

1 **Does small-game management benefit steppe birds of conservation concern? A**
2 **field study in central Spain**

3
4 Alba Estrada^{1,2*}, Miguel Delibes-Mateos^{1,3,4}, Jesús Caro¹, Javier Viñuela¹, Silvia Díaz-
5 Fernández¹, Fabián Casas^{1,5}, and Beatriz Arroyo¹

6
7 ¹ Instituto de Investigación en Recursos Cinegéticos - IREC (CSIC-UCLM-JCCM),
8 Ronda de Toledo s/n. 13071. Ciudad Real, Spain.

9 ² CIBIO/InBIO, Universidade de Évora. Casa Cordovil 2º andar, Rua Dr. Joaquim
10 Henrique da Fonseca, 7000-890. Évora, Portugal.

11 ³ CIBIO/InBIO, Universidade do Porto, Campus de Vairao 4485-661, Vairao Vila do
12 Conde, Portugal.

13 ⁴ Instituto de Estudios Sociales Avanzados (IESA-CSIC). Campo Santo de los Mártires
14 7, 14004 Córdoba, Spain.

15 ⁵ Estación Experimental de Zonas Áridas - CSIC, Carretera de Sacramento s/n. La
16 Cañada de San Urbano, 04120-Almería, Spain.

17
18
19 *Corresponding author. E-mail: albaestradaa@gmail.com. Telephone: +34627984108

20
21
22 Short title: Game management and conservation

23

24 **Abstract**

25 In Europe, hunting and game management are centuries-old activities that have had
26 profound effects on the landscapes and the biodiversity they support. Game
27 management is a potentially important tool to enhance game populations, and may also
28 affect other wildlife. We investigated the relationship between red-legged partridge
29 (*Alectoris rufa*) game management and steppe-bird abundance in central Spain. We
30 surveyed 54 red-legged partridge hunting estates with varying game-management
31 intensity in spring and/or summer in 2006 and 2008-2010. Information about game
32 management was gathered through questionnaires to game managers. Birds were
33 counted from fixed points and the amount of different land uses in each point was
34 visually estimated. Our results show that the abundance of granivorous species
35 (sandgrouse) increased significantly with the density of feeders, whereas non-
36 granivorous species were more abundant in estates with more intensive fox control,
37 although the latter relationship was weaker. Land-use variables, specifically agricultural
38 lands, appeared in the models of all the groups considered. Therefore, there is an option
39 for designing optimal management for red-legged partridge estates that potentially
40 benefits non-target species: an effective combination of habitat management, adequate
41 use of supplementary food and water, and possibly selective legal predator control when
42 necessary and effective for the target game species, although the latter needs further
43 investigation.

44

45 **Keywords:** bustards, game management, predator control, red-legged partridge,
46 sandgrouse, small game, steppe birds, supplementary feeding.

47

48 **Introduction**

49 In Europe, sport hunting and especially small-game hunting is an important social and
50 cultural tradition in many agrarian areas (Willebrand, 2009; Fischer *et al.*, 2013).
51 Management to improve the abundance or access to game has been carried out for
52 centuries and has had profound effects on landscapes and their associated biodiversity
53 (Duckworth *et al.*, 2003; Pohja-Mykra, Vuorisalo & Mykra, 2005). Game managers
54 currently apply a variety of different tools to maintain or increase harvest including
55 predator control (Reynolds & Tapper, 1996), habitat management (Bro *et al.*, 2004),
56 provision of food and water (Stoate & Szczur, 2001), and release of farm-bred animals
57 (Laikre *et al.*, 2010). The use of these practices has become increasingly common
58 among small-game managers (Martin, 2011), not only because many small-game
59 species populations have suffered strong declines within their ranges (Bro *et al.*, 2000;
60 De Leo *et al.*, 2004; Blanco-Aguilar *et al.*, 2012), but also because there is greater
61 interest in extracting economic revenue from this activity (Martin, 2011).

62 Game-management activities are aimed to affect game species, but they may
63 also affect other species inhabiting the same area, in a positive (Oldfield *et al.*, 2003) or
64 negative way (Villafuerte, Viñuela & Blanco, 1998). An argument typically used in
65 defence of hunting is that it can contribute to the conservation of species or habitats that
66 are beneficial to biodiversity (Oldfield *et al.*, 2003). For example, in UK, areas managed
67 for hunting red grouse (*Lagopus lagopus scoticus*) maintained more moorland habitat
68 (Robertson, Park & Barton, 2001) and areas managed for shooting pheasants maintained
69 more lowland woodlands than unmanaged areas (Duckworth *et al.*, 2003). In addition,
70 there are some game-management tools used with the aim of allowing high densities of
71 game species, such as the provision of supplementary food and water, which may also
72 benefit some non-game species (Draycott *et al.*, 2005; Gaudioso Lacasa *et al.*, 2010). In

73 contrast, other game-management tools have been considered detrimental for
74 conservation in certain circumstances. For example, predator control is frequently
75 carried out as part of game management in some parts of Europe because hunters
76 believe that predators limit game numbers (Valkama *et al.*, 2005; Holt *et al.*, 2008; Park
77 *et al.*, 2008), but this practice causes conflicts with other stakeholders (Bro, Arroyo &
78 Migot, 2006; Holt *et al.*, 2008; Thirgood & Redpath, 2008). Although some authors
79 found that predator control might be beneficial for some non-target species (Suárez *et*
80 *al.*, 1993; Fletcher *et al.*, 2010), illegal control of some predators of conservation
81 concern still takes place, and this has at times led to their subsequent elimination from
82 large areas (Etheridge, Summers & Green, 1997; Villafuerte *et al.*, 1998). Finally,
83 where game management is intensive, practices such as restocking of game populations
84 with farm-bred animals, or introducing new, alien species for hunting frequently occur.
85 Such practices have been suggested to have a negative effect on biodiversity, e.g.,
86 through the introduction of new pathogens or the release of hybrids that could represent
87 a threat for the long term survival of native species (Villanúa *et al.*, 2007; Sanchez-
88 Donoso *et al.*, 2012).

89 Several studies have addressed the effect of hunting and small-game
90 management on biodiversity, both on target (Tapper, Potts & Brockless, 1996;
91 Aebischer & Ewald, 2004; Delibes-Mateos, Ferreras & Villafuerte, 2008; Casas &
92 Viñuela, 2010), and on non-target species (Parish & Sotherton, 2004; Draycott,
93 Hoodless & Sage, 2008; White *et al.*, 2008; Fletcher *et al.*, 2010). However, the latter
94 have frequently focused on one management tool only [e.g., predator control (Suárez *et*
95 *al.*, 1993; Smith *et al.*, 2010), game crops (Sage *et al.*, 2005), supplementary feeding
96 and water (Gaudioso Lacasa *et al.*, 2010)], or simply compare managed to non-managed
97 areas (Stoate, Borralho & Araújo, 2000; Beja *et al.*, 2009; Caro *et al.*, 2014a), which

98 makes it difficult to identify the relative effect of individual management tools on
99 biodiversity when applied simultaneously. It is important to evaluate which of the
100 management techniques employed to promote small-game species have a stronger effect
101 on non-target fauna as this, along with an evaluation of their efficacy to increase game
102 species populations, may be used to identify those management systems that combine
103 the most efficient and beneficial (or least detrimental) techniques for wildlife in general.
104 This could help us to shift the debate about whether hunting is beneficial for
105 biodiversity conservation to recommending how to best use game management for the
106 promotion of biodiversity.

107 In Spain, small-game species in farmland areas include birds such as red-legged
108 partridges (*Alectoris rufa*) or quails (*Coturnix coturnix*), and mammals such as rabbits
109 (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) and hares (*Lepus sp.*). Small-game hunting in central Spain is
110 very important both socially and economically, being practised in more than 85% of the
111 whole territory (Ríos-Saldaña, 2010). Management for small game is also very
112 widespread there, occurring on more than 90% of the hunting estates (Ríos-Saldaña,
113 2010). Moreover, central Spain is rich in species of conservation concern (Martí & del
114 Moral, 2003). Thus, this region constitutes an ideal location to evaluate the relationship
115 between game-management practices and the conservation of biodiversity.

116 We investigate the relationship between different game-management activities
117 and the abundance of steppe birds of conservation concern in small-game hunting areas
118 in central Spain. We focused on the main game-management practices employed to
119 improve red-legged partridge populations, the main small-game species in our study
120 area (Díaz-Fernández, Viñuela & Arroyo, 2012). We selected steppe birds as the study
121 species because: i) they are important from a conservation point of view (Council
122 Directive 2009/147/EC on the Conservation of Wild Birds); and ii) steppe birds share

123 ecological needs with partridges [i.e. ground-nesting species inhabiting open landscapes
124 with morphological, physiological and behavioural resemblances (De Juana, 2005)].
125 Finally, we discuss how game-management practices could help to promote biodiversity
126 conservation.

127

128 **Methods**

129 *Study area and game-management data*

130 We surveyed 54 hunting estates managed for partridge hunting in central Spain (Fig. 1).
131 Estate size ranged from 2 to 280 km² (mean \pm SD = 36.79 \pm 54.70). Land was privately
132 managed for hunting purposes and surveys were carried out with the approval of the
133 person responsible for the game activity within the estate.

134 Hunting estates vary largely in the intensity of implementation of management
135 practices (Arroyo *et al.*, 2012). Information about game management was gathered
136 through semi-structured interviews to game managers, who voluntarily participated in
137 the study. Interviews were mostly carried out before or immediately after the bird
138 surveys (permission to carry out surveys was usually granted during the interview or
139 while arranging that meeting). Therefore, game-management measures as reported
140 reflect the management performed when birds were surveyed. For each estate, we
141 obtained data on estate size, number of gamekeepers (converted to full-time equivalents
142 such that two part-time gamekeepers were considered one full-time gamekeeper),
143 number of red foxes killed annually the year prior to the interview, number of feeders
144 (devices with grain or commercial feed for consumption by partridges, always refilled
145 during spring and summer, and sometimes also in winter), and number of artificial
146 water ponds. The latter were of two types: small and large. Small water points (less than

147 500 l) are water tanks maintaining a constant water level in an external small dish.
148 Large water points are shallow artificial ponds containing more than 500 l of water and
149 covering up to more than 100 m². Variables were expressed per estate surface area
150 (Table S1 in Appendix S1) to express variation in game-management intensity.
151 Additionally, there are differences related to the economic regime to which each estate
152 adheres (*Hunting regime* in Table S1). These regimes are: i) non-commercial hunting
153 estates (where the stated aim was to provide recreational hunting for hunting groups or
154 societies, not economic profit; n = 12); ii) commercial estates (where the stated aim was
155 to obtain economic benefit from the hunting rights; n = 36); and iii) intensive estates, a
156 specific type of commercial hunting estate characterized by the legal release of farm-
157 reared partridges throughout the hunting season, higher frequency of driven-shooting
158 days, higher revenues, and management practices that are more intensive than in other
159 estate types (n = 6). More details in Díaz-Fernández *et al.* (2012) and Arroyo *et al.*
160 (2012).

161

162 *Steppe-bird surveys and land-use variables*

163 Field surveys were carried out in spring and/or summer in 2006 and 2008-2010. Data
164 were recorded using point-count methods (Bibby, Burgess & Hill, 1992): observers
165 drove along tracks distributed throughout the whole of the estate or, when it was too
166 large (n = 2 estates with more than 200 km²), through a third part of the estate
167 stratifying by habitat (where tracks were selected on aerial photographs so that the
168 surveyed area had the same proportion of open and close habitats as the whole of the
169 estate). Every 700-750 m observers stopped, and the steppe birds (Table 1) observed
170 (using binoculars) during 10 minutes were recorded. The number of points assessed at
171 each estate was 59 ± 57 (range 4-420), depending on estate surface area. Observations

172 took place in the early morning (sunrise to three hours later) and in the evenings (three
173 hours before sunset), avoiding the hottest central hours of the day when bird activity is
174 the lowest (Bibby *et al.*, 1992). We calculated the total number of individuals observed
175 (hereafter called ‘abundance’).

176 We also sampled the availability of different land uses in each estate to control
177 the effect of habitat on steppe-bird abundance. We visually estimated the cover of each
178 land use in a circular buffer of 250-300 m radius around each observation point. Each
179 land-use type (Table 2) within that distance was noted as a percentage and we then
180 obtained the average of all observation points as an estimate of land-use availability in
181 the hunting estate.

182 More details about the bird and land-use surveys are included in Appendix S2 in
183 Supporting Information.

184

185 *Statistical analyses*

186 We observed five different steppe-bird species in the study area (Table 1): black-bellied
187 sandgrouse (*Pterocles orientalis*), pin-tailed sandgrouse (*Pterocles alchata*), little
188 bustard (*Tetrax tetrax*), great bustard (*Otis tarda*) and Eurasian thick-knee (*Burhinus*
189 *oediconemus*). We obtained two different response variables related to steppe-bird
190 abundance in each hunting estate: abundance of granivorous steppe birds (as the sum of
191 observations of both sandgrouse species), and abundance of non-granivorous steppe
192 birds (the sum of observations of the other three species, Table 1). We did this
193 classification because the two groups of species differ in their diet (Herranz & Suárez,
194 1999; Lane *et al.*, 1999; Green, Tyler & Bowden, 2000; Jiguet, 2002) and may respond
195 differently to grain supply; therefore our prediction was that feeders (providing grain for

196 partridges) would have a stronger effect on granivorous than on non-granivorous
197 species.

198 We reduced the five land-use categories into two orthogonal factors using a
199 Principal Component Analysis [PCA; e.g. (Caro *et al.*, 2014a)]. Multicollinearity
200 between these components of land use and game-management variables was assessed
201 using Spearman's correlation coefficients (ρ) and the variance inflation factor (VIF).

202 Statistical analyses were performed in R 3.0.3 (R Core Team, 2014) through the
203 interface of RStudio (RStudio, 2012). Given that some of the hunting estates were
204 surveyed twice (in spring and summer, see Appendix S2), we had repeated measures of
205 the independent variables in those estates, sometimes in different years. For this reason,
206 we performed generalized linear mixed models (GLMMs) and included year nested in
207 hunting estate as a random variable. We included season as a fixed variable. Our
208 abundance response variables are count data and fitted a Poisson distribution, therefore
209 we used a GLMM with a Poisson error distribution, and used the number of surveyed
210 points in each estate (\log_{10} transformed) as an offset. To control the potential effect of
211 the different survey effort (especially in very large estates), we used the log-number of
212 observation points divided by the area of the estate as a weighting term in the analyses,
213 thus giving more weight to the observations from estates that were sampled more
214 thoroughly. We assessed whether models were affected by overdispersion, accepting
215 dispersion parameter levels below 1.5 (Zuur *et al.*, 2009). Models were calculated with
216 the function *glmer* [library *lme4* (Bates, Maechler & Bolker, 2013)].

217 We were interested in knowing if game-management activities influenced non-
218 target species abundance, whilst controlling for habitat effects. Therefore, we performed
219 a general model which included season, the first two axes of the land-use PCA and
220 game-management variables (Tables 2 and S1). All game-management variables

221 considered (and thus all possible combinations of them) could theoretically influence
222 steppe-bird abundance. For example, predator control could benefit steppe birds as they
223 are ground-nesting (Fletcher *et al.*, 2010). Additionally, food or water provided for
224 partridges could also benefit steppe birds, as occurs with other bird species (Gaudioso
225 Lacasa *et al.*, 2010). The number of gamekeepers could be related to steppe-bird
226 abundance in two different ways: positively, as more gamekeepers could imply more
227 feeders or predator control but, at the same time, more keepers could disturb steppe
228 birds (Sastre *et al.*, 2009), expecting a negative relationship. Finally, we also included
229 type of hunting regime, because we wanted to know if the economic interests of the
230 estate, and the related intensity of game management and releases (Arroyo *et al.*, 2012),
231 had an effect on the abundance of each group considered.

232 We performed all possible combinations of the independent variables with the
233 function *dredge* [library *MuMIn* (Bartón, 2012)], as we wanted to specifically evaluate
234 the relative importance of different game-management variables when considered
235 together with habitat related ones. We then calculated an averaged model with all the
236 models that presented a difference of AIC_c (ΔAIC_c) < 2 (Burnham & Anderson, 2002)
237 to obtain the relative importance of each variable in the selected models. We performed
238 the analyses with the estates that have information for all game-management variables,
239 thus our final database included 66 records from 47 estates.

240

241 **Results**

242 The PCA with land-use variables produced two orthogonal axes which together
243 accounted for more than 85% of the variance (Table 2). The first axis mainly reflects a
244 gradient from hunting estates with more agricultural land to estates with lower
245 proportion (lower PC1 values indicate higher proportion of agricultural lands). The

246 second axis contrasts encroached Mediterranean scrubland *versus* open and managed
247 oak woodland ('dehesas').

248 The number of small water points and the number of feeders in each estate were
249 highly correlated ($\rho = 0.85$), as they are usually placed together. For this reason we
250 only used artificial feeders and ponds (large water points) in the analyses (Table S1). No
251 other pair of our land use (PCA axes) or game-management variables presented a rho
252 correlation value higher than 0.5, and our models were not affected by multicollinearity
253 between the variables (maximum VIF value was 1.22). Additionally, none of our
254 abundance models were affected by overdispersion.

255 Best general models for the different response variables considered ($\Delta AIC_c < 2$)
256 are shown in Table S2 in Appendix S1. Table 3 summarizes model-averaged
257 coefficients of those models. Both steppe-bird groups showed a positive correlation
258 with some game-management activities, in addition of being affected by land use. The
259 abundance of granivorous species increased significantly with the density of feeders.
260 Non-granivorous steppe birds were more abundant in estates with more intensive fox
261 control, although this relationship was not significant when considering the 95%
262 confidence interval of the parameter estimate, as the lower limit of interval was just
263 under zero. Abundance of both groups was positively and significantly influenced by
264 the availability of agricultural lands while non-granivorous species seemed to benefit
265 also from the presence of Mediterranean shrubs, although the latter relationship was
266 weaker (Table 3).

267

268 **Discussion**

269 One objective of the European Union Treaty is the promotion of game management as a
270 form of sustainable development (Brainerd, 2007). In Europe, millions of hectares of
271 land are currently managed for hunting, and therefore it is essential to identify which
272 game-management practices can positively contribute to the conservation of wildlife
273 and their habitats. In this study, we found a positive correlation between the provision
274 of supplementary feeding and the abundance of granivorous steppe birds (sandgrouse).
275 Given that in our study area feeders are placed together with small water points, it is not
276 possible to entirely disentangle the relative benefit of food or water for these steppe
277 birds. However, since the effect of feeders was only apparent for granivorous species, it
278 is likely that the provision of food itself is beneficial. This management activity has also
279 been found to benefit partridge productivity in the same area (Díaz-Fernández *et al.*,
280 2013), which would suggest that food or water are potentially limiting resources for
281 these farmland species. Stoate & Szczur (2001) suggested that supplementary feeding
282 for game species increased breeding densities and winter survival of omnivorous and
283 granivorous passerines in some farms of Great Britain. In northwest Spain, Gaudioso
284 Lacasa *et al.* (2010) observed that non-game bird species also used water troughs
285 designed for game species, suggesting that the provision of water itself may also be
286 beneficial. In any case, the way in which food or water supplementation benefit steppe
287 birds in Mediterranean farmland regions, where water could be a limiting factor during
288 summer, are still unclear, and require further investigation.

289 Predator control is frequently used by hunters to increase the numbers of game
290 species in central Spain, being foxes the most common legally controlled predator
291 (Delibes-Mateos *et al.*, 2013). Its use is controversial, since conservationists usually
292 argue that it detrimentally affects some predators of conservation concern (Thirgood &
293 Redpath, 2008), while some authors have shown that predator control may benefit some

294 species of conservation concern [see a review in Smith *et al.* (2010)]. Regarding steppe
295 birds, predator control has contributed towards the stabilization of bustard populations
296 in central Europe (Faragó, Giczi & Wurm, 2001). In our study, fox control was included
297 in the best model explaining the abundance of non-granivorous steppe-bird species in
298 central Spain (Table S2) and its relative importance in the averaged model was high
299 (Table 3). The relationship between fox control and abundance was apparently positive
300 (although the lower limit of the 95% confidence interval for the parameter estimate of
301 this variable was just under zero). If confirmed in further studies, the positive
302 correlation between abundance of non-granivorous steppe birds and predator control
303 could indicate higher mortality or breeding failure in areas without fox control, or that
304 birds disperse from areas with higher fox densities (Suárez *et al.*, 1993). Nevertheless,
305 the lack of significance of predator control in our results indicates that we have to be
306 cautious regarding the potential positive effects of fox control on non-granivorous
307 species. Interestingly, the relationship of predator control with granivorous species was
308 less important than for non-granivorous species. A possible explanation of this result is
309 that the number of feeders is more important for granivorous species than any other
310 game-management variable considered in the analyses, so the contribution of predator
311 control to the model (once including feeders) is very low, or that this group of species is
312 less responsive behaviourally or demographically to the presence of predators. In any
313 case, even if there is potential for predator control to have benefits for some vulnerable
314 bird populations (Smith *et al.*, 2010), this requires a whole-ecosystem view to avoid
315 unforeseen negative effects. For example, removal of some predators can result in
316 changes in intraguild interactions and outbreaks of other predators, leading in turn to
317 increase predation on prey (Ritchie & Johnson, 2009). This may be particularly
318 important in predator-rich communities like those observed in central Spain (Virgós &

319 Travaini, 2005). Therefore, if fox densities are high, fox control using legal and
320 selective methods might be a complementary conservation strategy to help recover
321 certain steppe-bird populations in central Spain, but additional research is needed to
322 confirm this fact and to evaluate how fox control may affect predator communities
323 (Virgós & Travaini, 2005).

324 Density of gamekeepers appeared in the model explaining abundance of non-
325 granivorous species, but the coefficient confidence interval included zero and its relative
326 importance was very low. Keepers can be theoretically related to steppe-bird abundance
327 both positively, implying for instance more positive management not considered in our
328 analyses, or negatively, as birds might be more disturbed with higher human presence
329 (Sastre *et al.*, 2009); thus, the overall effect of this variable may be diluted if both
330 aspects happen simultaneously.

331 Over the past decades, the release of farm-bred partridges for shooting has
332 exponentially increased in central Spain (Caro *et al.*, 2014b). The spread of diseases and
333 parasites by farm-reared partridges has not only affected wild partridge populations
334 (Díaz-Sánchez *et al.*, 2012), but also steppe birds (Villanúa *et al.*, 2007). In this sense, a
335 lower steppe-bird abundance could be expected in intensive estates, where there are
336 more gamekeepers that can cause disturbance and massive partridge releases take place
337 (Arroyo *et al.*, 2012). However, this was not observed in our study. A possible
338 explanation is that these estates are also associated with more intensive supplementary
339 feeding and fox control (Arroyo *et al.*, 2012), both of which may be, in themselves,
340 beneficial to steppe birds. In any case, further research is needed to assess the
341 relationship between the release of farm-reared partridges for shooting and steppe birds.

342 Finally, land-use variables were very important in explaining the estimated
343 abundance of all groups considered. In general, steppe birds were more common in

344 hunting estates with more surface of agricultural lands, which was expected because
345 these are their preferred habitats in the western Palaearctic (Suárez, Naveso & De Juana,
346 1997). These findings suggest that habitat conservation and management in hunting
347 estates could be very important for improving the biodiversity value of these areas
348 (Robertson *et al.*, 2001; Duckworth *et al.*, 2003), especially if applied in intensive
349 agricultural lands (Bretagnolle *et al.*, 2011). For example, the maintenance of nesting
350 and foraging habitats in Portugal for red-legged partridges seems to have favoured
351 populations of the corn bunting (*Miliaria calandra*) (Stoate *et al.*, 2000), which share
352 habitat requirements with game birds. In agricultural areas within central Spain, habitat
353 management actions also seem to be favourable for game and non-game species
354 (Delibes-Mateos *et al.*, 2008; Buenestado *et al.*, 2009). In these areas, actions aimed at
355 increasing the proportion of natural vegetation within the farmland matrix (such as
356 Mediterranean scrub or the maintenance of grassy field edges) is likely to be beneficial
357 for both partridges (Buenestado *et al.*, 2009; Casas & Viñuela, 2010) and overall
358 farmland biodiversity (Reino *et al.*, 2009; Vickery, Feber & Fuller, 2009). Indeed, a
359 positive (albeit not significant) relationship has been found between the PCA factor
360 positively related to Mediterranean shrubs and the abundance of non-granivorous steppe
361 birds (Tables 2 and 3). As land-use variables were the most relevant predictors
362 explaining abundance of both studied steppe-bird groups (Table 3), changes in
363 landscape characteristics, habitat availability and agricultural practices could be key
364 elements for the conservation of these species (White *et al.*, 2008).

365

366 *Maximizing hunting outputs and conservation of farmland birds*

367 Our study was not experimental, and thus it is possible that observed effects of
368 management are confounded by other (non-evaluated) environmental variables.

369 Additionally, the survey methods used may be associated with certain biases (see
370 Appendix S2). However, our analyses control for potential biases, and our results
371 suggest that both the conservation of farmland habitats and certain game-management
372 activities (i.e., density of feeders and possibly fox control) might be particularly relevant
373 in our study area for the conservation of steppe birds. Interestingly, our results show
374 that not all of the game-management tools affect in the same way steppe-bird
375 abundance, a result also found for wild red-legged partridge summer density (Díaz-
376 Fernández *et al.*, 2013). Thus, there is a potential for improving management in order to
377 optimize both red-legged partridge hunting and also benefit steppe birds of conservation
378 concern: an effective combination of habitat management, an adequate use of
379 supplementary food and water, and possibly a selective legal predator control when
380 necessary and effective for the target game species (supported by further investigations).
381 This could mean a sustainable natural resource management approach promoting both
382 nature conservation and socio-economic benefits to rural communities.

383

384 **Acknowledgments**

385 We thank Sarah Young for the English revision of the manuscript, and Vincenzo
386 Penteriani and two anonymous reviewers for their comments that contributed to
387 improve the manuscript. We also thank people who helped with fieldwork and game
388 managers for their collaboration. A.E. has a postdoctoral contract funded by the project
389 BIODIVERSA/0003/2011. M.D.M. is currently funded by Consejería de Economía,
390 Innovación, Ciencia y Empleo (Junta de Andalucía), and the European Union's Seventh
391 Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration
392 under grant agreement 267226. F.C. was supported by a JAE-Doc contract financed by
393 CSIC and the European Social Fund (ESF). J.C. and S.D.F. had postdoctoral and

394 predoctoral contracts jointly financed by the ESF and by the Junta de Comunidades de
395 Castilla-La Mancha (JCCM), in the framework of the Operational Programme FSE
396 2007-2013 and PRINCET 2005-2010, respectively. This work was supported by the EC
397 under the 7th Framework Programme through project HUNT (212160, FP7-ENV-2007-
398 1), by the Consejería de Agricultura of JCCM, and by the Ministerio de Ciencia y
399 Tecnología (CGL2008-04282/BOS).

400

401 **References**

402 Aebischer, N. J. & Ewald, J. A. (2004). Managing the UK Grey Partridge *Perdix perdix*
403 recovery: population change, reproduction, habitat and shooting. *Ibis* 146, 181.

404 Arroyo, B., Delibes-Mateos, M., Díaz-Fernández, S. & Viñuela, J. (2012). Hunting
405 management in relation to profitability aims: red-legged partridge hunting in
406 central Spain. *Eur. J. Wildlife Res.* 58, 847.

407 Bartón, K. (2012). MuMIn: Multi-model inference. R package version 1.7.7.

408 <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn>.

409 Bates, D., Maechler, M. & Bolker, B. (2013). lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using
410 S4 classes. R package version 0.999999-2. <http://CRAN.R->

411 [project.org/package=lme4](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4).

412 Beja, P., Gordinho, L., Reino, L., Loureiro, F., Santos-Reis, M. & Borralho, R. (2009).
413 Predator abundance in relation to small game management in southern Portugal:
414 conservation implications. *Eur. J. Wildlife Res.* 55, 227.

415 Bibby, C. J., Burgess, N. D. & Hill, D. A. (1992). *Bird census techniques*. London:
416 Academic Press.

417 Blanco-Aguiar, J. A., Delibes-Mateos, M., Arroyo, B., Ferreras, P., Casas, F., Real, R.,
418 Mario Vargas, J., Villafuerte, R. & Viñuela, J. (2012). Is the interaction between

419 rabbit hemorrhagic disease and hyperpredation by raptors a major cause of the
420 red-legged partridge decline in Spain? *Eur. J. Wildlife Res.* 58, 433.

421 Brainerd, S. (2007). European Charter on Hunting and Biodiversity – Bern Convention
422 Document. 28). Strasbourg, France: International Council for Game and
423 Wildlife Conservation on behalf of the Council of Europe.

424 Bretagnolle, V., Villers, A., Denonfoux, L., Cornulier, T., Inchausti, P. &
425 Badenhausser, I. (2011). Rapid recovery of a depleted population of Little
426 Bustards *Tetrax tetrax* following provision of alfalfa through an agri-
427 environment scheme. *Ibis* 153, 4.

428 Bro, E., Arroyo, B. & Migot, P. (2006). Conflict between grey partridge *Perdix perdix*
429 hunting and hen harrier *Circus cyaneus* protection in France: a review. *Wildlife*
430 *Biol.* 12, 233.

431 Bro, E., Mayot, P., Corda, E. & Reitz, F. (2004). Impact of habitat management on grey
432 partridge populations: assessing wildlife cover using a multisite BACI
433 experiment. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 41, 846.

434 Bro, E., Sarrazin, F., Clobert, J. & Reitz, F. (2000). Demography and the decline of the
435 grey partridge *Perdix perdix* in France. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 37, 432.

436 Buenestado, F. J., Ferreras, P., Blanco-Aguilar, J. A., Tortosa, F. S. & Villafuerte, R.
437 (2009). Survival and causes of mortality among wild Red-legged Partridges
438 *Alectoris rufa* in southern Spain: implications for conservation. *Ibis* 151, 720.

439 Burnham, K. P. & Anderson, D. R. (2002). *Model selection and multimodel inference: a*
440 *practical information-theoretic approach*. 2nd edn. New York, USA: Springer-
441 Verlag.

442 Caro, J., Delibes-Mateos, M., Estrada, A., Borralho, R., Gordinho, L., Reino, L., Beja,
443 P. & Arroyo, B. (2014a). Effects of hunting management on Mediterranean
444 farmland birds. *Bird Conserv. Int.*, In press.

445 Caro, J., Delibes-Mateos, M., Vicente, J. & Arroyo, B. (2014b). A quantitative
446 assessment of the release of farm-reared red-legged partridges (*Alectoris rufa*)
447 for shooting in central Spain. *Eur. J. Wildlife Res.* 60, 919.

448 Casas, F. & Viñuela, J. (2010). Agricultural practices or game management: which is
449 the key to improve red-legged partridge nesting success in agricultural
450 landscapes? *Environ. Conserv.* 37, 177.

451 De Juana, E. (2005). Steppe birds: a characterisation. In *Ecology and conservation of*
452 *steppe-land birds* 25-48. Bota, G., Morales, M. B., Mañosa, S. & Camprodon, J.
453 (Eds.). Barcelona, Spain: Lynx edicions & Centre Tecnològic Forestal de
454 Catalunya.

455 De Leo, G. A., Focardi, S., Gatto, M. & Cattadori, I. M. (2004). The decline of the grey
456 partridge in Europe: comparing demographies in traditional and modern
457 agricultural landscapes. *Ecol. Model.* 177, 313.

458 Delibes-Mateos, M., Díaz-Fernández, S., Ferreras, P., Viñuela, J. & Arroyo, B. (2013).
459 The role of economic and social factors driving predator control in small game
460 estates in central Spain. *Ecol. Soc.* 18, 28.

461 Delibes-Mateos, M., Ferreras, P. & Villafuerte, R. (2008). Rabbit populations and game
462 management: the situation after 15 years of rabbit haemorrhagic disease in
463 central-southern Spain. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 17, 559.

464 Díaz-Fernández, S., Arroyo, B., Casas, F., Martínez-Haro, M. & Viñuela, J. (2013).
465 Effect of game management on wild red-legged partridge abundance. *PLoS ONE*
466 8, e66671.

467 Díaz-Fernández, S., Viñuela, J. & Arroyo, B. (2012). Harvest of red-legged partridge in
468 central Spain. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 76, 1354.

469 Díaz-Sánchez, S., Moriones, A., Casas, F. & Höfle, U. (2012). Prevalence of
470 *Escherichia coli*, *Salmonella* sp. and *Campylobacter* sp. in the intestinal flora of
471 farm-reared, restocked and wild red-legged partridges (*Alectoris rufa*): is
472 restocking using farm-reared birds a risk? *Eur. J. Wildlife Res.* 58, 99.

473 Draycott, R. A. H., Hoodless, A. N. & Sage, R. B. (2008). Effects of pheasant
474 management on vegetation and birds in lowland woodlands. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 45,
475 334.

476 Draycott, R. A. H., Woodburn, M. I. A., Carroll, J. P. & Sage, R. B. (2005). Effects of
477 spring supplementary feeding on population density and breeding success of
478 released pheasants *Phasianus colchicus* in Britain. *Wildlife Biol.* 11, 177.

479 Duckworth, J. C., Firbank, L. G., Stuart, R. C. & Yamamoto, S. (2003). Changes in
480 Land Cover and Parcel Size of British Lowland Woodlands over the Last
481 Century in Relation to Game Management. *Landscape Research* 28, 171.

482 Etheridge, B., Summers, R. W. & Green, R. E. (1997). The effects of illegal killing and
483 destruction of nests by humans on the population dynamics of the hen harrier
484 *Circus cyaneus* in Scotland. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 34, 1081.

485 Faragó, S., Giczi, F. & Wurm, H. (2001). Management for the Great Bustard *Otis tarda*
486 in western Hungary. *Game & Wildlife Science* 18, 171.

487 Fischer, A., Sandström, C., Delibes-Mateos, M., Arroyo, B., Tadie, D., Randall, D.,
488 Hailu, F., Lowassa, A., Msuha, M., Kereži, V., Reljić, S., Linnell, J. & Majić, A.
489 (2013). On the multifunctionality of hunting – an institutional analysis of eight
490 cases from Europe and Africa. *Journal of Environmental Planning and*
491 *Management* 56, 531.

492 Fletcher, K., Aebischer, N. J., Baines, D., Foster, R. & Hoodless, A. N. (2010). Changes
493 in breeding success and abundance of ground-nesting moorland birds in relation
494 to the experimental deployment of legal predator control. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 47, 263.

495 Gaudioso Lacasa, V., Sánchez García-Abad, C., Prieto Martín, R., Bartolomé
496 Rodríguez, D., Pérez Garrido, J. & Alonso de La Varga, M. (2010). Small game
497 water troughs in a Spanish agrarian pseudo steppe: visits and water site choice
498 by wild fauna. *Eur. J. Wildlife Res.* 56, 591.

499 Green, R. E., Tyler, G. A. & Bowden, C. G. R. (2000). Habitat selection, ranging
500 behaviour and diet of the stone curlew (*Burhinus oedicnemus*) in southern
501 England. *J. Zool.* 250, 161.

502 Herranz, J. & Suárez, F. (1999). *La ganga ibérica (Pterocles alchata) y la ganga ortega*
503 *(Pterocles orientalis) en España: distribución, abundancia, biología y*
504 *conservación*: Ministerio de Medio Ambiente. Organismo Autónomo Parques
505 Nacionales.

506 Holt, A. R., Davies, Z. G., Tyler, C. & Staddon, S. (2008). Meta-Analysis of the Effects
507 of Predation on Animal Prey Abundance: Evidence from UK Vertebrates. *Plos*
508 *One* 3, e2400.

509 Jiguet, F. (2002). Arthropods in diet of Little Bustards *Tetrax tetrax* during the breeding
510 season in western France: Seasonal, age- and sex-related variations in the diet
511 were studied during March to October. *Bird Study* 49, 105.

512 Laikre, L., Schwartz, M. K., Waples, R. S., Ryman, N. & Ge, M. W. G. (2010).
513 Compromising genetic diversity in the wild: unmonitored large-scale release of
514 plants and animals. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 25, 520.

515 Lane, S. J., Alonso, J. C., Alonso, J. A. & Naveso, M. A. (1999). Seasonal changes in
516 diet and diet selection of great bustards (*Otis t. tarda*) in north-west Spain. *J.*
517 *Zool.* 247, 201.

518 Martí, R. & del Moral, J. C. (2003). *Atlas de las aves reproductoras de España*. Madrid:
519 Dirección General de Conservación de la Naturaleza-Sociedad Española de
520 Ornitología.

521 Martin, J. (2011). The Transformation of Lowland Game Shooting in England and
522 Wales since the Second World War: The Supply Side Revolution. *Rural*
523 *History-Economy Society Culture* 22, 207.

524 Oldfield, T. E. E., Smith, R. J., Harrop, S. R. & Leader-Williams, N. (2003). Field
525 sports and conservation in the United Kingdom. *Nature* 423, 531.

526 Parish, D. M. B. & Sotherton, N. W. (2004). Game crops as summer habitat for
527 farmland songbirds in Scotland. *Agr. Ecosyst. Environ.* 104, 429.

528 Park, K. J., Graham, K. E., Calladine, J. & Wernham, C. W. (2008). Impacts of birds of
529 prey on gamebirds in the UK: a review. *Ibis* 150, 9.

530 Pohja-Mykra, M., Vuorisalo, T. & Mykra, S. (2005). Hunting bounties as a key measure
531 of historical wildlife management and game conservation: Finnish bounty
532 schemes 1647-1975. *Oryx* 39, 284.

533 R Core Team (2014). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
534 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL [http://www.R-](http://www.R-project.org/)
535 [project.org/](http://www.R-project.org/).

536 Reino, L., Beja, P., Osborne, P. E., Morgado, R., Fabião, A. & Rotenberry, J. T. (2009).
537 Distance to edges, edge contrast and landscape fragmentation: Interactions
538 affecting farmland birds around forest plantations. *Biol. Conserv.* 142, 824.

539 Reynolds, J. C. & Tapper, S. C. (1996). Control of mammalian predators in game
540 management and conservation. *Mammal Rev.* 26, 127.

541 Ríos-Saldaña, C. A. (2010). *Los planes técnicos de caza de Castilla-La Mancha y su*
542 *aplicación en la gestión y conservación de las especies cinegéticas*. PhD Thesis,
543 University of Castilla-La Mancha.

544 Ritchie, E. G. & Johnson, C. N. (2009). Predator interactions, mesopredator release and
545 biodiversity conservation. *Ecol. Lett.* 12, 982.

546 Robertson, P. A., Park, K. J. & Barton, A. F. (2001). Loss of heather *Calluna vulgaris*
547 moorland in the Scottish uplands: the role of red grouse *Lagopus lagopus*
548 *scoticus* management. *Wildlife Biol.* 7, 11.

549 RStudio (2012). RStudio: Integrated development environment for R (Version
550 0.96.225). Boston, MA. Available from <http://www.rstudio.org/>.

551 Sage, R. B., Parish, D. M. B., Woodburn, M. I. A. & Thompson, P. G. L. (2005).
552 Songbirds using crops planted on farmland as cover for game birds. *Eur. J.*
553 *Wildlife Res.* 51, 248.

554 Sanchez-Donoso, I., Vilà, C., Puigcerver, M., Butkauskas, D., Caballero de la Calle, J.
555 R., Antonio Morales-Rodriguez, P. & Domingo Rodriguez-Teijeiro, J. (2012).
556 Are farm-reared quails for game restocking really common quails (*Coturnix*
557 *coturnix*)?: A genetic approach. *Plos One* 7, e39031.

558 Sastre, P., Ponce, C., Palacín, C., Martín, C. & Alonso, J. (2009). Disturbances to great
559 bustards (*Otis tarda*) in central Spain: human activities, bird responses and
560 management implications. *Eur. J. Wildlife Res.* 55, 425.

561 Smith, R. K., Pullin, A. S., Stewart, G. B. & Sutherland, W. J. (2010). Effectiveness of
562 predator removal for enhancing bird populations. *Conserv. Biol.* 24, 820.

563 Stoate, C., Borralho, R. & Araújo, M. (2000). Factors affecting corn bunting *Miliaria*
564 *calandra* abundance in a Portuguese agricultural landscape. *Agr. Ecosyst.*
565 *Environ.* 77, 219.

566 Stoate, C. & Szczur, J. (2001). Could game management have a role in the conservation
567 of farmland passerines? A case study from a Leicestershire farm. *Bird Study* 48,
568 279.

569 Suárez, F., Naveso, M. A. & De Juana, E. (1997). Farming in the drylands of Spain:
570 birds of pseudosteppes. In *Farming and birds in Europe. The common*
571 *agricultural policy and its implications for bird conservation: 79–116*. Pain, D.
572 J. & Pienkowski, N. W. (Eds.). San Diego: Academic Press.

573 Suárez, F., Yanes, M., Herranz, J. & Manrique, J. (1993). Nature reserves and the
574 conservation of Iberian shrubsteppe passerines: The paradox of nest predation.
575 *Biol. Conserv.* 64, 77.

576 Tapper, S. C., Potts, G. R. & Brockless, M. H. (1996). The effect of an experimental
577 reduction in predation pressure on the breeding success and population density
578 of grey partridges *Perdix perdix*. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 33, 965.

579 Thirgood, S. & Redpath, S. (2008). Hen harriers and red grouse: science, politics and
580 human–wildlife conflict. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 45, 1550.

581 Valkama, j., Korpimäki, K., Arroyo, B., Beja, P., Bretagnolle, V., Bro, E., Kenward, R.,
582 Mañosa, S., Redpath, S. M., Thirgood, S. & Viñuela, J. (2005). Birds of prey as
583 limiting factors of gamebird populations in Europe: a review. *Biol. Rev.* 80, 171.

584 Vickery, J. A., Feber, R. E. & Fuller, R. J. (2009). Arable field margins managed for
585 biodiversity conservation: A review of food resource provision for farmland
586 birds. *Agr. Ecosyst. Environ.* 133, 1.

587 Villafuerte, R., Viñuela, J. & Blanco, J. C. (1998). Extensive predator persecution
588 caused by population crash in a game species: The case of red kites and rabbits
589 in Spain. *Biol. Conserv.* 84, 181.

590 Villanúa, D., Casas, F., Viñuela, J., Gortázar, C., García de la Morena, E. & Morales,
591 M. (2007). First occurrence of *Eucoleus contortus* in a little bustard *Tetrax*
592 *tetrax*: negative effect of red-legged partridge *Alectoris rufa* releases on steppe
593 bird conservation? *Ibis* 149, 405.

594 Virgós, E. & Travaini, A. (2005). Relationship between small-game hunting and
595 carnivore diversity in central Spain. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 14, 3475.

596 White, P. J. C., Stoate, C., Szczur, J. & Norris, K. (2008). Investigating the effects of
597 predator removal and habitat management on nest success and breeding
598 population size of a farmland passerine: a case study. *Ibis* 150, 178.

599 Willebrand, T. (2009). Promoting hunting tourism in north Sweden: opinions of local
600 hunters. *Eur. J. Wildlife Res.* 55, 209.

601 Zuur, A. F., Ieno, E. N., Walker, N. J., Saveliev, A. A. & Smith, G. M. (2009). *Mixed*
602 *effects models and extensions in ecology with R*. New York: Springer
603 Science+Business Media.

604

605

Table 1. Species considered in the analysis. Total: total number of individuals observed in the surveys. Mean: Mean number of individuals in estates with presence of the species. SD: standard deviation.

| Species | Total | Mean | SD |
|--|--------------|-------------|-----------|
| Granivorous steppe birds | | | |
| Black-bellied sandgrouse <i>Pterocles orientalis</i> | 122 | 7.18 | 6.00 |
| Pin-tailed sandgrouse <i>Pterocles alchata</i> | 963 | 26.75 | 28.43 |
| Non-granivorous steppe birds | | | |
| Little bustard <i>Tetrax tetrax</i> | 900 | 28.13 | 48.28 |
| Great bustard <i>Otis tarda</i> | 575 | 19.83 | 29.42 |
| Eurasian thick-knee <i>Burhinus oedicephalus</i> | 434 | 9.86 | 9.28 |

Table 2. Summary results of the Principal Component Analysis of land use variables.

| Variables | Code | PC1 | PC2 |
|---|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| % Agricultural land (mainly arable land with herbaceous crops or fallows, either ploughed or with vegetation, sometimes also small vineyards or olive groves) | Agri | -0.811 | -0.054 |
| % 'Dehesa': herbaceous crops with oaks | Dehesa | 0.446 | -0.70 |
| % Mediterranean shrubs | Shrub | 0.377 | 0.712 |
| % Grasslands | Grass | -0.027 | 0.010 |
| % Woodland | Wood | 0.003 | 0.003 |
| Cumulative explained variance | | 56.5% | 85.4% |

Table 3. Model-averaged coefficients for all variables included in the models with $\Delta AIC_c < 2$.

| Variable | Ab. granivorous steppe birds | | | | | Ab. non-granivorous steppe birds | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-------|------|--------|--------|----------------------------------|-------|------|--------|--------|
| | β | SE | RVI | -CI | +CI | β | SE | RVI | -CI | +CI |
| Intercept | -0.008 | 0.305 | | | | 0.205 | 0.323 | | | |
| PC1 | -0.033 | 0.008 | 1 | -0.049 | -0.018 | -0.048 | 0.011 | 1 | -0.071 | -0.025 |
| PC2 | | | | | | 0.030 | 0.019 | 0.73 | -0.009 | 0.069 |
| Feeder | 0.023 | 0.01 | 1 | 0.004 | 0.043 | | | | | |
| Ponds | 0.227 | 0.181 | 0.32 | -0.135 | 0.590 | | | | | |
| Fox | 0.036 | 0.052 | 0.19 | -0.067 | 0.140 | 0.074 | 0.038 | 0.75 | -0.003 | 0.150 |
| Keeper | | | | | | 1.074 | 1.334 | 0.13 | -1.596 | 3.744 |

Ab: Abundance; β : coefficients; SE: standard errors; RVI: relative variable importance. -CI and +CI: Confidence limits for coefficient estimates at the 95% confidence interval (CI). Variable codes as in Table 2 and Table S1. In bold, game management variables.

Figure 1. Municipalities (light grey) where hunting estates were located and their situation in mainland Spain (top left).

