Habitat use of culturally distinct Galápagos sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) clans

- 3 Running page head: Sperm whale clan habitat
- 4 Ana Eguiguren^{1,2*}, Enrico Pirotta^{3,4}, Maurício Cantor^{5,6}, Luke Rendell⁷, Hal Whitehead¹
- ⁵ ¹Department of Biology, Dalhousie University, Oxford Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3H 4J1

6 Canada

⁷ ²Colegio de Ciencias Biológicas y Ambientales, Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, PC

- ³Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Washington State University, Vancouver, WA 98686
 USA
- ⁴School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University College, Cork, T12K8AF,
- 12 Ireland
- ⁵Departamento de Ecologia e Zoologia, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis,
- 14 SC 88040-970 Brazil
- ⁶Centro de Estudos do Mar, Universidade Federal do Paraná, Pontal do Sul, PR 83255-976
- 16 Brazil
- ¹⁷ ⁷Center for Social Learning and Cognitive Evolution, and Sea Mammal Research Unit,
- 18 University of St Andrews, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 9TH UK
- 19 *Corresponding author email: anaeguibur@gmail.com

20 Abstract

Ecological niche is traditionally defined at the species level, but individual niches can vary 21 22 considerably within species. Research on intra-specific niche variation has been focused on 23 intrinsic drivers. However, differential transmission of socially learned behaviours can also lead 24 to intra-specific niche variation. In sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*), social transmission 25 of information is thought to generate culturally distinct clans, which at times occur sympatrically. Clans have distinct dialects, foraging success rates, and movement patterns, but 26 whether the niches of clan members are also different remains unknown. We evaluated the 27 28 differences in habitat use of clans off the Galápagos Islands, using data collected over 63 29 encounters between 1985 and 2014. During encounters, we recorded geographic positions, determined clan identity through analysis of group vocalizations and individual associations, and 30 used topographical and oceanographic variables as proxies of sperm whale prey distribution. We 31 32 used logistic Generalized Additive Models, fitted with Generalized Estimating Equations to 33 account for spatiotemporal autocorrelation, to predict clan identity as a function of the environment descriptors. Oceanographic variables marginally contributed to differentiating 34 35 clans. Clan identity could be predicted almost entirely based on geographic location. This fine-36 scale, within-region spatial partitioning likely derives from whales preferring areas where members of their clans occur over temporal scales of a few months to a few years. By identifying 37 differences in clans' space use, we have uncovered another level of sperm whale life that is 38 likely influenced by their cultural nature. 39

40 Key words: habitat preference, cetacean, culture, GAM, GEE, Galápagos

41

42 Introduction

Traditionally, ecological niche and habitat use have been defined at the species level (Hutchinson 43 44 1957, Leibold 1995). However, mounting evidence for individuals of the same population having low niche overlap reminds us that conspecifics are not always ecologically equivalent (Bolnick 45 et al. 2003). To date, most of the theoretical work on individual niche variation has focused on 46 47 intrinsic sources of variation, such as morphological, physiological, and ontogenic traits (Van Valen 1965, Roughgarden 1972, Svanbäck & Persson 2004). Less attention has been given to 48 social learning as a mechanism for individual niche variation (but see Galef 1976; Laland et al. 49 2000; Slagsvold and Wiebe 2007; Sargeant and Mann 2009). 50 51 When behavioural traits are socially learned and shared among groups of individuals, there is 52 culture (Boyd & Richerson 1996, Laland & Hoppitt 2003). Culture, as so defined, can play an important role in the divergence of resource and space use among individuals, especially in 53 species in which foraging strategies and habitat selection are socially transmitted (e.g. Laland & 54 Galef, 2009; Whitehead & Rendell, 2014). Notable cases include apes and monkeys that learn to 55 use different tools to exploit nuts and termites (McGrew et al. 1979, Boesch et al. 1994, Whiten 56 57 et al. 1999, van Schaik et al. 2003, Ottoni & Izar 2008), birds that learn about feeding areas and prey sizes from their parents' choices (Slagsvold & Wiebe 2011), female mountain sheep 58 retaining the home ranges of their social groups (Geist 1971), dolphins using the same foraging 59 60 tactics and areas of their mothers and/or peers (Mann & Patterson 2013, Cantor et al. 2018), and sea otters using foraging tools to meet their matrilineally transmitted dietary preferences (Estes et 61 al. 2003). These and other foraging techniques and habitat use patterns are socially acquired 62

63 behavioural traits that result in different resource use patterns, and so reduce trophic niche

overlap among subsets of individuals within the same population (Jaeggi et al. 2010, Slagsvold
& Wiebe 2011, Allen et al. 2013).

However, it is not always straightforward to disentangle culture from other underlying causes of
foraging behaviour variation. Both genetic and ecological factors are explanatory candidates for
behavioural divergence, especially in allopatric populations (e.g. Laland and Galef 2009; Koops
et al. 2013). One way to overcome this issue is excluding all sources of non-cultural behavioural
variation (Whiten et al. 1999), but this has proved problematic (Laland & Janik 2006).

Alternatively, by studying resource-use variation among sympatric groups of genetically-similar 71 72 individuals, one can account for such environmental and genetic mechanisms. Two particularly 73 well-known marine examples are killer whales (Orcinus orca) and Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops* sp.). Mammal-eating and fish-eating killer whales use the same waters off 74 British Columbia but feed exclusively on very different prey (Ford et al. 1998). Off Shark Bay, 75 76 Australia, part of a bottlenose dolphin population uses marine sponges as tools to forage on the 77 seafloor for prey that are hard to access otherwise, leading to distinct social communities of "sponging" and "non-sponging" dolphins that coexist in the same habitat (Mann et al. 2012). 78 79 Neither case can be explained by genetic variation alone (Krützen et al. 2005, Mann et al. 2012, 80 Riesch et al. 2012).

Over much wider spatial scales, there is the case of sympatric cultural divergence among female sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) into clans. While males lead mostly solitary lives in high latitudes, females and immatures live in tightly-knit social units, containing few matrilines, in tropical and subtropical waters (Best 1979, Christal et al. 1998). Social units form temporary larger groups (Whitehead et al. 1991), but they do so with other units with which they share a large proportion of their acoustic repertoire, thus delineating a higher social level: the *vocal clan*

87	(Rendell & Whitehead 2003, Whitehead et al. 2012, Gero et al. 2016). Sperm whale clans of the				
88	Eastern Tropical Pacific are genetically indistinct (Rendell et al. 2012) and sympatric (Rendell &				
89	Whitehead 2003). Members of different clans can encounter one another easily, in theory.				
90	However, they not only maintain distinct vocal dialects over time (Rendell & Whitehead 2005),				
91	but also differ in movement and social behaviour, reproductive and foraging success, and diet				
92	composition (Whitehead & Rendell 2004, Marcoux 2005, Marcoux et al. 2007a, Cantor &				
93	Whitehead 2015). These divergences suggest that sperm whales belonging to culturally distinct				
94	but sympatric clans may use different habitats, but this has not yet been studied directly.				
95	Understanding sperm whale niche is hampered by logistical constraints. Their trophic niche, for				
96	instance, is known only indirectly. Sperm whales seem to primarily prey on cephalopods, but				
97	since they live offshore and feed at great depths (Papastavrou et al. 1989), observations of				
98	predation are rare. Moreover, analyses of stomach contents and defecation yield contrasting				
99	results regarding the species consumed (see Clarke et al. 1988, Clarke & Paliza 2001, Smith &				
100	Whitehead 2000). While many bathypelagic squid have overlapping ranges and niches				
101	(Nigmatullin et al. 2001), different age and size classes within single species have different				
102	distributions and dietary preferences (Nigmatullin et al. 2001; Markaida 2006). On the other				
103	hand, the habitat component of sperm whale niche can be assessed via the environmental				
104	variables that influence the distribution of the cephalopods they prey upon (Jaquet & Whitehead				
105	1996), such as bottom topography and oceanographic variables that are related to upwelling				
106	processes and increased productivity (Jaquet & Whitehead 1996, Pirotta et al. 2011, Wong &				
107	Whitehead 2014).				

Here, we evaluate whether sympatric sperm whale clans differ in habitat use by investigating thespatial, oceanographic, and topographic characteristics of the waters they occupy off the

Galápagos Islands. Specifically, we compared the relative habitat use of two vocal clans that were particularly common in the area in the 1980's (Rendell & Whitehead 2003), and of two other clans that have recently replaced them in the 2010's (Cantor et al. 2016).

113 Methods

114 Field Methods

We studied sperm whales off the Galápagos Archipelago (93°-88°W; 3°N-3°S) aboard dedicated 115 research sailboats (10-12m) between January and June, in 1987, 1989, 2013, and 2014 (Table 1). 116 We searched for whales acoustically, monitoring hydrophones that could detect sperm whale 117 clicks up to about 7 kilometres away every 15-60 minutes (Whitehead 2003). During daylight 118 119 hours, we also searched for whales visually within a range of 0.2 to 2.0 km, depending on weather conditions. Upon finding a group of sperm whales, we approached it cautiously to 120 photograph their flukes for individual identification (Arnbom 1987). We refer to the periods 121 122 during which we had continuous (within less than 6 hours) visual and/or acoustic contact with the same group of females as *encounters*. 123

Groups of females and immatures (identified based on body size and behaviour; Whitehead 2003) were followed for as long as possible, during which time the vessel's geographic location was recorded. Until 1993, positions were estimated by interpolation from SATNAV fixes at least every 3 hours; after 1993, positions were recorded every 1-5 min using GPS (as in Whitehead and Rendell 2004). Vessel positions were used as indicators of the whales' locations, which, given the range of acoustic detection, could be up to 7 kilometres away from the vessel.

130 *Clan identification*

We assigned clan identity to groups of female and immature sperm whales based on the 131 similarity of their communication sounds, called codas (see Rendell and Whitehead 2003; Cantor 132 133 et al. 2016). A clan was considered a collection of groups of sperm whales that shared an identifiable part of their coda repertoires (see Rendell & Whitehead 2003). At least four vocal 134 clans were commonly sighted around Galápagos (Rendell & Whitehead 2003, Cantor et al. 135 136 2016): Regular (typically producing regularly-spaced clicks); Plus-One (typical codas with an extended pause before the last click), Short (typical codas with fewer than 5 clicks), and Four-137 138 *Plus* clan (typical codas with a basis of 4 regular clicks). 139 We assigned clan memberships to all groups of whales that were photo-identified together and had their acoustic repertoire sufficiently sampled (see Rendell & Whitehead 2003, Cantor et al. 140 141 2016). Geographic positions within a day were assigned to a corresponding clan because: 1) typically only one group of whales was tracked per day; 2) whales of the same group belong to 142 143 the same clan; 3) groups from different clans are typically found some days apart (Whitehead & 144 Rendell 2004). However, in four multiple-day encounters, more than one clan was identified, likely due to the replacement of the tracked group by one of another clan during the night. Since 145 146 we could not determine the time the new group of whales was found, for these encounters, we 147 used only geographic positions that were recorded in daylight (06:00-18:00), during which photo-identifications were available (see Whitehead and Rendell 2004). 148

149 Environmental descriptors

As topographical variables, we used depth from the General Bathymetric Chart of the Oceans (http://www.gebco.net/data_and_products/gridded_bathymetry_data/) and percentage of slope incline, calculated with Spatial Analysis tools in ArcGIS. As oceanographic variables, we used relative mean sea surface temperature (relSST) as a proxy for upwelling and standard deviation

of SST (sdSST) as a proxy for frontal activity from the Pathfinder Version 5.0 & 5.1 dataset 154 collected by the Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR) and processed by the 155 156 NOAA National Oceanographic Data Center for 1980's data points, and Aqua-MODIS satellite images distributed by the NOAA CoastWatch Program and NASA's Goddard Space Flight 157 Center for 2010's data points (see Griffin 1999; Praca et al. 2009; Pirotta et al. 2011). We 158 159 calculated relSST as the difference between SST at a geographic position and the mean SST over the entire Galápagos region (defined as 93°-88°W; 2°N-2°S for the 1980's period and 93°-88°W; 160 161 1.5°N-2°S for the 2010's period) for the corresponding month We also considered chlorophyll-a 162 concentration (Chla) as a measure of primary productivity for the 2013-2014 survey period, which was not available for the earlier studies. We obtained these data from NOAA CoastWatch 163 Program Aqua MODIS satellite images. Since the sperm whales' cephalopod prey are 164 165 themselves predatory, there is an expected temporal lag of about 3-4 months between primary productivity peaks and increases in cephalopod biomass (see Jaquet 1996; Pirotta et al. 2011). 166 167 Thus, we considered the monthly Chla concentration averaged over the three months prior to the encounter date. We note that while relSST, sdSST, and Chla reflect processes that affect primary 168 productivity at the surface, these values may not reflect high productivity hundreds of metres 169 170 below the surface, which is where sperm whale prey is found (Volkov & Moroz 1977; Pierce et al. 2008). However, an association between surface and subsurface waters is suggested by the 171 172 significant correlation between sperm whale feeding success and surface conditions (Smith & 173 Whitehead 1996). Finally, we used latitude and longitude to account for spatial variation unexplained by oceanographic and topographical variables. 174

We linked values of depth and slope to geographic positions using the raster package in R (RCore Team 2016). We obtained SST and Chla values for each geographic position using the

rerddapXtracto R package (Mendelssohn 2016). Topographic and oceanographic variables were
extracted at 0.10° resolution, to reflect the distances over which sperm whales could be detected
visually and acoustically. Oceanographic variables were weekly averages. In the case of Chla,
we used the monthly mean averaged over three months, starting from three months prior to
recorded geographic positions. During analysis, we found that models fitted using environmental
variables extracted at coarser spatial and temporal scales did not produce substantially different
results (Supplement 1)

184 Modelling differences in habitat use

185 To examine whether the different clans of sperm whales had different habitat use patterns, we used logistic Generalized Additive Models (GAMs) and Generalized Estimating Equations 186 187 (GEEs) in which oceanographic and topographic variables were used as predictors of clan identity (following Pirotta et al. 2011). We used GEEs to account for spatiotemporal 188 autocorrelation expected from our continuous method of data collection (Pirotta et al. 2011). 189 This method has previously been used in ecological studies when data were sequentially 190 collected or when measurements were gathered repeatedly from a group of individuals (Dormann 191 192 et al. 2007, Pirotta et al. 2011, Pirotta et al. 2014, Scott-Hayward et al. 2015). Specifically, sequential data points are grouped into independent blocks and a correlation structure is fitted 193 within blocks (Liang & Zeger 1986). We used a working independence model, which is 194 195 preferred when the true nature of the correlation is unknown (Liang & Zeger 1986, McDonald 1993, Pan 2001). This approach returns more realistic estimates of uncertainty compared with a 196 standard GAM to account for the observed degree of autocorrelation within blocks, but 197 198 parameter estimates are not affected.

We analyzed data collected in the 1980's and in the 2010's separately, because different clans 199 were sighted during each of these periods (Table 1; see also Cantor et al. 2016): predominantly 200 Plus-One and Regular in the former; Short and Four-Plus in the latter. For the 1980's analysis, 201 we included only sightings with *Plus-One* and *Regular* clans as there was only one encounter 202 with each of the *Short* and *Four-Plus* clans over this period (Table 1). We binarized records in 203 each period (i.e. assigning "0" to one clan, "1" to the other). We used individual geographic 204 positions as our unit of analysis and encounters with single clans as the blocking variable, 205 206 because each encounter represented one group of whales. All locations within each encounter 207 were included within a block. Autocorrelation function (ACF) plots of residuals from individual encounters for the final models (see below) rapidly converged to zero, indicating that encounter 208 was an appropriate blocking variable (Scott-Hayward et al. 2013; See Figs. S1 & S2 in 209 Supplement 2). We tested whether latitude and longitude were best entered as linear terms or 210 cubic spline smooths (see below), while other variables were treated as linear terms, because we 211 212 assumed that relationships between habitat use and oceanographic and topographic variables would be monotonic. 213

Habitat use can be influenced by behavioral states in cetacean species (Cañadas & Hammond
2008; Palacios et al. 2013) but we did not include behavioural information in our analyses.
Sperm whales have two very distinct behavioural states – they forage for about 75% of the time
and socialize during the rest (Whitehead and Weilgart 1991). While socializing, sperm whales
tend to move slowly and in more variable directions (Whitehead and Weilgart 1991), so that at
the spatial scales of this study (>10 km) positions collected during socializing would not be
much different, if at all, from those recorded at the end and beginning of the foraging bouts

respectively preceding and following the period of socialising. Therefore, in this case, habitat userecords will largely be determined by foraging behaviour.

We subsampled or interpolated geographic positions so that they were available approximately every hour and retained only geographic positions collected in areas that were sufficiently surveyed during both study periods (see Supplement 3 for further details). To identify and avoid collinearity, we calculated correlation coefficients for all pairs of explanatory variables (Tables S1-2 in Supplement 4). When variables were collinear ($|\mathbf{r}| > 0.4$), we fit alternative initial models that included only uncorrelated variables.

229 Model selection

230 To select the most parsimonious combination of uncorrelated variables and the best form (linear 231 or smooth) in which latitude and longitude should be included, we used the quasi-likelihood under independence model criterion (QIC)-an adaptation of Akaike's information criterion 232 (AIC) for GEEs (Pan 2001, Cui & Qian 2007) available in the MuMIn R package (Barton, 233 2016). First, we fitted alternative initial models using uncorrelated predictors, in which latitude 234 235 and longitude were entered as either linear terms or cubic splines, and then used QIC to select the 236 best shape at which these should be entered. Next, we used backwards stepwise selection to determine which variables to include. 237

We also fitted null models that included only latitude and longitude, aiming to capture variation in relative habitat preferences that could not be accounted for by any of the oceanographic or topographic variables available and investigate the degree to which oceanographic and topographic variables retained in the model improved predictive ability. All explanatory variables were standardised by subtracting the mean and dividing by the standard deviation.

243 *Prediction maps*

To examine the spatial distribution of predicted probabilities of encountering a given clan, we 244 245 produced prediction maps for each study period within areas where whales were found, using the 246 final models (see Supplement 5). We also generated maps of predicted probabilities under the null models for each study period. To identify regions where predictions from the final and the 247 248 null model differed the most, we generated a mean difference raster. Specifically, for each study period, we obtained the absolute difference between the calculated probabilities generated from 249 250 the final best model for each year and those calculated through the null model, and averaged 251 annual differences to create a single raster.

252 Validation

253 To validate the final models, we analyzed the following three aspects of predictive performance. 254 First, we used goodness of fit (GOF)—a measure of how well the final models fit the data—by generating confusion matrices to assess the models' accuracy in predicting the data used to fit 255 models (Fielding & Bell 1997). To build confusion matrices, we estimated the predicted 256 257 probability that locations during encounters indicated a given clan. We transformed predicted 258 probability values into a binary assignment using a cut-off that maximized the distance between 259 the Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve and a 1:1 line using the ROCR package in R 260 (Fielding & Bell 1997, Sing et al. 2005). Second, we used leave-one-out cross validation (LOO) 261 to quantify how accurately a model predicted clan identity for an encounter when that encounter 262 was iteratively removed from the data used to fit the model. In each encounter, we calculated the 263 percentage of geographic positions for which clan identity was correctly assigned (Hastie et al. 2009). Finally, we used external cross-validation, i.e. assessed how accurately models predicted 264 265 clan identity in data that were not used in the model fitting and selection process. We calculated

the accuracy in predicting clan identity for whales found in 1985 for the 1980's models, and for whales found in the western region during 2013 and 2014 for the 2010's models. For each study period, we compared these three aspects of performance of the final models to those of corresponding null models.

270 **Results**

271 *1980's period*

We analyzed 596 geographic positions collected between 1987 and 1989. Of these, 168 positions were collected while following the *Plus-One* clan whales and 479 while following *Regular* clan whales. Most encounters occurred in the west and northwest of the archipelago (Fig. 1a), and lasted between an hour and 6 days, averaging 1.6 days (SD = 1.4 days). We fitted two alternative initial models (Table S1 in Supplement 6). Our final model included latitude and longitude as cubic splines and slope and weekly sdSST as linear terms (GOF = 85.2%) (Table S2 in Supplement 6).

Most of the variation among the clans was explained by geographic variables. Whales of the 279 *Plus-One* clan were more likely to be found north of 0.25°N, although uncertainty in predicting 280 281 clan identity in that region was high (Fig. 2a-i). This is consistent with the observed latitudinal distributions of the Plus-One and Regular clans north of the Equator, but not with their 282 distributions in the southern limits of the study region where only *Plus-One* clan whales were 283 found (Fig. 3a-i). Plus-One whales were also found predominantly in more western waters, but 284 uncertainty in predicting clan identity increased east of the archipelago (91° W; Fig. 2a-ii). This 285 286 was consistent with the observed distribution of *Plus-One* whales throughout study years, which was restricted to areas west of 91.5° W, and with the distribution of Regular clan whales, which 287

occurred throughout the longitudinal range of sperm whale distribution (Fig. 3a-ii). High
uncertainty in predicting clan identity in the east likely resulted from the small number of
encounters that occurred in that area (Fig. 3a-ii). Although our final model included slope and
weekly sdSST (Figs. 2a-iii-iv), response curves did not reflect the observed slope, and sdSST at
which the clans were found (Figs. 3a-iii-iv).

The predominant effects of geographic variables in differentiating clan identity were also apparent from the similarity between predictive maps generated using the final model and the null model (Figs. 4a-i, ii). These two models predicted identical clan distributions in areas both close to and far from the Galápagos Islands, where there was little spatial overlap among the *Plus-One* and *Regular* clans, but more dissimilar distributions in regions of higher spatial overlap between the clans (Fig. 4a-iii).

The inclusion of oceanographic and topographic variables in the final model did not significantly improve the goodness of fit or the average predictive accuracy through LOO cross-validation in comparison to the null model (Fig. 5). Moreover, the inclusion of these variables did not improve the null model's poor ability to predict the clan identity of whales found in 1985 (Fig. 5).

303 *2010's period*

Between 2013 and 2014, we analyzed 370 geographic positions to the south of the Galápagos

305 Islands (Fig. 1b). Of these, 226 positions were collected while following the *Short* clan whales

and 144 while following *Four-Plus* clan whales. Encounters lasted between 1 hour and 8 days,

and averaged 1.3 days (SD = 2.3 days). We fitted six initial candidate models (Table S3 in

308 Supplement 6). The best final model included latitude and longitude as cubic splines, and weekly

relSST and sdSST (Table S4 in Supplement 6; GOF = 87 %).

The variation in clan distribution during this period was explained by geographic and 310 oceanographic variables. We found that Four-Plus whales were most likely to occur at around 311 312 2.2 and 1.8°S, and least likely to occur over latitudinal ranges between these values (Fig. 2b-i). Four-Plus whales were also more likely to occur east of 90.5°W, but uncertainty in predicting 313 clan identity was high further west, where there was only one encounter (with *Short* clan whales; 314 315 Fig. 2b-ii). This predicted geographic distribution reproduced the observed distribution of clans during the 2010's study period (Fig. 3b-i & ii). Four-Plus whales were also more likely to occur 316 317 in areas of higher weekly relSST (Fig. 2b-iii), and lower weekly sdSST (Fig. 2b-iv). The 318 modelled relationships between weekly relSST and sdSST and clan identity were consistent with the oceanographic conditions measured during the 2010's study period (Figs. 3b-iii, iv). 319 However, we note that the relSST mean is skewed towards lower temperatures by an encounter 320 with *Short* clan whales that consistently covered colder waters. 321 The importance of oceanographic variables in differentiating the habitat of Four-Plus and Short 322 323 clans was illustrated by the different prediction maps yielded by the final model and null models (Fig. 4b-i, ii). While both the full and null models generated identical probabilities in the 324 easternmost region where only Short clan whales were encountered, they differed greatly over 325 326 the regions where both clans overlapped (Fig. 4b-iii) However, while modelled differences in the oceanographic conditions over which Four-Plus and 327

328 Short clans occurred were consistent with observed differences in habitat use between Four-Plus

and *Short* clans, models that included oceanographic variables performed worse in terms of LOO

than the null model (Fig. 5b). The same was true regarding performance measured through

external cross-validation (Fig. 5b). Further, the performance measured through LOO and external

cross-validation of both null and full model was poor overall (<50%; Fig. 5b).

333 Discussion

We found that culturally distinct sperm whale clans that are sympatric at the regional scale, around the Galápagos Archipelago, vary considerably in fine-scale habitat use, delineated by spatial partitioning and, to a lesser degree, by oceanographic characteristics. In the 1980's, whales from the *Regular* and *Plus-One* clan used different geographical locations, while in the 2010's, *Four-Plus* and *Short* clan whales used waters with different oceanographic features. In the following sections, we discuss how the sociality of this species may influence its space use patterns via social transmission of habitat preferences and foraging behaviours.

341 Spatial partitioning

We found sperm whale clans used different areas around the Galápagos Archipelago. In the
1980's *Plus-One* whales were more common in offshore western waters than *Regular* clans
whales—consistent with previous findings (Whitehead & Rendell 2004). In the 2010's period,
only the *Four-Plus* clan occurred west of the archipelago and, in the southern region, the areas of
overlap with the *Short* clan were limited.

Previous analysis has shown that, over days up to a few weeks, areas on the scale at which we 347 can survey from a small vessel are predominantly occupied by groups of whales of a single clan 348 (Whitehead & Rendell 2004). Social units may group to forage together. Individuals may benefit 349 350 from eavesdropping on group members' echolocation clicks and locate prey more easily, or use other social information on prey location (Whitehead 1989, Whitehead et al. 1991). At daily to 351 weekly scales, we hypothesise that social units could benefit from remaining in an area where 352 353 other clan members are found and/or avoiding areas dominated by social units of other clans. In 354 this sense, the distribution of sperm whales could be affected by the distributions of fellow clan

members as well as by where members of other clans. The reactions of sperm whales to
encounters with other clans have not been documented, but active avoidance of members of
different cultural entities has been proposed for *transient* and *resident* killer whales (Bigg 1979,
Baird & Dill 1995). We note, however, that because these killer whale ecotypes have very
different diets, social avoidance could be entangled with different spatial use driven by prey
distribution, whereas diet differences are likely much subtler among sperm whale clans
(Marcoux et al. 2007), making social avoidance more evident.

We found that the spatial partitioning among sperm whale clans over few days and weeks was 362 363 consistent throughout the months over at least two years. This was most remarkable in the 1980's, during which the overall distribution of the clans was maintained despite variation in 364 environmental conditions and sperm whale feeding success between 1987-a strong el Niño 365 year— and 1989—a normal year (Whitehead & Rendell 2004). During the 1987 El Niño, 366 367 temperatures were 4°C higher than in 1989 (Whitehead & Rendell 2004). Increased temperatures 368 during El Niño events are associated with decreased marine production, which affects the fitness of species across taxa (Trillmich & Dellinger 1991, Boersma 1998, Schaeffer et al. 2008, Wolff 369 370 et al. 2012). Feeding rates of both *Regular* and *Plus-One* sperm whales were significantly lower 371 in 1987 than in 1989 (Whitehead and Rendell 2004). While there is no direct information on sperm whale prey abundance off the Galápagos Islands, decline in the biomass of the squid 372 373 Dosidicus gigas, an important prey of sperm whales in the region (Clarke et al. 1988, Clarke & 374 Paliza 2001) has been documented across the eastern Pacific during strong El Niño years (Taipe 375 et al. 1991, Markaida 2006). The distribution of clans remained relatively constant across two highly different years, suggesting that site fidelity over the annual temporal scale may be 376 maintained if social units rely on the presence of other clan members as a cue for habitat 377

selection. Thus, while sperm whale clans are often described as sympatric at a regional scale—
for example, around the Galápagos Archipelago, off the Coast of Chile, and in the Caribbean
(Gero et al. 2016; Rendell & Whitehead 2003)—spatial partitioning was apparent at a finer
spatial scale (less than 10 km).

Studies that span greater temporal and spatial scales indicate however that clan-specific habitat 382 383 use patterns become diluted. Our study focused on a window of up to three years around the Galápagos and was restricted to the months between January-June, which are mostly 384 representative of the warm season. This represents a snapshot of a female sperm whale's 385 lifespan—60 to 70 years (Rice 1989)—and a portion of the home range of such nomadic 386 387 animals-at least 2000 km across the Eastern Pacific (Whitehead et al. 2008, Mizroch & Rice 2013, Cantor et al. 2016). But throughout the decades, the clan composition in the Galápagos 388 Islands shifted abruptly from being dominated by the *Regular* and *Plus-One* clans in the 1980's, 389 390 to the *Regular* clan in the 1990's, and to the *Short* and *Four-Plus* clans in the 2010's (Cantor et 391 al. 2016). This shift may have resulted from movements triggered by environmental changes and fluctuation in prey availability over large scales (Cantor et al. 2016, 2017). Additionally, patterns 392 393 of habitat use for the same clans in other areas were less discrete (Whitehead & Rendell 2004). 394 Off the Chilean coast in the year 2000, Regular, Short, and Plus-One clans ranges overlapped more than off the Galápagos (Whitehead & Rendell 2004). Movement patterns of Regular clan 395 whales off Chile were also significantly more convoluted than those of *Regular* clan whales off 396 the Galápagos (Whitehead & Rendell 2004). 397

398 *Oceanographic variation*

Whether oceanographic conditions drive variation in clan space use remains uncertain. During
the 1980's, oceanographic variables did not contribute to discriminating the space use of *Plus*-

One and Regular clans. However, three lines of evidence suggest that oceanic conditions were 401 different in the areas occupied by the *Plus One* and *Regular* clans. First, the relative species 402 composition of sperm whale diet varied regionally, as described by the analysis of fecal samples 403 off the Galápagos Islands (Smith & Whitehead 2000). Second, Regular clan whales in this period 404 405 had a higher carbon-13 isotope signature compared to *Plus-One* clan whales (Marcoux et al. 406 2007b). Higher C-13 signatures are characteristic of less turbulent habitats, and have been suggested to reflect the difference in oceanic flow conditions between the more inshore habitat of 407 408 the *Regular* clan and the oceanic habitat of *Plus-One* clan whales (France 1995, Marcoux et al. 409 2007a). And third, Regular and Plus-One clan whales had significantly different movement patterns and foraging success rates during this period (Whitehead & Rendell 2004). Thus, 410 different conditions between the areas in which the clans were found could have existed but may 411 have not captured by the oceanographic variables we included in the present analysis. However, 412 it remains uncertain whether observed behavioural differences in *Regular* and *Plus-One* clans 413 414 were a consequence of different habitat conditions or if these behaviours caused different habitat selection patterns among the clans (Whitehead & Rendell 2004). 415 In the 2010's, Four-Plus clan whales were found in warmer waters and areas of higher variation 416 417 in SST than *Short* clan whales. These differences may have arisen if these clans were directly tracking different environmental cues to find their prey or if the prey they preferred was found in 418 419 association with different environmental conditions. Alternatively, these differences might also be a by-product of the spatial segregation described above. In addition, these patterns were 420

- 421 described based on a limited number of unevenly represented encounters and models that
- 422 captured these patterns performed poorly through cross-validation (although they fit well to the

data). Thus, our sample may not be sufficient to accurately represent the habitat of the *Short* and *Four-Plus* clans during this period.

425 Some of the uncertainty in characterizing the habitat of the clans arises from the difficulty in 426 measuring sperm whales' habitat accurately, and is further confounded by the lack of detailed 427 information on diving behaviour. Although the oceanographic and topographic variables we used 428 are valid proxies for the distribution of sperm whale prey (Jaquet & Whitehead 1996, Pirotta et al. 2011, Wong & Whitehead 2014), they do not equate to their presence, abundance or quality. 429 430 Furthermore, our measurements of oceanographic variables describe surface conditions. It is 431 uncertain the degree to which indicators of upwelling or frontal activity at the sea surface 432 represent those in deeper waters, because these features can be displaced or dissipated at greater depths (Jaquet 1996). Our inclusion of mostly surface-level oceanographic variables also likely 433 explains the small contribution that these variables had in predicting clan identity. Recent 434 435 advances in echosounding technology used to measure composition, biomass, and movements of 436 bathypelagic squid offer a promising way to better characterize the fine-scale habitat of sperm whales (Benoit-Bird et al. 2015, Benoit-Bird et al. 2017). Additionally, we aimed to identify 437 438 differences in niche traits among the clans but did not evaluate the possibility of niche width 439 varying among the clans, which has been found among killer whale ecotypes (Foote et al. 2009). 440 Thus, our decision to study only linear differences in habitat-use patterns may have restricted our ability to find non-monotonic contrasts in the oceanographic conditions where clans were found. 441

442 Conclusions

Our study reveals fine-scale spatial partitioning among clans around the Galápagos Islands that
suggests another layer of complexity in the cultural lives of sperm whales. We show that clans
differ in fine-scale space use, in addition to vocal repertoire (Rendell & Whitehead 2003),

movement patterns (Whitehead & Rendell 2004), fitness (Marcoux et al. 2007a), diet (Marcoux 446 et al. 2007b) and social behaviour (Cantor & Whitehead 2015). Taken together, these findings 447 448 suggest the niche of sperm whale clans is constructed on the basis of both social and environmental information, both of which interact over different spatial and temporal scales (see 449 also Boyd and Richerson 1988; Whitehead 2007; van der Post and Hogeweg 2009). The 450 451 potential ability of sperm whales to balance socially acquired traditions with environmental cues likely plays a part in their ecological success in such a highly dynamic, mesopelagic environment 452 453 (see also Laland et al. 2000; Whitehead 2007). 454 To further understand clan-specific niches of sperm whales, future studies should collect spatial data from other regions of the eastern Tropical Pacific and couple them with detailed diving data 455 using tag technologies and direct measurements of prey availability through echosounding 456

457 devices (Watwood et al. 2006, Benoit-Bird et al. 2015, Benoit-Bird et al. 2017). Combining such

458 large- and fine-scale spatial data will help clarify whether clans have consistently different

459 foraging strategies or if these behaviours are a response to varying environmental conditions.

460

461 **Ethics statement**

462 Field procedures for approaching, photographing, and recording sperm whales were approved by463 the Committee on Laboratory Animals of Dalhousie University.

464 Acknowledgements

465 We are grateful for all volunteer crewmembers for their hard work at sea, to G. Merlen and F.

466 Félix for help with logistics, and to the Ministerio de Defensa Nacional, Ministerio del

467 Ambiente, and Dirección del Parque Nacional Galápagos for research permits. We thank all

468	those who help processing data in the lab. We also thank Roy Mendelssohn for his help with					
469	satellite data, and Ari Friedlaender, Daniel Palacios, Marie Auger-Méthe, and Cindy Staicer for					
470	insightful comments on the manuscripts. AE thanks the contribution from the Dalhousie					
471	University Faculty of Graduate Studies, Nova Scotia Graduate Scholarship, and the Patrick F.					
472	Lett Graduate Students' Assistance Bursary; MC was funded by Conselho Nacional de					
473	Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (202581/2011-0, 153797/2016-9) and the Killam					
474	Trusts; LR was supported by the Marine Alliance for Science and Technology for Scotland					
475	(MASTs) pooling initiative and their support is gratefully acknowledged. MASTs is funded by					
476	the Scottish Funding Council (grant reference HR09011) and contributing institutions; HW was					
477	funded by Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, the National					
478	Geographic Society, the International Whaling Commission, the Whale and Dolphin					
479	Conservation Society, Cetacean Society International and the Green Island Foundation.					
480	Literature cited					
481	Allen J, Weinrich M, Hoppitt W, Rendell L (2013) Network-based diffusion analysis reveals					
482	cultural transmission of lobtail feeding in humpback whales. Science 340:485–488					
483	Arnbom T (1987) Individual identification of sperm whales. Rep Int Whaling Comm 37:201-					
484	204					
485	Baird RW, Dill LM (1995) Occurrence and behaviour of transient killer whales: seasonal and					
486	pod-specific variability, foraging behaviour, and prey handling. Can J Zool 73:1300-					
487	1311					
488	Barton K (2016) MuMIn: Multi-model inference. R package version 1.15.6. Available at:					
489	CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn					

490	Benoit-Bird KJ, Moline MA, Southall BL (2015) Deep mapping of teuthivorous whales and their					
491	prey fields. Report under contract to the Department of Defense Strategic Environmental					
492	Research and Development Program; OMB No. 0704-0188					
493	Benoit-Bird KJ, Moline MA, Southall BL (2017) Prey in oceanic sound scattering layers					
494	organize to get a little help from their friends. Limnol Oceanogr 73:2788–2798					
495	Best PB (1979) Social organization in sperm whales, Physeter macrocephalus. In: Norris KS					
496	(ed) Behavior of marine animals, Vol. 3. University of California Press, Berkeley					
497	Bigg MA (1979) Interaction between pods of killer whales off British Columbia and					
498	Washington. In: Third biennial conference on the biology of marine mammals: 3					
499	Bivand RS, Keitt T, Rowlingson B (2016). rdgal: bindings for the geospatial data abstraction					
500	library. R package version 1.2-5. Available at: CRAN.R-project.org/package=rdgal					
501	Bivand RS, Pebesma EJ, Gomez-Rubio V (2013). Applied spatial data analysis with R, Second					
502	Edition. Springer, New York					
503	Block WM, Brennan LA (1993) The habitat concept in ornithology: theory and applications. In					
504	Power DM (ed) Current ornithology, Vol. 11. Plenum Press, New York, p 35-91					
505	Boesch C, Marchesi P, Marchesi N, Fruth B, Joulian F (1994) Is nut cracking in wild					
506	chimpanzees a cultural behavior? J Hum Evol 26:325–338					
507	Bolnick DI, Svanbäck R, Fordyce JA, Yang LH, Davis JM, Hulsey CD, Forister ML (2003) The					
508	ecology of individuals: incidence and implications of individual specialization. Am Nat					
509	161:1–28					
510	Boyd R, Richerson PJ (1988) An evolutionary model of social learning: the effects of spatial and					
511	temporal variation. In: Zentall TR, Galef BG (eds) Social learning: psychological and					
512	biological perspectives. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, p 29-48					

- Boyd R, Richerson PJ (1996) Why culture is common, but cultural evolution is rare. Proc Br
 Acad 88:77–93
- 515 Cantor M, Eguiguren A, Merlen G, Whitehead H (2017) Galápagos sperm whales (*Physeter*
- 516 *macrocephalus*): waxing and waning over three decades. Can J Zool, 95: 645–652
- 517 Cantor M, Simões-Lopes PC, Daura-Jorge, FG (2018) Spatial consequences for dolphins
- 518 specialized in foraging with fishermen. Anim Behav 139: 19-27
- 519 Cantor M, Whitehead H (2015) How does social behavior differ among sperm whale clans? Mar
 520 Mamm Sci 31:1275–1290
- 521 Cantor M, Whitehead H, Gero S, Rendell L (2016) Cultural turnover among Galápagos sperm
- 522whales. R Soc Open Sci 3:160615
- 523 Cañadas A, Hammond P (2008) Abundance and habitat preferences of the short-beaked common
- dolphin *Delphinus delphis* in the southwestern Mediterranean: implications for
- 525 conservation. Endanger Species Res 4: 309-331
- 526 Christal J, Whitehead H, Lettevall E (1998) Sperm whale social units: variation and change. Can
- **527** J Zool 76:1431–1440
- 528 Clarke R, Paliza O (2001) The food of sperm whales in the southeast pacific. Mar Mamm Sci
 529 17:427–429
- 530 Clarke R, Paliza O, Aguayo A (1988) Sperm whales of the southeast Pacific, Part IV: Fatness,
- food and feeding. In: Pilleri G (ed) Investigations on Cetacea, Vol. XXI. Privately
- 532 published by G. Pilleri, Berne, p 53–195
- Cui J, Qian G (2007) Selection of working correlation structure and best model in GEE analyses
 of longitudinal data. Comm Stat Simul Comput 36:987–996

535	Dormann CF, McPherson JM, Araújo MB, Bivand R, Bolliger J, Carl G, Davies RG, Hirzel A,
536	Jetz W, Kissling WD, Kühn I, Ohlemüller R, Peres-Neto PR, Reineking B, Schröder B,
537	Schurr FM, Wilson R (2007) Methods to account for spatial autocorrelation in the
538	analysis of species distributional data: a review. Ecography 30: 609-628
539	Estes JA, Riedman ML, Staedler MM, Tinker MT, Lyon BE (2003) Individual variation in prey
540	selection by sea otters: patterns, causes and implications. J Anim Ecol 72:144-155
541	Fielding AH, Bell JF (1997) A review of methods for the assessment of prediction errors in
542	conservation presence/absence models. Environ Conserv 24:38-49
543	Foote AD, Newton J, Piertney SB, Willerslev E, Gilbert MTP (2009) Ecological, morphological
544	and genetic divergence of sympatric North Atlantic killer whale populations. Mol Ecol
545	18:5207–5217
546	Ford JK, Ellis GM, Barrett-Lennard LG, Morton AB, Palm RS, Balcomb III KC (1998) Dietary
547	specialization in two sympatric populations of killer whales (Orcinus orca) in coastal
548	British Columbia and adjacent waters. Can J Zool 76:1456–1471
549	France RL (1995) Carbon-13 enrichment in benthic compared to planktonic algae: foodweb
550	implications. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 124:307–312
551	Galef BG (1976) Social transmission of acquired behavior: a discussion of tradition and social
552	learning in vertebrates. Adv Stud Behav 3:77-100
553	Geist V (1971) Sheep society and home range formation. In: Mountain Sheep. The University of
554	Chicago Press, Chicago
555	Gero S, Whitehead H, Rendell L (2016) Individual, unit and vocal clan level identity cues in
556	sperm whale codas. R Soc Open Sci 3:150372
557	Griffin RB (1999) Sperm whale distributions and community ecology associated with a warm-

- core ring off Georges Bank. Mar Mamm Sci 15:33–51
- 559 Grinell J (1971) The niche-relationships of the California thrasher. Auk 34:427–433
- 560 Hall, LS, Krausman PR, Morrison ML (1997) The habitat concept and a plea for standard
- terminology. Wildl Soc Bull 25:173-182
- Hastie T, Tibshirani R, Friedman J (2009) The Elements of Statistical Learning, Second Edition.
 Springer Science & Business Media, New York
- Hijmans RJ (2016) raster: geographic data analysis and modeling. R package version 2.5-8.
 Available at: CRAN.R.project.org/package=raster
- Hutchinson GE (1957) Concluding remarks. Cold Spring Harb Symp Quant Biol 22:415–427
- 567 Jaeggi AV., Dunkel LP, Noordwijk MA van, Wich SA, Sura AA, van Schaik CP (2010) Social
- learning of diet and foraging skills by wild immature Bornean orangutans: implications
 for culture. Am J Primatol 72:62–71
- 570 Jaquet N (1996) How spatial and temporal scales influence understanding of sperm whale

distribution: a review. Mammal Rev 26:51–65

- 572 Jaquet N, Whitehead H (1996) Scale-dependent correlation of sperm whale distribution with
- environmental features and productivity in the South Pacific. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 135:1–9
- 574 Kanwisher JW, Ridgway SH (1983) The physiological ecology of whales and porpoises. Sci Am
- 575 248:110–120
- 576 Kawakami T (1980) A review of sperm whale food. Sci Rep Whales Res Inst 32:199–218
- 577 Koops K, McGrew WC, Matsuzawa T (2013) Ecology of culture: do environmental factors
- 578 influence foraging tool use in wild chimpanzees, *Pan troglodytes verus*? Anim Behav
 579 85:175–185
- 580 Krützen M, Mann J, Heithaus MR, Connor RC, Bejder L, Sherwin WB (2005) Cultural

581	transmission of tool use in bottlenose dolphins. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 102:8939–43
582	Laland KN, Galef BG (2009) The question of animal culture. Harvard University Press,
583	Cambridge
584	Laland KN, Janik VM (2006) The animal cultures debate. Trends Ecol Evol 21:542-547
585	Laland KN, Odling-Smee J, Feldman MW (2000) Niche construction, biological evolution, and
586	cultural change. Behav Brain Sci 23: 131-175
587	Leibold MA (1995) The niche concept revisited: mechanistic models and community context.
588	Ecology 76:1371–1382
589	Liang KY, Zeger SL (1986) Longitudinal data analysis using generalized linear models.
590	Biometrika 73:13–22
591	Mann J, Patterson EM (2013) Tool use by aquatic animals. Philos Trans R Soc Lond, B
592	368, 20120424
593	Mann J, Stanton MA, Patterson EM, Bienenstock EJ, Singh LO (2012) Social networks reveal
594	cultural behaviour in tool-using using dolphins. Nat Commun 3:980
595	Marcoux M (2005) Vocalizations, diet and fitness among acoustic clans of sperm whales
596	(Physeter macrocephalus). PhD dissertation, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS
597	Marcoux M, Rendell L, Whitehead H (2007a) Indications of fitness differences among vocal
598	clans of sperm whales. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 61:1093-1098
599	Marcoux M, Whitehead H, Rendell L (2007b) Sperm whale feeding variation by location, year,
600	social group and clan: evidence from stable isotopes. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 333:309-314
601	Markaida U (2006) Food and feeding of jumbo squid Dosidicus gigas in the Gulf of California
602	and adjacent waters after the 1997-98 El Niño event. Fish Res 79: 16-27
603	McDonald BW (1993) Estimating logistic regression parameters for bivariate binary data. JR

Stat Soc Ser B Stat Methodol 55:629–642					
McGrew WC, Tutin CEG, Baldwin PJ (1979) Chimpanzees, tools, and termites: cross-cultural					
comparisons of Senegal, Tanzania, and Rio Muni. J R Anthropol Inst 14:185-214					
Mizroch SA, Rice DW (2013) Ocean nomads: distribution and movements of sperm whales in					
the North Pacific shown by whaling data and Discovery marks. Mar Mamm Sci					
29:136–165					
Mendelssohn R (2016) rerddapXtracto: extracts environmental data from ERD's ERDDAP web					
service. R package version 0.1.0. Available at: github.com/rmendels/rerddapXtracto					
Nigmatullin CM, Nesis KN, Arkhipkin AI (2001) A review of the biology of the jumbo squid					
Dosidicus gigas (Cephalopoda: Ommastrephidae). Fish Res 54: 9-19					
Ottoni EB, Izar P (2008) Capuchin monkey tool use: Overview and implications. Evol Anthropol					
17:171–178					
Palacios D, Baumgartner M, Laidre K, Gregr E (2013) Beyond correlation: integrating					
environmentally and behaviourally mediated processes in models of marine mammal					
distributions. Endanger Species Res 22: 191-203					
Pan W (2001) Akaike's information criterion in generalized estimating equations. Biometrics					
57:120–125					
Papastavrou V, Smith SC, Whitehead H (1989) Diving behaviour of the sperm whale, Physeter					
macrocephalus, off the Galapagos Islands. Can J Zool 67:839-846					
Pirotta E, Matthiopoulos J, MacKenzie M, Scott-Hayward L, Rendell L (2011) Modelling sperm					
whale habitat preference: a novel approach combining transect and follow data. Mar Ecol					
Prog Ser 436:257–272					
Pirotta E, Thompson PM, Miller PI, Brookes KL, Cheney B, Barton TR, Graham IM, Lusseau D					

- 627 (2014) Scale-dependent foraging ecology of a marine top predator modelled using
 628 passive acoustic data. Funct Ecol 28:206–217
- 629 Pebesma EJ, Bivand RS (2005) Classes and methods for spatial data in R. R News 5:9-13
- 630 Praca E, Gannier A, Das K, Laran S (2009) Modelling the habitat suitability of cetaceans:
- example of the sperm whale in the northwestern Mediterranean Sea. Deep Res I 56:648–
 632 657
- 633 R Development Core Team (20016). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
- 634 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0, URL
- 635 <u>http://www.R-project.org</u>.
- Rendell L, Mesnick SL, Dalebout ML, Burtenshaw J, Whitehead H (2011) Can genetic
- 637 differences explain vocal dialect variation in sperm whales, *Physeter macrocephalus*?
 638 Behav Genet 42:332–343
- Rendell L, Whitehead H (2003) Vocal clans in sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*). Proc
 R Soc B 270:225–231
- 641 Rendell L, Whitehead H (2005) Spatial and temporal variation in sperm whale coda
- 642 vocalizations: stable usage and local dialects. Anim Behav 70:191–198
- 643 Rice DW (1989) Sperm whale *Physeter macrocephalus* Linnaeus, 1758. In: Ridgway SH,
- 644 Harrison R (eds) Handbook of marine mammals, Vol 4. Academic Press, London
- 645 Riesch R, Barrett-Lennard LG, Ellis GM, Ford JKB, Deecke VB (2012) Cultural traditions and
- 646 the evolution of reproductive isolation: ecological speciation in killer whales? Biol J Linn
- 647 Soc 106:1–17
- 648 Roughgarden J (1972) Evolution of niche width. Am Nat 106:683–718
- 649 Sargeant BL, Mann J (2009) From social learning to culture: intrapopulation variation in

650	bottlenose dolphins. In: Laland KN, Galef B (eds) The Question of Animal Culture.					
651	Harvard University Press, Cambridge, p 152–173					
652	Scott-Hayward L, Mackenzie ML, Ashe E, Williams R (2015) Modelling killer whale feeding					
653	behaviour using a spatially adaptive Complex Region Spatial Smoother (CReSS) and					
654	Generalized Estimating Equations (GEEs). J Agric Biol Environ Stat 20: 305-322					
655	Scott-Hayward L, Oedekoven C, Mackenzie ML, Walker CG, Rextad E (2013) User guide for					
656	the MRSea package: statistical modelling of bird and cetacean distributions in offshore					
657	renewables development areas. University of St. Andrews contract for Marine Scotland;					
658	SB9 (CR/2012/05)					
659	Sing T, Sander O, Beerenwinkel N, Lengauer T (2005) ROCR: Visualizing classifier					
660	performance in R. Bioinformatics 21:3940–3941					
661	Slagsvold T, Wiebe KL (2007) Learning the ecological niche. Proc R Soc B 274:19–23					
662	Slagsvold T, Wiebe KL (2011) Social learning in birds and its role in shaping a foraging niche.					
663	Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol 366:969–977					
664	Smith SC, Whitehead H (2000) The diet of Galápagos sperm whales Physeter macrocephalus as					
665	indicated by fecal sample analysis. Mar Mamm Sci 16:315-325					
666	Svanbäck R, Persson L (2004) Individual diet specialization, niche width and population					
667	dynamics: implications for trophic polymorphisms. J Anim Ecol 73:973-982					
668	Taipe A, Yamashiro C, Rojas P, Roque C (2001) Distribution and concentrations of jumbo flying					
669	squid (Dosidicus gigas) off the Peruvian coast between 1991 and 1999. Fish Res 54:21-					
670	32					
671	van der Post DJ, Hogeweg P (2009) Cultural inheritance and diversification of diet in variable					
672	environments. Anim Behav 78:155–166					

673	van Schaik CP, Ancrenaz M, Borgen G, Galdikas B, Knott CD, Singleton I, Suzuki A, Utami SS,					
674	Merrill M (2003) Orangutan cultures and the evolution of material culture. Science					
675	299:102–105					
676	Van Valen L (1965) Morphological variation and width of ecological niche. Am Nat 99:377–390					
677	Volkov AF, Moroz IF (1977) Oceanological conditions of the distribution of cetacean in the					
678	Eastern Tropical part of the Pacific Ocean. Rep Int Whal Comn 27: 186-188					
679	Watwood SL, Miller PJO, Johnson M, Madsen PT, Tyack PL (2006) Deep-diving foraging					
680	behaviour of sperm whales (Physeter macrocephalus). J Anim Ecol 75:814-825					
681	Whitehead H (1989) Formations of foraging sperm whales, Physeter macrocephalus, off the					
682	Galapágos Islands. Can J Zool 67:2131–2140					
683	Whitehead H (2003) Sperm Whales, Social Evolution in the Ocean. The University of Chicago					
684	Press, London					
685	Whitehead H (2007) Learning, climate and the evolution of cultural capacity. J Theor Biol					
686	245:341–350					
687	Whitehead H, Antunes R, Gero S, Wong SNP, Engelhaupt D, Rendell L (2012) Multilevel					
688	societies of female sperm whales (Physeter macrocephalus) in the Atlantic and Pacific:					
689	why are they so different? Int J Primatol 33:1142–1164					
690	Whitehead H, Coakes A, Jaquet N, Lusseau S (2008) Movements of sperm whales in the tropical					
691	Pacific. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 361:291–300					
692	Whitehead H, Rendell L (2004) Movements, habitat use and feedings success of cultural clans of					
693	South Pacific sperm whales. J Anim Ecol 73:190–196					
694	Whitehead H, Rendell L (2014) The cultural lives of whales and dolphins. University of Chicago					
695	Press, Chicago					

696	Whitehead H, Waters S, Lyrholm T (1991) Social organization of female sperm whales and their				
697	offspring: constant companions and casual acquaintances. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 29:385-				
698	389				
699	Whitehead H, Weilgart L (1991) Patterns of visually observable behaviour and vocalizations in				
700	groups of female sperm whales. Behaviour 118: 275-296				
701	Whiten A, Goodall J, McGrew WC, Nishida T, Reynolds V, Sugiyama Y, Tutin CEG,				
702	Wrangham RW, Boesch C (1999) Cultures in chimpanzees. Nature 399:682-685				
703	Wong SNP, Whitehead H (2014) Seasonal occurrence of sperm whales (Physeter				
704	macrocephalus) around Kelvin Seamount in the Sargasso Sea in relation to				
705	oceanographic processes. Deep Sea Res I 91:10–16				
700					

707 Tables

Table 1. Summary of time spent following female and juvenile sperm whales during the 1980's and

2010's surveys off the Galápagos Islands. Encounters were defined as consecutive geographic positions

that were assigned to the same clan and occurred within < 6 hours of each other.

Year	Surveyed period	Days spent following whales	Encounters with females and immatures ^a	Regular clan encounters	Plus-One clan encounters	Short clan encounters	Four-Plus clan encounters
1985°	Jan. 18 – Apr. 22	29	12	10	1	1	0
1987	Jan. 2 – Jun. 30	51	21	12	7	1	0
1989	Apr. 4 – May 22	32	16	10	3	0	1
2013 (Southern) ^b	Apr. 9 – Apr. 12	4	9	0	0	3	2
2013 ^c (Western) ^b	Jan. 3 –Feb. 21	10	2	0	0	0	2
2014 (Southern) ^b	Jan. 23 – May 22	24	11	0	0	2	3
2014 ^c (Western) ^b	Jan. 13 – Feb. 10	2	1	0	0	0	1
	Total	152	72	32	11	7	9

711

a. Encounter number includes encounters for which clan identity was not assigned, which is why

this number does not always equal the sum of encounters with each of the clans

b. Southern regions consist of areas south of 1.3°S and Western regions are north of 1.3°S (Fig. 1)

c. Data from these survey periods were used for external cross-validation only

716 Figures



Figure 1. Geographic positions in (a) 1987 and 1989 of *Plus-One* and *Regular* clan sperm whales, and (b)

- 719 in 2013 and 2013 of Four-Plus and Short clan sperm whales off the Galápagos Islands. The southern
- region that was included in the 2010's period is delineated by the dashed rectangle. A section of South
- 721 and Central America is shown for reference





Figure 2. Partial plots of log_e(odds) of female and juvenile sperm whales found off the Galápagos Islands
belonging to (a) the *Plus-One* clan in the 1980's study period and (b) the *Four-Plus* clan in the 2010's
study period. (a) In the 1980's, clan identity = *Plus-One* is modelled as function of (a-i) latitude, (a-ii)
longitude, (a-iii) slope incline, (a-iv) weekly standard deviation of SST (sdSST). (b) In the 2010's, clan
identity = *Four-Plus* is modelled as a function of (b-ii) latitude, (b-ii) longitude, (b-iii) weekly relSST,
and (b-iv) weekly sdSST. Grey lines represent 95% confidence intervals.



Figure 3. Bean-plots of observed geographic and oceanographic variables by clan; (a) shows the 1980's
distribution of variables in which *Plus-One* and *Regular* clan whales were found off the Galápagos
Islands: (a-i) latitude, (a-ii) longitude, (a-iii) slope incline, and (a-iv) weekly standard deviation of sea
surface temperature (sdSST); (b) shows the 2010's distribution of variables in which *Four-Plus* and *Short*clan sperm whales were found: (b-i) latitude (b-ii) longitude, (b-iii) weekly relSST, and (b-iv) weekly
sdSST.



Figure 4. Predicted probability of sperm whales belonging to different clans off the Galápagos Islands mapped at 0.12° resolution. (a) sperm whales of the *Plus-One* and *Regular* clans in 1987 and1989 as a function of (a-i) a full model, (a-ii) a null model (latitude and longitude only), and (a-iii) absolute difference between the full and null models. (b) sperm whales of the *Short* and *Four-Plus* clans in 2013 and 2014 as a function of (b-i) a full model, (b-ii), a null model (latitude and longitude only), and (b-iii) the absolute difference between the full and null models.

- 746
- 747
- 748



Figure 5. Predictive accuracy (%) of null models (fit with latitude and longitude only) and full models of



- and 2014). Predictive accuracy was measured through leave-one-out (LOO) and external cross-validation.
- 753 Standard errors are shown for LOO accuracy.