1   **Modelling activity patterns of wild animals - an application of the Multiple Discrete-Continuous Extreme**
2   **Value (MDCEV) model**
3
4   Chiara Calastri[1], Marek Giergiczny[2], Andreas Zedrosser[3] and Stephane Hess[1]

[1] Institute for Transport Studies and Choice Modelling Centre, University of Leeds (UK)

[2] Department of Economics, University of Warsaw (PL)

[3] Department of Natural Sciences and Environmental Health, University of South-Eastern Norway (NO)

Abstract

Advanced econometric models used in the field of transport or marketing are becoming increasingly sophisticated and able to capture complex decision making and outcomes. In this paper, we apply state-of-the-art discrete-continuous choice models to the field of Ecology, in particular to model activity engagement of the population of Swedish Brown bears. Using data from GPS collars that track wild animals over time, we estimate a Multiple Discrete-Continuous Extreme Value (MDCEV) model to understand activity engagement and duration as a function of both bear characteristics and other external factors. We show that the methodology is not only suitable to address this aim, but also allows us to produce insights into the connection between the animal's age and gender and activity engagement as well as the links with climate variables (temperature and precipitation) and human activity (hunting).

1. Introduction

The understanding of the patterns of movement of living organisms is a prominent area of study in animal biology and ecology. Indeed, the presence and distribution of different animals in space and time are a product of the underlying process of animal movement (Turchin 1998; Nathan et al. 2008; Kays et al. 2015). Identifying behavioural states along an animal's movement path is straightforward when visual observation is possible (Bates and Byrne 2009; Hayward et al. 2009). Direct observation is an effective method for investigating animal behaviour and the least prone to errors when it comes to identifying the specific behavioural state (Loettker et al. 2009; Shamoun-Baranes et al. 2012). However, in most cases it is challenging if not impossible to constantly observe animals as they go through their lives in their natural habitat. Wild animals are often elusive and can reside in remote areas with challenging terrain. Many species minimize exposure to perceived threats, which often include human encroachments. Due to the difficulties in locating and observing animals, early studies have been marred by small sample sizes, often resulting in insufficient data for statistical inference (Caro 2007). In addition, investigating wild animal behaviour via direct observation may pose threats to researcher safety.

The development and diffusion of animal telemetry devices has revolutionized the ability to study animal movements and behaviour in the wild (Cagnacci et al. 2010; Kays et al. 2015), helping to overcome many of the practical, logistical, and financial challenges of direct field observation. Recent advances in GPS radiocollar technologies allow tracking of animals for long sampling periods, providing large data sets of locations at flexible time intervals (Cagnacci et al. 2010). Telemetry data have created possibilities that allow to address some of the most fundamental ecological hypotheses about space use, movement, resource selection and behaviour. The GPS locations can be used to investigate, among others, habitat selection (Signer et al. 2019), spatiotemporal movements (Nathan et al. 2008) and habitat influences on animal movement (Patterson et al. 2008). One line of research specifically relevant to the present work is the use of GPS radio-collar data to infer and analyse animal behavioural states. A common assumption in the ecology literature is that individual animals have a small set of movement strategies (Nathan et al. 2008), and the time allocation to different behaviours (or "activity budgets") depends on environmental, individual animals' characteristics and external factors (Hooten et al. 2017). There are many approaches to infer animals' behaviour from radio-collar data. Some studies have decomposed an individual animal's movement trajectory into a broad set of movement bouts based on rates of movement (Johnson et al. 2002). Others have inferred behavioural states based on the time required for an animal to first move out of a circle centred on a location along their path (Frair et al. 2005) or total time spent in the vicinity of a location (Barraquand and Benhamou 2008). For example, in carnivore studies in which authors attempt to derive behaviour from GPS relocation data, the main goal has often been to identify GPS location clusters indicative of predation or bedding events (Merrill et al. 2010; Ordiz et al. 2011; Rauset et al. 2012). Clusters form when an animal spends a certain amount of time within a site of a given radius, where time and

radius are specified by the researcher and should be tailored to the behaviour of the study species and field conditions.

Movement trajectory and cluster analysis are common techniques for identifying behavioural states, such as resting (Ordiz et al. 2011), predation (Rauset et al. 2012) or foraging (Bastille-Rousseau et al. 2011; Hertel et al. 2016a; Hertel et al. 2016b). Frequently used methodologies to study patterns of animal movement and behaviour are autocorrelation analysis (Boyce et al. 2010) or generalized additive models for either net squared displacement or step length (Ciuti et al. 2012). The detailed overview of these techniques can be found in (Gurarie et al. 2016; Hooten et al. 2017). Simple random-utility based models (such as logit models) have also been used to study the behavioural states (e.g. Ordiz et al. 2011).

While the above-mentioned studies provide interesting insights into animal behavioural states, they are generally narrow in scope because they focus on the analysis of a single type of behaviour (also referred to as "activity" from here on) in isolation. This can limit the insights produced due to the lack of the overall picture: for example, an animal could move in a given direction so that they can conduct another activity, or because they have been conducting another activity/experienced certain circumstance.

The present work represents an advancement in this field of research not only by analysing engagement in multiple activities within a given time frame, but by jointly modelling activity choice and its duration. We refer to such choice processes as discrete-continuous. Many studies involving humans have recognised the importance of accommodating for the joint nature of multiple discrete-continuous decisions in econometric models (e.g. Bhat et al. 2005, Calastri et al. 2022, Van Nostrand et al. 2013). In this work we aim to test whether models accounting for the discrete-continuous nature of activity choice can be used to infer more detailed insights about animals' behaviour by acknowledging the connection between the choice of activity and its duration. For example, an important topic in brown bear research, highly relevant from the management and conservation perspective, is the impact of hunting on bears behaviour. A few studies have demonstrated that apex predators may perceive and respond to human-caused risk like prey responds to a natural predator (Ordiz et al. 2011). However, these studies explore the impact of hunting on a single behavioural state, for example Hartel et al. (2016a) analysed the impact of hunting on foraging, Ordiz et al. (2011) analysed the impact of hunting on the choice of places for bedding, whereas in this work we are able to document the impact of hunting on engagement in multiple activities and their durations. Our approach allows for better understanding of the full cost in terms of energy expenditure and intake for bears resulting from hunting. These topics lay in the heart of budget activity (Christiansen et al. 2013) and foraging ecology (Pyke, 2019).

Multiple discrete-continuous models have not been previously applied in Ecology, and this paper aims to present a proof-of-concept of their potential usefulness in this discipline.
In particular, by combining movement trajectory and cluster analysis we identify distinct behavioural states of brown bears (*Ursus arctos*) (i.e., rest, forage, move). We then apply the state-of-the-art Multiple Discrete-Continuous Extreme Value (MDCEV) model to jointly represent the engagement in and duration of activities. The long-term individual-animal based dataset used in this study allows us to better understand the effect of individual bear characteristics, environmental variables and external factors on bear behaviour over time.
The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. The next section presents the data, before we discuss the model structure. This is followed by the results of the empirical analysis, and finally, the study conclusions.

2. Methods

2.1. Species description, study area and data collection

The GPS telemetry data from brown bears are collected as part of the Scandinavian Brown Bear Research Project (www.bearproject.info), an individual-bear level, long-term population monitoring program in south-central Sweden. The bear population in the study area has been continuously monitored since 1985 (Swenson et al. 1994). As part of this project, bears are captured by darting (Dan-Inject, Børkop, Denmark) with an immobilizing drug from a helicopter soon after hibernation and den emergence in late April. Captured bears are equipped with a GPS collar (GPS Plus; Vectronic Aerospace, Germany) prior to re-release. For more information on capture and handling procedures, see Arnemo et al. (2011).

The study area is situated in Dalarna and Gävleborg counties in south-central Sweden. The terrain is hilly, with elevations between 250 and 650m above sea level and mostly covered by intensively managed coniferous forests mainly composed of Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*), Norway spruce (*Picea abies*), and birch (*Betula* spp*.*). The human settlement in the area consist of 24 scattered small villages and a few seasonally used independent houses. Human population density is low and ranges from 4.1 to 7.1 habitants per km^2 (Ordiz et al. 2012), but there is an extensive network of forestry roads (Frank et al. 2015). Bear density is about 30 bears per 1,000 km^2 (Bellemain et al. 2005), and bears are hunted in the study area (Frank et al. 2017). The annual brown bear hunting season in Sweden starts on 21 August and lasts for approximately 2 months or until predefined quotas are filled. Hunting is allowed from 1h after sunrise until 2h before sunset (Bischof et al. 2008, Bischof et al. 2018).

In this study, we have focussed on GPS relocation data from adult (≥ 4years) bears (Zedrosser et al. 2006, Zedrosser et al. 2009) collected on an hourly basis between 2008 and 2015. We removed GPS locations with a dilution of precision >10[1] from the data (D'eon and Delparte 2005). We focussed our analysis on the *berry season* (15th July – 15th September) (Ordiz et al. 2011, Hertel et al. 2018), i.e., the time period when bears build adipose tissue reserves in preparation for hibernation (Manchi and Swenson 2005). During this time period, the bears in our study area forage almost exclusively on berries, mainly *Vaccinium* spp. (Stenset et al. 2016). As the main purpose of this paper is to showcase MDCEV modelling framework in ecology, to reduce ecological complexity, we focused on solitary adult males (n=24) and adult females (n=40). Low satellite coverage may lead to failed GPS fixes (Moe et al. 2007). In only 30.9% of days for which fixes were recorded, all 24 fixes were available. In order to preserve data quality, we resorted to retaining observations (at the day level) for which at least 22 hourly fixes had been recorded (50.8% of all days). While data with up to two discontinuous missing fixes were retained, if the two missing fixes were contiguous, the whole day of data was discarded. In the case of such discontinuous missing fixes, the position for the missing hour was approximated as the midpoint between the two nearest available relocations.

2.2. Behavioural classifications

Bear behaviour was classified into three activities based on GPS data: *foraging*, *resting,* and *moving*. The classification of the behavioural states was based on the existing literature for brown bears in the study area (i.e. Moe et al. 2007, Ordiz et al. 2011, Hertel et al. 2016a, Hertel et al. 2016b). A bear was defined as exhibiting resting behaviour when a minimum of three consecutive GPS locations within a radius of 30m were recorded based on 30-minute GPS-relocation data (Ordiz et al. 2011). Given the coarser temporal

---

[1] Dilution of precision (DOP) is a term used in satellite navigation and geomatics engineering to specify the error propagation as a mathematical effect of navigation satellite geometry on positional measurement precision. Observations with DOP larger than 10 are considered as having too large error to be used for analysis (D'eon and Delparte 2005).

140 resolution in our data (60 min time intervals), we defined resting behaviour (*Rest*) as an activity in which
141 an animal stayed at least 1hour within a radius of 30m. Berry foraging by bears is characterized by slow
142 and meandering movements (Stelmock and Dean 1988). Hertel et al. (2016a, 2016b) defined berry
143 foraging in our study population as continuous movements in which a bear covered a distance of 25–300
144 m over at least three consecutive 30 min intervals. Field validation by Hertel et al. (2016a) confirmed that
145 bears were foraging on berries at 80% of the locations classified as forage based on GPS-relocation data.
146 For the purposes of this study, we slightly modified the criterion used by Hertel at al. (2018) and defined
147 feeding behaviour (*Feed*) as relocations within a distance of 30–300 m in 60 min (2 consecutive GPS fixes).
148 Any behaviour with movements longer than 300 m in 60min was classified as *Move.* This resulted in a very
149 wide range of travelled distances in this category (i.e., mean=911 m, std dev=592, max distance=8,504m).
150 Given the temporal resolution of our data, very heterogenous behaviour is likely within a 60 min interval,
151 including the whole spectrum from mostly feeding to pure travel. We tested two approaches to deal with
152 the *Move* category; first, we classified all observations with travelled distances longer than 300m/h as
153 *Move*; second, we further divided *Move* into two subcategories, *Short move* – including all relocations
154 ranging between 300m/h and 600m/h, and *Move* comprising all relocations for which the covered distance
155 was larger than 600m. The second approach resulted in significantly better model performance and was
156 used in the final model specification.

158 Table 1 presents a summary of the sample characteristics based on the defined criteria. As can be seen,
159 all four types of activities are conducted on the vast majority of all days, with *Rest* being conducted every
160 day.

162 Table 1. Summary statistics of GPS relocation data of radio-collared brown bears during the berry season
163 (15th July – 15th September) in south-central Sweden, 2008-2016.

	Daily activity duration (hours)			
	Mean	Std. dev.	Min.	Max.
Rest	8.72	2.57	2	21
Feed	6.00	2.81	0	18
Short move	5.47	3.02	0	18
Move	3.79	2.06	0	11
	Bear characteristics			
	Mean	Std. dev.	Min.	Max.
Sex	40 – females 24 – males			
Age (years, average in sample)	9.36	4.32	5	22
	Number of observations (days) (% of the sample)			
July (15th – 30)	1,321 (28%)			
August (1st – 31)	2,399 (51%)			
Sept (1st – 15th)	967 (21%)			
Days with Rest > 0h	4,687 (100%)			
Days with Feed >0h	4,647 (99.1%)			
Days with Short move>0h	4,508 (96.2%)			
Days with Move>0	4,505 (96.1%)			
	Mean	Std. dev.	Min.	Max.
Number of obs (days) per bear	73.25	60.36	1	266
Total number of observations	4,687			

164

165 ### 3. Modelling framework
166 ### 3.1. Overview
167 The family of Multiple Discrete-Continuous Extreme Value (MDCEV) models initially developed by Bhat
168 (2005) and subsequently extended in different directions (Bhat, 2008; Castro et al., 2012; Pinjari and Bhat,
169 2010, Mondal and Bhat, 2021, Palma and Hess, 2022), represents the current state of the art in modelling
170 multiple discrete-continuous choices. Human travel behaviour has been the main field of application of
171 this modelling framework, for example in the study of the choice of vehicle type and mileage (Bhat and
172 Sen, 2006), and to type and duration of activities (Bhat, 2005; Calastri et al., 2022). Application beyond
173 transport choices include those analysing residential energy consumption (Iraganaboina, & Eluru, 2021),
174 social interactions (Calastri et al., 2017) and consumer purchase behaviour (Lu et al., 2017). To the best of
175 our knowledge, MDCEV has never been applied to the study of animal behaviour.
176
177 The model is derived coherently with the random utility maximisation theory in economics, but
178 relaxes the mutual exclusivity assumption inherent in traditional discrete choice models. This means that
179 subjects are not constrained to selecting one option (in our case one activity) but allocate their available
180 resources to a combination of these. While the model has been developed in the generic context of
181 consumption choices, we describe it in terms of time allocation decisions, in line with the application
182 presented in this paper.
183 The MDCEV model is based on a direct utility function $U(x)$ that individuals (in this case bears)
184 maximise by choosing to allocate a vector x of non-negative time intervals to each of the K possible
185 activities, $x = (x_1,...,x_k)$. The choice of total time allocation is subject to a time "budget" constraint $\sum x = E$,
186 where E is the total time available.
187 The vector x generally includes a so-called "outside activity" to represent allocation to an activity
188 that is always undertaken by all the individuals (bears) in the sample, in our case *Rest*. A decision needs to
189 be made on the unit of measurement. In our case we work with data at the day level, implying a time
190 budget of 24 hours per observation. The time budget takes the following form:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} x = E, \ x_1 > 0, \ x_k \geq 0 \ \forall \ k \ (k = 2, ... K) \tag{1}$$

191 where in our model activity 1 is *Rest* , i.e. the *outside activity*, and K=4 (Rest, Feed, Move and Short move)
192 and E=24 hours.
193
194 ### 3.2. Econometrics
195 The utility formulation, introduced by Bhat (2008) is given by:

196 $$U(x) = \frac{1}{\alpha_1}\psi_1 x_1{}^{\alpha_1} + \sum_{k=2}^{K} \frac{\gamma_k}{\alpha_k}\psi_k \left(\left(\frac{x_k}{\gamma_k} + 1\right)^{\alpha_k} - 1\right), \tag{2}$$

197 such that $U(x)$ is quasi-concave, increasing and continuously differentiable with respect to x and ψ. ψ_k is
198 the baseline utility accrued from activity k. It is a function of observed characteristics of the individual
199 (bear) and of activity k, z_k, which also includes a constant δ_k representing the generic preference for activity
200 k, so that $\psi_k = \psi_k(z_k) * e^{\epsilon_k}$. The parameters γ_k and α_k relate to activity k. The γ_k parameters are
201 translation parameters that allow the model to accommodate corner solutions, i.e. observations for which
202 no time is allocated to a given activity k. They also affect satiation, as a higher γ_k implies that more time
203 invested in the corresponding activity (x_k) is needed to reach saturation. The α_k parameter is solely
204 associated with the satiation effect, i.e., decreasing marginal utilities.
205 Empirical identification requires some constraints for normalisation, and in our work, we make
206 use of the implementation of the MDCEV model in which we have product-specific γ parameters, i.e. we
207 estimate γ_k parameters for $k = 2,3,4$, along with a generic satiation parameter α. As in most of the work in

6

208 the literature, all the model specifications that we estimated displayed an extremely small value of α for
209 which we could not reject the null hypothesis that it was equal to zero, where, with $\alpha \to 0$, the utility form
210 collapses to a log utility formulation (cf. Bhat, 2008) with:
211
$$U(x) = \psi_1 \ln(x_1) + \sum_{k=2}^{K} \gamma_k \psi_k \left(\frac{x_k}{\gamma_k} + 1\right) \tag{3}$$
213 This formulation implies that direct utility increases with additional units of consumption in a logarithmic
214 fashion, i.e. with diminishing returns. The only parameters relating to satiation that we estimate are the
215 γ_k terms, which can be interpreted in terms of how long the activities of *Feed*, *Move* and *Short move* are
216 performed for.
217 The probability that an individual (bear) chooses a specific vector of time allocations $x_1^*, x_2^*, ..., x_M^*, 0, ..., 0$,
218 where M of the K activities are performed in a given day, is given by:

$$P(x_1^*, x_2^*, ..., x_M^*, 0, ..., 0) = \frac{1}{p_1} \frac{1}{\sigma^{M-1}} \left(\prod_{m=1}^{M} f_m\right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{p_m}{f_m}\right) \left(\frac{\prod_{m=1}^{M} e^{V_i/\sigma}}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} e^{V_k/\sigma}\right)^M}\right) (M-1)!, \tag{4}$$

220 where σ is an estimated scale parameter and where $f_m = \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{x_m^* + \gamma_m}\right)$.
221

3.3. Specification for our study

223
3.3.1 The discrete choice
225 As mentioned above, the baseline utility ψ_k broadly captures the "discrete choice", i.e., the likelihood of
226 performing an activity. In the present study, this is composed of a constant δ_k and additive shifts for each
227 of the covariates we consider. Differently from discrete choice models, the δ constants in the MDCEV
228 model are influenced by both the discrete and the continuous parts of the model, and this explains the
229 fact that the values for the constants for the non-base activities can be positive even though the base
230 alternative (*Rest*) is conducted more often.
231
3.3.2 The continuous choice
233 Analogously, in the case of the satiation component, we estimate one γ_k for each activity but allow for
234 heterogeneity as a function of covariates, i.e., measuring the impact of the covariates on the continuous
235 choice. Differently from the case of the baseline utility, the parameterisation of γ_k was operationalised in
236 a multiplicative fashion. For example, the overall satiation from activity k was expressed as:
237 $\qquad \gamma_k = \gamma_{k,base} * \prod_{i=1}^{I} f_k(z_i)$ (5)
238 where $\gamma_{k,base}$ is a constant for activity k (reported as "Core parameters" in Table 3), z_i is one of a set of I
239 covariates. For categorical variables, such as sex, we set a base category, and estimate a multiplier for
240 others, meaning that for a covariate with L levels, we use $f_k(z_i) = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \kappa_{ikl} \cdot (z_i == l)$, where $(z_i == l)$
241 is equal to 1 if z_i takes the lth level, and zero otherwise, and where we fix $\kappa_{ikl} = 1$ for one category. For
242 continuous variables, we use $f(z_i) = \left(z_i / \overline{z_i}\right)^{\lambda_{ik}}$, where the estimate of λ_{ik} captures the non-linearity.
243 We retained those effects in the model where the κ_{ikl} multipliers are significantly different from 1, or
244 where the elasticity parameters λ_{ik} were different from 0, implying that $f(z_i)$ is different from 1.
245
3.3.3 Explanatory variables
247 In our MDCEV application, we have tested the effect of a range of variables that have been demonstrated
248 by a large amount of ecological literature to be related to brown bears' behaviour. These mainly relate to
249 environmental/climatic factors, characteristics of the animal and potential human impacts. Here and in
250 the Results section, we only describe the variables for which statistically significant effects on activity

251   choice and duration were found. These include the bears age, sex, and two climatic variables. The full list
252   of the variables used in the final model specification is reported in Table 2.
253
254   Table 2 – Explanatory variables used in the model

Variable	Type of variable	Description
Sex	Categorical	1= Solitary adult female 0= Solitary adult male
Age	Categorical	1= 4-8 years old 2= 9-15 years old 3= Older than 15
Average daily temperature	Continuous	Range: 4.63-22.1 °C Mean: 13.12 °C
Average daily precipitation	Continuous	Range: 0-33.47 mm Mean: 2.94 mm
Daily duration of daylight*	Continuous	Range: 12.89-18.36 h Mean: 15.73 h
Daily duration of twilight*	Continuous	Range: 3.24-7.23 h Mean: 4.86 h
Daily duration of night*	Continuous	Range: 0-7.86 h Mean: 3.40 h
Hunting season	Categorical	1= hunting season 0= not hunting season

255   * Calculated for the central location of our study area (Tackåsen, Sweden: 61.5N, 15.05E)
256
257   The climatic variables related to temperature and precipitation were obtained from the Swedish
258   Meteorological and Hydrological Institute (SMHI). In particular, station-specific time series within the study
259   area were converted using the R package "mba" (Finley & Banerjee, 2014) to interpolated raster series
260   with a 5-day temporal resolution and a 5 km spatial resolution. To account for variation across the study
261   area, the raster values of these climate variables associated with the area inhabited by each bear were
262   averaged using a circular home range with a sex-specific average home range diameter (Bischof et al.,
263   2018). In our models, we tested minimum, maximum and average temperature. Since the focus of our
264   study is to understand how animals allocate time to different activities across 24 hours, the mean
265   temperature seemed to be the most appropriate measure. The R (R Core Team, 2020) library "maptools"
266   (Bivand and Lewin-Koh, 2020) was used to determine the length of day, night, and twilight for every day
267   during the berry season. We consider as "Daylight" the period between sunrise and sunset, "twilight" as
268   the time period between sunset and nautical dusk (i.e., when the sun moves to 12 degrees below the
269   horizon in the evening) and from nautical dawn (when the sun moves to 12 degrees below the horizon) to
270   sunrise. The remaining time (i.e., between nautical dusk and dawn) is defined as "night". Due to high
271   correlation between *Daylight* and *Night duration* only the former variable has been retained in the model.
272   This variable is also a good proxy for the time elapsed so far in the berry season, as the *Daylight duration*
273   changes linearly in the study period. The dummy variable taking value 1 for the time between 21 August –
274   15 September is used to test whether the hunting season affects the bears' behaviour. The MDCEV model
275   was estimated using the "apollo" package (Hess & Palma, 2019) in R (R Core Team, 2020).
276
277   **4. Model results**
278

279 The final model results are presented in Table 3. We look first at the baseline parameters that relate
280 primarily to the discrete choice, before looking at the satiation parameters that relate more to the
281 continuous choice. The baseline parameters have limited interpretation (Bhat, 2018).
282
283 Table 3 – Model results

	Coefficient	Estimate	Rob. t-ratio (0)	Rob. t-ratio(1)
Baseline parameters	α	0 (fixed)	NA	NA
	γ *feed*	4.099	15.174	11.472
	γ *move*	7.062	12.609	10.824
	γ *short move*	4.107	19.403	14.679
	δ *feed*	0.668	2.289	-1.135
	δ *move*	-2.568	-9.067	-12.598
	δ *short move*	-2.175	-17.939	-26.186
Shifts in the δ parameters	Age 16+ *feed*	0.081	2.729	-30.781
	Age 16+ *move*	-0.361	-9.928	-37.394
	Female *short move*	0.263	7.419	-20.713
	Daylight duration *feed*	-1.294	-7.649	-13.556
	Daylight duration *move*	0.705	4.195	-1.75
	Daylight duration *short move*	0.342	4.572	-8.814
	Hunting period *feed*	-0.142	-4.788	-38.401
	Hunting period *move*	0.047	1.051	-21.048
	Temperature *feed*	0.008	1.832	-208.204
	Temperature *move*	-0.008	-3.783	-429.586
	Precipitation *move*	-0.052	-3.856	-77.558
Multipliers of the γ parameters (κ_{ik})	Female *feed (base=male)*	1.256	16.827	3.431
	Female *short move (base=male)*	0.908	17.357	-1.738
	Hunting period *move (base=outside hunting period)*	0.943	10.18	-0.608
Exponential term in γ multipliers (λ_{ik})	Daylight duration *feed*	1.804	5.071	2.261
	Daylight duration *move*	-0.695	-1.415	-3.451
	Precipitation *move*	0.013	2.414	-182.821
	Temperature *feed*	-0.045	-0.375	-8.624
Scale	Scale parameter (σ)	0.272	64.741	-173.423

284 *Model performance:* Final LL: -32116.1; AIC: 64282.21; BIC: 64443.52
285
286 *4.1. Shifts in the **δ** parameters*

287 We found find that within a 24-hour time span, older bears (aged 16 years or over) are more likely to *Feed*
288 and less likely to *Move* compared to younger ones (cf. Table 3). The coefficient "Female short move" points
289 to the fact that females are more likely to move than solitary males, suggesting that they are more likely
290 to do a combination of activities in the given time frame. When the day lasts longer (i.e., at the beginning
291 of the berry season), the baseline utility of moving and short moving increases, while that of foraging
292 decreases.

9

293 The start of the hunting season has a significant effect on bear behaviour, i.e., the bears are more likely to
294 move and less likely to feed (cf. Table 3). Interestingly, since in our application all activities are modelled
295 jointly, we see that decreased probability of feeding is accompanied by increased probability of *moving*,
296 with *short move* being unaffected.
297 We tested for the effect of daily temperature in different forms (i.e., min, max, range, average), and daily
298 average temperature had the highest explanatory power and was retained in the final model specification.
299 A higher likelihood of *Feed* and a lower likelihood of *Move* are associated with increases in temperature
300 (Table 3).
301 The shift of the δ parameters as a consequence of precipitation (in mm) shows that an increase in this
302 variable is linked with a lower likelihood to *Move*.
303
304 *4.2. Multipliers of the γ parameters*
305
306 The results related to the parameterisation of the γ parameters are shown in the bottom part of Table 3.
307 Due to the fact that they enter the satiation equation multiplicatively, these parameters have a significant
308 impact if they are significantly different from 1. Female bears are found to spend longer time in *Feed* and
309 *Short move* as opposed to males. We also observe that during the hunting period, bears spend more time
310 moving as opposed to outside of the hunting season. This indicates that not only the probability of *Move*
311 increases due to hunting but also time spent in this activity increases.
312 The last set of parameters in Table 3 measure the sensitivity of the overall satiation to changes in
313 continuous variables. Figure 1 shows the impact of the duration of daylight on the satiation from *Feed* and
314 *Move*, given the estimated values of λ_{ik}.
315
316 Figure 1: Effect of the duration of daylight on satiation parameters

317
318 A positive value of this exponential term (cf. "Daylight duration *feed*") implies that as the duration of
319 daylight increases, the activity (*Feed*) will be performed for longer. The opposite is true for *Move*. This
320 implies that at the beginning of the berry season, if bears engage in *feeding,* they will do so for longer than

321 at the end of the berry season. The opposite is true for *Move*. This is likely related to the fact that the end
322 of the berry season corresponds with the hunting season, when bears feed less and move more.
323   The magnitude of the changes in satiation is determined by the value of the estimated parameters and
324 the baseline value ($\gamma_k base$). Precipitation positively affects the value of the satiation parameter for *Move*,
325 although its small value results in a slowly increasing trend (cf. Figure 2). Higher temperatures imply a
326 smaller amount of time spent foraging (cf. Figure 3).
327   Figure 2. Effect of the amount of precipitation on the satiation parameter for *move*

329
330   Figure 3. Effect of temperature on the satiation parameter for *Feed*

11

334   *4.3 Model validation*

335   In order to obtain a measure of how well our proposed model performs at capturing the trends in the data,
336   we have carried out a prediction of the shares of days on which a given activity is carried out, as well as of
337   the activity duration and compared it with the data. This is what is sometimes referred to as "base"
338   prediction, i.e. applying the model without introducing any changes to the data. As shown in Table 4, the
339   differences between the discrete and continuous choice statistics in the data and in the prediction are
340   limited, and the RMSE is low in both cases, indicating that the model adequately replicates the behaviour
341   in the data.

342

Discrete choice (share of days with non-zero time in activity)			Continuous choice (hrs spent)	
Activity	Share in data	Predicted share	Average duration in data	Average predicted duration
Rest	1.00	1.00	8.73	8.56
Feed	0.99	0.99	6.00	5.95
Short Move	0.96	0.97	3.80	3.92
Move	0.96	0.95	5.47	5.58
RMSE= 0.12			RMSE=0.01	

343

344   **5. Discussion**
345   In this paper, we present a proof-of-concept for the application of advanced econometrics models to
346   understand the behaviour of wild animals. Addressing the limitations of previous studies, we produced a
347   model of brown bear behaviour where we model engagement in multiple activities, considering not only
348   which activities are conducted but also the amount of time invested in each. We showed how both the
349   discrete and continuous outcomes are related to the characteristics of the animals themselves as well as
350   to environmental variables and external factors (i.e. hunting). While the MDCEV modelling framework
351   adopted was not previously used to improve the understanding of animal behaviour, we demonstrated
352   how this tool can be suitable for our investigation by obtaining results in line with existing work as well as
353   providing new insights made possible by the specific model structure.

354
355   To start with, our classifications of the different activities inferred via the GPS relocation data allowed us
356   to unveil behavioural patterns correlated with bear characteristics. We showed that female bears are more
357   likely to engage in the *Short Move* activity and do so for longer compared to males. This is an example of
358   a finding allowed by the MDCEV model, i.e., capturing discrete and continuous behaviour contextually. As
359   explained in the Methods section, this activity is most likely to be made up of a mixture of different
360   activities, implying that female bears have a more varied pattern of behaviour within each observed time
361   slot. We have also shown that older bears are more likely to engage in foraging rather than travelling long
362   distances.

363
364   Capturing both the discrete and the continuous outcomes allowed us to gain a more complete picture of
365   behaviour, as we understand which characteristics are associated with activity duration instead of only
366   providing insights on which activities are performed. A key result of our model is that during the hunting
367   season, bears are less likely to feed and more likely to move – and do so for longer periods of time. This
368   finding is in line with existing ecological literature which demonstrated that apex predators may perceive

369 and respond to hunting risk similar to that of prey responding to a natural predator (Ordiz et al. 2011;
370 Brook et al. 2012) , forcing them to increase vigilance at the expense of foraging.
371
372 Our results conform well with Hertel et al. (2016b), who found that bears effectively responded to
373 variation in risk during the day by decreasing their foraging activity in the morning hours of the hunting
374 season and not changing their behaviour in the afternoon foraging bout, indicating that bears did not
375 allocate antipredator behaviour to times of comparably lower risk. On the other hand, contrary to the
376 existing literature, which has focused on modelling one activity (Hertel et al. 2016a, Hertel et al. 2016b,
377 McLellan and McLellan 2015, Steyaert et al. 2016), the MDCEV framework allows us to directly identify the
378 trade-offs in bears behaviour. Bears reduce risk from hunting by increasing probability of Move and its
379 duration, this happens at the cost of the forage activity. This shows that hunting affects the energy budget
380 of bears in a more complex way than identified in the literature (Sahlen et al. 2015, Steyaert et al. 2016,
381 Hertel et al. 2016b), that is, not just by lowering energy intake by decreasing foraging activity, but also by
382 increasing energy expenditure as they are more likely to Move and do it for a longer period. This shows
383 that hunting season is highly costly for bears in terms of energy balance, as they are less likely to feed and
384 more likely to move at this crucial time for their energy intake, i.e., before hibernation. The additive effect
385 of reduced forage intake and higher engagement in movement is likely to result in poorer body condition
386 upon den entry and may ultimately reduce winter hibernation survival and reproductive success. This
387 result potentially enables managers and conservationists to better understand the ecology of this species
388 as well as how people affect its behaviours and what are the consequences on energy expenditure and
389 survival.
390 The sign and magnitude of the λ_{ik} parameters combined with the shift in the δ parameters (i.e. *Daylight*
391 *duration Feed)* showed that as *Daylight duration* decreases, bears are more likely to *Feed* but will carry out
392 this activity for a shorter period of time. Exactly the opposite pattern is true for *Move,* that is as *Daylight*
393 *duration* decreases bears are less likely to *Move* but will carry out this activity for a longer period of time
394 if it is conducted. The opposing trends displayed as time advances in the berry season indicates that bears
395 constantly change (adapt) their foraging strategy during the studied period. A possible explanation of the
396 observed phenomena is that at the beginning of the berry season, food is scarcer (or of lower quality) and
397 once bears find a feeding place, they will carry out the *Feed* activity for longer, as there are no good
398 alternatives available; whereas later in the berry season, when more berry species are available and food
399 is more abundant, bears will travel between high quality spots. This interpretation is in line with what has
400 been reported by Hertel et al. (2016b), who showed that in the berry season, bears are selective and
401 navigate in the forest landscapes by using areas of higher than average berry abundance.
402
403   Overall, this study is innovative in two ways: it demonstrated the application of a state-of-the art
404 discrete-continuous model to a new field of research, and it shows not only that results which are intuitive
405 and in line with the literature can be obtained, but also that new insights can be added due to the more
406 comprehensive approach looking at different activities and at both choice of activities and activity
407 duration. In particular, this approach allowed us to distinguish cases of zero time in an activity (i.e. a corner
408 solution) from small non-zero times, and that is allows for a study of satiation, i.e. non-linear gains in utility
409 from additional consumption. In terms of specific conclusions for our case study, the proposed approached
410 allowed us to observe that the disturbance due to hunting affects energy expenditure as it impacts on
411 multiple activities, namely feeding and moving. It also allowed us to understand key differences across the
412 animals. For example, we found that female bears not only engage in different types of activities (e.g.
413 Short Move) but also do so for different durations with respect to their male counterpart.
414
415   Like any study, we acknowledge that our work has a number of limitations. The classification of
416 the moving activity in two separate activities is subjective and while it helps with the interpretation of

417 results, it might not be ecologically accurate, and could impact our findings. Especially in the case of *Feed*
418 and *Move,* our activity classification is rather coarse with respect to studies using human data collected
419 with smartphone or GPS trackers that can virtually capture any movement. This is a result of working at
420 the level of one-hour data. Finer temporal resolution (i.e., GPS fixes every 30min or 15min) would allow
421 for more reliable classification and understanding of behaviours, as it is likely that bears undertake a
422 mixture of activities during 1h intervals. At the same time, this would be very battery-intensive and would
423 require capturing and re-releasing bears more often to change the batteries, which is expensive and may
424 not be possible due to animal welfare concerns. Additional improvement of the method could be achieved
425 by linking the GPS data with other high-resolution data such as, 3D accelerometers, heart-rate sensors.
426 Moreover, as this study aims to be a proof-of-concept, we only used a sub-set of the available data. Using
427 a larger and more comprehensive dataset could unveil further patterns of behaviour, for example the ones
428 of younger animals and females with dependent offspring. We leave these developments to future work,
429 with the main aim of the present paper being to present the method and its potential.
430

438 **References**
439 Arnemo, J. M., and A. Evans. 2017. Biomedical protocols for free-ranging brown bears, wolves, wolverines
440 and lynx. Technical Report, Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences, Evenstad, Norway.
441 Avgar, T., Potts, J. R., Lewis, M. A., & Boyce, M. S. (2016). Integrated step selection analysis: Bridging the
442 gap between resource selection and animal movement. Methods in Ecology and Evolution., 7, 619–630.
443 Barraquand, F. & Benhamou, S. (2008) Animal movements in heterogeneous landscapes: identifying
444 profitable places and homogeneous movement bouts. Ecology, 89, 3336–3348.
445 Bastille-Rousseau G, Fortin D, Dussault C, Courtois R, Ouellet JP (2011) Foraging strategies by omnivores:
446 are black bears actively searching for ungulate neonates or are they simply opportunistic predators?
447 Ecography, 34, 588-596.
448 Bates LA, Byrne RW. 2009. Sex differences in the movement patterns of free-ranging chimpanzees (*Pan*
449 *troglodytes schweinfurthii*): foraging and border checking. Behav Ecol Sociobiol. 64:247–255.
450 Bellemain E, J. Swenson, D. Tallmon, S. Brunberg, P. (2005). Taberlet, Estimating population size of elusive
451 animals using DNA from hunter-collected feces: Comparing four methods for brown bears. Conserv. Biol.
452 19, 150–161.
453 Bennison, A., Bearhop, S., Bodey, T.W., Votier, S.C., Grecian, W.J., Wakefield, E.D., Hamer, K.C. & Jessopp,
454 M. (2018). Search and foraging behaviours from movement data: a comparison of methods. Ecol. Evol. 8,
455 13–24.
456 Beyer, H. L., Haydon, D. T., Morales, J. M., Frair, J. L., Hebblewhite, M., Mitchell, M. & Matthiopoulos, J.
457 (2010). The interpretation of habitat preference metrics under use-availability designs. Philosophical
458 Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 365, 2245–2254
459 Bhat, C. R., 2005. A multiple discrete–continuous extreme value model: formulation and application to
460 discretionary time-use decisions. Transportation Research Part B: Methodological 39 (8), 679–707.
461 Bhat, C. R., 2008. The multiple discrete-continuous extreme value (mdcev) model: role of utility function
462 parameters, identification considerations, and model extensions. Transportation Research Part B:
463 Methodological 42 (3), 274–303.

464 Bhat, C. R., Sen, S., 2006. Household vehicle type holdings and usage: an application of the multiple
465 discrete-continuous extreme value (mdcev) model. Transportation Research Part B: Methodological 40 (1),
466 35–53.
467 Bhat, C. R. (2018). A new flexible multiple discrete–continuous extreme value (MDCEV) choice
468 model. Transportation Research Part B: Methodological, 110, 261-279.
469 Bischof, R., C. Bonenfant, I. M. Rivrud, A. Zedrosser, A. Friebe, T. Coulson, A. Mysterud, and J. E. Swenson.
470 2018. Regulated hunting re-shapes the life history of brown bears. Nature Ecology & Evolution 2:116-123.
471 Bischof, R., R. Fujita, A. Zedrosser, A. Soderberg, and J. E. Swenson. 2008. Hunting patterns, ban on baiting,
472 and harvest demographics of brown bears in Sweden. Journal of Wildlife Management 72:79-88.
473 Bivand, R., & Lewin-Koh, N. 2020. Package 'maptools'. Retrieved from https://cran.r-
474 project.org/web/packages/maptools/index.html.
475 Boyce MS, Pitt J, Northrup JM, Morehouse AT, Knopff KH, Cristescu B, Stenhouse GB. 2010. Temporal
476 autocorrelation functions for movement rates from global positioning system radiotelemetry data. Philos
477 Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 365:2213–2219
478 Boyce MS., 2006. Scale for resource selection functions. Divers Distrib, 12:269–276.
479 Brook LA, Johnson CN, Ritchie EG. 2012. Effects of predator control on behaviour of an apex predator and
480 indirect consequences
481 for mesopredator suppression. J Appl Ecol 49:1278–1286.
482 Cable, R. N. (2013). Oh, Behave: When Wildlife Behaviour Matters in Conservation. Michigan Journal of
483 Sustainability, 1.
484 Cagnacci, F., L. Boitani, R. A. Powell, and M. S. Boyce. 2010. Animal ecology meets GPS-based
485 radiotelemetry: A perfect storm of opportunities and challenges. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal
486 Society of London B: Biological Sciences, 365:2157– 2162.
487 Calastri, C., Hess, S., Daly, A., Maness, M., Kowald, M., & Axhausen, K. (2017). Modelling contact mode and
488 frequency of interactions with social network members using the multiple discrete–continuous extreme
489 value model. Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies, 76, 16-34.
490 Calastri, C., Pawlak, J., & Batley, R. (2022). Participation in online activities while travelling: an application
491 of the MDCEV model in the context of rail travel. Transportation, 1-27.
492 Caro T. 2007. Behaviour and conservation: a bridge too far? Trends Ecol Evol. 22:394–400.
493 Carter, N. H., D. G. Brown, D. R. Etter, and L. G. Visser. (2010). American black bear habitat selection in
494 northern Lower Peninsula, Michigan, USA, using discrete-choice modeling. Ursus 21:57–71.
495 Cyr, A. & Nebel, S. (2013) Satellite and Data Logger Telemetry of Marine Vertebrates. Nature Education
496 Knowledge 4(2):4
497 Cooper, A. B. & Millspaugh, J. J. (2001) Accounting for variation in resource availability and animal
498 behaviour in resource selection studies. In Radio tracking and animal populations (ed. J. Millspaugh & J.
499 M. Marzluff), pp. 246–273. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
500 Castro, M., Bhat, C. R., Pendyala, R. M., Jara-D´ıaz, S. R., 2012. Accommodating multiple constraints in the
501 multiple discrete–continuous extreme value (mdcev) choice model. Transportation Research Part B:
502 Methodological 46 (6), 729–743.
503 Christiansen F, Rasmussen M, Lusseau D (2013) Inferring activity budgets in wild animals to estimate the
504 consequences of disturbances. Behav Ecol 24: 1415–1425.
505 Ciuti S, Muhly TB, Paton DG, McDevitt AD, Musiani M, Boyce MS. 2012. Human selection of elk behavioural
506 traits in a landscape of fear. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci. 279:4407–4416.
507 Cristescu, B., G. B. Stenhouse, and M. S. Boyce. 2014.Predicting multiple behaviours from GPS radiocollar
508 clusterdata. Behav. Ecol. 26:452–464.
509 Dahle, B., and J. E. Swenson. 2003. Home ranges in adult Scandinavian brown bears (Ursus arctos): effect
510 of mass, sex, reproductive category, population density and habitat type. Journal of Zoology 260:329-335.

Dahle, B., Sørensen, O. J., Wedul, E. H., Swenson, J. E., Sandegren, F., 1998. The diet of brown bears ursus arctos in central scandinavia: effect of access to free-ranging domestic sheep ovis aries. Wildlife Biology 4 (2), 147–158.

Dingemanse, N. J., & Dochtermann, N. A. (2013). Quantifying individual variation in behaviour: mixed-effect modelling approaches. Journal of Animal Ecology, 82(1), 39-54.

D'eon, R. G., and D. Delparte. 2005. Effects of radio-collar position and orientation on GPS radio-collar performance, and the implications of PDOP in data screening. Journal of Applied Ecology 42:383-388.

Duchesne, T., D. Fortin, and N. Courbin. 2010. Mixed conditional logistic regression for habitat selection studies. Journal of Animal Ecology 79:548–555.

Dunham M. H., A. Helal, and S. Balakrishnan, (1997) "A Mobile Transaction Model That Captures Both the Data and Movement Behaviour," ACM J. Mobile Networks and Applications, vol. 2, pp. 149- 162, 1997.

Fauchald, P. & Tveraa, T. (2003) Using first-passage time in the analysis of area-restricted search and habitat selection. Ecology, 84, 282–288.

Finley, A. O. & Banerjee, S. *MBA: Multilevel B-Spline Approximation*. R package version 0.0-8 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, 2014).

Fortin D, Beyer HL, Boyce MS, Smith DW, Duchesne T, Mao JS: Wolves influence elk movements: behaviour shapes a trophic cascade in Yellowstone National Park. Ecology 2005, 86:1320–1330.

Frair JL, Merrill EH, Visscher DR, Fortin D, Beyer HL, Morales JM. 2005. Scales of movement by elk (*Cervus elaphus*) in response to heterogeneity in forage resources and predation risk. Landsc Ecol. 20:273–287.

Frank, S. C., A. Ordiz, J. Gosselin, A. Hertel, J. Kindberg, M. Leclerc, F. Pelletier, S. Steyaert, O. G. Stoen, J. Van de Walle, A. Zedrosser, and J. E. Swenson. 2017. Indirect effects of bear hunting: a review from Scandinavia. Ursus 28:150-164.

Frank, S. C., S. M. J. G. Steyaert, J. E. Swenson, I. Storch, J. Kindberg, H. Barck, and A. Zedrosser. 2015. A "clearcut" case? brown bears slection of coars woody debris and carpenter ants on clearcuts. Forest Ecology and Managment 348:164-173.

Guilford, T., J. Meade, J. Willis, R. Phillips, D. Boyle, S.Roberts, et al. 2009. Migration and stopover in a smallpelagic seabird, the Manx shearwater Puffinus puffinus: insights from machine learning. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.,276:1215–1223.

Gurarie, E. (2013) bcpa: Behavioural Change Point Analysis of Animal Movement (R package version 1.0).

Gurarie, E., Bracis, C., Delgado, M.M., Meckley, T.D., Kojola, I. & Wagner, C.M. (2016). What is the animal doing? Tools for exploring behavioural structure in animal movements. J. Anim. Ecol., 85, 69–84

Hayward M, Hayward G, Druce D, Kerley G. 2009. Do fences constrain predator movements on an evolutionary scale? Home range, food intake and movement patterns of large predators reintroduced to Addo Elephant National Park, South Africa. Biodivers Conserv. 18:887–904.

Hertel, A. G., R. Bischof, O. Langval, A. Mysterud, J. Kindberg, J. E. Swenson, and A. Zedrosser. (2018). Berry production drives bottom-up effects on body mass and reproductive success in an omnivore. Oikos 127:197-207.

Hertel A.G., Steyaert SM, Zedrosser A, Mysterud A, Lodberg-Holm HK, Gelink HW, Kindberg J, Swenson JE. (2016a). Bears and berries: species specific selective foraging on a patchily distributed food resource in a human-altered landscape. Behav Ecol Sociobiol. 70:831–842.

Hertel A.G., Zedrosser A, Mysterud A, Støen OG, Steyaert SM, Swenson JE. (2016b). Temporal effects of hunting on foraging behaviour of an apex predator: do bears forego foraging when risk is high? Oecologia. 182:1019–1029.

Hess, S. & Palma, D. (2019), Apollo version 0.1.0, user manual, www.ApolloChoiceModelling.com.

Hooten, M. B., Johnson, D. S., McClintock, B. T., & Morales, J. M. (2017). Animal movement: Statistical models for telemetry data. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press

Iraganaboina, N. C., & Eluru, N. (2021). An examination of factors affecting residential energy consumption using a multiple discrete continuous approach. Energy and Buildings, 240, 110934.

559 Johnson CJ, Parker KL, Heard DC, Gillingham MP. 2002. Movement parameters of ungulates and scale-
560 specific responses to the environment. J Anim Ecol. 71:225–235.
561 Jønsson, K.A., Tøttrup, A.P., Borregaard, M.K., Keith, S.A., Rahbek, C., & Thorup, K. (2016). Tracking Animal
562 693 Dispersal: From Individual Movement to Community Assembly and Global Range 694 Dynamics.
563 Trends in ecology & evolution, 31(3), 204-214.
564 Karasov, W. H. 1992. Daily energy expenditure and the cost of activity in mammals. American Zoologist
565 32:238-248.
566 Kapur, A., Bhat, C., 2007. Modeling adults' weekend day-time use by activity purpose and accompaniment
567 arrangement. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board (2021), 18–
568 27.
569 Kays, R., Crofoot, M. C., Jetz, W., & Wikelski, M. (2015). Terrestrial animal tracking as an eye on life and
570 planet. Science.
571 Knopff, K. H., Knopff, A. A., Warren, M. B., and Boyce, M. S. (2009). Evaluating global positioning system
572 telemetry techniques for estimating cougar predation parameters. The Journal of Wildlife Management
573 73, 586–597.
574 Kranstauber, B., Kays, R., LaPoint, S.D., Wikelski, M. & Safi, K. (2012) A dynamic Brownian bridge movement
575 model to estimate utilization distributions for heterogeneous animal movement. Journal of Animal
576 Ecology, 81, 738–746.
577 Langrock, R., King, R., Matthiopoulos, J., Thomas, L., Fortin, D. & Morales, J.M. (2012) Flexible and practical
578 modeling of animal telemetry data: hidden Markov models and extensions. Ecology, 93, 2336–2342.
579 Loettker P, Rummel A, Traube M, Stache A, Sustr P, Mueller J, Heurich M. 2009. New possibilities of
580 observing animal behaviour from a distance using activity sensors in GPS-collars: an attempt to calibrate
581 remotely collected activity data with direct behavioural observations in red deer *Cervus elaphus*. Wildl
582 Biol. 15:425–434.
583 Lu, H., Hess, S., Daly, A., & Rohr, C. (2017). Measuring the impact of alcohol multi-buy promotions on
584 consumers' purchase behaviour. Journal of Choice Modelling, 24, 75-95.
585 Manchi, S., and J. E. Swenson. 2005. Denning behaviour of Scandinavian brown bears Ursus arctos. Wildlife
586 Biology 11:123-132.
587 Manly BF, McDonald LL, Thomas DL, McDonald TL, Erickson WP: Resource selection by animals: statistical
588 design and analysis for field studies. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers; 2002.
589 Marshall, H. H., A. J. Carter, T. Coulson, J. M. Rowcliffe, and G. Cowlishaw. (2013). Exploring foraging
590 decisions in a social primate using discrete-choice models. American Naturalist 180:481–495.
591 McDonald, T.L., Manly, B.F.J., Nielson, R.M. & Diller, L.V. (2006) Discrete-choice modeling in wildlife studies
592 exemplified by northern spotted owl nighttime habitat selection. Journal of Wildlife Management, 70,
593 375–383.
594 Merrill E, Sand H, Zimmermann B, McPhee H, Webb N, Hebblewhite M, Wabakken P, Frair JL. 2010.
595 Building a mechanistic understanding of predation with GPS-based movement data. Philos Trans R Soc
596 Lond B Biol Sci. 365:2279–2288.
597
598 Moe TF, Kindberg J, Jansson I, Swenson JE (2007) Importance of diel behaviour when studying habitat
599 selection: examples from female Scandinavian brown bears (Ursus arctos). Can J Zool 85(4):518–525.
600 Mondal, A., and Bhat, C. R. 2021 "A New Closed Form Multiple Discrete-Continuous Extreme Value
601 (MDCEV) Choice Model with Multiple Linear Constraints". Transportation Research Part B, pp. 42-66.
602 Moorcroft, P.R., Lewis, M.A. & Crabtree, R.L. (1999). Home range analysis using a mechanistic home range
603 model. Ecology, 80, 1656–1665.
604 Morales, J. M. et al. (2010). Building the bridge between animal movement and population dynamics. –
605 Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B 365: 2289–2301.

606 Nagy, K.A. et al. (1999) Energetics of free-ranging mammals, reptiles, and birds. Annu. Rev. Nutr. 19, 247–
607 277.
608 Nathan, R., W. Getz, E. Revilla, M. Holyoak, R. Kadmon, D. Saltz, and P. Smouse. 2008. A movement ecology
609 paradigm for unifying organismal movement research. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,
610 105:19052–19059.
611 Ordiz, A., O.-G. Støen, S. Sæbø, J. Kindberg, and J. E. Swenson. 2012. Do bears know they are being hunted?
612 Biological Conservation 152:21-28.
613 Ordiz A, Støen O-G, Delibes M, Swenson JE (2011) Predators or prey? Spatio-temporal discrimination of
614 human-derived risk by brown bears. Oecologia 166: 59–67.
615 Palma, D. and Hess, S. 2022. "Extending the Multiple Discrete Continuous (MDC) modelling framework to
616 consider complementarity, substitution, and an unobserved budget". Transportation Research Part B:
617 Methodological, pp. 13 - 35.
618 Palomares ML Pauly D (1989) A multiple regression model for prediction the food consumption of Marine
619 Fish populations. Marine and Freshwater Research 40, 259-273.
620 Patterson, T.A., Thomas, L., Wilcox, C., Ovaskainen, O. & Matthiopoulos, J. (2008). State–space models of
621 individual animal movement. Trends Ecol. Evol., 23, 87–94.
622 Pedersen, M. W., T. A. Patterson, U. H. Thygesen, and H. Madsen. (2011). Estimating animal behaviour and
623 residency from movement data. Oikos 120:1281–1290.
624 Pinjari, A. R., Bhat, C., 2010. A multiple discrete–continuous nested extreme value (mdcnev) model:
625 formulation and application to non-worker activity time-use and timing behaviour on weekdays.
626 Transportation Research Part B: Methodological 44 (4), 562–583.
627 Pitman, R. T., Swanepoel, L. H., and Ramsay, P. M. (2012). Predictive modelling of leopard predation using
628 contextual Global Positioning System cluster analysis. Journal of Zoology 288, 222–230.
629 Pyke, G.H., 2019, Optimal foraging theory: An introduction. In Encyclopedia of animal behaviour, 2nd ed.;
630 Choe, J.C., Ed.; Academic Press: Oxford, UK, pp. 111–117.
631 R Core Team (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical
632 Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.R-project.org/.
633 Rauset GR, Kindberg J, Swenson JE (2012) Modeling female brown bear kill rates on moose calves using
634 global positioning satellite data. J Wildl Manag 76:1597–1606
635 Ropert-Coudert, Y. & Wilson, R. P. 2005 Trends and perspectives in animal-attached remote sensing. Front.
636 Ecol. Environ. 3, 437–444. (doi:10.1890/1540-9295(2005) 003[0437:TAPIAR]2.0.CO;2)
637 Ryan PG, Petersen SL, Peters G, Gremillet D (2004) GPS tracking a marine predator: the effects of precision,
638 resolution and sampling rate on foraging tracks of African Penguins. Mar Biol, 145:215–223.
639 Schick, R.S., Loarie, S.R., Colchero, F., Best, B.D., Boustany, A., Conde, D.A. et al. (2008). Understanding
640 movement data and movement processes: current and emerging directions. Ecol. Lett., 11, 1338–1350.
641 Shamoun-Baranes J, Bom R, van Loon EE, Ens BJ, Oosterbeek K, Bouten W. 2012. From sensor data to
642 animal behaviour: an oystercatcher example. PLoS One. 7:e37997.
643 Signer, J., Fieberg, J., & Avgar, T. (2019). Animal movement tools (amt): R package for managing tracking
644 data and conducting habitat selection analyses. Ecology and Evolution, 9, 880–890.
645 Squires JR, DeCesare NJ, Olson LE, et al. (2013) Combining resource selection and movement behaviour to
646 predict corridors for Canada lynx at their southern range periphery. Biological Conservation 157: 187–195.
647 Stelmock, J., and F. C. Dean. 1986. Brown bear activity and habitat use, Denali National Park—1980.
648 International Conference on Bear Research and Management 6:155–167
649 Stenset, N. E., Lutnæs, P. N., Bjarnad´ottir, V., Dahle, B., Fossum, K. H., Jigsved, P., Johansen, T., Neumann,
650 W., Opseth, O., Rønning, O., et al. (2016). Seasonal and annual variation in the diet of brown bears ursus
651 arctos in the boreal forest of southcentral sweden. Wildlife Biology 22 (3), 107–117.
652 Stephens, D.W.; Brown, J.S. & Ydenberg, R.C. (2007). *Foraging: Behaviour and Ecology*. Chicago: University
653 of Chicago Press

654 Swenson, J. E., F. Sandegren, A. Bjärvall, A. Söderberg, P. Wabakken, and R. Franzén. 1994. Size, trend,
655 distribution and conservation of the brown bear Ursus arctos population in Sweden. Biological
656 Conservation 70:9-17.
657 Tambling, C. J., Cameron, E. Z., Du Toit, J. T., and Getz, W. M. (2010). Methods for locating African lion kills
658 using global positioning system movement data. The Journal of Wildlife Management 74, 549–556.
659 doi:10.2193/2009-010
660 Thurfjell H., Ciuti S., Boyce M. S., (2014) Applications of stepselection functions in ecology and
661 conservation. Mov. Ecol. 2, 4. doi: 10.1186/2051-3933-2-4; pmid: 25520815.
662 van Moorter, B., Visscher, D.R., Jerde, C.L., Frair, J.L. & Merrill, E.H. (2010) Identifying movement states
663 from location data using cluster analysis. Journal of Wildlife Management, 74, 588–594.
664 Van Nostrand, C., Sivaraman, V., & Pinjari, A. R. (2013). Analysis of long-distance vacation travel demand
665 in the United States: A multiple discrete–continuous choice framework. Transportation, 40(1), 151-171.
666 Vardakis M, Goos P, Adriaensen F, Matthysen E (2015) Discrete choice modelling of natal dispersal:
667 "choosing" where to breed from a finite set of available areas. Methods Ecol Evol 6:997– 1006.
668 Webb, N. F., Hebblewhite, M., and Merrill, E. H. (2008). Statistical methods for identifying wolf kill sites
669 using global positioning system locations. The Journal of Wildlife Management 72, 798–807.