

**University of Groningen**

## **Experimental evidence for cryptic interference among socially foraging shorebirds**

Bijleveld, Allert Imre; Folmer, Eelke Olov; Piersma, Theun

*Published in:*  
Behavioral Ecology

*DOI:*  
[10.1093/beheco/ars034](https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/ars034)

**IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.**

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*  
2012

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Bijleveld, A. I., Folmer, E. O., & Piersma, T. (2012). Experimental evidence for cryptic interference among socially foraging shorebirds. *Behavioral Ecology*, 23(4), 806-814. DOI: 10.1093/beheco/ars034

**Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Take-down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

*Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.*

Original Article

# Experimental evidence for cryptic interference among socially foraging shorebirds

Allert Imre Bijleveld,<sup>a,b</sup> Eelke Olov Folmer,<sup>a,b</sup> and Theunis Piersma<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Marine Ecology, NIOZ Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research, PO Box 59, 1790 AB Den Burg, Texel, the Netherlands and <sup>b</sup>Animal Ecology Group, Centre for Ecological and Evolutionary Studies (CEES), University of Groningen, PO Box 11103, 9700 CC Groningen, the Netherlands

Foraging rate and the distribution of foragers depend on prey distribution in conjunction with interindividual interactions. Generalized functional response models predict intake rates and spatial distributions of foragers on the basis of resource distribution and interference competition. The adequacy of these models depends on how well they capture the foragers' essential behavior. In this paper, we report on the results of a foraging experiment designed to examine the mechanisms of interference competition using red knots *Calidris canutus* that feed on buried bivalves. Red knots are rarely observed to interfere in the field, but this does not imply absence of interference. Our experimental setup minimized resource depletion, which allowed us to quantify interference competition as the decline in intake rate as a function of group size, with prey density and social status as additional treatments. We found that intake rate and searching efficiency decreased with group size and that dominant birds had higher intake rates than subordinates. Additionally, time spent searching for prey increased with group size. The decrease in intake rate was not due to conventional interference mechanisms (such as kleptoparasitism and time spent interacting with conspecifics) but to "cryptic interference," that is, avoidance of physical encounters with conspecifics. To accurately predict intake rates and foraging distributions, theory and models need to account for the possibility that animals anticipate and try to avoid, at some costs, physical encounters with conspecifics (i.e., conflicts that would make conventional interference behavior visible). **Key words:** agonistic interactions, attack rate, flock size, functional response, ideal free distribution, intraspecific competition. [*Behav Ecol*]

## INTRODUCTION

Intake rate and the distribution of foraging animals depend on the distribution of resources and the presence of conspecifics (Krebs 1972). The latter can be both beneficial and detrimental (Stephens et al. 2007; Danchin et al. 2008; Sumpter 2010; Folmer et al. 2011). Conspecific presence can be beneficial because it provides information on food availability (Krause and Ruxton 2002; Valone 2007; Danchin et al. 2008; Bijleveld et al. 2010) and predation risk (Lima and Dill 1990; Krause and Ruxton 2002). In addition, it dilutes the risk of being depredated (Hamilton 1971; Lima and Dill 1990; Quinn and Cresswell 2006). The presence of conspecifics may also lead to interference competition with negative effects on intake rate (Goss-Custard 1980; Sutherland 1983; Tregenza 1995; Johnson et al. 2006; Klaassen et al. 2006).

If animals behaved ideally and freely (Fretwell and Lucas 1970), intake rates and foraging distributions could be predicted using generalized functional response models (van der Meer and Ens 1997; Smallegange and van der Meer 2009). Such models combine prey density and parameters that capture the negative effect of nearby conspecifics to predict intake rates, which in turn may be used to predict spatial

foraging distributions (Beddington 1975; Sutherland 1983; Ruxton et al. 1992; Bautista et al. 1995; Holmgren 1995; Tregenza 1995; Johnson et al. 2006; van Gils et al. 2006).

There exist 2 classes of generalized functional response models to describe and predict intake rates in standing stock situations: phenomenological and mechanistic models (van der Meer and Ens 1997). Both have been used to describe and predict intake rates for various species (Bautista et al. 1995; Smallegange and van der Meer 2009; van der Meer and Smallegange 2009; Gyimesi et al. 2010), including shorebirds (Piersma et al. 1995; Stillman et al. 1997; Goss-Custard et al. 2006; van Gils et al. 2006; Rutten, Oosterbeek, van der Meer, et al. 2010).

Phenomenological generalized functional response models are based on statistical relationships between intake rate and competitor density and summarize interference into one parameter (Hassell and Varley 1969; Sutherland and Koene 1982). Mechanistic generalized functional response models are derived from basic behavioral processes, which are modeled as transitions between mutually exclusive behavioral states (e.g., searching, handling, fighting). Transition rates are assumed to be constant functions of competitor density. These models, however, do not take into account that animals may anticipate events and adjust behavior accordingly. Hence, they assume that animals act as "aimless billiard balls" (van der Meer and Ens 1997). Mechanistic models are considered superior to phenomenological models because they are more generic than case-specific phenomenological models (Stillman et al. 1997; van der Meer and Ens 1997; Smallegange and van der Meer 2009). How well generalized functional

Address correspondence to A.I. Bijleveld. E-mail: allert.bijleveld@nioz.nl.

Allert Imre Bijleveld and Eelke Olov Folmer contributed equally to this work.

Received 31 July 2011; revised 15 February 2012; accepted 15 February 2012.

response models predict intake rates and spatial distributions depends on how well these models capture essential foraging behavior. Particularly, small differences in the relationship between intake rate and group size (i.e., interference) can have a large influence on the predicted foraging distributions (van der Meer and Ens 1997). Interference has become a central topic in behavioral ecology, but the current understanding of the behavioral mechanisms of interference competition is still incomplete (van der Meer and Ens 1997; Vahl, van der Meer, et al. 2005). The mechanisms of interference competition are generally assumed to be kleptoparasitism and time lost in aggressive interactions (Tregenza 1995; Stillman et al. 1997; Smallegange and van der Meer 2009).

In the field, the various mechanisms of interference competition are not necessarily observed because animals may space out to avoid or mitigate interference costs while maintaining the benefits of conspecific presence (Vahl et al. 2007; Folmer et al. 2010; Gyimesi et al. 2010). That is, foragers will trade-off the benefits and costs of social foraging, which will lead to “spaced-out gregariousness” (Kennedy and Crawley 1967). The degree of spacing between social foragers will depend on the net benefits of the presence of conspecifics (Folmer et al. 2011). In the field, only the net effect of conspecific attraction and interference on the spatial distribution of foraging animals can be observed (Folmer et al. 2010), and the relative strengths of each of the separate mechanisms can only be assessed indirectly (Folmer et al. 2011). Therefore, detailed information on the mechanisms of interference competition cannot be obtained from field observations (Vahl et al. 2007; Gyimesi et al. 2010; Rutten, Oosterbeek, van der Meer, et al. 2010). To gain insight into the various mechanisms of interference, experiments are needed.


The objective of this study is to obtain insight into the mechanisms of interference for a gregarious forager to underpin and improve on generalized functional response models. We used red knots *Calidris canutus*, a species that does not show typical interference behavior in the field (van Gils and Piersma 2004). We studied foraging behavior at different competitor densities while ensuring minimal prey depletion to avoid confounding of resource competition and interference competition (Vahl, van der Meer, et al. 2005; Smallegange et al. 2006). Because prey density and social status also influence interference competition, these factors are incorporated as treatments.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Birds

Red knots are medium-sized shorebirds that outside the breeding season usually feed on mollusks (Zwarts and Blomert 1992; Piersma et al. 1993; Piersma et al. 1998; van Gils, Piersma, et al. 2003). Their short prey handling times and the fact that prey items are swallowed in their entirety (Piersma et al. 1995) reduce opportunities for kleptoparasitic acts (Ens et al. 1990; van Gils and Piersma 2004).

The experimental animals, 23 knots of the *islandica* subspecies (Piersma 2007), were captured with mistnets on 7 and 8 February 2005 in the western Dutch Wadden Sea (53°15'N, 5°15'E). The birds were housed in 2 indoor aviaries at the Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research (NIOZ), Texel, the Netherlands. Each aviary, 4.5 m × 1.5 m surface × 2.5 m height, contained a fresh water tray. To keep the aviary floors and the feet of the birds clean, salt water was constantly flowing over the floors. The light was kept at a constant light regime (12:12 h light:dark) and temperatures were kept constant at 12 °C. To avoid different dominance hierarchies to develop in the 2 aviaries, every day membership to aviary



**Figure 1**

The experimental shorebird facility: (1) aviary, (2) food patch, (3) observation hide, (4) water, (5) covered lane, and (6) electrical engine with beam to roll the sheet on. (2), (4), and (5) make up the experimental “arena.”

groups were assigned randomly. A metal identification ring was fitted to the right tibia together with plastic color rings on each tarsus for individual recognition. After the experiment, in June 2005, the birds were returned to the field. The experiment complied with Dutch law regarding animal experiments under permits issued by the DEC-KNAW.


The staple food and experimental prey items were blue mussels *Mytilus edulis*, a mollusk that commonly occurs in the diet of free-living knots (Zwarts and Blomert 1992; Dekinga and Piersma 1993). Every other week fresh mussels were collected from the breakwaters at Den Helder (52°57'N, 4°43'E). After collection, bundles of mussels were disentangled and sorted based on length. Mussels smaller than 20 mm were used as staple food and mussels between 8 and 12 mm were used as experimental prey items.

### Experimental setup

Inspired by Smallegange et al. (2006), we kept prey density relatively constant by minimizing prey depletion as follows. In the experimental arena (7 m by 7 m), an elevated lane (6.5 m long, 0.7 m wide, and 0.3 m deep) was filled with sand in which the prey items were buried at approximately 3 cm depth (Figure 1). The water in the arena was kept at such a level that only the lane was above water and accessible for the birds. The lane was covered with a polyester sheet, which contained a square hole of 0.7 m × 0.7 m in which the knots were able to forage; this hole is the food patch. During a trial, the sheet was rolled onto a beam that was driven by an electrical motor so that it smoothly slid across the lane from one end to the other at an average speed of 1 cm s<sup>-1</sup>, which mimics the receding water line in the field. As the food patch moved across the lane, new prey became available and the area that had been foraged on disappeared underneath the sheet (see supplementary material online for an example trial video).

### Social status

Prior to the interference trials, we obtained the social status of each experimental animal as follows. We covered the lane with a large quantity of mussels over which the patch moved. After



**Figure 2**  
Social status of experimental birds ranked by dominance coefficients. The 5 intermediate birds were selected as focal birds.

14 h of fasting, all 23 knots were released in the arena to forage. The number of aggressive interactions between foraging individuals, that is, threatening, charging (moving toward conspecifics), and receding, was recorded, as were the winners and losers of each interaction. Individuals that retreated were taken as losers. The trial ended when the sheet reached the end of the lane; when one individual had taken control of the patch; or when one individual interacted extremely aggressive toward other birds. The red knot that dominated the group was isolated from the rest, and the above procedure was repeated with the reduced group. We repeated the procedure until a group of individuals remained that rarely interacted. The whole procedure was repeated 5 times per day for 4 consecutive days.

In a group of 23 birds, there are  $(23 \times 22)/2 = 253$  combinations of paired individuals between whom interactions can take place. The 20 repetitions gave a total of 771 interactions between 207 pairs. On the basis of the interactions, we calculated a dominance coefficient for each individual as follows. We assumed transitivity, that is, we assumed that if bird A is dominant over B and B is dominant over C, then A is dominant over C, that is, a linear dominance hierarchy. We estimated dominance coefficients by means of logistic regression, where  $X_{ij}$ , which is the number of victories of bird  $i$  over  $j$ , is binomially distributed with parameters  $p_{ij}$ , the probability of bird  $i$  winning the pairwise confrontation, and  $N_{ij}$  the total number of disputes between bird  $i$  and  $j$ . A dominance coefficient  $d$  is estimated for each individual and the expected logit  $p_{ij}$  equals the difference  $\Delta d$  between the pair's dominance coefficients. In practice, it means that the rows of the design matrix are formed by all pairwise combinations of individual birds with the value 1 for the reference bird in the pair, -1 for the partner, and 0 elsewhere (van der Meer 1992; Tufto et al. 1998). Hence, the estimated dominance coefficients represent the social statuses of the birds and allow estimating the probability of winning a pairwise confrontation as  $e^{\Delta d}/(1 + e^{\Delta d})$ .

On the basis of their social status, individuals were divided into 3 groups (Figure 2): 9 subordinates, 5 intermediates (focal bird group), and 9 dominants. The average dominance coefficient per group was subordinates -1.2 (standard error [SE] 0.2,  $n = 9$ ), focal birds -0.3 (SE 0.07,  $n = 5$ ), and dominant individuals 0.8 (SE 0.2,  $n = 9$ ) (Figure 2).

### Interference experiment

From May till June 2005, the foraging behavior of the focal birds was studied under various combinations of bird and prey densities and in relative subordinate or dominant social positions. The level of interference competition was set by group size,

which ranged from 2 to 8, including the focal bird of which there was one per trial. Because we used a fixed patch size ( $0.5 \text{ m}^2$ ), competitor density is linearly related to group size.

Two levels of prey density were used: low and high (20 and 30 mussels  $\text{m}^{-2}$ , respectively). These densities are in line with the densities encountered in the field (Dekker and Beukema 2007) and are sufficiently low to prevent digestive constraints (van Gils et al. 2005), as indicated by the fact that all birds kept foraging until the end of the trials. The prey items were buried into the lane at predetermined positions with  $1 \text{ cm}^2$  accuracy, which allowed retrieving remaining prey items after each trial. To avoid the possibility that birds learned the spatial distribution of prey items, we randomly selected 1 of the 2 available configurations of burial positions for each trial.

Social status treatment consisted of composing the group around the focal bird at a trial with birds randomly chosen from either the pool of subordinates or dominants. Accordingly, the same focal bird was either the most dominant or the most subordinate member of the group. Social status is potentially influenced by group size, but we rarely observed subordinate birds attacking dominants, and subordinates suffered more from the presence of dominants than the other way around. We thus conclude that the hierarchy was reflected in the experiments with smaller groups.

The different combinations of treatments consisted of manipulating group size (7 levels, varying from 2 to 8), prey density (2 levels), and social status (2 levels) resulting in 28 trials per focal bird and 140 trials in total. We ran between 2 and 10 trials per day. We maintained a random order in which the trials were carried out over the 29 days of experimentation.

The knots were fasted for 12 h during the night before each experimental day and at least 60 min before each trial (i.e., larger than the time needed to digest the consumed prey; van Gils et al. 2005). The trial lengths were short enough to ensure that all birds were highly motivated to forage during the trials. Thirty minutes before the trial the birds were released into 1 of the 2 randomly chosen aviaries adjacent to the "arena" (Figure 1) to acclimatize. Hereafter, a sliding door between the aviary and the arena was opened so that the birds could enter the arena. The trial started 30 s after the first bird entered the patch. At that moment, the electric engine was started to move the food patch. The trial ended when the patch had moved halfway the length of the lane. For efficiency reasons, the lane was split into 2 sections of equal length, and each section was used for one trial. At the end of a trial, the arena, but not the adjacent aviary, was darkened to make the birds fly to the lightened aviary. The polyester sheet was then moved one patch length so that unexploited mudflat was available for the next trial with new birds. The second trial of a session lasted for the remainder of the lane. The average duration of a trial was 241 s (standard deviation [SD] = 12.8). As the beam with the sheet thickened when winding up, the average speed of the moving patch was slightly larger in the second trial, which explains the variance in trial duration. This effect is negligible because the SD is less than 13 s on a mean of 241 s, and we randomly assigned trials to 1 of the 2 lane sections. After a session of 2 trials, the remaining prey were dug out and counted per trial to determine prey depletion. New prey items for the following session were then buried according to the method described above.

All trials were recorded on video by an observer who was positioned in a hide near the patch (Figure 1). The videotapes were analyzed using The Observer 5.0 Event recorder (Noldus Information Technology, Wageningen, the Netherlands). The Observer software allowed measurements of time budgets with an accuracy of 0.04 s per behavioral bout.

Following Vahl, van der Meer, et al. (2005), we measured the time spent by the focal birds in a trial on the following,



mutually exclusive, behaviors: searching (probing the sediment in search of prey, either while moving or standing still), watching (watching the surroundings while standing still with the bill at an upward angle of at least 45° with the sediment; note that this may include watching conspecifics), moving (taking steps with the bill at an upwards angle of at least 45° with the sediment), interacting (both attacking [i.e., moving toward conspecifics aggressively]) and evading (i.e., moving away from attacking conspecifics), handling (touching prey with bill until swallowed, lost, or dropped), and being off-patch (not on the food patch). In addition, we scored the number of prey intakes and vigilance acts (head up while tilting the head sideways at least 45°; note that in the wild vigilance behavior is used to detect approaching raptors [Cresswell 1994]). On average, a focal bird showed approximately one vigilance act per trial. Because of the absence of predators, the birds may have experienced the experimental area as a safe environment (van den Hout et al. 2010). Vigilance was not included as a fraction in the time budget because a vigilance act takes less than a second and constitutes a marginal part of the total time budget (Piersma et al. 1995). Instead, we used vigilance rates calculated as the number of vigilance acts divided by trial duration (vigilance, # min<sup>-1</sup>). Handling times are also very short. They were averaged per trial (handling, s).

### Statistical analyses

One focal bird rarely foraged during trials. Its average intake rate was close to zero, whereas the other 4 individuals had substantially higher intake rates. The hypothesis of equal average intake rates for the 5 focal birds was rejected (analysis of variance [ANOVA],  $F_{4,135} = 3.1$ ,  $P = 0.02$ ), whereas it was not rejected for the 4 focal birds without the outlier (ANOVA,  $F_{3,108} = 0.5$ ,  $P = 0.69$ ). Therefore, the outlier was omitted from further analyses, which gave an adjusted sample size of 112.

The average experienced prey density per trial ( $D$ , m<sup>-2</sup>) was calculated by averaging the initial and final prey density. To normalize the distribution of model residuals, we ln-transformed average experienced resource density. Average intake rate (IR, # s<sup>-1</sup>) per trial was obtained by dividing the number of prey intakes by the duration of the trial. Average searching efficiency (cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) per trial was calculated by  $1/(T_s \times D)$  (i.e., instantaneous rates of discovery; Holling 1959), where  $T_s$  is the average searching time per prey item and  $D$  is the average experienced resource density.

The following behaviors of the focal bird were analyzed: 1) the time spent off-patch relative to the trial duration. The proportion of time spent off-patch was analyzed using a generalized linear mixed model with binomial errors and focal bird as random intercept. The following on-patch behaviors were analyzed as proportions of time spent on-patch: 2) searching, 3) watching, 4) moving, 5) interacting. The proportions 2–5 are “sum constrained,” that is, they sum up to one. The sum constraint was accounted for by ln-ratio transformation (Aitchinson 1986; Kucera and Malmgren 1998). That is, the dependent variables 2–5 are

$$y'_i = \ln \left( \frac{y_i}{\left( \prod_{i=2}^{n=5} y_i \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}} \right),$$

where  $y_i$  is the fraction of time spent on behavior  $i$ . Zeroes were replaced by  $\delta = 100\% \times 0.5 \times 0.04/\text{average trial time}$ , which gives half the smallest percentage unit that behavior was recorded in (Aitchinson 1986). Note that 0.04 s is the duration of one video frame.

Additionally, 6) handling and 7) vigilance were determined as explained above. Both were ln-transformed to normalize the data. To avoid possible zeroes in the ln-transformations of vigilance, we increased the argument by one.

The impacts of experimental treatments on intake rate, searching efficiency, time budget, handling time, and vigilance rate were analyzed in R v2.11.1 (R Development Core Team 2011) using general linear mixed models with focal bird as random intercept. Because experienced prey density, IR, and searching efficiency were negatively and nonlinearly related to group size, the latter was ln-transformed.

We started the statistical analyses with models, including all experimental treatments and their interactions as explanatory variables. The models were simplified by removing nonsignificant terms ( $P > 0.05$ ) from the initial model applying a stepwise backward procedure (i.e., terms were removed one by one in order of decreasing  $P$  values; Quinn and Keough 2005). However, regardless of statistical significance, the main effects of experimental treatments were retained in the final model. Normality of residuals was judged by visual inspection of QQ plots (Miller 1986).

## RESULTS

### Experienced resource density

Experienced prey densities slightly declined with ln(group size). The average experienced prey density declined by  $-0.17$  (SE 0.02,  $F_{1,108} = 70.3$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) with ln(group size) and at approximately equal rates for both prey densities ( $F_{1,108} = 2.6$ ,  $P = 0.11$ ) and social status treatments ( $F_{1,108} = 0.4$ ,  $P = 0.53$ ).

### Interference

During the 112 trials, we observed only 4 events in which prey items were stolen from conspecifics (i.e., kleptoparasitism). Table 1a and Figure 3A show that IR was significantly lower in the low prey density treatment than in the high density treatment ( $-0.008$  s<sup>-1</sup>, SE 0.002). In addition, IR declined linearly with ln(group size). The decline was approximately equal for both prey densities ( $-0.028$ , SE 0.003; Figure 3A and Table 1a). The IR of a focal bird in a dominant position was on average  $0.005$  s<sup>-1</sup> (SE 0.002) higher than when it was in a subordinate position. The interactions between ln(group size) and social status and ln(group size) and prey density were nonsignificant indicating that the negative impact of ln(group size) on IR did not vary by these treatments. Searching efficiency declined linearly with ln(group size) ( $-22.47$ , SE 2.36; Table 1b and Figure 3B) but was not affected by either prey density or social status.

### Time budgets

Focal birds tended to spend less time off-patch when they were in dominant positions than when they were in subordinate positions (Table 2a). However, the fraction of time spent off-patch did not differ by prey density or by group size.

From Table 2b and Figure 4A, it follows that the fraction of time spent searching for prey was larger on the low prey density patch than on the high prey density patch. Moreover, it varied by social status: focal birds in dominant positions spent more time searching than when they were in subordinate positions. An interesting finding is that the proportion of time spent searching for prey increased with group size.

The fraction of time spent watching increased with group size. It was also larger on the low prey density patch than on the high prey density patch (Table 2c and Figure 4B). For subordinates, the fraction of time spent watching was smaller

**Table 1**  
Intake rate ( $\# \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) and searching efficiency ( $\text{cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) models

		Response variables	Predictors	Coefficient	SE	<i>P</i>	
a)	Fixed effects	Intake rate (# s <sup>−1</sup> )	Intercept <sup>b</sup>	0.066	0.005	<0.01	
			Group size <sup>b</sup>	−0.028	0.003	<0.01	
			Prey density (low) <sup>b</sup>	−0.008	0.002	<0.01	
	Social status (dominant) <sup>a</sup>		0.005	0.002	0.04		
	Random effects		Focal bird	SD = 0.000			
			Residual	SD = 0.013			
b)	Fixed effects	Searching efficiency (cm <sup>2</sup> s <sup>−1</sup> )	Intercept <sup>b</sup>	54.32	4.12	<0.01	
			Group size <sup>b</sup>	−22.47	2.36	<0.01	
			Prey density (low)	0.43	2.15	0.84	
	Social status (dominant)		1.23	2.15	0.57		
	Random effects		Focal bird	SD = 1.79			
			Residual	SD = 11.37			

The treatments are prey density (high and low), social status of focal birds (subordinate and dominant), and ln-transformed group size (number of individuals, including focal). The reference case (intercept at group size = 0) is the high prey density treatment for focal birds in subordinate positions.

<sup>a</sup> Treatment significant at the 0.05 level.

<sup>b</sup> Treatment significant at the 0.01 level.

than for dominants, but the significant interaction between social status and group size suggests that this difference was mitigated by group size.

The fraction of time spent moving increased with group size (Table 2d and Figure 4C). For small group sizes, the fraction of time spent moving was higher on the low prey density patch than on the high prey density patch. However, this difference decreased with group size. Additionally, birds in dominant

positions spent more time moving than when the birds were in subordinate positions.

The proportion of time spent interacting decreased with group size and was lower on the low prey density patch than on the high prey density patch (Table 2e and Figure 4D). In addition, birds in dominant positions spent less time on interactions than in subordinate positions.


Table 2f shows that neither prey density nor group size had significant effects on handling times. Birds in a dominant position, however, had larger handling times than when they were in a subordinate position.

Birds in dominant positions tended to be more vigilant than in subordinate positions. However, this effect was mitigated by group size as indicated by the significant negative interaction between group size and social status (Table 2g).

## DISCUSSION

One main finding of this study is that increasing group size had a negative effect on intake rate. It declined by 93% on the low prey density patch and 78% on the high density patch when group size increased from 2 to 8. Another important result is that the decline was not due to conventional mechanisms of interference competition. We observed only 4 cases of kleptoparasitism during the 112 trials and time spent interacting with conspecifics decreased with group size. The reduction in intake rate coincided with a decline in searching efficiency. Furthermore, the time budget models showed that with an increase in group size, the time spent searching, watching, and moving increased.

To avoid the possibility that decreased intake rate due to resource depletion is incorrectly attributed to interference competition as group sizes increase, resource depletion needs to be controlled for (Vahl, van der Meer, et al. 2005; Smallegange et al. 2006). Previous experiments accounted for prey depletion by using unnaturally high prey densities or by using very short trial durations (Vahl, van der Meer, et al. 2005; Gyimesi et al. 2010; van Dijk et al. 2012). In experiments with shore crabs, *Carcinus maenas* Smallegange et al. (2006) kept prey densities constant by replenishing consumed prey. In our experiment, prey density declined 21% when group size increased from 2 to 8 birds. This effect was much smaller than the negative impact of group size on intake rate even though the effects of group size on the other behaviors were smaller



**Figure 3**  
Intake rate ( $\# \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) (A) and searching efficiency ( $\text{cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) (B) as functions of group size. The plotted lines are based on the final regression models (Table 2). Vertical bars denote standard errors of the means. The values on the x axis are adjusted for graphical representation.

**Table 2**  
**Time budget models**

		Behaviors	Predictors	Coefficient	SE	<i>P</i>
a)	Fixed effects	Off-patch	Intercept	−1.53	0.80	0.05
			Prey density (low)	−0.08	0.53	0.88
	Random effects		Social status (dominant)	−1.11	0.57	0.05
			Group size	0.07	0.13	0.60
			Focal bird	SD = 0.00		
			Residual	SD = 0.16		
b)	Fixed effects	Searching	Intercept <sup>b</sup>	1.54	0.21	<0.01
			Prey density (low) <sup>a</sup>	0.29	0.14	0.04
	Random effects		Social status (dominant) <sup>b</sup>	0.83	0.14	<0.01
			Group size <sup>a</sup>	0.07	0.04	0.04
			Focal bird	SD = 0.00		
			Residual	SD = 0.74		
c)	Fixed effects	Watching	Intercept <sup>a</sup>	−0.74	0.29	0.01
			Prey density (low) <sup>a</sup>	0.30	0.14	0.03
	Random effects		Social status (dominant) <sup>b</sup>	1.35	0.37	<0.01
			Group size <sup>b</sup>	0.18	0.05	<0.01
			Social status (dominant) × group size <sup>a</sup>	−0.16	0.07	0.02
			Focal bird	SD = 0.21		
d)	Fixed effects	Moving	Residual	SD = 0.72		
			Intercept <sup>b</sup>	−2.42	0.33	<0.01
	Random effects		Prey density (low) <sup>b</sup>	1.21	0.38	<0.01
			Social status (dominant) <sup>b</sup>	0.51	0.14	<0.01
			Group size <sup>b</sup>	0.32	0.05	<0.01
			Prey density (low) × group size <sup>a</sup>	−0.17	0.07	0.02
e)	Fixed effects	Interacting	Focal bird	SD = 0.35		
			Residual	SD = 0.75		
	Random effects		Intercept	0.79	0.56	0.16
			Prey density (low) <sup>a</sup>	−0.93	0.36	0.01
			Social status (dominant) <sup>b</sup>	−1.90	0.36	<0.01
			Group size <sup>b</sup>	−0.41	0.09	<0.01
f)	Fixed effects	Handling time (s)	Focal bird	SD = 0.30		
			Residual	SD = 1.88		
	Random effects		Intercept <sup>b</sup>	−0.64	0.10	<0.01
			Prey density (low)	−0.11	0.06	0.09
			Social status (dominant) <sup>a</sup>	0.13	0.06	0.04
			Group size	−0.02	0.02	0.11
g)	Fixed effects	Vigilance (# min <sup>−1</sup> )	Focal bird	SD = 0.06		
			Residual	SD = 0.31		
	Random effects		Intercept	0.05	0.09	0.62
			Prey density (low)	0.00	0.04	0.94
			Social status (dominant) <sup>b</sup>	0.47	0.11	<0.01
			Group size	0.01	0.01	0.73
	Social status (dominant) × group size <sup>b</sup>		−0.07	0.02	<0.01	
	Focal bird	SD = 0.09				
		Residual	SD = 0.22			

The different behaviors are time spent off the food patch (off-patch), searching for prey (searching), watching with head up (watching), moving (moving), interacting with conspecifics, that is, attacking or retreating (interacting), handling prey (handling), and vigilance. Treatments and reference case as in Table 1. Model estimates refer to transformed data (see MATERIALS AND METHODS).


<sup>a</sup> Treatment significant at the 0.05 level.

<sup>b</sup> Treatment significant at the 0.01 level.

than that on intake rate. The methods used here lead to substantially reduced depletion effects compared with comparable interference experiments (Vahl, van der Meer, et al. 2005). Moreover, in our experimental setup, we were able to study interference mechanisms in trials of approximately 4 min at naturally occurring prey densities (Vahl, van der Meer, et al. 2005; Gyimesi et al. 2010; Rutten, Oosterbeek, van der Meer, et al. 2010; van Dijk et al. 2012).

As noted in the Introduction, mechanistic functional response models generally assume that the main mechanisms of interference competition are kleptoparasitism and time lost in agonistic interactions. In oystercatchers *Haematopus ostralegus*, for instance, it has indeed been found that kleptoparasitism and time spent interacting with conspecifics increased with forager density while intake rate declined (Sutherland and

Koene 1982; Ens and Goss-Custard 1984). For shore crabs *Carcinus maenas*, Smallegange et al. (2006) observed that aggressive interactions increased with group size but that kleptoparasitism rarely occurred. Our results are consistent with the negative effect of group size on intake rate, but the common mechanisms of interference competition were virtually absent or operated in the opposite direction. Kleptoparasitism rarely occurred while time spent interacting declined. However, we found that time spent searching increased with group size, which was also observed in an interference experiment with mallards *Anas platyrhynchos* (van Dijk et al. 2012). Absence of kleptoparasitism was probably due to short handling times (similar results were obtained by van Gils, Schenk, et al. 2003; van Gils and Piersma 2004; Vahl, van der Meer, et al. 2005). The decrease in time spent interacting, and the increase in time



**Figure 4**

Mean transformed fractions of time spent on searching for prey (A), watching (B), moving on the food patch (C), and on interacting with conspecifics (D). The plotted lines are model estimates for prey densities and social status (Table 2). Note the differences in range on the vertical axes between panels. Each point in the graph represents the mean value.

devoted to searching with increasing group size, could be the result of red knots scrambling for prey (Clark and Mangel 1986; Grant 1993; Dubois and Giraldeau 2005). Additionally, a reduction in vigilance with group size could allow more time to be spent searching for prey (Pulliam 1973; Beauchamp 2003, 2009). In our study, the already low vigilance rates (overall one act every 2.4 min) indeed decreased with increasing group sizes. However, the amount of time gained from a reduction in vigilance was very small.

Larger group sizes led to more time spent on watching and moving as well as to a decrease in searching efficiency. We hypothesize that these behaviors resulted from birds shunning aggressive interactions. Time spent watching increased with group size because our knots had to increasingly divert their attention between searching for prey and avoiding interactions with conspecifics which in turn reduced searching efficiency (Goss-Custard 1976; Dukas and Kamil 2001). Time spent moving increased with group size because our knots increasingly had to avoid collisions with conspecifics. Because this may disturb preferred search paths (e.g., to avoid revisiting the same depleted locations), it reduced searching efficiency (Cresswell 1997). We follow Gyimesi et al. (2010) in suggesting to label the decline in intake rate due to covert avoidance behavior and associated reduced searching efficiency “cryptic interference”: these mechanisms are not the typical overt interference mechanisms.

Dominant birds are less susceptible to interference competition (Ens and Goss-Custard 1984; Stillman et al. 1996), because they may displace subordinates and monopolize food patches (Vahl, Lok, et al. 2005; Rutten, Oosterbeek, Verhulst, et al. 2010). Consequently, subordinates spend time avoiding dominants at the cost of foraging time (Stillman et al. 1997; Smallegange and van der Meer 2009) or at the cost of selecting less preferred foraging locations (Dolman 1995; Rutten, Oosterbeek, Verhulst, et al. 2010). In line with these results, we found that intake rates were higher when focal birds were dominant than when they were subordinate. Searching efficiencies, however, did not differ between dominance

treatments. Dominant birds had higher intake rates because they spent more time on the food patch searching for prey. Subordinate birds on the other hand more often avoided encounters with conspecifics and were more often excluded from the food patch as indicated by the fact that they spent more time off-patch.

Our experiments have shown that red knots incur decreased intake rates from avoiding encounters with conspecifics. In the field, this is rarely observed because mechanisms are cryptic (Gyimesi et al. 2010) and because suitable foraging areas are often large enough (van Gils et al. 2006; Kraan, van Gils, et al. 2009; Kraan, van der Meer, et al. 2009), such that encounters and physical hindering are minimal while maintaining the benefits of group foraging (Goss-Custard 1976).

Interference models have been used to predict spatial distributions of different species of shorebirds at various spatial scales (e.g., Stillman and Goss-Custard 2010; Quaintenne et al. 2011). For instance, Quaintenne et al. (2011) explain the distribution of red knots between wintering areas in NW Europe, including sites in the Netherlands, UK, and France, by means of an interference model. Their model is parameterized on the basis of small-scale experiments but applied to explain and predict distributions of red knots over large spatial and temporal scales. The explanation of Quaintenne et al. (2011) is therefore (implicitly) based on the notion that interference may operate over large spatial and temporal scales. Our results do not support this hypothesis because they indicate that knots attempt to avoid direct encounters with conspecifics. In intertidal areas, knots have sufficient opportunities to “space out gregariously” because foraging areas are extensive (Kraan, van Gils, et al. 2009; Kraan, van der Meer, et al. 2009). Indeed, in the field aggressive interactions and kleptoparasitism between knots are rarely observed.

As explained in the Introduction, a prerequisite for mechanistic generalized functional response models to adequately predict intake rate and spatial distributions is that it adequately captures the foragers’ essential behavior. Uncertainty about the mechanisms of interference hampers the validity and



generality of predictions from such models. The mechanisms of interference competition that we observed challenge the assumed mechanisms in the existing functional response models (that we know of). For instance, Smallegange and van der Meer (2009), considering a state of conspecifics avoidance, suggest that their model, and in principle any mechanistic model, may be extended to various situations by expanding the set of behavioral states. However, this requires unambiguous definitions, nonoverlapping states and unambiguous observations of behavioral states. In our experiment, such unambiguous assignments were perhaps not possible despite detailed behavioral observations. For instance, part of the behavior that we scored as “searching” could have been a combination of avoiding conspecifics whilst probing. Moreover, because it already is difficult to disentangle behavioral states in an experiment, in the field this will be nearly impossible (Gyimesi et al. 2010).

The phenomenological “Hassell and Varley model” allows for a decline of searching efficiency with group size (Hassell and Varley 1969), but all behavioral mechanisms are aggregated into one interference parameter. Hence, this model is unable to fully capture the interference mechanisms and lose their generality (van der Meer and Ens 1997; Smallegange and van der Meer 2009).

Our results showed that current generalized functional response models do not adequately capture the interference mechanisms that we have observed. Therefore, the aggregative response functions (i.e., the predicted distributions of foragers across food patches) are imprecise. Perhaps better predictions and understanding of interference may be obtained when current models are elaborated to take into account the fact that animals behave in ways such that agonistic interactions are anticipated and covertly avoided (i.e., cryptic interference).

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Supplementary material can be found at <http://www.beheco.oxfordjournals.org/>.

## FUNDING

E.O.F. was supported by a Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (NWO) research grant to the University of Groningen (*Breedtestrategie*).

We thank skipper Ewout Adriaans, Bernard Spaans, and Laurens van Kooten for their help capturing the birds; Eva Volman, Eveline van der Tuin, Sjoerd van Kessel, Suzanne Ansem, and Bianca Kieft for their help with the experiments; Maarten Brugge and Anne Dekinga for helping us collecting mussels on groins in all kinds of weather conditions and helping us taking care of the birds; Roel Bakker for building the moving patches; Dick Visser for preparing the figures; Jaap van der Meer for assistance with the dominance rank analyses and insightful discussions on interference competition as well as Jan van Gils, Maus Sabelis, and Wouter Vahl. Finally, we thank Jan van Gils and 2 referees for commenting on the manuscript.

## REFERENCES

- Aitchinson J. 1986. The statistical analysis of compositional data. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Bautista LM, Alonso JC, Alonso JA. 1995. A field-test of ideal free distribution in flock-feeding common cranes. *J Anim Ecol*. 64:747–757.
- Beauchamp G. 2003. Group-size effects on vigilance: a search for mechanisms. *Behav Process*. 63:111–121.
- Beauchamp G. 2009. How does food density influence vigilance in birds and mammals? *Anim Behav*. 78:223–231.
- Beddington JR. 1975. Mutual interference between parasites or predators and its effect on searching efficiency. *J Anim Ecol*. 44:331–340.
- Bijleveld AI, Egas M, van Gils JA, Piersma T. 2010. Beyond the information centre hypothesis: communal roosting for information on food, predators, travel companions and mates? *Oikos*. 119:277–285.
- Clark CW, Mangel M. 1986. The evolutionary advantages of group foraging. *Theor Popul Biol*. 30:45–75.
- Cresswell W. 1994. Flocking is an effective anti-predation strategy in redshanks, *Tringa totanus*. *Anim Behav*. 47:433–442.
- Cresswell W. 1997. Interference competition at low competitor densities in blackbirds *Turdus merula*. *J Anim Ecol*. 66:461–471.
- Danchin E, Giraldeau L, Cézilly F. 2008. Behavioural Ecology. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dekinga A, Piersma T. 1993. Reconstructing diet composition on the basis of feces in Mollusk-eating Wader, the Red Knot *Calidris canutus*. *Bird Study*. 40:144–156.
- Dekker R, Beukema JJ. 2007. Long-term and large-scale variability in productivity of the tellinid bivalve *Macoma balthica* on Wadden Sea tidal flats. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser*. 337:117–134.
- van Dijk JGB, Duijns S, Gyimesi A, de Boer WF, Nolet BA. 2012. Mallards feed longer to maintain intake rate under competition on a natural food distribution. *Ethology*. 118:169–177.
- Dolman PM. 1995. The intensity of interference varies with resource density—evidence from a field-study with snow buntings, *Plectrophenax nivalis*. *Oecologia*. 102:511–514.
- Dubois FD, Giraldeau LA. 2005. Fighting for resources: the economics of defense and appropriation. *Ecology*. 86:3–11.
- Dukas R, Kamil AC. 2001. Limited attention: the constraint underlying search image. *Behav Ecol*. 12:192–199.
- Ens BJ, Esselink P, Zwarts L. 1990. Kleptoparasitism as a problem of prey choice—a study on mudflat-feeding curlews, *Numenius arquata*. *Anim Behav*. 39:219–230.
- Ens BJ, Goss-Custard JD. 1984. Interference among Oystercatchers *Haematopus ostralegus*, feeding on *Mytilus edulis*, on the estuary. *J Anim Ecol*. 53:217–231.
- Folmer EO, Olff H, Piersma T. 2010. How well do food distributions predict spatial distributions of shorebirds with different degrees of self-organization? *J Anim Ecol*. 79:747–756.
- Folmer EO, Olff H, Piersma T. 2011. The spatial distribution of flocking foragers: disentangling the effects of food availability, interference and conspecific attraction by means of spatial autoregressive modeling. *Oikos*. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.19739.x.
- Fretwell SD, Lucas HL. 1970. On territorial behaviour and other factors influencing habitat distribution in birds. *Acta Biotheor*. 19:17–36.
- van Gils JA, Dekinga A, Spaans B, Vahl WK, Piersma T. 2005. Digestive bottleneck affects foraging decisions in red knots *Calidris canutus*. II. Patch choice and length of working day. *J Anim Ecol*. 74:120–130.
- van Gils JA, Piersma T. 2004. Digestively constrained predators evade the cost of interference competition. *J Anim Ecol*. 73:386–398.
- van Gils JA, Piersma T, Dekinga A, Dietz MW. 2003. Cost-benefit analysis of mollusc-eating in a shorebird II. Optimizing gizzard size in the face of seasonal demands. *J Exp Biol*. 206:3369–3380.
- van Gils JA, Schenk IW, Bos O, Piersma T. 2003. Incompletely informed shorebirds that face a digestive constraint maximize net energy gain when exploiting patches. *Amer Nat*. 161:777–793.
- van Gils JA, Spaans B, Dekinga A, Piersma T. 2006. Foraging in a tidally structured environment by red knots (*Calidris canutus*): ideal, but not free. *Ecology*. 87:1189–1202.
- Goss-Custard JD. 1976. Variation in the dispersion of Redshank *Tringa totanus* on their wintering feeding grounds. *Ibis*. 118:257–263.
- Goss-Custard JD. 1980. Competition for food and interference amongst waders. *Ardea*. 68:31–52.
- Goss-Custard JD, West AD, Yates MG, Caldow RWG, Stillman RA, Bardsley L, Castilla J, Castro M, Dierschke V, le V. dit Durell SEA, et al. 2006. Intake rates and the functional response in shorebirds (Charadriiformes) eating macro-invertebrates. *Biol Rev*. 81:501–529.
- Grant JWA. 1993. Whether or not to defend—the influence of resource distribution. *Mar Behav Physiol*. 23:137–153.
- Gyimesi A, Stillman RA, Nolet BA. 2010. Cryptic interference competition in swans foraging on cryptic prey. *Anim Behav*. 80:791–797.
- Hamilton WD. 1971. Geometry for the selfish herd. *J Theor Biol*. 31:295–311.

- Hassell MP, Varley GC. 1969. New inductive population model for insect parasites and its bearing on biological control. *Nature*. 223:1133–1137.
- Holling CS. 1959. Some characteristics of simple types of predation and parasitism. *Can Entomol*. 91:385–398.
- Holmgren N. 1995. The ideal free distribution of unequal competitors—predictions from a behavior-based functional response. *J Anim Ecol*. 64:197–212.
- van den Hout PJ, Mathot KJ, Maas LRM, Piersma T. 2010. Predator escape tactics in birds: linking ecology and aerodynamics. *Behav Ecol*. 21:16–25.
- Johnson CA, Giraldeau LA, Grant JWA. 2006. Intensity of interference affects the distribution of house sparrows, *Passer domesticus*, at food patches. *Anim Behav*. 71:965–970.
- Kennedy J, Crawley L. 1967. Spaced-out gregariousness in Sycamore aphids *Drepanosiphum platanioides* (Schrank) (Hemiptera, Callaphididae). *J Anim Ecol*. 36:147–170.
- Klaassen RHC, Nolet BA, Bankert D. 2006. The influence of social interactions on the foraging path of Bewick's Swans *Cygnus columbianus bewickii*. *Ardea*. 94:477–484.
- Kraan C, van Gils JA, Spaans B, Dekinga A, Bijleveld AI, van Roomen M, Kleefstra R, Piersma T. 2009. Landscape-scale experiment demonstrates that Wadden Sea intertidal flats are used to capacity by molluscivore migrant shorebirds. *J Anim Ecol*. 78:1259–1268.
- Kraan C, van der Meer J, Dekinga A, Piersma T. 2009. Patchiness of macrobenthic invertebrates in homogenized intertidal habitats: hidden spatial structure at a landscape scale. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser*. 383:211–224.
- Krause J, Ruxton GD. 2002. *Living in groups*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krebs CJ. 1972. *Ecology: the experimental analysis of distribution and abundance*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kucera M, Malmgren BA. 1998. Logratio transformation of compositional data—a resolution of the constant sum constraint. *Mar Micropaleontol*. 34:117–120.
- Lima SL, Dill LM. 1990. Behavioral decisions made under the risk of predation—a review and prospectus. *Can J Zool*. 68:619–640.
- van der Meer J. 1992. Statistical analysis of the dichotomous preference test. *Anim Behav*. 44:1101–1106.
- van der Meer J, Ens BJ. 1997. Models of interference and their consequences for the spatial distribution of ideal and free predators. *J Anim Ecol*. 66:846–858.
- van der Meer J, Smallegange IM. 2009. A stochastic version of the Beddington-DeAngelis functional response: modelling interference for a finite number of predators. *J Anim Ecol*. 78:134–142.
- Miller RG. 1986. *Beyond ANOVA, basics of applied statistics*. New York: Wiley.
- Piersma T. 2007. Using the power of comparison to explain habitat use and migration strategies of shorebirds worldwide. *J Ornithol*. 148:S45–S59.
- Piersma T, van Aelst R, Kurk K, Berkhoudt H, Maas LRM. 1998. A new pressure sensory mechanism for prey detection in birds: the use of principles of seabed dynamics? *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 265:1377–1383.
- Piersma T, van Gils JA, de Goeij P, van der Meer J. 1995. Holling's functional response model as a tool to link the food-finding mechanism of a probing shorebird with its spatial distribution. *J Anim Ecol*. 64:493–504.
- Piersma T, Hoekstra R, Dekinga A, Koolhaas A, Wolf P, Battley PF, Wiersma P. 1993. Scale and intensity of intertidal habitat use by knots *Calidris canutus* in the western Wadden Sea in relation to food, friends and foes. *Neth J Sea Res*. 31:331–357.
- Pulliam HR. 1973. On the advantages of flocking. *J Theor Biol*. 38:419–422.
- Quaintenne G, van Gils JA, Bocher P, Dekinga A, Piersma T. 2011. Scaling up ideals to freedom: are densities of red knots across western Europe consistent with ideal free distribution? *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 278:2728–2736.
- Quinn GP, Keough MJ. 2005. *Experimental design and data analyses for biologists*. 4th ed. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- Quinn JL, Cresswell W. 2006. Testing domains of danger in the selfish herd: sparrowhawks target widely spaced redshanks in flocks. *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 273:2521–2526.
- R Development Core Team. 2011. *R: a language and environment for statistical computing*. [Internet] Vienna (Austria): R Foundation for Statistical Computing Available from: <http://www.R-project.org> [accessed 1 October 2010].
- Rutten AL, Oosterbeek K, van der Meer J, Verhulst S, Ens BJ. 2010. Experimental evidence for interference competition in oystercatchers, *Haematopus ostralegus*. I. Captive birds. *Behav Ecol*. 21:1251–1260.
- Rutten AL, Oosterbeek K, Verhulst S, Dingemanse NJ, Ens BJ. 2010. Experimental evidence for interference competition in oystercatchers, *Haematopus ostralegus*. II. Free-living birds. *Behav Ecol*. 21:1261–1270.
- Ruxton GD, Gurney WSC, de Roos AM. 1992. Interference and generation cycles. *Theor Popul Biol*. 42:235–253.
- Smallegange IM, van der Meer J. 2009. The distribution of unequal predators across food patches is not necessarily (semi)truncated. *Behav Ecol*. 20:525–534.
- Smallegange IM, van der Meer J, Kurvers RHJM. 2006. Disentangling interference competition from exploitative competition in a crab-bivalve system using a novel experimental approach. *Oikos*. 113:157–167.
- Stephens DW, Brown JS, Ydenberg RC. 2007. *Foraging: behavior and ecology*. Chicago (IL): The University of Chicago Press.
- Stillman RA, Goss-Custard JD. 2010. Individual-based ecology of coastal birds. *Biol Rev*. 85:413–434.
- Stillman RA, Goss-Custard JD, Caldow RWG. 1997. Modelling interference from basic foraging behaviour. *J Anim Ecol*. 66:692–703.
- Stillman RA, Goss-Custard JD, Clarke RT, le V. dit Durell SEA. 1996. Shape of the interference function in a foraging vertebrate. *J Anim Ecol*. 65:813–824.
- Sumpter DJT. 2010. *Collective animal behavior*. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press.
- Sutherland WJ. 1983. Aggregation and the 'ideal free' distribution. *J Anim Ecol*. 52:821–828.
- Sutherland WJ, Koene P. 1982. Field estimates of the strength of interference between Oystercatchers *Haematopus ostralegus*. *Oecologia*. 55:108–109.
- Tregenza T. 1995. Building on the ideal free distributions. *Adv Ecol Res*. 26:253–307.
- Tufto J, Solberg ES, Ringsby TH. 1998. Statistical models of transitive and intransitive dominance structures. *Anim Behav*. 55:1489–1498.
- Vahl WK, Lok T, van der Meer J, Piersma T, Weissing FJ. 2005. Spatial clumping of food and social dominance affect interference competition among ruddy turnstones. *Behav Ecol*. 16:834–844.
- Vahl WK, van der Meer J, Meijer K, Piersma T, Weissing FJ. 2007. Interference competition, the spatial distribution of food and free-living foragers. *Anim Behav*. 74:1493–1503.
- Vahl WK, van der Meer J, Weissing FJ, van Dulleman D, Piersma T. 2005. The mechanisms of interference competition: two experiments on foraging waders. *Behav Ecol*. 16:845–855.
- Valone TJ. 2007. From eavesdropping on performance to copying the behavior of others: a review of public information use. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol*. 62:1–14.
- Zwarts L, Blomert AM. 1992. Why Knot *Calidris canutus* take medium-sized *Macoma balthica* when 6 prey species are available. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser*. 83:113–128.