

Title	Habitat use of culturally distinct Galápagos sperm whale <i>Physeter macrocephalus</i> clans
Authors	Eguiguren, Ana;Pirotta, Enrico;Cantor, Maurício;Rendell, Luke;Whitehead, Hal
Publication date	2019-01-17
Original Citation	Eguiguren, A., Pirotta, E., Cantor, M., Rendell, L. and Whitehead, H. (2019) 'Habitat use of culturally distinct Galápagos sperm whale <i>Physeter macrocephalus</i> clans', <i>Marine Ecology Progress Series</i> , 609, pp. 257-270. doi:10.3354/meps12822
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	https://www.int-res.com/abstracts/meps/v609/p257-270/ - 10.3354/meps12822
Rights	© 2019, Inter-Research. All rights reserved.
Download date	2024-04-26 13:01:28
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/7517

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

Running page head: Sperm whale clan habitat

Ana Eguiguren^{1,2*}, Enrico Pirotta^{3,4}, Maurício Cantor^{5,6}, Luke Rendell⁷, Hal Whitehead¹

¹Department of Biology, Dalhousie University, Oxford Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia B3H 4J1

Canada

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

17-1200-841 Ecuador

³Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Washington State University, Vancouver, WA 98686

USA

⁴School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University College, Cork, T12K8AF,

Ireland

⁵Departamento de Ecologia e Zoologia, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis,

SC 88040-970 Brazil

⁶Centro de Estudos do Mar, Universidade Federal do Paraná, Pontal do Sul, PR 83255-976

Brazil

⁷Center for Social Learning and Cognitive Evolution, and Sea Mammal Research Unit,

University of St Andrews, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 9TH UK

*Corresponding author email: anaeguibur@gmail.com

Abstract

Ecological niche is traditionally defined at the species level, but individual niches can vary considerably within species. Research on intra-specific niche variation has been focused on intrinsic drivers. However, differential transmission of socially learned behaviours can also lead to intra-specific niche variation. In sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*), social transmission 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 whether the niches of clan members are also different remains unknown. We evaluated the differences in habitat use of clans off the Galápagos Islands, using data collected over 63 encounters between 1985 and 2014. During encounters, we recorded geographic positions, determined clan identity through analysis of group vocalizations and individual associations, and used topographical and oceanographic variables as proxies of sperm whale prey distribution. We used logistic Generalized Additive Models, fitted with Generalized Estimating Equations to account for spatiotemporal autocorrelation, to predict clan identity as a function of the environment descriptors. Oceanographic variables marginally contributed to differentiating clans. Clan identity could be predicted almost entirely based on geographic location. This fine-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 differences in clans' space use, we have uncovered another level of sperm whale life that is likely influenced by their cultural nature.

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

Introduction

Traditionally, ecological niche and habitat use have been defined at the species level (Hutchinson 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 et al. 2003). To date, most of the theoretical work on individual niche variation has focused on 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 social learning as a mechanism for individual niche variation (but see Galef 1976; Laland et al. 2000; Slagsvold and Wiebe 2007; Sargeant and Mann 2009).

When behavioural traits are socially learned and shared among groups of individuals, there is 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 species in which foraging strategies and habitat selection are socially transmitted (e.g. Laland & Galef, 2009; Whitehead & Rendell, 2014). Notable cases include apes and monkeys that learn to use different tools to exploit nuts and termites (McGrew et al. 1979, Boesch et al. 1994, Whiten 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 retaining the home ranges of their social groups (Geist 1971), dolphins using the same foraging 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 al. 2003). These and other foraging techniques and habitat use patterns are socially acquired 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 individuals, one can account for such environmental and genetic mechanisms. Two particularly 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 British Columbia but feed exclusively on very different prey (Ford et al. 1998). Off Shark Bay, Australia, part of a bottlenose dolphin population uses marine sponges as tools to forage on the 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). Neither case can be explained by genetic variation alone (Krützen et al. 2005, Mann et al. 2012, 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 matriline, 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*

(Rendell & Whitehead 2003, Whitehead et al. 2012, Gero et al. 2016). Sperm whale clans of the Eastern Tropical Pacific are genetically indistinct (Rendell et al. 2012) and sympatric (Rendell & Whitehead 2003). Members of different clans can encounter one another easily, in theory. However, they not only maintain distinct vocal dialects over time (Rendell & Whitehead 2005), but also differ in movement and social behaviour, reproductive and foraging success, and diet composition (Whitehead & Rendell 2004, Marcoux 2005, Marcoux et al. 2007a, Cantor & Whitehead 2015). These divergences suggest that sperm whales belonging to culturally distinct but sympatric clans may use different habitats, but this has not yet been studied directly.

Understanding sperm whale niche is hampered by logistical constraints. Their trophic niche, for instance, is known only indirectly. Sperm whales seem to primarily prey on cephalopods, but since they live offshore and feed at great depths (Papastavrou et al. 1989), observations of predation are rare. Moreover, analyses of stomach contents and defecation yield contrasting results regarding the species consumed (see Clarke et al. 1988, Clarke & Paliza 2001, Smith & Whitehead 2000). While many bathypelagic squid have overlapping ranges and niches (Nigmatullin et al. 2001), different age and size classes within single species have different distributions and dietary preferences (Nigmatullin et al. 2001; Markaida 2006). On the other hand, the habitat component of sperm whale niche can be assessed via the environmental variables that influence the distribution of the cephalopods they prey upon (Jaquet & Whitehead 1996), such as bottom topography and oceanographic variables that are related to upwelling processes and increased productivity (Jaquet & Whitehead 1996, Pirotta et al. 2011, Wong & Whitehead 2014).

Here, we evaluate whether sympatric sperm whale clans differ in habitat use by investigating the spatial, 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).

Methods

Field Methods

We studied sperm whales off the Galápagos Archipelago (93°-88°W; 3°N-3°S) aboard dedicated research sailboats (10-12m) between January and June, in 1987, 1989, 2013, and 2014 (Table 1). We searched for whales acoustically, monitoring hydrophones that could detect sperm whale clicks up to about 7 kilometres away every 15-60 minutes (Whitehead 2003). During daylight 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 photograph their flukes for individual identification (Arnbom 1987). We refer to the periods during which we had continuous (within less than 6 hours) visual and/or acoustic contact with the same group of females as *encounters*.

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.

Clan identification

We assigned clan identity to groups of female and immature sperm whales based on the similarity of their communication sounds, called codas (see Rendell and Whitehead 2003; Cantor 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 clans were commonly sighted around Galápagos (Rendell & Whitehead 2003, Cantor et al. 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-Plus* clan (typical codas with a basis of 4 regular clicks).

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. 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 the same clan; 3) groups from different clans are typically found some days apart (Whitehead & 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 we could not determine the time the new group of whales was found, for these encounters, we used only geographic positions that were recorded in daylight (06:00-18:00), during which photo-identifications were available (see Whitehead and Rendell 2004).

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 collected by the Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR) and processed by the 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 Center for 2010's data points (see Griffin 1999; Praca et al. 2009; Pirota et al. 2011). We 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; 1.5°N-2°S for the 2010's period) for the corresponding month. We also considered chlorophyll-a 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 Program Aqua MODIS satellite images. Since the sperm whales' cephalopod prey are 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; Pirota et al. 2011). 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 productivity at the surface, these values may not reflect high productivity hundreds of metres 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 significant correlation between sperm whale feeding success and surface conditions (Smith & Whitehead 1996). Finally, we used latitude and longitude to account for spatial variation unexplained by oceanographic and topographical variables.

We linked values of depth and slope to geographic positions using the raster package in R (R Core 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)

Modelling differences in habitat use

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 (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 autocorrelation expected from our continuous method of data collection (Pirotta et al. 2011). This method has previously been used in ecological studies when data were sequentially collected or when measurements were gathered repeatedly from a group of individuals (Dormann 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 within blocks (Liang & Zeger 1986). We used a working independence model, which is 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 standard GAM to account for the observed degree of autocorrelation within blocks, but parameter estimates are not affected.

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

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

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

223 We subsampled or interpolated geographic positions so that they were available approximately
224 every hour and retained only geographic positions collected in areas that were sufficiently
225 surveyed during both study periods (see Supplement 3 for further details). To identify and avoid
226 collinearity, we calculated correlation coefficients for all pairs of explanatory variables (Tables
227 S1-2 in Supplement 4). When variables were collinear ($|r| > 0.4$), we fit alternative initial models
228 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
232 under independence model criterion (QIC)—an adaptation of Akaike’s information criterion
233 (AIC) for GEEs (Pan 2001, Cui & Qian 2007) available in the MuMIn R package (Barton,
234 2016). First, we fitted alternative initial models using uncorrelated predictors, in which latitude
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
237 determine which variables to include.

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

243 *Prediction maps*

244 To examine the spatial distribution of predicted probabilities of encountering a given clan, we
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
247 null models for each study period. To identify regions where predictions from the final and the
248 null model differed the most, we generated a mean difference raster. Specifically, for each study
249 period, we obtained the absolute difference between the calculated probabilities generated from
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
255 generating confusion matrices to assess the models' accuracy in predicting the data used to fit
256 models (Fielding & Bell 1997). To build confusion matrices, we estimated the predicted
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.
264 2009). Finally, we used external cross-validation, i.e. assessed how accurately models predicted
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.

Results

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 *Plus-One* clan were more likely to be found north of 0.25°N, although uncertainty in predicting 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 distributions in the southern limits of the study region where only *Plus-One* clan whales were found (Fig. 3a-i). *Plus-One* whales were also found predominantly in more western waters, but uncertainty in predicting clan identity increased east of the archipelago (91° W; Fig. 2a-ii). This 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

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).

2010's period

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

310 The variation in clan distribution during this period was explained by geographic and
 311 oceanographic variables. We found that *Four-Plus* whales were most likely to occur at around
 312 2.2 and 1.8°S, and least likely to occur over latitudinal ranges between these values (Fig. 2b-i).
 313 *Four-Plus* whales were also more likely to occur east of 90.5°W, but uncertainty in predicting
 314 clan identity was high further west, where there was only one encounter (with *Short* clan whales;
 315 Fig. 2b-ii). This predicted geographic distribution reproduced the observed distribution of clans
 316 during the 2010's study period (Fig. 3b-i & ii). *Four-Plus* whales were also more likely to occur
 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
 319 the oceanographic conditions measured during the 2010's study period (Figs. 3b-iii, iv).
 320 However, we note that the relSST mean is skewed towards lower temperatures by an encounter
 321 with *Short* clan whales that consistently covered colder waters.

322 The importance of oceanographic variables in differentiating the habitat of *Four-Plus* and *Short*
 323 clans was illustrated by the different prediction maps yielded by the final model and null models
 324 (Fig. 4b-i, ii). While both the full and null models generated identical probabilities in the
 325 easternmost region where only *Short* clan whales were encountered, they differed greatly over
 326 the regions where both clans overlapped (Fig. 4b-iii)

327 However, while modelled differences in the oceanographic conditions over which *Four-Plus* and
 328 *Short* clans occurred were consistent with observed differences in habitat use between *Four-Plus*
 329 and *Short* clans, models that included oceanographic variables performed worse in terms of LOO
 330 than the null model (Fig. 5b). The same was true regarding performance measured through
 331 external cross-validation (Fig. 5b). Further, the performance measured through LOO and external
 332 cross-validation of both null and full model was poor overall (<50%; Fig. 5b).

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.

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 can survey from a small vessel are predominantly occupied by groups of whales of a single clan (Whitehead & Rendell 2004). Social units may group to forage together. Individuals may benefit 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 weekly scales, we hypothesise that social units could benefit from remaining in an area where other clan members are found and/or avoiding areas dominated by social units of other clans. In 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 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 environmental conditions and sperm whale feeding success between 1987—a strong el Niño year— and 1989—a normal year (Whitehead & Rendell 2004). During the 1987 El Niño, temperatures were 4°C higher than in 1989 (Whitehead & Rendell 2004). Increased temperatures 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 et al. 2012). Feeding rates of both *Regular* and *Plus-One* sperm whales were significantly lower 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 *Dosidicus gigas*, an important prey of sperm whales in the region (Clarke et al. 1988, Clarke & Paliza 2001) has been documented across the eastern Pacific during strong El Niño years (Taipe 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 maintained if social units rely on the presence of other clan members as a cue for habitat

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 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 representative of the warm season. This represents a snapshot of a female sperm whale's lifespan—60 to 70 years (Rice 1989)—and a portion of the home range of such nomadic 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 Islands shifted abruptly from being dominated by the *Regular* and *Plus-One* clans in the 1980's, to the *Regular* clan in the 1990's, and to the *Short* and *Four-Plus* clans in the 2010's (Cantor et 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 of habitat use for the same clans in other areas were less discrete (Whitehead & Rendell 2004). 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 whales off Chile were also significantly more convoluted than those of *Regular* clan whales off the Galápagos (Whitehead & Rendell 2004).

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-*

401 *One* and *Regular* clans. However, three lines of evidence suggest that oceanic conditions were
402 different in the areas occupied by the *Plus One* and *Regular* clans. First, the relative species
403 composition of sperm whale diet varied regionally, as described by the analysis of fecal samples
404 off the Galápagos Islands (Smith & Whitehead 2000). Second, *Regular* clan whales in this period
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
407 suggested to reflect the difference in oceanic flow conditions between the more inshore habitat of
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
410 patterns and foraging success rates during this period (Whitehead & Rendell 2004). Thus,
411 different conditions between the areas in which the clans were found could have existed but may
412 have not captured by the oceanographic variables we included in the present analysis. However,
413 it remains uncertain whether observed behavioural differences in *Regular* and *Plus-One* clans
414 were a consequence of different habitat conditions or if these behaviours caused different habitat
415 selection patterns among the clans (Whitehead & Rendell 2004).

416 In the 2010's, *Four-Plus* clan whales were found in warmer waters and areas of higher variation
417 in SST than *Short* clan whales. These differences may have arisen if these clans were directly
418 tracking different environmental cues to find their prey or if the prey they preferred was found in
419 association with different environmental conditions. Alternatively, these differences might also
420 be a by-product of the spatial segregation described above. In addition, these patterns were
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.

Some of the uncertainty in characterizing the habitat of the clans arises from the difficulty in measuring sperm whales' habitat accurately, and is further confounded by the lack of detailed information on diving behaviour. Although the oceanographic and topographic variables we used 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. Furthermore, our measurements of oceanographic variables describe surface conditions. It is uncertain the degree to which indicators of upwelling or frontal activity at the sea surface 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 explains the small contribution that these variables had in predicting clan identity. Recent advances in echosounding technology used to measure composition, biomass, and movements of 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 differences in niche traits among the clans but did not evaluate the possibility of niche width varying among the clans, which has been found among killer whale ecotypes (Foote et al. 2009). 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.

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 et al. 2007b) and social behaviour (Cantor & Whitehead 2015). Taken together, these findings 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 also Boyd and Richerson 1988; Whitehead 2007; van der Post and Hogeweg 2009). The 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 (see also Laland et al. 2000; Whitehead 2007).

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 using tag technologies and direct measurements of prey availability through echosounding devices (Watwood et al. 2006, Benoit-Bird et al. 2015, Benoit-Bird et al. 2017). Combining such large- and fine-scale spatial data will help clarify whether clans have consistently different foraging strategies or if these behaviours are a response to varying environmental conditions.

Ethics statement

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

Acknowledgements

We are grateful for all volunteer crewmembers for their hard work at sea, to G. Merlen and F. Félix for help with logistics, and to the Ministerio de Defensa Nacional, Ministerio del 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 Arnborn 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

513 Boyd R, Richerson PJ (1996) Why culture is common, but cultural evolution is rare. *Proc Br*
514 *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
522 whales. *R Soc Open Sci* 3:160615

523 Cañadas A, Hammond P (2008) Abundance and habitat preferences of the short-beaked common
524 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,
531 food and feeding. In: Pilleri G (ed) *Investigations on Cetacea, Vol. XXI*. Privately
532 published by G. Pilleri, Berne, p 53–195

533 Cui J, Qian G (2007) Selection of working correlation structure and best model in GEE analyses
534 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, Piattney 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-

558 core ring off Georges Bank. *Mar Mamm Sci* 15:33–51

559 Grinnell 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
561 terminology. *Wildl Soc Bull* 25:173–182

562 Hastie T, Tibshirani R, Friedman J (2009) *The Elements of Statistical Learning*, Second Edition.
563 Springer Science & Business Media, New York

564 Hijmans RJ (2016) raster: geographic data analysis and modeling. R package version 2.5-8.
565 Available at: CRAN.R-project.org/package=raster

566 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
568 learning of diet and foraging skills by wild immature Bornean orangutans: implications
569 for culture. *Am J Primatol* 72:62–71

570 Jaquet N (1996) How spatial and temporal scales influence understanding of sperm whale
571 distribution: a review. *Mammal Rev* 26:51–65

572 Jaquet N, Whitehead H (1996) Scale-dependent correlation of sperm whale distribution with
573 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 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*

604 Stat Soc Ser B Stat Methodol 55:629–642

605 McGrew WC, Tutin CEG, Baldwin PJ (1979) Chimpanzees, tools, and termites: cross-cultural
606 comparisons of Senegal, Tanzania, and Rio Muni. J R Anthropol Inst 14:185–214

607 Mizroch SA, Rice DW (2013) Ocean nomads: distribution and movements of sperm whales in
608 the North Pacific shown by whaling data and Discovery marks. Mar Mamm Sci
609 29:136–165

610 Mendelsohn R (2016) rerddapXtracto: extracts environmental data from ERD’s ERDDAP web
611 service. R package version 0.1.0. Available at: github.com/rmendels/rerddapXtracto

612 Nigmatullin CM, Nesis KN, Arkhipkin AI (2001) A review of the biology of the jumbo squid
613 *Dosidicus gigas* (Cephalopoda: Ommastrephidae). Fish Res 54: 9-19

614 Ottoni EB, Izar P (2008) Capuchin monkey tool use: Overview and implications. Evol Anthropol
615 17:171–178

616 Palacios D, Baumgartner M, Laidre K, Gregr E (2013) Beyond correlation: integrating
617 environmentally and behaviourally mediated processes in models of marine mammal
618 distributions. Endanger Species Res 22: 191-203

619 Pan W (2001) Akaike’s information criterion in generalized estimating equations. Biometrics
620 57:120–125

621 Papastavrou V, Smith SC, Whitehead H (1989) Diving behaviour of the sperm whale, *Physeter*
622 *macrocephalus*, off the Galapagos Islands. Can J Zool 67:839–846

623 Pirotta E, Matthiopoulos J, MacKenzie M, Scott-Hayward L, Rendell L (2011) Modelling sperm
624 whale habitat preference: a novel approach combining transect and follow data. Mar Ecol
625 Prog Ser 436:257–272

626 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:
 631 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 <http://www.R-project.org>.
 636 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
 639 Rendell L, Whitehead H (2003) Vocal clans in sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*). *Proc*
 640 *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 Galapagos 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

706


707 **Tables**

708 Table 1. Summary of time spent following female and juvenile sperm whales during the 1980's and
 709 2010's surveys off the Galápagos Islands. Encounters were defined as consecutive geographic positions
 710 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	<i>Regular</i> clan encounters	<i>Plus-One</i> clan encounters	<i>Short</i> clan encounters	<i>Four-Plus</i> clan encounters
1985 ^c	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
- 712 a. Encounter number includes encounters for which clan identity was not assigned, which is why
 713 this number does not always equal the sum of encounters with each of the clans
 714 b. Southern regions consist of areas south of 1.3°S and Western regions are north of 1.3°S (Fig. 1)
 715 c. Data from these survey periods were used for external cross-validation only

716 **Figures**



717
 718 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
 720 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 $\log_e(\text{odds})$ 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-i) 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 and 1989 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.




Figure 5. Predictive accuracy (%) of null models (fit with latitude and longitude only) and full models of clan identity of sperm whales off the Galápagos Islands in the 1980's (1987 and 1989), and 2010's (2013 and 2014). Predictive accuracy was measured through leave-one-out (LOO) and external cross-validation. Standard errors are shown for LOO accuracy.