

Full Title: The utility of a Bayesian Markov model with Pólya-Gamma sampling for estimating individual behavior transition probabilities from accelerometer classifications

Toryn L. J. Schafer^{1,*}, Christopher K. Wikle¹, Jay A. VonBank², Bart M. Ballard², and Mitch D. Weegman³

¹Department of Statistics, University of Missouri, Middlebush Hall, Columbia, MO 65211

²Caesar Kleberg Wildlife Research Institute, Texas A&M University-Kingsville, John Howe Building, Kingsville, TX 78363, USA

³School of Natural Resources, University of Missouri, Anheuser-Busch Natural Resources Building Columbia, Missouri 65211, USA

*Email: tskb4@mail.missouri.edu, Phone: 847-274-1723

Running Title: Markov model for ACC behavior transitions

ABSTRACT

The use of accelerometers in wildlife tracking provides a fine-scale data source for understanding animal behavior and decision-making. Current methods in movement ecology focus on behavior as a driver of movement mechanisms. The Bayesian Markov model is a flexible and efficient method for inference related to effects on behavior that considers dependence between current and past behaviors. We applied this model to behavior data from six greater white-fronted geese (*Anser albifrons frontalis*) during spring migration in mid-continent North America and considered likely drivers of behavior, including habitat, weather, and time of day effects. We modeled the transition between flying, feeding, stationary, and walking behavior states using a first-order Bayesian Markov model. We introduced Pólya-Gamma latent variables for automatic sampling of the covariate coefficients from the posterior distribution and we calculated the odds ratios from the posterior samples. The model provided a unifying framework for including both acceleration and Global Positioning System data. We found significant pairwise differences between transitions across habitat types, confirmed diurnal behavior and behavioral changes due to weather. Our model provided straightforward inference of behavioral time allocation across used habitats which is not amenable in activity budget or resource selection frameworks.

KEY-WORDS

animal behavior, auxiliary variables, Greater white-fronted goose, hierarchical models, multinomial logistic, spring migration

INTRODUCTION

Animals make decisions daily that can result in differential fitness (Brown et al., 2004; Breed and Moore, 2015). The knowledge of an animal's behavior provides insight into its decision-making process. Historically, behavioral studies of animal populations were conducted using methods such as direct observation of focal individuals or instantaneous scan sampling of the group or flock (Altmann, 1974). However, data collection by direct observation prevents a comprehensive understanding of the decision-making process because it is limited to specific times and places when

the animal is observable, and is often expensive. The introduction of wildlife tracking devices has largely mitigated these constraints and provided observations over greater time and space. Recent improvements in tracking technology have allowed researchers to gather high frequency data collected over extended periods of time (e.g. >1 year), which has led to unprecedented insights into animal decision-making (Nathan et al., 2012; Leos-Barajas et al., 2017).

High frequency location data from recent wildlife tracking technology has provided new opportunities in ecological analyses of animal movement and behavior, and inspired methodological development, mainly associated with trajectory prediction and resource selection (Hooten et al., 2017). Location prediction primarily relies on state-space models for estimating movement features. Such models describe the evolution through time of an animal's location "state," which can be improved through the estimation of behavior-specific movement parameters. However, deriving behavioral states solely from location data can be limiting because of the general low frequency of such information and similarities among trajectories for behaviors characterized by the same amount of displacement (change in position over a set period of time). For this reason, state-space models do not typically consider more than two behavioral states: those associated with moving (exploratory) and not moving (encamped) (Morales et al., 2004; Jonsen et al., 2005; Patterson et al., 2008). For examples of state space models considering more than two states see McClintock et al. (2017) and Michelot et al. (2017). The discrimination of the unobserved movement pattern behavioral states is determined by decomposing the location trajectories into a step length and turning angle. Specifically, an exploratory state is assumed to be characterized by longer step lengths and smaller turning angles, whereas an encamped state is characterized by shorter step lengths and larger turning angles. State estimation in this context can be accomplished via Hidden Markov Models (McClintock, 2017), which have proven to be an efficient method for estimating an unobserved sequence of a categorical variable, such as behavior, that is associated with the values of observed quantities (e.g step length and turning angle; Zucchini et al., 2016). In general, the estimated states are not interpretable as true behaviors, but rather proxies as they arise from a mixture model clustering procedure (Patterson et al., 2017; Michelot and Blackwell, 2019).

The inclusion of accelerometers in wildlife tracking devices has become increasingly common, but the utility of these data has not yet been widely recognized in the animal ecology literature. An accelerometer is a tool for measuring an object's acceleration (ACC), and when placed on animals, can be used to derive energy expenditure and behavior of the tagged individual independent of location information (Nathan et al., 2012). Data collected from accelerometers are substantially different from Global Positioning System (GPS) observations in quantity, resolution, and quality. That is, ACC data can be collected at a high frequency throughout the life of the tracking device, which results in richer and relatively larger data sets. The frequency of ACC collection can range from nearly continuous to more widely spaced intervals depending on the battery performance and device size. Importantly, unlike location tracking devices, accelerometers do not typically miss “fixes” because the accelerometer instrument does not require linkages with external equipment such as satellites or radio trackers. In addition, ACC is collected in two or three axes of movement relative to the device position, which provides the ability to discriminate between behavioral states with similar trajectory profiles.

Behavioral state classification based on accelerometers can be conducted using machine learning algorithms when “ground truth” observations are available to train the algorithms (Resheff et al., 2014; Chakravarty et al., 2019). These approaches have greater reliability at identifying more than two states when compared to methods that consider only location data (Resheff et al., 2014). Importantly, using classified data sets, the focus is typically on the behavioral process of the animal rather than the location and movement. That is, the focus is to infer behavior time allocation of animals rather than more general mechanics of behavior and movement. Currently, to make inference from the classifications, researchers summarize the classified data within a time scale of interest (e.g. days or hours) and use a traditional activity budget framework, such as linking proportions of observed behaviors to covariates through generalized linear mixed models (Broekhuis et al., 2014; Heurich et al., 2014). However, by analyzing the aggregate summarized data, inherent temporal structure and small scale processes in the data may not be fully utilized. The analysis of the activity budgets generally ignores temporal dependence in the data by modeling the proportions

of behaviors separately. [Rugg and Buech \(1990\)](#) showed using a Markov model for behavior resulted in improved estimates of time allocation compared to traditional activity budget analyses. By modeling the classified behavior data on the same time scale as collection, we can capture more fine scale variability, but also maintain the ability to infer covariate effects on proportions of time spent in different behavioral states.

We explicitly model temporal dependence in high frequency observations via a Markov model. The Markov model works directly on the behavioral state transitions and inherently assumes that current behavior depends on recent behavior (i.e. the Markov assumption states that given the most recent past, the current behavior is independent of the long-term past). The transition probabilities are modeled with a logistic function to link covariates to the probability of transition. Therefore, covariate effects retain the useful odds ratio interpretation as in multinomial logistic regression, and provide insight into how covariates affect the tradeoff between time spent in each behavior. By using additional habitat information from location data, we can infer habitat use and behavior simultaneously. As compared to traditional resource selection frameworks, we can make these inferences without having to define an "availability distribution" ([Hooten et al., 2017](#)). Resource selection models determine preferential selection of habitats by animals based on differences in frequency of use and availability. Although these approaches are important for identifying frequently used habitat, they do not define use and availability with respect to behavior. The Markov model framework allows one to consider behavior profiles for different utilized habitats. Our approach provides the ability to answer questions about differential use of selected habitats that may be apparent from the focal animal's behavior. For instance, a resource selection study may identify two different agricultural crops as preferentially used, but these results do not identify the behavior associated with the crops or the differences in behavioral rates between the crops.

The relationship between energy expenditure and fitness is especially critical for migratory animals because the time allocation of behaviors during migration, such as feeding, can impact survival during migration and subsequent reproductive success ([Harrison et al., 2011](#)). We consider a long-distance migrant bird, the greater white-fronted goose (*Anser albifrons frontalis*), to

demonstrate the inference capabilities of our Markov model. The migration route of the geese spans a wide range of habitats in mid-continent North America. It is known that these geese use different habitat types for different behaviors (e.g. roosting in water and feeding in crops) and thus, we expect differences in behavior transition rates depending on habitat (Krapu et al., 1995). The Markov model has the ability to provide inference on potential differences in behavior rates among habitats that serve a similar purpose. For example, feeding may primarily occur in agricultural fields, but rates of feeding may differ by crop type. Variability in rates of behavior may also be related to environmental factors such as weather. Although activity budget analyses during winter have not found strong effects of weather (Ely, 1992), studies during spring have found important relationships between weather and the timing of migratory movements (Fox et al., 2003). Additional previous work demonstrated heterogeneity in the movement of the geese (Hooten et al., 2018). We include weather variables comprising temperature and wind because we anticipate that these features can explain variation in behavior transitions during spring migration (e.g. favorable conditions increase rates of flight as geese decide to continue their migration).

We implement the Markov model in a Bayesian framework. At the core of the Markov model is multinomial logistic regression. There is a rich literature on Bayesian estimation of logistic models because sampling from the posterior distribution requires Metropolis-Hastings Markov Chain Monte Carlo algorithms that can be difficult to implement (tune) for moderate numbers of covariates or low observed frequencies of categories (Albert and Chib, 1993; Holmes and Held, 2006; Frühwirth-Schnatter and Frühwirth, 2010; Polson et al., 2013). To mitigate this challenge, automatic sampling strategies have been developed that rely on augmentation of data with latent variables. For example, Albert and Chib (1993) introduced the use of truncated normal random variables for category membership using probit link regression. Hooten et al. (2010) used the Albert and Chib sampling for a multinomial movement model. Holmes and Held (2006) expressed a multinomial logistic model as a product of binary models and used truncated scale mixture normals to define category membership. Alternatively, Polson et al. (2013) developed a class of Pólya-Gamma distributions for automatic sampling of Bayesian logistic regression models that

is faster and provides exact inference when compared to the scale mixture latent variables. The introduction of Pólya-Gamma latent variables induces simple Gibbs updating steps for the logistic regression coefficients when using a normal (Gaussian) prior. Note that Pólya-Gamma latent variables have been used to estimate coefficients of a transition probability matrix of a Hidden Markov Model for rainfall data (Holsclaw et al., 2017) and to learn dependence structure in topic models for text mining applications (Chen et al., 2013; Linderman et al., 2015; Glynn et al., 2019). These models have yet to be applied to animal movement data.

We explore the relationships among habitat, weather, and behavior for greater white-fronted geese during their spring migration over mid-continent North America. We employ a Bayesian Markov model, and develop a more efficient computational framework by introducing Pólya-Gamma latent variables. The method provides rich inference about covariate effects including information related to the location from GPS data on the sequence of observed behaviors derived from ACC data. We expected to estimate behavior transition probabilities for greater white-fronted geese during spring migration that confirm prior knowledge of the diurnal pattern of behavior and habitat use. The coefficients should reflect an increase in stationary behavior overnight in water and wetland habitats while also suggesting more movement during the day. Additionally, the estimates were hypothesized to exhibit variability among habitat types which would suggest variability in time allocation. Furthermore, we expected behavioral transitions associated with flight and feeding to be influenced by inclement weather more than walking and stationary behaviors. In the end, the method provides a fine-scale picture of the behavioral decision-making process that is driven by both ACC and GPS data rather than mechanistic drivers of movement.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Dataset

Greater white-fronted geese, hereafter white-fronted geese, migrate from wintering areas in the southern US (i.e. Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas) to breeding areas in Alaska and northern Canada (e.g. Nunavut; Fig.1; Baldassarre, 2014). Individual female white-fronted geese were captured using rocket nets between December 2017 and January 2018 in Texas. Captured

individuals were each fitted with a U.S. Geological Survey metal leg band and solar-powered Ornitela (<http://www.ornitela.com>) neck collar, comprising GPS, ACC and Global System for Mobile communications (i.e. for daily data upload) technology. Age, sex, and morphometric measurements (normal wing cord [cm], head, culmen, tarsus, middle toe lengths [mm], and mass [nearest 0.1 kg]) were also collected. We set tracking devices to obtain ACC values at 10Hz for 3 seconds at 6 minute intervals and GPS locations at 30 minute intervals with data upload every 24 hours. To demonstrate our modeling approach, we used GPS and ACC data from six white-fronted geese subset to 1-31 March 2018, which comprises a portion of the spring migration period (Fig.1). For simplicity, we chose a time period when all of the geese were migrating within the United States rather than defining the specific dates associated with the geese leaving the wintering habitat and arriving at breeding grounds. The average number of ACC fixes per individual was 7,257 with a range of 7,054 to 7,319. The ACC fixes were classified into four behavioral categories (i.e. flying, feeding, stationary, and walking) using a random forest model with 95.44% accuracy on the training data set acquired by video recording (Resheff et al., 2014).

The location data were used to determine habitat and weather factors experienced by geese during spring migration. The U.S. Department of Agriculture maintains a raster of habitat and crop data throughout the contiguous lower 48 states (CropScape; <https://nassgeodata.gmu.edu/CropScape/>), which is updated annually. We assumed the habitat at the GPS fix was best represented by the CropScape grid cell containing the observed point. The original CropScape categories were combined into fewer groups (Table 1). The National Centers for Environmental Prediction's North American Regional Reanalysis (NARR; <https://rda.ucar.edu/datasets/ds608.0/>) data provide high resolution historical weather data in space and time. NARR is available eight times daily (i.e. every three hours) on an approximately 32 km grid. We assumed that the weather at the time of GPS fix was best represented by the NARR value corresponding to the nearest time and grid cell containing the observed point. We further assumed the weather and habitat at the time of an ACC fix were best represented by the values assigned to the most recent GPS location. The weather variables obtained were temperature, wind direction, and wind speed. Temperature was further summarized

to daily minima and maxima. Weather variables were standardized to have mean 0 and standard deviation 1. We assumed diurnal variability relates to variation in behaviors because geese move most predictably near dawn and dusk between roosting and feeding areas; thus, we included such variability by using the local solar time of GPS fixes. We captured the diurnal behavior of the geese through two continuous covariates with a 24 hour period calculated from the local solar time of day (in seconds) by $\cos(2\pi(\text{seconds})/86400)$ and $\sin(2\pi(\text{seconds})/86400)$, referred to as $\cos(\text{time})$ and $\sin(\text{time})$. That is, $\cos(\text{time})$ is a representation of night (high values) and day (low values), while $\sin(\text{time})$ represents the first half of the day (high values) and the second half of the day (low values).

Model

Data Model

The observed data consist of regularly spaced time series of categorical behaviors, $S_{nT_n} = \{s_{n0}, \dots, s_{nT_n} : s_{nt} \in \{1, \dots, J\}\}$, where s_{nt} is the observed behavior category for individual n , $n = 1, \dots, N$, and time point t , $t = 0, 1, \dots, T_n$, from the set of J behavioral categories. A Markov model for categorical time series data is defined by a transition probability matrix, \mathbf{P}_{nt} , describing the time-varying transition probabilities between observed states $s_{n,t-1}$ and s_{nt} as follows:

$$\mathbf{P}_{nt} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} p_{n11t} & p_{n12t} & \cdots & p_{n1Jt} \\ p_{n21t} & p_{n22t} & \cdots & p_{n2Jt} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ p_{nJ1t} & p_{nJ2t} & \cdots & p_{nJ3t} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where $p_{nijt} \equiv P(s_{nt} = j | s_{n,t-1} = i)$, and the row probabilities sum to one, $\sum_{j=1}^J p_{nijt} = 1$. Therefore, given the behavioral state at the previous time step ($t - 1$), the current observed category (at time t) is modeled as a multinomial trial with probabilities from the corresponding row of the transition matrix (1). We let y_{nijt} be an indicator for individual n 's transition from state i at time $t - 1$ to state j at time t , in other words, $y_{nijt} = 1(s_{nt} = j | s_{n,t-1} = i)$ is defined to be 1 for the case

when the n th individual is in state i at time $t - 1$ and state j at time t , and 0 otherwise. Then the aggregated transition indices vector $\mathbf{y}_{nit} = \left[y_{ni1t} \ \dots \ y_{niJt} \right]'$, along with the corresponding transition probabilities, $\mathbf{p}_{nit} = \left[p_{ni1t} \ \dots \ p_{niJt} \right]'$, describe a multinomial trial.

Covariates are introduced by the logit link function on the elements of the vector of transition probabilities, \mathbf{p}_{nit} , (e.g. see [Sung et al., 2007](#); [Holsclaw et al., 2017](#)):

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{nijt} &\equiv \text{logit}(p_{nijt}) = \log \left((p_{nijt}) / (p_{niJt}) \right) = \mathbf{x}'_{nt} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{ij}, \quad \text{and} \\ \text{logit}^{-1}(\psi_{nijt}) &= p_{nijt} = (\exp(\mathbf{x}'_{nt} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{ij})) / \left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{J-1} \exp(\mathbf{x}'_{nt} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{ik}) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where we assume the vector of parameter coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{iJ} = 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, J$ for identifiability. Note that covariates may vary by individual and/or time, which induces non-homogeneous transition probabilities.

Parameter Model

The B -dimensional parameter vectors in the data model logistic functions, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{ij}$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, J$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, J - 1$ are partitioned into three components:

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{ij} = \left[(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{ij})' \quad (\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{ij})' \quad (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij})' \right]'. \quad (3)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{ij}$ is an $(N - 1)$ -dimensional vector of random individual effects, $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{ij}$ is an H -dimensional vector of habitat intercepts, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}$ are $B - (N - 1 + H)$ -dimensional vectors of fixed quantitative covariate effects. The random individual effects are subject to a “sum to zero” constraint and we assume independent normal distribution priors for each of the coefficients as given below. The habitat coefficients for each transition are assumed to have the same mean, μ_{ij} . This mean is essentially the average intercept and, therefore, each habitat coefficient can be interpreted as the mean plus the habitat effect, similar to a cell means model in ANOVA. The common mean is assigned a flat prior. The hierarchical centering of these habitat parameters leads to less correlation between parameters compared to estimating H habitat effects and an intercept in the regression

model (Gilks et al., 1995). In addition, centering provides more interpretability compared to including a baseline intercept and $H - 1$ coefficients. In summary, the prior distributions for these coefficients are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_{ij} &= \left[\alpha_{1ij} \quad \dots \quad \alpha_{(N-1)ij} \right]' \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_{\alpha_{ij}}^2 \mathbf{I}), \text{ such that } \sum_{n=1}^N \alpha_{nij} = 0, \\ \zeta_{ij} &= \left[\zeta_{1ij} \quad \dots \quad \zeta_{Hij} \right]' \sim N(\mu_{ij} \mathbf{1}, \sigma_{\zeta_{ij}}^2 \mathbf{I}), \quad p(\mu_{ij}) \propto 1, \\ \theta_{ij} &= \left[\theta_{1ij} \quad \dots \quad \theta_{B-(N-1+H)ij} \right]' \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_{\theta_{ij}}^2 \mathbf{I}).\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ are vectors of zeroes and ones, respectively. Note, all prior variances ($\sigma_{\alpha_{ij}}^2, \sigma_{\zeta_{ij}}^2, \sigma_{\theta_{ij}}^2$) are fixed at 100 to induce a vague prior and reduce number of parameters needing to be estimated.

Model Fitting

The likelihood of each coefficient vector, β_{ij} , is the product of multinomial logistic functions, which requires sampling by a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm in a Bayesian model due to non-conjugacy. As the dimension of β_{ij} increases, the tuning of such a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm becomes increasingly difficult. Latent variable schemes provide ways to automatically sample from the posterior without tuning and are generalized from binomial logistic regression to multinomial logistic regression (Albert and Chib, 1993; Holmes and Held, 2006; Frühwirth-Schnatter and Frühwirth, 2007; Polson et al., 2013). Specifically, the latent variable schemes express the likelihood as a product of binary logistic functions by the following transformation:

$$\begin{aligned}L(\beta_{ij} | \beta_{i,-j}, \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_N) &\propto \prod_{n=1}^N \prod_{t=1}^{T_n} \prod_{j=1}^{J-1} \left[e^{\psi_{nijt}} / (1 + e^{\psi_{nijt}}) \right]^{y_{nijt}}, \\ &\propto \prod_{n=1}^N \prod_{t=1}^{T_n} \left[e^{\eta_{nijt}} / (1 + e^{\eta_{nijt}}) \right]^{y_{nijt}} \left[1 / (1 + e^{\eta_{nijt}}) \right]^{1 - y_{nijt}},\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

where $\eta_{nijt} = \psi_{nijt} - C_{nijt}$ and $C_{nijt} = \log \sum_{k \neq j} \exp\{\psi_{nikt}\}$. In this formulation, η_{nijt} is the log odds for a binomial random variable, which indicates whether or not the transition was from state i to j for individual n at time point t (Holmes and Held, 2006; Polson et al., 2013). Importantly, sampling

with Pólya-Gamma latent variables can then be accomplished by using the following relationship:

$$[(e^{\eta_{nijt}})/(1 + e^{\eta_{nijt}})]^{y_{nijt}} = e^{((y_{nijt}-1)\eta_{nijt})/2} \int_0^\infty e^{-\omega\eta_{nijt}^2/2} p(\omega) d\omega, \quad (6)$$

where $\omega \sim p(\omega) \equiv \text{PG}(1,0)$. The Pólya-Gamma distribution contains a normal kernel for η_{nijt} , which leads to a Gibbs sampler for β_{ij} (Polson et al., 2013).

Our model contains J separate Bayesian multinomial logistic regressions with T_i , $i = 1, \dots, J$, observations where T_i is the number of transitions from category i . The covariate matrix, \mathbf{X}_i , is $T_i \times B$, with rows \mathbf{x}_{nt} and response vector \mathbf{Y}_{ij} is a $T_i \times 1$ vector with elements y_{nijt} where t corresponds to a transition from state i . The Gibbs updating steps are then:

$$\begin{aligned} (\beta_{ij} | \Omega_{ij}) &\sim N(\mathbf{m}_{ij}, \mathbf{V}_{ij}), \\ (\omega_{nijt} | \beta_{ij}) &\sim \text{PG}(1, \eta_{nijt}), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{V}_{ij}^{-1} = \mathbf{X}'_i \Omega_{ij} \mathbf{X}_i + \mathbf{V}_0^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{ij} = \mathbf{V}_{ij} (\mathbf{X}'_i ((\mathbf{Y}_{ij} - 1/2) + \Omega_{ij} \mathbf{C}_{ij}) + \mathbf{V}_0^{-1} \mathbf{m}_0)$. Here, Ω_{ij} is a $T_i \times T_i$ diagonal matrix with ω_{nijt} along the diagonal and \mathbf{C}_{ij} is a $T_i \times 1$ vector with elements C_{nijt} where t indexes transitions from category i . In this case, \mathbf{V}_0 and \mathbf{m}_0 correspond to the prior variance matrix and mean vector for β_{ij} , respectively.

Throughout model fitting, we used “walking” as our reference behavioral category in the multinomial logistic function (2). Choice of walking as the reference category was for convenience and the method is amenable to choosing a different reference category. If it is of interest to more easily interpret effects on state duration, the reference category would depend on the previous state (i.e. for transitions from flight, the reference category would be flight).

We assessed parameter convergence by monitoring trace plots and setting different random starting values (Brooks and Gelman, 1998). For inference, we sampled 15000 iterations from the model posterior and the first 5000 were discarded as burn in to ensure summaries were not influenced by the starting values.

The posteriors for odds ratios were obtained by exponentiating the coefficients each iteration.

The posterior samples for coefficients and odds ratios were summarized to the posterior mean and 95% credible intervals. We determined significance by whether or not the 95% credible intervals for the quantitative covariates for weather and time of day included zero. The significance of the quantitative coefficients corresponded to the 95% credible interval for the odds ratio not containing one and a proportion of greater than 0.95 (positive effect) or less than 0.05 (negative effect) of iterations in which odds ratio was greater than one. For each transition probability, we investigated the pairwise differences in habitat effects by calculating the pairwise proportion of iterations in which habitat coefficients differed in magnitude, $\zeta_{aij} > \zeta_{bij}$, $a, b \in \{1, \dots, H\}$, and $a \neq b$. Two habitat coefficients for a transition were considered significantly different if the proportion of iterations with a difference in magnitude was greater than 0.95 (habitat a effect greater than habitat b) or less than 0.05 (habitat a effect smaller than habitat b). We did not adjust the proportion cut off or widen credible intervals to account for inherent multiplicity in this case because we modeled the habitat coefficients with a common mean, which pools the coefficient estimates (4). The hierarchical centering shrinks estimates toward the common mean, μ_{ij} , which makes it harder for significant pairwise differences to occur, thus eliminating the need to make additional post hoc adjustments for multiple comparisons (Gelman et al., 2012).

The assumption of a discrete time Markov process implicitly accomodates inference on the original sampling scale of the ACC data schedule (e.g. every 6 minutes). We interpreted all coefficient estimates as effects on behavioral transitions from state i to state j at a 6 minute interval, relative to a base behavior state of walking. For brevity, we did not explicitly restate “relative to walking at a 6 minute interval” for each interpretation. Similarly, the odds ratios are interpreted as the multiplicative change in odds of transitions to state j from state i versus transitions to walking from state i .

RESULTS

Our modeling framework established flexibility and efficiency in estimating covariate effects in the behavioral decision-making process by specifying transition-specific coefficients. The variability in coefficients across starting states is indicative of the complexity in the decision-making

process in migrating white-fronted geese. The estimated effects of different habitats on behavior transitions did not follow the same patterns across the starting states (Fig. 2). By contrast, for weather and time of day covariates, the pattern in the coefficient estimates was similar across starting states (Fig. 3).

There were significant pairwise differences between habitats for every transition except feeding to flight (see Appendix S1). We estimated significantly more transitions from feeding, stationary, and walking to feeding for food crops such as corn and soybeans and significantly fewer when the birds were in open water habitat (Fig. 4). The positive coefficient estimates for corn and soybeans indicated an odds ratio greater than one for transitions to feeding from feeding, stationary, and walking. For example, the mean effect of corn was 0.61 with corresponding mean odds ratio 1.83, indicating the odds of transitioning from feeding to feeding was 83% times greater than the odds of transitioning to walking from feeding in corn habitat (Table 2). The effect of wheat habitats was greater than the effect of grass habitats on transitions to feeding from feeding and stationary. Transitions to stationary from flight, stationary, and walking were significantly greater in open water habitats than at least one agricultural habitat. In general, the widths of the credible intervals have an inverse relationship with the observed proportions of habitats. For example, the most frequently used habitats were corn and open water, which tended to have the narrowest credible intervals (Fig. 2).

Transitions to flight from flight and from feeding increased significantly during the first half of the day (Fig. 3a). There were few flying behaviors observed during night hours, which corresponds to the significant negative effects of $\cos(\text{time})$ on all transitions to flight (Fig. 3a). Stationary behavior occurred most frequently and occurred in greater proportions at night. Therefore, it is not surprising that many diurnal coefficients corresponding to transitions to the stationary state were significant (Table 3). Transitions to feeding from feeding, stationary, and walking were less likely overnight (negative effect of $\cos(\text{time})$; Fig. 3a).

Daily minimum and maximum temperatures did not affect transitions the same way. Greater daily minimum temperatures decreased transitions to flight from flight, but greater daily maximum

temperatures increased transitions to flight from flight (Fig. 3b). Increased wind speeds decreased transitions to flight from flight and to feeding from feeding, stationary or walking. We found more significant effects of weather variables on transitions from flight and walking than from feeding and stationary. Transitions from flight to flight were significantly affected by three of the four variables (minimum daily temperature, maximum daily temperature, and wind speed; Table 3).

DISCUSSION

We provide a unified framework to connect variation in animal behavior with that in habitat use and weather by fully propagating uncertainty in transitions using a Bayesian Markov model with data from a long-distance migratory bird. Our approach is broadly applicable to other focal species and study systems across ecology. By analyzing data on the scale of frequency of collection, inferences are more intuitive and appropriate than aggregating to proportions. Importantly, our approach allows analysis of the behavior sequence with inherent temporal dependence and inference about covariate effects on behavior transition probabilities.

Transition matrices are well studied and can provide a wealth of inference and prediction beyond what is presented in this study including simulation of behavior sequences in different settings. In fact, transition matrix models are utilized in ecological and evolutionary research beyond behavioral applications and Markov models. We extended the Markov model with a Pólya-Gamma sampling scheme, which will be useful for fast and automatic estimation of other complex ecological models that utilize the logistic link function.

We also implemented a unique approach to analyzing both ACC and GPS data from tracking devices. When we have an understanding of the location of animals on the landscape, quantifying the effects of habitat on behavior transitions provides unprecedented information regarding the differential rates of behavior in specific habitats. We made simple assumptions when we constructed our covariates by assigning values to ACC fixes from the most recent GPS fix, but there is the potential to link to existing animal movement models for interpolation of location data at times of ACC observations. [McClintock et al. \(2017\)](#) used a continuous time correlated random walk model to predict locations at a regular time interval. The locations could be predicted to the time

points of the ACC fixes and covariate values could reflect the prediction location or imputed from the prediction distribution (Hooten et al., 2010; Scharf et al., 2017).

Our model can include transition-specific coefficients only or a mix of transition-specific and behavior-specific coefficients. Transition-specific covariates provide insight on the dynamic decision-making process which depends on the current behavior while behavior-specific coefficients provide insight into more overarching effects independent of the current behavior. In the white-fronted goose analysis, the habitat coefficients appeared relatively specific to the starting states whereas the time of day covariates appeared more similar. For example, during spring migration, the odds of transitioning to flight versus walking significantly decreased during the evening across all starting states, suggesting a common coefficient may be more appropriate (Fig. 3a, $\cos(\text{time})$). Holsclaw et al. (2017) estimated a transition matrix for a Hidden Markov model with a transition-specific intercept and state specific coefficients for all covariates. They estimated weather covariates specific to rainfall states at weather stations in India in order to identify global effects of weather systems. For animal migration and behavior, the occurrence of certain weather systems or the time of day may always result in a specific decision regardless of the current behavior which would suggest a model with behavior specific coefficients may be a better fit. Within the Bayesian framework, models with different parameter formulations can be compared using tools such as Bayes factors, information criteria, or prediction of hold out samples to test hypotheses about the behavior process (Hooten and Hobbs, 2015).

In the case of white-fronted geese during spring migration, different rates of behavior can be attributed to different habitats. Larger relative effects of habitats associated with food sources such as corn and soybeans on transitions to feeding compared to effects of wetland habitats and open water aligns with previous knowledge of white-fronted goose ecology (Ely, 1992; Krapu et al., 1995). Increases in transitions to feeding in wheat habitat compared to grass habitat indicate differential feeding rates for two food sources. Open water consistently was smaller pairwise than food habitats for transitions to feeding and flight. Our finding that white-fronted geese were less likely to transition to grazing or flight in open water compared to food habitats was consistent with our expectations.

Also, we found significant effects of weather on behavior transition probabilities of white-fronted geese during spring migration. Higher winds decreased the odds of transitions to feeding from Feeding, stationary, and walking. Duration of flight behavior (flight to flight transitions) was the most influenced by weather. The opposite effects of minimum and maximum daily temperature on flight durations may be indicative of more complex decision-making processes by white-fronted geese. An increase in flight duration with an increase in maximum daily temperature aligns with our *a priori* assumptions that these birds do not often migrate beyond the snow line during spring because food is relatively inaccessible under snow. Our analysis was limited to a month-long subset of the spring 2018 migration and this pattern may become more clear with the inclusion of more years. Although, much of the inference was verification of previous knowledge about white-fronted geese, the methodology allows us to infer about habitat use and behavior simultaneously using both the GPS and ACC information. Most importantly, we developed a detailed picture of time allocation in reference to the specific habitat types used by white-fronted geese during spring migration which is not addressed by traditional models used in activity budget analysis, movement trajectory prediction, or resource selection frameworks.

Advances in animal tracking technologies continue to provide more frequently collected data for a greater duration of time. Thus, rich data sets are emerging as never before for ecologists and evolutionary biologists. Hence, there is an increasing need for development of models that appropriately handle the structure and volume of collected information for improved inference. The Markov model framework provides much more capability for directly interpreting behavior patterns. In addition, the Pólya-Gamma latent variables allowed for more efficient sampling and have yet to be used in the animal behavior and movement literature. If classification of behaviors is not feasible, the Pólya-Gamma sampling scheme can be incorporated into Bayesian estimation of transition probability matrices in a hidden Markov model framework (Holsclaw et al., 2017). The model directly handles temporal dependence in ACC data and learns about the behavior process from both ACC and GPS data. New data sources coupled with appropriate modeling have unprecedented potential to provide a comprehensive understanding of complex ecological and

evolutionary processes in animal movement.

DATA ACCESSIBILITY

We will archive relevant data files in the Dryad Digital Repository.

REFERENCES

- Albert, J. H. and Chib, S. (1993). “Bayesian analysis of binary and polychotomous response data.” *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 88(422), 669–679.
- Altmann, J. (1974). “Observational study of behavior: Sampling methods.” *Behaviour*, 49(3-4), 227–266.
- Baldassarre, G. A. (2014). *Ducks, Geese, and Swans of North America*, Vol. 1. JHU Press.
- Breed, M. D. and Moore, J. (2015). *Animal Behavior*. Academic Press.
- Broekhuis, F., Grünewälder, S., McNutt, J. W., and Macdonald, D. W. (2014). “Optimal hunting conditions drive circalunar behavior of a diurnal carnivore.” *Behavioral Ecology*, 25(5), 1268–1275.
- Brooks, S. P. and Gelman, A. (1998). “General methods for monitoring convergence of iterative simulations.” *Journal of computational and graphical statistics*, 7(4), 434–455.
- Brown, J. H., Gillooly, J. F., Allen, A. P., Savage, V. M., and West, G. B. (2004). “Toward a metabolic theory of ecology.” *Ecology*, 85(7), 1771–1789.
- Chakravarty, P., Cozzi, G., Ozgul, A., and Aminian, K. (2019). “A novel biomechanical approach for animal behaviour recognition using accelerometers.” *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*.
- Chen, J., Zhu, J., Wang, Z., Zheng, X., and Zhang, B. (2013). “Scalable inference for logistic-normal topic models.” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2445–2453.
- Ely, C. R. (1992). “Time allocation by Greater white-fronted geese: influence of diet, energy reserves and predation.” *The Condor*, 94(4), 857–870.

- Fox, A. D., Glahder, C. M., and Walsh, A. J. (2003). “Spring migration routes and timing of Greenland white-fronted geese—results from satellite telemetry.” *Oikos*, 103(2), 415–425.
- Frühwirth-Schnatter, S. and Frühwirth, R. (2007). “Auxiliary mixture sampling with applications to logistic models.” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 51(7), 3509–3528.
- Frühwirth-Schnatter, S. and Frühwirth, R. (2010). “Data augmentation and MCMC for binary and multinomial logit models.” *Statistical modelling and regression structures*, Springer, 111–132.
- Gelman, A., Hill, J., and Yajima, M. (2012). “Why we (usually) don’t have to worry about multiple comparisons.” *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 5(2), 189–211.
- Gilks, W. R., Richardson, S., and Spiegelhalter, D. (1995). *Markov chain Monte Carlo in practice*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Glynn, C., Tokdar, S. T., Howard, B., Banks, D. L., et al. (2019). “Bayesian analysis of dynamic linear topic models.” *Bayesian Analysis*, 14(1), 53–80.
- Harrison, X. A., Blount, J. D., Inger, R., Norris, D. R., and Bearhop, S. (2011). “Carry-over effects as drivers of fitness differences in animals.” *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 80(1), 4–18.
- Heurich, M., Hilger, A., Küchenhoff, H., Andrén, H., Bufka, L., Krofel, M., Mattisson, J., Odden, J., Persson, J., Rauset, G. R., et al. (2014). “Activity patterns of Eurasian lynx are modulated by light regime and individual traits over a wide latitudinal range.” *PLoS One*, 9(12), e114143.
- Holmes, C. C. and Held, L. (2006). “Bayesian auxiliary variable models for binary and multinomial regression.” *Bayesian analysis*, 1(1), 145–168.
- Holsclaw, T., Greene, A. M., Robertson, A. W., Smyth, P., et al. (2017). “Bayesian nonhomogeneous Markov models via Pólya-Gamma data augmentation with applications to rainfall modeling.” *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 11(1), 393–426.
- Hooten, M. B. and Hobbs, N. T. (2015). “A guide to Bayesian model selection for ecologists.” *Ecological Monographs*, 85(1), 3–28.

- Hooten, M. B., Johnson, D. S., Hanks, E. M., and Lowry, J. H. (2010). “Agent-based inference for animal movement and selection.” *Journal of Agricultural, Biological and Environmental Statistics*, 15(4), 523–538.
- Hooten, M. B., Johnson, D. S., McClintock, B. T., and Morales, J. M. (2017). *Animal Movement: Statistical Models for Telemetry Data*. CRC Press.
- Hooten, M. B., Scharf, H. R., Hefley, T. J., Pearse, A. T., and Weegman, M. D. (2018). “Animal movement models for migratory individuals and groups.” *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 9(7), 1692–1705.
- Jonsen, I. D., Flemming, J. M., and Myers, R. A. (2005). “Robust state–space modeling of animal movement data.” *Ecology*, 86(11), 2874–2880.
- Krapu, G. L., Reinecke, K. J., Jorde, D. G., and Simpson, S. G. (1995). “Spring-staging ecology of midcontinent greater white-fronted geese.” *The Journal of wildlife management*, 736–746.
- Leos-Barajas, V., Photopoulou, T., Langrock, R., Patterson, T. A., Watanabe, Y. Y., Murgatroyd, M., and Papastamatiou, Y. P. (2017). “Analysis of animal accelerometer data using hidden Markov models.” *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 8(2), 161–173.
- Linderman, S., Johnson, M., and Adams, R. P. (2015). “Dependent multinomial models made easy: Stick-breaking with the Pólya-Gamma augmentation.” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 3456–3464.
- McClintock, B. T. (2017). “Incorporating telemetry error into hidden Markov models of animal movement using multiple imputation.” *Journal of Agricultural, Biological and Environmental Statistics*, 22(3), 249–269.
- McClintock, B. T., London, J. M., Cameron, M. F., and Boveng, P. L. (2017). “Bridging the gaps in animal movement: hidden behaviors and ecological relationships revealed by integrated data streams.” *Ecosphere*, 8(3), e01751.

- Michelot, T. and Blackwell, P. G. (2019). “State-switching continuous-time correlated random walks.” *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 10(5), 637–649.
- Michelot, T., Langrock, R., Bestley, S., Jonsen, I. D., Photopoulou, T., and Patterson, T. A. (2017). “Estimation and simulation of foraging trips in land-based marine predators.” *Ecology*, 98(7), 1932–1944.
- Morales, J. M., Haydon, D. T., Frair, J., Holsinger, K. E., and Fryxell, J. M. (2004). “Extracting more out of relocation data: building movement models as mixtures of random walks.” *Ecology*, 85(9), 2436–2445.
- Nathan, R., Spiegel, O., Fortmann-Roe, S., Harel, R., Wikelski, M., and Getz, W. M. (2012). “Using tri-axial acceleration data to identify behavioral modes of free-ranging animals: general concepts and tools illustrated for griffon vultures.” *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 215(6), 986–996.
- Patterson, T. A., Parton, A., Langrock, R., Blackwell, P. G., Thomas, L., and King, R. (2017). “Statistical modelling of individual animal movement: an overview of key methods and a discussion of practical challenges.” *ASIA Advances in Statistical Analysis*, 101(4), 399–438.
- Patterson, T. A., Thomas, L., Wilcox, C., Ovaskainen, O., and Matthiopoulos, J. (2008). “State–space models of individual animal movement.” *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 23(2), 87–94.
- Polson, N. G., Scott, J. G., and Windle, J. (2013). “Bayesian inference for logistic models using Pólya-Gamma latent variables.” *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 108(504), 1339–1349.
- Resheff, Y. S., Rotics, S., Harel, R., Spiegel, O., and Nathan, R. (2014). “AcceleRater: a web application for supervised learning of behavioral modes from acceleration measurements.” *Movement Ecology*, 2(1), 27.

Rugg, D. J. and Buech, R. R. (1990). “Analyzing time budgets with Markov chains.” *Biometrics*, 1123–1131.

Scharf, H., Hooten, M. B., and Johnson, D. S. (2017). “Imputation approaches for animal movement modeling.” *Journal of Agricultural, Biological and Environmental Statistics*, 22(3), 335–352.

Sung, M., Soyer, R., and Nhan, N. (2007). “Bayesian analysis of non-homogeneous Markov chains: Application to mental health data.” *Statistics in Medicine*, 26(15), 3000–3017.

Zucchini, W., MacDonald, I. L., and Langrock, R. (2016). *Hidden Markov Models for Time Series: An Introduction using R*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.

TABLE 1. Habitat categories used in the Bayesian Markov model with the associated CropScape categories from the USDA. CropScape categories were matched to GPS data for six greater white-fronted geese during March 2018.

Habitat Category	CropScape Categories
Corn	Corn, Pop or Orn Corn
Developed	Developed\High Intensity, Developed\Med Intensity, Developed\Low Intensity, Developed\Open Space
Fallow\Idle Cropland	Fallow\Idle Cropland
Grasses	Alfalfa, Grass\Pasture, Other Hay\Non Alfalfa, Switchgrass
Herbaceous Wetlands	Herbaceous Wetlands
Open Water	Open Water
Other Crops	Dry Beans, Millet, Oats, Peas, Rye, Sorghum, Sugarbeets, Sunflower
Soybeans	Soybeans
Wheat	Spring Wheat, Winter Wheat
Woody Wetlands	Woody Wetlands

TABLE 2. Means and 95% credible intervals for odds ratios for habitat coefficients for the feeding to feeding transition arranged by increasing mean estimated in a Bayesian framework for six greater white-fronted geese in March 2018. A significant difference between habitats is indicated by non-overlapping credible intervals.

Covariate	Mean	95% CI	
Woody Wetlands	0.94	0.50	1.60
Open Water	1.04	0.91	1.18
Herbaceous Wetlands	1.52	1.17	1.94
Grasses	1.71	1.51	1.95
Soybeans	1.78	1.53	2.05
Fallow/Idle Cropland	1.79	1.13	2.70
Corn	1.83	1.68	2.01
Developed	1.91	0.97	3.55
Other Crops	2.25	1.53	3.21
Wheat	2.58	1.66	3.87

TABLE 3. A selection of means, 95% credible intervals, and proportion of samples with an estimate greater than 1 for odds ratios for quantitative covariate coefficients estimated in a Bayesian framework for six greater white-fronted geese in March 2018. The quantitative variable has a significant effect on the transition probability if the credible interval does not overlap with 1.

Transition	Covariate	mean	95% CI		Proportion of Samples > 1
Flight to Flight	Maximum Daily Temperature	1.30	1.18	1.41	1.00
	Minimum Daily Temperature	0.78	0.71	0.85	0.00
	Wind Speed	0.80	0.73	0.87	0.00
Feeding to Stationary		1.08	0.98	1.19	0.94
Walking to Stationary	cos(time)	1.17	1.09	1.25	1.00
Stationary to Stationary		1.21	1.14	1.28	1.00
Flight to Stationary		1.25	1.04	1.48	0.99
Walking to Stationary	sin(time)	0.97	0.91	1.04	0.18
Flight to Stationary		1.00	0.87	1.14	0.48
Feeding to Stationary		1.13	1.02	1.24	0.99
Stationary to Stationary		1.19	1.12	1.25	1.00

Locations from February to May 2018




Fig. 1. Spring migration paths in North America of 6 individual greater white-fronted geese (*Anser albifrons frontalis*) from GPS equipped tracking devices. The highlighted section (orange) are the locations for March 2018 used in the analysis of behavior transition probabilities.




Fig. 2. 95% credible intervals for habitat coefficients on the logit scale estimated in a Bayesian framework by behavior transition for six greater white-fronted geese in March 2018. There are significant pairwise differences between intervals that do not overlap.





Fig. 3. 95% credible intervals for diurnal (a) and weather (b) covariate coefficients on the logit scale estimated in a Bayesian framework by behavior transition for six greater white-fronted geese in March 2018. Significance refers to whether or not the credible interval overlaps zero.




Fig. 4. Matrix of pairwise comparisons between habitat coefficients for the transition feeding to feeding for six greater white-fronted geese in March 2018. The values indicate the proportion of samples in which the habitat coefficient down the row was greater than the coefficients along the column; the upper triangular values and lower triangular values sum to 1. For example, in the first row, corn, the proportion of times the estimate for the corn habitat coefficient was greater than the open water habitat coefficient was 1.