1 **State-behavior feedbacks suppress personality variation in boldness during**
2 **foraging in sticklebacks**

3 **Authors:** Hannah E. A. MacGregor^{1*}, Aislinn Cottage¹, Christos C. Ioannou¹.

4 **Affiliations**

5 ¹School of Biological Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 ITQ, U.K.

6 *Correspondence to: hannah.macgregor@bristol.ac.uk

7 **Abstract**

8 Consistent inter-individual variation within a population, widely referred to as
9 personality variation, can be affected by environmental context. Feedbacks between an
10 individual's personality and state can strengthen (positive feedback) or weaken
11 (negative feedback) individual differences when experiences such as predator
12 encounters or winning contests are dependent on personality type. We examined the
13 influence of foraging on individual-level consistency in refuge use (a measure of risk-
14 taking, i.e. boldness) in three-spined sticklebacks, *Gasterosteus aculeatus*, and
15 particularly whether changes in refuge use depended on boldness measured under
16 control conditions. In the control treatment trials with no food, individuals were
17 repeatable in refuge use across repeated trials, and this behavioral consistency did not
18 differ between the start and end of these trials. In contrast, when food was available,
19 individuals showed a higher degree of consistency in refuge use at the start of the trials
20 versus controls but this consistency significantly reduced by the end of the trials. The
21 effect of the opportunity to forage was dependent on personality, with bolder fish
22 varying more in their refuge use between the start and the end of the feeding trials than
23 shyer fish. This suggests a state-behavior feedback, but there was no overall trend in
24 how individuals changed their behavior, with some individuals spending more, and
25 others less, time in the refuge area at the end than at the start of the trials. Our study
26 shows that personality variation can be suppressed in foraging contexts and a potential
27 but unpredictable role of feedbacks between state and behavior.

28 **Keywords**

29 Animal temperament, risk-taking, repeatability, refuge use, *Gasterosteus aculeatus*,
30 consistency

31 INTRODUCTION

32 Individuals of the same species within a population often differ consistently in their
33 behavior over time and contexts (Dall et al., 2004; Magurran et al., 1998; Sih et al.,
34 2004). For instance, individuals may be consistent in their reaction to environmental
35 stimuli such as food (MacGregor et al., 2020; Szopa-Comley et al., 2020) or predators
36 (Boissy, 1995), or express behavioral correlations across contexts such as being more
37 aggressive to conspecifics and also bolder in the presence of predators (Huntingford,
38 1976). It is increasingly evident that this personality variation can be heritable (Oers et
39 al., 2004), has fitness consequences (Smith and Blumstein, 2008), and contributes to a
40 diverse range of ecological and evolutionary processes (Carere and Gherardi, 2013; Dall
41 et al., 2012; Dingemanse and Réale, 2005).

42 Recently, attention has turned to understanding the conditions that promote the
43 expression of animal personality, and the interplay between personality and behavioral
44 plasticity (Briffa et al., 2008; Dingemanse et al., 2010; Mathot et al., 2011). On the one
45 hand, plasticity in behavioral traits can allow individuals to respond rapidly and
46 adaptively to changing conditions, including to factors such as predation risk, resources,
47 and the social environment (Snell-Rood, 2013; Via et al., 1995). On the other hand,
48 personality variation can arise under fluctuating selection where the optimal behavioral
49 phenotype varies over space or time (Boon et al., 2007; Mangel, 1991). Conventionally,
50 personality and plasticity in behavior have been studied independently, however it is
51 increasingly apparent that they may co-vary, with individuals differing in their

52 responsiveness to changes in environmental and social conditions (Bevan et al., 2018;
53 Biro et al., 2010; Dingemanse et al., 2012; Laskowski and Bell, 2013; Stamps, 2016;
54 Westneat et al., 2011).

55 The effects of environmental and social factors on the expression of behavioral
56 variation may be linked to the state-dependence of behavior, where state variables refer
57 to intrinsic factors (e.g. morphology, physiology, information, fecundity) that influence
58 the balance between the costs and benefits of an animal's behavioral decisions
59 (Dingemanse and Wolf, 2010; Houston et al., 1999; Sih et al., 2015). It is widely
60 accepted that personality variation may affect, and be affected by, an individual's state.
61 For example, individuals more willing to accept risk (bolder individuals) can have
62 greater access to food (McDonald et al., 2016) and become satiated, while satiation can
63 reduce the risk-taking behavior of bold individuals (Nakayama et al., 2012). These
64 effects can result in feedbacks (Sih et al., 2015) that can be positive (the effect of a
65 behavior on state and the effect of state on behavior act to reinforce each other) or
66 negative (the effect of behavior on state and the effect of state on behavior have
67 opposing effects) (Luttbeg and Sih, 2010; Rands et al., 2003).

68 Positive feedback can reinforce and magnify personality expression while
69 negative feedback can reduce it. In the context of foraging, negative feedback between
70 state and behavior may occur when individuals with low energy reserves show greater
71 risk-taking behavior than those with high energy reserves and thus acquire more food
72 allowing them to be more cautious in the future (i.e. the asset protection principle
73 (Clark, 1994), although see Rands et al. 2003). However, under high predation risk,
74 positive feedback between state and risk-taking may occur because individuals in good
75 condition are better equipped to escape when confronted with a predator and are

76 therefore willing to take more risks during foraging (i.e. state-dependent safety, Luttbeg
77 and Sih, 2010). In this scenario, individuals in good condition will acquire more
78 resources, reinforcing their condition and helping to maintain personality differences.
79 Despite strong theoretical support, empirical evidence for the effects of state-behavior
80 feedbacks on animal personality is mixed, and mostly confined to studies demonstrating
81 a correlation between state variables and personality traits (Niemelä and Dingemanse,
82 2018). One exception is a recent study of consistent inter-individual differences in
83 foraging behavior and gizzard mass in red knots, where diet quality was found to
84 increase gizzard mass and larger gizzard size was associated with higher food intake,
85 supporting a positive feedback between gizzard mass and foraging behavior (Mathot et
86 al., 2017).

87 Fish express consistent inter-individual differences in a range of behaviors
88 related to functionally important tasks, including mating behavior (Magellan and
89 Magurran, 2007), parental care (Budaev et al., 1999), predator avoidance (Kortet et al.,
90 2015) and foraging (MacGregor et al., 2020). Research on the factors that influence the
91 expression of personality in these contexts has mainly focused on the role of predation
92 risk (Brown et al., 2007; Dingemanse et al., 2009; Harris et al., 2010), although
93 increasingly the effects of other environmental variables including abiotic factors are
94 being explored (e.g. temperature (Biro et al., 2010), turbidity (Ehlman et al., 2019),
95 salinity (Sommer-Trembo et al., 2017)), as well as the effects of the social environment
96 (Bevan et al., 2018; McDonald et al., 2016). Together, these studies provide evidence
97 that the expression of consistent individual differences in behavior is highly context
98 dependent, often varying in response to changes in subtle aspects of the environment
99 and over short time scales.

100 In natural environments food resources fluctuate in space and time; prey species
101 must make decisions whether or not to leave the safety of a refuge to forage (Sih, 1997).
102 These decisions can have enormous impacts on ecological communities owing to their
103 effects on predation risk, predator-prey dynamics, and trophic interactions (Belgrad and
104 Griffen, 2016; Orrock et al., 2013; Sih et al., 1988). In three-spined sticklebacks
105 (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*), refuge use behavior is known to vary consistently between
106 individuals (Bevan et al., 2018; Szopa-Comley et al., 2020) and is a measure of an
107 individual's willingness to accept potential risk traded-off for greater access to
108 resources (also known as boldness, Balaban-Feld et al., 2019; Harcourt et al., 2009;
109 McDonald et al., 2016). In this study, we presented three-spined sticklebacks with either
110 a foraging context (feeding treatment) or a control trial with no food (control treatment)
111 on alternate days for four consecutive days to experimentally test whether the
112 opportunity to forage affected inter-individual consistency in refuge use behavior. We
113 measured consistency within each pair of repeated time segments: the first five minutes
114 of the two foraging trials, the final five minutes of the foraging trials, the first five
115 minutes of the two control trials, and the final five minutes of the control trials. To
116 examine whether plasticity in refuge use behavior varied with personality, we then
117 tested whether changes in refuge use at the start compared to at the end of the feeding
118 treatment trials differed between bold and shy individuals (as measured in control
119 trials). Actively foraging and consuming food may increase refuge use due to satiation
120 (a negative feedback with boldness) or decrease refuge use as individuals acclimatize
121 more quickly to the area outside the refuge initially perceived as risky (a positive
122 feedback with boldness). If feedback effects are negative due to satiation, we predicted
123 that the opportunity to forage in our feeding treatment would reduce inter-individual

consistency in refuge use behavior at the end compared to the start of the trials. In this scenario, bolder individuals were predicted to increase their refuge use because bolder individuals should consume more food and reduce their risk-taking behavior more. If feedback effects are positive due to learning and acclimatization, we predicted that the opportunity to forage would reinforce inter-individual consistency in refuge use behavior, because bolder individuals will learn that their environment offers high reward and low risk, increasing their time spent away from the refuge area. We predicted that feedback effects would be strongest in bolder compared to shy individuals because bolder individuals will interact more with their environment. Despite the likely role of state-behavior feedbacks in animal personality, evidence for the effects of environmentally induced changes in state on the expression of animal personality is limited. To help address this gap, our study aimed to explicitly test the effect of foraging on the expression of personality differences in refuge use.

137

138 MATERIALS AND METHODS

139 Study Animals

Three-spined sticklebacks (37 ± 7.0 mm, standard body length (SL) $\pm$ SD at time of testing), were collected from the River Cary, Somerset, UK (ST 469 303) and transported to laboratory facilities. The fish were held for 14 months prior to the experiment in glass tanks (70 cm (L) $\times$ 45 cm (W) $\times$ 37.5 cm (H)) of approximately 50 individuals each and fed daily with defrosted frozen bloodworm (*Chironomid* larvae). The fish were not sexed because the ambient temperature (16°C) and photocycle (11:13

146 h light:dark) prevented them from attaining sexual maturation. Sixty-four fish were used
147 in the study.

148 **Experimental Set-up**

149 Experiments took place in a white acrylic plastic arena (136 (L) × 72 (W) × 19.5 (H)
150 cm) divided into four identical channels (136 (L) × 14.5 (W) cm). Lighting was
151 provided by a florescent lamp positioned at each of the narrow ends of the arena. The
152 arena was sloped lengthways and filled with dechloroniated water varying from 7 cm
153 to 10 cm in depth. In the shallow end of each channel was a single refuge consisting of
154 half a teracotta clay plant pot (10 (L) × 11-7 (W) × 5-3.5 (H) cm) laid on its side. The
155 exit for each refuge faced towards the shallow end wall of the arena and was 15cm from
156 the wall. In the deep end of each channel was a clear petri dish (ø: 9cm) centred 10 cm
157 from the wall so that any food within the petri dish could be visible to the fish once they
158 had exited and swum around the refuge. We filmed trials from above with a GoPro
159 Hero5 video camera (resolution: 1920 × 1080, 30 frames per second) positioned
160 centrally 92 cm above the arena. The camera was connected to an external monitor,
161 allowing observations during trials, and video recording was triggered remotely. The
162 arena was enclosed to camera height with white corrugated plastic to minimize external
163 disturbances.

164 **Experimental protocol**

165 Experiments were conducted on four batches of sixteen fish over four consecutive
166 weeks (23rd October to 16th November 2018). For each fish, testing took place over four
167 consecutive days (Tuesday to Friday). On the Monday morning before the first day of
168 experiments, we assigned sixteen fish to four groups of four individuals and transferred

169 them to smaller glass holding tanks (70 (L) × 25 (W) × 37.5 (H) cm). Assignment was
 170 carried out by netting four fish of similar body length from the stock tanks and
 171 randomly allocating them to one of the four groups. We repeated this process three
 172 more times with different size classes of individuals to create variance in body length
 173 within each group that could be used for individual identification. Following
 174 assignment, the groups were fed defrosted frozen bloodworm in the afternoon of the
 175 same day. Over the subsequent four days, we tested fish once per day with one of two
 176 treatment types: feeding or control. All four fish within a group were tested
 177 simultaneously, one fish in each of the four channels. Each batch of 16 fish was
 178 alternated as to whether they received the feeding or control treatment on the first day of
 179 testing and the order of treatments was then alternated between days. The order of
 180 testing of the groups was allocated at random each day within the constraint that each
 181 group was tested, first, second, third and forth in their batch over the four days. Each
 182 individual in the group was allocated to a channel in the arena at random within the
 183 constraint that they experienced all four channels over the four days.

184 Trials lasted for 40 minutes. In the feeding treatment, fifty medium sized (~1 cm
 185 long) bloodworm were placed in the petri dish immediately prior to commencing the
 186 trial such that the presense of food could be detected by the fish based on chemical cues
 187 but would not be visible until they had exited and swum around the refuge. To quantify
 188 food consumption in the feeding treatment, we subtracted the number of bloodworm
 189 remaining at the end of the trial from fifty. At the end of a trial the fish were
 190 immediately transferred to their holding tank. All groups were fed with bloodworm
 191 following the last trial in a day to standardize levels of satiation. The arena water was
 192 airated with airstones when not in use. All individuals received four trials except in two

193 cases where two individuals from the same group escaped from their holding tank prior
194 to their second feeding treatment trial. This resulted in a final dataset of 254 trials for 64
195 individuals. All procedures regarding the use of animals in research followed United
196 Kingdom guidelines and were approved by the institutional ethics committee (UIN
197 UB/17/060).

198 **Video analysis**

199 Behavioral data were extracted from the video footage using the event recording
200 software BORIS (Friard et al., 2016) by two observers who were allocated trials to
201 process at random and in a random order, and who were blind to the identities of
202 individual fish during the data extraction. The channels were subdivided along their
203 long axis into three zones: a refuge area, ending at the closed end of the refuge; a neutral
204 area, beginning at the closed end of the refuge and ending on a tangent with the inner
205 edge of the petri dish; and a feeding area, beginning on a tangent with the inner end of
206 the petri dish and ending at the wall. We quantified the following behaviors from the
207 videos: latency to emerge from the refuge that terminated once the fish had their entire
208 body out of the refuge, which we used to measure boldness (e.g. Brown et al., 2005);
209 the duration of time (to the nearest second) that the fish spent in the refuge area for the
210 start and end five minute segments of the trial, where we deemed that a fish had crossed
211 from one zone to another when their head crossed the boundary between zones; and
212 whether a fish fed in each of the start and end five minute segments of a trial. If the fish
213 did not emerge during the trial they were given an emergence latency of 2400s to match
214 the length of the trial. One fish was not successfully transferred into the refuge at the
215 start of the second feeding treatment trial and was therefore excluded from analyses of
216 inter-individual consistency in latency to emerge from the refuge.

217 **Statistical analyses**

218 Statistical analyses were performed in R version 3.6.0. The initial analyses tested
 219 whether the willingness to accept risk and emerge from the refuge was affected by
 220 experimental variables (treatment and trial number) and body length. A generalized
 221 linear mixed model (GLMM) with binomial error distribution was used to test for the
 222 effects of treatment, trial number (1 to 4), and standard body length (SL) on the
 223 likelihood that a fish emerged from the refuge during a trial (coded 0: no emergence or
 224 1: emerged) with individual identity included as a random intercept. A negative
 225 binomial GLMM including treatment, trial number, and SL as main effects and
 226 individual identity as a random intercept was used to examine the predictors of latency
 227 to emerge from the refuge. To test whether individual identity accounted for significant
 228 variation in the likelihood and the latency of fish to emerge from the refuge, we
 229 compared the goodness-of-fit (deviance) of the GLMMs to the models with individual
 230 identity removed using a likelihood ratio test (LRT).

231 To estimate inter-individual consistency in the latency to emerge from the refuge
 232 (with a maximum value of 2400 s) in the control and feeding treatments and the time
 233 spent in the refuge area during the start and end five minute periods (with a maximum
 234 value of 300 s assigned for each time segment) we used Spearman's rank correlation
 235 coefficients due to the statistical issues associated with a large proportion of data points
 236 being right-censored (e.g. inflated repeatability, Stamps et al., 2012). To statistically
 237 compare the correlation coefficients we performed randomization tests with 1,000
 238 iterations (Manly, 1991). For emergence latency, the Spearman's rank correlation
 239 coefficient was calculated separately for the control and feeding treatment trials. The
 240 difference between these correlations was used as the observed difference in inter-

individual consistency in emergence latency between treatments. For each iteration of the randomization, each individual fish's emergence latencies were randomly shuffled between treatments, and the correlation coefficients, and their difference, was recalculated. We compared the absolute observed difference of the correlation coefficients to the frequency distribution of the absolute randomized expected differences to determine the significance ($\alpha = 0.05$). We used a similar approach to compare the Spearman's rank correlation coefficient in time spent in the refuge area between the start segments of the two feeding trials, and separately the two end segments. Here, the difference between the start and end correlation coefficients was used as the observed change in consistency between the start and end segments. For each iteration of the randomization, each individual fish's values for the time spent in the refuge area were randomly shuffled between the start and the end segments, and the correlation coefficients, and their difference, was recalculated. The analysis was repeated for the control treatment trials. The feeding trial data were then split between the 50% boldest and 50% shyest fish, and the randomisation procedure repeated on each subset of the data separately. Individuals were categorised as bold ($n = 31$) or shy ($n = 31$) based on their mean emergence latency from the refuge in the two control treatment trials with the median value (246.75 s) across individuals as the cut-off threshold between the categories ($n = 2$ individuals were excluded due to missing data).

An individual's mean latency to emerge from the refuge in the control treatment trials was used as an estimate of their boldness in further analyses (where smaller values represent bolder fish). To test whether the absolute change or directional change in individuals' refuge use during the feeding trials was associated with boldness, we estimated the Spearman's rank correlation between the mean latency to emerge from the

265 refuge in the control treatment trials and the absolute (i.e. negative values made
266 positive) difference in the time that a fish spent in the refuge area between the start and
267 end of the feeding treatments, using an individual's mean difference in time from the
268 two trials. The correlation test then was repeated using the non-absolute rather than
269 absolute difference. GLMMs were not performed due to violation of parametric
270 assumptions.

271 To test whether boldness predicted foraging behavior we used Generalized linear
272 models (GLM) with binomial error distribution to test whether the mean latency to
273 emerge from the refuge in the control treatment predicted the likelihood that a fish fed
274 during the start, and in a separate model at the end, of the feeding treatment, controlling
275 for SL and test order (1st or 2nd) as main effects. Individual identity was not included in
276 the models because the random effect variance was estimated close to zero. The two
277 individuals with data for only one trial were excluded from both analyses. The
278 likelihood that a fish fed was analyzed as a response variable rather than the number of
279 bloodworm consumed per individual because in over half of the trials no bloodworm
280 were consumed by the focal fish at the start and at the end of the feeding treatment.

281 Analyses assuming a negative binomial distribution were checked for model
282 assumptions using diagnostic plots in R package *DHARMa*. The statistical significance
283 of fixed effects was tested with likelihood ratio tests in R package *lme4*.

284

285 **RESULTS**

286 **Inter-individual consistency in risk-taking behavior**

287 In 13% of cases ($n = 33/253$) the fish did not emerge from the refuge during a trial.
 288 There was no significant difference between the feeding and control treatments (GLMM
 289 (binomial): treatment (control as reference level): Estimate = 0.52 ± 0.461 , $\chi^2 = 1.32$, P
 290 = 0.25), or between fish of different body length (SL: Estimate = -0.062 ± 0.0520 , $\chi^2 =$
 291 1.43, $P = 0.23$), in their likelihood to emerge from the refuge. However, there was a
 292 significant effect of trial number with the likelihood that a fish emerged from the refuge
 293 declining significantly over the four trials (trial number: Estimate = -0.54 ± 0.218 , $\chi^2 =$
 294 6.79, $P = 0.009$). There were consistent differences between individuals in their
 295 likelihood to emerge, including after controlling for body length, treatment, and trial
 296 number (Individual Identity Intercept: LRT: $\chi^2 = 15.6$, $P < 0.0001$).

297 The latency to first leave the refuge during a trial was longer for larger fish than
 298 for smaller fish (GLMM (negative binomial): SL: Estimate = 0.06 ± 0.021 , $\chi^2 = 7.90$, P
 299 = 0.05) and increased over the four days of trials (trial number: Estimate = $0.23 \pm$
 300 0.059 , $\chi^2 = 15.28$, $P < 0.0001$), but there was no significant effect of treatment
 301 (treatment (control as reference level): Estimate = 0.07 ± 0.119 , $\chi^2 = 0.39$, $P = 0.53$).
 302 There were consistent differences between individuals in their latency to first leave the
 303 refuge, including after controlling for body length, treatment, and trial number
 304 (Individual Identity Intercept: LRT: $\chi^2 = 89.4$, $P < 0.0001$).

305 When analyzing the data from the two treatments separately, inter-individual
 306 differences in latency to emerge from the refuge were significantly correlated in the
 307 control (Spearman's rank correlation: $R_s = 0.53$, $p < 0.0001$, $n = 61$) and feeding
 308 (Spearman's rank correlation: $R_s = 0.62$, $p < 0.0001$, $n = 61$) treatments, however the
 309 difference between treatments in the Spearman's rank correlation coefficients in latency
 310 to emerge from the refuge did not differ significantly from the frequency distribution of

the absolute randomized expected differences suggesting there was no significant effect of treatment on the consistency in inter-individual differences (observed absolute difference in Spearman's rank correlation = 0.10, mean expected absolute difference in Spearman's rank correlation = 0.10, $P = 0.50$, Fig. S1). An individual's mean latency to emerge from the refuge in the control treatment (boldness) was significantly positively correlated with their mean latency to emerge from the refuge in the feeding treatment (Spearman's rank correlation: $R_s = 0.75$, $P < 0.0001$, $n = 64$).

Effects of opportunity to forage and personality type on inter-individual consistency in refuge use

Inter-individual differences in the time spent in the refuge area were significantly correlated in the start (Spearman's rank correlation: $R_s = 0.73$, $p < 0.0001$, $n = 62$) and end ($R_s = 0.43$, $P = 0.0006$, $n = 62$) segments of the two feeding treatment trials and almost significantly correlated at the start ($R_s = 0.24$, $P = 0.06$, $n = 64$) and significantly correlated at the end ($R_s = 0.33$, $P = 0.008$, $n = 64$) segments of the two control treatment trials (Fig. 1). The difference in the Spearman's rank correlation coefficients in the time spent in the refuge area across the start of the trials and across the end of the trials did not differ significantly from the frequency distribution of the absolute randomized expected differences in the control treatment (observed absolute difference in Spearman's rank correlation = 0.09, mean expected absolute difference in Spearman's rank correlation = 0.13, $P = 0.58$, Fig. 2a). In contrast, in the feeding treatment the difference between the correlation coefficients did differ significantly from expected (observed absolute difference in Spearman's rank correlation = 0.30, mean expected absolute difference in Spearman's rank correlation = 0.11, $P = 0.021$, Fig. 2b). The time in the refuge area was less correlated between the two feeding trials

at the end compared to the start of the trials, i.e. the correlation decreased between the start and end segments (Fig. 1b, d).

The decreased inter-individual consistency in refuge use at the end of the feeding treatment trials appeared to be driven by the behavior of the bold fish, which were more consistent in their refuge use at the start (Spearman's rank correlation: $R_s = 0.70$, $p < 0.001$, $n = 31$) than at the end ($R_s = 0.37$, $P = 0.038$, $n = 31$) of the feeding trials compared to the shy fish, which were less consistent at the start ($R_s = 0.30$, $P = 0.10$, $n = 31$) than at the end ($R_s = 0.46$, $P = 0.01$, $n = 31$; Fig. S2). However, the difference in correlations for the start and end segments were not significantly different from expected in the bold fish (Feeding Treatment: Observed absolute difference in bold fish: $R_s = 0.33$, mean expected absolute difference in R_s in bold fish: $R_s = 0.16$, $P = 0.096$) or in the shy fish (Observed difference in shy fish: $R_s = 0.15$, mean expected difference in R_s in shy: $R_{ind} = 0.20$, $P = 0.54$, no. of randomizations = 1,000, Fig. S3).

During the feeding treatment trials, the mean absolute difference in time that fish spent in the refuge area between the start and end of the feeding treatments was significantly negatively correlated with their mean latency to emerge from the refuge in the control treatment (Spearman's rank correlation: $R_s = -0.40$, $P = 0.0012$, $n = 62$, Fig. S4). Bold fish changed their refuge use behavior more between the start and end of the feeding treatment trials than shy fish (Fig. 3). However, there was no significant correlation between the mean latency to emerge from the refuge in the control treatment and the mean non-absolute difference in time spent in the refuge area between the start and end of the feeding treatments (Spearman's rank correlation: $R_s = 0.18$, $P = 0.16$, $n = 62$). While shy fish tended to not change their refuge use at the end compared to the start of the feeding treatment trials, bold fish showed more variation with some bold

individuals increasing and others decreasing their refuge use at the end compared to the start of the trials (Fig. 4).

Predictors of bloodworm consumption

Individuals consumed 17 ± 1.2 (mean $\pm$ standard error) bloodworm on average in the feeding treatment trials (Fig. S5). In only 4 of 126 trials were all 50 bloodworm consumed, and in 23 trials no bloodworm were consumed. Changes in refuge use between the start and the end of a trial may be driven by food consumed, either due to positive feedback (e.g. learning about the food reward outside of the refuge) or negative feedback (e.g. from satiation). The likelihood that a fish fed during the start of a feeding trial was predicted by boldness (GLM (binomial): mean latency to emerge from refuge in control treatment: Estimate = -0.95 ± 0.337 , $\chi^2 = 11.69$, $P = 0.0006$), but indicative of satiation, this was not the case at the end of the feeding trials (mean latency to emerge from refuge in control treatment: Estimate = 0.15 ± 0.280 , $\chi^2 = 0.29$, $P = 0.589$). There was also a significant effect of body size on the likelihood of feeding at the start with smaller fish more likely to feed (SL: Estimate = -0.58 ± 0.222 , $\chi^2 = 7.40$, $P = 0.0064$), however, there was no effect of body size at the end of the trials (SL: Estimate = -0.43 ± 0.307 , $\chi^2 = 2.12$, $P = 0.15$). Test order was not a significant predictor of the likelihood that a fish fed at either the start (test order (1st test as reference level): Estimate = -0.52 ± 0.307 , $\chi^2 = 1.54$, $P = 0.21$) or the end (test order (1st test as reference level): Estimate = 0.29 ± 0.554 , $\chi^2 = 0.29$, $P = 0.59$) of the trials.

DISCUSSION

Here we show that consistent inter-individual differences in refuge use in three-spined sticklebacks were reduced following the opportunity to forage, suggesting that foraging

383 can suppress the expression of personality variation. Although bold fish were less
 384 correlated in their refuge use at the end compared to the start of the feeding treatment
 385 trials the difference was not statistically significant. However, as in studies of
 386 sticklebacks demonstrating that plasticity in behavior can covary with personality (e.g.
 387 Bevan et al., 2018; Harcourt et al., 2009; Laskowski and Bell, 2013), we found that bold
 388 fish changed their refuge use more than shy fish between the start and end of the feeding
 389 treatment trials. This greater change in the behaviour of bolder fish was predicted from
 390 state-behaviour feedbacks as bold fish are more likely to interact with the environment.
 391 An individual's boldness predicted whether they fed at the start, but not at the end, of
 392 the feeding treatment trials in support of negative feedback between state (satiation) and
 393 behavior (refuge use) causing the observed reduction in personality expression.
 394 However, contrary to predictions of negative feedbacks, we did not find evidence that
 395 bolder fish used the refuge more at the end compared to the start of the trials, with some
 396 bold individuals increasing and others decreasing their refuge use.

397 While previous studies have often sought to understand how individuals'
 398 personality traits change over long time frames, such as during ontogeny (Brommer and
 399 Class, 2015), very little is known about the processes underlying short-term fluctuations
 400 in personality expression. The state dependency of behavior is a central concept in
 401 theory to explain the origin and maintenance of consistent behavioral variation but
 402 could also provide a mechanistic explanation for breakdowns in personality expression
 403 when state variables are labile and produce a negative feedback on behavior
 404 (Dingemanse and Wolf, 2010; Sih et al., 2015). In support of this, reduced inter-
 405 individual consistency in refuge use during the feeding trials was associated with the
 406 opportunity for individuals to increase their nutritional state, and no change in inter-

individual consistency was observed in control trials without food. Furthermore, the absence of a significant difference in the first time to leave the refuge (i.e. the emergence latency) between the treatments suggested that it was encountering the food directly rather than the presence of food olfactory cues that affected the inter-individual consistency in behavior.

Previous studies on fish have shown that bolder individuals are more likely to feed in risky contexts (McDonald et al., 2016) but are also more at risk of predation (Balaban-Feld et al., 2019; Bell and Sih, 2007), and that nutritional state can influence foraging behavior (Salvanes and Hart, 1998). Therefore, we predicted that a satiation effect in the feeding treatment trials would be strongest in bolder individuals, and, as a result, bolder individuals would change their behavior more than shy individuals and in the direction of increased refuge use at the end compared to the start of the trials (due to being satiated and the potential risks associated with being away from the refuge). However, counter to expectation, our results did not support directionality to the behavioral changes in bolder individuals, with some bolder individuals expressing even bolder behavior (more time away from the refuge) and others converging on the refuge use behavior of shy fish (as predicted due to negative feedback effects between satiation and refuge use). Some of this variation among bold fish could be explained by variation in body size, because smaller fish should satiate more quickly (Brett, 1971; Ende et al., 2018). However, while we found that smaller fish were more likely to feed at the start of the trials than larger fish, there was no body size effect at the end of trials. An alternative explanation is that the motivation to feed away from a refuge over repeated foraging trips close together in time initially increases with acclimatization and learning about the resource, then reduces with satiation. Such a trend over time was documented

431 by McDonald et al. (McDonald et al., 2016) in shoals of three-spined sticklebacks. In
432 our experiment, some bold fish may have been in the first phase, reducing their refuge
433 use at the end of the trials, while others were in the satiation phase, increasing their
434 refuge use at the end of the trials.

435 Spatial and temporal fluctuations in the availability of food resources are
436 common in natural environments (Ward et al., 2006). Our results show that individual
437 differences between bold fish may become less consistent when resources are abundant,
438 resulting in the suppression of personality variation. This suggests that the maintenance
439 of personality types could depend on foraging opportunities, with consistent individual
440 differences in behavior more strongly expressed in low resource environments. Such
441 inconsistency in behavior during foraging could also have an important adaptive
442 function, for example, by making individuals less predictable to predators or
443 competitors if encountering the same individuals repeatably (Briffa, 2013; Chang et al.,
444 2017), weakening the strength of directional selection on boldness behavior and its
445 correlated traits. More generally, inconsistency in the expression of phenotypes may
446 have important evolutionary consequences by potentially weakening evolutionary
447 responses to changes in the environment. Future work that considers the context-
448 dependent expression of animal personality will help to better understand the selection
449 pressures that shape consistent inter-individual differences in behavior. There is
450 growing evidence of how boldness behavior such as refuge use can have ecological
451 consequences, including influences on population dynamics via individuals' growth,
452 survival, and reproductive success, and on trophic interactions via the effects on the
453 costs and benefits of different predator strategies (Belgrad and Griffen, 2016; Orrock et
454 al., 2013; Sih et al., 1988). However, one key outstanding question is in the ecological

455 implications of covariation between personality and behavioral plasticity. Our study
456 suggests this could be particularly challenging to address when behavioral plasticity is
457 unpredictable due to unpredictable state-behavior feedbacks.

458

459 **Acknowledgements**

460 This work was supported by the Natural Environment Research Council grant number
461 NE/P012639/1 to C.C.I. We also thank Andrew Szopa-Comley for comments and Sarah
462 Washington for help carrying out the experiment.

463

464 **REFERENCES**

- 465 Balaban-Feld J, Mitchell WA, Kotler BP, Vijayan S, Elem LTT, Rosenzweig ML,
466 Abramsky Z, 2019. Individual willingness to leave a safe refuge and the trade-
467 off between food and safety: a test with social fish. *Proceedings of the Royal*
468 *Society B: Biological Sciences* 286:20190826.
- 469 Belgrad BA, Griffen BD, 2016. Predator and prey interactions mediated by prey
470 personality and predator hunting mode. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
471 *Biological Sciences* 283:20160408.
- 472 Bell AM, Sih A, 2007. Exposure to predation generates personality in threespined
473 sticklebacks (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*). *Ecology Letters* 10:828-834.
- 474 Bevan PA, Gosetto I, Jenkins ER, Barnes I, Ioannou CC, 2018. Regulation between
475 personality traits: individual social tendencies modulate whether boldness and
476 leadership are correlated. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*
477 *Sciences* 285:20180829.

478 Biro PA, Beckmann C, Stamps JA, 2010. Small within-day increases in temperature
479 affects boldness and alters personality in coral reef fish. *Proceedings of the*
480 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 277:71-77.

481 Boissy A, 1995. Fear and Fearfulness in Animals. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*
482 70:165-191.

483 Boon AK, Reale D, Boutin S, 2007. The interaction between personality, offspring
484 fitness and food abundance in North American red squirrels. *Ecology Letters*
485 10:1094-1104.

486 Brett JR, 1971. Satiation Time, Appetite, and Maximum Food Intake of Sockeye
487 Salmon (*Oncorhynchus nerka*). *Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of*
488 *Canada* 28:409-415.

489 Briffa M, 2013. Plastic proteans: reduced predictability in the face of predation risk in
490 hermit crabs. *Biol Lett* 9:20130592-20130592.

491 Briffa M, Rundle SD, Fryer A, 2008. Comparing the strength of behavioural plasticity
492 and consistency across situations: animal personalities in the hermit crab
493 *Pagurus bernhardus*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*
494 275:1305-1311.

495 Brommer JE, Class B, 2015. The importance of genotype-by-age interactions for the
496 development of repeatable behavior and correlated behaviors over lifetime.
497 *Frontiers in Zoology* 12:S2.

498 Brown C, Burgess F, Braithwaite VA, 2007. Heritable and experiential effects on
499 boldness in a tropical poeciliid. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 62:237-
500 243.

501 Brown C, Jones F, Braithwaite V, 2005. In situ examination of boldness–shyness traits
502 in the tropical poeciliid, *Brachyrhaphis episcopi*. *Animal Behaviour* 70:1003-
503 1009.

504 Budaev SV, Zworykin DD, Mochek AD, 1999. Individual differences in parental care
505 and behaviour profile in the convict cichlid: a correlation study. *Animal*
506 *Behaviour* 58:195-202.

507 Carere C, Gherardi F, 2013. Animal personalities matter for biological invasions.
508 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 28:5-6.

509 Chang C-c, Teo HY, Norma-Rashid Y, Li D, 2017. Predator personality and prey
510 behavioural predictability jointly determine foraging performance. *Scientific*
511 *Reports* 7:40734.

512 Clark CW, 1994. Antipredator behavior and the asset-protection principle. *Behavioral*
513 *Ecology* 5:159-170.

514 Dall SRX, Bell AM, Bolnick DI, Ratnieks FLW, 2012. An evolutionary ecology of
515 individual differences. *Ecology Letters* 15:1189-1198.

516 Dall SRX, Houston AI, McNamara JM, 2004. The behavioural ecology of personality:
517 consistent individual differences from an adaptive perspective. *Ecology Letters*
518 7:734-739.

519 Dingemanse JN, Réale D, 2005. Natural selection and animal personality. *Behaviour*
520 142:1159-1184.

521 Dingemanse NJ, Bouwman KM, van de Pol M, van Overveld T, Patrick SC, Matthysen
522 E, Quinn JL, 2012. Variation in personality and behavioural plasticity across
523 four populations of the great tit *Parus major*. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 81:116-
524 126.

525 Dingemanse NJ, Kazem AJ, Reale D, Wright J, 2010. Behavioural reaction norms:
526 animal personality meets individual plasticity. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*
527 25:81-89.

528 Dingemanse NJ, Van der Plas F, Wright J, Reale D, Schrama M, Roff DA, Van der Zee
529 E, Barber I, 2009. Individual experience and evolutionary history of predation
530 affect expression of heritable variation in fish personality and morphology.
531 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 276:1285-1293.

532 Dingemanse NJ, Wolf M, 2010. Recent models for adaptive personality differences: a
533 review. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*
534 365:3947-3958.

535 Ehlman SM, Halpin R, Jones C, Munson A, Pollack L, Sih A, 2019. Intermediate
536 turbidity elicits the greatest antipredator response and generates repeatable
537 behaviour in mosquitofish. *Animal Behaviour* 158:101-108.

538 Ende SSW, Thiele R, Schrama JW, Verreth JAJ, 2018. The influence of prey density
539 and fish size on prey consumption in common sole (*Solea solea* L.). *Aquatic*
540 *Living Resources* 31:16.

541 Friard O, Gamba M, Fitzjohn R, 2016. BORIS: a free, versatile open-source event-
542 logging software for video/audio coding and live observations. *Methods in*
543 *Ecology and Evolution* 7:1325-1330.

544 Harcourt JL, Ang TZ, Sweetman G, Johnstone RA, Manica A, 2009. Social feedback
545 and the emergence of leaders and followers. *Current Biology* 19:248-252.

546 Harris S, Ramnarine IW, Smith HG, Pettersson LB, 2010. Picking personalities apart:
547 estimating the influence of predation, sex and body size on boldness in the
548 guppy *Poecilia reticulata*. *Oikos* 119:1711-1718.

549 Houston AI, McNamara JM, I HA, 1999. Models of Adaptive Behaviour: An Approach
550 Based on State: Cambridge University Press.

551 Huntingford FA, 1976. The relationship between anti-predator behaviour and
552 aggression among conspecifics in the three-spined stickleback, *Gasterosteus*
553 *Aculeatus*. *Animal Behaviour* 24:245-260.

554 Kortet R, Sirkka I, Lai Y-T, Vainikka A, Kekäläinen J, 2015. Personality differences in
555 two minnow populations that differ in their parasitism and predation risk.
556 *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 3:1-9.

557 Laskowski KL, Bell AM, 2013. Competition avoidance drives individual differences in
558 response to a changing food resource in sticklebacks. *Ecology Letters* 16:746-
559 753.

560 Luttbeg B, Sih A, 2010. Risk, resources and state-dependent adaptive behavioural
561 syndromes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological*
562 *Sciences* 365:3977-3990.

563 MacGregor HEA, Herbert-Read JE, Ioannou CC, 2020. Information can explain the
564 dynamics of group order in animal collective behaviour. *Nature*
565 *Communications* 11:2737.

566 Magellan K, Magurran AE, 2007. Behavioural profiles: individual consistency in male
567 mating behaviour under varying sex ratios. *Animal Behaviour* 74:1545-1550.

568 Magurran AE, May RM, Wilson DS, 1998. Adaptive individual differences within
569 single populations. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*
570 *Series B: Biological Sciences* 353:199-205.

571 Mangel M, 1991. Adaptive walks on behavioural landscapes and the evolution of
572 optimal behaviour by natural selection. *Evolutionary Ecology* 5:30-39.

573 Manly BFJ, 1991. Randomization and Monte Carlo methods in biology: Chapman and
574 Hall.

575 Mathot KJ, Dekinga A, Piersma T, Sandercock B, 2017. An experimental test of state–
576 behaviour feedbacks: gizzard mass and foraging behaviour in red knots.
577 Functional Ecology 31:1111-1121.

578 Mathot KJ, van den Hout PJ, Piersma T, Kempenaers B, Reale D, Dingemanse NJ,
579 2011. Disentangling the roles of frequency-vs. state-dependence in generating
580 individual differences in behavioural plasticity. Ecology Letters 14:1254-1262.

581 McDonald ND, Rands SA, Hill F, Elder C, Ioannou CC, 2016. Consensus and
582 experience trump leadership, suppressing individual personality during social
583 foraging. Science Advances 2:e1600892.

584 Nakayama S, Johnstone RA, Manica A, 2012. Temperament and Hunger Interact to
585 Determine the Emergence of Leaders in Pairs of Foraging Fish. PLOS ONE
586 7:e43747.

587 Niemelä PT, Dingemanse NJ, 2018. Meta-analysis reveals weak associations between
588 intrinsic state and personality. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological
589 Sciences 285:20172823.

590 Oers Kv, Drent PJ, Goede Pd, Noordwijk AJv, 2004. Realized heritability and
591 repeatability of risk-taking behaviour in relation to avian personalities.
592 Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B: Biological Sciences
593 271:65-73.

594 Orrock JL, Preisser EL, Grabowski JH, Trussell GC, 2013. The cost of safety: Refuges
595 increase the impact of predation risk in aquatic systems. Ecology 94:573-579.

596 Rands AS, Cowlshaw G, Pettifor AR, Rowcliffe JM, Johnstone AR, 2003. Spontaneous
597 emergence of leaders and followers in foraging pairs. *Nature* 423:432-434.

598 Salvanes AGV, Hart PJB, 1998. Individual variability in state-dependent feeding
599 behaviour in three-spined sticklebacks. *Animal Behaviour* 55:1349-1359.

600 Sih A, 1997. To hide or not to hide? Refuge use in a fluctuating environment. *Trends in*
601 *Ecology & Evolution* 12:375-376.

602 Sih A, Bell A, Johnson JC, 2004. Behavioral syndromes: an ecological and evolutionary
603 overview. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 19:372-378.

604 Sih A, Mathot KJ, Moiron M, Montiglio PO, Wolf M, Dingemanse NJ, 2015. Animal
605 personality and state-behaviour feedbacks: a review and guide for empiricists.
606 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 30:50-60.

607 Sih A, Petranks JW, Kats LB, 1988. The dynamics of prey refuge use: A model and
608 tests with sunfish and salamander larvae. *The American naturalist* 132:463-483.

609 Smith BR, Blumstein DT, 2008. Fitness consequences of personality: a meta-analysis.
610 *Behavioral Ecology* 19:448-455.

611 Snell-Rood EC, 2013. An overview of the evolutionary causes and consequences of
612 behavioural plasticity. *Animal Behaviour* 85:1004-1011.

613 Sommer-Trembo C, Petry AC, Gomes Silva G, Vurusic SM, Gismann J, Baier J, Krause
614 S, Iorio JdAC, Riesch R, Plath M, 2017. Predation risk and abiotic habitat
615 parameters affect personality traits in extremophile populations of a neotropical
616 fish (*Poecilia vivipara*). *Ecology and Evolution* 7:6570-6581.

617 Stamps JA, 2016. Individual differences in behavioural plasticities. *Biological Reviews*
618 91:534-567.

619 Stamps JA, Briffa M, Biro PA, 2012. Unpredictable animals: individual differences in
620 intraindividual variability (IIV). *Animal Behaviour* 83:1325-1334.

621 Stoffel MA, Nakagawa S, Schielzeth H, Goslee S, 2017. rptR: repeatability estimation
622 and variance decomposition by generalized linear mixed-effects models.
623 *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 8:1639-1644.

624 Szopa-Comley AW, Donald WG, Ioannou CC, 2020. Predator personality and prey
625 detection: inter-individual variation in responses to cryptic and conspicuous
626 prey. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 74:70.

627 Via S, Gomulkiewicz R, De Jong G, Scheiner SM, Schlichting CD, Van Tienderen PH,
628 1995. Adaptive phenotypic plasticity: consensus and controversy. *Trends in*
629 *Ecology & Evolution* 10:212-217.

630 Ward AJW, Webster MM, Hart PJB, 2006. Intraspecific food competition in fishes.
631 *Fish and Fisheries* 7:231-261.

632 Westneat DF, Hatch MI, Wetzel DP, Ensminger AL, 2011. Individual Variation in
633 Parental Care Reaction Norms: Integration of Personality and Plasticity. *The*
634 *American naturalist* 178:652-667.

635

636 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

637 **Figure 1.** Correlations between the time spent in the refuge area at the start (a, b) and at
638 the end (c, d) of the trials for the control (a, c) and feeding (b, d) treatments. Points
639 depict data for individual fish (white: control treatment and black: feeding treatment).

640 **Figure 2.** The expected difference in Spearman's rank correlation coefficients in the
641 time spent in the refuge area across the start and across the end of the trials for (a) the
642 control treatment and (b) the feeding treatment. Values are based on 1,000
643 randomizations of the data within individuals. If the observed difference (dashed black
644 line) is outside of the 95% limits of the randomized data's distribution (solid black
645 lines), it is unlikely that observed difference occurred by chance.

646 **Figure 3.** The absolute difference in the time spent in the refuge area at the start and end
647 of the feeding treatment for bold and shy fish. The boxes depict the interquartile range
648 of the data and the median, and the whiskers extend to $1.5 \times$ the interquartile range.
649 Data beyond the whiskers are shown as points. The crosses indicate the mean value.
650 Fish were categorized as bold or shy based on their mean latency to emerge from the
651 refuge in control treatment (threshold set as the median value: 246.75 s).

652 **Figure 4.** Difference in time spent in the refuge area between the start and end of the
653 feeding treatment in (a) bold fish and (b) shy fish. The black dashed line shows the
654 mean difference in time in each case. Fish were categorized as bold or shy based on
655 their mean latency to emerge from the refuge in control treatment (threshold set as the
656 median value: 246.75 s).

FIGURES