A peer-reviewed version of this preprint was published in PeerJ on 6 February 2020.

<u>View the peer-reviewed version</u> (peerj.com/articles/8425), which is the preferred citable publication unless you specifically need to cite this preprint.

Goswami S, Tyagi PC, Malik PK, Pandit SJ, Kadivar RF, Fitzpatrick M, Mondol S. 2020. Effects of personality and rearing-history on the welfare of captive Asiatic lions (*Panthera leo persica*) PeerJ 8:e8425 <u>https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.8425</u>

Effects of personality and life-history on the welfare of captive Asiatic lions (*Panthera leo persica*)

Sitendu Goswami 1 , Praveen C Tyagi 1 , Pradeep K Malik 1 , Shwetank J Pandit 2 , Riyazahmed F Kadivar 2 , Malcolm Fitzpatrick 3 , Samrat Mondol $^{Corresp.\ 1}$

¹ Wildlife Institute of India, Uttarakhand, India

² Sakkarbaug Zoological Garden, Junagadh, Gujarat, India

³ London Zoo, Zoological Society of London, United Kingdom

Corresponding Author: Samrat Mondol Email address: samrat@wii.gov.in

Background

The long-term success of ex-situ conservation programmes depends on husbandry and enrichment practices complemented by a robust welfare assessment protocol. Most zoos and conservation programmes continue to employ a bottom-up approach to measure animal welfare that often fails to account for intraspecific variations. Despite accepting animal sentience, we are yet to address individuality and its role in governing animal welfare in captive conditions. We explored the role of individuality (personality traits, and life history) on behaviour-based welfare indices of 35 (14:21) captive Asiatic lions in Sakkarbaug Zoological Garden, Junagadh, India. We categorized the subjects based on personality traits (bold or shy), life history (wild-rescued or captive-raised) and gender, and compared welfare indices in the form of behavioural diversity, latency to novel objects, enclosure usage patterns and aberrant repetitive behaviours between the groups. Further, we assessed the inter-relationships between different behavioural measures of welfare.

Results

Our results show that intraspecific variations based on life history and personality traits consistently predict the welfare states of captive lions. Asiatic lions with bold traits (M=0.5, SD=0.12, n=21) and captive-raised life history (M=0.47, SD=0.12, n=16) used enclosure space more homogenously compared to shy (M=0.71, SD=0.15, n=14) and wild-rescued (M=0.67, SD=0.15, n=19) animals. Behaviour diversity was significantly higher in captive-raised (M=1.26, SD=0.3, n=16) and bold (M=1.23, SD=0.26, n=21) subjects compared to wild-rescued (M=0.83, SD=0.35, n=19) and shy (M=0.73, SD=0.34, n=14) individuals. On the other hand, aberrant repetitive behaviours (stereotypy) were significantly lower in bold (M=7.01, SD=3.9, n=21) and captive-raised (M = 7.74, SD = 5.3) individuals compared to wild-rescued (M=13.12, SD=6.25, n=19) and shy (M=16.13, SD=5.4, n=16) lions. Behaviour diversity was reliably predicted by the enclosure usage patterns and aberrant repetitive behaviours displayed by subjects. The enclosure usage pattern of subjects was predicted by their latency to novel objects, behaviour diversity, and age.

Discussion

Our findings underline the importance of individual-centric, behaviour-based, and multi-dimensional welfare assessment tools in ex-situ conservation programmes. The results suggest that behavioural welfare indices complemented with personality can help improve welfare of Asiatic lions and highlight the

critical need to address intraspecific variation in behavioural welfare measures in captive animals.

1 Effects of personality and life-history on the welfare of captive Asiatic lions

2 (Panthera leo persica)

- 3
- 4 Sitendu Goswami^a, Praveen C. Tyagi^a, Pradeep K. Malik^a, Shwetank Pandit^b, Riyazahmed F

5 Kadivar^b, Malcolm Fitzpatrick^c, Samrat Mondol^{a#}

- 6
- 7 ^a Wildlife Institute of India, Uttarakhand, India.
- 8 ^b Sakkarbaug Zoological Garden, Junagadh, Gujarat, India
- 9 ^c London Zoo, Zoological Society of London, United Kingdom
- 10
- 11 [#]Corresponding author: Samrat Mondol, Wildlife Institute of India, Chandrabani, Dehradun
- 12 248001, Uttarakhand, India. E-mail: samrat@wii.gov.in
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 1)
- 20

21 Abstract

22 Background

23 The long-term success of ex-situ conservation programmes depends on husbandry and 24 enrichment practices complemented by a robust welfare assessment protocol. Most zoos and 25 conservation programmes continue to employ a bottom-up approach to measure animal welfare 26 that often fails to account for intraspecific variations. Despite accepting animal sentience, we are 27 yet to address individuality and its role in governing animal welfare in captive conditions. We 28 explored the role of individuality (personality traits, and life history) on behaviour-based welfare 29 indices of 35 (14:21) captive Asiatic lions in Sakkarbaug Zoological Garden, Junagadh, India. 30 We categorized the subjects based on personality traits (bold or shy), life history (wild-rescued 31 or captive-raised) and gender, and compared welfare indices in the form of behavioural diversity, 32 latency to novel objects, enclosure usage patterns and aberrant repetitive behaviours between the 33 groups. Further, we assessed the inter-relationships between different behavioural measures of 34 welfare.

35 Results

36 Our results show that intraspecific variations based on life history and personality traits 37 consistently predict the welfare states of captive lions. Asiatic lions with bold traits (M=0.5, 38 SD=0.12, n=21) and captive-raised life history (M=0.47, SD=0.12, n=16) used enclosure space 39 more homogenously compared to shy (M=0.71, SD=0.15, n=14) and wild-rescued (M=0.67, 40 SD=0.15, n=19) animals. Behaviour diversity was significantly higher in captive-raised 41 (M=1.26, SD=0.3, n=16) and bold (M=1.23, SD=0.26, n=21) subjects compared to wild-rescued 42 (M=0.83, SD=0.35, n=19) and shy (M=0.73, SD=0.34, n=14) individuals. On the other hand, 43 aberrant repetitive behaviours (stereotypy) were significantly lower in bold (M=7.01, SD=3.9,

n=21) and captive-raised (M = 7.74, SD = 5.3) individuals compared to wild-rescued (M=13.12,
SD=6.25, n=19) and shy (M=16.13, SD=5.4, n=16) lions. Behaviour diversity was reliably
predicted by the enclosure usage patterns and aberrant repetitive behaviours displayed by
subjects. The enclosure usage pattern of subjects was predicted by their latency to novel objects,
behaviour diversity, and age.

49 Discussion

50 Our findings underline the importance of individual-centric, behaviour-based, and multi-51 dimensional welfare assessment tools in ex-situ conservation programmes. The results suggest 52 that behavioural welfare indices complemented with personality can help improve welfare of 53 Asiatic lions and highlight the critical need to address intraspecific variation in behavioural 54 welfare measures in captive animals.

- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60
- 50
- 61
- 62
- 63
- 64

65 **Introduction**

66 Welfare is defined as the balance between pathophysiology and affective states (Spruijt, Bos & 67 Pijlman, 2001; Meehan & Mench, 2007; Boissy et al., 2007; Butterworth, Mench & 68 Wielebnowski, 2011; Panksepp, 2011), or the state of the animal as it copes with its environment 69 (Broom, 1991). Accurate welfare assessments are essential for long-term biopsychosocial health 70 of captive animals housed in ex-situ conservation institutions (Engel, 1980; Korte, Olivier & 71 Koolhaas, 2007; Broom, 2011). Animals housed under poor welfare conditions often suffer from 72 allostatic overload, lose essential behaviour diversity, cognitive skills, and suffer from chronic 73 stress (Sheperdson, Carlstead & Wielebnowski, 2004; Kroshko et al., 2016; Razal, Pisacane & 74 Miller, 2016), affecting their overall survival and reproductive potential (Broom, 1991; Schreck, 75 2010). However, welfare assessments of captive animals pose unique challenges (Butterworth, 76 Mench & Wielebnowski, 2011) as it encompasses both physical and psychological well-being 77 (Brambell, 1965; Meehan & Mench, 2007; Panksepp, 2011). Significant body of research 78 suggests personality traits (Izzo, Bashaw & Campbell, 2011; Watters & Powell, 2012), and 79 early-life experiences (Butterworth, Mench & Wielebnowski, 2011) may predispose individuals 80 to be more sensitive to changes in husbandry practices (Boissy & Erhard, 2014). Despite an 81 urgent requirement of individual-centric welfare assessments for endangered species, most ex-82 situ facilities continue to employ a uni-dimensional approach where either of physiological, 83 behavioural and keeper evaluations are used in such assessments (Watanabe, 2007; Butterworth, 84 Mench & Wielebnowski, 2011). Ideally conservation breeding programs involving endangered 85 species should account for individuality and address intraspecific variations during welfare assessments (Bracke & Hopster, 2006; Volpato et al., 2009; Rees, 2016) in zoological 86 institutions. 87

88 Asiatic lion (Panthera leo persica) is one such example of an endangered species that is 89 relegated to a fraction of their historic range and currently found in the greater Gir landscape of 90 Gujarat, India (Banerjee et al., 2013). With a global wild and captive population of about 523 91 and 359 individuals, respectively, (Srivastav, 2014; Pant, 2015) the future survival of Asiatic 92 lions may depend on a successful conservation breeding program complemented by repatriation 93 across historic ranges (Jhala et al., 2006; Meena, 2009). While extensive research on population 94 ecology (Joslin, 1973; Jhala et al., 2009), behaviour (Meena, 2008), social dynamics (Meena, 95 2009; Chakrabarti & Jhala, 2017), and human-animal interaction (Joslin, 1973; Banerjee, Jhala & 96 Pathak, 2010; Banerjee et al., 2013) of wild Asiatic lions has been conducted, the captive 97 populations and their welfare needs have received relatively less attention. Pastorino et al., 98 (2016, 2017) studied feline-keeper interactions, personality variations, and behavioural aspects 99 of welfare in captive Asiatic lions at London zoo, but were limited by a small sample size (n=4)100 and a short study period. There is a paucity of information on detailed welfare status of captive 101 Asiatic lions despite their presence across major global zoological institutions, and it is critical to 102 evaluate and adopt the best welfare standards to meet long-term conservation goals for this 103 species.

We studied 35 Asiatic lions housed in the ex-situ conservation breeding centre of Sakkarbaug Zoological Garden, Gujarat, India to understand how life history and personality influence behaviour-based welfare evaluations. Sakkarbaug zoo is the coordinating institution for the conservation breeding of Asiatic lion and hosted 47-60 individuals during 2015-2017. We categorized these subjects based on their life histories (wild-rescued vs. captive-raised), sex, and personality traits (bold vs. shy), and used species-typical behaviour diversity (Powell, 1995; Wemelsfelder et al., 2000; Rabin, 2003; Clark & Melfi, 2012; Miller, Pisacane & Vicino, 2016),

space usage patterns (Kessel & Brent, 1996; Mallapur, Qureshi & Chellam, 2002; Ross & Shender, 2016), latency to novel objects (Murphy, 1977; Meehan & Mench, 2002; Sneddon, Braithwaite & Gentle, 2003), and proportion of aberrant behaviours (Mason, 2006; Tan et al., 2013; Japyassú & Malange, 2014; Kroshko et al., 2016) to assess the impacts of individual variations on welfare measures. We believe that such holistic welfare measurement will provide zoo managers an individual-focused welfare assessment tool to plan better husbandry practices in ex-situ conservation programs.

118 Materials & methods

119 Research permit and ethical considerations

Research permit for this study was granted by the Gujarat Forest Department, India (Permit no:
WLP/28/A/1316-21/2015-16). This study complies with the regulations of zoo animal welfare
standards set by the Central Zoo Authority, Government of India.

123 Study area

124 We conducted the study at Sakkarbaug Zoological Garden (SZG henceforth), which is situated 125 within the natural range of Asiatic lions (*Panthera leo persica*). SZG is the coordinating zoo for 126 the Asiatic lion conservation-breeding programme in India and hosts the largest captive 127 population (n=60) in the world (n=359). The zoo has a separate off-display conservation 128 breeding facility, which houses 47 genetically diverse individuals sourced across the greater Gir 129 landscape, Gujarat, India. This facility provided us a unique opportunity to study behaviour of 130 wild-rescued and captive born lions under similar housing conditions. These animals are housed 131 in large naturalistic enclosures that resemble the wild habitat of Asiatic lions. A map of the off-132 display conservation breeding enclosures of SZG is provided in Supplementary Figure 1.

133 Subjects and housing

134 We collected systematic data from 35 (14:21) healthy Asiatic lions housed in the off-display area of SZG. The study animals were either born in captivity (n=16; 3:13) or rescued from wild 135 136 (n=19; 11:8). The subjects were housed in 13 enclosures spread across 8-ha area with a minimum 137 of 500m² of space/animal. All enclosures had outdoor (paddocks) and indoor (retiring/feeding 138 cells) areas (3m x 3m x 2m dimensions) with access to drinking water. Lions were brought inside 139 their respective retiring/feeding cells at 1700 hours regularly for feeding and released back into 140 the paddock at 2200 hours. All subjects were group-housed during the entire study duration. 141 Some related females were iso-sexually paired and few males were housed with two related 142 females. The enclosure size and husbandry practices were similar for all subjects. The animals 143 were designated to specific groups of keepers, who trained them to respond to their house names 144 and vocal instructions. Their diet included in-house slaughtered, quality-inspected buffalo meat. The animals were fed inside separate feeding cells from 1700-1900 hours daily. The average 145 meat consumption was 3.5 kg (SD = 0.5 kg) for females (n=21) and 4.9 kg (SD = 1.4 kg) for 146 147 males (n=14), with a starve day on every Sunday. The details of the study subjects are provided 148 in Supplementary Table 1.

149 Study design

This study was conducted from July 2015 to January 2017. We assessed the behavioural effects of husbandry and management practices on captive Asiatic lions with different personalities and life histories. We conducted novel-object latency tests on subjects (Frost et al., 2007), followed by keeper interviews on a likert-scale based personality questionnaire that measured traits such as extraversion, openness to novel experience and activity (Allport and Allport, 1921; Gosling and John, 1999; Sloan Wilson et al., 1994). Subjects were grouped into different categories based

156 on life histories (wild-rescued or captive-raised), personalities (bold-shy continuum), and sex 157 (male or female). Individuals born in the zoo and rescued as cubs and hand-raised by keepers 158 were categorized as captive-raised (n=16). Subjects that were rescued from the wild as adults 159 were categorised as wild-rescued (n=19). We coded for personality traits of interest once at the 160 beginning of the study and repeated after six months to check for trait consistency (Martin and 161 Réale, 2008; Galhardo et al., 2012). For behaviour data collection, we used pre-existing ethogram for felids (Powell, 1995; Stanton, Sullivan & Fazio, 2015) and modified it to include 162 unique behaviours displayed by subjects (Supplementary Table 2). Two independent observers 163 164 collected all behaviour data. To minimize inter-observer bias, behaviour recording was 165 commenced after inter-observer reliability reached satisfactory levels from the same group of 166 animals (Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.8$) (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). We recorded behaviour at three different 167 time periods: 0500-1100 hours, 1300-1800 hours and 2200-0500 hours. We used a combination 168 of instantaneous scan sampling and focal animal sampling to collect behavioural data (Altmann, 169 1974; Mason & Mendl, 2007). We recorded instantaneous scan at one-minute intervals for one-170 hour duration followed by a 15-minute rest to mitigate observer fatigue. During each scan, we 171 recorded the behavioural state of the subject and its location in the enclosure. We measured the 172 directionality of all social interactions between subjects. We conducted focal animal sampling 173 through video recordings to accurately measure durations of social, and aberrant repetitive 174 behaviours (Martin & Bateson, 1993). We collected data on the following parameters:

175 Personality assessment and latency to novel objects

Personality is defined as the consistent difference between individuals in their behaviour across time and contexts (Réale et al., 2007; Franks, Higgins & Champagne, 2014). Personality is related to an individual's coping style and often determines its response to welfare concerns in

179 captivity (Koolhaas et al., 1999; Moneta & Spada, 2009; Melotti et al., 2011; Gartner, Powell & 180 Weiss, 2016). Personality traits of individual animals determine their decision-making skills 181 which contribute to survival success in the wild (Coelho, de Azevedo & Young, 2012; Carter et 182 al., 2013; Franks et al., 2013; Owen, Swaisgood & Blumstein, 2017), and thus can be useful in welfare measures (Rouff, Sussman & Strube, 2005). Personality assessments based solely on 183 184 keeper evaluations can be biased due to keeper-animal associations (Broom, 1991; Mills, 1998; 185 Gartner, Powell & Weiss, 2016). To ensure consistency and reliability in personality assessment, we adopted a combination of rating and coding (Funder & Colvin, 1988; Funder, 1995; Gosling 186 187 & Vazire, 2002; Highfill et al., 2010). We assessed subjects on bold-shy continuum of 188 personality, as it is an important indicator of cognitive performance (Sloan Wilson et al., 1994; 189 Highfill et al., 2010; Coelho, de Azevedo & Young, 2012; Chadwick, 2014). Experienced keepers rated subjects on a scale of 1-9 for pre-selected personality traits on the bold-shy 190 191 continuum (Supplementary Table 3). To validate the keeper ratings, we conducted personality 192 tests in day kraals for ten minutes using video recorders in the absence of keepers and observers. 193 During these tests, the subject was (a) observed interacting with conspecifics in its enclosure; (b) 194 approached by an unknown person; and (c) was exposed to non-food novel objects (lion-sam 195 ball, and bungee cord). Naive observers with no prior exposure to study subjects coded the 196 behaviour of subjects corresponding to personality traits under consideration i.e. boldness and 197 shyness. Observers also recorded the time taken in seconds (latency value) for subjects to touch novel objects or approach unknown person (Sih, Bell & Johnson, 2004; Frost et al., 2007). The 198 199 percentage of time spent by animals in bold (extroversion or curious) vs. shy (wary or afraid) 200 behaviour was measured.

We repeated the novel object tests after a month to check for trait consistency, and an average of the latency values was calculated for each subject. Observers grouped subjects into bold and shy categories based on a comparison between the proportion of bold and shy behaviours performed by subjects across all trials. We found that keepers (n=3) and observers (n=3) reliably agreed on the personality type (Cronbach's alpha > 0.9) of subjects (bold-shy continuum).

206 Enclosure usage pattern

207 Enclosure usage pattern is a critical behavioural parameter that is influenced by the biological 208 relevance of different zones of the captive environment (Traylor-Holzer & Fritz, 1985; Plowman, 209 2003; Rose & Robert, 2013; Ross & Shender, 2016). Although large naturalistic enclosures are 210 necessary for good welfare, enclosure usage should be closely monitored to evaluate their 211 functionality (Mallapur, Qureshi & Chellam, 2002; Rose & Robert, 2013). We divided each 212 enclosure into ten equal zones, which included three broad zones viz. a) proximal, b) medial, and c) distal zones. Each of these broad zones was further subdivided into three smaller zones as i) 213 214 left, ii) middle, and iii) right. The tenth zone was the paddock area next to the retiring cell 215 (Figure 1). We recorded the enclosure zone location of subjects during each scan.

216 Species-typical behaviour diversity

We used a combination of instantaneous scan sampling and focal animal sampling (Altmann, 1974; Gilby, Pokempner & Wrangham, 2010) to record lion behaviour patterns in captivity. During each scan, we recorded detailed behavioural states (Supplementary Table 3) of the lion and the enclosure zone in which it was located. In case the subject was performing a social behaviour or aberrant repetitive behaviours (ARBs), we recorded the duration and directionality of the behaviour along with the name of participants. We used a double observer method to standardize behaviour sampling strategy and reduce inter-observer bias. To increase inter-

observer reliability (Caro et al., 1979) both observers recorded the behaviour patterns of same subjects independently for three consecutive day until agreeability ratings increased to acceptable levels (Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.9$). We gathered a total of 2,009 hours of behaviour observation data (average data of 57 hours/ subject) across 486 observation days.

228 Aberrant repetitive behaviours (ARB)

Aberrant repetitive behaviours (ARB) are reliable indicators of poor welfare conditions 229 230 (Dawkins & Hill, 2004; Watters, 2009; Kroshko et al., 2016). Repetitive behaviours are 231 indicative of changes in neurophysiology and cognitive dysfunction (Muehlmann & Lewis, 232 2012). We calculated the proportion of ARBs displayed by each subject per session. ARBs 233 mostly included, stereotypic swaying, pacing, and nose rubbing behaviours (Supplementary 234 Table 3). We did not record displacement behaviours such as pacing performed before feeding, 235 or while interacting with conspecifics housed in adjacent enclosures as ARB. We considered 236 behaviours persisting over five consecutive scans and without a valid cause as ARB. We 237 calculated the proportion of scans spent by each subject performing ARBs as an indicator of poor 238 welfare (Mason & Latham, 2004).

239 Hypothesis

We tested three hypotheses on how behavioural welfare measures might vary among different groups of captive Asiatic lions housed under similar conditions. Our first hypothesis was that there would be no variations in behavioural welfare measures between male and female subjects and the measures would perform reliably for both sexes. Our second hypothesis was that the wild-rescued lions would display more diverse measures of behavioural welfare compared to captive-raised animals. Our final hypothesis was that individuals with shy personality would show less diversity in behavioural welfare measures compared to bold individuals.

247 Data analysis

248 We categorized the subjects (n = 35) into six groups based on their personality (bold=21, 249 shy=14), life history experiences (captive-raised=16, wild-rescued=19) and sex classes (male=14) 250 and female=21) and all six groups served as independent categorical variables. We measured 251 different indices of welfare such as enclosure space usage (SPI), behaviour diversity (SWI), 252 latency to novel objects, and aberrant repetitive behaviours as dependent variables for 253 downstream analyses. We conducted all analyses with R version 3.4 and 3.5 through RStudio 254 (RStudio, 2012) using packages, dplyr (Wickham & Francois, 2016), ggplot2 (RStudio, 2015), 255 Im, lubridate (Spinu, Grolemund & Wickham, 2018), tidyverse (Wickham, 2017), and 256 funModeling. For exploratory data analyses we used Shapiro-Wilk test and Levene's test to 257 ascertain the normal distribution and homogeneity of variance in SPI, SWI, latency and ARB 258 values, respectively, and conducted bivariate Pearson's correlation. We compared welfare 259 indices between groups using independent samples t-test. When comparing between means of 260 two groups with different sample sizes, it is important to report effect sizes in addition to p-261 values to indicate the scale independent degree of difference. We calculated effect sizes to 262 quantify differences in welfare measures between groups (Cohen, 1992; Lakens, 2013).

Finally, we explored causative inter-relationships between latency to novel objects, aberrant repetitive behaviours (ARB), behaviour diversity (SWI) and enclosure usage patterns (SPI). We conducted three linear regression (univariate) using enclosure space usage, behaviour diversity, aberrant behaviours (ARB) as dependent and predictor variables interchangeably. Before conducting regression analysis, we checked for multicollinearity between predictor variables using measures of VIF (variance inflation factor). If two variables showed a high level of correlation, we avoided using them as predictors in a regression model.

270 Personality and latency to novel object

We used a combination of behavioural coding and personality-rating instrument (Highfill et al., 2010) to ascertain personality profile of subjects, which considered aggression levels, activity, boldness, curiosity and level of stereotypy (King & Figueredo, 1997). We asked three zookeepers to rate subjects on a likert scale of 1-9 for measures of personality traits based on bold and shy continuum.

276 We measured the latency of each subject to react to non-food novel objects over the course of 277 two trials with different non-food novel objects (i.e. a ball and a rope). We categorized subjects 278 as bold or shy based on the proportion of bold and shy behaviours performed during the tests. 279 For all 35 subjects, the keeper ratings agreed with the conclusions drawn by observers based on 280 novel-stimulus tests (Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.9$). Based on personality tests, and keeper rating, we 281 categorized 21 subjects (10:11) as bold and 14 subjects (4:10) as shy. We found that latency 282 measures were not normally distributed across subjects, therefore we used non-parametric 283 statistics (Kolmogorov Smirnov test) to compare the means of latency values between subjects of 284 different personality types, life history, and sex.

285 Enclosure usage pattern

We calculated the spread of participation index (SPI) (Plowman, 2003) of enclosure usage for all subjects across 486 observation days using instantaneous scan data. We conducted independent-samples t-test between different groups of subjects followed by multiple regressions to understand the interconnection of different welfare indices. We calculated the SPI values using the following formula:

291 SPI= $\frac{\Sigma |fo - fe|}{2(N - femin)}$

where f_o stands for observed frequency of usage of enclosure zones, f_e stands for expected frequency of enclosure usage. N stands for total number of observations in all zones of the enclosure and f_{emin} stands for the expected frequency of observation for the smallest zone (Plowman, 2003). SPI measures indicate the homogeneity of space usage patterns. A high SPI value (close to 1) indicates that subjects are biased towards certain areas of the enclosure, while a lower SPI value (close to 0.5 or lower) indicates that lions use most areas of the enclosure equitably.

299 Species-typical behaviour diversity

300 We used Shannon-Weiner diversity index (SWI) to measure species-typical behaviour diversity 301 as this approach considers both richness and evenness of species-typical behaviours in the data 302 set (Clark & Melfi, 2012; Miller, Pisacane & Vicino, 2016; Spiezio et al., 2018). We compiled 303 an ethogram of all behaviour states and events observed from all subjects during the study period 304 (Supplementary Table 3). We pooled all behaviour observations of each subject to calculate 305 behaviour diversity. We excluded aberrant repetitive behaviours from the calculations, since they 306 did not qualify as species-typical behaviours. We employed t-test to compare the means between 307 subjects belonging to different life histories, personality types, and sex.

308 Aberrant repetitive behaviours

We counted the total number scans of ARBs displayed by each subject during every study session. We calculated proportion of ARBs displayed across the entire study period by each subject and used that as a continuous variable to compare across different categories of subjects based on their age, sex, life history, and personality. We used t-tests, and multiple regression analysis to explore the relationship between various welfare indices.

314 **Results**

315 Latency to novel object

316 The mean latency for all subjects after averaging both observations (six months apart) was 47.76 317 seconds (SD=46.85). Captive-raised individuals showed significantly lower latency to novel 318 objects (M=18.61, SD=21.55, n=16) compared to wild-rescued individuals (M=72.30, SD=48.7, 319 n=19) with effect size (Cohen's d) of 1.49 (Table 1, Figure 2). Bold animals showed significantly 320 lower latency to novel objects (M=11.13, SD=3.65, n=21) compared to shy individuals 321 (M=102.71, SD=17.4, n=14), with a high effect size (Cohen's d = 7.508) (Table 1, Figure 2). 322 Our gender-based comparative analyses revealed no difference in latency scores between male 323 (M=37.02, SD=45, n=14) and female (M=54.9, SD=47.8, n=21) subjects (Cohen's d = 0.38) 324 subjects.

We found that latency to novel objects was positively correlated (Supplementary Figure 2, Table 2) to enclosure usage (SPI values) index (r=0.6, n=35, p=0.00), and proportion of aberrant repetitive behaviours (r=0.53, n=35, p=0.00). Latency was negatively correlated to behaviour diversity (r=-0.58, n= 35, p=0.00). We did not conduct linear regression analysis to ascertain its relationship with other welfare indices, as the latency values were not normally distributed.

330 Enclosure usage

Enclosure space usage pattern varied significantly between subjects with different personality types and life history parameters. Wild-rescued individuals used enclosure space less homogeneously (M=0.67, SD=0.15, n=19) than captive-born individuals (M=0.47, SD=0.12, n=16) (t (33) =4.28, p=0.0001, Cohen's d=1.47) (Table 1, Figure 2). Bold subjects had significantly lower SPI scores signifying homogenous enclosure use (M=0.5, SD=0.12, n=21) compared to shy individuals (Table 1, Figure 2) (M=0.71, SD=0.15, n=14) (t (33) =-4.572, p=

337 0.0001, Cohen's d=1.54). Overall, the SPI value of males (M=0.61, SD=0.20, n=14) was not 338 significantly different from female (M=0.57, SD=0.15, n=21) lions (t (33) = 5.28, p = 0.6).

339 Enclosure usage (SPI values) is positively correlated (Supplementary Figure 2, Table 2) with 340 latency values (r=0.6, p=0.00), and proportion of ARBs (r= 0.53, p= 0.001). Enclosure usage is 341 negatively correlated with behaviour diversity (r=-0.61, p=0.001). As aberrant repetitive behaviour and behaviour diversity were highly correlated, we avoided using them together as 342 predictors for regression analyses. Multiple regression analyses revealed that behaviour diversity, 343 latency to novel object, and age of subject explained 66% of the variance in enclosure space 344 usage ($R^2=0.66$, F (3, 31) = 20.66, p < 0.001) (Table 3). The predicted regression equation for 345 346 enclosure usage is SPI = $-0.64 + (-0.21) \times (Behaviour diversity) + (3.7e-5) \times (age in days) + (1.3e-6) \times (age in days) + (1.3e-$ 347 03) x (Latency). From the regression analysis we can infer that younger subjects used enclosure 348 evenly compared to older subjects. Higher latency to novel objects can also correspond to low 349 enclosure space use. Furthermore, subjects that use the enclosure space evenly are likely to have a diverse species-typical behaviour repertoire. 350

351 Species-typical behaviour diversity

We found that species-typical behaviour diversity of captive-raised animals (M=1.26, SD=0.3, n=16) was higher than wild-rescued animals (M=0.83, SD=0.35, n=19) (t (33) =-3.94, p=0.001, Cohen's d=1.35) (Table 1, Figure 2). Further, bold animals had higher behaviour diversity (M=1.23, SD=0.26, n=21) than shy individuals (M=0.73, SD=0.34, n=14) (t (33) = 4.897, p=0.0001, Cohen's d=1.64) (Table 1, Figure 2). However, there was no significant difference in the diversity of species-typical behaviours between male (M=0.96, SD=0.43, n=14) and female (M=1.1, SD=0.35, n=21) lions (t (33) = -0.85, p = 0.4).

359 Behaviour diversity was negatively correlated with latency to novel objects, (r=-0.59, p=0.01), 360 aberrant repetitive behaviours (r=0.884, p=0.01), and enclosure usage (r=-0.61, p=0.01) 361 (Supplementary Figure 2, Table 2). Multiple regression analyses indicated that latency to novel 362 objects, space usage patterns and age of subjects explained 53% of the variance in the behaviour diversity ($R^2=0.85$, F (2,32) = 90.92, p<0.001) (Table 3). The predicted regression equation is 363 Behaviour diversity = $1.8 + (-0.046) \times (Aberrant repetitive behaviour) + (-0.46) \times (Enclosure)$ 364 365 usage). The results from the linear regression indicate that subjects that show less ARB and use enclosure space more homogenously are likely to have higher behaviour diversity. 366

367 Aberrant repetitive behaviours (ARB)

368 Proportion of aberrant repetitive behaviours (ARBs) varied between wild-rescued individuals 369 (M=13.12, SD=6.25, n=19) than captive-raised individuals (M=7.74, SD=5.3, n=16) (t (33) 370 =2.71, p=0.01, Cohen's d=0.92) (Table 1, Figure 2). Bold individuals (n=21) showed 371 significantly lower amount of stereotypic behaviour such as pacing and swaying (M=7.01, SD=4, n=21) compared to shy individuals (M=16.13, SD=5.4, n=14) (t (33) =-5.82, p=0.000, Cohen's 372 373 d=1.94) (Table 1, Figure 2). We found no variation in expression of stereotypic behaviour 374 between male (M=11.04, SD=7.05, n=14) and female (M=10.41, SD=6.02, n=21) subjects (t (33)) =0.282, p=0.78, Cohen's d = 0.09). 375

ARB was positively correlated with latency to novel objects (r=0.57, p=0.01), and enclosure usage (r = 0.54, p =0.01) but was negatively correlated with behaviour diversity (r=-0.88, p=0.01) (Supplementary Figure 2, Table 2). Regression analysis explained 85% of variance in ARB values with behaviour diversity and age as the significant predictor variables (R²=0.85, F (2,32) = 90.27, p=0.000) (Table 3). The predicted regression equation for aberrant repetitive behaviour is, ARB = 28.08 + (-15.05) x (behaviour diversity) + (-6.7e-04) x (age in days). From

the regression analysis we can assert that subjects displaying a higher diversity of species-typical behaviours were less likely to show ARBs. Interestingly, age had a miniscule yet statistically significant effect on ARBs, implying that younger individuals were more likely to show such behaviours.

386 **Discussion**

387 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to compare the behavioural welfare measures 388 of wild-rescued and captive-raised Asiatic lions with differing personality traits in an empirical 389 framework. Our sample size constitutes 10% of the global captive stock and 6% of the wild 390 population of Asiatic lions, making the results relevant for the global conservation initiatives for 391 this species. The results clearly show that personality and life history significantly affect 392 behavioural welfare measures. We did not observe any sex-specific variations in behavioural 393 welfare measures of the subjects, confirming our first hypothesis. However, contrary to our 394 second hypothesis, wild-rescued lions showed low behaviour diversity, high enclosure-use bias, 395 increased stereotypy, and higher latency to novel objects compared to captive-raised subjects. 396 Since most wild-origin lions were rescued as adults, we believe that they were unable to perform 397 diverse array of species-typical behaviours due to the lack of sufficient cognitive stimulus in 398 captivity. We also found that most wild-rescued individuals have shy personality traits (n=12), 399 whereas majority of captive-raised individuals have bold traits (n=14). Finally, our results 400 supported the third hypothesis that captive-raised lions with bold personalities are more resilient 401 to small changes in welfare conditions than shy subjects. We found that behaviour diversity of 402 Asiatic lions had a strong linear relationship with proportion of aberrant repetitive behaviours 403 along with enclosure usage patterns. Therefore, animals with low behaviour diversity were 404 highly likely to display more ARBs and show more enclosure zone bias. Existing studies suggest

405 that the inability to perform instinctive and habitual behaviours might result in allostatic overload 406 (Korte, Olivier & Koolhaas, 2007). However, it is important to point out that the proportion of 407 ARBs differed significantly between wild-rescued and captive-raised lions. This means that the 408 inability to perform species-typical behaviours translates into an increase in stereotypy and 409 timely intervention and improvement of husbandry practices would lead to better welfare to 410 wild-rescued, and shy animals. Overall, Asiatic lions with different personality traits (bold and shy) and life-history (captive-raised and wild-rescued) significantly differed on measures of 411 412 welfare, which supports earlier studies (Japyassú & Malange, 2014) on animal individuality.

These results may misconstrue that wild-rescued lions and those with shy personality traits are condemned to suffer more in captivity. On the contrary, our results simply indicate the need for different husbandry practices, enclosure design, and enrichment interventions for animals with differing life histories and personality traits. Zoo managers and biologists should address the welfare needs of individuals to meet conservation goals through tailored-husbandry practices and individual-centric welfare measures to create a richer cognitive experience for wild-rescued and shy animals.

420 Animal welfare as a discipline has its foundations in ethical concerns for animals but has slowly 421 embraced the scientific concept from animal ecology, behaviour and physiology (Broom, 1991; 422 Fraser, 1999). Modern welfare science uses animal behaviour in the subjective context of affective states of animals to create opportunities for positive emotions (Dawkins, 2004; Fraser, 423 424 2009; Whitham & Miller, 2016). The impacts of welfare are far-reaching as it affects cognitive 425 performance (Harding, Paul & Mendl, 2004; Broom, 2011; Boissy & Erhard, 2014), behaviour diversity (Rabin, 2003; Greggor et al., 2016) and affective states (Mendl et al., 2009; Whitham & 426 427 Miller, 2016) of animals. Good welfare practices are vital for the success of an ex-situ

428 conservation programme (Rabin, 2003; Teixeira et al., 2007; Broom, 2011). Existing research on 429 animal personality posits that bold and shyness are important attributes that can provide survival 430 value to animals (Bremner-Harrison, Prodohl & Elwood, 2004). Early life experiences can alter 431 the personality state of animals (Higley et al., 1991; Frost et al., 2007; Watters & Powell, 2012) 432 which can lead to intraspecific variation in welfare requirements. Recent studies also indicate a strong inter-relationship between personality and cognition with implications in ex-situ 433 434 conservation programme success (Watters & Powell, 2012; Gartner, Powell & Weiss, 2016) as 435 personality traits determine the umwelt of individuals and affect cognition, affective states, and 436 ultimately welfare (Carere & Locurto, 2011; Izzo, Bashaw & Campbell, 2011; Boissy & Erhard, 437 2014). Our findings support this theory in Asiatic lions, where animals with different personality 438 traits significantly differ on behavioural measures of welfare under similar housing conditions.

439 In this study, we also explored the inter-relationship between different welfare indices. We found that subjects that used enclosure space homogenously and displayed less ARBs were more likely 440 to show diverse behaviour repertoire, which was supported by existing studies (Wemelsfelder et 441 442 al., 2000; Clark & Melfi, 2012). We found that latency to novel objects is positively correlated to 443 stereotypy and enclosure usage bias (Wemelsfelder et al., 2000; Sneddon, Braithwaite & Gentle, 2003; Watters, Margulis & Atsalis, 2009) and negatively correlated to behaviour diversity. 444 Latency measure is an important tool for managers to evaluate the welfare condition of animals. 445 Our regression models show that evenness of enclosure usage was determined by the age of 446 447 subjects, latency to novel objects, and behaviour diversity of subjects. Proportion of ARBs and behaviour diversity was highly negatively correlated, which presents a strong case for zoo 448 449 managers to increase the gamut of sensory stimuli available for captive animals to display natural 450 behaviours (Swaisgood & Shepherdson, 2005). All four behavioural welfare measures used in

this study was significantly affected by personality and life-history parameters of the subjects.
Moreover, bivariate correlation and regression models underlined strong inter-linkages between
all welfare indices (Rabin, 2003; Rose & Robert, 2013; Kroshko et al., 2016). To reiterate,
Asiatic lions have diverse intraspecific variations that lead to statistically significant behavioural
welfare measures under similar husbandry protocols.

456 Felids are among the most represented taxa across zoological institutions, which necessitates a 457 uniform welfare index to evaluate captive conditions (Szokalski, Litchfield & Foster, 2013). 458 Welfare assessments validated through this study such as personality assessments, latency, 459 enclosure usage, and behavioural diversity can be useful, cost-effective, and non-invasive tools 460 to diagnose and prevent zoochosis in captive wild animals (Broom, 1991; Mason & Mendl, 461 2007). Ex-situ conservation breeding programmes aim to create a line of genetically healthy and 462 behaviourally diverse stock of animals that can successfully recolonize wild habitats (Keulartz, 2015). Studies show that regular individual-centric welfare assessments are necessary for long-463 term goals of ex-situ conservation breeding programmes (Whitehouse et al., 2013; Cannon et al., 464 465 2016; Whitham & Miller, 2016). Our results underline an urgent need for managers to implement 466 welfare assessment protocols that measure animal cognition, behaviour diversity, and 467 functionality of captive environment, which can lead to individual-specific husbandry practices. To achieve this objective, we must optimize captive environment and management practices to 468 ensure good animal welfare in ex-situ conservation programmes (Reading, Miller & 469 470 Shepherdson, 2013; Moorhouse et al., 2015). We hope that this study encourages managers and biologists to revisit traditional husbandry protocols and optimize them to the cognitive needs of 471 individual animals under their care. 472

473 Conclusion

Optimized animal welfare practices are a prerequisite of every ex-situ conservation programme. 474 475 A significant corpus of animal welfare research focuses on the prevention and amelioration of negative emotions in captive individuals. The first major stepping stone in animal welfare 476 477 research was acceptance of animals as sentient beings capable of suffering (Dawkins, 1990; 478 McMahon et al., 2013). The current philosophy of animal welfare has been galvanized in 479 ethology (Hediger, 1968), positivism (Mendl et al., 2009; Fraser, 2009), and affective states 480 (Dawkins, 1990; Fraser & Duncan, 1998; Bateson & Matheson, 2007; Fraser, 2009). 481 Acknowledging individual personalities and welfare requirements must be the next logical step 482 to increase behaviour diversity in ex-situ conservation breeding programmes (Martin-Wintle et 483 al., 2017). Modem ex-situ conservation facilities must create opportunities for individuals to experience positive emotions, which ultimately lead to better biopsychosocial health. As shown 484 in our study, similar husbandry practices may lead to various welfare outcomes due to 485 486 intraspecific differences. Ex-situ conservation should focus on welfare requirement of individual 487 animals, in consonance with long-term goals. We encourage zoo management to address welfare 488 deficits by employing personality, life history, and behavioural indices. This study emphasizes 489 the dire requirement for individual-centric welfare measurement indices for all animals at ex-situ 490 conservation breeding centers and on-display enclosures. Long-term sustenance of endangered 491 species must be achieved by the combination of optimized ex-situ and in-situ conservation 492 measures also known as the "one-plan approach" (Schwitzer et al., 2013). Based on the results 493 from this study, we propose to facilitate tailored husbandry and enrichment practices at ex-situ 494 institutions to conserve cognitive capabilities of captive animals. We believe that this study 495 elucidates the importance of personality-based approach to welfare assessment in ex-situ

496 conservation institutions and paves way for a wider utilization of these techniques by managers497 and biologists.

498 Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. A. P. Singh, Chief Conservator of Forest, Junagadh for providing research permits and Gujarat Forest Department and Sakkarbaug Zoological Garden for logistical support in this study. We are thankful to Salim Chuvan, animal keeper, Sakkarbaug Zoological Garden, and Ashkar Bloch, field assistant for their support during field work. We acknowledge timely technical inputs from Gitanjali Bhattacharya, Craig Bruce, Julien Godfrey, Jim Mackie, and Graeme Williamson from ZSL. We thank the Director, Dean and Research Coordinator of Wildlife Institute of India for their support.

506 **References**

- Ainsworth MS, Bowlby J. 1991. An ethological approach to personality development. *American Psychologist* 46:333.
- 509 Altmann J. 1974. Observational study of behaviour: sampling methods. *Behaviour* 49:227–267.
- Banerjee K, Jhala YV, Chauhan KS, Dave CV. 2013. Living with lions: The economics of
 coexistence in the Gir forests, India. *PloS One* 8:1–11. DOI:
 10.1371/journal.pone.0049457.
- 513 Banerjee K, Jhala YV, Pathak B. 2010. Demographic structure and abundance of Asiatic lions
 514 *Panthera leo persica* in Girnar Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat, India. *Oryx* 44:248. DOI:
 515 10.1017/S0030605309990949.
- Bateson M, Matheson SM. 2007. Performance on a categorisation task suggests that removal of
 environmental enrichment induces "pessimism" in captive European starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*). *Animal Welfare* 16:33–36.

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

519	Boissy A, Erhard HW. 2014. How studying interactions between animal emotions, cognition,
520	and personality can contribute to improve farm animal welfare. In: Genetics and the
521	Behavior of Domestic Animals. Elsevier, 81-113. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-12-394586-
522	0.00003-2.
523	Boissy A, Manteuffel G, Jensen MB, Moe RO, Spruijt B, Keeling LJ, Winckler C, Forkman B,
524	Dimitrov I, Langbein J, Bakken M, Veissier I, Aubert A. 2007. Assessment of positive
525	emotions in animals to improve their welfare. Physiology & Behavior 92:375-397. DOI:
526	10.1016/j.physbeh.2007.02.003.

- 527 Bracke MBM, Hopster H. 2006. Assessing the importance of natural behavior for animal
 528 welfare. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 19:77–89. DOI:
 529 10.1007/s10806-005-4493-7.
- 530 Brambell FWR. 1965. *Welfare of animals kept under intensive livestock husbandry systems*. HM
 531 Stationery Office.
- 532 Bremner-Harrison S, Prodohl PA, Elwood RW. 2004. Behavioural trait assessment as a release
- 533 criterion: boldness predicts early death in a reintroduction programme of captive-bred swift
- 534 fox (*Vulpes velox*). *Animal Conservation* 7:313–320. DOI: 10.1017/S1367943004001490.
- 535 Broom D. 1986. Indicators of Poor Welfare. *British Veterinary Journal* 142:524–526.
- Broom DM. 1991. Animal welfare: concepts and measurement. *Journal of Animal Science*69:4167–4175.
- 538 Broom DM. 2011. A history of animal welfare science. *Acta Biotheoretica* 59:121–37. DOI:
 539 10.1007/s10441-011-9123-3.
- 540 Butterworth A, Mench JA, Wielebnowski N. 2011. Practical strategies to assess (and improve)
- 541 welfare. *Animal Welfare*:200–214.

- 542 Cannon TH, Heistermann M, Hankison SJ, Hockings KJ, McLennan MR. 2016. Tailored
 543 enrichment strategies and stereotypic behavior in captive individually housed macaques
- 544 (Macaca spp.). Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science 19:171–182. DOI:
- 545 10.1080/10888705.2015.1126786.
- 546 Carere C, Locurto C. 2011. Interaction between animal personality and animal cognition.
 547 *Current Zoology* 57:491–498.
- 548 Caro TM, Roper R, Young M, Dank GRR, Caro TM, Dank GRR, Roper R. 1979. Inter-observer
 549 reliability. *Behaviour* 69:303–315. DOI: 10.1163/156853979X00520.
- 550 Carter AJ, Marshall HH, Heinsohn R, Cowlishaw G. 2013. Personality predicts decision making
- only when information is unreliable. *Animal Behaviour* 86:633–639. DOI:
 10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.07.009.
- Chadwick C. 2014. Social behaviour and personality assessment as a tool for improving the
 management of cheetahs (*Acinonyx jubatus*) in captivity. Doctoral dissertation, University
 of Salford).
- 556 Chakrabarti S, Jhala Y V. 2017. Selfish partners: resource partitioning in male coalitions of
 557 Asiatic lions. *Behavioral Ecology* 28:1532–1539.
- Clark FE, Melfi VA. 2012. Environmental enrichment for a mixed-species nocturnal mammal
 exhibit. *Zoo Biology* 31:397–413. DOI: 10.1002/zoo.20380.
- 560 Clubb R, Mason G. 2003. Captivity effect on wide-ranging carnivores. *Nature* 425:473–474.
 561 DOI: 10.1038/425473a.
- 562 Coelho CM, de Azevedo CS, Young RJ. 2012. Behavioral responses of maned wolves
 563 (*Chrysocyon brachyurus*, *Canidae*) to different categories of environmental enrichment

- stimuli and their implications for successful reintroduction. *Zoo biology* 31:453–69. DOI:
 10.1002/zoo.20410.
- 566 Cohen J. 1992. A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin* 112:155–159. DOI: 10.1037/0033567 2909.112.1.155.
- 568 Costa PT, McCrae RR. 1997. Personality trait structures as a human universal. *American*569 *Psychologist* 52:509–516.
- 570 Dawkins MS. 1990. From an animal's point of view: Motivation, fitness, and animal welfare.
 571 *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 13:1–9. DOI: 10.1017/S0140525X00077104.
- 572 Dawkins MS. 2004. Using behaviour to assess animal welfare. *Animal Welfare* 13:3–7. DOI:
 573 10.1177/1091581812471490.
- 574 Dingemanse NJ, Kazem AJ, Réale D, Wright J. 2010. Behavioural reaction norms: animal 575 personality meets individual plasticity. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 25:81–89.
- 576 Engel GL. 1980. The clinical application of the biopsychosocial model. *American Journal of*577 *Psychiatry* 137:535-544.
- Franks B, Higgins ET, Champagne FA. 2014. A theoretically based model of rat personality with
 implications for welfare. *PloS One* 9(4). e95135. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0095135.
- 580 Franks B, Reiss D, Cole P, Friedrich V, Thompson N, Higgins ET. 2013. Predicting how
- 581 individuals approach enrichment: Regulatory focus in Cotton Top Tamarins (Sanguinus
- 582 *oedipus*). *Zoo Biology* 32:427–435. DOI: 10.1002/zoo.21075.
- 583 Fraser D. 1999. Animal ethics and animal welfare science: bridging the two cultures. *Applied*584 *Animal Behaviour Science* 65:171–189. DOI: 10.1016/S0168-1591(99)00090-8.
- 585 Fraser D. 2009. Animal behaviour, animal welfare and the scientific study of affect. Applied
- 586 *Animal Behaviour Science* 118:108–117. DOI: 10.1016/j.applanim.2009.02.020.

- 587 Fraser D, Duncan IJ. 1998. "Pleasures", "pains" and animal welfare: toward a natural history of
 588 affect. *Animal Welfare* 7:383–396.
- 589 Frost AJ, Winrow-giffen AA, Ashley PJ, Sneddon LU. 2007. Plasticity in animal personality
- traits: does prior experience alter the degree of boldness? *Proceedings of the Royal Society*
- 591 *B: Biological Sciences* 274:333–339. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2006.3751.
- Funder DC. 1995. On the accuracy of personality judgment: A realistic approach. *Psychological Review* 102:652–670. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.102.4.652.
- Funder DC, Colvin CR. 1988. Friends and strangers: Acquaintanceship, agreement, and the
 accuracy of personality judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 55:149–
- 596 158. DOI: 10.1037//0022-3514.55.1.149.
- 597 Gartner MC, Powell DM, Weiss A. 2016. Comparison of subjective well-being and personality
- 598 assessments in the clouded leopard (Neofelis nebulosa), snow leopard (Panthera uncia),
- and African lion (*Panthera leo*). Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science 19:294–302.
- 600 DOI: 10.1080/10888705.2016.1141057.
- 601 Gilby IC, Pokempner A A, Wrangham RW. 2010. A direct comparison of scan and focal
- 602 sampling methods for measuring wild chimpanzee feeding behaviour. *Folia Primatologica*;
- 603 *International Journal of Primatology* 81:254–64. DOI: 10.1159/000322354.
- 604 Gliem JA, Gliem RR. 2003. Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability
- 605 coefficient for Likert-type scales. In: Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult,606 Continuing, and Community Education.
- Goold C, Newberry RC. 2017. Modelling personality, plasticity and predictability in shelter
 dogs. *Royal Society Open Science* 4:170618–170618. DOI: 10.1101/145367.

609	Gosling SD, Vazire S. 2002. Are we barking up the right tree? Evaluating a comparative
610	approach to personality. Journal of Research in Personality 36:607-614. DOI:
611	10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00511-1.
612	Greggor AL, Berger-Tal O, Blumstein DT, Angeloni L, Bessa-Gomes C, Blackwell BF, St Clair
613	CC, Crooks K, de Silva S, Fernández-Juricic E, Goldenberg SZ, Mesnick SL, Owen M,
614	Price CJ, Saltz D, Schell CJ, Suarez A V., Swaisgood RR, Winchell CS, Sutherland WJ.
615	2016. Research priorities from animal behaviour for maximising conservation progress.
616	Trends in Ecology and Evolution 31:953–964. DOI: 10.1016/j.tree.2016.09.001.
617	Griffin AS, Guillette LM, Healy SD. 2015. Cognition and personality: An analysis of an

- 618 emerging field. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 30:207–214. DOI:
 619 10.1016/j.tree.2015.01.012.
- 620 Teixiera, CP, De Azevedo CS, Mendl, M, Cipreste, CF, Young RJ. 2007. Revisiting
 621 translocation and reintroduction programmes: the importance of considering stress. *Animal*622 *Behaviour* 73:1-1 DOI: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2006.06.002.
- Harding EJ, Paul ES, Mendl M. 2004. Cognitive bias and affective state. *Nature* 427:312. DOI:
 10.1038/427312a.
- 625 Hediger H. 1968. The detrimental effects of captivity on the behaviour of wild animals.
 626 *World*:1–54.
- Highfill L, Hanbury D, Kristiansen R, Kuczaj S, Watson S. 2010. Rating vs. coding in animal
 personality research. *Zoo Biology* 29:509–16. DOI: 10.1002/zoo.20279.
- 629 Higley JD, Hasert MF, Suomi SJ, Linnoila M. 1991. Nonhuman primate model of alcohol abuse:
- 630 effects of early experience, personality, and stress on alcohol consumption. *Proceedings of*
- 631 *the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 88:7261–5.

- 632 Izzo GN, Bashaw MJ, Campbell JB. 2011. Enrichment and individual differences affect welfare
- 633 indicators in squirrel monkeys (Saimiri sciureus). Journal of Comparative Psychology
- 634 125:347–352. DOI: 10.1037/a0024294.
- 635 Japyassú HF, Malange J. 2014. Plasticity, stereotypy, intra-individual variability and personality:
- Handle with care. *Behavioural Processes* 109:40–47.
- 637 Jhala Y V, Chellam R, Qureshi Q, Meena V, Chauhan KS, Dave C, Banerjee K. 2006. Social
- 638 organization and dispersal of Asiatic lions and ecological monitoring of Gir. Technical
- 639 Report. Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun, India.
- 640 Jhala Y V, Mukherjee S, Shah N, Chauhan KS, Dave C V, Meena V, Banerjee K. 2009. Home
- 641 range and habitat preference of female lions (*Panthera leo persica*) in Gir forests, India.
- 642 *Biodiversity and Conservation* 18:3383–3394. DOI: 10.1007/s10531-009-9648-9.
- 643 Joslin P. 1973. The Asiatic Lion: A Study of ecology and behaviour.
- 644 Kessel AL, Brent L. 1996. Space utilization by captive-born baboons (Papio sp.) before and after
- 645 provision of structural enrichment. *Animal Welfare* 5:37–44.
- 646 Keulartz J. 2015. Captivity for conservation? Zoos at a crossroads. Journal of Agricultural and
- 647 *Environmental Ethics* 28:335–351. DOI: 10.1007/s10806-015-9537-z.
- 648 King JE, Figueredo AJ. 1997. The five-factor model plus dominance in chimpanzee personality.
- 649 *Journal of Research in Personality* 31:257–271. DOI: 10.1006/jrpe.1997.2179.
- 650 Koolhaas J, Korte S, De Boer S, Van Der Vegt B, Van Reenen C, Hopster H, De Jong I, Ruis M,
- Blokhuis H. 1999. Coping styles in animals: current status in behavior and stressphysiology. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 23:925–935.
- 653 Korte SM, Olivier B, Koolhaas JM. 2007. A new animal welfare concept based on allostasis.
- 654 *Physiology & Behavior* 92:422–8. DOI: 10.1016/j.physbeh.2006.10.018.

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

655	Kroshko J, Clubb R, Harper L, Mellor E, Moehrenschlager A, Mason G. 2016. Stereotypic route
656	tracing in captive Carnivora is predicted by species-typical home range sizes and hunting
657	styles. Animal Behaviour 117:197–209. DOI: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.05.010.

- Lakens D. 2013. Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: A
 practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. *Frontiers in Psychology* 4:1–12. DOI:
 10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00863.
- Lawrence AB, Terlouw EMC. 1993. A review of behavioral factors involved in the development
 and continued performance of stereotypic behaviors in pigs. *Journal of Animal Science*71:2815–25.
- Locurto C. 2006. Individual differences and animal personality. *Comparative Cognition & Behavior Reviews* 2:67–78. DOI: 10.3819/ccbr.2008.20004.
- Mallapur A, Qureshi Q, Chellam R. 2002. Enclosure design and space utilization by Indian
 leopards (Panthera *pardus*) in four zoos in southern India. *Animal Welfare* 5:111–124.
- 668 Martin P, Bateson P. 1993. Measuring behaviour. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139168342.
- 669 Martin-Wintle MS, Shepherdson D, Zhang G, Huang Y, Luo B, Swaisgood RR. 2017. Do
- 670 opposites attract? Effects of personality matching in breeding pairs of captive giant pandas
- 671 on reproductive success. *Biological Conservation* 207:27–37. DOI:
 672 10.1016/j.biocon.2017.01.010.
- Mason GJ. 2008. Stereotypic Animal Behaviour: Fundamentals and Applications to Welfare and
 beyond. Cabi. DOI: 10.1079/9780851990040.0227.
- 675 Mason GJ, Latham NR. 2004. Can't stop, won't stop: Is stereotypy a reliable animal welfare
- 676 indicator? *Animal Welfare* 13:57–69. DOI: 10.2307/4493573.

677 McCrae RR, Costa Jr PT, Ostendorf F, Angleitner A, Hřebíčková M, Avia MD, Sanz J, Sanchez-

- Bernardos ML, Kusdil ME, Woodfield R. 2000. Nature over nurture: temperament,
 personality, and life span development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*78:173.
- 681 McMahon CR, Harcourt R, Bateson P, Hindell M a. 2013. Animal welfare and conservation, the
- debate we must have: A response to Draper and Bekoff (2012). *Biological Conservation*158:424. DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2012.10.027.
- Meehan C, Mench J. 2002. Environmental enrichment affects the fear and exploratory responses
 to novelty of young Amazon parrots. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 79:75–88.
- 686 Meehan CL, Mench JA. 2007. The challenge of challenge: Can problem solving opportunities
- enhance animal welfare? *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 102:246–261. DOI:
 10.1016/j.applanim.2006.05.031.
- 689 Meena V. 2008. Reproductive strategy and behaviour of male Asiatic lions.
- Meena V. 2009. Variation in social organisation of lions with particular reference to the Asiatic
 Lions *Panthera leo persica* (Carnivora: Felidae) of the Gir forest, India. *Africa* 1:158–165.
- 692 Melotti L, Oostindjer M, Bolhuis JE, Held S, Mendl M. 2011. Coping personality type and
- 693 environmental enrichment affect aggression at weaning in pigs. *Applied Animal Behaviour*694 *Science* 133:144–153.
- 695 Mendl M, Burman OHP, Parker RMA, Paul ES. 2009a. Cognitive bias as an indicator of animal
- 696 emotion and welfare: Emerging evidence and underlying mechanisms. Applied Animal
- 697 *Behaviour Science* 118:161–181. DOI: 10.1016/j.applanim.2009.02.023.

698	Mendl M, Burman OHP, Parker RMA, Paul ES. 2009b. Cognitive bias as an indicator of animal
699	emotion and welfare: Emerging evidence and underlying mechanisms. Applied Animal
700	Behaviour Science 118:161–181.
701	Miller LJ, Pisacane CB, Vicino GA. 2016. Relationship between behavioural diversity and faecal
702	glucocorticoid metabolites: a case study with cheetahs (Acinonyx jubatus). Animal Welfare
703	25:325–329.
704	Mills D. 1998. Personality and individual differences in the horse, their significance, use and
705	measurement. Equine Veterinary Journal 30:10–13.
706	Moneta GB, Spada MM. 2009. Coping as a mediator of the relationships between trait intrinsic

- and extrinsic motivation and approaches to studying during academic exam preparation.
 Personality and Individual Differences 46:664–669. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2009.01.012.
- Moorhouse TP, Dahlsjö CAL, Baker SE, Cruze NCD. 2015. The Customer isn't Always Right
 Conservation and animal welfare implications of the increasing demand for wildlife
 tourism. *Plos One* 10:10. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0138939.
- 712 Muehlmann AM, Lewis MH. 2012. Abnormal repetitive behaviours: Shared phenomenology and
- 713 pathophysiology. Journal of Intellectual Disability Research 56:427–440. DOI:
- 714 10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01519.
- 715 Murphy LB. 1977. Responses of domestic fowl to novel food and objects. *Applied Animal*716 *Ethology* 3:335–349.
- 717 Owen MA, Swaisgood RR, Blumstein DT. 2017. Contextual influences on animal decision-
- 718 making: Significance for behavior-based wildlife conservation and management.
- 719 *Integrative Zoology* 12:32–48. DOI: 10.1111/1749-4877.12235.

- 720 Panksepp J. 2011. The basic emotional circuits of mammalian brains: Do animals have affective
- 721 lives? *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* 35:1791–1804. DOI:
 722 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2011.08.003.
- 723 Pant S C. 2015. 14th Lion Population Estimation Report 2015.
- 724 Pastorino GQ, Soares NRP, Mazzola S, Preziosi R. 2016. Personality assessment and feline -
- keepers' relationship in lions (*Panthera leo*). International Journal of Health Animal
 Science & Food Safety III:1–2.
- 727 Pastorino GQ, Viau A, Curone G, Pearce-kelly P, Faustini M, Vigo D, Mazzola SM, Preziosi R.
- 728 2017. Role of personality in behavioral responses to new environments in captive Asiatic
- 729 lions (*Panthera leo persica*). Veterinary Medicine International. DOI:
 730 https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/6585380.
- Plowman AB. 2003. A note on a modification of the spread of participation index allowing for
 unequal zones. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 83:331–336. DOI: 10.1016/S0168-
- 733 1591(03)00142-4.
- Powell D. 1995. Preliminary evaluation of environmental enrichment techniques for African
 lions (*Panthera leo*). *Animal Welfare* 4:361–370.
- Rabin LA. 2003. Maintaining behavioural diversity in captivity for conservation: natural
 behaviour management. *Animal Welfare* 12:85–94.
- Razal CB, Pisacane CB, Miller LJ. 2016. Multifaceted approach to personality assessment in
 cheetahs (*Acinonyx jubatus*). *Animal Behaviour* 3:22–31. DOI: 10.12966/abc.03.01.2016.
- 740 Reading RP, Miller B, Shepherdson D. 2013. The value of enrichment to reintroduction success.
- 741 *Zoo Biology* 32:332–341. DOI: 10.1002/zoo.21054.

742	Réale D, Reader SM, Sol D, McDougall PT, Dingemanse NJ. 2007. Integrating animal
743	temperament within ecology and evolution. Biological Reviews 82:291-318. DOI:
744	10.1111/j.1469-185X.2007.00010.
745	Rees PA. 2016. Studying captive animals – a workbook of methods in behaviour, welfare and
746	ecology. DOI: 10.1080/00207233.2015.1114761.
747	Rose P, Robert R. 2013. Evaluating the activity patterns and enclosure usage of a little-studied
748	zoo species, the sitatunga (Tragelaphus spekii). Journal of Zoo and Aquarium Research
749	1:14–19.

- 750 Ross SR, Shender MA. 2016. Daily travel distances of zoo-housed chimpanzees and gorillas:
- 751 implications for welfare assessments and space requirements. *Primates* 57:395–401. DOI:
 752 10.1007/s10329-016-0530-6.
- 753 Rouff JH, Sussman RW, Strube MJ. 2005. Personality traits in captive lion-tailed macaques
- 754 (*Macaca silenus*). American Journal of Primatology 67:177–198. DOI: 10.1002/ajp.20176.
- 755 RStudio. 2012. RStudio: integrated development environment for R. *RStudio Inc, Boston,*756 *Massachusetts*.
- 757 RStudio. 2015. Data Visualization with ggplot2: Cheat Sheet. :2–2. DOI:
 758 10.1080/15228959.2015.1060147.
- 759 Schreck CB. 2010. Stress and fish reproduction: The roles of allostasis and hormesis. *General*760 *and Comparative Endocrinology* 165:549–556.
- 761 Schwitzer CC, Carroll B, Schwitzer FC, Andrews J, Faust L, Ferrie G, Kilmar L, Kongprom U,
- 762 Leus K, Schwartz K, Schwitzer C, Thongphakdee A, Tsao E, Spuy S Van Der. 2013. An
- 763 institutional application of the One Plan Approach to conservation planning working group
- 764 report. :1–6.

765	Sheperdson D, Carlstead K, Wielebnowski N. 2004. Cross-institutional assessment of stress
766	response in zoo animals using longitudinal monitoring of faecal corticoids and behaviour.
767	Animal Welfare 13:105–113.

- Sih A, Bell A, Johnson JCC. 2004. Behavioral syndromes: an ecological and evolutionary
 overview. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 19:372–8. DOI: 10.1016/j.tree.2004.04.009.
- Sloan Wilson D, Clark AB, Coleman K, Dearstyne T. 1994. Shyness and boldness in humans
 and other animals. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 9:442–446. DOI: 10.1016/01695347(94)90134-1.
- 773 Sneddon LU, Braithwaite VA, Gentle MJ. 2003. Animal studies repository novel object test:
- Examining nociception and fear in the rainbow trout. *The Journal of Pain* 4:431–440.
- Spiezio C, Valsecchi V, Sandri C, Regaiolli B. 2018. Investigating individual and social
 behaviour of the Northern bald ibis (*Geronticus eremita*): behavioural variety and welfare. *PeerJ* 6: e5436. DOI: 10.7717/peerj.5436.
- Spinu V, Grolemund G, Wickham H. 2018. lubridate: Make dealing with dates a little easier, R
 package version 1.7. 4.
- Spruijt BM, Bos R van den, Pijlman FT. 2001. A concept of welfare based on reward evaluating
 mechanisms in the brain: anticipatory behaviour as an indicator for the state of reward
 systems. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 72:145–171.
- 783 Srivastav A. 2014. International Studbook of Asiatic lion (Panthera leo persica).
- 784 Stanton LA, Sullivan MS, Fazio JM. 2015. A standardized ethogram for the Felidae: A tool for
- behavioral researchers. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 173:3–16. DOI:
 10.1016/j.applanim.2015.04.001.

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

787	Swaisgood RR, Shepherdson DJ. 2005. Scientific approaches to enrichment and stereotypies in
788	zoo Animals: what's been done and where should we go next? Zoo Biology 518:499-518.
789	DOI: 10.1002/zoo.

- Szokalski MS, Litchfield CA, Foster WK. 2013. What can zookeepers tell us about interacting
 with big cats in captivity? *Zoo Biology* 32:142–51. DOI: 10.1002/zoo.21040.
- 792 Tan HM, Ong SM, Langat G, Bahaman AR, Sharma RSK, Sumita S. 2013. The influence of
- enclosure design on diurnal activity and stereotypic behaviour in captive Malayan Sun
- bears (Helarctos malayanus). Research in Veterinary Science 94:228–239. DOI:
- 795 10.1016/j.rvsc.2012.09.024.
- Traylor-Holzer K, Fritz P. 1985. Utilization of space by adult and juvenile groups of captive
 chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *Zoo Biology* 4:115–127. DOI: 10.1002/zoo.1430040205.
- 798 Volpato GL, Giaquinto PC, de Castilho MF, Barreto RE, de Freitas EG. 2009. Animal welfare:
- from concepts to reality. *Oecologia Australis* 13:05–15. DOI: 10.4257/oeco.2009.1301.01.
- Watanabe S. 2007. How animal psychology contributes to animal welfare. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 106:193–202. DOI: 10.1016/j.applanim.2007.01.003.
- Watters JJ V. 2009. Toward a predictive theory for environmental enrichment. *Zoo Biology*28:609–622. DOI: 10.1002/zoo.20284.
- Watters JV, Margulis SW, Atsalis S. 2009. Behavioral monitoring in zoos and aquariums: A tool
 for guiding husbandry and directing research. *Zoo Biology* 28:35–48. DOI:
 10.1002/zoo.20207.
- 807 Watters J V., Powell DM. 2012. Measuring animal personality for use in population management
- in zoos: suggested methods and rationale. *Zoo Biology* 31:1–12. DOI: 10.1002/zoo.20379.

809	Wemelsfelder F, Haskell M, Mendl MT, Calvert S, Lawrence AB. 2000. Diversity of behaviour
810	during novel object tests is reduced in pigs housed in substrate-impoverished conditions.
811	Animal Behaviour 60(3):385-394.
812	Whitehouse J, Micheletta J, Powell LE, Bordier C, Waller BM. 2013. The impact of cognitive
813	testing on the welfare of group housed primates. PloS One 8: e78308. DOI:
814	10.1371/journal.pone.0078308.
815	Whitham J, Miller L. 2016. Using technology to monitor and improve zoo animal welfare.
816	Animal Welfare 25:395–409. DOI: 10.7120/09627286.25.4.395.
817	Wickham H. 2017. Tidyverse: Easily install and load 'tidyverse' packages. <i>R package version</i> 1.
818	
819	
820	
821	
822	
823	Figure legends
824	Figure 1: Schematic representation of an enclosure in Sakkarbaug zoological garden with the
825	layout of zones for behavioural observations of enclosure use by study subjects.

826

827 Figure 2: Comparison of behavioural welfare indices of Asiatic lions across personality (bold 828 and shy), life-history (wild and captive) and gender (male and female) categories. The 829 behavioural welfare indices used here are a) Enclosure usage; b) Behaviour diversity; c) 830 Aberrant repetitive behaviour; and d) Latency to novel objects.

Figure 1

Schematic representation of an enclosure in Sakkarbaug zoological garden with the layout of zones for behavioural observations of enclosure use by study subjects.



Figure 2

Comparison of behavioural welfare indices of Asiatic lions across personality (bold and shy), life-history (wild and captive) and gender (male and female) categories.

The behavioural welfare indices used here are a) Enclosure usage; b) Behaviour diversity; c) Aberrant repetitive behaviour; and d) Latency to novel objects.







d. Latency to novel objects



Table 1(on next page)

Comparison of welfare indices between captive-born and wild-rescued Asiatic lions

1	Table 1. Comp	arison of welfare	indices between	captive-born and	wild-rescued	Asiatic lions
	1			1		

Life-histories	Captive-born	Wild-rescued	t(33)	p-value	Effect size (Cohen's d)
Enclosure usage	0.47±0.12	0.67±0.15	4.28	< 0.000	1.47
Behaviour diversity	1.26±0.3	0.83±0.35	-3.94	< 0.00	1.35
Aberrant behaviours	7.74±5.3	13.12±6.25	2.71	0.10	0.92
Latency to novel object	18.61±21.55	72.30±48.7	4.08	< 0.000	1.42
Personality	Bold	Shy	t(33)	p-value	Effect size (Cohen's d)
Enclosure usage	0.5±0.12	0.71±0.15	-4.572	<0.000	1.54
Behaviour diversity	1.23±0.26	0.73±0.34	4.897	< 0.000	1.64
Aberrant behaviours	7.01±3.9	16.13±5.4	-5.825	< 0.000	1.94
Latency to novel object	11.13± 3.65	102.71±17.4	-1.11	< 0.000	7.28
Sex	Male	Female	t(33)	p-value	Effect size (Cohen's d)
Enclosure usage	0.61±0.2	0.57±0.15	5.28	0.60	0.17
Behaviour diversity	0.96±0.43	1.1±0.35	-0.85	0.4	0.28
Aberrant behaviours	11.04±7.05	10.41±6.02	0.282	0.78	0.09
Latency to novel object	37.02±45	54.91±47.8	-1.11	0.27	0.38

2

3

Table 2(on next page)

Correlations between welfare indices and life history parameters

1 Table 1. Correlations between welfare indices and life history parameters

	Enclosure usage	Behaviour diversity	Aberrant behaviours	Latency to novel object	Age
Enclosure usage					
Behaviour diversity	-0.611**				
Aberrant behaviours	0.536**	-0.884**			
Latency to novel object	0.593**	-0.587**	0.569**		
Age	0.261	0.127	-0.240	-0.085	
** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$					

2 3

PeerJ Preprints | https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27495v1 | CC BY 4.0 Open Access | rec: 19 Jan 2019, publ: 19 Jan 2019

4 5

Table 3(on next page)

General linear regression results for inter-relationships between welfare measures

1 Table 3. General linear regression results for inter-relationships between welfare measures

2									
Independent variables	Estimates	Std error	t	p values	R-squared	F	Durbin-Watson		
	Enclosure usage								
(Intercept)	8.22e-01	6.56e-02	12.52	7.09e-14	0.66	20.66	1.9		
Age	-3.46e-05	1.35e-05	2.56	.0152					
Latency to novel objects	1.31e-03	5.10e-04	2.56	0.01					
Behaviour diversity	-3.25e-01	5.03e-02	-6.47	2.79e-07					
		Behav	iour diversity						
(Intercept)	1.793	0.09	18.870	2e-16	0.85	90.92	1.78		
Enclosure space usage	-0.459	0.20	-2.258	0.030					
Aberrant repetitive behaviour	-0.046	0.005	-8.49	1.04e-09					
Aberrant repetitive behaviour									
Intercept	2.808e+01	1.494e+00	18.793	< 2e-16	0.85	90.27	1.58		
Behaviour diversity	-1.505e+01	1.144e+00	-13.151	1.89e-14					
age	-6.779e-04	3.071e-04	-2.207	0.0346					

3

4