

¹ Nest shape influences colony organization in ants: colony spatial
² distribution differs from random movement

³ Greg T. Chism^a, William Nichols^b, Anna Dornhaus^c

^a Graduate Interdisciplinary Program in Entomology and Insect Science University of Arizona Tucson AZ U.S.A.

^b School of Plant Sciences University of Arizona Tucson AZ U.S.A.

^c Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology University of Arizona Tucson AZ U.S.A.

⁴ **Abstract**

Many social animals produce architectures that greatly increase the builder's ability to survive across environments. For example, the many forms and functions of ant nests facilitate their ability to occupy nearly every biome. However, nest shape is not always determined by the ants, as some species inhabit cavities with externally determined shapes, such as rock crevices or hollow sticks. In both cases, we can ask not only how ant behaviour can affect the form and function of nests, but also how nest shapes impact the inhabiting ant colony's behaviour. We examined how the spatial organization of *Temnothorax rugatulus* ants differed across given artificial nests with radically different internal shapes. We used geometric measures to describe the emerging spatial relationships of workers, brood, queens, and alates in these two shapes, and show that overall distributions of all types of colony members are influenced by nest shape. However, we also found that individual spatial fidelity zone size, i.e. the areas repeatedly occupied by individuals, which may be linked to their division of labor, are overall not affected by nest shape. This is even though spatial fidelity zone size does vary as a function of distance from the nest entrance and brood center; and that this relationship is affected by both nest shape and density. Finally, we show that workers are found closer to the nest entrance than would be expected in a random walk model in both nest shapes. These findings indicate that ants actively regulate their nest occupation, and that they may compensate for effects of nest architecture constraints. We conclude in this study that physical properties of nests can influence the in-nest spatial organization of ant colonies, which highlights the need to explore nest shape as a direct influence on the organization, movement, and communication of the inhabiting ant colony.

⁵ **Keywords:** Ants, Nest Architecture, *Temnothorax*, Colony Organization, Nest Entrance, Brood

*Corresponding author
Email address: gchism@arizona.edu (Greg T. Chism)

6 Introduction

7 Social animal architectures benefit individuals by opening a wider range of suitable habitats that they,
8 and their kin, can successfully inhabit. These architectures, i.e. built environmental modifications, range
9 from simple depressions in the ground (e.g. social crab burrows, Laidre et al., 2018) to massive above and
10 below ground structures that span meters across (e.g. Macrotermes termites, Harris 1956). This diversity is
11 unified by the impact each architecture can have on the social behaviour of their occupants: social weaver
12 bird nests promote altruism through spatial and social clustering (van Dijk et al., 2014), kin cohabitation
13 increases with burrow size in social crabs (Laidre et al., 2018, Laidre 2019), and reproductive division of
14 labor is facilitated by both naked mole rat burrows (Tofts and Franks 1992; Faulkes and Bennett 2001) and
15 social insects nests (Wilson and Kinne 1990, Wilson 1992). Ant nests are particularly interesting because of
16 both their representation in nearly every environment, and their diversity in form and function within these
17 environments (Wilson and Kinne 1990, Wilson 1992).

18

19 Here we are interested in how the geometric shape of such built architectures influences the organization of
20 the colony within. Ants have been demonstrated to be distributed non-uniformly across their internal nest
21 space (Sendova-Franks and Franks 1995; Sendova-Franks and Franks 1999; Tschinkel 1999; Tschinkel 2005).
22 For example, colony members may be concentrated in specific sections of the nest (Tschinkel 1999; Tschinkel
23 2005); and workers may use chemical ‘road-signs’ to navigate nest space and differentiate chambers with
24 different functions (Heyman et al., 2017). However, some complex spatial relationships in the nest may
25 be predicted by a random walk model (Sendova-Franks and Van Lent 2002, Davidson and Gordon 2017),
26 implying that the placement of colony members may not be an explicit adaptive strategy. In addition, many
27 ants exploit pre-existing natural structures as nests (e.g. Temnothorax - ‘acorn’ and ‘rock’ ants: Prebus 2017,
28 Cephalotes turtle ants that occupy unmodifiable wood nests: Powell 2008, and rock-dwelling Rhytidoponera
29 metallica ponerine ants: Thomas 2002), which means that the geometry of the available space may not be
30 under the ants’ control. We therefore ask how the internal nest space may influence the spatial organization
31 of workers, queens, and brood in the nest.

32

33 Some studies have previously shown that nest architectural features can greatly affect how workers move
34 and interact in the nest. For example, worker interactions and recruitment increases from movement within
35 more physically connected nest chambers (Pinter-Wollman 2015; Vaes et al., 2020), information processing
36 and exploitation of the environment is decreased in foragers utilizing a nest with multiple entrances (Lehue
37 and Detrain 2019; Lehue and Detain 2020; Lehue et al., 2020a,b; Lehue and Detrain 2020), and panicked
38 workers are slowed by bottleneck effects while evacuating through a single nest entrance (Burd et al., 2010;
39 Wang and Song 2016). These behavioural changes are directly related to a colony’s distribution in the
40 nest, implying consequences of choosing one nest site over another. Here, we examine more basically how
41 nest shape directly influences the spatial positions of colony members, which may translate to changes in
42 performing essential tasks such as foraging.

43

44 Different areas of social insect nests serve different functions. Most prominently in ants, the queen(s) and
45 her brood are typically concentrated in a particular area or chamber(s), referred to as the ‘brood pile’. The
46 location of the brood pile may be influenced by which locations are both more accessible from other nest
47 spaces and possibly more defensible during nest invasions (Varoudis et al., 2018). Worker task allocation,
48 i.e. the types of work performed by different social insect workers, is thus associated with where workers
49 are typically located - individual consistency in their location in the nest is described as ‘spatial fidelity
50 zones’ (Sendova-Franks and Franks 1994; Sendova-Franks and Franks 1995; Sendova-Franks and Franks
51 1999). The locations of these zones for different workers, and the spread of workers across the nest area is a
52 hypothesized mechanism for achieving division of labor in social insects (Robinson et al., 2009). The size of
53 these fidelity zones varies a lot, possibly relating to the type of task available at different locations within

54 the nest (e.g. smaller spatial fidelity zones in workers performing brood care, Sendova-Franks and Franks
55 1995; Jandt and Dornhaus 2009). Inactive workers also occupy smaller fidelity zones, often near the nest
56 center (near/on the brood pile, Charbonneau et al., 2017), and their placement is an indication that they
57 may represent a reserve workforce specializing in brood care (Charbonneau, Poff, et al., 2017; Charbonneau
58 et al., 2017; Leitner and Dornhaus 2019). Thus, the role of different in-nest locations in colony organization
59 varies, and workers occupying space near or on the brood area often have different roles in the colony than
60 workers occupying space in the periphery or near the nest entrance. We therefore focus much of our analyses
61 on the location of colony members relative to the brood pile or the nest entrance.

62

63 Nest-related collective behaviour has been well studied in the *Temnothorax* genus. Rock-dwelling *Temnothorax*
64 have been the subject of studies involving house-hunting (Franks et al., 2002; Dornhaus et al., 2004;
65 Sasaki et al., 2013; Sasaki et al., 2015), collective nest building (Franks et al., 1992; Franks and Deneubourg
66 1997; Aleksiev et al., 2007a; Aleksiev et al., 2007b; Aleksiev et al., 2007c; DiRienzo and Dornhaus 2017),
67 life-history strategy and risk-taking behaviours relating to competition for nest sites (Bengston and Dorn-
68 haus 2014; Bengston and Dornhaus 2015; Bengston et al., 2017), among other topics. We used the rock
69 ant *Temnothorax rugatulus* to examine the influence of nest shape on its occupants because they dwell in
70 pre-existing rock-crevices, producing single-chambered nests that are easily replicated and manipulated in a
71 laboratory setting (Charbonneau and Dornhaus 2015). Worker spatial position in *Temnothorax unifasciatus*
72 nests closely predicts the task they perform, such as brood care near the brood pile (Sendova-Franks and
73 Franks 1995), and *T. unifasciatus* workers will return to their spatial positions in relation to one another in
74 new nests (Sendova-Franks and Franks 1994).

75

76 Here, we determine whether the nest shape affects the in-nest colony organization of *T. rugatulus* colonies.
77 We first compared colony member distributions in two artificial nest designs that differed markedly in
78 physical accessibility. We then asked how in-nest locations of the nest entrance and the center of gravity of
79 the brood distribution or of the physical space as a whole relate to where workers and other colony members
80 are found in the nest. Next, we determined whether the spatial fidelity zones of individual workers are
81 different across nest shapes, relate to the location of nest features or centers, or are conserved individually
82 across nest shapes. Finally, we asked whether worker distributions are predicted by a random walk model.

83

84 Methods

85 Colony collections

86 We collected 20 colonies of *Temnothorax rugatulus* from rocky semi-steep slopes on the Santa Catalina
87 Mountains (GPS: 32.395, -110.688), USA, Pima County, Arizona from July to October 2017 and February
88 to May 2018. The second half of the colonies (IDs 11-20) were collected during the colonies' reproductive
89 period, which allowed us to examine alate spatial organization. The first ten colonies had only workers and
90 (non-alate) queens (and brood), whereas seven of the latter ten colonies had alates (i.e. winged queens and
91 males). We found all our colonies in a pine-juniper zone (altitude approximately 2500m) inhabiting granite
92 rock-crevices where entire colonies were collected by aspiration after prying open the nest cavity.

93

94 Initial housing and care

95 We initially placed all colonies in generic artificial nests resembling their natural nest sites in rock crevices.
96 These nests consisted of a 2-mm-thick piece of cardboard (75 mm x 50 mm x 2 mm) sandwiched between
97 two glass panes (76.2 mm x 50.8 mm x 0.5 mm), with a 2 mm x 2 mm entrance at the center of one long
98 side leading to an open nest space (35 mm x 25 mm) (Charbonneau et al., 2015; Appendix, Fig. A1). We


99 gave colonies food and water *ad libitum*, refreshed weekly, for the duration of their housing: water was given
100 through water-filled cotton ball stopped 5 ml plastic tubes, and food was given through 2 ml microcentrifuge
101 tubes of honey water with a concentration of 1/4 teaspoon honey per 50ml water, and 1/8 (approximately
102 0.075 g) of a fresh-frozen cockroach (*Nauphoeta cinerea*). We kept colonies on a 12:12 h light cycle (8
103 a.m. to 8 p.m.), constant temperature (approximately 21-24 °C). We placed all artificial nests in open-top
104 plastic containers (11.1 cm x 11.1 cm x 3.3 cm) with walls lined with ‘insect-a-slip’ (BioQuip 2871A, ‘fluon’)
105 to prevent escape. We individually marked CO²⁺ anesthetized workers with four identifying marks with
106 multicolored paints (Testor’s Pactra® paint): one each on the head and prosoma, and two on the gaster
107 (Charbonneau and Dornhaus 2015). We marked ants three to five days before the colony was placed into
108 experimental nests.

109

110 **Experimental setup**

111 We used two nest types, a circle, and a tube-shaped nest, for the experimental phase (Fig. 1). We gave
112 colonies comparable nest densities by scaling the internal area of the nest cavities to colony size (number of
113 workers). We examined the size of a *Temnothorax rugatulus* colony that utilized nearly all of the available
114 nest space in a pre-experimental nest (248 workers, Appendix, Fig. A1) and doubled the area per worker to
115 permit flexible nest space use (0.033 mm² per worker) - we termed this the high worker density treatment.
116 We further produced a low worker density treatment by doubling the nest area allocated to each worker
117 compared to that first treatment, producing a density half as dense as the high-density treatment (0.066
118 mm² per worker). These density treatments could result in nature from nest competition: colonies prefer
119 nests that allow lower worker densities (Visscher 2007), but high nest competition could result in populations
120 occupying nests with overall higher density; whereas low nest competition could allow colonies to occupy
121 their preferred nests.

122 ## here() starts at /Users/gregchism/Library/Mobile Documents/com~apple~CloudDocs/Desktop/NestArchOrg



123 **Figure 1.** Nest shapes used for this study, a circle (a) and tube (b) nest.

125

126 **Experimental timeline**

127 We had three distinct experimental phases which were used for both density treatments. Note that half
128 of the colonies experienced the high nest density treatment, and the other half experienced the low nest
129 density treatment.

130

131 *Pre-experimental nest acclimation* - We gave colonies three days to acclimate after a forced emigration into
132 either their circle or tube experimental nest. We randomly assigned nest shapes such that ten of our colonies
133 experienced the circle nest first and assigned the other ten colonies the tube nest first.

134

¹³⁵ *Nest assignment I* - Following the three-day acclimation period, we photographed colonies in their first nest
¹³⁶ assignment for 16 days.

¹³⁷

¹³⁸ *Second pre-experimental nest acclimation* - Following the ‘Nest assignment I’ phase, we removed the top pane
¹³⁹ of glass to expose their nest cavity, which makes emigration into a new nest more desirable than remaining
¹⁴⁰ in their current exposed nest space. We offered a new nest of the other type (circle or tube) and repeated
¹⁴¹ the Pre-experiment acclimation procedure.

¹⁴²

¹⁴³ *Nest assignment II* - We repeated the methods from Nest assignment I for the second nest type for each
¹⁴⁴ colony.

¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁶ ***Photo collection***

¹⁴⁷ We took daily photos to capture colony organization in both nest shapes over both Nest assignment I and II
¹⁴⁸ (see experimental timeline) with an HD camera (Nikon D7000 with 60 mm lens). We used 10 photos from
¹⁴⁹ each nest assignment for analyses.

¹⁵⁰

¹⁵¹ ***Photo analysis***

¹⁵² We assigned cartesian coordinates to each colony member on the digital images and standardized (i.e. trans-
¹⁵³ lated them back into real distances in mm) them with the image analysis software Fiji (Schindelin et al.,
¹⁵⁴ 2012). To standardize coordinates, we converted each coordinate from pixels to metric using a known
¹⁵⁵ distance between reference coordinates from each image (5cm between the bottom-left and top-right nest
¹⁵⁶ corners).

¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁸ ***Nest sections and colony member densities***

¹⁵⁹ We divided each nest into eight equal-area sections from the nest entrance to the back of the nest (1-8, see
¹⁶⁰ Appendix, Fig. A2). We chose not to use more than eight bins because these nest section assignments were
¹⁶¹ potentially large enough to capture and segregate different worker tasks. We determined all colony member
¹⁶² densities by calculating what proportion of total observed individuals of that type on the same image were
¹⁶³ found in that section.

¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁵ ***Scaled distances in the nest***

¹⁶⁶ *Distance to the nest entrance*: We calculated the shortest linear distance within the available nest cavity
¹⁶⁷ from each colony member to the nest entrance (Appendix, Fig. A3). Specifically: In the circle nest, we
¹⁶⁸ calculated each colony member’s distance to the nest entrance (per a scaled reference x and y coordinate)
¹⁶⁹ using the formula: $\sqrt{((\text{colony member } x - \text{entrance } x)^2 + (\text{colony member } y - \text{entrance } y)^2)}$ (Appendix,
¹⁷⁰ Fig. A3a).

¹⁷¹

¹⁷² In the tube nest, where a direct (i.e. straight-line) path was often not possible within the available nest
¹⁷³ space, we found each colony member’s distance to the nest section closest to the entrance using reference
¹⁷⁴ coordinates for that nest section, where we then added the shortest distance from that nest section to the
¹⁷⁵ entrance through reference coordinates (Appendix, Fig. A3).

¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁷ Correcting corner cuts at the entrance: Near the entrance of both nests (in nest section 1), a colony
¹⁷⁸ member's distance to the nest entrance can cut through the corner where the entrance tunnel opens into
¹⁷⁹ the nest (Appendix, Fig. A4). We solved this by determining whether a colony member's distance would
¹⁸⁰ cut through the corner and then assigning an alternative distance to the entrance where necessary.

¹⁸¹

¹⁸² *Distance to the brood center:* We found the distances of each mobile colony member (workers, queens, and
¹⁸³ alates) in every observation to the center of the brood pile (Appendix, Fig. A5), which has been characterized
¹⁸⁴ as a nest center in *Temnothorax* ants (Sendova-Franks and Franks 1995). We calculated the brood center
¹⁸⁵ as the average brood x and y coordinates in the nest section with the most brood items in each observation.
¹⁸⁶ Calculating the overall center of gravity of brood across the entire nest would often take this 'center' outside
¹⁸⁷ of the nest space boundaries in the tube nest. We then found the distance from each mobile colony member
¹⁸⁸ to this brood center. Specifically:

¹⁸⁹ In the circle nest, we found each colony member's shortest distance to the brood center for that observation:
¹⁹⁰ $\text{sqrt}((\text{colony member x} - \text{brood center x})^2 + (\text{colony member y} - \text{brood center y})^2)$ (Appendix, Fig. A5a).

¹⁹¹

¹⁹² In the tube nest, we calculated the shortest distances of mobile colony members and the brood center to
¹⁹³ one another if a direct line path was available within the available nest area. Otherwise, we used a method
¹⁹⁴ similar to worker mean distance to nest sections (e.g. a colony member in nest section 3 and the brood center
¹⁹⁵ in nest section 5, Appendix, Fig. A5b): $\text{sqrt}((\text{colony member x} - \text{xref4})^2 + (\text{colony member y} - \text{yref4})^2)$
¹⁹⁶ $+ (\text{sqrt}((\text{brood center x} - \text{xref4})^2 + (\text{brood center y} - \text{yref4})^2))$.

¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁸ *Distance scaling:* Actual possible distances varied across nests since the nest dimensions were scaled to
¹⁹⁹ colony size to keep a consistent worker density across colonies. To be able to compare overall distribution
²⁰⁰ of colony elements in nests, we scaled all calculated distances by setting the shortest distance from the back
²⁰¹ of the tube nest shape to the entrance as 1, resulting in 0.34 as the maximum distance possible in the circle
²⁰² nest shape.

²⁰³

²⁰⁴ ***Site fidelity***

²⁰⁵ We calculated site fidelity for each paint-marked worker that had at least seven observations: 136 out of
²⁰⁶ 941 possible workers in the high-density treatment and 247 out of 838 possible workers from the low-density
²⁰⁷ treatment. This loss occurred in part because although all workers were initially individually painted, many
²⁰⁸ lost parts of their marks.

²⁰⁹

²¹⁰ *Fidelity and occurrence zone assignment:* We divided each of the eight nest sections described above by
²¹¹ three into twenty-four total zones (Appendix, Fig. A6). We assigned all workers with identifiable unique
²¹² color markings to these zones, but only zones with 15% of the total observations were included in each
²¹³ worker's spatial fidelity zone size (possible zone occupancy therefore was between 15% and 100% of total
²¹⁴ observations for that worker), whereas all zones were included to calculate a worker's overall space usage
²¹⁵ (henceforth termed 'occurrence zone'). We only included workers with at least seven observations because
²¹⁶ if fidelity zones of workers with six or fewer observations are included, this will create a strong positive
²¹⁷ association between fidelity zone size and sample size based on our calculation method (Appendix, Fig.
²¹⁸ A7).

²¹⁹

²²⁰ *Fidelity and occurrence zone size:* We determined fidelity and occurrence zone sizes adding the occupied
²²¹ zones for a total possible twenty-four zones. We used this method to calculate zone sizes (instead of, for

example, a minimum convex polygon: Jandt and Dornhaus 2009; Charbonneau et al., 2017) as an easy method for calculating the area occupied by each worker across our nest spaces, and to ensure that we did not overestimate tube nest zone sizes. Note that this relative-size measure will scale with colony size as total nest area is adjusted to colony size. We additionally considered the true area (cm^2) of worker site fidelity in each nest shape (Fig. 6), and how these scales with colony size (Fig. 7).

We used the agent-based simulation software Netlogo (v6.2.2; Wilenski 1999) to simulate a random walk in our tube and circle nests to test whether our observed worker distributions could be explained by random movement.

Model parameters: We simulated 100 workers in each of our simulations. We defined nest sizes through the same method as our experimental setup, representing our high- and low-density experimental treatments. We started our simulations with all agents at position (37.5, 2), which represents two pixels above the nest entrance (37.5, 0). Our agents picked a heading at random (out of 360°) at each time step. If there was either an agent moving towards the same pixel space in the nest, or a black pixel ahead (which defines space outside of the nest) the agent selects a new random step direction towards an unoccupied nest space.

Simulations: We produced 1000 simulations for the four nest types (small circle, small tube, large circle, large tube), resulting in 4000 total simulations. Our simulations ran for 50,000-time steps, which we determined, by visualizing results (e.g. Figs. 3,4), was sufficient time for agents to evenly distribute throughout the nest in each simulation type

We conducted all data processing using the statistical software R (v4.1.1; R Core Team 2017) and RStudio (v1.2.5042; Allaire 2012), specifically the Tidyverse language ('tidyverse' v1.3.1: Wickham et al., 2019). All original data and analysis scripts are publicly available on Github:

https://github.com/Gchism94/Nest_Arch_ColonyOrganization.

Colony distributions: We used linear mixed effects models to examine colony member distributions (proportion in each nest section) in our experimental nests using the R package 'lme4' (v1.1-27.1; Bates et al., 2014), where P values were calculated through the R package 'lmerTest' (v3.1-3; Kuznetsova et al., 2017). We report the relationships between colony member distributions across nest sections (quadratic term) and nest shape though the interactions term (nest * nest section), and report how nest density affects this relationship through a three-way interaction term (Nest * Nest section * Nest density). Our linear mixed effects models here and below (unless noted otherwise) had colony identification (hereby termed 'ColonyID') as a random effect, and by comparing the variation explained by the fixed effects alone (marginal R^2) and with the random effect included (conditional R^2), we determined the amount of variation that ColonyID explained (marginal and conditional R^2 values calculated through the R package 'MuMIn' v1.43.17; Bartoń 2020).

Scaled distances: We used linear mixed effects models to examine the relationships between nest shape and colony member scaled distances from the nest entrance and mobile colony member distances to the brood center. We examined how nest density affects the relationships between colony member distances and nest shape through an interaction term (Nest * Nest density).

266

267 Worker site fidelity: We used linear mixed effects models to test the effect of nest shape, nest density, and
268 colony identification on worker spatial fidelity and occurrence zone sizes. Our linear mixed effects models
269 predicting fidelity and occurrence zone sizes had worker color identification (hereby termed ‘AntID’) as a
270 random effect. We also consider the true zone sizes (cm^{2+}) and how they relate to colony size through linear
271 mixed effects models.

272

273 Worker site fidelity and distances in the nest: We used linear mixed effects models to test the effect of
274 either worker mean scaled distance to the nest entrance and nest shape, or the effect of worker mean scaled
275 distance to the brood center and nest shape on site fidelity. We assessed how nest density influenced these
276 relationships through the interaction terms between nest distances and nest density, and the three-way
277 interaction between nest distances, nest shape, and nest density. We lastly used an ANOVA to test whether
278 workers had spatial fidelity in relation to the brood center across nest shapes.

279

280 Random walk simulations: We used a quadratic regression (nest section is a quadratic term) to compare
281 worker and simulated distributions across nest sections in both nest shapes. We then used a generalized
282 linear regression with a binomial fit to compare the peak distributions of workers and simulated distributions
283 in nest sections: we assigned a 1 to the nest section with the peak proportion of workers and agents and a
284 0 to all other nest sections. We further compared observed and simulated distributions using two-sample
285 Cramér-von Mises’s tests (calculated through the R package ‘twosamples’ v1.1.1, Dowd 2020), with False
286 Discovery Rate corrected p-values (Benjamini and Hochberg 1995). We chose this distribution test because
287 it compares sums of square differences across entire distribution pairs, whereas the more commonly used
288 Kolmogorov–Smirnov test largely compares the center of the distribution and is therefore less sensitive to
289 differences in the tails (Anderson 1962). Finally, we used a linear regression to compare observed worker
290 and simulated agent scaled distances from the nest entrance.


291

292 Results

293 **Colony distributions**

294 *Nest shape influenced how colony members were distributed across the nest*

295 Broadly, all types of colony members (i.e. workers, brood, queens, and alates) were distributed differently
296 in the two nest shapes (Fig. 2).




297

298 **Figure 2.** Illustration of colony distribution in nests for one example colony (no. 11). Shown are the
 299 distributions of workers (top-left), brood and queens (top-right, queens are red triangles), alates (bottom-
 300 left), and the low density Netlogo random walk simulated workers (bottom-right). Distributions in circle
 301 nests are on the left and the tube nest on the right. Each point is colored by the number of k-nearest
 302 neighbors (KNN) within a radius that's standardized by the data range (indicated by respective legends
 303 below each sub-figure). Colony 11 was selected to illustrate all colony members since not all colonies possess
 304 alates. The scatter plot grid for every colony, and respective Netlogo simulation, can be found as Appendix,
 305 Figs. 12-31.


306

307 Workers and brood were found in nest sections closer to the entrance, in relative terms, in the tube nest
 308 than in the circle nest (Workers: $\beta + SE = 0.003 + 0.001$, $t_{3178} = 4.334$, $P < 0.001$; Fig. 3, Appendix,
 309 Table A1), (Brood: $\beta + SE = -0.008 + 0.001$, $t_{3170} = -6.122$, $P < 0.001$; Figs. 4a-b, Appendix, Table A2),
 310 but this was not seen in queens ($\beta + SE = -0.004 + 0.003$, $t_{3178} = -1.403$, $P = 0.161$, Figs. 4c-d, Appendix,
 311 Table A3) or alates ($\beta + SE = -0.001 + 0.004$, $t_{448} = -0.150$, $P = 0.881$; Fig. 4e, Appendix, Table A4).
 312 However, both queens (Appendix, Table A3) and alates (Appendix, Table A4) were not evenly distributed
 313 in either nest shape. All colony member distributions across nest sections were therefore different between
 314 the two nest shapes, suggesting that colonies have an occupation strategy different than evenly distributing
 315 across nest space.



316

317 **Figure 3.** Workers tend to be clustered near the entrance in both nest types, but this is more pronounced
 318 in the tube nest: shown here are the worker ('Osv', solid colors) and Netlogo simulated random walk result
 319 ('RandWalk', white) proportions of workers in each nest section of the tube (a, b; red) and circle (c, d; blue)
 320 nests (each section has the same area across both nest types, but is scaled with colony size). These figures
 321 also show the high (a, c) and low (b, d) nest density treatment. Here, and in all following boxplots, boxes
 322 represent first and third quartiles (75% of the data), the bar within boxes is the median, and whiskers are
 323 the data range. Sample size was 3192 worker proportions in nest sections across 20 colonies.



324

325 **Figure 4.** Brood and queens, but not alates, are generally found further from the entrance than workers in
 326 both nest types shown here are the difference in brood (a, b), queen (c, d) and alate (e) proportions across

327 tube (red) and circle (blue) nest sections. The brood and queen densities are represented in both the high
328 (a, c) and low (b, d) nest density treatments. Note that here, and below, alates were only present in the
329 low nest density treatment. Sample sizes for colony members in nest sections: brood = 3184, queen = 3192,
330 alates = 456.

331

332 *Brood in low nest density were more evenly distributed in each nest shape*

333 Represented by a three-way interaction between nest shape, nest density, and nest section, brood were
334 distributed more evenly at the low density treatment in both nest shapes, and they were found closer to the
335 back of the circle nest at high nest density when compared to the tube nest shape (Brood: $\beta + SE = 0.004$
336 $+ 0.002$, $t_{3170} = 2.513$, $P = 0.012$; Figs. 4a-b, Appendix, Table A2). In contrast, there was no significant
337 three-way interaction between nest shape, density, and section in workers ($\beta + SE = -0.002 + 0.001$, $t_{3178} =$
338 -1.695 , $P = 0.090$; Fig. 3, Appendix, Table A1), or queens ($\beta + SE = 0.001 + 0.004$, $t_{3178} = 0.308$, $P =$
339 0.758 , Figs. 4c-d, Appendix, Table A3). Therefore, brood care may be distributed across more nest space
340 in lower densities, but mobile colony members occupy nest space similarly across densities.

341

342 *No differences between colonies in overall colony member distributions in nest sections*

343 In our models, 0.00% of variation in the proportions of workers, brood, queens, and alates in nest sections
344 is explained by ColonyID (Appendix, Tables A1-4).

345

346 ***Distances from specific points in the nest***


347 *Nest shape affected colony member distance to the nest entrance*

348 Our tube nest design was long and narrow, thus allowing colony members to be located at much further
349 farther actual distances from the entrance in the tube nest than was possible in the circle nest: (Workers:
350 Appendix, Figs. A8a-b, Table A5), (Brood: Appendix, Figs. A9a-b, Table A6), (Queens: Appendix, Figs.
351 A9c-d, Table A7), (Alates: Appendix, Figs. A9e-f, Table A8). We further found that male alates were
352 closer than queen alates to the nest entrance in both nest shapes (Appendix, Fig. A9f, Table A8). As they
353 settled in the nest, workers (Appendix, Table A5), brood (Appendix, Table A6), and queens (Appendix,
354 Table A6) moved closer to the nest entrance (Appendix, Tables A5-8), but alates moved farther over time
355 (Appendix, Table A8). These results suggest that shorter distances to the entrance are an important factor
356 in *Temnothorax rugatulus* nest occupation.

357

358 *Nest shape affected mobile colony member distance to the brood center*

359 All mobile colony members, i.e. workers, queens, and alates, were also farther from the brood center in the
360 tube nest shape: (Workers: $\beta + SE = 0.103 + 0.002$, $t_{26669.530} = 45.530$, $P < 0.001$; Figs. 7a-b, Appendix,
361 Table A9), (Queens: $\beta + SE = 0.090 + 0.011$, $t_{1067.062} = 8.143$, $P < 0.001$; Figs. 7c-d; Appendix, Table
362 A10), (Alates: $\beta + SE = 0.211 + 0.018$, $t_{2.895} = 11.672$, $P = 0.002$; Fig. 7e, Appendix, Table A11). We also
363 found that male alates were found farther from the brood center than queen alates (Appendix, Table A11).
364 We lastly found that mobile colony member distances to the brood center did not change over the course
365 of the experiment (Appendix, Tables A9-11). Therefore, nest shapes that elongate nest space (e.g. like our
366 tube nest) likely force mobile colony members to distances farther from the brood center.



367
368 **Figure 5.** Worker and queen distributions center near the center of the brood distribution; but in the tube
369 nest, the distances of both from the brood center are much larger. The peak of alate distributions is away

370 from the brood center. Shown on the x-axis are the actual distances from the brood center (see Methods),
371 scaled only by setting the farthest point of the tube nest as a distance of 1 (instead of dividing the nest
372 into sections as in Figs. 3-4). This implies that distances given here are also scaled with colony size. Panels
373 show workers (a, b), queens (c, d), and alates (e, f). The difference between male and female alates is shown
374 in (f), denoted by letters A for females and B for males. Differences in distributions are additionally shown
375 across high (a, c) and low (b, d) nest densities. Sample sizes for colony member distances from the brood
376 center: workers = 26733, queens = 1080, alates = 676.

377

378 *Nest density increased worker and brood distance to the entrance in each nest shape*

379 Workers and brood were found farther from the nest entrance in both nest shapes at low nest density, but
380 this was more pronounced in the tube nest shape (Workers: Figs. 3a-b, Appendix, Figs. A8a-b, Table A5),
381 (Brood: Figs. 4a-b, Appendix, Figs. A9a-b, Table A6). In contrast, there was no effect of nest density on
382 queen distances from the entrance in each nest (Queens: Figs. 4c-d, Appendix, Figs. A9c-d, Table A7).
383 These results may imply that at low density, colonies do not prioritize being near the entrance, perhaps
384 because of short travel times.

385

386 *Nest density decreased worker distance to the brood center both nest shapes*

387 We saw that workers were farther from the brood center in low nest density, which was more pronounced
388 in the tube nest (Workers: $\beta + SE = 0.034 + 0.003$, $t_{26709.876} = 11.769$, $P < 0.001$; Figs. 5a-b, Appendix,
389 Table A9), but queen distances to the brood center were not different across density treatments (Queens: β
390 $+ SE = 0.001 + 0.013$, $t_{1060.719} = 0.105$, $P = 0.916$; Figs. 5c-d; Appendix, Table A10). Queen placement
391 in nest shapes is likely more influenced by distance to the brood center than the entrance, while workers are
392 possibly more influenced by distance to the nest entrance.

393

394 *Small differences between colonies in distance relationships, particularly in alates*


395 For proximity to the nest entrance, the model variation explained by colony ID was 1.5% for workers
396 (Marginal R^2+ = 0.337, Conditional R^2+ = 0.352, Appendix, Table A5), 4.8% for brood (Marginal R^2+ =
397 0.439, Conditional R^2+ = 0.487, Appendix, Table A6), 7.2% for queens (Marginal R^2+ = 0.492, Conditional
398 R^2+ = 0.564, Appendix, Table A7), and 17.2% for alates (Marginal R^2+ = 0.451, Conditional R^2+ =
399 0.623, Appendix, Table A8). Concerning proximity to the brood center, the model variation explained by
400 ColonyID was 2.2% for workers (Marginal R^2+ = 0.279, Conditional R^2+ = 0.301, Appendix, Table A9),
401 8.6% for queens (Marginal R^2+ = 0.249, Conditional R^2+ = 0.335, Appendix, Table A10), and 0.6% for
402 alates (Marginal R^2+ = 0.340, Conditional R^2+ = 0.346, Appendix, Table A11).

403

404 *Worker site fidelity*

405 *Scaled worker site fidelity was influenced by neither nest shape nor nest density*


406 Nest shape did not influence worker spatial fidelity zone size as measured in nest sections ($\beta + SE = -0.145$
407 $+ 0.146$, $t_{378.727} = -0.994$, $P = 0.321$; Figs. 8a-b, Appendix, Table A12) or occurrence zone size in this
408 measurement ($\beta + SE = -0.080 + 0.214$, $t_{378.858} = -0.372$, $P = 0.710$; Figs. 8b-c, Appendix, Table A13),
409 nor did nest density (Fidelity zones: $\beta + SE = -0.320 + 0.159$, $t_{14.107} = -2.010$, $P = 0.064$, Appendix,
410 Tables A12) (Occurrence zones: $\beta + SE = 0.282 + 0.248$, $t_{19.358} = 1.137$, $P = 0.270$, Appendix, Tables
411 A13). Therefore, ant workers appear to be able to maintain the same site fidelity regardless of nest shape.



412 **Figure 6.** Comparison of worker fidelity and occurrence zones sizes (cm^2) in the circle (blue) and tube
 413 (red) nests for both the high (a, c) and low (b, d) nest density treatments. Fidelity zone sizes are the same
 414 in each nest shape ($\beta + \text{SE} = -0.022 + 0.044$, $t_{377.968} = -0.494$, $P = 0.622$, Appendix, Table A14) and
 415 across density treatments ($\beta + \text{SE} = 0.148 + 0.082$, $t_{19.161} = 1.799$, $P = 0.088$, Appendix, Table A14).
 416 Occurrence zone sizes are the same in each nest shape ($\beta + \text{SE} = -0.023 + 0.071$, $t_{366.580} = -0.324$, $P =$
 417 0.746, Appendix, Table A15) but are larger in lower nest density ($\beta + \text{SE} = 0.808 + 0.337$, $t_{16.682} = 2.398$,
 418 $P = 0.029$, Appendix, Table A15). Histograms represent the data distribution; boxplots are the first and
 419 third quartiles where the black bar is the median and the whiskers extend to the data range. Please see
 420 the methods for details on how scaled worker fidelity and occurrence zone size calculations, which here were
 421 multiplied by the total area of the nest to achieve unscaled zone sizes. The sample size was 383 marked ants
 422 across 19 colonies.
 423

424
 425 *Worker identity explained some worker site fidelity variation*
 426 The model variation explained (notably small) by the random effect ColonyID was 4.6% in fidelity zone
 427 sizes (marginal $R^{2+} = 0.022$, conditional $R^{2+} = 0.068$, Appendix, Table A12) and 6.3% in scaled occurrence
 428 zone sizes (marginal $R^{2+} = 0.015$, conditional $R^{2+} = 0.078$, Appendix, Table A13).

429




430
 431 **Figure 7.** Relationship between true worker fidelity and occurrence zones sizes (cm²) and colony size in the
 432 circle (blue) and tube (red) nests for both the high (a, c) and low (b, d) nest density treatments. Points are
 433 jittered on the x and y axis. Lines show significant linear relationships, but note that the relationships in
 434 (a, c) and (b, d) are not significantly different (Appendix, Tables A16-17). The sample size was 383 marked
 435 ants across 19 colonies.

436
 437 **Worker site fidelity and distances in the nest**
 438 *No consistent relationship between worker site fidelity and distance to the nest entrance*
 439 We saw that both worker spatial fidelity and occurrence zones had inconsistent relationships with that
 440 worker's distance to the nest entrance both across nest shapes and nest densities ($\beta + SE = 6.710 + 3.339$,
 441 $t_{375} = 2.010$, $P = 0.045$; Appendix, Figs. A10a-b, Table A18), ($\beta + SE = -14.610 + 4.870$, $t_{374.994} =$
 442 -3.000 , $P = 0.003$; Appendix, Figs. A10c-d, Table A19) - e.g. fidelity zones: the relationship in the circle
 443 nest was positive in high density but negative in low density, both of which were the opposite of the tube
 444 nest relationships in their respective nest densities (Figs. Appendix, Figs. A10a-b, Table A18). Therefore,
 445 we did not find a consistent relationship between worker site fidelity and distance to the nest entrance.

446
 447 *Distance to the brood center did not influence spatial fidelity zones*
 448 There was no relationship between worker spatial fidelity zones and distance from the brood center ($\beta + SE$
 449 $= 1.517 + 4.715$, $t_{360.029} = 0.322$, $P = 0.748$; Figs. 8a-b, Appendix, Table A20), but occurrence zones had
 450 an inconsistent relationship both across nest shapes and nest densities ($\beta + SE = 18.951 + 6.889$, $t_{374.920} =$
 451 2.751 , $P = 0.006$; Figs. 8c-d, Appendix, Table A21). We therefore do not find that workers in different

452 areas of the nest have differently sized spatial fidelity zones.



453
454 **Figure 8.** The relationship between scaled individual worker fidelity (a, b) and occurrence (c, d) zone sizes
455 (scaled relative to total nest size, which was related to colony size) and average scaled distance to the brood
456 pile in the circle (blue circles, solid lines) and tube (red triangles, dashed lines) nest shapes. Lines represent
457 significant linear relationships. These differences are additionally compared across the high (a, c)
458 and low (b, d) nest density treatments. There were no significant differences in any scaled zone sizes across nest
459 shapes or density treatments (Appendix, Tables A20-21). The sample size was 383 marked ants across 19
460 colonies.

461

462 *Workers have spatial fidelity in relation to the brood center across nest shapes*

463 Individual workers were found at different distances from the brood center across all observations that they
464 were identifiable (ANOVA: $F_{\sim 380, 2328} = 4.180$, $P < 0.001$, Appendix, Table A22). We therefore can
465 conclude that though workers did not have consistent spatial fidelity zone sizes (Appendix, Table A12),
466 workers held repeatable spatial fidelity in their distances from the brood center.

467

468 *Small differences between colonies in the relationship between worker site fidelity and nest distances*

469 In models of the relationship between worker site fidelity and distance to the entrance, we saw that the
470 variation explained by our random effect (ColonyID) was 3.7% for fidelity zone size (marginal R² = 0.045,
471 conditional R² = 0.082, Appendix, Table A18) and 6.2% for occurrence zone size (marginal R² = 0.041,
472 conditional R² = 0.103, Appendix, Table A19). In models of the relationship between worker site fidelity
473 and distance to the brood center, we saw that the variation explained by our random effects was 3.1%

474 for fidelity zone size (marginal R² = 0.036, conditional R² = 0.067, Appendix, Table A20) and 8.0% for
475 occurrence zone size (marginal R² = 0.038, conditional R² = 0.118, Appendix, Table A21).

476 **Random walk simulations**

477 *Empirical worker distributions differed from those predicted by a random walk*

478 We saw that empirical and random walk simulated distributions were different (Appendix, Tables A23-26).
479 Specifically, simulated agents were more evenly distributed, while real (observed) workers were found closer
480 to the nest entrance (NestSection2 * Nest * WorkerType: $\beta + SE = -0.002 + 0.000$, $t_{35167} = -5.385$, $P < 0.001$; Fig. 3, Appendix, Table A24). The spatial distribution of ant colonies in their nests is thus
482 significantly different from the outcome that would result from a random walk.

483 *Empirical worker peak distributions differed from those predicted by a random walk*

484 We saw that the nest section with the highest proportion of workers (peak worker distribution) was closer
485 to the entrance in the tube nest than the circle nest, whereas simulated peaks were equally likely to be in
486 any nest section (NestSection2 * WorkerType * Nest: $\beta + SE = -0.133 + 0.041$, $z_{35168} = -3.262$, $P = 0.001$;
487 Appendix, Fig. A11, Appendix, Table A25).

488 **Discussion**

489 Available nest shape influences the spatial organization of colonies in the rock-dwelling ant *Temnothorax*
490 *rugatulus*. Overall, ants preferred the areas in their nest that were closer to the entrance and moved closer
491 to the entrance over the 10 days of our measurements. But in the tube-shaped nest, we found that workers,
492 brood, queens, and alates were on average located further from the nest entrance (Figs. 3-4, Appendix,
493 Figs. A8-9) and further from the brood pile compared to the circle nest (Fig. 5), presumably because the
494 circle nest did not allow such longer distances, but maybe also because of a lack of available space closer to
495 these points in the tube nest. Supporting this second interpretation, workers, brood, and queens were found
496 closer to the nest entrance relative to the maximum available distance in that nest type in the tube-shaped
497 nest. None of these patterns are explained by a null model of ants moving around randomly in the same
498 nest shapes (Fig. 3, Appendix, Figs. A8, A11). Nest shape alone could therefore significantly impact the
499 distances between individuals and biologically relevant points in the nest, and thus how ants can interact
500 with each other and their nest space.

501 We found, however, that both worker spatial fidelity zone sizes and overall area used by each worker ('occurrence
502 zone' size) were not affected by nest shape, either when measured in absolute area or relative to total
503 nest size (Figs. 6, 8). We also did not find a consistent relationship of these zone sizes with location in the
504 nest (e.g. distance to the brood pile, Fig. 8). This is different from what has been demonstrated previously
505 in both *Temnothorax unifasciatus* and the bumble bee *Bombus impatiens*; in both species, workers further
506 from the nest center (brood pile) had larger spatial fidelity zones (Sendova-Franks and Franks 1995; Jandt
507 and Dornhaus 2009). However, our result is consistent with earlier studies on our species *T. rugatulus* which
508 showed that while inactive workers tended to both have small spatial fidelity zones and remain near the nest
509 center while inactive, this was not the case when including these workers' active phases (Charbonneau et
510 al., 2017). We however found that individual workers held spatial fidelity over time in relation to distance
511 from the brood center, despite no consistent trends. The site fidelity of social insect workers in the nest
512 may relate to task specialization, as certain tasks are more likely to be performed in specific nest sections
513 (Sendova-Franks and Franks 1995); smaller fidelity zones thus may be connected to and allow for more
514 specialized workers. Given that workers are more crowded in the tube-shaped nest in our experiment, the
515 lack of a consistent effect on worker spatial fidelity zones may suggest that workers actively regulate their
516 zone size even against constraints imposed by nest shape, to maintain a desired association between workers
517 and their tasks. This bears further investigation.

518 Our study confirms that the spatial distribution of colony members in ant nests is not identical to one that
519 would be produced by 'random movement'. We do not propose that it is realistic that ants move randomly;
520 rather, we believe this is an appropriate null hypothesis to clarify whether the outcome of movement is in

fact different from one in which individual actions do not add up to a non-random trend to accumulate in particular areas. In other studies, the outcome of ant movement has sometimes been indistinguishable from similar null hypotheses of randomness (e.g. worker sorting: Sendova-Franks and Van Lent 2002; interactions between potential and returning foragers: Davidson and Gordon 2017). Additionally, movement in the nest from one ant *T. albipennis* can be predicted by movement from another, and faster movement occurs when more ants are in motion (Gallotti and Chialvo 2018). Outside of the nest, random movement that is reinforced by trail pheromones explains ant coordination along specific trails to and from food sources and the nest (Ma et al., 2013; Chang et al., 2021). The non-random nest occupation of our *T. rugatulus* colonies therefore demonstrates not only that individual ants' movement is not random, but that in aggregate, individual movement rules are such that they bias worker movement to produce clustering and heterogeneity in distribution at the colony level, and that the effects of nest shape we find here cannot be produced by passive effects of geometry on random movement.

The total area available in an enclosed ant nest will determine worker density. Both nest area and worker density in the nest have previously been demonstrated to be important in ants, and our results support this. Nest area is an important consideration for nest site selection in *Temnothorax* ants (Pratt and Pierce 2001; Mitrus 2015), where workers measure the size of prospective nests (Pratt 2005). Crowded nests can significantly increase worker energy expenditure in *T. rugatulus* colonies (Cao and Dornhaus 2008), while also both increasing foraging and scouting rates and inducing polydomy (Cao 2013). The consequences of nest density to ant colonies, such as traffic jammed panicked nest evacuation, can be mediated by small structural features at the nest entrance (Burd et al., 2010; Shiawakoti et al., 2014; Wang and Song 2016). Ants may even adaptively regulate contact rate with each other, as a part of strategies for task allocation and information exchange (Pacala et al., 1996; Pinter-Wollman et al., 2012; Pinter-Wollman et al., 2013; Lehue et al., 2020b). Contact rate may also be used to estimate colony or group size (Gordon et al., 1992; Pratt 2005; Dornhaus and Franks 2006). In our study here, we compared colonies at two different worker densities, but also found that local density in nests is heterogeneous and may be driven by overall nest shape and thus access to all parts of the nest. We saw that colony members spread out more in both nest shapes at low worker density, but this effect was more pronounced in the tube nest shape; in addition, we saw that constraints of space led to higher local density near the entrance in the tube nest (e.g. see Figs. 3-4). Our study did not address whether the spatial distribution of colony members in their nests is a passive effect of particular cavity shapes and densities, or a result of adaptive, flexible individual strategies used by *Temnothorax* ants in response to the particular nest spaces encountered. *Temnothorax* ants, in nature, can also modify their nest spaces by adding internal stone walls to the cavity their nest inhabits (Franks et al., 1992; Franks and Deneubourg 1997; Aleksiev et al., 2007a; Aleksiev et al., 2007b; Aleksiev et al., 2007c; DiRienzo and Dornhaus 2017). The purpose of such nest modifications is not well studied, but it is a possibility that these ants actively modify either the available area or the shape of their nest space. Future work may reveal more about how these spatial distributions affect colony performance, and thus spatial properties of both nest cavities and colony distribution matter most to colonies.

Overall, we found that nest shape affected how ants of the species *T. rugatulus* occupied their nests, and therefore traits of nest cavities available in the ants' environment may affect the behaviour of the colonies inhabiting them. Nest geometry may affect the accessibility of the nest entrance and center of the brood pile, and it may affect ant-ant interactions through heterogeneity in worker density in the nest. On the other hand, we found that at least one important characteristic of the distribution of ant workers in their nests, namely the 'spatial fidelity zone size' for ant workers, appears resilient to such changes in nest shape. It is therefore possible that such resilience is the result of evolved strategies by ant workers to deal with such variability in nest geometry. We argue that nest shape and worker density need to be considered when studying topics such as worker site fidelity, task specialization, overall nest space usage, and nest site selection in ant colonies. Both the approach and results of our study could possibly be extended to other social animal architects, such naked mole rats, social crabs, and social weaver birds, providing insights into how the structural components of their built architectures (i.e. burrows, nests) can influence occupant behaviours such as kinship and division of labor.

571 **Acknowledgements**

572 The authors thank Colin Lynch, Victor (Blue) Paat, Michaela Stearman, Lovina Hadley, Wiley Faron, Kerry
573 Marquardt and Mariya Belishka for their integral work in collecting the data for this study. The authors
574 acknowledge funding from the National Science Foundation awarded to AD (grants no. IOS-3014230 and
575 ABI-3019760) and to GC (grant no. IOS-3014230).

576 **References**

- 577 Allaire, J. (2012). *RStudio: integrated development environment for R*. Boston, MA, 770(394), 165-171.
578 URL: <http://www.rstudio.com/>
- 579 Aleksiev, A. S., Longdon, B., Christmas, M. J., Sendova-Franks, A. B., and Franks, N. R. (2007a).
580 Individual choice of building material for nest construction by worker ants and the collective outcome for
581 their colony. *Animal Behaviour*, 74(3), 559-566. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2006.12.019>
- 582 Aleksiev, A. S., Sendova-Franks, A. B., and Franks, N. R. (2007b). Nest ‘moultling’ in the ant *Temnothorax*
583 *albipennis*. *Animal Behaviour*, 74(3), 567-575. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2006.12.023>
- 584 Aleksiev, A. S., Sendova-Franks, A. B., and Franks, N. R. (2007c). The selection of building material for
585 wall construction by ants. *Animal Behaviour*, 73(5), 779-788. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2006.06.014>
- 586 Anderson, T. W. (1962). On the Distribution of the Two-Sample Cramer-von Mises Criterion. *Ann.*
587 *Math. Statist.* 33(3) 1148 - 1159. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177704477>
- 588 Bartoń, K. (2020). *MuMIn: multi-model inference*. R package version 1.43. 17. Vienna, Austria: The
589 Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN) <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn> Bates, D.,
590 Mächler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S. (2014). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *arXiv*
591 preprint arXiv:1406.5823. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>
- 592 Benjamini, Y., and Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful
593 approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 57(1),
594 289-300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x>
- 595 Bengston, S. E., and Dornhaus, A. (2014). Be meek or be bold? A colony-level behavioural syndrome in
596 ants. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 281(1791), 20140518. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.0518>
- 597 Bengston, S. E., and Dornhaus, A. (2015). Latitudinal variation in behaviors linked to risk tolerance
598 is driven by nest-site competition and spatial distribution in the ant *Temnothorax rugatulus*. *Behavioral*
599 *Ecology and Sociobiology*, 69(8), 1265-1274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-015-1939-4>
- 600 Bengston, S. E., Shin, M., and Dornhaus, A. (2017). Life-history strategy and behavioral type: risk-
601 tolerance reflects growth rate and energy allocation in ant colonies. *Oikos*, 126(4), 556-564. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.0351>
- 602 Burd, M., Shiwakoti, N., Sarvi, M., and Rose, G. (2010). Nest architecture and traffic flow: large potential
603 effects from small structural features. *Ecological Entomology*, 35(4), 464-468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2311.2010.01202.x>
- 604 Cao, T. T., and Dornhaus, A. (2008). Ants under crowded conditions consume more energy. *Biology*
605 *Letters*, 4 (6), 613-615. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2008.0381>
- 606 Cao, T. T. (2013). High social density increases foraging and scouting rates and induces polydomy in *Tem-*
607 *nothorax* ants. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 67(11), 1799-1807. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-013-1587-5>
- 608 Chang, J., Powell, S., Robinson, E. J., and Donaldson-Matasci, M. C. (2021). Nest choice in arboreal
609 ants is an emergent consequence of network creation under spatial constraints. *Swarm Intelligence*, 15(1),
610 7-30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11721-021-00187-5>

- 613 Charbonneau, D., and Dornhaus, A. (2015). Workers ‘specialized’ on inactivity: behavioral consistency
 614 of inactive workers and their role in task allocation. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 69(9), 1459-1472.
 615 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-015-1958-1>
- 616 Charbonneau, D., Hillis, N., and Dornhaus, A. (2015). ‘Lazy’ in nature: ant colony time budgets show high
 617 ‘inactivity’ in the field as well as in the lab. *Insectes Sociaux*, 62(1), 31-35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00040-014-0370-6>
- 618 Charbonneau, D., Poff, C., Nguyen, H., Shin, M. C., Kierstead, K., and Dornhaus, A. (2017). Who
 619 are the “lazy” ants? The function of inactivity in social insects and a possible role of constraint: inactive
 620 ants are corpulent and may be young and/or selfish. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, 57(3), 649-667.
 621 <https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icx029>
- 622 Charbonneau, D., Sasaki, T., and Dornhaus, A. (2017). Who needs ‘lazy’ workers? Inactive workers
 623 act as a ‘reserve’ labor force replacing active workers, but inactive workers are not replaced when they are
 624 removed. *PLoS ONE*, 12(9), e0184074. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0184074>
- 625 Davidson, J. D., and Gordon, D. M. (2017). Spatial organization and interactions of harvester ants during
 626 foraging activity. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 14(135), 20170413. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2017.0413>
- 627 DiRienzo, N., and Dornhaus, A. (2017). Temnothorax rugatulus ant colonies consistently vary in nest struc-
 628 ture across time and context. *PLoS One*, 12(6), e0177598. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177598>
- 629 Dornhaus, A., Franks, N. R., Hawkins, R. M., and Shere, H. N. S. (2004). Ants move to improve:
 630 colonies of Leptothorax albipennis emigrate whenever they find a superior nest site. *Animal Behaviour*,
 631 67(5), 959-963. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2003.09.004>
- 632 Dornhaus, A., and Franks, N. R. (2006). Colony size affects collective decision-making in the ant Tem-
 633 nothorax albipennis. *Insectes Sociaux*, 53(4), 420-427. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00040-006-0887-4>
- 634 Dowd, C. (2020). A New ECDF Two-Sample Test Statistic. arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.01360. URL:
 635 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.01360>
- 636 Faulkes, C. G., and Bennett, N. C. (2001). Family values: group dynamics and social control of reproduc-
 637 tion in African mole-rats. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 16(4), 184-190. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(01\)02116-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-

 638 5347(01)02116-4)
- 639 Franks, N. R., Wilby, A., Silverman, B. W., and Tofts, C. (1992). Self-organizing nest construction in ants:
 640 sophisticated building by blind bulldozing. *Animal Behaviour*, 44, 357-375. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-3472\(92\)90041-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-

 641 3472(92)90041-7)
- 642 Franks, N. R., and Deneubourg, J. L. (1997). Self-organizing nest construction in ants: individual worker
 643 behaviour and the nest’s dynamics. *Animal Behaviour*, 54(4), 779-796. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-3472\(92\)90041-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-

 644 3472(92)90041-7)
- 645 Franks, N. R., Pratt, S. C., Mallon, E. B., Britton, N. F., and Sumpter, D. J. (2002). Information flow, opin-
 646 ion polling and collective intelligence in house-hunting social insects. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal
 647 Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 357(1427), 1567-1583. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2002.1066>
- 648 Gallotti, R., and Chialvo, D. R. (2018). How ants move: individual and collective scaling properties.
 649 *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 15(143), 20180223. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2018.0223>
- 650 Gordon, D. M. (1992). Nest relocation in harvester ants. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*,
 651 85(1), 44-47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aesa/85.1.44>
- 652 Heyman, Y., Shental, N., Brandis, A., Hefetz, A., and Feinerman, O. (2017). Ants regulate colony spatial
 653 organization using multiple chemical road-signs. *Nature Communications*, 8(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms1541>
- 654 Jandt, J. M., and Dornhaus, A. (2009). Spatial organization and division of labour in the bumblebee
 655 Bombus impatiens. *Animal Behaviour*, 77(3), 641-651. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-011-1244-9>

- 657 Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., and Christensen, R. H. (2017). lmerTest package: tests in linear mixed
 658 effects models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 82(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v082.i13>
- 659 Laidre, M. E., Wellborn, G. A., and Thiel, M. (2018). Evolutionary ecology of burrow construction and
 660 social life (pp. 279-301). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- 661 Laidre, M. E. (2019). Architectural modification of shells by terrestrial hermit crabs alters social dynamics
 662 in later generations. *Ecology*, 100(9), e02767. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2767>
- 663 Lehue, M., and Detrain, C. (2019). What's going on at the entrance? A characterisation of the social
 664 interface in ant nests. *Behavioural Processes*, 160, 42-50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2018.12.006>
- 665 Lehue, M., and Detrain, C. (2020). Foraging through multiple nest holes: An impediment to collective
 666 decision-making in ants. *PLoS One*, 15(7), e0234526. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234526>
- 667 Lehue, M., Collignon, B., and Detrain, C. (2020a). Multiple nest entrances alter foraging and information
 668 transfer in ants. *Royal Society Open Science*, 7(2), 191330. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.191330>
- 669 Lehue, M., Detrain, C., and Collignon, B. (2020b). Nest entrances, spatial fidelity, and foraging patterns in
 670 the red ant *Myrmica rubra*: a field and theoretical study. *Insects*, 11(5), 317. <https://doi.org/10.3390/insects11050317>
- 671 Leitner, N., and Dornhaus, A. (2019). Dynamic task allocation: how and why do social insect workers
 672 take on new tasks?. *Animal Behaviour*, 158, 47-63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2019.09.021>
- 673 Ma, Q., Johansson, A., Tero, A., Nakagaki, T., and Sumpter, D. J. (2013). Current-reinforced random
 674 walks for constructing transport networks. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 10(80), 20120864.
- 675 Mitrus, S. (2015). The cavity-nest ant *Temnothorax crassispinus* prefers larger nests. *Insectes Sociaux*,
 676 62(1), 43-49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00040-014-0372-4>
- 677 Pacala, S. W., Gordon, D. M., and Godfray, H. C. J. (1996). Effects of social group size on information
 678 transfer and task allocation. *Evolutionary Ecology*, 10(2), 127-165. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01241782>
- 679 Pinter-Wollman, N., Hubler, J., Holley, J. A., Franks, N. R., and Dornhaus, A. (2012). How is activity
 680 distributed among and within tasks in *Temnothorax* ants?. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 66(10),
 681 1407-1420.
- 682 Pinter-Wollman, N., Bala, A., Merrell, A., Queirolo, J., Stumpe, M. C., Holmes, S., and Gordon, D. M.
 683 (2013). Harvester ants use interactions to regulate forager activation and availability. *Animal Behaviour*,
 684 86(1), 197-207. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-012-1396-2>
- 685 Pinter-Wollman, N. (2015). Nest architecture architectures the collective behaviour of harvester ants.
 686 *Biology Letters*, 11(10), 20150695. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2015.0695>
- 687 Powell, S. (2008). Ecological specialization and the evolution of a specialized caste in *Cephalotes* ants.
 688 *Functional Ecology*, 22(5), 902-911. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2008.01436.x>
- 689 Pratt, S. C., and Pierce, N. E. (2001). The cavity-dwelling ant *Leptothorax curvispinosus* uses nest geome-
 690 try to discriminate between potential homes. *Animal Behaviour*, 62(2), 281-287. <https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2001.1777>
- 691 Pratt, S. C. (2005). Quorum sensing by encounter rates in the ant *Temnothorax albipennis*. *Behavioral
 692 Ecology*, 16(2), 488-496. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/ari020>
- 693 Prebus, M. (2017). Insights into the evolution, biogeography and natural history of the acorn ants, genus
 694 *Temnothorax* Mayr (hymenoptera: Formicidae). *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, 17(1), 1-22. [017-1095-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12862-

 695 017-1095-8)
- 696 R Core Team (2017). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for
 697 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.

- 698 Robinson, E. J., Feinerman, O., and Franks, N. R. (2009). Flexible task allocation and the organization
699 of work in ants. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 276(1677), 4373-4380.
700 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2009.1244>
- 701 Sasaki, T., and Pratt, S. C. (2013). Ants learn to rely on more informative attributes during decision-
702 making. *Biology Letters*, 9(6), 20130667. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2013.0667>
- 703 Sasaki, T., Colling, B., Sonnenschein, A., Boggess, M. M., and Pratt, S. C. (2015). Flexibility of collective
704 decision making during house hunting in *Temnothorax* ants. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 69(5),
705 707-714. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arr007>
- 706 Schindelin, J., Arganda-Carreras, I., Frise, E., Kaynig, V., Longair, M., Pietzsch, T., ... and Tinevez,
707 J. Y. (2012). Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image analysis. *Nature methods*, 9(7), 676.
708 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2019>
- 709 Sendova-Franks, A. B., and Franks, N. R. (1994). Social resilience in individual worker ants and its role
710 in division of labour. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 256(1347),
711 305-309. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1994.0085>
- 712 Sendova-Franks, A. B., and Franks, N. R. (1995). Spatial relationships within nests of the ant *Leptothorax*
713 *unifasciatus* (Latr.) and their implications for the division of labour. *Animal Behaviour*, 50(1), 121-136.
714 <https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.1995.0226>
- 715 Sendova-Franks, A. B., and Franks, N. R. (1999). Self-assembly, self-organization and division of labour.
716 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 354(1388), 1395-1405.
717 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1999.0487>
- 718 Sendova-Franks, A. B., and Van Lent, J. (2002). Random walk models of worker sorting in ant colonies.
719 *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 217(2), 255-274. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jtbi.2002.3011>
- 720 Shiwakoti, N., Sarvi, M., and Burd, M. (2014). Using non-human biological entities to understand pedestrian
721 crowd behaviour under emergency conditions. *Safety Science*, 66, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2014.01.010>
- 722 Thomas, M. L. (2002). Nest site selection and longevity in the ponerine ant *Rhytidoponera metallica*
723 (Hymenoptera, Formicidae). *Insectes Sociaux*, 49(2), 147-152. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00040-002-8294-y>
- 724 Tofts, C., and Franks, N. R. (1992). Doing the right thing: ants, honeybees and naked mole-rats. *Trends
725 in Ecology and Evolution*, 7(10), 346-349. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347\(92\)90128-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347(92)90128-X)
- 726 Tschinkel, W. R. (1999). Sociometry and sociogenesis of colonies of the harvester ant, *Pogonomyrmex
727 badius*: distribution of workers, brood and seeds within the nest in relation to colony size and season.
728 *Ecological Entomology*, 24(2), 222-237. https://doi.org/10.1673/2006_06_32.1
- 729 Tschinkel, W. R. (2005). The nest architecture of the ant, *Camponotus socius*. *Journal of Insect Science*,
730 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1093/jis/5.1.9>
- 731 Vaes, O., Perna, A., and Detrain, C. (2020). The effect of nest topology on spatial organization and re-
732 cruitment in the red ant *Myrmica rubra*. *The Science of Nature*, 107, 1-14. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00114-020-01675-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00114-
733 020-01675-0)
- 734 van Dijk, R. E., Covas, R., Doutrelant, C., Spottiswoode, C. N., and Hatchwell, B. J. (2015). Fine-scale
735 genetic structure reflects sex-specific dispersal strategies in a population of sociable weavers (*Philetairus
736 socius*). *Molecular Ecology*, 24(16), 4296-4311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.13308>
- 737 Varoudis, T., Swenson, A. G., Kirkton, S. D., and Waters, J. S. (2018). Exploring nest structures
738 of acorn dwelling ants with X-ray microtomography and surface-based three-dimensional visibility graph
739 analysis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 373(1753), 20170237.
740 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2017.0237>

- 741 Visscher, P. K. (2007). Group decision making in nest-site selection among social insects. *Annual Review*
 742 of Entomology, 52, 255-275. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ento.51.110104.151025>
- 743 Wang, S., and Song, W. (2016). Experimental study of ant movement in a straight passageway under
 744 stress conditions. *Journal of Insect Behavior*, 29(6), 735-743. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10905-016-9593-x>
- 745 Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D. A., François, R., ... and Yutani, H.
 746 (2019). Welcome to the Tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 4 (43), 1686. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>
- 747 Wilensky, U. (1999). *NetLogo*. <http://ccl.northwestern.edu/netlogo/>. Center for Connected Learning and
 748 Computer-Based Modeling, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.
- 749 Wilson, E. O. (1992). The effects of complex social life on evolution and biodiversity. *Oikos*, 13-18.
 750 <https://doi.org/10.2307/3545511>
- 751 Wilson, E. O., and Kinne, O. (1990). *Success and dominance in ecosystems: the case of the social insects*
 752 (Vol. 2, pp. I-XXI). Oldendorf/Luhe: Ecology Institute.
- 753 Appendix
- 754 **Table A1.** Proportions of workers in each nest section related to nest shape and physical properties. Here
 755 and below: Sections (NestSect) begin at the nest entrance (1) and complete at the back of the nest (8) and
 756 is a quadratic term. Density is the amount of area allocated for each worker (high = 0.033 cm², low = 0.066
 757 cm² x 2), Day is the observation day along the experimental timeline. Corner is the presence of corners in
 758 the nest section. The random effect ColonyID is colony identification. Asterisks denote interactions, and
 759 bold P values indicate significance. Linear mixed effects model: PropWorker ~ poly(NestSect, degree = 2,
 760 raw = TRUE) * Nest * Density + Day + Corner + (1 | ColonyID)
- 761 **Table A2.** Proportions of brood in each nest section related to nest shape and physical properties. Linear
 762 mixed effects: PropBrood ~ poly(NestSect, degree = 2, raw = TRUE) * Nest * Density + Day + Corner +
 763 (1 | ColonyID)
- 764 **Table A3.** Proportions of queens in each nest section related to nest shape and physical properties. Linear
 765 mixed effects: PropQueens ~ poly(NestSect, degree = 2, raw = TRUE) * Nest * Density + Day + Corner
 766 + (1 | ColonyID)
- 767 **Table A4.** Proportions of alates in each nest section related to nest shape and physical properties. Linear
 768 mixed effects: PropAlates ~ poly(NestSect, degree = 2, raw = TRUE) * Nest + Day + Corner + (1 |
 769 ColonyID)
- 770 **Table A5.** Relationships between workers scaled distance to the nest entrance and nest shape and physical
 771 properties. Distance to the entrance is scaled such that 1 is the back of the tube nest shape. Linear mixed
 772 effects: ScaledDist ~ Nest * Density + Day + Corner + (1 | ColonyID)
- 773 **Table A6.** Relationships between brood scaled distance to the nest entrance and nest shape and physical
 774 properties. Linear mixed effects: ScaledDist ~ Nest * Density + Day + Corner + (1 | ColonyID)
- 775 **Table A7.** Relationships between queens scaled distance to the nest entrance and nest shape and physical
 776 properties. Linear mixed effects: ScaledDist ~ Nest * Density + Day + Corner + (1 | ColonyID)
- 777 **Table A8.** Relationships between workers scaled distance to the nest entrance and nest shape, nest physical
 778 properties, and alate sex. Sex is male or female alates, and ratio is the proportion of male alates over all
 779 alate types in the observation. Linear mixed effects: ScaledDist ~ Nest + Sex + Ratio + Day + Corner +
 780 (1 | ColonyID)
- 781 **Table A9.** Relationships between workers scaled distance to the brood center and nest shape and physical
 782 properties. The brood center is a colony's brood center in each observation. Distance to the brood center
 783 is the absolute value of the difference between the scaled distances of the brood center from each worker to
 784 the entrance and is scaled such that 1 is the back of the tube nest. Linear mixed effects: ToBrood ~ Nest *

785 Density + Day + Corner + (1 | ColonyID) Table A10. Relationships between queen scaled distance to the
786 brood center and nest shape and physical properties. Linear mixed effects: ToBrood ~ Nest * Density +
787 Day + Corner + (1 | ColonyID)

788 **Table A11.** Relationships between alate scaled distance to the brood center and nest shape and physical
789 properties. Linear mixed effects: ToBrood ~ Nest + Sex + Ratio + Day + Corner + (1 | ColonyID)

790 **Table A12.** The relationship between worker spatial fidelity zone size and nest shape. Fidelity zone size is
791 the summation of all zones that a worker was found in (zones must have at least 7 observations and 15% of
792 total observations), with twenty-four total possible zones. Linear mixed effects: SFZ ~ Nest * Density + (1
793 | ColonyID)

794 **Table A13.** The relationship between worker occurrence zone size and nest shape. Occurrence zone size
795 is the ratio between the summation of all zones that a worker was found in (zones must have at least 7
796 observations), and twenty-four (total possible zones). Linear mixed effects: Occur ~ Nest * Density + (1 |
797 ColonyID)

798 **Table A14.** The relationship between true worker spatial fidelity zone size (cm²) and nest shape. Here and
799 below the ratio between the total number of occupied zones with >15% observations (fidelity zone size) and
800 the twenty-four possible zones is multiplied by nest area to produce true fidelity zone size. Linear mixed
801 effects: SFZ_Area ~ Nest * Density + (1 | ColonyID)

802 **Table A15.** The relationship between true worker occurrence zone size (cm²) and nest shape. Here
803 and below the ratio between the total number of occupied zones (occurrence zone size) and the twenty-
804 four possible zones is multiplied by nest area to produce true occurrence zone size. Linear mixed effects:
805 Occur_Area ~ Nest * Density + (1 | ColonyID)

806 **Table A16.** The relationship between true worker spatial fidelity zone size (cm²) and colony size (worker.number).
807 Linear mixed effects: SFZ_Area ~ Number.workers * Nest * Density + (1 | ColonyID)

808 **Table A17.** The relationship between true worker occurrence zone size (cm²) and colony size (worker.number).
809 Linear mixed effects: Occur_Area ~ Number.workers * Nest * Density + (1 | ColonyID)

810 **Table A18.** The relationship between a worker's spatial fidelity zone size and average scaled distance to
811 the nest entrance across nest shapes. Linear mixed effects: SFZ ~ MeanScaledDist * Nest * Density + (1 |
812 ColonyID)

813 **Table A19.** The relationship between a worker's occurrence zone size and average scaled distance to the
814 nest entrance across nest shapes. Linear mixed effects: Occur ~ MeanScaledDist * Nest * Density + (1 |
815 ColonyID)

816 **Table A20.** The relationship between a worker's spatial fidelity zone size and average scaled distance to
817 the brood center across nest shapes. Linear mixed effects: SFZ ~ MeanToBrood * Nest * Density + (1 |
818 ColonyID)

819 **Table A21.** The relationship between a worker's occurrence zone size and average scaled distance to the
820 brood center across nest shapes. Linear mixed effects: Occur ~ MeanToBrood * Nest * Density + (1 |
821 ColonyID)

822 **Table A22.** Individual worker (marked) fidelity in relation to distance from the brood center across all
823 observations. AntIDColNest is each identifiable ant in the study. ANOVA: ToBrood ~ Nest * Density +
824 AntIDColNest

825 **Table A23.** Distribution comparisons between the worker and Netlogo random walk simulation results.
826 Two-sample Cramér-von Mises's test statistics were calculated through 2000 random resample bootstraps of
827 the worker and simulated distributions, from which the P value was derived. False Discovery Rates inherent
828 to multiple comparisons were corrected using the Benjamini-Hochberg method.

829 **Table A24.** The relationship between proportions of worker and Netlogo random walk simulated results
830 in each nest section and nest shape and physical properties. WorkerType is whether the observation was a
831 worker or Netlogo random walk simulated result. Linear regression: PropWorker ~ poly(NestSect, degree =
832 2, raw = TRUE) * Nest * WorkerType * Density + Corner

833 **Table A25.** The maximum worker and Netlogo random walk simulated result proportions in each nest
834 section. Nest sections with the max worker or simulated result proportion in each observation were assigned
835 a 1, where the other sections are 0. Logistic regression: MaxNestSect ~ NestSect * WorkerType * Nest *
836 Density, family = Binomial

837 **Table A26.** Relationships between worker and Netlogo random walk simulated result scaled distance to the
838 nest entrance and nest shape and physical properties. Linear regression: ScaledDist ~ Nest * WorkerType
839 + Density + Corner

840 **Figure A1.** The reference photo used to determine the nest area allocated to each worker in a colony.
841 The colony contains 248 individuals, determined with the image analysis software Fiji. The internal area
842 is approximately 4.11mm², producing 0.017 mm² for each worker, which was doubled to 0.033 mm² to
843 promote more flexible space usage. This value represents the high nest density treatment and was doubled
844 to produce the low nest density treatment: 0.066 mm² for each worker in a colony

845 **Figure A2.** The eight equal-area nest sections for the circle (a) and tube (b) nests (black lines) used to
846 determine the densities of colony members and Netlogo simulations through the nest.

847 **Figure A3.** Visual examples of the shortest distance to the entrance calculation utilized for spatial analysis
848 of colony members and Netlogo simulations in the circle (a) and tube (b) nests.

849 **Figure A4.** The criteria used to determine if a colony member required an alternative linear distance to
850 the nest entrance near the corner formed from the nest entrance tunnel opening into the nest (black solid
851 lines). The red dot represents a colony member, and the black dot represents the entrance. The dashed
852 lines represent the hypotenuses between the colony member and the corner (red) and the corner and the
853 entrance (black). The arcs represent angles, and the black square represents 90°. The solid red polygon
854 indicates nest space that would require this type of alternative calculation of distance to the nest entrance.
855 Please see the methods for a full description.

856 **Figure A5.** Visual example of the shortest distance from an example worker (red dots) to an example
857 brood center (white dots) in the circle (a) and tube (b) nests. Figure A6. The twenty-four equal area zones
858 used to calculate worker site fidelity in the circle (a) and tube (b) nests.

859 **Figure A7.** The relationship between the number of observations that contributed to the sizes of worker
860 fidelity (a, c) and occurrence (b, d) zones. Zones are scaled (a, b) and unscaled (cm²) (c, d). Points are
861 individual workers and are jittered in height and width. The sample size was 383 marked ants across 19
862 colonies.

863 **Figure A8.** When showing the actual distances of workers from the nest entrance (scaled only by colony
864 size, by setting the farthest point of the tube nest as a distance of 1) instead of sections as in Figs. 3-4, it
865 becomes clear how colonies in tube nests are spread out more from the entrance and from each other relative
866 to the circle nest. Shown are worker distributions (a, b) and Netlogo random walk simulation results (c, d)
867 for the circle (blue) and tube (red) nests. These distances are also compared in high (a, c) and low (b, d)
868 nest density treatments. Sample sizes were 30247 workers across 20 colonies and 400000 Netlogo simulated
869 agents across 4000 simulations.

870 **Figure A9.** The differences in brood (a, b), queen (c, d), and alate (e, f) scaled distances from the nest
871 entrance. Differences in these distributions are also shown across the low (a, c) and high (b, d) nest density
872 treatments. The significant difference between each alate sex's scaled distances to the nest entrance is shown
873 in (f), denoted by an A for females and B for males (Appendix, Table A8). Sample sizes for colony member
874 distances from the entrance: workers = 30247, brood = 59459, queens = 1178, alates = 1006.

875 **Figure A10.** The relationship between scaled (see methods) individual worker fidelity (a, b) and occurrence
876 (c, d) zone sizes and average scaled distance to the nest entrance in the circle (blue circles, solid lines) and
877 tube (red triangles, dashed lines) nest shapes, and across the high (a, c) and low (b, d) nest density
878 treatments. These differences are additionally compared across the high (a, c) and low (b, d) nest density
879 treatments. Lines represent significant linear relationships (Appendix, Tables A16-17). There were no
880 significant differences in any scaled zone sizes in each nest shape or across density treatments (Appendix,
881 Tables A12-13). The sample size was 383 marked ants across 19 colonies. The sample size was 383 marked
882 ants across 19 colonies.

883 **Figure A11.** The nest sections with the maximum number of workers are near the entrance in the real ants
884 (a), whereas in the random walk simulation the densest area could be in any nest section (b). Lines represent
885 significant binomial logistic regression fits for high (solid) and low (dashed) nest density treatments, in the
886 tube (red) and circle (blue) nest shapes. Sample size was 3192 worker proportions in nest sections across 20
887 colonies, and 32000 Netlogo simulated agents across 40000 simulations.

888 **Figures A12-31.** The densities of workers, brood, queens (red triangles), and, where present, alates in
889 the circle (left) and tube (right) nest shapes for all experimental colonies. Densities of Netlogo simulated
890 workers are also shown in the high (colonies 1-10) or low (colonies 11-20) nest density treatments. Each
891 point is colored by the number of k-nearest neighbors within a radius that's standardized by the data range,
892 where the sub-figure legends are increasing nearest neighbor values from left to right. Note that alates are
893 not always present in both nest shapes.

894 write.bibtex(file="references.bib")