1 **Impulsivity and Behaviour Problems in Dogs: A Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory**

2 **Perspective**

3 Patrizia Piotti[a,1]*, Liam Paul Satchell[a,2], Tom Steven Lockhart[a]

4

5 **Affiliations**

6 [a] Department of Psychology, University of Portsmouth, King Henry Building, King Henry 1st

7 Street Portsmouth, PO1 2DY, U.K.

8

9 ***Corresponding author:** Patrizia.piotti@yahoo.it

10

11 **Present/permanent address**

12 [1] Department of Ethology, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Pázmány Péter sétány 1/c, 1117,

13 Budapest, Hungary

14 [2] School of Law and Criminology, University of West London, St Mary's Rd, London, W5 5RF,

15 U.K.

16

17

18

1. Introduction

Trait impulsivity is stirring growing interest among comparative researchers. One species where the trait is being extensively investigated is the domestic dog (*Canis familiaris*) (e.g. Miller et al., 2010, 2012; Fadel et al., 2016; Riemer et al., 2014; Wright et al., 2011, 2012). Research shows theoretical and evidential convergence between human and dog impulsivity. For example, consistent neuro-behavioural individual differences in cognitive control are found in dogs (Cook et al., 2016) as well as humans (e.g. Kane and Engle, 2002). Likewise, both in dogs and humans, self-control relies on biological mechanisms related to blood glucose levels (Miller, et al., 2010). There are also indications of human-dog convergence regarding genotype-phenotype associations for trait impulsivity (humans: Munafó et al., 2008; dogs: Hejjas et al., 2009; Wan et al., 2013). Impulsivity in dogs is also related to behaviours similar to human psychological disorders. For example, genetic and behavioural homologies between dogs and humans have been observed in relation to the Attention Deficit and Hyperactive Disorder (ADHD) (e.g. Hejjas et al., 2009; Vas et al., 2007), as measured in dogs through a rating scale for the assessment of ADHD in children, reworded for describing dog behaviour (Vas et al., 2007) and a behaviour battery (Kubinyi et al., 2012). Another typical case is the relationship between high impulsivity and aggressive behaviour, which has also been observed both in humans (Apter, et al., 1990) and dogs (Amat et al., 2013; Wright et al., 2012).

The current study brings together a biologically based human measure of impulsivity and a well validated dog measure of impulsivity, to investigate the extent to which the measures show convergence.

Trait impulsivity may be measured in domestic dogs with questionnaire scales, such as the Dog Impulsivity Assessment Scale (DIAS; Wright et al., 2011). The DIAS provides an overall questionnaire score (OQS), which directly reflects the dog owner's opinion on how impulsive their dog is and resulted to be higher in dogs with behaviour problems (Wright et al., 2011) as well as

44   behavioural measures (Brady et al., 2018). However, the scale also provides three independent

45   sub-factors, which can reflect distinct nuanced features of dog impulsivity. Factor 1, 'Behaviour

46   Regulation' factor provides a more focused measure of impulsivity: high scores relates to having

47   little control over a response to stimuli, little thinking before acting and being impatient, on the

48   other side relates to showing extreme physiological signs when being excited. Factor 2,

49   'Aggression and Response to Novelty' relates to lower tolerance thresholds to potentially aversive

50   stimuli: individuals with high scores are less keen on new situations and more likely to respond

51   aggressively to stimuli. Factor 3, 'Responsiveness' relates to general responsiveness and

52   environmental awareness: high scores reflect high trainability, long interest in stimuli and quick

53   reactions (Wright et al., 2011). The scale was found to relate to variation in the behaviour

54   observed in two systematically manipulated experimental designs, i.e. a delayed reward choice

55   test (Wright et al., 2012) and, for the OQS and Factor 1, a spatial discounting test (Brady et al.,

56   2018); correlations were found also between the DIAS scores and variation in physiological

57   factors - i.e. serotonin metabolites (5-HIAA) levels (Wright et al., 2012). This suggests that the

58   DIAS is a reliable measure of trait impulsivity in domestic dogs. Further investigations have

59   indicated that DIAS scores and cognitive measures in behaviour tests remain stable over time,

60   suggesting that personality trait of impulsivity is consistent over time (Riemer et al., 2014; Fadel

61   et al., 2016).

62   In a broader sense trait impulsivity, as measured by the DIAS, may also be regarded as

63   part of a wider network of theories investigating dispositional approach and avoidance behaviour.

64   In this paper, we investigated how one such theory, the Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory (RST)

65   of personality, might be of interest to research areas on dogs' individual differences.

66   RST is a neuropsychological account of the neural and cognitive processes underlying the

67   major dimensions of personality (Corr, 2008). The theory describes three neurologically defined

68   systems which influence the organism's behaviours; the Behavioural Approach System (BAS,

69   activated by signals of reward), the Behavioural Inhibition System (BIS, related to the monitoring

70   and resolution of conflict between compelling goals) and the Fight-Flight-Freeze System (FFFS,

71   activated by aversive stimuli). The BAS has its neural basis in the dopaminergic reward circuitry

72   (Pickering and Gray, 2001) and underlies any behaviour that involves approaching appetitive

73   stimuli, whether it is to eat food or attack a prey. Because of this, the BAS is related to personality

74   traits such as optimism, reward-orientation and impulsivity (Corr, 2004). The neural basis of the

75   FFFS is the periaqueductal grey and medial hypothalamus (McNaughton and Corr, 2004). On a

76   proximal level, the system is activated in response to aversive stimuli, encouraging active

77   avoidance behaviours, and is responsible for personality traits such as proneness to fear (Corr &

78   McNaughton, 2008). The BIS can be related to the septo-hippocampal system (Gray &

79   McNaughton, 2000; Miller, 1991). The BIS is concerned with the monitoring and resolution of

80   conflict between incompatible but equally compelling approach and avoidance goals. In humans,

81   a strong presence of trait BIS is experienced as repetitive thoughts, rumination and anxiety

82   (Andersen, Moore, Venables & Corr, 2008; Markarian, Pickett, Deveson & Kanona, 2013; Morgan

83   et al., 2009). While low trait BIS is manifested as risk proneness and has been linked to Attention

84   Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (Gomez, Woodworth, Waugh & Corr, 2012).

85   RST is highly relevant to the non-human animal research as it was developed from

86   experimental non-human animal behaviour research (Gray, 1987; Wilson, Barrett & Gray, 1989).

87   In fact, several RST neurological studies have been performed on non-human animals, such as

88   rodents (Ito & Lee, 2016; Young & McNaughton, 2008) and even AI programs have been coded

89   using RST (Fua, Horswill, Ortony & Revelle, 2009). RST is especially useful when observing

90   behaviour in non-verbalising species, as tendencies of approaching or avoiding aspects of the

91   environment are readily codeable, in that behaviour measures may be unambiguous, such as

92   increasing and decreasing of distances from a specific stimulus (see Budaev, 1997; Mather &

93   Anderson, 1993). Finally, the strong focus on overt behaviour in experimental settings, such as

94   go/no-go tasks, (Moore, Mills, Marshman & Corr, 2012) aids objective scoring of behaviour by

95   human observers.

96   There are also some examples where elements drawn from RST have been employed in

97   the development of frameworks directed, for example, to domestic animal research of affective

98   states (Mendl, Burman & Paul, 2010) or individual differences in sensitivity to punishment and

99   reward (Sheppards & Mills, 2002). To our knowledge, however, the RST of personality has not

100   been applied in its entirety to companion animals' research (i.e. without integration within further

101   theories). It is therefore not yet clear to which degree RST may be relevant to companion animals

102   and whether there is any overlapping with existing theories. For this reason, it was of interest to

103   place domestic dogs' trait impulsivity in an RST theoretical network.

104   Dogs were chosen as a species of interest because they are adapted to life with humans

105   and share human social environment (Hare & Tomasello, 2002; Miklósi et al., 2003), which makes

106   them an ideal and convenient model of comparison in the study of personality (Gosling et al.,

107   2003). Additionally, the investigation of frameworks that are able to predict individual traits

108   potentially linked to increased risk of developing behaviour problems in dogs has implications for

109   animal welfare. For example, there are indications that aggressive behaviour in dogs may relate

110   to neurotransmitters linked to impulsivity (Amat et al., 2013; Wright et al., 2012), a low BIS or high

111   BAS-related trait. Aggressive responses may also be fear-related in dogs (van der Borg, Graat

112   and Beerda, 2017; Zapata, Serpell and Alvarez, 2017), i.e. relevant to the FFFS. For example,

113   tendency to engage in active avoidant behaviours like barking or growling could be seen as

114   defensive behaviours, reflected in the FFFS. Or it could be the case that high trait BIS leads to

115   better inhibition of destructive behaviour that may occur when the animal is distressed.

116   Consistently with the theoretical link between impulsivity and behaviour inhibition, it has been

117   observed that depletion of self-control is linked to risk proneness in dogs (Miller et al., 2012).

118   The current study brings together the DIAS (Wright et al., 2011) and a psychometric

119   measure of RST (adapted from a children-focused scale; Cooper et al., 2017). As stated above,

120   the principal reason for including both DIAS and RST measures is due to the mutual importance

121   of trait impulsivity. We therefore predicted a positive association between the DIAS 'Behaviour

122 Regulation' trait (which is correlated with the spatial discounting test of impulsivity, Brady et al.,

123 2018) and the RST BAS (which includes impulsivity) traits. Further, given that RST BIS is arguably

124 the inverse of impulsivity and we expected this factor to negatively relate to the DIAS impulsivity

125 measures. We had an exploratory approach regarding the relationship between the other factors

126 of the RST and DIAS measures. Further we investigated the relationships between behavioural

127 problems and the personality measures. Given that the DIAS was designed with behavioural

128 problems in mind, we predicted that the DIAS traits predict behavioural problems. It was expected

129 that FFFS would positively correlate with avoidance behaviours (e.g. biting, barking, cowering,

130 trying to escape). We had no other explicit hypotheses for the relationship between the RST

131 measures and the behavioural problems.

132

133 **2. Material and Methods**

134

135 **2.1. Procedure & Questionnaires**

136 The current study was approved by the University of Portsmouth's Science Faculty Ethics

137 Committee (2017 - 026). The described work been performed in accordance with the Code of

138 Ethics of the World Medical Association (Declaration of Helsinki) for experiments involving

139 humans. Responses were provided anonymously by the participants. This work did not involve

140 direct experimentation, observation or interaction with live animals and ethics was required for

141 the data collection with animal owners.

142 After providing informed consent, participants completed the RST personality trait

143 questionnaire. This measure was adapted from the 'Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory Personality

144 Questionnaire - Child (RSTPQ-C, 21 items; Cooper et al., 2017): for the current study, the

145 RSTPQ-C was reworded into a format that allowed owners to report on their dogs' behaviour,

146 creating a Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory Personality Questionnaire-Dog (RSTPQ-D). Care

147 was taken so that the RST system each question was referring to was not altered. In order to

148 imitate the RSTPQ-C, the RSTPQ-D was also answered on a four-point scale with the options;

149 *Not at all* (scoring 1), *Slightly* (2), *Moderately* (3) and *Highly* (4). The mean response to each of

150 the RSTPQ-D subscales was used for analysis. The RSTPQ-D has 3 subscales of 7 items each,

151 reflecting trait BIS, FFFS and BAS.

152 After completion of the RSTPQ-D, participants completed the 18 item DIAS. DIAS

153 response is measured on a 5 point scale from *Strongly Agree* (5) to *Strongly Disagree* (1), with a

154 sixth *Don't know/not applicable* option. Consistent with the scoring for the DIAS (Wright et al.,

155 2011), each sub-factor was calculated as a ratio of the potential total score of items that had a

156 response (due to the *Don't know* option, participants could opt to not respond to some items). The

157 DIAS (Wright et al. 2011) has 3 factors, Factor 1 'Behavioural Regulation' (10 items, a high score

158 implies higher trait impulsivity), Factor 2 'Aggression and Response to Novelty' (5 items, a high

159 score suggests a more aggressive/aversive aversion to novelty) and Factor 3 'Responsiveness'

160 (5 items, a high score implies fast and engaged responses to new things).

161 Finally, participants were asked to answer to a checklist of 12 further questions related to

162 behaviour problems and indicate how well they described their dog's behaviour. Questions were

163 presented in a 5-point scale, from *Very much like my dog* (5), to *Not at all like my dog* (1).

164 Questions referred to aggressive behaviours (barking, growling, biting, showing teeth, snapping),

165 cowering/fearful behaviour (shaking, panting, moving away), destructive behaviour (digging,

166 chewing) and house soiling. A copy of the questionnaire is provided as Supplemental Information

167 1.

168

169 **2.2. Participants**

170 The inclusion criteria for dog owners to participate in the study were to be at least 18 years

171 old and to have owned their dog for at least 6 months at the time they participated. Responses

172 from owners of 730 adults dogs (age range: 1 - 16 years, median = 5 years, SD = 3.36, M : F =

173   1, neutered : intact = 6 : 1) were used for analysis. Dogs' demographic information is included in

174   the Supplemental Information 2.

175

176   **3. Results**

177   **3.1. Behaviour Checklist Factors.**

178   Data were analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 22 and R (R Core Team, 2015).

179   We examined the grouping of the behaviours listed in the checklist as it was expected that some

180   behaviours may co-occur in some dogs. We first used an exploratory orthogonal (varimax)

181   principal component analysis (henceforth 'EFA') with the loadings of the 12 behaviours. This

182   suggested a four factor structure (Eigenvalue= 1.69, explaining 72% of variance) and grouped

183   the behaviours in the checklist in the expected manner. A confirmatory factor analysis (henceforth

184   'CFA') further evidenced this (χ^2 (df= 48) = 153.90, p < 0.001, CFI= 0.97, RMSEA= 0.06). The four

185   factors generated related to Active Avoidance (i.e. increasing distance from a perceived threat),

186   Passive Avoidance (i.e. withholding interaction with a perceived threat), Destructive and

187   Inappropriate Elimination Behaviours. Active Avoidance Behaviours consisted of frequency of

188   Snapping (EFA loading= 0.89; CFA loading= 0.86), Biting (0.91; 0.92), Growling (0.82; 0.83) and

189   Barking (0.74; 0.78). Passive Avoidance Behaviours constituted of frequency of Avoiding others

190   (0.83; 0.95), Shaking (0.83; 0.96) and Panting (0.78; 0.87). Destructive Behaviours included

191   frequent Damaging of objects (0.81; 0.71), Digging (0.72; 0.59) and Other Destructive behaviours

192   (0.84; 0.76). Inappropriate Elimination related to reported Defecation (0.90; 0.52) and Urination

193   (0.90; 0.74) at inappropriate locations. For further analyses, we retain aggregate response of the

194   items for each factor, with a higher score indicating stronger endorsement of that behaviour. It is

195   important to note that Inappropriate Elimination Behaviours were rarely endorsed (see Table 1)

196   as were Destructive Behaviours (to a lesser extent). There was more variation in the Active and

197   Passive Avoidance Behaviours but, on average, owners were more likely to disagree that these

198   behaviours describe their dogs than agree (see Table 1).

199

3.2. Personality Factors.

We computed average score totals for the DIAS and RSTPQ-D. The RSTPQ-D retained an acceptable fit for its factor structure (21 items into three domains of FFFS, BIS and BAS) when applied to the owner's ratings of dogs (CFA: χ^2 (df= 186) = 1001.94, p < 0.001, CFI= 0.88, RMSEA= 0.08). The descriptive statistics for these personality factors can be found in Table 1. Given that both these data and those of the behaviours are considered non-normal by Kolmogorov-Smirnov testing (table 1), we investigate relationships between our variables using Spearman's rho correlations. In order to correct for multiple comparisons, the significance level has been corrected for the number of comparisons, therefore a significance level of alpha = 0.002 was accepted (alpha = 0.05 / 24).

The RSTPQ-D's BAS measure positively correlated with the DIAS' Responsiveness (r_s(730)= 0.46, 95% CI [0.40, 0.53], p< 0.001), this suggests that the RST's BAS has a similar function to the DIAS' Responsiveness trait. There were small negative correlations with the DIAS' Aggression/Response to Novelty (r_s(730)= -0.19, 95% CI [-0.26, -0.12], p< 0.001) and Behavioural Regulation (r_s(730)= -0.12, 95% CI [-0.19, -0.05], p= 0.002).

There was a notable negative correlation between the RSTPQ-D's BIS and the DIAS' Behavioural Regulation factor (r_s(730)= -0.30, 95% CI [-0.37, -0.22], p< 0.001), reflecting that reported impulsivity is in opposition to reported inhibition. There were much weaker correlations with the DIAS' Aggression/Response to Novelty (r_s(730)= 0.15, 95% CI [0.08, 0.23], p< 0.001) and Responsiveness (r_s(730)= -0.08, 95% CI [-0.15, -0.01], p= 0.024) factors.

The RSTPQ-D's FFFS factor was largely distinct to the DIAS factors. It did not notably correlate with Behavioural Regulation (r_s(730)= -0.02, 95% CI [-0.10, 0.06], p= 0.531), Aggression/Response to Novelty (r_s(730)= 0.04, 95% CI [-0.03, 0.12], p= 0.243) or Responsiveness (r_s(730)= -0.12, 95% CI [-0.20, -0.04], p= 0.002). Overall, RST's FFFS and the DIAS' Aggression/Response to Novelty did not correlate with the behavioural factors. Both FFFS

225   and Aggression/Response to Novelty relate to avoidance-style behaviours and this result would

226   suggest that they relate to different aspects of behavioural avoidance. Fig 1. provides a visual

227   overview of the relationships between the trait factors.

228

229   **3.3. Personality and Behaviours.**

230   One aim of this study was to identify personality traits that related to common problem

231   behaviours in dogs. The correlations between personality and behaviours are reported in Table

232   2. Overall the DIAS better reflects problem behaviours than the RSTPQ-D. There are notable

233   correlations between DIAS' Behavioural Regulation (impulsivity measure) and the more overt

234   Active Avoidance and Destructive Behaviours. DIAS' Aggression/Response to Novelty positively

235   correlated with both the Active and Passive Avoidance Behaviours, implying that a trait aversion

236   to novel stimuli was more likely to lead to behavioural avoidance. DIAS' Responsiveness showed

237   no noteworthy correlations with the behaviours.

238   The RSTPQ-D had smaller correlations with the Behaviours than the DIAS. However, the

239   FFFS trait did positively correlate with Passive Avoidant traits and (weakly) negatively with Active

240   Avoidance traits and the difference in the size of these two correlations is notably large (Fisher's

241   Z test= 7.76, $p<0.001$). This suggests that the FFFS trait may reflect an axis of Active to Passive

242   Avoidant Behaviour and offer more discriminability in the *style* of avoidance behaviour than the

243   DIAS traits. BIS and BAS largely did not correlate with the behaviours.

244

245   **4. Discussion**

246   The current study investigated the overlap between measures of domestic dog

247   impulsivity (DIAS) and a broader cross-species theory of individual differences in

248   approach/avoid behaviour, Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory (Gray and McNaughton, 2000).

249   Our results show that, in dogs, RST trait inhibition (BIS) is the inverse to impulsivity, as

250   measured by the DIAS Behavioural Regulation, as hypothesised. Another interesting result is

251   the positive relationship between BAS and Responsiveness, as predicted. The DIAS

252   Responsiveness factor contains behaviours related to high trainability, interest in the

253   environment and quick reactions (Wright et al., 2011). Such behaviours intuitively relate to trait

254   BAS, which promotes reward seeking and goal-oriented behaviours (Corr, 2004). These

255   findings suggest that the RST theoretical framework can be used to complement the DIAS tool.

256   None of the DIAS facets related with the RST trait FFFS. FFFS did demonstrate a small

257   positive correlation with the Passive Avoidance behaviour problems and a negative relationship

258   with the Active Avoidance. From this, we see that FFFS is largely distinct from the DIAS model

259   but it may potentially have predictive value for fear-related behavioural problems in dogs, such

260   as aggression (in line with previous findings on dog aggression: Amat et al., 2013; Wright et al.,

261   2012). According to RST, FFFS is related to the Fight-Flight-Freeze response, which reflects

262   defensive avoidance strategies based on the perceived intensity of a threat. Threat perception

263   may be measured in terms of defensive distance, i.e. distance from a threat that causes various

264   defensive behaviours (Blanchard and Blanchard, 1988). The smallest defensive distances result

265   in explosive attack (fight response), while intermediate defensive distances lead to flight and

266   freeze (Blanchard and Blanchard, 1988; McNaughton and Corr, 2004). Interestingly, an

267   alternative measure of individual differences in dogs, the PANAS scale (Positive and Negative

268   Activation Scale, Sheppard and Mills, 2002), is partially driven from an RST scale based on an

269   earlier version of the framework (Carver and White, 1994) and measures dogs' sensitivity to

270   reward and to punishment, which reflects the directional component of the most recent version

271   of RST (Gray and McNaughton, 2000). Given the current results, investigating how the PANAS

272   relates with the updated FFFS domain would provide further evidence of the applicability of RST

273   to the investigation of dog behaviour.

274   The relationship between DIAS-Behaviour Regulation and Active Avoidance /

275   Destructiveness (both characterised by high activity levels) also suggests that such behaviours

276   might relate to mechanisms such as frustration and lack of self-control. Such a possibility is in

11

277 line with the human literature, where low BIS is associated with risk proneness and ADHD

278 (Gomez, Woodworth, Waugh & Corr, 2012) and the canine literature, where high impulsivity, as

279 measured with the DIAS, is associated with aggressive behaviour (Wright et al., 2012). While it

280 is not possible to draw conclusions on similar patterns in dogs, given the established similarities

281 between human and dog ADHD (Hejjas et al., 2009; Kubinyi et al., 2012; Vas et al., 2007), it

282 may be also of interest to understand whether RST relates with the existing measures of canine

283 ADHD.

284   Overall, the current results highlight how RST might be potentially of interest for the

285 investigation of dogs' individual differences, especially in the investigation of approach and

286 avoidance behaviour. We suggest that the questions relating to the FFFS factor of the RSTPQ-

287 D could integrate the existing DIAS scale. We also suggest that future research should look

288 further into how RST framework may be used to interpret results obtained from the DIAS. In

289 order to further explore this possibility, future research on the relationship between RST and

290 trait dog behaviour should be investigated through behavioural experiments, providing direct

291 observation of behaviour under systematic manipulation. Various existing experimental

292 paradigms have indicated individual differences in dogs based on approach and avoidance

293 behaviours (e.g. cognitive bias test, Starling et al., 2014; response to threat, Vas et al., 2008).

294 There is also evidence that difference in persistence affects dogs' strategies when trying to

295 retrieve a food reward in the presence of a cognitive conflict, such as in the so-called *unsolvable*

296 *task* (Marshall-Pescini et al., 2017). Finally, several experimental tasks have been developed to

297 measure inhibitory control in dogs (which is supposedly related to impulsive behaviour as

298 measured by the DIAS, Wright et al., 2011), suggesting a subdivision in persistency,

299 compulsivity and decision speed (Brucks et al., 2017). This subdivision suggests it may be of

300 interest to investigate how the result of these behaviour tests relate with the RST domains.

301 Given the existing strong neurobiology basis of RST, it is also worthy to consider that

302 behavioural findings should be followed up by electrophysiological measures, typical of the RST

12

303   literature - for example, in humans, behaviour tests based on go/no go and stop signal tasks are

304   paired with EEG measurements (Brier et al., 2010; Moore et al., 2012; Shadli, Glue, McIntosh &

305   McNaughton, 2015). Finally, RST work could also be extended to other non-human species

306   where individual differences research focuses on approach-avoid behaviours (e.g. birds: Meier

307   et al., 2017; sheep: Beausoleil et al., 2005; sharks: Byrnes and Brown, 2016; Finger et al., 2016;

308   minks: Malmkvist et al., 2003)

309   The current study revolves on data coded by dog-owners rather than direct observations

310   of dogs' behaviour, which may be considered a limitation of the presented work. Although care

311   was taken to avoid questions on "internalised" processes, it should be understood that the

312   responses reflect the owner's interpretation of their dog's behaviour. However, previous

313   research indicates that dog owners are relatively reliable in describing their dogs' behaviour

314   (Gosling et al., 2003). Additionally, the DIAS scale has been validated against experimental

315   measures and for consistency over time (Wright et al., 2011; Riemer et al., 2014; Fadel et al.,

316   2016). Moreover, the aim of the current study was to measure correlations between the two

317   scales, RSTPQ-D and DIAS, rather than informing on the validity of an RST measure in itself.

318   Validation should be in fact a consideration for future studies.

319   Another consideration regards the relatively small correlations observed between the

320   RST and the DIAS factors. This may suggest that part of the observed variance might be

321   attributable to external factors (Ferguson, 2009) not considered in this study, such as breed

322   differences or training experience. These and other potential confounders should be evaluated

323   in the future.

324   Finally, it is noteworthy that the current findings support the idea that investigating the

325   potential applications to RST to non-human animals may provide benefits also to animal

326   welfare. Versions of RST scales (e.g. Carver and White, 1994; Gray 1994; McNaughton & Corr,

327   2008) have been beneficial to the development of frameworks, based on approach and

328   avoidance, to be used in non-human animal research (e.g. Sheppard and Mills, 2002; Mendl et

329   al., 2010), providing evidence that RST may be relevant to companion animals in general and

330   dogs specifically. For example, research based on measuring dogs' tendency to approach

331   rewarding stimuli and avoid unpleasant ones, has led to the demonstration of a negative

332   cognitive bias in dogs affected by separation related issues (Burman et al., 2009). Additionally,

333   a scale (PANAS), which partially draws from an earlier version of RST, proved to be useful in

334   measuring sensitivity to reward and punishment in dogs, which is particularly relevant to predict

335   the success of dog training or veterinary behaviour medicine interventions (Sheppard and Mills,

336   2002). Indeed, RST provides a theoretical framework grounded on neurobiological evidence to

337   understand traits related to behaviour issues, such as impulsive behaviour or anxiety. The

338   partial overlapping between the RSTPQ-D and the DIAS and the relationship of the FFFS facet

339   with reported behaviour issues potentially related to fear and anxiety (avoidance behaviours)

340   further advocates for the investigation of RST as a tool to understand companion animals'

341   behaviour. Given the necessary validation, RST might, in the future, aid the selection of

342   treatments in clinical cases through a better distinction between FFFS-fear behaviours and BIS-

343   anxiety behaviours, in line with the definitions provided by Gray and McNaughton (2000),

344   especially in those cases characterised by immobility as behavioural response, which might

345   reflect freezing behaviour (activation of FFFS) or conflict (activation of BIS). Again, RST has

346   proved to be beneficial in human psychology for the identification of markers for the risk to

347   develop psychological disorders (e.g. anxiety, Shadli et al., 2015); similar research directions

348   could be explored in veterinary behaviour medicine, especially in the presence of other known

349   environmental risk factors, such as dogs adopted from pet shops or shelters (Cannas et al.,

350   2017). Nevertheless, benefits may be extended also to other species, even beyond domestic

351   animals. For example, inhibitory control in a stop-signal task has been linked to increased fit and

352   survival in pheasants (Whiteside et al., 2016).

353

354   **4.1. Conclusion**

355   In conclusion, the findings of this work suggest an overlap between RST and the

356   constructs of trait impulsivity in dogs (as measured by the DIAS). However, this is a starting

357   point, the aim of which is to suggest RST as a useful framework for the cross-specific

358   investigation of individual differences. Future experimental and large scale personality studies

359   will allow for the comprehensive framework of RST to contribute to the literature on dogs' and

360   other non-human animals' welfare and behaviour.

361

365

370

371   **References**

372

373   1. Amat, M., Le Brech, S., Camps, T., Torrente, C., Mariotti, V. M., Ruiz, J. L., & Manteca, X.

374   (2013). Differences in serotonin serum concentration between aggressive English cocker

375   spaniels and aggressive dogs of other breeds. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior: Clinical*

376   *Applications and Research*, *8*(1), 19-25.

377   2. Andersen, S. B., Moore, R. A., Venables, L., & Corr, P. J. (2009) Electrophysiological

378   correlates of anxious rumination. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 71(2), 156–

379   169.

380   3. Apter A., van Praag H. M., Plutchik R., Sevy S., Korn M., Brown S-L. (1990)

381   Interrelationships among anxiety, aggression, impulsivity, and mood: A serotonergically

382   linked cluster? *Psychiatry Research*, 32(2), 191–199.

383   4. Beausoleil, N. J., Stafford, K. J., & Mellor, D. J. (2005) Sheep show more aversion to a dog

384   than to a human in an arena test. *Applied animal behaviour science*, *91*(3), 219-232.

385   5. Blanchard, D. C., & Blanchard, R. J. (1988) Ethoexperimental approaches to the biology of

386   emotion. *Annual review of psychology, 39*(1), 43-68.

387   6. Brady, K., Hewison, L., Wright, H., Zulch, H., Cracknell, N., & Mills, D. (2018) A spatial

388   discounting test to assess impulsivity in dogs. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*.

389   7. Brier, M. R., Ferree, T. C., Maguire, M. J., Moore, P., Spence, J., Tillman, G. D., Hart Jr, J.

390   and Kraut, M. A. (2010) Frontal theta and alpha power and coherence changes are

391   modulated by semantic complexity in Go/NoGo tasks. *International Journal of*

392   *Psychophysiology, 78*(3), pp.215-224.

393   8. Budaev, S. V. (1997) Alternative styles in the European wrasse, Symphodus ocellatus:

394   boldness-related schooling tendency. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *49*(1), 71-78.

395   9. Cannas, S., Talamonti, Z., Mazzola, S., Minero, M., Picciolini, A., & Palestrini, C. (2017).

396   Factors associated with dog behavior problems referred to a behavior clinic. *Journal of*

397   *Veterinary Behavior*.

398   10. Cook P. F., Spivak M, Berns G (2016) Neurobehavioral evidence for individual differences

399   in canine cognitive control: an awake fMRI study. *Animal cognition*, 19(5), 867-878.

400   11. Cooper, A. J., Stirling, S., Dawe, S., Pugnaghi, G., & Corr, P. J. (2017) The reinforcement

401   sensitivity theory of personality in children: A new questionnaire. *Personality and Individual*

402   *Differences*, 115, 65–69.

403   12. Corr, P. J. & McNaughton, N. (2008) Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory and personality. In

404   P. J. Corr (ed.), The Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory of Personality (pp. 155-187).

405   Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

406   13. Fadel, F.R., Driscoll, P., Pilot, M., Wright, H., Zulch, H. and Mills, D. (2016) Differences in

407   trait impulsivity indicate diversification of dog breeds into working and show lines. *Scientific*

408   *reports*, *6*, p.22162.

409   14. Ferguson, C.J. (2009) An effect size primer: a guide for clinicians and

410   researchers. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *40*(5), p.532.

411   *15.* Fua, K., Horswill, I., Ortony, A., & Revelle, W. (2009) *Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory and*

412   *Cognitive Architectures* (AAAI Technical Repots FS-09-01). Arlington: AAAI Press

413   16. Gray, J. A., McNaughton, N. (2000) The neuropsychology of anxiety: an enquiry into the

414   functions of the septo-hippocampal system, 2nd ed., Oxford University Press.

415   17. Goldberg L. R. (1990) An alternative "description of personality": the big-five factor

416   structure. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 59(6), 1216.

417   18. Gomez, R., Woodworth, R., Waugh, M., & Corr, P. J. (2012) Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity

418   Disorder symptoms in an adult sample: Associations with Cloninger's temperament and

419   character dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(3), 290–294.

420   19. Gosling S. D., Kwan V. S., John O. P. (2003) A dog's got personality: a cross-species

421   comparative approach to personality judgments in dogs and humans. *Journal of*

422   *personality and social psychology*, 85(6), 1161.

423   20. Hare, B., Brown, M., Williamson, C., & Tomasello, M. (2002) The domestication of social

424   cognition in dogs. *Science*, *298*(5598), 1634-1636.

425   21. Hejjas K., Kubinyi E., Ronai Z., Szekely A., Vas J., Miklósi Á., Sasvari-Szekely M.,

426   Kereszturi E (2009) Molecular and behavioral analysis of the intron 2 repeat polymorphism

427   in the canine dopamine D4 receptor gene. *Genes, Brain and Behavior*, 8(3), 330-336.

428   22. Ito, R., & Lee, A. C. H. (2016) The role of the hippocampus in approach-avoidance conflict

429   decision-making: Evidence from rodent and human studies. *Behavioural Brain Research*,

430   313, 345–357.

431   23. Leary T. (1957) Interpersonal Diagnosis of Personality: A Functional Theory and

432   Methodology for Personality Evaluation. Ronald: New York.

433   24. Markarian, S. A., Pickett, S. M., Deveson, D. F., & Kanona, B. B. (2013) A model of

434   BIS/BAS sensitivity, emotion regulation difficulties, and depression, anxiety, and stress

435   symptoms in relation to sleep quality. *Psychiatry Research*, 210(1), 281–286.

436   25. Mather, J. A., & Anderson, R. C. (1993) Personalities of octopuses (*Octopus*

437   *rubescens*). *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, *107*(3), 336

438   26. Meier, C., Pant, S.R., van Horik, J.O., Laker, P.R., Langley, E.J., Whiteside, M.A.,

439   Verbruggen, F. and Madden, J.R., (2017) A novel continuous inhibitory-control task:

440   variation in individual performance by young pheasants (*Phasianus colchicus*). *Animal*

441   *cognition*, *20*(6), pp.1035-1047.

442   27. Miller, H. C., Pattison, K. F., DeWall, C. N., Rayburn-Reeves, R., & Zentall, T. R. (2010)

443   Self-control without a "self"? Common self-control processes in humans and dogs.

444   *Psychological science*, 21(4), 534-538.

445   28. Miller, H. C., DeWall, C. N., Pattison, K., Molet, M., & Zentall, T. R. (2012) Too dog tired to

446   avoid danger: Self-control depletion in canines increases behavioral approach toward an

447   aggressive threat. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, *19*(3), 535-540.

448   29. Malmkvist, J., Herskin, M. S., & Christensen, J. W. (2003) Behavioural responses of farm

449   mink towards familiar and novel food. *Behavioural processes*, *61*(3), 123-130.

450   30. Moore, R. A., Mills, M., Marshman, P., & Corr, P. J. (2012) Behavioural Inhibition System

451   (BIS) sensitivity differentiates EEG theta responses during goal conflict in a continuous

452   monitoring task. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, *85*(2), 135-144.

453   31. Morgan, B. E., van Honk, J., Hermans, E. J., Scholten, M. R., Stein, D. J., & Kahn, R. S.

454   (2009) Gray's BIS/BAS dimensions in non-comorbid, non-medicated social anxiety

455   disorder. *The World Journal of Biological Psychiatry*, *10*(4-3), 925-928.

456   32. Munafò M. R., Yalcin B., Willis-Owen S. A., Flint J. (2008) Association of the dopamine D4

457   receptor (DRD4) gene and approach-related personality traits: meta-analysis and new

458   data. *Biological psychiatry*, 63(2), 197-206.

459   33. R Core Team (2015). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R

460   Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.R-project.org/.

461   34. Riemer S., Mills D. S., Wright H. (2014) Impulsive for life? The nature of long-term

462   impulsivity in domestic dogs. *Animal cognition*, 17(3), 815-819.

463   35. Shadli, S. M., Glue, P., McIntosh, J., & McNaughton, N. (2015) An improved human

464   anxiety process biomarker: Characterization of frequency band, personality and

465   pharmacology. *Translational Psychiatry*, 5, e699.

466   36. Sheppard, G., & Mills, D. S. (2002) The development of a psychometric scale for the

467   evaluation of the emotional predispositions of pet dogs. *International journal of comparative*

468   *psychology*, *15*(2).

469   37. van der Borg, J. A., Graat, E. A., & Beerda, B. (2017). Behavioural testing based breeding

470   policy reduces the prevalence of fear and aggression related behaviour in

471   Rottweilers. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, *195*, 80-86.

472   38. Vas, J., Topál, J., Péch, E., & Miklósi, A. (2007) Measuring attention deficit and activity in

473   dogs: a new application and validation of a human ADHD questionnaire. *Applied Animal*

474   *Behaviour Science*, *103*(1), 105-117.

475   39. Wan M., Hejjas K., Ronai Z., Elek Z., Sasvari-Szekely M., Champagne F. A., Miklósi Á.,

476   Kubinyi E. (2013) DRD4 and TH gene polymorphisms are associated with activity,

477   impulsivity and inattention in Siberian Husky dogs. *Animal genetics*, 44(6), 717-727.

478   40. Whiteside, M. A., Sage, R., & Madden, J. R. (2016) Multiple behavioural, morphological

479   and cognitive developmental changes arise from a single alteration to early life spatial

480   environment, resulting in fitness consequences for released pheasants. *Royal Society*

481   *open science*, *3*(3), 160008.

482   41. Wright, H. F., Mills, D. S., Pollux, P. M. (2011) Development and validation of a

483   psychometric tool for assessing impulsivity in the domestic dog (*Canis familiaris*).

484   *International Journal of Comparative Psychology*, 24(2).

485   42. Wright, H.F., Mills, D.S. and Pollux, P.M., 2012. Behavioural and physiological correlates of

486   impulsivity in the domestic dog (Canis familiaris). *Physiology & behavior*, *105*(3), pp.676-

487   682.

488   43. Young, C. K., & McNaughton, N. (2008) Coupling of Theta Oscillations between Anterior

489   and Posterior Midline Cortex and with the Hippocampus in Freely Behaving Rats. *Cerebral*

490   *Cortex*, 19(1), 24–40.

491   44. Zapata, I., Serpell, J. A., & Alvarez, C. E. (2016). Genetic mapping of canine fear and

492   aggression. *BMC genomics*, *17*(1), 572.

493

Tables:

Table 1. The descriptive statistics of the critical behavioural and personality variables in this study

| Variable	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Kolgmorov-Smirnov test
Behaviours					
Active Avoidance Behaviours	1.93	0.93	1.25	1.44	0.16**
Passive Avoidance Behaviours	2.20	1.05	0.67	-0.25	0.13**
Destructive Behaviours	1.74	0.82	1.20	1.12	0.19**
Inappropriate Elimination Behaviours	1.34	0.71	2.62	7.76	0.41**
Traits					
Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory Personality Questionnaire - Dog					
Behavioural Approach System	3.81	0.81	-0.58	-0.08	0.09**
Behavioural Inhibition System	2.92	1.07	-0.04	-0.89	0.07**
Fight/Flight/Freeze System	2.46	0.84	0.29	-0.23	0.05**
Dog Impulsivity Assessment Scale					
Behavioural Regulation	2.78	0.78	-0.13	0.10	0.05*
Aggression/Response to Novelty	2.07	0.78	0.51	-0.14	0.12**
Responsiveness	3.63	0.59	-0.21	-0.01	0.09**
Overall Questionnaire Score	2.88	0.51	0.19	-0.35	0.05*

Notes: *p=.001, **p<.001

495

496

497

498

1

Table 2. Spearman's correlations between the behaviour and personality trait variables (absolute _p_ values in brackets) [95% CI in square brackets]

Traits	Active Avoidance Behaviours	Passive Avoidance Behaviours	Destructive Behaviours	Inappropriate Elimination Behaviours
**Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory Personality Questionnaire - Dog**				
Behavioural Approach System	-0.08 (=0.032) [-0.15, -0.00]	-0.11 (=0.002) [-0.18, -0.04]	0.01 (=0.965) [-0.08, 0.08]	-0.04 (=0.281) [-0.12, 0.05]
Behavioural Inhibition System	-0.00 (=0.961) [-0.08, 0.08]	**0.16 (<0.001) [0.08, 0.23]**	**-0.15 (<0.001) [-0.24, -0.08]**	0.06 (=0.113) [-0.02, 0.13]
Fight/Flight/Freeze System	**-0.14 (<0.001) [-0.22, -0.06]**	**0.26 (<0.001) [0.19, 0.34]**	0.03 (=0.360) [-0.04, 0.11]	0.11 (=0.002) [0.02, 0.19]
**Dog Impulsivity Assessment Scale**				
Behavioural Regulation	**0.34 (<0.001) [0.27, 0.40]**	**0.17 (<0.001) [0.09, 0.24]**	**0.30 (<0.001) [0.23, 0.36]**	**0.22 (<0.001) [0.15, 0.29]**
Aggression/Response to Novelty	**0.53 (<0.001) [0.45, 0.57]**	**0.48 (<0.001) [0.38, 0.50]**	0.10 (=0.005) [0.02, 0.17]	**0.13 (<0.001) [0.04, 0.18]**
Responsiveness	-0.034 (=0.319) [-0.11 0.04]	-0.11 (=0.003) [-0.18, 0.04]	0.03 (=0.415) [-0.04, 0.11]	-0.03 (=0.431) [-0.10, 0.05]
Overall Questionnaire Score	**0.40 (<0.001) [0.34, 0.46]**	**0.18 (<0.001) [0.12. 0.26]**	**0.29 (<0.001) [0.23, 0.36]**	**0.20 (<0.001) [0.13, 0.26]**

Notes:

Bold = p< 0.002 (corrected alpha level of 0.05 over 24 comparisons)

499

Figures:

502   **Fig 1. Overview of the relationships between the behavioural and trait (from the Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory**
503   **Personality Questionnaires and Dog Impulsivity Assessment Scale) factor variables in the study.** Spearman rho's
504   correlations, with r above 0.20 are shown ($p < 0.002$ – corrected alpha level of 0.05 over 24 comparisons; r cut-off was selected
505   based on Ferguson, 2009).
506

507 *Supplemental information 1*

508

Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory of Personality Questionnaire - Dog

		Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
1.	My dog would be frozen to the spot if there was a dangerous animal in the house with him/her.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	My dog would be frozen to the spot if he/she saw a large shadow when swimming.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	My dog would run away if he/she saw a dangerous animal.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	My dog would freeze if he/she thought a something was going to attack him/her.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	My dog would freeze if he/she heard scary noises at night.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	My dog would run away from an animal if it was making her/him feel scared.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	My dog would run upstairs if there was something scary downstairs.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	My dog is careful when doing something that might hurt him/her.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	My dog would be careful when playing.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	My dog would stop what he/she was doing if he/she thought there was physical danger or he/she might hurt him/herself.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	My dog would stop what he/she was doing if he/she thought it was too risky to keep going.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	My dog worries about getting hurt.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	My dog would stop and think before going down a steep slope or sharp drop (where they would not be able to stop easily).	1	2	3	4	5
14.	My dog appears to stop and think carefully before trying out for something.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	My dog spends a lot of time trying to get better at things he/she likes doing (such as fetch/agility).	1	2	3	4	5
16.	My dog works hard to do well at the things they like doing (like playing 'find it' or 'fetch').	1	2	3	4	5
17.	My dog likes to practice something he/she likes doing.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	My dog puts in lots of effort to achieve a goal (or get what he/she wants).	1	2	3	4	5
19.	My dog wants to keep on improving (getting better) at his/her favourite things.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	My dog is interested in exploring places.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	My dog likes to do new and exciting things.	1	2	3	4	5

512
513
RSTPQ-D questionnaire and comparison with the original child version (Cooper t al., 2017)
516

	RSTPQ-D	RSTPQ-Child (Cooper et al., 2017)
FFFS:		
1.	My dog would be frozen to the spot if there was a dangerous animal in the house with him/her.	I would be frozen to the spot if there was a snake or spider in the bathroom with me.
2.	My dog would be frozen to the spot if he/she saw a large shadow when swimming.	I would be frozen to the spot if I saw a large shadow when swimming in the ocean.
3.	My dog would run away if he/she saw a dangerous animal.	I would run away if I saw a spider or snake.
4.	My dog would freeze if he/she thought a something was going to attack him/her.	I would freeze if I thought a bird was going to attack me.
5.	I would say my dog would freeze if he/she heard scary noises at night.	I would freeze if I heard strange noises when in bed at night time.
6.	My dog would run away from an animal if it was making her/him feel scared.	I would run away from an animal if it was making me feel scared.
7.	My dog would run upstairs if there was something scary downstairs.	I would run back upstairs if there were no lights on downstairs.
BIS:		
8.	My dog is careful when doing something that might hurt him/her.	I am careful when doing something that might hurt me.
9.	My dog would be careful when playing.	I would be careful when playing a game or sport.
10.	My dog would stop what he/she was doing if he/she thought there was physical danger or he/she might hurt him/herself.	I would stop what I was doing if I thought there was physical danger or I might hurt myself.
11.	My dog would stop what he/she was doing if he/she thought it was too risky to keep going.	I would stop what I was doing if I thought it was too risky to keep going.
12.	My dog worries about getting hurt.	I worry about what would happen if I was hurt.
13.	My dog would stop and think before going down a steep slope or sharp drop (where they would not be able to stop easily).	I would stop and think before going down a hill on a skateboard, rollerblades, bike etc.
14.	My dog appears to stop and think carefully before trying out for something.	I would think carefully about trying out for something (e.g., sports team, school captain etc.) in case I didn't

		make it in.
BAS:		
15.	My dog spends a lot of time trying to get better at things he/she likes doing (such as fetch/agility).	I am training to be better at sport/things I like doing.
16.	My dog works hard to do well at the things they like doing (like playing 'find it' or 'fetch').	I work hard to do well at the things I like doing.
17.	My dog likes to practice something he/she likes doing.	I like to practise something I like doing so I can get better.
18.	My dog puts in lots of effort to achieve a goal (or get what he/she wants).	I put in lots of effort to achieve a goal (or get where I want).
19.	My dog wants to keep on improving (getting better) at his/her favourite things.	I want to keep on improving (getting better) at my favourite things.
20.	My dog is interested in exploring places.	I am interested in exploring places.
21.	My dog likes to do new and exciting things.	I like to do new and exciting things.

517

518

Check-list of Behaviour Problems:

520   1.   My dog barks, charges or lunges at people, dogs, other animals or certain objects

521   2.   My dog growls or snarl (shows his/her teeth) at people, dogs, other animals or certain
522   objects

523   3.   My dog tries to bite people, dogs, other animals or certain objects

524   4.   My dog snaps or bites people, dogs, other animals or certain objects

525   5.   My dog urinates where he/she shouldn't (e.g. in the house)

526   6.   My dog defecates where he/she shouldn't (e.g. in the house)

527   7.   My dog shakes in the presence of certain people, animals, objects or   situations (e.g.
528   crowded places or loud noises)

529   8.   My dog pants in the presence of certain people, animals, objects or   situations (e.g.
530   crowded places or loud noises)

531 9.   My dog tries to avoid people, other animals, objects or situations (e.g.   crowded places
532   or loud noises)

533 10.   My dog damages or destroys objects (e.g. chews shoes or carpets)

534 11.   My dog digs holes in the garden, etc.

535 12.   My dog shows other destructive behaviours

536
537