contact with midden workers (Gordon & Mehdiabadi 1999).

In field studies, experiments suggest other decision rules based on encounter rate. One set of experiments shows how a forager's decision whether to go out and collect food depends on its interactions with other workers. We find that the rates of interaction with at least two types of workers influence a forager's activity: interactions with patrollers, and with other foragers.

Patrollers leave the nest each morning before foragers. First the nest patrollers go a few centimeters from the nest entrance and then turn back. The next set of patrollers go around the mound and then out on the trails. These trail patrollers choose the directions taken later by the foragers (Gordon 1991), and foragers will ignore food sources not visited earlier by patrollers (Gordon 1983). It appears that the first foragers prefer the directions in which they encounter most returning patrollers, and later foragers mimic the directions of the earlier foragers.

The rate of interactions with patrollers determine whether foragers leave the nest. Removal experiments (Gordon 2002) show that when nest patrollers do not return, activity outside the nest ceases; there is no further patrolling and foraging never begins. When trail patrollers do not return, outside activity ceases, and foraging never begins. Thus the patrollers influence an all-or-none decision, whether to forage or not on a given day. The return of the first, nest mound patrollers seems to inform the rest of the exterior workers, including foragers, that it is feasible to leave the nest that day. Nest mound patrollers may assess humidity and temperature. After the nest mound patrollers have gone back in, trail patrollers choose foraging directions, based on encounters with the foragers with neighboring colonies and perhaps on food availability (Gordon 1992, Gordon & Kulig 1996). Once foraging has begun, a forager's decision whether to go out to forage depends in part on its rate of contact with successful returning foragers (Gordon 1991, 2002).

Experiments like these show how an ant's moment-to-moment decision about which task to perform, and whether to perform it actively, depends on its interactions with other workers. Interactions between workers of some task groups apparently provide negative feedback, while others provide positive feedback. It appears that what matters to an ant is the *pattern* of interactions it experiences, rather than a particular message or signal transferred at each interaction. Ants do not tell each other what to do when they meet, but the pattern of interaction each ant experiences influences the probability it will perform a task. Each ant uses a set of rules such as, "I'm a forager and if I meet a returning patroller every so often, I remain likely to go out". Evidence for such a rule is that if the forager does not meet a returning patroller, the probability it will go out diminishes.

Research on social insects is only now beginning to unravel the local rules that influence individual behavior. Social insect research is a small and young field. Most of the thousands of social insect species have never been studied at all. Honeybees have been more intensively studied than any other social insect species, because they have been agriculturally important for agriculture throughout human history. Even for honey bees many of the details of individual task decisions are not known. There is no reason to expect that the details of task allocation will be the same in all social insect species. In fact, because social insects thrive in such diverse environments, it is likely that different species have evolved very different social interactions. For example, the relation of patrolling and foraging in harvester ants allows for very slow adjustment to changes in

food availability, which is appropriate in the desert where food availability changes slowly. More opportunistic ant species, that quickly take advantage of small bursts in food supply, probably operate very differently.

An important question about task allocation in harvester ants arises from intriguing results on the effects of colony age. Colonies live 15 to 20 years, founded by a single queen who produces all the workers. Colonies begin with 0 ants and grow to a size of about 10,000 ants when the colony is about 5 years old and begins to reproduce (Gordon 1992); it then stays at about this size for another 10 to 15 years. The behavior of older, larger colonies, of about 10,000 ants, is more stable to perturbation, and more homeostatic, than that of younger, smaller ones of about 3,000 ants (Gordon 1987). Since individual ants live only a year, this cannot be due to the experience of older ants. The simplest hypothesis is that individual decision rules are the same in young and old colonies, but such rules have a different outcome in a small and large system. For example, interaction rates in a small colony might be lower than in a large one, because in a young, small colony, each ant has fewer nestmates it could meet. The dynamics of the interaction network seems to depend on its overall size.

Several types of models have been used to model task decisions in social insects (reviewed in Hirsh & Gordon 2001). Most of these model the behavior of workers engaged in one task, such as foraging, or in several related tasks, such as nest construction in wasps, which involves collecting both paper and water. These include self-organization models (e.g. Deneubourg & Goss 1989), which have mostly been used to predict the formation and shape of foraging trails (e.g. Deneubourg et al 1989). Versions of these models have been applied to more general AI problems such as the travelling salesman problem (Dorigo et al. 1996). Nest construction by wasps has also been studied theoretically and empirically (Theralauz et al 1998).

There have been few attempts to model formally the allocation of workers among different tasks. One approach to modelling the allocation of workers among tasks is the 'foraging-for-work' hypothesis (Tofts 1993) that an individual's decision whether to perform a task may depend on whether it finds itself in a location where that task is required. The threshold model of Robinson & Page (1989) is an informal model of honeybee behavior based on genotypic differences among workers. It supposes that each genotype has a threshold stimulus at which it will perform a task. Empirical studies of honeybees support the threshold model with regard to some tasks but not others (Winston & Katz 1982, Robinson & Page 1995).

So far there have been two theoretical models of task allocation in harvester ants. The first (Gordon et al. 1992) involves a parallel distributed process, such as a neural network. In this model, individual decisions are based wholly on interactions with nestmates. The second model (Pacala et al. 1996) is an analytic model that uses differential equations to describe more deterministically the dynamics of task allocation. In this model, an individual's decision about which task to perform, and whether to perform it actively, is based on two kinds of stimuli: 1) environmental cues that determine whether the ant is 'successful' at its task, e.g. whether a forager finds food and gets it back to the nest, whether a midden worker manages to carry a dead ant to the midden and dump it there, and so on, and 2)

interactions with other individuals. This model is more realistic than the first in that it incorporates environmental as well as social stimuli. Following on this, we investigated how the robustness and sensitivity of the system depends on colony size and on the type of feedback between tasks (Pereira & Gordon 2000). Currently we are developing an agent-based simulation to model task allocation in harvester ants using empirical data to set the parameter values.

It seems likely that in all social insects, both environmental and social cues contribute to an individual's task decisions. Picnics provide an example of an environmental cue; if ants did not respond to changes in food supply, we would not see ants at picnics. Response to environmental stimuli is a component of several previous models (e.g. Jeanne 1996). Numbers of interactions, rate of interaction, transfer of material, waiting time to transfer material, or time elapsed since the last interaction are a component of several recent models of the organization of some aspect of social insect behavior (e.g. Deneubourg & Goss 1989; Jeanne 1999; Andersen and Ratnieks 1999).

The most important outstanding questions about task allocation in social insects are probably similar to the outstanding questions about any complex biological system: How much do the attributes of the individual components (in social insects, the workers) contribute to the dynamics of the system? For example, is it reasonable as a first step to assume that all workers are alike? How do the internal dynamics of the system react to and bring about changes in the environment? The colony is not a closed system: it absorbs materials from, takes cues from, and in turn modifies its environment. Finally, how does the size of the system determine its dynamics? In social insects, this is a developmental question since colonies grow larger as they grow older. Though similar methodological questions apply to all complex systems, the answers will be in the details, and thus will certainly differ among systems.

References

- Albert R & A-L. Barabasi. 2002. Statistical mechanics of complex networks. *Reviews Modern Physics* 74:47-97.
- Adler, F. R. and D. M. Gordon. 1992. Information collection and spread by networks of patrolling ants. *American Naturalist* 40:373-400.
- Andersen, C. and F. L. W. Ratnieks. 1999. Worker allocation in insect societies: coordination of nectar foragers and nectar receivers in honey bee (*Apis mellifera*) colonies. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 46:73-81.
- Deneubourg, J.L., Goss, S., Franks, N. and Pasteels, J.M. 1989 The blind leading the blind: chemically mediated morphogenesis and army ant raid patterns *Journal of Insect Behavior* 2: 715-729.

Dorigo, M., Maniezzo, V., Colorni, A 1996 Ant system: optimization by a colony of cooperating agents IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics-Part B 26: 29-41.

Gordon, D. M. 1983. The relation of recruitment rate to activity rhythms in the harvester ant, *Pogonomyrmex barbatus*. J. Kansas Entomological Society 56(3):277-285.

Gordon D.M. 1987. Group-level dynamics in harvester ants: young colonies and the role of patrolling. Animal Behaviour. 35:833-843.

Gordon D.M. 1989. Dynamics of task switching in harvester ants. Animal Behaviour. 38:194-204.

Gordon D.M. 1991. Behavioral flexibility and the foraging ecology of seed-eating ants. American Naturalist. 138:379-411.

Gordon, D. M. 1996. The organization of work in social insect colonies. Nature 380:121-124.

Gordon, D. M. 1999. Ants at Work: how an insect society is organized. Free Press, Simon and Schuster. 2000 paperback, W. W. Norton.

Gordon, D. M. 2002. The regulation of foraging activity in red harvester ant colonies. American Naturalist 159:509-518.

Gordon, D. M. and A. W. Kulig. 1996. Founding, foraging and fighting: colony size and the spatial distribution of harvester ant nests. Ecology 77:2393-2409.

Gordon D.M. and Mehdiabadi N. 1999. Encounter rate and task allocation in harvester ants. Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology. 45:370-377.

Gordon, D. M. , B. Goodwin, and L. E. H. Trainor. 1992. A parallel distributed model of ant colony behaviour. Journal of Theoretical Biology 156:293-307.

Hirsh, A. E. and D. M. Gordon. 2001. Distributed problem solving in social insects. Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence 31:199-221.

Jeanne, R. L. 1996. Regulation of nest construction behaviour in *Polybia occidentalis*. Animal Behaviour 52:473-488.

Jeanne, R. L. 1999. Group size, productivity and information flow in social wasps. In: Information Processing in Social Insects, eds. C Detrain, J. L. Deneubourg and J M Pasteels. Birkhauser, Basel, pp 3-30.

- Pacala, S. W., D. M. Gordon and H.C.J. Godfray. 1996. Effects of social group size on information transfer and task allocation. *Evolutionary Ecology* 10:127-165.
- Pereira, H. and D. M. Gordon. 2001. A trade-off in task allocation between sensitivity to the environment and response time. *J. Theoretical Biology* 208:165-184.
- Robinson, G. E. and Page, Jr R. E. 1995 Genotypic constraints on plasticity for corpse removal in honey bee colonies *Animal Behaviour* 49: 867-876
- Robinson, G.E, and Page, Jr., R. E. 1989. Genetic basis for division of labor in an insect society. Breed, M.D. and Page, Jr., R. E, eds. *The Genetics of Social Evolution* Boulder CO, Westview Press.
- Theralauz, G., Bonabeau, E., and J. L. Deneubourg. 1998. The origin of nest complexity in social insects. *Complexity* 3:15-25.
- Tofts, C. 1993. Algorithms for task allocation in ants (a study of temporal polyethism theory). *Bulletin Mathematical Biology* 55: 891-918.
- Wagner, D., M. J. F. Brown, P. Broun, W. Cuevas, L. E. Moses, D. L. Chao and D. M. Gordon. 1998. Task-related differences in the cuticular hydrocarbon composition of harvester ants, *Pogonomyrmex barbatus*. *J Chemical Ecology* 24:2021-2037
- Wagner, D., Tissot, M., Cuevas, W., and D. M. Gordon. 2000. Harvester ants utilize cuticular hydrocarbons in nestmate recognition. *J Chemical Ecology* 26: 2245-2257.
- Wagner, D., Tissot, M. and D. M. Gordon. 2001. Task-related environment alters the cuticular hydrocarbon composition of harvester ants. *J Chemical Ecology* 27:1805-1819.
- Winston, M.L. and Katz, S.J. 1982. Foraging differences between cross-fostered honey bee workers (*Apis mellifera*) of European and Africanized races. *Behavioral Ecology Sociobiology* 10:125-129.