# Stafford, Richard and Hart, Adam G and Goodenough, Anne E (2013). *A visual method to identify significant latitudinal changes in species' distributions.* Ecological Informatics, 15, 74-84. ISSN 15749541

# Inferential and visual analysis of ethogram data using multivariate techniques

Richard Stafford[a]*, Anne E. Goodenough[b], Kathy Slater[c], William Carpenter[b], Laura Collins[b], Heather Cruickshank[b], Sarah Downing[b], Sally Hall[b], Katie McDonald[d], Heather McDonnell[b], Bryony Overs[b], Lizzie Spiers[b], Mark Stetter[e], Heike Zitzer[c], Adam G. Hart[b]

a) Luton Institute of Research in Applied Natural Sciences, University of Bedfordshire

b) Department of Natural and Social Sciences, University of Gloucestershire, Cheltenham

c) Operation Wallacea, Spilsby, Lincolnshire

d) West Midlands Safari Park, Bewdley, Worcestershire

e) Animals Science and Environment, Walt Disney World, Lake Buena Vista, Florida

* Corresponding author. Email: rick.stafford7@gmail.com

Division of Science, University of Bedfordshire, Luton, LU1 3JU, UK.

Tel: +44 (0) 1582 489158

Fax: +44 (0) 1582 489212

Word count =

**Inferential and visual analysis of ethogram data using multivariate techniques**

Activity budgets are frequently used to examine behaviours of animals, especially of large mammals in field or captivity conditions (e.g. Altmann 1974; Weller and Bennett 2001; MacNulty et al. 2007). Often, such processes are conducted using ethograms, where a number of typical behaviours are listed (such as foraging, sleeping, walking, standing still, interacting with others) and either the duration of each behaviour within each observation period is noted, or, more normally, the occurrence of a certain behaviour is recorded at a regular time interval (Dawkins 2007; Martin and Bateson 2007). The technique is simple, and clearly effective in calculating the proportion of time spent undertaking each of the behaviours. However, analysis of the data is problematic (Ramson and Cade 2009). Even if the same animal is repeatedly sampled (for example on different days), the averages and some measure of variability or precision are normally calculated for each of the behavioural categories included in the ethogram separately (Ramson and Cade 2009). While inferential statistics could be used to calculate significant differences between individuals in terms of the occurrence of a specific behaviour, there are problems with the independence of these data both in terms of repeated measures, and because all behaviours must sum to 1 as they are mutually exclusive– see Aitchison 1986 and Underwood 1996 for more details about these points). Even if such strict limitations on data analysis are relaxed, then this still only indicates whether animal X conducts behaviour A more or less frequently than animal Y.

Because of these issues, it would be preferable to use a multivariate method to analyse the overall behaviour of individuals (defined as all behaviours in the activity budget e.g. Mielke and Berry 2007) and to compare it to other individuals for whom identical data are held. Principal Component Analysis (PCA), and associated plotting of resultant components in 2 or 3 dimensions, is one possible method (i.e. biplots, where any given case is plotted against the first two principal components). This can give an indication of how different animals behave, based on all the behaviours examined. However, several limitations to this technique exist. It is generally

recommended that the case to variable ratio for PCA is > 3:1, that is the number of observed animals should be >3 times the number of behaviours examined (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1989), and that ideally the number of cases should be high (> 300, Comrey and Lee 1992). Given that most ethograms include a large number of different behaviours, and the number of animals studied is often small, these limitations are significant. It is possible to use replicate sampling of the same animal to boost the number of cases (using each replicate sampling period as a separate case), but differences are likely to occur in behaviours based on factors such as time since eating, proximity of other individuals of the same or opposite sex, hormonal changes or seasonal changes. Furthermore, with traditional PCA techniques, it is not possible to determine whether differences in behaviour are statistically significant or not (despite techniques such as concentration ellipses, which do not give a good indication of statistical differences). Theoretically, if a biplot indicates clustering of cases from one animal, and distinct, separate clustering of cases from a second animal, then they are likely to be different, but, in practice, points are often interspersed and overlap with one another for the reasons mentioned previously. As such, judging differences in behaviour becomes very subjective (Gabriel 1971).

A method of combining inferential statistics with PCA has recently been developed, based on constructing bootstrapped confidence intervals (or confidence radii since precision is calculated in three dimensions) for each case in the PCA (Catlin-Groves et al. 2009). Because this technique calculates the precision of the mean using confidence intervals, many limitations of PCA, such as the case to variable ratio are less important, since lack of precision on the PCA axes is indicated by increased confidence intervals. Furthermore significant differences can be inferred on the basis of whether confidence radii overlap (Catlin-Groves et al. 2009). As such, the technique should be beneficial for application to activity budget behavioural data collected through ethogram studies.

67 Here we develop the framework for applying this technique to activity budget studies, and
68 show the results of its application to four studies (captive and non-captive mammals, and
69 invertebrates) that indicate its potential broad application.

70 **Field data collection**

71 *Tigers in captivity*

72 Data collection took place at West Midland Safari Park in Bewdley, Worcestershire, UK (52°22'51" N,
73 2°17'06" W). In total, four Bengal tigers (*Panthera tigris tigris*) were studied, in two pairs. Each pair
74 cohabited permanently, and was moved around a number of enclosures on a day-by-day basis. The
75 first pair (tigers 1 and 2) was an unrelated male-female pair and the second pair (3 and 4) was a male
76 – female sibling pair. The enclosures in which the tigers were studied contained trees and a dual
77 layered platform in the centre of the compound. One of the enclosures also contained a small pool.

78 Data were collected in 1 h or 2 h periods, with behaviours recorded on an ethogram (Table
79 1) at 30 second intervals. In total 12 h of data were collected for each tiger (with a data point
80 collected from pairs of tigers simultaneously), giving 1440 ethogram observations per tiger.

81

82 *Elephants in a nature reserve*

83 This study was conducted at the 73.6km$^2$ Pongola Nature Reserve in South Africa (27°28'18''S,
84 31°56'49''E). Data were collected on five adult males using instantaneous scan sampling at 5 min
85 intervals (as per Altmann 1974). At each scan the behaviour of each elephant was recorded using the
86 behavioural categories listed in Table 2. Data from each male was collected until the male's
87 behaviour could no longer be accurately visually identified using binoculars. In total 154 data
88 collection points were collected for the five elephants, with a minimum of 22 ethogram observations
89 per individual.

90

91 *Dogs in rescue shelters*

92 Dogs were studied at Cheltenham Animal Shelter, Gloucestershire, UK (51° 54' 50.84" N, 2° 4' 59.51"
93 W). Dogs had already been assigned a traffic light coding of behaviour with red dogs being
94 aggressive and green dogs being friendlier and with fewer behavioural problems. This coding was
95 decided from a preliminary behaviour assessment by the shelter staff when the dogs entered the
96 shelter. Three red dogs and three green dogs were observed while being exercised in the shelter's
97 paddock. Each dog was observed three times for a total of 20 minutes, and behaviours noted every
98 20s from the list in Table 3. In total 180 ethogram observations were collected from each dog.

99

100 *Shore crab behaviour to a simulated predator*

101 Crabs were collected from a rockpool at Crantock Beach in Cornwall, UK (50˚24'20" N, 5˚07'51" W).
102 The rockpool was ~ 2.5 m above chart datum. For each trial, three crabs were transferred to a 1 m
103 diameter plastic experimental arena (filled with 10 cm depth of freshly collected seawater), located
104 *in situ* next to the rock pool, and allowed to acclimatise for 1 h before being observed for 10 mins.
105 During this 10 min period, crab behaviour was recorded every 30 s from the list of behaviours in
106 Table 4. Crabs were placed in groups of either three adult crabs (carapace width > 40 mm) or
107 juvenile crabs (carapace width > 20 but < 40 mm) and for each group, they were either left free from
108 visual disturbance over the 10 min period or were presented with a shadow of a predator (a
109 silhouette of a seagull) for 10 s at 60 s intervals. In total 24 crabs were used, hence each of the four
110 treatments (adult or juvenile, in the presence or absence of a visual predator stimulus) was
111 replicated twice. Each crab had 20 ethogram observations. After the study, crabs were released back
112 into the rockpool from which they came. In no cases were crabs removed from their natural
113 environment for more than 2 h.

**Statistical methods**

The bootstrapped PCA process was derived from that described in Catlin-Groves et al. (2009) and slightly modified here for use on behavioural datasets. The code runs in the R statistics environment (R Core Development Team 2011) and is available as supplementary material to this paper, along with a sample dataset used in this study (the tiger dataset).

For each analysis, a frequency distribution table was set up for all cases using a spreadsheet. A unique classifying number for each behaviour in the ethogram was assigned (e.g. for Table 1, '1' would be assigned to feeding, '2' to foraging and so on). This classification number was typed into the spreadsheet in a vertical column, with the number of entries corresponding to the percentage frequency of that behaviour. For example, if behaviour 1 occurred 32% of the time, the term '1' appeared in the first 32 rows of the spreadsheet. As such, each case is inputted in separate columns, and behaviours indicated in rows 1-100. The number of different columns was equal to the number of cases being considered within a specific analysis. The term 'case' is defined by the user. In most studies here, it is the combined ethograms from any individual animal, over all the sampling periods, but could be combined data from ethograms for an individual on days it had been fed, as compared to days it had not been fed, for example, or multiple individuals within a particular category such as sex. This classification of 'case' is considered in greater detail in the discussion and examples of different classifications of case are given in the results. The conversion of behaviour into percentages is to ensure that there were always 100 data points in each sample, and allow consistent rules to be formulated (such as the size of the subsample for bootstrapping) to apply the technique generally to behaviours where the number of observations can vary (as per the studies considered here).

From each case, 100 points were randomly taken, with replacement, to obtain a sample of the behaviour (the use of 100 points – with replacement – from 100 does not imply all points are sampled each time, and is the overwhelming consensus of sample size for bootstrapping in the

literature – e.g. Efron 1979; Crawley 2007; Martínez-Muoz and Suárez 2010). Using the 'prcomp' function in R, the first three principal components of each sample were calculated and stored for each case, and the process repeated 10 000 times. A mean value of the 10 000 replicates was calculated and 95% confidence limits were calculated by excluding the highest and lowest 2.5 % of the values (Crawley, 2005). By altering this parameter to the highest and lowest 5% or 10%, confidence limits can be obtained at 90% or 80% levels, respectively. Upper and lower confidence intervals for all three of the stored principal components were averaged to give a confidence radius. The mean values of the principal components for each site were plotted in 3 dimensions and the confidence radius indicated the size of the sphere, or bubble. Plots were made using the RGL library and rgl.sphere function for R (Adler and Murdoch 2008). However, because of some issues of how principal components are calculated, the following modifications were required to produce the bootstrapped means and confidence radii.

Initially, the full dataset was analysed using the 'prcomp' function to give a baseline value for each case. For each replicate run of the bootstrapped principal components (where n = 100; but sampled with replacement), the full dataset (where n = 100; but without replacement) for each case was also analysed, essentially doubling the cases in replicate run. By calculating a vector to transform each point from the full dataset back to its corresponding baseline point (equation 1), and then applying the same vector to the bootstrap points (equation 2), the variability in the bootstrapped points is restricted to variation between differences in the placement of points on the initial principal component axes, and not variation between both the placement of points and alignment of principal component axes. So:

$$v_{[x,y,z]} = I_{[x,y,z]} - i_{[x,y,z]} \quad [1]$$

$$B_{mod[x,y,z]} = B_{calc[x,y,z]} + v_{[x,y,z]} \quad [2]$$

where v is the vector, I is the initial full data point calculated without the addition of the bootstrap points, i is the full data point calculated along with the bootstrap points, $B_{mod}$ is the bootstrapped point modified by the vector and $B_{calc}$ is the bootstrap point calculated directly by PCA.

Applying this vector also accounted for the arbitrary sign applied to the magnitude of the principal component (during replicates on identical datasets, the value of a point on a principal component axis could be assigned as 1 or -1). The vector transformation eliminated this problem unless the sign (+ or -) of the full dataset differed from the sign of the bootstrapped dataset for the same point. If this was the case, the magnitude of the vector in this dimension was ~ 2 x that of the magnitude of the value of the full dataset point. To account for this problem, if the magnitude of the vector exceeded 1.2 x that of the magnitude of the value of the full dataset point, the magnitude of the vector in this dimension was calculated by adding the two points (equation 3) and then subtracting the calculated bootstrap value from the vector (equation 4).

$$v_{[x,y,z]} = I_{[x,y,z]} + i_{[x,y,z]} \quad [3]$$

$$B_{mod[x,y,z]} = v_{[x,y,z]} - B_{calc[x,y,z]} \quad [4]$$

The value of 1.2 x the magnitude as the demarcation between equations 1 and 3 being applied was previously been shown to be suitable, and sensitivity analysis of the results indicate that values between 1 and 1.5 do not cause changes in output (Catlin-Groves et al. 2009).

## Results and Discussion

*Tigers in captivity*

Using the standard 'prcomp' function on the full data set, the first three principal components were shown to explain 99.0% of the total variance of the data set. Analysis of the four tigers showed that the two females (2 and 4) had overlapping bubbles indicating that their behaviours were not significantly different from each other. The two males had bubbles which also overlapped, but tiger 3 had a significantly different behaviour from tiger 4, but not from tiger 2 (Figure 1). Tiger 1 showed significantly different behaviour compared to both females. The male tiger 3 was more similar in behaviour to the two females than the male tiger 1 – which spent a considerable less time pacing than the other three individuals. Indeed, Tiger 1 was recorded pacing on average 2.75 times per day, compared to an average of 65.5 times per day with the other male, Tiger 3. While little work has been conducted on sex specific behaviours in captive carnivores, some studies (e.g. Renner and Lussier 2002) have found sex specific differences to certain aspects of captive carnivore behaviours. The results from this study provide some support for sex specific differences in captive tiger behaviour, but also indicate that variability between individuals may be as important as sex based differences.

*Elephants in a nature reserve*

Using the standard 'prcomp' function on the full data set, the first three principal components were shown to explain 92.1% of the total variance of the dataset. Analysis of the five bull elephants' activity budgets using the bootstrapping methods showed no significant differences between elephants at the 95 % confidence level, as there is overlap between all of the coloured bubbles that represented the individual elephants (Figure 2a). Such a lack of difference in activity budgets may be unsurprising, given that activity levels in the African savannah are heavily constrained by time spent resting as a means of coping with heat stress (Dunbar 1992). Moreover, elephant activity at Pongola is further constrained by limited food available to this population, which far exceeds the park's carrying capacity. However, the distribution of the bubbles does correspond closely to the previously determined dominance hierarchy of these bull elephants (H. Zitzer unpublished data), with the left

most elephant being the most dominant, and the dominance hierarchy decreasing from left to right (Figure 2a). Given that dominance was calculated by aggressive interactions, and these data presented in this study are from activity budgets (where dominance interactions are largely absent), such a correlation of results is a good indication that the technique is incorporating many aspects of the elephants' behaviour.

The plot of all five bull elephants can make determining significant differences between non-adjacent individuals difficult. However, pairwise comparisons can also be plotted, without the analysis being rerun. To minimise type I errors of pairwise comparisons, it is logical to examine the furthest apart individuals first (here elephants 1 and 5), as per the procedure in standard post-hoc tests such as Student-Newman-Keuls (SNK) tests. In this case, while no significant differences occur at the 95% confidence level (Figure 2b), differences do occur at the 90% confidence level between the overall activity budget of elephants 1 and 5 (Figure 2c). From an examination of the activity budget data, it can be seen that the key differences in behaviour are an increase in resting and feeding, and a decrease in moving in the most dominant elephant, as compared to the least dominant (Elephant 1 – movement = 43%, resting = 26%, feeding = 25%; Elephant 5– movement = 58%, resting = 17%, feeding = 15%). The differences in activity budget between the highest and lowest ranking male are in line with previous field observations of these elephants. The dominant male spent nearly all of his time travelling with the larger of the two female herds. As he constantly had access to females, the dominant male travelled less and spent more time resting and feeding with the females. The subordinate male spent a significant amount of time alone wandering between the two female herds attempting to gain access to the females and as a result spent significantly more time moving than the dominant male (K. Slater and H. Zitzer unpublished data).

*Dogs in rescue shelters*

Using the standard 'prcomp' function on the full data set, the first three principal components were shown to explain 92.1% of the total variance of the data set. The bubble plot displayed some significant differences between dogs (Figure 3a). The clustered group of three bubbles represent the red dogs, and the three separated bubbles represent the green dogs. There is a clear significant difference between all three green dogs in relation to one another and each of the red dogs, indicating that their initial behavioural classification could also be determined by activity budget ethograms. By redefining the classes used here, it was also possible to determine if differences occur between the red and green dogs studied in general. By combining all data on the three red and three green dogs, the process can be rerun. This is case, pooling the data in this way demonstrates that there is not an overall significant difference between the red and green dogs, despite each individual green dog being different from all red dogs (Figure 3b), although again, a significant difference occurs at 90% confidence (Figure 3c). As with the tiger data, such a response indicates that variability between dogs (especially the green classified dogs) can be large. In this case, differences in green dog behaviour are larger than between red dogs. This may be explained by the fact that red dogs are classified by aggressive characteristics – hence all behave in an aggressive manner, whereas green dogs display a more natural, and varied range of domestic dog behaviours.

*Shore crab behaviour to a simulated predator*

Using the standard 'prcomp' function on the full data set, the first three principal components were shown to explain 99.7% of the total variance of the data set. Significant differences in behaviours between the treatment groups were found at the 95% confidence level (Figure 4). Juvenile crabs behaved in a similar way in the absence of a predator stimulus to adult crabs in the presence of the predator stimulus. Both juveniles and adults showed a similar response to predators (a downwards movement in the plot of behaviour in Figure 4). From a re-examination of the data, this tends to indicate an increase in hiding behaviour from both juveniles and adults in the presence of a predator

(from 13 to 37 % of the time in mature crabs and from 47 to 75 % of the time in juveniles). Differences in behaviour of crustaceans, especially in regard to life- and moult-cycle stage, are well classified, with reduced locomotion and feeding activity at the most vulnerable stages (e.g. Lipcius and Herrnkind 1992), hence while both adult and juvenile respond to a predator stimulus by hiding, they start from different baseline activity behaviours.

*The statistical methods*

The technique of bootstrapping PCA analysis works well on the examples of activity budget / ethogram-recorded behaviours studied here. The technique is flexible as regards: the number of samples taken per animal, the confidence level examined, and, to a large extent, the definition of 'case', which could be an individual animal, or a group of animals (of the same sex, age group or any other logical classification). However, there are some potential considerations and recommendations for the application of the technique.

Firstly, the number of ethogram recordings used (or the sample size) must be large enough to provide a good estimate of the activity budget of the animal studied. While the conversion of different behaviours to percentages (hence the effective sample size is always 100) will not affect the confidence interval size of a bootstrap method, clearly, limited recording may not capture the full behaviour of the animal, as such, it is best to use similar sample sizes for different animals in the study and to report the sample sizes used in the methods or results.

Secondly, all the data sets considered here had very large proportions of variability explained by the first three principal components (> 90% in all cases). This means that the positions of the bubbles on three dimensional plots are accurate simplifications of the multivariate complexity inherent in the original data. If the proportion of variability explained by the first three principal components decreases, the number of dimensions required of the plots needs, theoretically, to

increase – although this would make visual interpretation of the data very difficult. As such it is recommended that this technique only be used where > 90% of the variability in the data is explained by the first three principal components (this figure also follows standard practice recommendations for biplots given in Crawley 2007).

Thirdly, the technique will naturally face some of the disadvantages of all confidence interval methods as compared to inferential statistical hypothesis tests (Lanzante 2005). For example, confidence interval estimation for univariate methods is not as powerful as equivalent t-tests or ANOVA, at least when the data fulfil parametric assumptions. However, following the procedures derived for ANOVA post-hoc tests, which involve testing the most different cases first, reduces the number of pairwise comparisons which need to be made (see elephant example above). Furthermore, corrections to eliminate type I error could easily be made by increasing the level of significance from 95%, as per Bonferroni corrections or that occur in the standard Tukey test, although this should be undertaken with caution since many authors advise against such modifications due to the unproportional risk of type II error over minimising type I error (e.g. Underwood 1996). Whether or not such changes to confidence limits need to be made depends on the study in question, and whether interpretation of results is most sensitive to falsely detecting differences, or not detecting real differences. While these modifications can help prevent issues of type I error, the problems of pooling estimates of variability to a common standard deviation, which can result in type 2 errors (the type most frequently found with the use of confidence interval analysis - Lanzante 2005) do not apply to bootstrapping processes, where confidence intervals are estimated directly from the data, and do not require an estimation of standard deviation. Furthermore, the bootstrapping process does not necessarily result in symmetrical confidence intervals around the mean, making the technique robust to the assumptions for parametric statistics such as normally distributed data. Therefore, in many ways, the bootstrapping method detailed here is more robust than many statistics for hypothesis testing, which require the homogeneous standard deviations and normally distributed data between cases (Underwood 1996).

Finally, the issue of selecting a 'case' is not as advanced as for some statistical techniques. In normal PCA, a case would correspond to a single observation period. Here, multiple observation periods of a single individual can be combined as a case, as can multiple observation periods of many individuals within a group (providing the replication of directly observed behaviour proposed by Dawkins 2007). While this provides a flexible framework for hypothesis testing, a parallel can be drawn with nested designs in general linear models. Nesting hierarchical responses (i.e. observations of the same individual are nested within each individual, individuals of the same sex are then nested within sex), rather than simply combining responses across all levels would, potentially, allow differences in individuals, as well as differences between higher level 'cases' to be determined in a single analysis, and allow an understanding of where the greatest variability lies (i.e. between a behavioural category, between individuals or between replicate measures of the same individual). However, such an approach would not present data in such a visually simple manner, and in some cases, nesting factors within others produces less powerful inferential tests than not conducing this nesting process (Hernández-Sánchez et al. 2003). A method of including nesting would be a useful future improvement to this technique, however, it would also create an additional level of complexity in performing the analysis, which in most cases, would not make a significant difference to the outcome of the analysis.

The technique presented here provides an excellent framework for visualising activity budget collected data and provides a novel method for determining significant differences between classifications of interest within the dataset. While there are some residual issues in the application of the technique, which necessitate researchers to think through analysis and interpretation of resultant plots carefully, the method is a vast improvement on the statistical methods currently used for such analysis.

**Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank Heinz Kohrs, director of 'Space for Elephants' project and Cheltenham Animal Shelter for their assistance in with this study.

## References

**Adler, D. & Murdoch, D.** 2008. *rgl: 3D Visualization Device System (OpenGL)*. R Package Version 0.77. http://rgl.neoscientists.org.

**Aitchison, J.** 1986. The statistical analysis of compositional data (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society (B)*, **44**, 1313–1325.

**Altmann, J.** 1974. Observational study of behavior: sampling methods. *Behaviour*, **49**, 227-267.

**Catlin-Groves, C.L., Kirkhope, C.L., Goodenough, A.E. & Stafford, R.** 2009. Use of confidence radii to visualise significant differences in principal components analysis: application to mammal assemblages at locations with different disturbance levels. *Ecological Informatics,* **4**, 147–151.

**Comrey, A.L. & Lee, H.B.** 1992. *A First Course in Factor Analysis.* 2nd Edition. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbalm Associates.

**Crawley, M.J.** 2005. *Statistics: an Introduction using R*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.

**Crawley, M.J.** 2007. *The R Book*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.

**Dawkins, M.S**. 2007. *Observing animal behaviour: design and analysis of quantitative data*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

**Dunbar, R.I.M.** 1992. Time: a hidden constraint on the behavioural ecology of baboons. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology,* **31**, 35-49.

**Efron, B.** 1979 Bootstrap methods: another look at the Jackknife. *Annals of Statistics,* **7**, 1-26.

354 **Gabriel, K.R.** 1971. The biplot graphic display of matrices with application to principal component
355 analysis. *Biometrika*, **58**, 453–467.

356 **Hernández-Sánchez, J., Haley, C.S. & Visscher, P.M.** 2003. Power of QTL detection using association
357 tests with family controls. *European Journal of Human Genetics*, **11**, 819–827.

358 **Lanzante, J.R.** 2005. A cautionary note on the use of error bars. *Journal of Climate*, **18**, 3699-3703.

359 **Lipcius, R.N. & Herrnkind, W.F.** 1992. Molt cycle alterations in behavior, feeding and diel rhythms of
360 a decapod crustacean, the spiny lobster *Panulirus argus*. *Marine Biology*, **68**, 241-252.

361 **MacNulty, D.R., Mech, L.D. & Smith, D.W**. 2007. A proposed ethogram of large-carnivore predatory
362 behavior, exemplified by the wolf. *Journal of Mammalogy*, **88**, 595-605.

363 **Martin, P.R. & Bateson, P.** 2007*. Measuring Behaviour: an Introductory Guide*. 3rd Edition.
364 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

365 **Martinez-Munoz, G. & Suarez, A**. 2010. Out-of-bag estimation of the optimal sample size in bagging.
366 *Pattern Recognition*, **43**, 143-152.

367 **Mielke, P.W. & Berry, K.J.** 2007. *Permutation Methods: a Distance Function Approach*. 2nd Edition.
368 New York: Springer.

369 **R Development Core Team.** 2011. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna:
370 R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

371 **Ramson, J.I. & Cade, B.S.** 2009. *Quantifying Equid Behavior: a Research Ethogram for Free-Roaming*
372 *Feral Horses.* Reston, Virginia: US Geological Survey.

373 **Renner, M.J. & Lussier, J.P.** 2002. Environmental enrichment for the captive spectacled bear
374 (*Tremarctos ornatus*). *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behaviour*, **73**, 279-283.

**Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S.** 1989. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. New York: Harper Collins.

**Underwood, A.J.** 1996. *Experiments in Ecology: Their Logical Design and Interpretation using Analysis of Variance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van den Berg, L., Schlider, M.B.H. & Knoll, B.W. 2003. Behaviour genetics of canine aggression: Behavioural phenotyping of golden retrievers by means of an aggression test. *Behaviour Genetics,* **33**, 469-483.

**Wheller, S.H. & Bennett, C.L.** 2001. Twenty-four hour activity budgets and patterns of behavior in captive ocelots (*Leopardus pardalis*). *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, **71**, 67-79.

385 Table 1. Ethogram of behaviours used for activity budget data collection of tigers

| Behaviour | Description of behaviour (where required) |
|---|---|
| Eating | - |
| Drinking | - |
| Playing | Engaging in playing activities alone |
| Social interaction | Interacting with another tiger – either aggressive or affiliative; including grooming one another |
| Rolling | - |
| Scent marking | Spraying an object, rubbing back paws on ground or rubbing head against objects. |
| Walking | - |
| Running | - |
| Pacing | Repeated walking in the same pattern without an apparent goal. |
| Alert standing | - |
| Alert sitting | - |
| Alert laying down | Lying down with eyes open |
| Not alert laying down | Lying down with eyes closed |
| Stalking | Walking slowly with eyes fixed on one object |
| Grooming | - |
| Defecating/urinating | - |
| Jumping at fence | - |
| Vocalise | - |
| Other | Any behaviour that does not fit into any of the above descriptions. |

386

387

388 Table 2: Ethogram of behaviours used for activity budget data collection of elephants

| Behaviour | Description of behaviour (where required) |
|---|---|
| Feeding | - |
| Foraging | Actively searching for or extracting food items such as bark stripping |
| Moving | Excluding foraging |
| Resting | Including sleep |
| Socialising | Including both aggressive and affiliative behaviours |
| Vigilant | Elephant is standing alert |
| Drinking | - |

389

390

391

Table 3: Ethogram of behaviours used for activity budget data collection of dogs (adapted from van den Berg et al., 2003).

| Behaviour | Description of behaviour (if required) |
|---|---|
| Barking | - |
| Pulling (on lead) | - |
| Tail wagging | - |
| Growling | - |
| Jumping Up | - |
| Sitting still | - |
| Spinning | Dog spins in circles or changes direction frequently whilst on or off the lead. |
| Standing upright | - |
| Tail erect | - |
| Territorial Marking | Including urination |
| Approach other dogs | - |
| Panting | - |
| Whining/Whimpering | - |
| Yawn | - |

397 Table 4. Ethogram of behaviours used for activity budget data collection of shore crabs

| Behaviour | Description of behaviour (if required) |
|---|---|
| Claws outstretched | - |
| Hide | - |
| Pile | Piling on top of, or forcing themselves underneath other crabs |
| Still | - |
| Quick movement | ≥ 5 $cm.s^{-2}$ |
| Slow movement | < 5 $cm.s^{-2}$ |

398

399

Figure 1. Three dimensional principal component bubble plot with confidence radii for tiger behavioural data. Bubbles represent individual tigers. Tigers 1 and 3 are males and 2 and 4 are females.

Figure 2. Three dimensional principal component bubble plot with confidence radii for elephant behavioural data. (a) Each bubble represents one of the five vasectomised bull elephants, overlap of bubbles indicates no significant differences at the 95% confidence level between adjacent individuals. (b) Pairwise bubble plot between the most behaviourally different elephants (as determined in figure 2a) at 95% confidence – overlap between bubbles indicates no significant difference. (c) Pairwise bubble plot between the most different elephants at 90% confidence, here no overlap of bubbles occurs, so differences can be considered significant with 90% confidence.

Figure 3. Three dimensional principal component bubble plot with 95% confidence radii for dog behavioural data. (a) the clustered group of three dogs on the right indicate red dogs, the three remaining, non-overlapping bubbles indicate the green dogs. (b) combining the data into two cases, green dogs (upper bubble) and red dogs (lower bubble) shows no overall significant difference in behaviour in these classifications of dogs. (c) differences do occur at the 90% confidence level between green and red dogs.

Figure 4. Three dimensional principal component bubble plot with 95% confidence radii for crab behavioural data. Key: 1) Adult crabs in the absence of a visual predator stimulus, 2) Adult crabs in the presence of visual predator stimulus, 3) Juvenile crabs in absence of visual predator stimulus, 4) Juvenile crabs in the presence of visual predator stimulus.