The ecological costs to females in a system with allied sexual coercion

Megan M. Wallen^{a*}, Eric M. Patterson^a, Ewa Krzyszczyk^a, and Janet Mann^{a,b}

^aDepartment of Biology, Georgetown University, Washington D.C.

^bDepartment of Psychology, Georgetown University, Washington D.C.

*Author for correspondence: M.M. Wallen, 406 Reiss Science Bldg., Georgetown University, Washington D.C., 20057-1229, USA. Telephone: +1 202-684-7139. Fax: +1 202-687-5662. Email address: mmw89@georgetown.edu

Word Count: 6914

The ecological costs to females in a system with allied sexual coercion

ABSTRACT

Sexual coercion results from extreme conflict over mating. As a male strategy to overcome female resistance, coercion can impose fitness costs on females. Among mammals, most cases involve single males or temporary coalitions, with allied aggression towards females being rare. Among Shark Bay bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops cf. aduncus*), male alliances harass, guard, and consort with females to obtain mating access, which has known physical costs to females. However, the behavioural and ecological costs of sexual coercion to females remain largely unexplored. Given the importance of individual differences in ranging and habitat use for dolphin foraging ecology, social networks, and fitness, we hypothesised that male coercion also imposes ecological costs on females. Using 25 years of longitudinal data, we examined how adult male presence relates to female space use and found that females ($N = 32$) altered their ranging when associating with adult males, but also when cycling. Additionally, females reduced use of their primary (preferred) habitat when with males, but cycling had no effect. Ranging shifts were slightly greater for males than for females when they were together, but only for females did this alter their spatial ecology. While it is also possible that males follow fertile females, and/or that females move to avoid males, the well-documented coercive mating system suggests that males, as part of their coercive mating tactics, sequester females to areas that females would not

otherwise occupy. Our results show that in a coercive mating system, males can alter females' basic behavioural ecology, and suggest that males spatially sequester individual females via allied consortships.

KEYWORDS

Sexual conflict, sexual coercion, habitat use, centroid, ranging, bottlenose dolphin, mating system, *Tursiops*, spatial ecology

Word Count: 6914

Sexual coercion, an extreme example of sexual conflict, is defined as when males, at some cost to females, direct "force" or the "threat of force" toward females to increase their chances of mating when females are fertile, and to decrease females' chances of mating with other males (Smuts and Smuts 1993). Coercion, an adaptive male strategy to overcome female resistance to mating and monopolise breeding opportunities, is an important force in sexual selection (Clutton-Brock and Parker 1995) and can potentially even lead to divergence and speciation (Panhuis et al. 2001). Furthermore, direct costs to females due to male sexual aggression can be severe and include injury (Le Boeuf and Mesnick 1991; Hiruki et al. 1993), increased energy expenditure (Watson et al. 1998), increased mortality (Réale et al. 1996), physiological stress (Muller et al. 2007), and decreased reproductive success (Hiruki et al. 1993;

Ojanguren and Magurran 2007; den Hollander and Gwynne 2009; Gay et al. 2009; Rossi et al. 2010; Takahashi and Watanabe 2010). Nonetheless, because documenting such fitness costs is challenging, particularly in wild, long-lived animals, some researchers have examined the behavioural and ecological costs females experience as a result of male coercion, which may or may not have consequences for fitness. For example, studies documenting changes in movement and ranging (e.g. Grevy's zebra *Equus grevyi*, Sundaresan et al. 2007), activity patterns (e.g. southern elephant seals *Mirounga leonina*, Galimberti et al. 2000; mollies *Poecilia* spp., Heubel and Plath 2008; humpback whales *Megaptera novaengliae*, Cartwright and Sullivan 2009; and guppies *Poecilia mexicana*, Köhler et al. 2011), and sociality (e.g. guppies *Poecilia reticulata*, Darden et al 2009; Darden and Watts 2012) suggest that male coercion influences important aspects of female behavioural ecology and likely fitness. Yet among these studies, few have examined the impact males have on female behaviour or fitness when they act collectively, i.e., coalitionary or allied aggression, perhaps because outside of humans (Rodseth and Novak 2009), some non-human primates (chimpanzees *Pan troglodytes*: Watts 1998, Muller et al. 2009, Connor and Vollmer 2009; baboons *Papio*: Noë 1992; spider monkeys *Ateles*: Link et al. 2009), and some bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops* spp.) populations (Connor et al. 1992a, Connor and Vollmer 2009), allied males rarely direct aggression towards females.

In several long-term studies of bottlenose dolphins, researchers have documented a sexually coercive mating system in which adult males form long-term, stable alliances (Connor and Vollmer 2009) of variable size (Wells 1991; Connor et al. 2001; Owen et al 2002; Wiszniewski et al. 2012) that cooperate to consort and mate

with individual, primarily cycling, females (Connor et al. 1992a; Smolker et al. 1992; Connor et al. 1996). Consortships are typically initiated by aggressive herding behaviours such as biting, hitting, chasing, and threat displays or captures, followed by intermittent aggression throughout the consortship (Connor et al. 1992a; Connor and Smolker 1996). Among Indian Ocean bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops cf. aduncus*) in Shark Bay, Australia, preliminary evidence suggests that allied males influence female ecology. Previous work found that females spend more time in deeper water and less time in shallow water when in consortships (Watson-Capps 2005). Although the benefits or costs of this shift are not fully understood, changes in depth use suggest that male coercion may impact female spatial ecology.

Shark Bay dolphin spatial ecology has been previously described in some detail. Individuals exhibit bisexual philopatry and have large, overlapping home ranges that are stable through time (Tsai and Mann 2013). Habitat use is influenced by both predator (tiger shark, *Galeocerdo cuvier*) and prey distributions on large and small spatial scales (Heithaus and Dill 2002; 2006), meaning even small shifts in space use could have potentially serious ecological outcomes for dolphins. However, such shifts likely have the greatest impact on female ecology given that females exhibit habitat specific foraging specialisations (Sargeant et al. 2007, Mann and Sargeant 2003; Sargeant et al. 2005; Mann et al. 2008; 2012), have smaller home ranges, and lower habitat use diversity compared to males (Patterson 2012). For example, some females specialise in a foraging tactic known as sponging, which involves the use of marine sponges as tools and only occurs in the deep channels where sponges and appropriate prey are found (Mann et al. 2008; Sargeant et al. 2007; Patterson and Mann 2011). Sponger females

could be severely impacted if consorting males move them away from the channel habitat. In contrast, individual males and alliances have much larger home ranges and greater habitat use diversity (Randić et al. 2012; Patterson 2012), which likely relates to their need to roam the bay to find and maintain access to fertile females. Thus, not only is efficient space use inherently important for survival, but the observed variation among individuals and among sexes is an explicit representation of individual ecological needs.

When considering that male and female space use must coalesce during consortships, three scenarios are possible. First, it may be that males spatially sequester females by consorting with them in accordance with their alliance's space use. Here one would expect substantial ecological costs to females, and no such costs to males. Second, it may be that males spatially sequester females to some extent, but also partially adjust their alliance's space use to temporarily match that of fertile females. Here one would expect ecological costs to both sexes, the magnitude of which would depend on the relative space use shifts for each sex. Finally, it may be that males do not spatially sequester females and instead temporarily adjust their alliance's space use to match that of their targeted mate's range, i.e., males go where the fertile females are and follow them around. Here one would expect males, but not females, to suffer an ecological cost.

Given the aggressive nature of consortships, the first or second scenario, both of which impose some ecological costs on females, seem most likely. Thus, we hypothesise that males present an ecological cost to adult females by altering female space use, specifically, their ranging and habitat use. If alliances sequester females to their own, much larger home ranges, females will likely be far from their core home

range area and their preferred foraging habitats. Accordingly, we predict that (1) females will be farther from their home range core (i.e. the centroid) when they are with more than one male compared to when they are not, and that (2) females will use their preferred habitat less when they are with more than one male compared to when they are not. However, this does not preclude consortships from affecting male space use. Nonetheless, given that males have larger home ranges and greater habitat use diversity than females, even if males do alter their space use during consortships, we expect the relative impact of consortships on spatial ecology to be greater for females than for males. Thus, we predict that (3) if males do experience space use shifts during consortships, such shifts in both ranging and habitat use will be relatively greater for females than for males when the sexes are together. Female-biased space use shifts would suggest that females suffer an ecological cost in this coercive mating system.

METHODS

Study Population and Site

Our study population consists of individually recognised wild Indian Ocean bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops cf. aduncus*) residential to Shark Bay, Western Australia (Mann et al. 2000; Tsai and Mann 2013). As part of the Shark Bay Dolphin Research Project (SBD RP), researchers have collected behavioural, demographic, reproductive, ecological, social, and genetic data on >1800 dolphins since 1984. Individuals are distinguished using standard dorsal fin identification techniques (Würsig and Würsig

1977). Sex is determined by the presence of a dependent calf, views of the genital area (Smolker et al. 1992), and in a few cases, DNA (Krützen et al. 2004). Age is determined from known or estimated birthdates (if seen as a calf), physical and behavioural characteristics (Mann and Smuts 1999), and/or the presence and degree of ventral speckling (Krzyszczuk and Mann 2012).

Our main study site is a 300 km² area of the eastern gulf of Shark Bay (25°47' S, 113°43' E) within a UNESCO World Heritage Site, and as a result, remains relatively pristine with low human impact. Habitat in the study area, as defined by Patterson (2012), consists of six distinct types (average depths reported relative to datum): *channel* (7.13 m) with a substrate of rock, shell, and coral debris, *deep open* (6.56 m) with a mixed sand, silt and clay substrate, *seagrass beds* (2.00 m) with continuous seagrass coverage (predominantly *Amphibolis antarctica* and more sparsely *Posidonia australis*), *sand flats* (-0.11 m) with continuous sand coverage, and two edge habitats: *deep ecotone*, the transition zone between a shallow (*seagrass beds* or *sand flats*) and deep (*channel* or *deep open*) habitat and *shallow ecotone*, the transition zone between two shallow habitats (*seagrass beds* and *sand flats*). Relative habitat availability was calculated as the proportion of the study area with coverage of that habitat type (Patterson 2012).

Data Collection

Survey records

Data collection for the SBD RP consists primarily of observational, boat-based records. For this study data were drawn from surveys, which are opportunistic sightings of dolphins, conducted from 1988–2012. A survey began when observers are close enough to identify or photograph individuals. Scan sampling (Altmann 1974; Mann 1999) is used for the first five minutes of a survey to determine group composition and activity. Group membership was determined using a 10-meter chain rule, where all individuals within 10 meters of another group member were considered to be in association (Smolker et al. 1992). Predominant group activity was recorded as the behaviour that $\geq 50\%$ of the group members engaged in during the scan in the first five minutes. Spatial data (latitude and longitude) were also collected during each survey, to later be used in classifying each survey's habitat based on the aforementioned habitat classifications. If an individual had more than one survey sighting in a day, we restricted our dataset to include only the last survey point per individual per day to reduce spatial and temporal correlation.

Female cycling

Male interest in females is expected to vary with female reproductive status. Thus, we included female cycling status (whether or not she was cycling) as the first factor in our study. Bottlenose dolphins are seasonally polyoestrous with an estimated 6-month peak cycling period prior to the ~12-month pregnancy (Schroeder 1990; O'Brien and Robeck 2012). Accordingly, we assigned cycling periods as the 6-month period before the start of known pregnancies (from known births). However, this definition biases observations against females who have produced no or few surviving

calves, or have long intervals between nursing calves since they are potentially fertile during periods when no pregnancies are confirmed by a birth. Consequently, we included additional time periods in which a female could be cycling, based on the period: a) from the female's 12th birthday (when 42.4% of first births occur, while 22.0% occur at age 11, $N = 59$ adult females where age of first birth was known) until her first known pregnancy, and b) one year prior to weaning date for calves that nursed beyond the age of four, the average weaning age (average interbirth interval between surviving calves is 4.7 years; Mann et al. 2000). This method overestimates cycling periods (increasing the risk of Type II error), but since females go through several non-conceptive cycles per year, it conservatively accounts for potential fertile periods. Since most of our data (76% of surveys) were collected during the 6 months prior to the November peak births/conceptions (Mann et al. 2000), we have adequate coverage over periods of cycling. Females were considered to be non-cycling if they were (1) pregnant, or (2) nursing a calf that was at least 12 months from its weaning date. Thus, our cycling factor has two levels: cycling and not cycling. Females under age 12 were excluded from analysis.

Male presence

Individual pairs or trios of males (first-order alliances) typically have very strong bonds, with half-weight coefficients of association (COAs) as high as 0.8-1.0 (Connor et al. 1992a, b; 2011). Second-order alliances are composed of two or more first-order alliances (Connor and Vollmer 2009) with COAs ranging from 0.24-0.67 (Connor & Krützen 2015), and third-order alliances are composed of second-order alliances and

their close male associates with slightly lower COAs ranging from 0.10-0.17 (Connor et al. 2011). Because males are found so frequently with their alliance partners and very rarely with non-partners, as a proxy for consortships we used the presence of more than one adult male in a survey. Males were considered to be adult at 12 years of age or older (Cheal and Gales 1992). Thus, we used male presence as the second factor in our study, having two levels: >1 male present, in which more than one adult male was present in the survey (representing the minimal unit for allied coercion), and males absent, in which no adult males were present in the survey. Here, single-male associations were omitted. Males and females are monomorphic and there is no evidence that a single male can monopolise a female. Although allied aggression towards females is frequently observed (Connor et al. 1996; Scott et al. 2005), aggression by a lone adult male towards an adult female has never been observed in 28 years of study and 3467 hours of focal observation on 127 adult females (Scott et al. 2005; unpublished data). Further, associations between single males and single or multiple females are rare (Table I). Nevertheless, for a subset of females in our sample, we included a third level for the male factor: surveys in which a single male was present with at least one adult female (see Supplementary Material).

Data Analysis

Cycling status (cycling or not cycling) and adult male presence (males absent, one male present, >1 male present) were included as factors in our analyses. Since reproductively successful females spend most of their adult life pregnant and/or

lactating, not cycling, and rarely in association with males (Gibson and Mann 2008), we considered the baseline state to be surveys when females were not cycling and males were absent. We conducted a similar analysis on males to examine if their behaviour is impacted by the presence of a female. Males spend most of their time with each other (Connor et al. 1992a, b; 2011) and not in consortships, so we considered the male baseline state to be surveys when no adult females were present (females absent) and there was at least one additional adult male present. The male baseline was compared to surveys where males were with at least one female (cycling or non-cycling), resulting in a single factor with three levels for the male analysis (no females, only non-cycling female(s) present, and only cycling female(s) present). Dolphins were included in the sample if they had a minimum of six survey sightings on different days in each factor level (e.g. cycling female with males; one point possible for each habitat based on habitat availability), and the same females ($N = 32$) and males ($N = 73$) were used for all analyses (the smaller sample size for females reflects the additional cycling restriction). A subset of 11 females with adequate survey data was analysed using the single-male comparison (results shown in the Supplementary Material). For all analyses regardless of overall significance tests, we conducted *a priori* contrasts between all three levels of male presence.

Ranging

As a measure of core ranging we calculated a baseline centroid for each individual by averaging all GPS locations from survey records in the baseline state. Centroids for males and females were calculated for their baseline state excluding

sightings from all other factor levels. To examine if ranging differed with cycling status and male presence (for females) or with female presence including cycling status (for males), we compared the distances between the baseline centroid and each survey GPS record within each factor level using permutation tests with dolphin ID as a blocking factor. While somewhat counterintuitive, we also compared the distance of the baseline centroid to each baseline survey point used in its calculation, as this serves as the best measure of expected distance from the baseline centroid if there were no effect of male presence or cycling status. We then compared the distances from the baseline for each sex when they were found together to determine if females and males differentially shifted in ranging. The average number of surveys ($\pm$ SD) per female, per factor level was 102.75 ± 103.24 (not cycling, males absent), 21.13 ± 14.50 (not cycling, >1 male present), 46.31 ± 38.96 (cycling, males absent), and 26.41 ± 17.32 (cycling, >1 male present). The average number of surveys ($\pm$ SD) per male, per factor level was 43.69 ± 17.57 (females absent), 66.97 ± 53.15 (cycling female(s) present) and 15.38 ± 8.70 (only non-cycling female(s) present).

To further understand how cycling and male presence influence female ranging, and how female presence influences male ranging, we also calculated the average pairwise distance between all sightings for each individual within each factor level (hereafter average ranging distance). We examined the effect of cycling, male presence, and their interaction (for females), and the effect of female presence (for males) on this average ranging distance using permutation tests.

Habitat use

After spatially intersecting our survey sightings with the six habitat classifications, we quantified individual preferred (hereafter primary) habitat use using selection ratios. Selection ratios indicate habitat selection by an individual while correcting for habitat availability. Selection ratios were calculated as the proportional use of a habitat divided by the proportional availability of that habitat (Manly et al. 2002). Values greater than one indicate selection above expected based on availability, values less than one indicate selection below expected based on availability, and values equal to one indicate selection in accordance with availability. We ranked each individual's baseline habitats (1°, 2°, 3°, etc.) in descending order by their selection ratio, with the primary (1°) habitat having the highest value. Habitat use shifts were examined as a function of cycling status and male presence (for females) and female presence including cycling status (for males), using distanced-based, permutation MANOVAs with dolphin ID as a blocking factor. In this analysis the last-ranked habitat (6°) was dropped since otherwise the response would be linearly dependent.

Because many dolphins, mostly females, specialise in habitat-specific foraging tactics (Sargeant et al. 2007, 2005; Mann et al. 2008; Patterson and Mann 2011), we examined primary habitat use alone with permutation independence tests. We expected the primary habitat to be the most important habitat for females and likely the most affected by male presence. We then compared the primary habitat use selection ratio for each sex when they were found together to determine if females and males differentially changed use of their primary habitat. The average number of surveys ($\pm$ SD) per female, per factor level was 99.94 ± 103.97 (not cycling, males absent), 20.13 ± 14.00 (not cycling, >1 male present), 44.38 ± 38.42 (cycling, males absent), and $23.78 \pm$

15.05 (cycling, >1 male present). The average number of surveys ($\pm$ SD) per male, per factor level was 36.89 ± 17.24 (females absent), 57.16 ± 49.43 (cycling female(s) present), and 14.35 ± 8.25 (only non-cycling female(s) present). See the Interactive Map for a visualization of habitats in the study area as well as representative male and female spatial data by factor level.

Statistical considerations

All of our response variables deviated significantly from normality (all Shapiro-Wilk tests $P < 0.01$), thus permutation tests were used in all analyses (Anderson 2001). Permutations (1000 randomizations) were performed using the coin package (Hothorn et al. 2006) in R, version 3.2.1 (R Core Team 2015), except for the female habitat and ranging distance analyses in which custom permutations tests were written using the lme4 package for R (Bates 2014) to test for interaction (Anderson 2001). Permutation MANOVAs were performed using the adonis() function in the vegan package for R (Oksanen et al. 2013), which permutes the raw data and calculates a pseudo-F using a multivariate distance measure, here the Bray-Curtis distance. For all analyses, the interactions were tested and tests for main effects were only performed if interactions were determined to be non-significant. Significance was set at $\alpha = 0.05$ for all tests, and Bonferroni adjustments were applied where there were multiple contrasts and the corrected P -values are reported. Female centroid distances were natural-log transformed to correct for heteroscedasticity (Levene's test $P < 0.01$), but raw distance values are reported for illustrative purposes.

RESULTS

Female associations with males

Table I shows that adult females spend most of their time either alone or with other adult females. Females are with >1 male about one-third of the time when cycling, and are very rarely with lone males regardless of reproductive state. These descriptive data provide context for our results.

For all the following analyses, results from the single-male associations were either not significant or largely intermediate between male-absent and multi-male associations (see Figure S1a-c, Table S1). As evident from Table I, the instances of single-male association with females are rare and our sample sizes were limited. See the Supplementary Material for all single male results and discussion.

Ranging

There was no interactive effect of cycling status and male presence on distance from baseline for females ($F = 0.24$, $P = 0.63$), so main effects are reported. Both cycling status ($Z = -4.30$, $P < 0.0001$) and male presence ($Z = -7.08$, $P < 0.0001$) influenced the distance (natural log-transformed) a female was found from her baseline centroid. Females were sighted farthest from their baseline centroid when they were with males, and also when they were cycling (Fig. 1a). In contrast, male distances from their baseline centroid were unrelated to female presence or female cycling status

($maxT = 1.63$, $P = 0.20$; Fig. 2a). In comparing male and female distances from their baselines to when there was at least one female and >1 adult male in the group, the distances of each sex to their respective baseline centroids differed ($Z = -2.35$, $P = 0.02$), with males being farther from their baseline centroid than females.

Females' average ranging distance was not influenced by an interaction between cycling status and male presence ($F = 0.13$, $P = 0.72$) so main effects are reported. Both cycling status ($Z = -2.55$, $P = 0.009$) and male presence ($Z = -3.06$, $P = 0.003$) affected a female's average ranging distance (Fig. 1b). Females had the highest average ranging distance when cycling and >1 male was present, which was significantly higher than the baseline state only ($Z = -3.56$, $P < 0.0001$) after a Bonferroni correction (Fig. 1b). However, cycling females without males also had a higher average ranging distance than females in the baseline state ($Z = -2.85$, $P = 0.001$; Fig. 1b).

Males' overall average ranging distance was influenced by female presence ($maxT = 5.09$, $P < 0.0001$). Males had the highest average ranging distance when no females were present compared to when non-cycling female(s) ($Z = 4.79$, $P < 0.0001$) and cycling females ($Z = -2.77$, $P = 0.005$) were present (Fig. 2b). Average male ranging distance was greater when cycling females were present compared to only non-cycling female presence ($Z = 3.24$, $P = 0.002$; Fig. 2b).

Table I: Proportion of sightings per individual per factor level used in the full data set (32 females; $N = 4611$ surveys and 7004 female sightings). For analysis, surveys with

one female and one male were lumped with those that had more than one female and one male to form the one-male factor level.

SIGHTING PROPORTION

	Not cycling	Cycling
♀ or ♀ ♀	0.715	0.551
♀, ♂	0.021	0.015
♀, ♂ ♂	0.040	0.114
♀ ♀, ♂	0.073	0.071
♀ ♀, ♂ ♂	0.152	0.248

♂ = 1 adult male present, ♂ ♂ = >1 adult male present.
 ♀ = 1 adult female present, ♀ ♀ = >1 adult female present.

Figure 1: Adult female ($N = 32$) (a) distance from the baseline centroid, (b) average ranging distance, and (c) primary habitat selection ratios for each combination of cycling and male presence factor levels. Error bars indicate ± 1 SE. Letters indicate significant differences after Bonferroni adjustments. Distances in (a) were natural log-transformed for analysis but raw distances are shown for illustrative purposes.

(see source file)

Figure 2: Adult male ($N = 73$) (a) distance from the baseline centroid, (b) average ranging distance, and (c) primary habitat selection ratios for each factor level. Error bars indicate ± 1 SE. For distance from baseline centroid, no significant differences across

groups. For average ranging distance and habitat selection ratios (b), letters indicate significant differences after Bonferroni adjustments.

(see source file)

Habitat use

The interaction between male presence and cycling status on overall female habitat use was not significant (Table II). However, overall female habitat use did change significantly as a function of male presence, but not cycling status (Table II). Per our *a priori* prediction, we examined the effect of cycling and male presence on female primary habitat alone (Fig. 1c). There was no interaction between cycling status and male presence on primary habitat use ($F = 0.44$, $P = 0.53$) so only main effects are reported. Consistent with the results from the MANOVA, all females used their primary habitat less when in the presence of >1 male ($Z = 3.32$, $P = 0.0003$), independent of cycling status, which itself was not significant ($Z = 0.28$, $P = 0.78$). In the baseline state, females were sighted in their primary habitat 62% of the time, and this decreased by an average of 15% when >1 male was present.

Overall male habitat use changed as a function of female presence (Table II), as did the primary habitat when analysed alone ($\max T = 3.54$, $P = 0.001$). Males used their primary habitat less when either cycling or non-cycling females were present compared to when no females were present (cycling females: $Z = -4.25$, $P < 0.0001$; non-cycling females: $Z = 2.59$, $P = 0.008$; Fig. 2c). However, male habitat use did not differ

depending on if they were with cycling females or non-cycling females ($Z = 0.23$, $P = 0.84$). In baseline, males were sighted in their primary habitat 54% of the time, and this decreased by an average of 4% when either cycling or non-cycling females were present. In comparing the reduction in primary habitat use between males and females from their baseline to when there was at least one female and >1 adult male in the group, the reduction in primary habitat use did not differ between the sexes ($Z = 0.54$, $P = 0.58$).

Table II: MANOVA results for overall female habitat use selection ratios and the effect of female cycling status and male presence, and overall male habitat use selection ratios and the effect of female presence including cycling status. df = degrees of freedom, MS = mean squares, F = model statistic from the permuted F-tests, R^2 = adjusted R-squared or effect size, P = significance value.

		df	MS	F	R^2	P
Females	Cycling	1	0.05	0.66	0.01	0.29
	Male presence	1	0.19	2.33	0.02	<0.01
	Cycling*Male presence	1	0.04	0.55	0.00	0.37
	Residual	124	9.85		0.97	
Males	Female presence	2	0.12	1.40	0.01	0.03
	Residual	216	0.09		0.99	

DISCUSSION

Our findings are consistent with the sexual coercion hypothesis that allied males impose ecological costs on females, in that females experienced space use shifts when in the presence of more than one adult male. Specifically, females were sighted farthest from their baseline centroid, had greater average ranging distances, and showed altered habitat use when with more than one male, regardless of cycling status. Interestingly, cycling status alone also affected female ranging in that females had greater ranging distances and were found farther from their baseline when cycling, regardless of male presence. This suggests an overall change in ranging, although not habitat use, during cycling that may be unrelated to mating. Together, our results suggest that allied male coercion imposes ecological costs on female bottlenose dolphins, but some range shifts may occur outside of consortships when females are cycling.

Males did not experience as great a shift in their spatial ecology during mating contexts as did females. Males were found equally far from their baseline whether or not a female (either cycling or non-cycling) was present. However, male average ranging distance decreased when with cycling and non-cycling females. This is unsurprising as males are expected to range widely when searching for females, and preliminary data suggest males have smaller home ranges during peak breeding in the spring (Randić 2008). When a female was present, male average ranging distance was higher if the female was cycling, which suggests males a) match movement of the females they are consorting, and/or b) maintain greater ranging to avoid detection or conflict with other alliances. Both predictions corroborate our finding that female average ranging distance was higher when cycling. While males did alter their overall habitat use and decreased

their primary habitat use in the presence of females, this did not depend on a female's cycling status. The lack of a cycling status effect here may indicate that males have imperfect detection of female reproductive states. Females nurse calves for 2.5 to 9 years and often wean their calf during the next pregnancy (Mann et al. 2000; unpublished data). With such long and variable lactation periods, male ability to detect or predict female fertility is likely imperfect. Males have also been observed to consort non-cycling and pregnant females (Connor et al. 1996, Furuichi et al. 2014), which may be a male bonding tactic rather than about increasing the likelihood of conceptions *per se*.

When directly comparing centroid and habitat shifts during sightings of possible mating contexts (i.e. > 1 male and ≥ 1 female together in surveys), we found that males experienced larger ranging shifts than females, and there was no habitat shift sex difference. However, while the presence of males altered females' normal ranging patterns (Fig. 1a), the same was not true for males when in the presence of females (Fig. 2a); male centroid distance remained constant regardless of female presence (cycling or non-cycling). Males typically have larger home ranges than females (Owen et al. 2002; Urian et al. 2009; Patterson 2012; Randić et al. 2012; Sprogis et al. 2016; but see Tsai and Mann 2013), so any shift they experience likely has less of an impact on their overall space use compared to a similar shift in females. In fact, increased ranging may actually be beneficial for males since the size of their home ranges is associated with their coercive mating tactics (Randić et al. 2012), and alliances tend to range more widely to maximise their search area and access to females (Randić 2012). Further, while both males and females experienced similar primary habitat use shifts in

mating contexts, adult males have higher habitat use diversity than adult females (Patterson 2012), and don't specialise in foraging tactics nearly as much as females (e.g. Mann and Sargeant 2003; Sargeant et al. 2005; Mann et al. 2008; 2012), so a shift in primary habitat likely has less of an impact on male foraging than it would for more specialised females.

While males experienced smaller shifts in their spatial ecology when with females, our results clearly demonstrate ranging shifts for females in consortship contexts that likely impose ecological costs. For example, adult female home ranges in Shark Bay average 51 km² (Tsai and Mann 2013), compared to 76 km² for adult males (Randić et al. 2012). Thus, the average centroid shift of 3 km when cycling and with males reported here would likely place a female near the edge or outside of her home range, if, as a conservative example, a female has a circular home range with an area of 51 km² and a radius of 4 km.

Interestingly, female sightings were farther apart (ranging distance) and farther from their baseline centroid when they were cycling regardless of male presence. Thus, in general, cycling females appear to increase their ranging. For some of these females that still have dependent calves, additional ranging may be especially costly, which raises the question of why cycling females might increase their ranging behaviour. We propose three possible explanations for increased movement during cycling, all of which warrant further investigation. First, cycling females might increase ranging to avoid detection by allied males. Second, females might increase ranging to avoid consortships with specific alliances (e.g. reduce probability of incestuous matings, see Frère et al. 2010a) and/or increase the chance of encountering preferred alliances or

multiple male partners. Third, as an artifact of our study methods, females might be sighted between consortships after males have already moved them far from their core ranging area. Increased traveling during cycling has been reported in other systems: in Mahale chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii*), estrous females travelled greater distances (Hasegawa 1990) and spent more time moving than their anestrus counterparts (Matsumoto-Oda and Oda 1998). In giraffes (*Giraffa camelopardalis*), cycling females tended to locomote more than pregnant females (del Castillo et al. 2005). Lactating Grevy's zebra have elevated speeds compared to non-lactating females, and these females experience the most male harassment (Sundaresan et al. 2007). In black-faced impalas (*Aepyceros melampus petersi*), post-parturient females foraged in different microhabitats and elevations than pre-parturient females (Matson et al. 2007), suggesting finer scale habitat decisions may indeed be influenced by reproductive status alone. In contrast, in our study female cycling status influenced average ranging distance and distance from baseline centroid, but not habitat use. This suggests that although females do increase ranging and possibly their home range, they appear to do so in way that maintains their preferred habitat use. Such range shifts are not likely as costly as those experienced in a consortship context.

Females experienced overall habitat use shifts, and importantly a reduction in primary habitat use, when with more than one male. Reduced primary habitat use has direct implications for female foraging behaviour since many females specialise in habitat-specific foraging tactics (Sargeant et al. 2007, 2005; Mann et al. 2008; Patterson and Mann 2011). For instance, given that spongers are almost never sighted greater than 6 km from their channel habitat (Mann and Patterson 2013), consorting by males

almost certainly takes them in to unfamiliar habitat outside of their baseline area. In fact, one sponger female in this study reduced her channel habitat use by 36% when she was with males. In such a scenario, habitat and site unfamiliarity may present significant challenges, such as extra search effort to find sponge tools and/or prey, which may alter foraging success (Patterson et al. 2015). Indeed, previous work found that females foraged less during consortships (Watson-Capps 2005), which could be because they were spending less time in their primary foraging habitat. An examination of group behaviour data from the surveys used in this study indicates that females have reduced foraging budget in consortship contexts. Foraging was the predominant activity of groups consisting of a female and more than one male only 20% of the time, compared to 32% for groups of females without males. While such a reduction suggests an energy intake cost to females as a result of male coercion, we emphasise that these group behaviour data are not ideal for examining individual female changes in activity budgets (Karniski et al. 2014). Instead, individual focal follow data should provide a more accurate picture of female activity budgets with respect to cycling status and male presence, a topic of our future work.

Together, our results suggest that males spatially sequester females during consortships, from which they may gain several benefits. By sequestering females, males likely impact the ability of females to counter their efforts. For example, on a number of occasions, we have witnessed adult females appearing to “assist” other females in consortships (see also Connor et al. 2006). In these cases, the assisting female may join a group where males are harassing a close associate, and remain in close proximity or even establish physical contact with her. While males may try to

569 separate these females, the females sometimes succeed in leaving the group. By
570 spatially moving females away from their close associates, males might reduce the risk
571 that they will receive aid. Indeed, female social relationships are closely tied to their
572 home ranges (Frère et al. 2010b; Mann et al. 2012), so females displaced from their
573 preferred areas may not have their common female associates available, albeit
574 temporarily.

575 Another benefit of sequestration is that males may be able to reduce competition
576 from other alliances. Alliances vary in size (Connor et al. 1999; Randić et al. 2012) and
577 can be fiercely competitive, with larger alliances often defeating smaller ones (Connor et
578 al. 1999). Presumably this is why males cooperate in the first place – to increase their
579 ability to maintain exclusive access to a female even though they must share in matings
580 with alliance members. The best tactic for males might be to remove a female from an
581 area where other males are likely to search. Finally, by using coercion within or outside
582 of female cycling periods, males may be acting to increase their own reproductive
583 success, as has been found in chimpanzees (Feldblum et al. 2014).

584 While our data indicate that male coercion negatively impacts female spatial
585 ecology, three alternative, but non-mutually exclusive, explanations are possible. First,
586 females might actually alter their space use when cycling, and males simply follow them
587 in order to gain mating access. As noted above, females of a variety of mammalian
588 species increase their ranging during cycling for many reasons. However, we failed to
589 find an overall effect of cycling on habitat use. Thus for this alternative hypothesis to
590 hold, females would need to specifically alter their preferred habitat use only in the
591 company of males, or, males would need to only follow a female if she is both cycling

and in a non-preferred habitat. While this is certainly possible, we are unaware of any data that support this somewhat unusual scenario. Second, females might shift their space use to avoid males, and thus the ecological shifts represent the costs of a female counterstrategy to male aggression, rather than the cost of coercion itself. While we cannot rule out this possibility, in such a scenario the threat of male coercion would still impose an indirect cost on females if avoidance requires moving away from preferred areas. Finally, rather than experiencing direct costs from sexual coercion, females may be experiencing indirect costs as a result of a male strategy to reduce intrasexual competition via spatial segregation. Since these two explanations result in the same behaviour (females mating with sequestering males, and not other competing males), we are unable to disentangle the root source of these ecological costs. If alliance formation and maintenance is actually a strategy to reduce male competition, particularly in areas where males have a high encounter rate (Connor and Whitehead 2005; Connor and Krützen, 2015) and encounters with cycling females are rare, then coalitionary aggression, sequestration, and monopolization of individual females may be the best way for males to achieve mating success. Future studies employing focal follow methods on individual females with and without males, in all reproductive states, may prove useful in ruling out these alternative explanations.

Currently, the costs of sexual conflict are not well understood, especially among long-lived mammals where fitness outcomes can take decades to assess (Aloise King et al. 2013), and female counterstrategies may be in place (Palombit 2014). However, our results suggest that in bottlenose dolphins, males have a significant impact on female space use that likely impacts foraging behaviour and potentially fitness. Given

that female bottlenose dolphins spend weeks or even months in consortships (Connor et al. 1996), these spatial, ecological costs may be long lasting. For reproductively successful females that nurse calves for three or more years and cycle about every 4–5 years, consortship frequency, and thus the costs of male coercion may be low. However, for females with low calving success, repeated annual consortship events might have more severe negative impacts. As such, the fitness costs of sexual conflict to females in the bottlenose dolphin mating system deserve further study.

Our study contributes to the growing body of literature documenting behavioural costs to coercive mating, and provides clear evidence for the costs of allied male aggression in a non-human species. In other coercive systems, the threat of male coercion forces female avoidance (e.g. guppies *Poecilia reticulata*, Darden and Croft 2008), and even sexual social segregation (e.g. small-spotted catsharks *Scyliorhinus canicula*, Wearmouth et al. 2012). Male chimpanzees lead females away in consortships, effectively mate guarding (Tutin 1979). However, all known cases involve single male harassment of females (but see Watts 1998), and we are unaware of any cases where males engage in stable and long-term cooperation to coerce females as in bottlenose dolphins. Importantly, few studies have looked at the relationship between coercion, female reproductive status, and the effects on individual ecology. Such an integrative approach is important for understanding the mechanisms by which coercion can influence female fitness, and ultimately the evolution of mating systems.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank current and past members of the SBD RP, and numerous field assistants, for their efforts in data collection used for this project, as well as two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript. We also thank the Western Australia Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPaW) and the Monkey Mia Dolphin Resort for their logistical support in the field. This work was approved by the Georgetown University Animal Care and Use Committee, permit #07–041, #10–023, #13-069, DPaW permit #SF007418, #SF007975, #SF006897, #SF007457, #SF009311, #SF008076, #SF009876, and The University of Western Australia animal ethics permit #600-37. The study was funded by NSF grants 0941487, 0918308, 0316800, National Geographic Society Committee for Research and Exploration, ONR BAA 10230702, and Georgetown University.

LITERATURE CITED

- Aloise King, E. D., Banks, P. B., and Brooks, R. C. (2013). Sexual conflict in mammals: consequences for mating systems and life history. *Mammal Review*, 43, 47-58.
- Altmann, J. (1974). Observational study of behavior: sampling methods. *Behaviour*, 49, 227-266.

659 Anderson, M. J. (2001). Permutation tests for univariate or multivariate analysis of
 660 variance and regression. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*,
 661 58, 626-639.

662 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S. (2014). lme4: Linear mixed-effects
 663 models using Eigen and S4. R package version 1.1-7. [http://cran.r-](http://cran.r-project.org/package=lme4)
 664 [project.org/package=lme4](http://cran.r-project.org/package=lme4).

665 Cartwright, R. and Sullivan, M. (2009). Associations with multiple male groups increase
 666 the energy expenditure of humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) female
 667 and calf pairs on the breeding grounds. *Behaviour*, 146, 1573–1600.

668 del Castillo, S. M., Bashaw, M. J., Patton, M. L., Rieches, R. R., and Bercovitch, F. B.
 669 (2005). Fecal steroid analysis of female giraffe (*Giraffa camelopardalis*)
 670 reproductive condition and the impact of endocrine status on daily time budgets.
 671 *General and Comparative Endocrinology*, 141, 271-281.

672 Cheal, A.J. and Gales, N.J. (1992). Growth, sexual maturity and food-intake of
 673 Australian Indian Ocean bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops-truncatus*, in
 674 captivity. *Australian Journal of Zoology*, 40, 215-223.

675 Clutton-Brock, T. H. and Parker, G. A. (1995). Sexual coercion in animal societies.
 676 *Animal Behaviour*, 49, 1345–1365.

677 Connor, R. C., Smolker, R. A., and Richards, A. F. (1992a). Two levels of alliance
 678 formation among male bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops* sp.). *Proceedings of the*
 679 *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 89, 987–90.

680 Connor, R. C., Smolker, R. A., and Richards, A. F. (1992b). Dolphin Alliances and
 681 Coalitions. In A. H. Harcourt and F. B. M de Waal (Eds.) *Coalitions and Alliances*

682 *in Humans and Other Animals* (pp. 415–443), New York, NY, U.S.A.: Oxford
683 University Press.

684 Connor, R. C., Richards, A., Smolker, R., and Mann, J. (1996). Patterns of female
685 attractiveness in Indian Ocean bottlenose dolphins. *Behaviour*, 133, 37–69.

686 Connor, R. C. and Smolker, R. (1996). “Pop” goes the dolphin: a vocalization male
687 bottlenose dolphins produce during consortships. *Behaviour*, 133, 643–662.

688 Connor, R. C., Heithaus, M. R., Barre, L. M., Spoor, F., Higgins, P. O., Dean, C., and
689 Lieberman, D. E. (1999). Superalliance of bottlenose dolphins. *Nature*, 397, 571–
690 572.

691 Connor, R. C., Heithaus, M. R., and Barre, L. M. (2001). Complex social structure,
692 alliance stability and mating access in a bottlenose dolphin ‘super-alliance’. *Proc.*
693 *R. Soc. Lond. B*, 268, 263–267.

694 Connor, R. C. and Whitehead, H. (2005). Alliances II: rates of encounter during
695 resource utilization: a general model of intrasexual alliance formation in fission-
696 fusion societies. *Animal Behaviour*, 69, 127–132.

697 Connor, R. C., Mann, J., and Watson-Capps, J. J. (2006). A sex-specific affiliative
698 contact behavior in Indian Ocean bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops* sp. *Ethology*,
699 112, 631–638.

700 Connor, R. C. and Vollmer, N. L. (2009). Sexual coercion in dolphin consortships: a
701 comparison with chimpanzees. In M. N. Muller and R. W. Wrangham (Eds.),
702 *Sexual Coercion in Primates and Humans* (pp. 218–243), Cambridge, MA,
703 U.S.A.: Harvard University Press.

704 Connor, R. C., Watson-Capps, J. J., Sherwin, W. S., and Krützen, M. (2011). A new
 705 level of complexity in the male alliance networks of Indian Ocean bottlenose
 706 dolphins (*Tursiops* sp.). *Biology Letters*, 7, 623-626.

707 Connor, R. C. and Krützen, M. (2015). Male dolphin alliances in Shark Bay: changing
 708 perspectives in a 30-year study. *Animal Behaviour*, 103, 223-235.

709 Darden, S. K. and Croft, D. P. (2008). Male harassment drives females to alter habitat
 710 use and leads to segregation of the sexes. *Biology Letters*, 4, 449–51.

711 Darden, S. K., James, R., Ramnarine, I. W., and Croft, D. P. (2009). Social implications
 712 of the battle of the sexes: sexual harassment disrupts female sociality and social
 713 recognition. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 276, 2651–6.

714 Darden, S. K. and Watts, L. (2012). Male sexual harassment alters female social
 715 behaviour towards other females. *Biology Letters*, 8, 186–188.

716 Feldblum, J. T., Wroblewski, E. E., Rudicell, R. S., Hahn, B. H., Paiva, T., Cetinkaya-
 717 Rundel, M., Pusey, A., and Gilby, I. C. (2014). Sexually coercive male
 718 chimpanzees sire more offspring. *Current Biology*, 24, 2855-2860.

719 Frère, C., Krützen M., Kopps, A., Ward, P., Mann, J., and Sherwin, W. B. (2010a).
 720 Inbreeding tolerance and fitness costs in wild bottlenose dolphins. *Proceedings*
 721 *of the Royal Society B*, 277, 2667-2673.

722 Frère, C. H., Krützen, M., Mann, J., Watson-Capps, J. J., Tsai, Y. J., Patterson, E. M.,
 723 Connor, R.C., Bejder, L., and Sherwin, W. B. (2010b). Home range overlap,
 724 matrilineal and biparental kinship drive female associations in bottlenose
 725 dolphins. *Animal Behaviour*, 80, 481–486.

726 Furuichi, T., Connor, R. C., and Hashimoto, C. (2014). Non-conceptive sexual
727 interactions in monkeys, apes & toothed whales. In J. Yamagiwa and L.
728 Karczmarski (Eds.) *Primates & cetaceans: Field research and conservation of*
729 *complex mammalian societies* (pp. 385-408). Tokyo, Japan: Springer.

730 Galimberti, F., Boitani, L., and Marzetti, I., (2000). The frequency and costs of
731 harassment in southern elephant seals. *Ethology Ecology & Evolution*, 12, 345-
732 365.

733 Gay, L., Eady, P. E., Vasudev, R., Hosken, D. J., and Tregenza, T. (2009). Costly
734 sexual harassment in a beetle. *Physiological Entomology*, 34, 86-92.

735 Gibson, Q. A. and Mann, J. (2008). The size, composition and function of wild
736 bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops* sp.) mother-calf groups in Shark Bay, Australia.
737 *Animal Behaviour*, 76, 389-405.

738 Hasegawa, T. (1990). Sex differences in ranging patterns. In T. Nishida (Ed.) *The*
739 *Chimpanzees of the Mahale Mountains* (pp. 99-114), Japan: University of Tokyo
740 Press.

741 Heithaus, M. and Dill, L. (2002). Food availability and tiger shark predation risk influence
742 bottlenose dolphin habitat use. *Ecology*, 83, 480–491.

743 Heithaus, M.R. and Dill, L.M. (2006). Does tiger shark predation risk influence foraging
744 habitat use by bottlenose dolphins at multiple spatial scales? *Oikos*, 114, 257–
745 264.

746 Heubel, K. U. and Plath, M. (2008). Influence of male harassment and female
747 competition on female feeding behaviour in a sexual-asexual mating complex of

748 mollies (*Poecilia mexicana*, *P. formosa*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*,
 749 62, 1689-1699.

750 Hiruki, L. M., Stirling, I., Gilmartin, W. G., Johanos, T. C., and Becker, B. L. (1993).
 751 Significance of wounding to female reproductive success in Hawaiian monk seals
 752 (*Monachus schauinslandi*) at Laysan Island. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 71,
 753 469-474.

754 den Hollander, M. and Gwynne, D. T. (2009). Female fitness consequences of male
 755 harassment and copulation in seed beetles, *Callosobruchus maculatus*. *Animal*
 756 *Behaviour*, 78, 1061–1070.

757 Hothorn, T., Hornik, K., van de Wiel, M. A., and Zeileis, A. (2006). A Lego system for
 758 conditional inference. *The American Statistician*, 60, 257–263.

759 Karniski, C., Patterson, E. M., Krzyszczyk, E., Foroughirad, V., Stanton, M., and Mann,
 760 J. (2015). A comparison of survey and focal follow methods for estimating
 761 individual activity budgets of cetaceans. *Marine Mammal Science*.
 762 DOI:10.1111/mms.12198

763 Köhler, A., Hildenbrand, P., Schleucher, E., Riesch, R., Arias-Rodriguez, L., Streit, B.,
 764 and Plath, M. (2011). Effects of male sexual harassment on female time budgets,
 765 feeding behavior, and metabolic rates in a tropical livebearing fish (*Poecilia*
 766 *mexicana*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 65, 1513–1523.

767 Krützen, M., Sherwin, W. B., Berggren, P., and Gales, N. (2004). Population structure in
 768 an inshore cetacean revealed by microsatellite and mtDNA analysis: bottlenose
 769 dolphins (*Tursiops* sp.) in Shark Bay, Western Australia. *Marine Mammal*
 770 *Science*, 20, 28-47.

771 Krzyszczyk, E. and Mann, J. (2012). Why become speckled? Ontogeny and function of
 772 speckling in Shark Bay bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops* sp.). *Marine Mammal*
 773 *Science*, 28, 295-307.

774 Link, A., De Fiore, A., and Spehar, S. N. (2009). Female-directed aggression and social
 775 control in spider monkeys. In M. N. Muller and R. W. Wrangham (Eds.), *Sexual*
 776 *Coercion in Primates and Humans* (pp. 157-183), Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.:
 777 Harvard University Press.

778 Le Boeuf, B. and Mesnick, S. (1991). Sexual behavior of male northern elephant seals:
 779 I. Lethal injuries to adult females. *Behaviour*, 116, 143–162.

780 Manly, B. F. J., McDonald, L. L., Thomas, D. L., McDonald, T. L. and Erickson, W. P.
 781 2002. *Resource Selection by Animals Statistical Design and Analysis for Field*
 782 *Second Edition*. 2nd edn. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.

783 Mann, J. (1999). Behavioral sampling methods for cetaceans: a review and critique.
 784 *Marine Mammal Science*, 15, 102–122.

785 Mann, J. and Smuts, B. (1999). Behavioral development in wild bottlenose dolphin
 786 newborns (*Tursiops* sp.). *Behaviour*, 136, 529-566.

787 Mann, J., Connor, R. C., Barre, L. M., and Heithaus, M. R. (2000). Female reproductive
 788 success in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops* sp.): life history, habitat, provisioning,
 789 and group-size effects. *Behavioral Ecology*, 11, 210–219.

790 Mann, J., and Sargeant, B. (2003). Like mother, like calf: the ontogeny of foraging
 791 traditions in wild Indian ocean bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops* sp.). In D. M.
 792 Fragaszy and S. Perry (Eds.), *The Biology of Traditions* (pp. 236–266),
 793 Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Cambridge University Press.

794 Mann, J., Sargeant, B. L., Watson-Capps, J. J., Gibson, Q. A., Heithaus, M. R., Connor,
 795 R. C., and Patterson, E. (2008). Why do dolphins carry sponges? *PloS ONE*, 3,
 796 e3868.

797 Mann, J., Stanton, M. A., Patterson, E. M., Bienenstock, E. J., and Singh, L. O. (2012).
 798 Social networks reveal cultural behaviour in tool-using dolphins. *Nature*
 799 *Communications*, 3, 980.

800 Mann, J. and Patterson, E. M. (2013). Tool use by aquatic animals. *Philosophical*
 801 *Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 368, 20120424.

802 Matson, T.K., Putland, D. A., Jarman, P. J., le Roux, J., and Goldizen, A. W. (2007).
 803 Influences of parturition on home range and microhabitat use of female black-
 804 faced impalas. *Journal of Zoology*, 271, 318-327.

805 Matsumoto-Oda, A., and Oda, R. (1998). Changes in the activity budget of cycling
 806 female chimpanzees. *American Journal of Primatology*, 46, 157-166.

807 Muller, M. N., Kahlenberg, S. M., Thompson, M. E., and Wrangham, R. W. (2007). Male
 808 coercion and the costs of promiscuous mating for female chimpanzees.
 809 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 274, 1009-1014.

810 Muller, M. N., Kahlenberg, S. M., and Wrangham, R. W. (2009). Male aggression
 811 against females and sexual coercion in chimpanzees. In M. N. Muller and R. W.
 812 Wrangham (Eds.), *Sexual Coercion in Primates and Humans* (pp. 184-217),
 813 Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press.

814 Noë, R. (1992). Alliance formation among male baboons: shopping for profitable
 815 partners. In A. H. Harcourt and F. B. M de Waal (Eds.) *Coalitions and Alliances in*

816 *Humans and Other Animals* (pp. 285-321), New York, NY, U.S.A.: Oxford
817 University Press.

818 O'Brien, J. K. and Robeck, T. R. (2012). The relationship of maternal characteristics and
819 circulating progesterone concentrations with reproductive outcome in the
820 bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) after artificial insemination, with and
821 without ovulation induction, and natural breeding. *Theriogenology*, 78, 469-482.

822 Ojanguren, A. F., and Magurran, A. E. (2007). Male harassment reduces short-term
823 female fitness in guppies. *Behaviour*, 144, 503-514.

824 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F. G., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., O'Hara, R.B., Simpson, G. L.,
825 Solymos, P., Stevens, M. H. H. and Wagner, H. (2013). vegan: Community
826 ecology package. R package version 2.0-10. [http://CRAN.R-](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan)
827 [project.org/package=vegan](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan)

828 Owen, E., Wells, R. S. and Hofmann, S. (2002). Ranging and association patterns of
829 paired and unpaired adult male Atlantic bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*,
830 in Sarasota, Florida, provide no evidence for alternative male strategies.
831 *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 80, 2072–2089.

832 Palombit, R. A. (2014). Sexual conflict in nonhuman primates. *Advances in the Study of*
833 *Behavior*, 46, 191-280.

834 Panhuis, T. M., Butlin, R., Zuk, M., and Tregenza, T. (2001). Sexual selection and
835 speciation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 16, 364-371.

836 Patterson, E. M. and Mann, J. (2011). The ecological conditions that favor tool use and
837 innovation in wild bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops sp.*). *PLoS ONE*, 6, e22243.

838 Patterson, E. M. (2012). *Ecological and life history factors influence habitat and tool use*
839 *in wild bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops sp.)* (Doctoral dissertation, Georgetown
840 University, Washington DC).

841 Patterson, E. M., Krzyszczyk, E., and Mann, J. (2015). Age-specific foraging
842 performance and reproduction in tool-using wild bottlenose dolphins. *Behavioral*
843 *Ecology* doi:10.1093/beheco/arv164.

844 R Development Core Team. (2015). R: A language and environment for statistical
845 computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
846 <http://www.R-project.org/>.

847 Randić, S. (2008). *Spatial analysis of the distribution and home ranges of male*
848 *bottlenose dolphins in Shark Bay, Australia* (Master's thesis, University of
849 Massachusetts Dartmouth, Dartmouth, MA).

850 Randić, S., Connor, R. C., Sherwin, W. B., and Krützen, M. (2012). A novel mammalian
851 social structure in Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops* sp.): complex male
852 alliances in an open social network. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 279,
853 3083–90.

854 Réale, D., Boussès, P., and Chapuis, J.-L. (1996). Female-biased mortality induced by
855 male sexual harassment in a feral sheep population. *Canadian Journal of*
856 *Zoology*, 74, 1812-1818.

857 Rodseth, L. and Novak, S. A. (2009). The political significance of gender violence. In M.
858 N. Muller and R. W. Wrangham (Eds.), *Sexual Coercion in Primates and Humans*
859 (pp. 292-321), Cambridge, MA, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press.

860 Rossi, B. H., Nonacs, P., and Pitts-Singer, T. L. (2010). Sexual harassment by males
 861 reduces female fecundity in the alfalfa leafcutting bee, *Megachile rotundata*. *Animal*
 862 *Behaviour*, 79, 165–171.

863 Sargeant, B. L., Mann, J., Berggren, P., and Krützen, M. (2005). Specialization and
 864 development of beach hunting, a rare foraging behavior, by wild bottlenose
 865 dolphins (*Tursiops* sp.). *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 83, 1400–1410.

866 Sargeant, B. L., Wirsing, A. J., Heithaus, M. R., and Mann, J. (2007). Can
 867 environmental heterogeneity explain individual foraging variation in wild
 868 bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops* sp.)? *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 61,
 869 679–688.

870 Sargeant, B. L. and Mann, J. (2009). Developmental evidence for foraging traditions in
 871 wild bottlenose dolphins. *Animal Behaviour*, 78, 715–721.

872 Schroeder, P.J. (1990). Breeding bottlenose dolphins in captivity. In S. Leatherwood
 873 and R. R. Reeves (Eds.), *The Bottlenose Dolphin* (pp.435-446), New York, NY,
 874 U.S.A., Academic Press.

875 Scott, E., Mann, J., and Watson-Capps, J. J. (2005). Aggression in bottlenose dolphins:
 876 evidence for sexual coercion, male-male competition, and female tolerance
 877 through analysis of tooth-rake marks and behaviour. *Behaviour*, 142, 21–44.

878 Smolker, R., Richards, A., Connor, R., and Pepper, J. (1992). Sex differences in
 879 patterns of association among Indian Ocean bottlenose dolphins. *Behaviour*,
 880 123, 38–69.

881 Smuts, B. B. and Smuts, R. (1993). Male aggression and sexual coercion of females in
 882 nonhuman primates and other mammals: evidence and theoretical implications.
 883 *Advances in the Study of Behavior*, 22, 1–63.

884 Sprogis, K. R., Raudino, H. C., Rankin, R., MacLeod, C. D., and Bejder, L. (2016).
 885 Home range size of adult Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops aduncus*) in
 886 a coastal and estuarine system is habitat and sex-specific. *Marine Mammal*
 887 *Science*, 32, 287-308.

888 Sundaresan, S. R., Fischhoff, I. R., and Rubenstein, D. (2007). Male harassment
 889 influences female movements and associations in Grevy's zebra (*Equus grevyi*).
 890 *Behavioral Ecology*, 18, 860–865.

891 Takahashi, Y. and Watanabe, M. (2010). Female reproductive success is affected by
 892 selective male harassment in the damselfly *Ischnura senegalensis*. *Animal*
 893 *Behaviour*, 79, 211–216.

894 Tsai, Y. J. and Mann, J. (2013). Dispersal, philopatry, and the role of fission-fusion
 895 dynamics in bottlenose dolphins. *Marine Mammal Science*, 29, 261-279.

896 Tutin, C. E. G. (1979). Mating patterns and reproductive strategies in a community of
 897 wild chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii*). *Behavioral Ecology and*
 898 *Sociobiology*, 6 29-38.

899 Urian, K. W., Hofmann, S. and Wells, R. S. (2009). Fine-scale population structure of
 900 bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in Tampa Bay, Florida. *Marine Mammal*
 901 *Science*, 25, 619-638.

902 Watson, P. J., Arnqvist, G., and Stallmann, R. R. (1998). Sexual conflict and the
 903 energetic costs of mating and mate choice in water striders. *The American*
 904 *Naturalist*, 151, 46-58.

905 Watson-Capps, J. J. (2005). *Female mating behavior in the context of sexual coercion*
 906 *and female ranging behavior of bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops sp.) in Shark Bay,*
 907 *Western Australia* (Doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University, Washington,
 908 DC).

909 Watts, D. P. (1998). Coalitionary mate guarding by male chimpanzees at Ngogo, Kibale
 910 National Park, Uganda. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 44, 43-55.

911 Wearmouth, V. J., Southall, E. J., Morritt, D., Thompson, R. C., Cuthill, I. C., Partridge,
 912 J. C., and Sims, D. W. (2012). Year-round sexual harassment as a behavioral
 913 mediator of vertebrate population dynamics. *Ecological Monographs*, 82, 351-
 914 366.

915 Wells, R. (1991). The role of long-term study in understanding the social structure of a
 916 bottlenose dolphin community. In K. Pryor and K. S. Norris (Eds.), *Dolphin*
 917 *Societies: Discoveries and Puzzles* (pp.199-225), Berkeley, CA, U.S.A.:
 918 University of California Press.

919 Wiszniewski, J., Brown, C., and Möller, L. M. (2012). Complex patterns of male alliance
 920 formation in a dolphin social network. *Journal of Mammalogy*, 93, 239-250.

921 Würsig, B. and Würsig, M. (1977). The photographic determination of group size,
 922 composition, and stability of coastal porpoises (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Science*,
 923 198, 755–756.

924

Figure 1

Figure 2