Title	Social significance of trunk use in captive Asian elephants
Author(s)	Yasui, Saki; Idani, Gen ' ichi
Citation	Ethology Ecology & Evolution (2017), 29(4): 330-350
Issue Date	2017-07-04
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2433/228270
Right	This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in 'Ethology Ecology & Evolution' on 2017, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/03949370.2016.1179684 .; The full-text file will be made open to the public on 04 July 2018 in accordance with publisher's 'Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving'.; This is not the published version. Please cite only the published version. この論文は出版社版でありません。引用の際には出版社版をご確認ご利用ください。
Type	Journal Article
Textversion	author

Social significance of trunk use in captive Asian elephants

SAKI YASUI[1,*] and GEN'ICHI IDANI[2]

[1]*Kyoto City Zoo, Okazaki Koen, Okazaki Houshojicho, Sakyo-Ku, Kyoto city, Kyoto, 606-8333, Japan*

[2] *Wildlife Research Centre,*

Wildlife Research Centre, Kyoto University, 2-24 Tanaka-Sekiden-cho, Sakyo-Ku, Kyoto, 606-8203, Japan

[*]Corresponding author: Saki Yasui, Kyoto City Zoo, Okazaki Koen, Okazaki Houshojicho, Sakyo-Ku, Kyoto city, Kyoto 606-8333, Japan (E-mail: s2a1k9i@gmail.com).

Running head: Social significance of trunk use

16 Tactile behaviour plays an important role in maintaining social relationships
17 in several mammalian species. Touching with the tip of the trunk is a common
18 social behaviour among Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*). This is considered an
19 affiliative behaviour; however, few studies have investigated it in detail. Therefore,
20 this study aimed to determine whether this is an affiliative behaviour and whether
21 it has other functions. We directly observed a group of captive female Asian
22 elephants in Thailand. We found that the elephants usually touched each other
23 with their trunks shaped in a U (U-type) or S (S-type) shape. The S-type shape was
24 observed mainly when the elephants touched the lips of other elephants; however,
25 this behaviour was occasionally observed in agonistic or play contexts, where it
26 appeared to be a threat or dominant behaviour, particularly within adults. In
27 contrast, the U-type shape was more frequently observed when the elephants were
28 disturbed, where it appeared as a gesture for reassurance. We found that the
29 U-type touch on the genitals may be used for interacting with neonates. Therefore,
30 we suggest that despite the S-type touch having a tactile component, it may be a
31 rare behaviour in Asian elephants that is similar to visual threat displays in other
32 mammals. However, the U-type touch is similar to social grooming behaviour in
33 primates or flipper rubbing in dolphins and can be used as an indicator of

affiliative relationships. Asian elephants change the shape of their trunk while touching others depending on their motivation and the situation, thereby demonstrating that the nuances of trunk use can assist in understanding the social relationships between individuals.

KEY WORDS: Asian elephant, touch with trunk, function, affiliative, aggressive.

INTRODUCTION

In various animal species, social relationships are regulated by tactile behaviours. Social grooming is one such tactile behaviour that has been frequently studied in various mammalian species (Spruijt et al. 1992). In most species, the primary function of grooming is to maintain healthy skin by removing parasites (Spruijt et al. 1992). However, social grooming has several additional functions, such as reconciliation and consolation following an aggressive interaction (Nakamura & Sakai 2013) and the maintenance of social bonds (Dunbar 1991, 2010; Nakamura & Sakai 2013). Thus, it is an indicator of affiliative relationships (McCowan et al. 2008; Kasper & Voelkl 2009). Dolphins exhibit a tactile behaviour termed flipper rubbing, which has functions similar to those of social grooming in primates (Sakai et al. 2006; Tamaki et al. 2006). Thus, tactile interactions are utilized for various purposes and are important for establishing and maintaining social relationships.

Elephant societies exhibit complexity similar to that of primate and cetacean societies (Poole & Moss 2008). The societies of both Asian (*Elephas maximus*) and African (*Loxodonta* spp.) elephants are centred on maternal groups. The female elephants live in a natal (family) group throughout their lives, whereas

58 the males leave the group when they become sexually mature. However, the family
59 groups temporarily reunite and then separate again. Longitudinal studies in wild
60 African elephants have revealed that they have a hierarchical social structure
61 (Wittemyer et al. 2005), whereas Asian elephants tend to form smaller groups with
62 a looser association (de Silva et al. 2011). Asian elephants use vocal, seismic (Payne
63 et al. 1986; O'Connell-Rodwell 2007; Nair et al. 2009; de Silva, 2010) and chemical
64 (Rasmussen 1999) communication to maintain their complex social structure.
65 Tactile behaviour is an important and prominent behaviour between them (Vidya
66 & Sukumar 2005); however, few studies have investigated this behaviour to date.
67 Asian elephants show various tactile behaviours (Gadgil & Nair 1984;
68 Makecha et al. 2012). Mostly, they use their trunks to touch other individuals
69 (Gadgil & Nair 1984; Makecha et al. 2012), which serves not only as a form of
70 tactile communication but also as a form of chemical communication (Garaï 1992;
71 Makecha et al. 2012). Asian elephants have an excellent sense of smell and receive
72 chemical information by touching body orifices or glands (Rasmussen &
73 Krishnamurthy 2000). Some studies have shown that elephants touch the genitals
74 and interdigital glands to assess the oestrus state of females (Slade et al. 2003;
75 Thitaram et al. 2009). Other behavioural studies have suggested that touching

76 with the trunk is an affiliative behaviour (Garaï 1992; Makecha et al. 2012). For
77 example, touching the lips or mouth of another individual with the trunk is
78 associated with investigation of food, reassurance, affirmation of affiliative
79 relationships and individual recognition (Garaï 1992; Langbauer 2000; Sukumar
80 2003; Plotnik & de Waal 2014). In addition, touching the genitals of another
81 individual provides reassurance or an exchange of information regarding health or
82 reproductive state (Garaï 1992; Sukumar 2003; Kurt & Garaï 2006). However, to
83 date, only a few studies have systematically investigated the precise function of
84 the various types of elephant trunk touches.

85 Elephant trunks have a function similar to that of human and primate
86 hands (Onodera & Hicks 1999; Martin & Niemitz 2003). Elephants use their
87 trunks to feed and communicate in a manner similar to how primates use their
88 hands for the same purposes. Elephant trunks are flexible; therefore, elephants
89 can change their trunk shape depending on their requirements, such as for
90 grabbing or reaching out. However, both Asian and African elephants can
91 communicate with each other by changing their trunk shape, just as humans can
92 change their hand shape to convey various intentions (McNeill 1992; Moss et al.
93 2011). African elephants entwine their trunks with one another as a greeting or

94 during play (Moss et al. 2011). Garaï (1992, p. 14) reported that Asian elephants
95 sometimes touched the mouths of other elephants using a complicated twisting of
96 the trunk, which she speculated is used to prevent aggressive behaviour from
97 escalating. Therefore, it is possible that elephants change their trunk shape to
98 convey different intentions to the recipients. Deciphering complex behaviours,
99 such as the form and function of elephant trunk use, will provide us with a better
100 understanding of the social relationships among Asian elephants.

101 The aim of our study was to investigate the various functions of Asian
102 elephant trunk touching by recording the trunk shape and any associated
103 behaviours. In the present report, we examined the relationship between the types
104 of trunk touch and the proximity between individuals, which is frequently used as
105 an index of affiliative relationships among primates and elephants (Garaï 1992;
106 Schel et al. 2013). We also investigated the behavioural context around trunk
107 touching (play and aggression) to understand the nature of this type of tactile
108 communication among Asian elephants.

109

110 ## METHODS

111 *Study site*

We collected behavioural data from the Surin Elephant Study Centre in Ban Ta Klang Elephant Village, Surin Province, Thailand (15°15′59.7″N, 103°29′48.3″E), which is managed by the Zoological Park Organization and the Surin Provincial Administration Organization. This village is home to the Guay tribe, who are known for their skills in caring, training and working with elephants. This region experiences three seasons: summer (February–April), rainy (May–October) and winter (November–January) (Polthanee & Promkhambut 2014). Approximately 200 elephants have been registered at the Centre by their mahouts, Approximately 40 elephants work at elephant shows or provide rides for tourists, whereas others work in volunteer programmes (e.g. allowing visitors to experience the lifestyle of a mahout). The elephants at the Centre also participate in ceremonies or parades in other regions of Thailand. When the elephants have no work, they are chained in front of the mahout's house or sheltered in the village and are taken on walks for bathing a few times each day.

Research periods and subjects

The present research was conducted between July and September 2012 (Period 1) and between December 2012 and March 2013 (Period 2). We observed

130 the group of elephants that was involved in the Surin Project volunteer programme,
131 which was started in 2009 by the Save Elephant Foundation. This group usually
132 included 10–13 elephants. During our study period, some elephants left or newly
133 joined the group. We observed a total of 17 elephants (16 females and one male;
134 Table 1).

135 All elephants under observation were born in captivity, but their life
136 histories before joining the project differed. Some elephants were used for working
137 in shows, whereas others were used for street begging (walking the city streets to
138 obtain money from tourists by providing them the experience of feeding elephants,
139 etc.). In addition, some elephants were cared for by only one mahout or his family
140 members for their entire lives, whereas others were cared for by different mahouts.

141 We identified each individual elephant by their body size or body
142 characteristics (e.g. ear or tail shape and pink pigmentation on their ears and
143 trunks). We categorised the elephants into four age classes: neonate (birth to 2
144 years), juvenile (3–10 years), subadult (11–15 years) and adult (> 15 years). The
145 neonates were usually tied to their mother with a rope (approximately 2 m) around
146 their necks.

147

Behavioural observations

Our subjects were taken for a walk around the village and/or spent time at an enclosure in the village for 3–6 hr per day, following the weekly schedule of the Surin Project. The mahouts usually stayed around their elephants and occasionally interacted with their elephants during activities. The volunteers and staff of the Surin Project also walked with the elephants, although they always maintained a greater distance between themselves and the elephants than the mahouts and did not interact with the elephants. During their walks, the elephants occasionally stopped walking to eat bark in the forest or the sugar cane that had been scattered for them in advance. During their time at the enclosure, the volunteers and staff did not stay in the enclosure, whereas the mahouts remained near their own elephants or at the shelter in the enclosure. All observations were conducted by S. Yasui, who also conducted the preliminary observations of the same study group from December 2011 to March 2012. All elephants showed little interest in the observer during the study periods, indicating that the observer had almost no influence on their behaviours.

The daily schedule comprised one activity (e.g. a walk or enclosure time) in the morning and one activity in the afternoon. All subjects walked or spent time in

the enclosure together except when they showed health problems or were required to work elsewhere. Focal animal sampling (Altmann 1974) was conducted on one target animal during each activity, using a total of 10 females. All social behaviour relating to the focal animal were recorded continuously (Martin & Bateson 1993) using an IC digital voice recorder (SONY ICD-UX523) and a video camera (SONY HDR-550V), and the names and postures of the actor and recipient were also noted. All observation data on the elephants during both study periods are provided in Table 1. The total observation time was 271.9 hr. Each subject was observed 17–23 times (average 20.2 ± 1.89) for an average duration of 1.34 ± 0.58 hr. The distance between the target animal and the observer was 2–30 m. All subjects were under the authority of their mahouts. At few instances, the mahouts attempted to stop interactions, particularly severe aggressive interactions, between the elephants using vocal commands or physical contact. All observations were made following the guidelines on the ethics of animal studies of the Wildlife Research Centre of Kyoto University.

Definitions and terminology

We use the term 'touch' to refer only to the physical contact made with the

tip of the elephant trunk. It has been shown that elephants exhibit social behaviours more frequently when they become excited (Garaï 1992; Plotnik & de Waal 2014). Therefore, we defined an excited situation as one in which the focal animal made any vocalisation combined with excited postures (head or tail raised and ears extended). This excited situation ended when the subject returned to the normal posture (de Silva et al. 2011; Moss et al. 2011). We used the modified versions of ethograms presented in previous studies for our observations (Table 2; Olson 2004; Moss et al. 2011).

Data analysis

Initially, we determined whether there were any differences in the observed number of times elephants touched different body parts and whether there were any age-related differences in the number of times elephants touched or received touches. We examined differences in touch frequencies between individuals and pairs of elephants. To calculate the touch frequency for each individual, the observed number of times that the focal animal touched or received touches was divided by the focal time. In contrast, differences in the touch frequencies of pairs were calculated using the following formula: $(O_{AB\text{-}A} + O_{AB\text{-}B}) / (T_{AB} + T_{BA})$, where

$O_{AB–A}$ indicates the number of times that A touched B when A was the focal animal, $O_{AB–B}$ indicates the number of times that A touched B when B was the focal animal, T_{AB} indicates the time during which both A and B were in the study group with A as the focal animal and T_{BA} indicates the same measurement with B as the focal animal.

We also examined whether touches were correlated with the proximity index for each pairs of elephants, which was calculated using the formula: $(P_{AB} + P_{BA}) / (T_{AB} + T_{BA})$, where P_{AB} indicates the time when A and B were in proximity to each other with A as the focal animal and P_{BA} indicates the same measurement with B as the focal animal. In this context, proximity refers to when either of the two individuals could touch the body of the other. Four individuals (Thong deng, Soi thong, Tuk or Kham koon) were excluded from the present analysis as they stayed in the same group for < 10 hr during each focal observation period. In addition, we did not include proximity data between Kaem sean and Nopa gao as they were tied to each other.

We then examined whether the frequency of touching increased when the elephants were excited. In the present analysis, we distinguished between excited situations in which the mahout interacted with the elephants, for example, using

220 vocal commands or physical contact to calm their elephants (excited with mahouts)
221 and those in which there was no interaction between the mahout and the elephant
222 (excited). We also distinguished between normal situations in which the mahouts
223 held the ears of their elephants to direct them (normal with mahouts) and those
224 that did not require the ears to be held (normal). Thus, we compared the frequency
225 of touches between four situations: normal, normal with mahouts, excited and
226 excited with mahouts. In addition, we categorised the excited situations according
227 to the perceived cause of the excitement (i.e. disturbance and play; see Table S1 of
228 supplemental material for definitions) and compared the frequency of touches
229 between the normal situations and each of these categories. We examined whether
230 both the actor and recipient of the touches were excited or only one of these was
231 excited.

232 To interpret the social context of the touches, we investigated the social
233 behaviours that occurred just before and after the touch. We also investigated the
234 relationship between the context of the touches and pair types: with or without
235 adults, subadults and 'young' (juveniles and neonates). Here, each category
236 indicates that one or both individuals of the pair belonged to that age category, for
237 example, 'with adults' indicates that one or both individuals of the pair were adults.

238 We also investigated whether the actor exhibited a threat posture during the
239 touch.

240 We conducted all analyses using generalised linear mixed-effect models
241 [GLMER function using the lme4 package in R software (Version 2.15.3)]. GLMER
242 fits the model using the maximum likelihood method. The best model was then
243 selected from all possible models with or without each explanatory variable based
244 on the Akaike information criterion (AIC, Akaike 1974). The model with the lowest
245 AIC value was chosen as the best model. Multiple pair-wise comparisons were then
246 performed using Tukey's method with the GLHT function in the multcomp package.
247 To examine the frequency at which elephants touched different body parts, we
248 included the observed times of touch as a response variable, body part as an
249 explanatory variable and log (focal time) as an offset. We also included animal
250 identification (ID) as a random effect to avoid pseudo-replication (Hurlbert 1984).
251 To analyse the effect of age on touch frequencies, we included the observed number
252 of touches as the response variable, age class as an explanatory variable, log (focal
253 time) as an offset and animal ID as a random effect. We tested the relationship
254 between each touch and the proximity index by including the observed number of
255 touches as the response variable, the proximity index as an explanatory variable,

log (time when the two individuals in each pair remained in the study group) as an offset and pair ID as a random effect. To investigate the effect of excitement on touch frequency, we included the observed number of touches as the response variable, the situation (normal with mahout, normal, excited with mahout or excited) as an explanatory variable, log (focal time) as an offset and animal ID as a random effect. The Poisson distribution and a log link function were used for these analyses.

We categorised all social behaviours into one of the four groups: movement, touch/smell, aggression or play (see Table 2). To compare the effect of social behaviours on touch frequencies, we included the occurrence of a social behaviour (1 = yes or 0 = no) as the response variable, the touch type as an explanatory variable, and pair ID as a random effect. We also investigated the effect of pair type (with or without adults, subadults and young) on social behaviour by including the occurrence of a social behaviour (1 = yes or 0 = no) as the response variable, the pair type as an explanatory variable, and pair ID as a random effect. We also included command (whether the mahouts used a vocal command to stop interactions following the touch as an explanatory variable to investigate the effect of interactions with the mahouts. The binomial distribution and a logit link

function were used for these analyses.

In addition, we also analysed the difference in the touch type between pair types by including the observed number of U-type lip touches as the response variable, the observed number of U-type genital touches and pair type (with or without adults, subadults, juveniles and neonates) as explanatory variables, and pair ID as a random effect. The Poisson distribution and a log link function were used for this analysis.

RESULTS

Overview

In most cases, the 10 female elephants touched the body parts of other elephants with their trunks in a U-shape (U-type, Fig. 1a), but occasionally with their trunks in an S-shape (S-type, Fig. 1b). All elephants performed or received both U-type and S-type touches during the study. The elephants performed S-type touches on 187 occasions when touching others' lips (193 times) and on 4 occasions when touching others' genitals.

The observed frequency of touches differed between body parts (Fig. 2). We distinguished between touches to the lips and mouth by observing whether the

292 elephants touched around the mouth (lips) or inside the mouth (mouth).
293 Recipients opened their mouths during mouth touches whereas they usually closed
294 their mouth during lip touches. All subjects performed touches to all body parts,
295 despite the varying body size of the focal animals. The elephants touched the lips
296 and genitals of other elephants more frequently than any other parts of the body
297 (Fig. 2, lips vs all other body parts, $P < 0.01$; genitals vs all other body parts, $P <$
298 0.01). Therefore, we specifically focused on these two touches. In 83 of 193 S-type
299 touches, the elephants performed a U-type touch either before or after the S-type
300 touch at the same distance from the recipient. Thus, it appeared as natural and
301 easy for the elephants to touch with their trunks in the U-type shape; however,
302 they also sometimes touched with their trunks in the S-type shape. The observed
303 number of each touch type during each focal period is shown in Table 3. As
304 observed, individuals that performed or received U-type touches frequently did not
305 typically perform or receive S-type touches frequently.

306 Differences between pairs in touch frequency are shown in Table 4. Of the
307 top 10% of pairs that performed U-type lip touches, five also ranked in the top 10%
308 for U-type genital touches. In contrast, of the top 10% of pairs that performed
309 S-type lip touches, only one pair ranked in the top 10% for U-type genital touches,

and no pair ranked in the top 10% for U-type lip touches. In Table 4, the individuals are arranged according to age (oldest to youngest). For all touch types, younger individuals touched older individuals at an almost identical frequency to older individuals touching younger individuals in the top 10% of pairs. The subadults received S-type lip touches more frequently than the adults (N = 10; adults vs subadults: coefficient = − 1.41 ± 0.57, z = − 2.47, P = 0.04; adults vs juveniles: coefficient = − 0.76 ± 0.59, z = − 1.29, P = 0.40; subadults vs juveniles: coefficient = 0.66 ± 0.0.58, z = 1.13, P = 0.50). However, there was no relationship between age class and the frequency of receiving U-type lip and U-type genital touches). One mother (Kaem sean) only gave U-type lip touches 0.07 times/hr and U-type genital touches 0.14 times/hr to her son, Nopa gao, despite them usually being attached to each other with a rope. Kanoon performed the highest frequency of U-type touches to Nopa gao (U-type lip: 0.99 times/hr; U-type genital: 2.55 times/hr). Kaem sean did not give any S-type lip touches to her son.

Relationship between touches and proximity

We found that the proximity index was not related to the occurrence of aggressive behaviours (N = 74). In addition, we did not observe any aggressive

behaviours between pairs whose proximity index was > 0.15. Therefore, we used the data from all 74 pairs in our analyses. The models for U-type lip touches and U-type genital touches, including the proximity index, were chosen as the best models (Fig. 3, U-type lip: coefficient = 7.84 ± 1.16; U-type genital: coefficient = 8.47 ± 0.87). In contrast, the model that included the proximity index was not selected as the best model for S-type touches. Therefore, proximity is not necessarily related to the frequency of S-type touches.

Relationship between touches and excitement

For the 10 focal animals, frequencies of all touch types were relative to the situation (Table 5a). Elephants performed U-type lip and U-type genital touches more frequently when they were excited (excited and excited with mahouts) than under normal situations (normal and normal with mahouts), with a significant difference between normal and excited. The frequency of U-type genital touches was not related to the type of situation either with or without interaction with the mahouts, and the frequency of S-type lip touches did not significantly differ between normal and excited situations which involved no interaction with the mahouts.

346 In 347 of 635 excited events, we could identify the cause of excitement,
347 which included disturbance, play and interaction by the mahouts. The definitions
348 of each of these are provided in Table S1 (supplemental material). In our analyses,
349 we examined the touch frequencies in each of these situations by including normal,
350 disturbance and play events that were observed for a sufficient time and were
351 unrelated to human interaction, as well as normal, disturbance and play situations
352 involving interaction with mahouts. The model comprising these detailed
353 situations was selected as the best model for all touch types (Table 5b). U-type lip
354 and genital touches were observed significantly more frequently during
355 disturbance and play than during normal situations ($P < 0.01$). In addition, S-type
356 lip touches were observed more frequently during disturbance and play involving
357 interaction no interaction with the mahouts than during normal situations
358 involving interaction with the mahouts ($P < 0.05$), whereas was no significant
359 difference existed among disturbance, play and normal situations involving no
360 interactions with the mahouts.
361 During disturbances, both the actor and recipient were excited for 49.99%
362 ± 21.22% of U-type lip touches and 45.85% ± 19.48% of U-type genital touches.
363 During play, both the actor and recipient were excited for 71.43% ± 45.18% ($N = 10$)

364 of U-type lip touches and 44.27% ± 39.80% of U-type genital touches.

365

366 *Behavioural context before and after touches*

367 There was no significant difference between touch types in the proportion of
368 play behaviour observed before or after touches (Fig. 4, U-type lip: N = 1444; S-type
369 lip: N = 193; U-type genital: N = 807). When analysing the proportion of touches in
370 which aggressive behaviour occurred before the touches, the model that included
371 touch type was selected as the best model. A higher proportion of aggressive
372 behaviour occurred before S-type lip touches than before U-type lip and genital
373 touches (Fig. 4, S-type lip vs U-type genital: coefficient = − 3.64 ± 1.07, z = 3.41, P <
374 0.01; U-type lip vs U-type genital: coefficient = 0.11 ± 1.24, z = 0.09, P = 0.99;
375 U-type lip vs S-type lip: coefficient = − 3.54 ± 0.79, z = − 4.45, P < 0.01).

376 Aggressive behaviour was never observed after U-type genital touches;
377 therefore, we used only the data for U-type lip and S-type lip touches to investigate
378 the relationship between touch types and aggressive behaviour after the touch.
379 The model that included touch type was selected as the best model, and it was
380 found that a higher proportion of aggressive behaviour occurred after S-type lip
381 touches than after U-type lip touches (Fig. 4, U-type lip: coefficient = − 3.90 ± 0.63;

S-type lip: coefficient = − 2.27 ± 0.25). The results of the analyses of all social behaviours before and after touches are shown in Table S2 (supplemental material).

The elephants exhibited a higher proportion of threatening postures during S-type lip touches than during U-type lip and genital touches (S-type lip vs U-type genital: coefficient = 3.48 ± 0.25, $z = 13.73$, $P < 0.01$; U-type lip vs U-type genital: coefficient = 0.09 ± 0.17, $z = 0.52$, $P = 0.86$; U-type lip vs S-type lip: coefficient = − 3.38 ± 0.79, $z = -14.87$, $P < 0.01$).

S-type lip touches were not observed in neonates; therefore, they were excluded from this analysis. Play behaviour occurred before S-type lip touches at a higher frequency in the pairs with young individuals than in those without young individuals (Fig. 5, with young: $N = 111$, coefficient = 2.46 ± 1.95, without young: $N = 82$, coefficient = − 4.39±1.01) but at a lower frequency in pairs with adults than in those without adults (with adults: $N = 91$, coefficient = − 4.50 ± 1.01; without adults: $N = 102$, coefficient = 2.66 ± 1.05). There was no relationship between the occurrence of subadults in a pair (with subadults: $N = 131$; without subadults: $N = 62$) and the frequency of play behaviour before S-type lip touches. The frequencies of play behaviour after S-type lip touches were neither related to any pair type nor

400 to vocal commands from the mahouts.

401 The frequency of aggressive behaviour before and after S-type lip touches
402 was not related to any pair type. The frequency of aggressive behaviour after
403 S-type lip touches was also unrelated to vocal commands from the mahouts.

404

405 *U-type touch interaction with neonates*

406 As shown in Fig. 6, pairs that included neonates had a tendency to perform
407 fewer U-type lip touches and more U-type genital touches than pairs without
408 neonates. The model that included U-type genital touches and pair type with
409 neonates was selected as the best model (U-type genital: coefficient = 0.05 ± 0.01;
410 pair type with neonates: N = 30, coefficient = − 0.80 ± 0.39; pair type without
411 neonates: N= 84, coefficient = 1.71 ± 0.43). U-type genital touches were observed in
412 14 of 30 pairs with neonates. In 70.80% ± 7.81% of these touches, it was the elders
413 (those older than neonates) who touched the genitals of the neonates.

414

415 DISCUSSION In this study, we found that the female Asian elephants
416 touched the lips of other individuals using two different trunk shapes: U-shaped
417 trunks and S-shaped trunks. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to

418 analyse the functions of different touch types in elephants.

419 As shown in Tables 3 and 4, touch frequencies varied between individuals
420 and pairs; therefore, we included animal ID or pair ID as a random factor in all
421 analyses. Only one of the analysed variables was affected by age: the subadults
422 received S-type lip touches more frequently than the adults. This could be related
423 to the time when the subadults had been in the study group, as will be discussed
424 later.

425 We determined whether the U-type and S-type touches were affiliative
426 behaviours by investigating the relationship between these touches and the
427 proximity index. In our study group, the proximity indices were not positively
428 correlated with aggressive behaviours. In addition, pairs with high proximity
429 indices did not exhibit any aggressive behaviour. These findings confirmed that the
430 proximity index was an appropriate affiliative index in our study group. Further,
431 we found that the frequencies of U-type lip and genital touches were positively
432 correlated with the proximity index, whereas the frequency of S-type lip touches
433 was not, which may suggest that the U-type lip and genital touches are affiliative.
434 This supports previous studies on captive Asian elephants that used trunk tip
435 touches as indicators of affiliative or investigative behaviours (Garaï 1992;

436 Slade-Cain et al. 2008; Makecha et al. 2012). Similarly, in African elephants,
437 studies have described mouth and genital touches as types of greeting behaviours
438 (Moss 1988; Moss et al. 2011).

439 Next, we examined whether the touches were used more frequently when
440 the elephants were excited. U-type lip and genital touches were observed more
441 frequently during excited situations than during normal situations and were
442 frequently used when elephants became excited because of disturbance.
443 Furthermore, for many of the U-type touches, both the actor and the recipient were
444 excited. These findings might suggest that the elephants touch the lips or genitals
445 of other individuals with U-shaped trunks to reassure others and themselves
446 during disturbances. Similarly, in a captive group of four Asian elephants, Garai
447 (1992) reported that lip and genital touches occurred more frequently during
448 arousal than during non-arousal. Furthermore, Plotnik and de Waal (2014) showed
449 that captive Asian elephants frequently touched the genitals and mouths of other
450 individuals following stressful situations. Our results supported these patterns
451 and also showed that the trunk touch type varied between circumstances.
452 Therefore, as with humans and non-human primates (Hertenstein et al. 2006),
453 physical contact between elephants appears to provide reassurance and comfort.

Further, we found that female Asian elephants frequently used U-type touches when they became excited during play. This might suggest that U-type lip and genital touches are part of their play behaviour. In addition, S-type lip touches were observed more frequently when elephants were excited during play than during normal situations, despite there being no relationship between this and disturbance. Therefore it appears that female Asian elephants do not use S-type touches for reassurance but as a playful behaviour.

We also considered the effect of interactions with the mahouts on elephant behaviour during these analyses. Under normal conditions, the elephants showed less U-type and S-type lip touches when the mahouts pulled their ears than when they did not. Mahouts usually pulled the ears of their elephants to direct them when walking and it is possible that by doing so, mahouts affected the activity of these elephants, resulting in elephants interacting less frequently with others while walking than during other situations, such as during feeding or bathing. U-type lip touches were also observed less frequently during excited situations involving interactions with the mahouts than those involving no such interaction. to compare, the frequency of U-type genital touches was not significantly different between excited situations and normal situations with and without interactions of

472 the mahouts. These results may indicate that U-type genital touches were not as
473 greatly affected by interactions with the mahouts as U-type and S-type lip touches.
474 However, additional systematic studies are required to better understand the
475 relationship between elephants and their mahouts.

476 In addition, we investigated whether the touches were related to aggression
477 or play. Aggressive behaviour rarely occurred before or after U-type lip and genital
478 touches, and the elephants also rarely displayed threatening postures during these
479 touches. In contrast, the elephants exhibited aggressive behaviour more frequently
480 before and after S-type lip touches, during which the actors typically adopted
481 threatening postures. These findings support the results of the first analysis that
482 investigated the relationship between U-type touches and the proximity index and
483 may suggest that S-type lip touching is a more aggressive behaviour than U-type
484 touching. Garaï (1992) reported that mouth touching, which includes touches with
485 complex trunk twisting, was often observed in pairs of captive Asian elephants
486 that showed frequent aggressive interactions and suggested that this may reduce
487 aggressive motivation. Because the actors of S-type lip touches usually showed
488 threatening postures, it might be difficult to consider this as appeasement
489 behaviour. However, both types of mouth touches in Garaï's study and S-type lip

490 touches in our study were associated with aggressive behaviour. It was
491 occasionally difficult to observe whether the elephants were touching the other
492 elephants inside or around the mouth as the actor's trunk tip was hidden by the
493 recipient's trunk. Thus, it is possible that the S-type lip touch in the present study
494 and the mouth touch with twisted trunk in Garaï's study refer to the same
495 behaviour.

496 As shown in Fig. 4, the likelihood of S-type lip touches escalating to
497 aggressive behaviour was not very high. Furthermore, this behaviour was never
498 observed in neonates, which are much smaller and weaker than the others. Thus,
499 we may suggest that female Asian elephants change their trunk shape during lip
500 touching, a frequently observed affiliative interaction, to show dominance both
501 visually and tactually. In this study, the subadults received S-type lip touches more
502 frequently than the adults, further supporting this interpretation, as two of the
503 three subadults were the newest members of the group and so may have needed to
504 find their places in the dominance hierarchy.

505 Play behaviour occurred before S-type lip touches at a higher frequency in
506 pairs without adults than in pairs with adults. Therefore, it may be possible that
507 this touch type also functions as a play behaviour, particularly among young

508 individuals, but then develops into aggressive behaviour among adults. Similar
509 behavioural changes as a consequence of maturation are observed in other species;
510 for example, 'chase' and 'kick' behaviours in primates (Nishida et al. 2010; Cordoni
511 & Palagi 2011). There are few studies on the change in these behaviours from the
512 development viewpoint, though Nishida (2003) revealed that in wild chimpanzees
513 the reaction of recipients to such behaviours change depending on the actors' age.

514 Finally, we examined whether there were any differences in the behaviours
515 depending on the age classes of the pairs. We found that the pairs that included
516 neonates used U-type genital touches more frequently than the pairs without
517 neonates. Previous studies on genital touches in Asian elephants have mainly
518 focused on reproductive behaviour (Meyer et al. 2008; Slade-Cain et al. 2008).
519 However, our results suggest that U-type genital touches may have an additional
520 function unrelated to reproductive behaviour. Elders touched the genitals of
521 neonates more frequently than neonates touched the genitals of the elders.
522 Therefore, it is possible that this behaviour was performed to assess the health of
523 the neonates while demonstrating affiliative relationships, as some previous
524 studies have suggested for both Asian and African elephants (Sukumar 2003; Moss
525 et al. 2011).

526 In this study, the elephants used U-type lip and genital touches during
527 affiliative interactions and disturbance, possibly for reassurance. Both touches
528 were observed frequently, as noted in previous studies (Garaï 1992; Makecha et al.
529 2012). Therefore, we recommend that more research is conducted on this topic,
530 because it might be possible that U-type touches in Asian elephants are
531 comparable with social grooming in primates or flipper rubbing in dolphins
532 (Nakamura & Sakai 2013) as female Asian elephants also appear to use these
533 touches as indicators of affiliative relationships. We did not focus on the functions
534 of these touch types from the viewpoint of chemical communication. Sexual
535 maturation or dominance rank may be related to touch type; however, we were
536 unable to obtain this information on our subjects. Therefore, it is also possible that
537 each trunk touch type has additional functions, such as individual recognition or
538 investigation of food, which requires further research.

539 S-type lip touches were observed in agonistic interactions and appeared to
540 be related to dominant behaviour. Animals often threaten opponents using visual
541 displays or vocalisations (Deag 1977; Randall 2001), and animals occasionally
542 place a part of their body over an opponent's body, such as mounting, to show
543 dominance (Maslow 1936; Goodwin et al. 1997). Both Asian and African elephants

544 place their head over another elephant's head or back to show dominance (Olson
545 2004; Moss et al. 2011). However, in the case of S-type lip touches, the actors touch
546 the lips of recipients and do not put their weight on the bodies of recipients. Thus,
547 this behaviour appears to be intermediate between a visual threat display and
548 physical dominance behaviour and may be used as an initial step in an agonistic
549 interaction, –similar examples of which are rare in other mammals. Because trunk
550 touching does not hurt the recipient, it may also be possible for young individuals
551 to use S-type lip touches as one of their play behaviours. During play, it is common
552 to act out dominant or submissive roles, and thus it is reasonable to assume that
553 Asian elephants may use S-type lip touches as one of their play behaviours.
554 However, we need to collect more data and perform more detailed analyses to
555 understand the reason for these elephants exhibiting this behaviour.

556 Some previous studies have reported the laterality of elephant trunks
557 (Martin & Niemitz 2003; Haakonsson & Semple 2009). For example, Martin and
558 Niemitz (2003) reported that wild Asian elephants have a side preference for
559 twisting their trunk when they grab grasses, and Haakonsson and Semple (2009)
560 reported that captive Asian elephants have a side preference during feeding, trunk
561 swinging, self-touching and sand bathing. These side preferences are considered to

562 be related to the brain hemisphere. In the present study, we did not consider the
563 side to which the subjects twisted their trunks during S-type touches. However, it
564 is possible that the elephants also have a side preference for these touches, which
565 is related to their side preference during feeding.

566 The present study had several limitations. Our subjects were born in
567 captivity and had lived and worked with their mahouts since they were young.
568 During our observations, the mahouts usually stayed around their elephants, and
569 we found that interactions with the mahouts influenced the social behaviours of
570 these elephants to some extent. Furthermore, it should be noted that the mere
571 existence of mahouts and/or the relationship with them, may affect the social
572 behaviour of the elephants, most of whom do not have as much social experience as
573 wild elephants. Therefore, we need to confirm these results in wild Asian elephants
574 to understand Asian elephant societies.

575 Though the present preliminary investigation into the role(s) of trunk
576 touching in social relationships between Asian elephants, we demonstrated a novel
577 social ability of this species that will assist in understanding relationships between
578 individuals and their societies.

579

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the National Research Council of Thailand (NRCT, Thailand) for allowing us to perform this study. We appreciate our research collaborator, Dr Wanchai Tunwattana, a project manager of Elephant Kingdom Project, Zoological Parks Organization. We thank Mr Alex Godfrey and Mr Jack Chakkrapong, ex- and present Project Manager of the Surin Project, Save Elephant Foundation, for granting permission to conduct our research with the Surin Project. We would also like to thank all the staff and mahouts of the Surin Project for their cooperation. We thank Dr Fred Bercovitch for his valuable comments. This study was supported by grant-in-aid for Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) fellows (#245462), and ITP-HOPE and AS-HOPE programmes from JSPS.

REFERENCES Akaike H. 1974. A new look at the statistical model identification. IEEE Trans Automat Contr. 19:716–723.

Altmann J. 1974. Observational study of behaviour: Sampling methods. Behaviour. 49:227–267.

Cordoni G, Palagi E. 2011. Ontogenetic trajectories of chimpanzee social play: Similarities with humans. PloS One. 6:e27344.

Deag JM. 1977. Aggression and submission in monkey societies. Anim Behav. 25: 465–474.

de Silva S. 2010. Acoustic communication in the Asian elephant, *Elephas maximus maximus*. Behaviour. 147:825–852.

de Silva S, Ranjeewa ADG, Kryazhimskiy S. 2011. The dynamics of social networks among female Asian elephants. BMC Ecology. 11:17.Dunbar RI. 1991. Functional significance of social grooming in primates. Folia Primatologica. 57:121–131.

Dunbar RI. 2010. The social role of touch in humans and primates: Behavioural function and neurobiological mechanisms. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 34:260–268.

Gadgil M, Nair P. 1984. Observation on the social behaviour of free ranging groups

612 of tame Asiatic elephant (*Elephas maximus* Linn). Proc Indian Acad Sci.
613 93:225–233.
614 Garaï ME. 1992. Special relationships between female Asian elephants (*Elephas*
615 *maximus*) in zoological gardens. Ethology. 90:187–205.
616 Goodwin D, Bradshaw JWS, Wickens SM. 1997. Paedomorphosis affects agonistic
617 visual signals of domestic dogs. Anim Behav. 53:297–304.
618 Haakonsson JE, Semple S. 2009. Lateralisation of trunk movements in captive
619 Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*). Laterality. 144:413–422.
620 Hertenstein MJ, Verkamp JM, Kerestes AM, Holmes RM. 2006. The
621 communicative functions of touch in humans, nonhuman primates, and rats:
622 A review and synthesis of the empirical research. Genet Soc Gen Psychol
623 Monogr. 132:5–94.
624 Hurlbert SH. 1984. Pseudoreplication and the design of ecological field
625 experiments. Ecol Monogr. 54:187–211.
626 Kasper C, Voelkl B. 2009. A social network analysis of primate groups. Primates.
627 50:343–356.
628 Kurt F, Garaï ME. 2006. The Asian elephant in captivity: A field study. Cambridge
629 India: Foundation Press.

630 Langbauer WR Jr. 2000. Elephant communication. Zoo Biol. 19:425–445.

631 Makecha R, Fad O, Kuczaj SA. 2012. The role of touch in the social interactions of
632 Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*). Int J Comp Psychol. 25:60–82.

633 Martin F, Niemitz C. 2003. "Right-trunkers" and "left-trunkers": side preferences
634 of trunk movements in wild Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*). Int J Comp
635 Psychol. 117:371–379.

636 Martin P, Bateson P. 1993. Measuring behaviour: An introductory guide.
637 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.Maslow AH. 1936. The role of
638 dominance in the social and sexual behaviour of infra-human primates: III. A
639 theory of sexual behaviour of infra-human primates. Pedagog Semin J Genet
640 Psychol. 48:310–338.

641 McCowan B, Anderson K, Heagarty A, Cameron A. 2008. Utility of social network
642 analysis for primate behavioural management and well-being. Appl Anim
643 Behav Sci. 109:396–405.

644 McNeill D. 1992. Hand and mind: What gestures reveal about thought. Chicago:
645 University of Chicago Press.

646 Meyer JM, Goodwin TE, Schulte BA. 2008. Intrasexual chemical communication
647 and social responses of captive female African elephants, *Loxodonta africana*.

Anim Behav. 76:163–174.

Moss CJ. 1988. Elephant memories: Thirteen years in the life of an elephant family. New York: William Morrow and Co. Inc.

Moss CJ, Croze H, Lee PC, editors. 2011. The Amboseli elephants: A long-term perspective on a long-lived mammal. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nair S, Balakrishnan R, Seelamantula CS, Sukumar R. 2009. Vocalizations of wild Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*): structural classification and social context. J Acoust Soc Am. 126:2768–2778.

Nakamura M, Sakai M. 2013. Social touch in apes and dolphins. In: Yamagiwa J, Karczmarski L, editors. Primates and cetaceans: Field research and conservation of complex mammalian societies. Tokyo: Springer Japan; p. 355–383.

Nishida T. 2003. Harassment of mature female chimpanzees by young males in the Mahale Mountains. Int J Primatol. 24:503–514.

Nishida T, Zamma K, Matsusaka T, Inaba A, McGrew WC. 2010. Chimpanzee behaviour in the wild. An audio-visual encyclopaedia. Tokyo: Springer Japan.

O'Connell-Rodwell CE. 2007. Keeping an "ear" to the ground: seismic communication in elephants. Physiology. 22:287–294.

666 Olson D. 2004. Elephant husbandry resource. Lawrence (KS): Allen Press.

667 Onodera S, Hicks TP. 1999. Review: Evolution of the motor system: Why the
668 elephant's trunk works like a human's hand. Neuroscientist. 5:217–226.

669 Payne KB, Langbauer WR Jr, Thomas EM. 1986. Infrasonic calls of the Asian
670 elephant (*Elephas maximus*). Behav Ecol Sociobiol. 18:297–301.

671 Plotnik JM, de Waal FBM. 2014. Asian elephants (*Elephas maximus*) reassure
672 others in distress. PeerJ. 2:e278.

673 Polthanee A, Promkhambut A. 2014. Impact of climate change on rice-based
674 cropping systems and farmers' adaptation strategies in northeast Thailand.
675 Asian J Crop Sci. 6:262–272.

676 Poole JH, Moss CJ. 2008. Elephant sociality and complexity: the scientific evidence,
677 In: Wemmer C, Christen CA, editors. Elephants and ethics: towards a
678 morality of coexistence. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press; p. 69–
679 98.

680 Randall JA. 2001. Evolution and function of drumming as communication in
681 mammals. Am Zool. 41:1143–1156.

682 Rasmussen LEL. 1999. Evolution of chemical signals in the Asian elephant,
683 *Elephas maximus*: behavioural and ecological influences. J Biosci. 24:241–

251.

Rasmussen LEL, Krishnamurthy V. 2000. How chemical signals integrate Asian elephant society: The known and the unknown. Zoo Biol. 19:405–423.

Sakai M, Hishii T, Takeda S, Kohshima S. 2006. Flipper rubbing behaviours in wild bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops aduncus*). Mar Mam Sci. 22:966–978.

Schel AM, Rawlings B, Claidiere N, Wilke C, Wathan J, Richardson J, Pearson S, Herrelko ES, Whiten A, Slocombe K. 2013. Network analysis of social changes in a captive chimpanzee community following the successful integration of two adult groups. Am J Primatol. 75:254–266.

Slade BE, Schulte BA, Rasmussen LEL. 2003. Oestrous state dynamics in chemical communication by captive female Asian elephants. Anim Behav. 65:813–819.

Slade-Cain BE, Rasmussen LEL, Schulte BA. 2008. Estrous state influences on investigative, aggressive, and tail flicking behaviour in captive female Asian elephants. Zoo Biol. 27:167–180.

Spruijt BM, van Hooff JA, Gispen WH. 1992. Ethology and neurobiology of grooming behaviour. Physiol Rev. 72:825–852.

Sukumar R. 2003. The living elephants: evolutionary ecology, behaviour, and

conservation. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tamaki N, Morisaka T, Taki M. 2006. Does body contact contribute towards repairing relationships? The association between flipper-rubbing and aggressive behaviour in captive bottlenose dolphins. Behav Prosses. 73:209–215.

Thitaram C, Chansitthiwet S, Pongsopawijit P, Brown JL, Wongkalasin W, Daram P, Roongsri R, Kalmapijit A, Mahasawangkul S, Rojanasthien S, et al. 2009. Use of genital inspection and female urine tests to detect oestrus in captive Asian elephants. Anim Reprod Sci. 115:267–278.

Vidya TNC, Sukumar R. 2005. Social and reproductive behaviour in elephants. Curr Sci. 89:1200–1207.

Wittemyer G, Douglas-Hamilton I, Getz WM. 2005. The socioecology of elephants: analysis of the processes creating multitiered social structures. Anim Behav. 69:1357–1371.

APPENDICES

Table S1.

Reasons for excitement

Reason	Description	No. of events (with and without mahout interactions)
Disturbance	Elephants were disturbed by the sounds of cars or firecrackers, other species such as dogs or buffaloes and other elephants' vocalisations	234 (87, 147)
Play	Elephants became excited during bathing or dusting or before feeding	64 (20, 44)
Mahout's interaction	Elephants reacted to interactions with their mahouts	49 (49, 0)
Unknown	We were unable to identify the reason why elephants became excited.	288 (93, 195)

Table S2.

The social behaviours that occurred before or after touches. The percentages were calculated using the fomula $N_{before\ or\ after}/N_{touch} \times 100$ (where $N_{before\ or\ after}$ = the number of times that behaviouroccurred in each category before or after the touches and N_{touch} = the total number of touch events). * indicates that the rates were significantly different (GLMER followed by Tukey's test). We did not perform statistical analyses for 'unknown'.

Timing	Touch	Categories of behaviours before or after touch (%)				
		Movement	Play	Aggression	Touch or smell	Unknown
Before	U-type lip (*N*= 1444)	45.2 *	2.2	0.1 * *	51.0 *	1.5
	U-type genital (*N*= 807)	41.9	1.9	0.1	54.2	1.9
	S-type lip (*N*= 193)	35.2	7.8	5.2	51.2	0.6
After	U-type lip (*N*= 1444)	40.2 *	2.8	0.2 *	52.6	4.3
	U-type genital (*N*= 807)	40.5 *	1.6	0.0	52.3	5.6
	S-type lip (*N*= 193)	30.6	5.7	9.3	50.3	4.1

728 Table 1.

729 Subjects included in this study. The individuals with bold characters were the focal animals for this study. o indicates that the
730 individual stayed in the group during the particular period while × indicates that they did not stay in the group during that
731 particular period. * means that the individual joined or left the group in the middle of the period.

732

Name (Abbreviations)	Sex	Age (years)	Age class	Relationship	Period1	Period2	Focal time (hr)
Kaem sean (KS)	F	26	Adult		o	o	25.0
Fah sai (FS)	F	23	Adult		o	o	28.4
Mem (ME)	F	20	Adult		o	o	30.2
Euang loaung (EL)	F	18	Adult		o	o	26.2
Sai faa (SF)	F	15	Subadult		o	o	25.2
Kanoon (KN)	F	13	Subadult		o	o	24.7
Gem (GE)	F	11	Subadult		o	o	27.4
Nong nung (NO)	F	9	Juvenile		o	o	28.4
Nung ning (NU)	F	9	Juvenile		o	o	28.0
Teng mo (TM)	F	7	Juvenile		o	o	28.4
Nopa gao	M	1	Neonate	Kaem sean's son	o	×	–
Ploy	F	17	Adult		×	o	–
Khwan	F	1	Neonate	Ploy's daughter	×	o	–
Thong deng	F	19	Adult		*	×	–
Soi thong	F	0.67	Neonate	Thong deng's daughter	*	×	–
Tuk	F	10	Juvenile		*	×	–
Kham koon	F	5	Juvenile		×	*	–

733

734

735 Table 2.

736 Ethogram of social behaviours.

Behavioiur	Definition
MOVEMENT	
Approach	Move towards other individual such that they can touch each other (reach distance)
Leave	Move away from the reach distance of other individual
Follow	Walk behind other individual while maintaining the reach distance
TOUCH OR SMELL	
Touch	Touch other elephant's body (lip, genitals, body, head, mouth, ear, leg, tail, trunk, trunk tip) with the trunk tip
Touch with other body parts	Touch other elephant's body with other body parts, such as body, tail, leg
Trunk toward	Move trunk towards other elephant
AGGRESSION	
Head butt	Thump head against other elephant's head or body
Trunk hit	Slap other elephant's head or body with trunk
Kick	Kick other elephant's body with foreleg or hind leg
Trunk/head over head	Put trunk or head on other elephant's head
Trunk/head over back-aggressive	Put trunk or head on other elephant's back when the recipient is standing
Push-aggressive	Push other elephant's head with raised head
Push with tush	Push other elephant's body with tush
PLAY	
Mount	Put forelegs on other elephant's body from behind or side
Trunk/head over back -play	Put trunk or head on other elephant's back when the recipient is sitting
Push-play	Push other elephant's head or body with head or body without raised head
Rub	Rub head or body against other elephant's head or body
VOCALISATION	
Trunk smack	Hit ground with trunk outside and make sound
Air burst	Blow air from trunk and make noise
Other vocalisation	Rumble, growl, trumpet, squeak, chirp
POSTURE	
Threat posture	Raise head and extend ears towards opponent

737 Table 3.

738 Observed times and frequencies of touches in each focal animal.

Focal animal	U-type lip			U-type genital			S-type lip		
	N (times)	Act (times/hr)	Receive (times/hr)	N (times)	Act (times/hr)	Receive (times/hr)	N (times)	Act (times/hr)	Receive (times/hr)
KS	85	1.68	1.72	25	0.32	0.76	10	0.24	0.16
FS	226	4.43	3.52	96	1.13	2.25	25	0.60	0.28
ME	63	1.19	0.89	101	2.75	0.60	6	0.13	0.07
EL	197	3.06	4.47	67	1.11	1.45	3	0.00	0.11
SF	138	3.22	2.27	45	0.91	0.87	41	0.36	1.27
KN	138	2.87	2.71	169	4.57	2.18	23	0.36	0.57
GE	198	4.49	2.74	102	3.40	0.33	8	0.07	0.22
NO	151	2.46	2.85	52	1.20	0.63	21	0.18	0.56
NU	116	2.29	1.86	34	0.68	0.54	54	1.48	0.50
TM	132	2.25	2.39	118	0.77	3.31	2	0.04	0.04

Table 4

Observed touch frequencies for each pair. 'Other' shows the average frequency with which the animals other than the focal animals performed touches with the focal animal. The values that rank in the top 10% are highlighted.

(a) U-type lip

		Recipient										
		KS	FS	ME	EL	SF	KN	GE	NO	NU	TM	Other
Actor	KS		0.31	0.02	0.25	0.11	0.42	0.16	0.14	0.02	0.06	0.10
	FS	0.17		0.16	1.63	0.20	0.21	0.07	1.50	0.18	0.11	0.03
	ME	0.02	0.05		0.16	0.23	0.22	0.05	0.21	0.00	0.04	0.14
	EL	0.21	0.88	0.07		1.13	0.02	0.08	0.21	0.18	0.11	0.05
	SF	0.04	0.35	0.02	1.54		0.07	0.10	0.19	0.33	0.08	0.26
	KN	0.76	0.14	0.04	0.02	0.14		0.08	0.08	0.10	0.31	0.23
	GE	0.20	0.04	0.09	0.08	0.16	0.18		0.16	0.04	2.67	0.01
	NO	0.18	0.99	0.12	0.24	0.21	0.12	0.07		0.27	0.07	0.01
	NU	0.02	0.33	0.02	0.31	0.25	0.14	0.23	0.44		0.45	0.00
	TM	0.15	0.20	0.05	0.11	0.00	0.29	1.63	0.13	0.74		0.00
	Other	0.14	0.03	0.14	0.23	0.07	0.27	0.04	0.06	0.01	0.01	

(b) U-type genital

		Recipient										
		KS	FS	ME	EL	SF	KN	GE	NO	NU	TM	Other
Actor	KS		0.02	0.00	0.04	0.02	0.32	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02
	FS	0.00		0.00	0.44	0.04	0.02	0.05	0.48	0.04	0.02	0.00

	ME	0.15	0.28		0.09	0.14	0.31	0.02	0.03	0.07	0.07	0.55
	EL	0.04	0.56	0.00		0.29	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.00	0.08
	SF	0.00	0.20	0.02	0.41		0.11	0.04	0.02	0.08	0.00	0.14
	KN	0.56	0.08	0.06	0.15	0.11		0.12	0.16	0.14	0.24	0.98
	GE	0.00	0.04	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.16		0.04	0.04	2.98	0.01
	NO	0.00	0.77	0.02	0.11	0.04	0.06	0.04		0.04	0.04	0.05
	NU	0.04	0.16	0.00	0.06	0.06	0.22	0.05	0.04		0.05	0.01
	TM	0.04	0.07	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.20	0.20	0.00	0.15		0.01
	Other	0.04	0.02	0.15	0.11	0.07	0.16	0.01	0.05	0.00	0.02	

(c) S-type lip

		Recipient										
		KS	FS	ME	EL	SF	KN	GE	NO	NU	TM	Other
Actor	KS		0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	FS	0.17		0.00	0.00	0.22	0.19	0.09	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00
	ME	0.02	0.00		0.00	0.08	0.06	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
	EL	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00
	SF	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.04	0.08	0.21	0.00	0.00
	KN	0.02	0.14	0.06	0.02	0.00		0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02
	GE	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00
	NO	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02		0.14	0.02	0.00
	NU	0.04	0.05	0.00	0.09	0.68	0.02	0.07	0.43		0.00	0.00
	TM	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02		0.00

	Other	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

747

748 Table 5.

749 Statistical results of the generalised linear mixed-effect models followed by Tukey's test for the analyses of excited situations.

750 m refers to situations with interactions by the mahouts. * indicates $P < 0.05$ and ** indicates $P < 0.01$.

	U-type lip			U-type genitals			S-type lip		
(a) Excited or normal situations	Coefficient	*z*	*P*	Coefficient	*z*	*P*	Coefficient	*z*	*P*
Normal(m) vs. normal	− 0.90 ± 0.14	− 6.43	**	0.05 ± 0.12	0.42	0.98	− 1.77 ± 0.59	− 3.02	*
Normal(m) vs. excited(m)	− 1.91 ± 0.16	− 11.67	**	− 1.35 ± 0.16	− 8.54	**	− 0.91 ± 0.82	− 1.11	0.66
Normal(m) vs. excited	− 2.21 ± 0.15	− 14.38	**	− 1.33 ± 0.15	− 9.06	**	− 2.03 ± 0.66	− 3.10	*
Normal vs. excited(m)	− 1.01 ± 0.09	− 10.64	**	− 1.40 ± 0.12	− 11.78	**	0.86 ± 0.58	1.47	0.43
Normal vs. excited	− 1.31 ± 0.08	− 17.06	**	− 1.38 ± 0.11	− 13.13	**	− 0.26 ± 0.31	0.31	0.82
Excited(m) vs. excited	− 0.30 ± 0.11	− 2.63	*	0.02 ± 0.15	0.13	0.99	− 1.12 ± 0.65	− 1.72	0.29
(b) Detailed situations	Coefficient	*z*	*P*	Coefficient	*z*	*P*	Coefficient	*z*	*P*
Normal(m) vs normal	− 0.91 ± 0.14	− 6.48	**	0.09 ± 0.12	0.73	0.97	− 1.75 ± 0.59	− 3.00	*
Normal(m) vs disturbance(m)	− 2.22 ± 0.18	− 12.69	**	− 1.55 ± 0.18	− 8.49	**	− 1.17 ± 0.92	− 1.27	0.78
Normal(m) vs disturbance	− 2.50 ± 0.17	− 14.33	**	− 1.09 ± 0.21	−5.19	**	− 2.32 ± 0.74	− 3.15	*
Normal(m) vs play(m)	− 1.96 ± 0.22	− 8.81	**	− 1.31 ± 0.25	− 5.29	**	− 1.61 ± 0.92	− 1.75	0.47
Normal(m) vs play	− 2.01 ± 0.30	− 6.66	**	− 1.29 ± 0.37	− 3.46	**	− 2.89 ± 0.77	− 3.74	**
Normal vs disturbance(m)	− 1.31 ± 0.11	− 11.65	**	− 1.64 ± 0.15	− 10.98	**	0.59 ± 0.71	0.82	0.96
Normal vs disturbance	− 1.59 ± 0.11	− 14.26	**	− 1.18 ± 0.18	− 6.48	**	− 0.56 ± 0.46	− 1.23	0.80
Normal vs play(m)	− 1.05 ± 0.18	− 5.96	**	− 1.40 ± 0.22	− 6.31	**	0.15 ± 0.71	0.21	0.99
Normal vs play	− 1.10 ± 0.27	− 4.06	**	− 1.38 ± 0.36	− 3.84	**	− 1.13 ± 0.51	− 2.21	0.21
Disturbance(m) vs disturbance	− 0.27 ± 0.15	− 1.82	0.42	0.46 ± 0.23	2.02	0.30	− 1.15 ± 0.84	− 1.37	0.72
Disturbance(m) vs play(m)	0.26 ± 0.20	1.26	0.78	0.24 ± 0.26	0.95	0.92	− 0.44 ± 1.00	− 0.44	0.99
Disturbance(m) vs play	0.21 ± 0.29	0.73	0.97	0.26 ± 0.38	0.69	0.98	− 1.72 ± 0.87	− 1.97	0.33
Disturbance vs play(m)	0.53 ± 0.20	2.62	0.08	− 0.22 ± 0.28	− 0.77	0.97	0.71 ± 0.84	0.85	0.95

Disturbance vs play	0.49 ± 0.29	1.69	0.50	− 0.20 ± 0.40	− 0.49	0.99	− 0.57 ± 0.68	− 0.85	0.95
Play(m) vs play	− 0.05 ± 0.32	− 0.14	1.00	0.02 ± 0.42	0.04	1.00	− 1.28 ± 0.87	− 1.47	0.65

751 Fig. 1. — Examples of (a) U-type lip and (b) S-type lip touches.

752 Fig. 2. — Mean frequency of touches to each body part. The values are individual

753 means ± SD.

754 Fig. 3. — Relationships between the percentage of time in proximity to an

755 individual and the number of times (a) U-type lip, (b) U-type genital and (c) S-type

756 lip touches were performed.

757 Fig. 4. — Proportion of times that play or aggressive behaviours occurred (a)

758 before and (b) after the touches.

759 Fig. 5. — Proportion of times that play or aggressive behaviours occurred (a)

760 before and (b) after S-type touches between pairs with and without young.

761 Fig. 6. — Relationship between the number of times U-type lip and U-type genital

762 touches occurred in pairs with or without neonates.

Fig. 1



Fig. 2


frequency (times/hr)
9.0
8.0
7.0
6.0
5.0
4.0
3.0
2.0
1.0
0.0
S-type
U-type
lip
genital
body
trunk tip
ear
head
leg
tail
trunk
mouth

Fig. 3


(a)
(N = 74)
U-type lip (times)
250
200
150
100
50
0
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
(b)
(N = 74)
U-type genital (times)
200
150
100
50
0
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
(c)
(N = 74)
S-type lip (times)
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
proximity rate

Fig. 4


(a)
Proportion (%)
8
6
4
2
0
*
*
play
aggressive
(b)
Proportion (%)
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
*
play
aggressive
* : P < 0.05
U-type lip (N = 1444)
U-type genital (N = 807)
S-type lip (N = 193)

Fig. 5


(a)
proportion (%)
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
*
play
aggressive
(b)
Proportion (%)
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
play
aggressive
* : P < 0.05
with young (N = 111)
without young (N = 82)

Fig. 6


with neonates (N = 30)
without neonates (N = 84)
250
200
150
100
50
0
U-type lip (times)
0
100
200
U-type genital (times)