1 **Moderate consistency in smooth newt behaviour**

2

3 Petr Chajma^{1,*}, Oldřich Kopecký², Jiří Vojar¹

4

5 1–Department of Ecology, Faculty of Environmental Sciences, Czech University of Life

6 Sciences Prague, Kamýcká 129, Praha – Suchdol, 165 00, Czech Republic

7 2–Department of Zoology and Fish Farming, Faculty of Agrobiological Sciences, Food and Natural

8 Resources, Czech University of Life Sciences Prague, Kamýcká 129, Praha – Suchdol,

9 165 00, Czech Republic

10 * Corresponding author; e-mail: chajmap@fzp.czu.cz

11

12 **Abstract**

13 Behavioural consistency (i.e., personality) is a novel field of research in amphibians.

14 Current published studies often address only one or two aspects of personality and

15 therefore cannot assess more complex relationships and behavioural syndromes. This is

16 the first study focusing on all relevant behavioural traits and their relationships in

17 urodele amphibians. Based on the three trials of the experiment, we examined the

18 consistency of activity (time spent moving), boldness (latency of the first movement and

19 time spent escaping) and exploration (number of visited segments of testing arena) of 42

20 smooth newts (*Lissotriton vulgaris*). Individual consistency, calculated through the

21 intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC), was low in newt activity (ICC = 0.192) and

22 moderate in boldness (0.476) and exploration (0.403). Activity was moderately

23 consistent for each trial (0.425), indicating a possible habituation, supported by a

24 decrease of mean activity throughout the trials. Correlation of the behavioural traits

25 studied suggests the presence of a behavioural syndrome, which potentially shaped the
26 traits together. Our findings suggest the need for a complex approach to the study of
27 amphibian personality and the need for standardized methodology, which would solve
28 the current difficulties in comparing published results.

29 **Introduction**

30 Behavioural consistency (i.e., personality) is a well-known phenomenon studied in
31 many taxa (Gosling 2001; Sih et al. 2004; Réale et al. 2007; Garamszegi et al. 2013)
32 and recently studied in amphibians (Aragón 2011; Koprivnikar et al. 2011; Maes et al.
33 2012; Wilson and Krause 2012; Brodin et al. 2013; Carlson and Langkilde 2013,
34 2014a). Consistency in the expression of behavioural traits over time and in different
35 situations, as well as the correlation of those traits, i.e., behavioural syndrome (Sih et al.
36 2004), is often linked to survival in predator-prey situations (Dingemanse and de Goede
37 2004; Carlson and Langkilde 2014b) (but see Carlson and Langkilde 2014a),
38 reproductive success (Dingemanse and Réale 2005; Cole and Quinn 2014), disease risk
39 (Koprivnikar et al. 2011) and dispersal tendencies (Cote et al. 2010, 2013; Maes et al.
40 2012; Brodin et al. 2013). Therefore, animal personality plays an important part in
41 individual life histories and should be inspected and carefully considered when dealing
42 with most aspects of animal ecology.

43 Amphibian personality research, however, is limited and includes mostly studies
44 performed on anurans (for a thorough review, see Kelleher et al. 2017). In contrast,
45 there are considerably fewer studies for urodeles (Sih et al. 2003; Aragón 2011; Gifford
46 et al. 2014; Winandy and Denoël 2015) and none for caecilians. Existing amphibian
47 studies most commonly address the consistency of activity, boldness and exploration
48 and have yet to consider the consistency of remaining personality traits – aggressiveness

49 and sociability (Kelleher et al. 2017). Most of these studies (none of which consider
50 urodeles), however, address only one or two of these behavioural traits (axis of
51 personality) and usually cover some specific problem, not personality *per se*. There are
52 also differences in approaches to behavioural consistency, because some studies cover
53 differences across time (e.g. Wilson and Krause 2012; Maes et al. 2012; Carlson and
54 Langkilde 2013; Brodin et al. 2013), while others consider differences across situations
55 (e.g. Sih et al. 2003; Aragón 2011; Koprivnikar et al. 2011).
56 Therefore, the aim of our study was to measure the consistency of main behavioural
57 traits—activity, exploration and boldness—in one experiment to examine the main
58 types of behavioural responses and to focus only on temporal consistency while
59 reducing other factors. Furthermore, we wanted to assess the correlations between these
60 behaviour types (i.e., the existence of behavioural syndrome).

61 **Methods**

62 *Experimental design*

63 The experiment was carried out in laboratory conditions at the Czech University of Life
64 Sciences in Prague. For a model organism, we chose the urodele that was most
65 abundant locally, the smooth newt (*Lissotriton vulgaris*). At the start of the reproductive
66 season in the beginning of May 2017, 21 males and 21 females were captured by nets in
67 a single pond in the Stará Lysá village in the Central Bohemia region. The newts were
68 housed separately in plastic containers of dimensions 18 × 12 × 14 cm that were filled
69 with aged tap water, and the newts were fed *Daphnia* and Chironomidae larvae *ad*
70 *libitum*. The air temperature in the laboratory was constant and set to 17°C. Sufficient
71 light intensity in a diurnal cycle was provided by the translucent roof of the laboratory.

72 The experiment itself was conducted between 13th and 27th May in two experimental
73 arenas made of non-transparent round green water barrels with bottom diameters of 80
74 cm. Using a non-toxic waterproof marker, a square grid of 7 cm segments was drawn at
75 the bottom to better assess the position of each newt. The arena was filled with 5 cm of
76 cold tap water (10.8–11.2°C), and after each recording, the water was changed, and the
77 arena was thoroughly cleaned with a clean sponge, pressurized water and then left to
78 dry to eliminate any potential chemical cues that remained from the previous individual
79 tested.

80 Each trial of the experiment was 12 minutes long. Behaviour was recorded at 25 frames
81 per second with a full HD camera, positioned approximately 150 cm above the water
82 level. Newts were separately inserted under the transparent glass dome (10 cm
83 diameter) into the centre of the arena and left to calm down for the first two minutes.
84 Then, the dome was carefully removed in a motion perpendicular to the ground, and the
85 recording was initiated. To measure the temporal repeatability of the behaviour, each
86 individual was recorded three times with a six day gap between each recording, which
87 was the longest gap possible before the newts started to shift to the terrestrial phase of
88 the season. Unfortunately, three videos were lost due to technical difficulties in the last
89 trial of the experiment, so the total number of analysed videos was 123.

90 Three types of behaviour (personality traits) were tracked: activity, exploration and
91 boldness. Activity was measured as the amount of time [s] during which the individual
92 moved. Furthermore, the movement activity was divided to walking and swimming to
93 distinguish the role of each in total activity and the consistency of each as well as to
94 determine the consistency of the choice of locomotion (i.e. the proportion of activity
95 spent by walking). Exploration was recorded as the number of grid blocks that an

individual entered. For the sake of better comparison with the other studies, boldness/shyness was measured as the latency of the first movement [s] (the most common but imprecise measure of boldness, see Discussion) as well as the time [s] spent at the outermost edge of the arena (our preferred measure). Staying in its vicinity (thigmotaxis) can be interpreted as an escape response and therefore can be a valuable measure of shyness (Burns 2008; Harris et al. 2009; Carlson and Langkilde 2013). Behaviour was scored manually by the same person using the software Observer XT v. 10 (Noldus 2010). The study was carried out in accordance with permit SZ-092744/2012KUSK/3 issued by the Regional Office of the Central Bohemian Region of the Czech Republic and approved by an institutional committee based on the institutional accreditation No. 63479/2016-MZE-17214 of Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech Republic.

Data analysis

To test the differences in activity, time spent walking, swimming, number of visited squares (exploration), latency of the first movement (boldness) and time spent near the outermost edge of arena (shyness) between trials and sexes (independent variables), we created separate linear mixed effects models (LMM) for each mentioned characteristic (dependent variable) fitted by restricted maximum likelihood (REML) with the individual (1–42) as random intercept. Apart from mentioned variables, we also tested the dependency of the proportion of walking activity (i.e. time spent walking divided by time spent active) of each newt on the same fixed (trial and sex) and random effects (individual). This was done to assess if the preferred type of locomotion differed between sexes and trials. Albeit modelling proportions, this particular model reasonably met the assumptions for LMM.

Each model was also tested for the effect of time of day, when the experimental trial took place. Because the dependency on time is rarely linear, we decomposed this variable to sine and cosine of time in radians to accommodate for its periodical nature. Upon meeting all underlying assumptions, models were evaluated using Type II Wald Chi-squared tests. The time of day, nor the sex of the newts didn't affect any of tested variables (see Supplementary information for the details) and were therefore not included in repeatability analyses.

Individual consistency (repeatability) in measured traits (dependent variables from previous models) was calculated using the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC), computed from the variance components of models similar to previous ones, but with no fixed effects and the trial number as a second random variable. Note that adding trial number as a random intercept allowed us to estimate its' consistency, i.e. the between subject similarity in measured traits expression during each trial of the experiment and estimate individual repeatability stripped from the effect of trial order.

Confidence intervals (CI) for the ICC were estimated by parametric bootstrapping with 1000 iterations (for details see Nakagawa and Schielzeth 2010). Confidence interval for the proportion of walking activity was estimated from the fixed intercept of the linear mixed effects model with the individual and trial as random intercepts, using the profile likelihood method.

The existence of behavioural syndromes was tested using Kendall's coefficient of concordance, rather than ICC, because the interest lays in the ranks of responses, rather than their absolute value. Pairwise similarities were analysed using Pearson's correlation coefficient. All statistical analyses were performed in R 3.3.1 (R Core Team

2016) using *lme4* (Bates et al. 2015), *car* (Fox and Weisberg 2011) and *rptR* (Stoffel et al. 2017) packages at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$.

Data Availability

The datasets analysed during the current study are available in the Open Science Framework repository, <https://osf.io/nbfk6/>.

Results

Activity

Mean activity significantly differed between trials (for details, see Supplementary information). The initial mean activity of 309.9 seconds decreased by 32 % in the second trial and by 20 % in the third trial. Although with a low ICC (0.192), individual activity was significantly repeatable. Activity among the newts was also significantly repeatable within trials of the experiment ($ICC = 0.416$) (for details, see Table 1a and Table 1b).

Table 1a.	Individual repeatability of behavioural traits		Table 1b.	Trial repeatability of behavioural traits	
Variable	ICC	CI	Variable	ICC	CI
Activity	0.192	[0.06, 0.42]	Activity	0.416	[0.01, 0.73]
Walking	0.254	[0.05, 0.45]	Walking	0.058	[0, 0.22]
Swimming	0.385	[0.18, 0.57]	Swimming	0.156	[0, 0.42]
Walking proportion	0.373	[0.17, 0.55]	Walking proportion	0.046	[0, 0.18]
Squares explored	0.403	[0.2, 0.59]	Squares explored	0.051	[0, 0.18]
Latency of the first movement	0.121	[0, 0.32]	Latency of the first movement	0	[0, 0.05]
Thigmotaxis	0.476	[0.27, 0.64]	Thigmotaxis	0.022	[0, 0.12]

156 Activity – time spent moving
 157 Walking – time spent walking
 158 Swimming – time spent swimming
 159 Walking proportion – proportion of activity spent walking
 160 Squares explored – number of visited squares
 161 Latency of the first movement – time spent idle, before the first movement
 162 Thigmotaxis – time, spent in the outermost part of the test arena
 163 ICC – intraclass correlation coefficient
 164 CI – 95% Confidence intervals

165 When the activity was divided into walking and swimming, walking was the preferred
166 type of locomotion taking up 71 % of time spent active ($CI = [0.583, 0.840]$). Both the
167 amount of walking ($P < 0.01$) and swimming ($P < 10^{-4}$) differed significantly between
168 the trials of the experiment. The portion of activity spent by walking, however,
169 increased only slightly during the second and third trials ($P = 0.05$). Albeit significant,
170 the repeatability of walking was relatively low for each newt ($ICC = 0.254$) and non-
171 significant for the trial ($ICC = 0.058$). Swimming was more repeatable than walking and
172 was significant for each individual ($ICC = 0.385$) but not each trial ($ICC = 0.156$). The
173 proportion of walking activity was fairly consistent for individuals ($ICC = 0.373$) but
174 not for each trial ($ICC = 0.046$) (for details, see Table 1a and Table 1b).

175 *Exploration*

176 Similar to activity, there was a significant difference between each trial of the
177 experiment ($P = 0.01$, see Supplementary information). The initial mean of 27.8
178 explored squares decreased by 2.5 % in the second and by 18 % in the third trial.
179 Exploration was significantly repeatable for each newt with a moderate ICC (0.403). In
180 contrast to activity, there was no repeatability for the exploration in each trial ($ICC =$
181 0.051 , see Table 1a and Table 1b).

182 *Boldness*

183 Boldness was measured as the latency to move and the time spent with an escape
184 response. Latency to move was not dependent on any tested variables (see
185 Supplementary information). Time spent with an escape response was marginally
186 independent of the trial ($P = 0.06$). The initial mean time spent with the escape response
187 of 226.9 seconds decreased by 5.5 % in the second trial and then rose by 30 % in the
188 third trial. The repeatability of latency and time spent escaping was similar for each trial

189 of the experiment, but not for individual newts. Latency was not repeatable for both
190 newt ($ICC = 0.121$) and trial ($ICC = 0$). Time spent escaping was, on the other hand,
191 moderately repeatable for each newt ($ICC = 0.476$) and not repeatable for each trial
192 ($ICC = 0.022$, see Table 1a and Table 1b).

193 *Correlated behaviour*

194 The similarity in mean activity, exploration and time spent escaping (shyness) of
195 individuals was relatively high ($Kendall's W = 0.716$, $P < 10^{-13}$). Pairwise correlations
196 showed a strong positive relationship between activity and time spent escaping ($r =$
197 0.734 , $P < 10^{-6}$) and a moderate correlation between activity and exploration ($r = 0.539$,
198 $P = 0.0002$) and between time spent escaping and exploration ($r = 0.405$, $P = 0.0078$).

199 **Discussion**

200 Observed behavioural responses of studied newts were moderately individually
201 consistent for swimming activity, proportion of walking activity, exploration and escape
202 response (thigmotaxis). Repeatability of activity as a whole was lower because of the
203 less repeatable walking activity that was more prevalent than swimming activity. The
204 consistency of the proportion of walking, i.e., the choice of locomotion type, however,
205 suggests that even when activity levels change, the preferred type of locomotion does
206 not. The activity was moderately consistent for each trial, meaning it decreased for all
207 newts similarly during each trial of the experiment. Boldness was consistent only if
208 measured as thigmotaxis (i.e., time spent with escape response), not as the latency of the
209 first movement. Studied behaviour responses also did not differ between sexes (as
210 opposed to Aragón 2011) and were unaffected by the time of day when experiment
211 started.

212 According to recent review of Kelleher et al. (2018), a total of six studies tested the
213 consistency of expressed behavioural traits in larval and eight in post-metamorphic
214 amphibians. Up to date, there is, however, no review comparing the magnitude of
215 behavioural trait consistency of said studies. Therefore, in attempt to compare our
216 results to the remaining works, we reviewed available literature in Table 2. Out of 16
217 reviewed studies, five addressed urodeles, but only three provided repeatability
218 estimates, none of which had more than two repeated measurements. Furthermore only
219 one of described urodele studies provided evidence for temporal repeatability of a
220 personality trait (exploration) (Gifford et al. 2014). If we include the works that
221 compare behaviour in different odour treatments (no, conspecific or predator odour),
222 observed repeatability in our study was lower for general activity and similar for
223 boldness and exploration, though the unbiased comparison is impossible, due to
224 substantial differences in used methods.

225 *Activity*

226 Taking into account all of the reviewed studies for both anuran and urodelan
227 amphibians, the repeatability of activity varied odour treatments (Urszán et al. 2015a),
228 arena structure (Smith and Doupnik 2005), breeding origin – wild or captive (Maes et
229 al. 2012), sex (Aragón 2011), previous experience (Urszán et al. 2015b), used measures
230 (Videliér et al. 2014; Kelleher et al. 2017) and slightly with age (Urszán et al. 2015b)
231 (see Table 2). The greatest variability was between different arena structures in
232 *Lithobates catesbeianus*, being lowest in the rock-filled enclosure and highest at the
233 plant-filled enclosure (Smith and Doupnik 2005). When tested with different time gaps
234 between repeated measurements, the differences in the repeatability of activity were not
235 apparent (Maes et al. 2012). Furthermore, overall repeatability of activity of larval and

236 post-metamorphic amphibians did not differ much, but no study provided the
237 comparison between multiple life stages of the same individuals, probably due to vast
238 differences in locomotor abilities of larval and post-metamorphic anurans.

239 *Exploration*

240 Multiple behaviour patterns were observed for exploration. Most of the newts started
241 the trial with a quick escape response and then commenced with the exploration of the
242 outer ring of the arena, rarely visiting the inner parts. A smaller group was startled at
243 first and then explored the inner parts of the arena, eventually reaching the outer ring.
244 The repeatability of exploration in our study was almost identical to the results reported
245 by Gifford et al. (2014) for *Desmognathus brimleyorum*, measured in the same time
246 frame of three weeks. Unfortunately, we were not able to test for the reduction in
247 repeatability with time, as they did. Anuran research showed differences in the
248 consistency of exploration between naïve tadpoles of two different age groups and pre-
249 tested tadpoles, latter being the highest (Urszán et al. 2015b). The repeatability of post-
250 metamorphic exploration of *Pseudophryne corroboree* (Kelleher et al. 2017) did not
251 differ from larval exploration of *Lithobates catesbeianus* (Carlson and Langkilde 2013)
252 despite different time gaps between repeated measurements. It was also higher than
253 larval exploration of both *Rana temporaria* (Brodin et al. 2013) and *R. dalmatina*
254 (Urszán et al. 2015b), so there does not seem to be any obvious pattern in its strength.
255 The greatest drawback to the comparison of published results is difference in the
256 definition of exploration. It was defined as a buffer around the trajectory of the
257 individual (Brodin et al. 2013), number of visited squares (this study; Carlson and
258 Langkilde 2013; Gifford et al. 2014) or percentage of visited squares (Urszán et al.
259 2015b). Kelleher et al. (2017) even used three definitions – distance travelled, time

260 spent mobile and number of mobile events, that all showed different repeatability (Table
261 2). The strength of correlation (repeatability) should therefore not be the main indicator
262 of the suitability of certain measure as the best representative of exploration behaviour.
263 The studies are in need of standardized approaches if they are ever to be compared
264 effectively.

265 *Boldness*

266 In our study, the repeatability of boldness was present only for the escape response,
267 which is a similar measure to that of Carlson and Langkilde (2013), who counted the
268 number of square sides on the inner portion of the test arena crossed by an individual
269 and which is also a measure of thigmotaxis. Their results are less precise, and the
270 estimated coefficient is lower even though measured with the shorter 24 h breaks
271 between trials (see Table 2). The accuracy of latency of the first movement, as the
272 measure of boldness, was impaired for our study by the inability to consistently raise the
273 glass dome in the centre of the arena at the start of the experiment. We suspect this to be
274 issue in other studies as well, deeming this method impractical. This problem can be
275 mitigated by changing the first movement to a movement longer than one body length
276 (Wilson and Krause 2012), but in our opinion, it is better to choose a completely
277 different option, e.g., shelter use, escape initiation distance or thigmotaxis.

278 Similar consistency of boldness was reported for *Ambystoma barbouri* and *A. texanum*
279 (Sih et al. 2003) using shelter use as the preferred measure. Looking at other studies, the
280 consistency of boldness varied greatly from 0 to 77 %. The variation was caused by
281 previous experience (Urszán et al. 2015a, 2015b) and the breeding origin (Maes et al.
282 2012) of the study subjects, and probably by the differences in boldness definition
283 (supported by Kelleher et al. 2017). There does not seem to be any difference between

larval and post-metamorphic amphibians or between different time gaps in repeatability measurements (see Table 2).

Trial repeatability

Activity and exploration significantly decreased with each trial of the experiment, which suggests that habituation may have taken place (but see Carlson and Langkilde 2013). Except for activity, no behavioural trait was repeatable for each trial of the experiment. This could mean that the magnitude of habituation varied individually, i.e., individuality was stronger than habituation (see Fig. 1). For activity, its repeatability for each trial of the experiment was, unexpectedly, followed by low repeatability of both walking and swimming. Other than habituation, another less likely explanation is that the decrease in the expression of behaviour traits could have been caused by insufficient time between the trials of the experiment, allowing newts to remember the last trial. Unfortunately, it was not possible to allow more time between the trials because we feared that newts might switch to the terrestrial phase and change their behaviour. Nevertheless, most amphibian personality studies had an even lower gap between repeated measurements (Table 2). Habituation recovery time is unknown for the studied species. For the common toad, however, Ewert and Kehl (1978) stated that 6–24 h is long enough for recovery from habituation to an artificial rectangular-shaped prey dummy.

Figure 1. Individuality vs. habituation

A – activity between trials, B – exploration between trials, C – escape response between trials.

304

305 *Behavioural syndromes*

306 Behavioural syndromes are referred to as suites of correlated behaviours (Sih et al.,
 307 2004). According to Kelleher et al. (2018), a total of seven studies assessed behavioural
 308 correlations in larval and eight in post-metamorphic amphibians. Activity has been
 309 found to correlate with exploration (Koprivnikar et al. 2011; Maes et al. 2012; Wilson
 310 and Krause 2012) and boldness (Maes et al. 2012; Wilson and Krause 2012; Urszán et

al. 2015a). Boldness has also been found to correlate with exploration (Maes et al. 2012) (but see Brodin et al. 2013), as well as sociability (González-Bernal et al. 2014). Maes et al. (Maes et al. 2012) divided the behaviours using PCA (Principal component analysis) into two axes. The first contained activity and exploration, while the second contained only latency of the first movement. Contrary to their findings, our results show a correlation of all three measured behavioural types (activity, exploration and time spent escaping), potentially creating only one axis (*Kendall's W* = 0.694, *P* = 0.0001). These behaviours are causally independent and, even being as a part of a single open field test, do not have to be correlated. More movement does not necessarily translate into more squared explored, nor imply more movement near the edge of the arena. In our case, active individuals tended to explore more and were less bold, spending more time escaping. This behaviour might also be a result of a common selective pressure, favouring individuals with a greater insight on the situation in their home pond. The predation rate in the pond was, however, low (pers. obs.), and thus the pressure might be of a reproductive nature. Increase in locomotion activity has been found to benefit in mate searching (Martin et al. 1989), which might result in a correlation with sociability, but we are not aware of any studies researching aggressivity. Because of the absence of behavioural differences between sexes, this pressure might be beneficial for both males and females or at least not harmful for either. Whatever the cause, correlated behaviours, i.e., behaviours that are part of a syndrome should not be studied in isolation because they develop as a group (Sih et al. 2004). To study behaviour syndrome completely, it would also be beneficial to test if the correlations persist in different situations and ecological contexts.

334 In conclusion, amphibian personality research is sparse, and findings differ considerably
335 in both approach and results. Behavioural consistency is often studied on a small scale
336 in relatively specific conditions, and behavioural correlations are sometimes neglected.
337 We believe that a more complex approach (measuring more types of behaviour) and
338 standardized methodology (i.e., definition of behaviour types, correlation in time and
339 different situations, standard time gap between repeated measurements, number of
340 repeated measurements, duration of experiment and sampling effort, and test arena
341 shape and size) is due. Only then it would be possible to make general assumptions on
342 the global nature and consequences of studied phenomena.

343 **Acknowledgements.** The study was carried out in accordance with permit SZ-
344 092744/2012KUSK/3 issued by the Regional Office of the Central Bohemian Region of
345 the Czech Republic with the support of grants no. 20164234 and no. 20174216,
346 provided by the Internal Grant Agency of the Faculty of Environmental Sciences, Czech
347 University of Life Sciences Prague.

348 **Author contributions.** O. Kopecký captured and cared for newts, and together with P.
349 Chajma participated on the execution of the experiment. P. Chajma analysed the data,
350 prepared all figures and tables and together with J. Vojar wrote the main manuscript.
351 All authors reviewed the manuscript.

352 **Competing interests.** The author(s) declare no competing interests.

353

354 **References**

- 355 Aragón P. 2011. The response to the social environment reveals sex-dependent
356 behavioural syndromes in the Bosca's newt (*Lissotriton boscai*). *Journal of*
357 *Ethology* **29**: 79–83.
- 358 Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, Walker S. 2015. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models
359 Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* **67**: 1–48.
- 360 Brodin T, Lind M, Wiberg M, Johansson F. 2013. Personality trait differences between
361 mainland and island populations in the common frog (*Rana temporaria*).
362 *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **67**: 135–143.
- 363 Burns JG. 2008. The Validity of Three Tests of Temperament in Guppies (*Poecilia*
364 *reticulata*). *Journal of Comparative Psychology* **122**: 344–356.
- 365 Carlson BE, Langkilde T. 2013. Personality Traits Are Expressed in Bullfrog Tadpoles
366 during Open-Field Trials. *Journal of Herpetology* **47**: 378–383.
- 367 Carlson BE, Langkilde T. 2014a. No evidence of selection by predators on tadpole
368 boldness. *Behaviour* **151**: 23–45.
- 369 Carlson BE, Langkilde T. 2014b. Predation risk in tadpole populations shapes
370 behavioural responses of prey but not strength of trait-mediated indirect
371 interactions. *Oikos* **123**: 1519–1527.
- 372 Cole EF, Quinn JL. 2014. Shy birds play it safe: personality in captivity predicts risk
373 responsiveness during reproduction in the wild. *Biology Letters* **10**: 1–4.
- 374 Cote J, Clobert J, Brodin T, Fogarty S, Sih A. 2010. Personality-dependent dispersal:
375 characterization, ontogeny and consequences for spatially structured populations.
376 *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological*
377 *sciences* **365**: 4065–4076.
- 378 Cote J, Fogarty S, Tymen B, Sih A, Brodin T. 2013. Personality-dependent dispersal
379 cancelled under predation risk. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*
380 *Sciences* **280**: 1–9.
- 381 Dingemanse NJ, Réale D. 2005. Natural selection and animal personality. *Behaviour*
382 **142**: 1159–1184.
- 383 Dingemanse NJ, de Goede P. 2004. The relation between dominance and exploratory
384 behavior is context-dependent in wild great tits. *Behavioral Ecology* **15**: 1023–
385 1030.
- 386 Ewert JP, Kehl W. 1978. Configurational prey-selection by individual experience in the
387 toad *Bufo bufo*. *Journal of Comparative Physiology* **126**: 105–114.
- 388 Fox J, Weisberg S. 2011. *An R Companion to Applied Regression*. Sage: Thousand
389 Oaks CA.
- 390 Garamszegi LZ, Marko G, Herczeg G. 2013. A meta-analysis of correlated behaviors
391 with implications for behavioral syndromes: relationships between particular
392 behavioral traits. *Behavioral Ecology* **24**: 1068–1080.
- 393 Gifford ME, Clay TA, Careau V. 2014. Individual (Co)variation in Standard Metabolic
394 Rate, Feeding Rate, and Exploratory Behavior in Wild-Caught Semiaquatic

395 Salamanders. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology* **87**: 384–396.

396 González-Bernal E, Brown GP, Shine R. 2014. Invasive cane toads: Social facilitation
397 depends upon an individual's personality. *PLoS ONE* **9**.

398 Gosling SD. 2001. From mice to men: what can we learn about personality from animal
399 research? *Psychological bulletin* **127**: 45–86.

400 Gruber J, Brown G, Whiting MJ, Shine R. 2017. Is the behavioural divergence between
401 range-core and range-edge populations of cane toads (*Rhinella marina*) due to
402 evolutionary change or developmental plasticity? *Royal Society Open Science* **4**.

403 Harris AP, D'Eath RB, Healy SD. 2009. Environmental enrichment enhances spatial
404 cognition in rats by reducing thigmotaxis (wall hugging) during testing. *Animal*
405 *Behaviour* **77**: 1459–1464.

406 Kelleher SR, Silla AJ, Dingemanse NJ, Byrne PG. 2017. Body size predicts between-
407 individual differences in exploration behaviour in the southern corroboree frog.
408 *Animal Behaviour* **129**: 161–170.

409 Kelleher SR, Silla AJ, Byrne PG. 2018. Animal personality and behavioral syndromes
410 in amphibians: a review of the evidence , experimental approaches , and
411 implications for conservation.

412 Koprivnikar J, Gibson CH, Redfern JC. 2011. Infectious personalities: behavioural
413 syndromes and disease risk in larval amphibians. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*
414 *B: Biological Sciences* **279**: 1544–1550.

415 Maes J, Van Damme R, Matthysen E. 2012. Individual and among-population variation
416 in dispersal-related traits in Natterjack toads. *Behavioral Ecology* **24**: 521–531.

417 Martin E, Joly P, Bovet P. 1989. Diel pattern of activity in the alpine newt (*Triturus*
418 *Alpestris*, amphibia-urodela) during the aquatic phase. *Biology of Behaviour* **14**:
419 116–131.

420 Nakagawa S, Schielzeth H. 2010. Repeatability for Gaussian and non-Gaussian data: A
421 practical guide for biologists. *Biological Reviews* **85**: 935–956.

422 Noldus. 2010. *The Observer XT. Reference manual version 10*. Noldus Information
423 Technology, Wageningen, Wageningen.

424 R Core Team. 2016. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.

425 Réale D, Reader SM, Sol D, McDougall PT, Dingemanse NJ. 2007. Integrating animal
426 temperament within ecology and evolution. *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge*
427 *Philosophical Society* **82**: 291–318.

428 Sih A, Kats LB, Maurer EF. 2003. Behavioural correlations across situations and the
429 evolution of antipredator behaviour in a sunfish-salamander system. *Animal*
430 *Behaviour* **65**: 29–44.

431 Sih A, Bell A, Johnson J, Ziemba R. 2004. Behavioral syndromes: an integrative
432 overview. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* **79**: 241–277.

433 Smith GR, Doupnik BL. 2005. Habitat use and activity level of large American bullfrog
434 tadpoles: Choices and repeatability. *Amphibia Reptilia* **26**: 549–552.

435 Stoffel MA, Nakagawa S, Schielzeth H. 2017. An introduction to repeatability

436 estimation with rptR. : 1–33.

437 Urszán TJ, Garamszegi LZ, Nagy G, Hettyey A, Török J, Herczeg G. 2015a. No
 438 personality without experience? A test on *Rana dalmatina* tadpoles. *Ecology and*
 439 *Evolution* **5**: 5847–5856.

440 Urszán TJ, Török J, Hettyey A, Garamszegi LZ, Herczeg G. 2015b. Behavioural
 441 consistency and life history of *Rana dalmatina* tadpoles. *Oecologia* **178**: 129–140.

442 Videlier M, Bonneaud C, Cornette R, Herrel A. 2014. Exploration syndromes in the
 443 frog *Xenopus* (*Silurana*) *tropicalis*: Correlations with morphology and
 444 performance? *Journal of Zoology* **294**: 206–213.

445 Videlier M, Cornette R, Bonneaud C, Herrel A. 2015. Sexual differences in exploration
 446 behavior in *Xenopus tropicalis*? *Journal of Experimental Biology* **218**: 1733–1739.

447 Wilson ADM, Krause J. 2012. Personality and metamorphosis: Is behavioral variation
 448 consistent across ontogenetic niche shifts? *Behavioral Ecology* **23**: 1316–1323.

449 Winandy L, Denoël M. 2015. The aggressive personality of an introduced fish affects
 450 foraging behavior in a polymorphic newt. *Behavioral Ecology* **26**: 1528–1536.

451

452

453 **Table 2. | Summary of amphibian personality studies effect sizes**

Species	Life stage	Repeatability			Sample size	Trials	Type of consistency	Reference
		Activity	Exploration	Boldness				
<i>Rana temporaria</i>	larval	-	-	$r = 0.34^*$	60	2	temporal (12 days gap)	Brodin et al. (2013)
	larval/post-metamorphic	-	$r = 0.25$	$r = 0.25$	60	2	across life stages	
<i>Rana dalmatina</i>	larval	ICC = 0.4*	ICC = 0.01	ICC = 0.01	19	3	temporal (1 day gap), naive individuals (11 days age),	Urszán et al. (2015b)
		ICC = 0.55*	ICC = 0.24*	ICC = 0.09	18	3	temporal (1 day gap), naive individuals (Gosner stage 32–36)	
		ICC = 0.3*	ICC = 0.39*	ICC = 0.24	18	3	temporal (1 day gap), pre-tested individuals (Gosner stage 32–36)	
<i>Rana dalmatina</i>	larval	ICC = 0	-	ICC = 0.11	18	3	temporal (1 day gap), no odour	Urszán et al. (2015a)
		ICC = 0.27		ICC = 0.15	18	3	temporal (1 day gap), conspecifics' odour	
		ICC = 0.56*		ICC = 0.3*	20	3	temporal (1 day gap), predators' odour	
		ICC = 0.53*		ICC = 0.2	17	3	temporal (1 day gap), conspecifics' and predators' odour	
<i>Pelophylax ridibundus</i>	post-metamorphic	$r_s = 0.8^*$	-	$r_s = 0.56^*$	50	2	temporal (1 day gap)	Wilson and Krause (2012)
<i>Lithobates catesbeianus</i>	larval	$r = 0.36^*$	-	-	19	3	temporal (all during one week), plant treatment	Smith and Doupnik (2005)
		$r = -0.15$	-	-	19	3	temporal (all during one week), rock treatment	

		$r = 0.22$	-	-	19	3	temporal (all during one week), depth treatment	
<i>Lithobates catesbeianus</i>	larval	ICC = 0.12	ICC = 0.68*	ICC = 0.25	8	4	temporal (1 day gap)	Carlson and Langkilde (2013)
<i>Lithobates sylvaticus</i>	larval	$r = 0.3^{**}$	-	-	26	3	different treatments (control, novel object, parasite infestation)	Koprivnikar et al. (2011)
<i>Epidalea calamita</i>	post-metamorphic	ICC = 0.64*		ICC = 0.03	32	2	temporal (6 week gap), raised individuals	Maes et al. (2012)
		ICC = 0.52*		ICC = 0.38*	120	2	temporal (6 week gap), collected individuals	
		ICC = 0.62*		ICC = 0.24	49	2	temporal (1 year gap), collected individuals	
<i>Rhinella marina</i>	post-metamorphic	-	-	ICC = 0.77*	36	2	temporal (1 day gap)	González-Bernal et al. (2014)
<i>Rhinella marina</i>	post-metamorphic	ICC = 0.01	-	ICC = 0.49*	unknown	2	temporal (unknown gap)	Gruber et al. (2017)
<i>Pseudophryne corroboree</i>	post-metamorphic	ICC = 0.25* (% of time spent active) ICC = 0.36* (number of active events)	ICC = 0.64* (distance travelled) ICC = 0.35* (time spent mobile) ICC = 0.49* (number of mobile events)	ICC = 0.32* (latency to forage after attack) ICC = 0.23* (latency to move after attack) ICC = 0.05 (% of time spent active after attack) ICC = 0.06 (% of time spent in strike zone after attack)	24	3	temporal (7 day gap)	Kelleher et al. (2017)
<i>Ambystoma barbouri</i>	larval	-	-	$r = 0.5^*$	58	2	different odour treatments	Sih et al. (2003)
<i>Ambystoma texanum</i>	larval	-	-	$r = 0.64^*$	32	2	different odour treatments	

<i>Desmognathus brimleyorum</i>	post- metamorphic	-	r = 0.39*	-	19	2	temporal (3 weeks)	Gifford et al. (2014)
		-	r = 0.3	-	19	2	temporal (6 weeks)	
		-	r = 0.15	-	19	2	temporal (9 weeks)	
<i>Lissotriton boscai</i>	post- metamorphic	r = 0.77* (males) r = 0.05 (females)	-	-	15 + 15	2	different odour treatments	Aragón (2011)
<i>Lissotriton vulgaris</i>	post- metamorphi c	ICC = 0.19* (activity) ICC = 0.25* (walking) ICC = 0.39* (swimming)	ICC = 0.4*	ICC = 0.12 (latency of the first movement) ICC = 0.48* (thigmotaxis)	42	3	temporal (6 day gap)	This study
<i>Silurana tropicalis</i>	post- metamorphic	no values*	no values*	no values*	37	3	temporal (4 hours)	Videliér et al. (2014)
<i>Silurana tropicalis</i>	post- metamorphic	no values*	no values*	no values*	98	3	temporal (4 hours)	Videliér et al. (2015)

454 Life stage – stage of individual development (larval – tadpoles, larvae; post-metamorphic – juveniles,
455 adults)
456 Trials – number of repeated measurements
457 ICC – intraclass correlation coefficient
458 r – Pearson’s correlation coefficient
459 r_s – Spearman’s correlation coefficient
460 * The result is statistically significant ($\alpha = 0.05$)
461 ** The result was obtained by conversion of supplemented Pearson’s χ^2 to Pearson’s r and is statistically
462 significant ($\alpha = 0.05$)