**Hunting management in relation to profitability aims: red-legged partridge
hunting in central Spain.**

Submitted, accepted and published: European Journal of Wildlife Research April 2012, doi: 10.1007/s10344-012-0632-4

Beatriz Arroyo^{a,*}, Miguel Delibes-Mateos^a, Silvia Díaz-Fernández^a, Javier Viñuela^a

^a *Instituto de investigación en Recursos Cinegéticos (IREC-CSIC-UCLM-JCCM). Ronda de
Toledo s/n, 13071 Ciudad Real, Spain.*

Corresponding author:

Beatriz Arroyo

IREC, Ronda de Toledo s/n, 13071 Ciudad Real, Spain

Tel: + 34 926295450

Fax: + 34 926295451

Email: Beatriz.arroyo@uclm.es

Abstract

Game management is widely implemented in Spain, affecting more than 70 % of land cover. Management intensity may be linked to the financial aims of hunting estates, but no study of these aspects has been developed in Spain, where commercial hunting is common. Through interviews with game managers and field surveys, we quantified physical and economic traits, management techniques and hunting methods in a sample of 59 small game hunting estates located in south-central Spain (where Red-legged partridge hunting has the highest socio-economic importance in the country). We compared non-commercial estates (aimed for leisure, managed mainly by local hunting societies) and commercial estates (aimed at financial benefit); among the latter, we also assessed “intensive” estates (a special category of commercial estates licensed to release farm-reared partridges without temporal or numerical limits throughout the hunting season). Commercial estates had more intensive management, including more and larger partridge releases, higher density of supplementary feeders and more intensive predator control. Thus, any positive or negative effects on biodiversity of these management techniques would be higher in commercial than in non-commercial estates. Commercial estates also retained more natural vegetation, which may help to enhance the landscape and biodiversity value of farmland in central Spain. On the other hand, differences in management and hunting styles were most marked between intensive and other type of estates (both commercial and non-commercial); this indicates that intensive estates are qualitatively different from other small game estates, both ecologically (hunting based on releases and driven shooting) and economically (higher inputs and outputs). It would be desirable to find ways to quantify the environmental or social costs and benefits of different management techniques, and integrate them in the economics of hunting estates.

Keywords: *Alectoris rufa*; Farm-reared partridge releases; Hunting pressure; Predator control; game commercialization.

1 Introduction

2
3 Hunting is an important socio-economic activity, practiced traditionally by many people over
4 wide areas either for recreation or subsistence (Milesen, 2009; Reboussin, 1991; Rose, 2001),
5 and currently including an important economic dimension (Bernabéu, 2002; Chardonnet et al.,
6 2002; Fontoura, 1992; Rao et al., 2010). Additionally, hunting interacts with local biodiversity
7 both through hunting activities and through game management practices, which are employed
8 broad-scale, and therefore fulfils also an ecological function. Game management commonly
9 implemented in Europe involves controversial practices, such as predator control or releasing
10 captive-reared animals (e.g. Barbanera et al., 2010; Fletcher et al. 2010; Reynolds and Tapper,
11 1996), as well as habitat management which can facilitate the preservation of natural
12 ecosystems and improve the ecological value of anthropogenic ones (Duckworth et al., 2003;
13 Robertson et al., 2001; Tapper, 1999).

14 Game management intensity (and thus its effects on the environment) may vary with
15 the economics of hunting estates (Sotherton et al., 2009). More intensive game management is
16 sometimes linked to estates that aim to make financial profit from hunting (commercial
17 estates), because game managers on these estates may try to boost the numbers of game
18 species to increase income, and re-invest some of this income in management. Additionally,
19 different forms of hunting may generate different financial profit for managers and lead to
20 variation in management intensity. For instance, in Britain, driven red-grouse (*Lagopus*
21 *lagopus scoticus*) shooting (where hunters remain in blinds while the grouse are driven by
22 beaters walking towards them) leads to larger bags of grouse, has a higher market value and
23 involves more intensive management than walked-up shooting (Thirgood et al., 2000).

24 In Spain, hunting is an important socioeconomic activity, with more than one million
25 hunters (FACE, 2005), and attracts more than 70000 foreign hunters each year (Mulero, 1991;
26 Rengifo, 2008). Hunting regimes in Spain changed at the end of the 1960s, from mostly open
27 access hunting to the current situation where approximately 75 % of Spain (~ 350000 km²) is
28 divided into hunting estates managed privately, by hunter associations or individual managers
29 (Grau, 1973; López-Ontiveros, 1986; MARM, 2006). These private game estates may be
30 managed with the objective of obtaining financial benefit from the hunting rights. Hunting
31 currently constitutes a major income in some rural areas (Bernabéu, 2002), and seems to be an
32 expanding economic activity (Garrido, 2009). Small game hunting, particularly of rabbits
33 (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) and red-legged partridges (*Alectoris rufa*), is of particular relevance
34 numerically and socio-economically (MARM, 2006; Ríos-Saldaña, 2010). However,

populations of these two species have strongly decreased in recent decades (Blanco-Aguilar, 2007; Delibes-Mateos et al. 2009). As a result, small-game management is often and increasingly associated with the release of captive-reared animals, to maintain harvest following the decline in wild stock (Blanco-Aguilar et al., 2008; Delibes-Mateos et al., 2008a). Since early 1990s, some red-legged partridge commercial hunting estates may even ask for a special permit to release farm-reared birds without temporal or numerical limits throughout the hunting season (referred in Spanish law as “*cotos intensivos de caza*”, i.e. “intensive hunting estates”). This variation in approach (from non-commercial to commercial hunting, and from wild to farm-reared stock) is probably linked to differences in game management or the most frequently used forms of hunting, but such information is scarce. However, knowledge about these issues may be useful to understand the extent to which game management practices support the commercial objectives of estates and the consequences that commercialization of hunting may have for the conservation of nature.

In this paper, we assess variation in characteristics, hunting styles or pressure and game management between red-legged partridge hunting estates with different commercial objectives, as a basis to discuss the potential contribution of each type of hunting to the conservation of biodiversity and rural economies. We specifically focused on red-legged partridge hunting in central Spain, which is the main hunting area in this country (Ríos-Saldaña 2010).

Methods

Data collection

We studied management and hunting practices on 59 small game hunting estates within central Spain, covering a total land surface of ca 209000 ha (Fig. 1). The main small game species in these estates was red-legged partridge. We selected estates representing the whole range of management intensity gradient. Data about different quantitative and qualitative aspects of every estate, characteristics and management were gathered through ‘face to face’ in-depth interviews with game managers, conducted between 2006 and 2009. In addition, field surveys were carried out in each estate to gather habitat data and estimates of partridge abundance. Data were recorded using point-count methods (Bibby et al., 1992), where observers drove along transects, stopping every 700-750 m (exact point depending on visibility of the surrounding area). On each point, partridge numbers and locations were recorded during 10

minutes. Surveys took place in summer (mid June to early August). We calculated a partridge abundance index as the sum of recorded partridges within 300 m at each observation point, divided by the number of observation points monitored in each estate. More details can be found in Díaz-Fernández et al. (2012). Additionally, habitat cover at each observation point was noted, and then averaged for each estate. Habitats described included agricultural land, the presence of natural vegetation, mainly scrubland and grasslands, which are known to add biodiversity value to farmland habitats in Mediterranean contexts (Olivero et al., 2011), or the presence of *dehesa* (sparse oak woodland with ground vegetation cultivated or used for livestock forage), which is also of conservation value (Blondel and Aronson, 1999; Halladay and Gilmour, 1995).

Variables analyzed were grouped into three main blocks. The first block included variables related to the *physical and economic characteristics* of the estate (Table 1). Land surface of the estates, the main land uses to which the estate was devoted, and the percentage of the land that belonged to the owner of the hunting rights were obtained from the interviews, whereas habitat and partridge abundance were obtained from the field surveys. Additionally, we specifically asked the managers about their economic objectives in the hunting estates.

The second group included *game management variables* (Table 2), obtained from interviews: partridges released per km², number of years prior to the survey in which releases were carried out, predator control, provision of supplementary feeding and water, and presence of game crops, the management techniques most commonly employed in the study area (Delibes-Mateos et al., 2008b; Ríos-Saldaña, 2010). In addition, we collected information on the number of gamekeepers per estate, which we present also per km².

The third block included *variables concerning hunting methods, hunting pressure and hunting bags* (Table 3), also obtained through interviews. Methods typically used for shooting partridges in central Spain include: 1) driven shooting, where assistants beat the land to flush partridges and drive them towards a strategically arranged line of hunters; 2) walked-up shooting, where hunters (with or without dogs) shoot the birds as they encounter them (Buenestado et al., 2009); 3) decoy shooting, where a male partridge decoy is placed in a territory to attract wild partridges. Partridge bags were expressed as the number of birds harvested on each estate during a hunting season, divided by the surface area of the estate. Annual hunting pressure was calculated as the number of hunters per day and km², multiplied by the number of hunting days in the hunting season.

Statistical analyses

The 59 hunting estates were categorized to three types:

- a) Non-commercial estates ($n = 14$); this included estates identified legally as “social”, and “private” ones where the stated aim was recreational hunting by a group of friends.
- b) Commercial estates with restricted releases ($n = 37$); this included private estates where the stated aim was to obtain economic benefit from the hunting rights, but without an administrative permit for unrestricted releases.
- c) Commercial estates with the “intensive” legal label, and thus no restriction on releases ($n = 8$).

For simplicity, we hereafter call these types “non-commercial” (a), “commercial-1” (b) and “commercial-2” (c).

We tested whether each of the variables mentioned above varied among the three types of estates using GLM for quantitative variables (log transformed, or arc-sine transformed in the case of habitat variables, to normalize the variables), and chi-square tests for proportions. Significant pair-wise differences among each pair of categories were evaluated through Tukey tests of LSMeans. Analyses were performed with SAS 9.2.

Results

Physical and economic characteristics

Non-commercial estates were much larger than commercial estates, but less of the land was owned by those with the hunting rights (Table 1). A very large proportion of estates of all types had other land uses, mainly agricultural, but the proportion of land covered by agricultural habitats was significantly smaller in commercial estates (mainly because of a lower proportion of permanent crops, i.e. olive trees and vineyards) and livestock was less common. In contrast, the proportion of non-productive land covered by natural vegetation (scrubland or uncultivated grasslands) was twice in commercial than non-commercial estates (Table 1). *Dehesas* were most common in some commercial-1 estates, but overall differences were not significant among groups (Table 1). No significant differences were found in summer partridge abundance between commercial and non-commercial estates (Table 1), although highest densities were found in commercial-1 estates (Fig. 2).

Game management characteristics

The intensity of all management techniques increased significantly from non-commercial to commercial-1 to commercial-2 estates (Table 2). As expected, this was particularly marked in terms of the frequency and intensity of partridge releases. The number of partridges released per km² was 10 times higher in commercial-1 than in non-commercial estates, and 1000 times higher in commercial-2 estates. Moreover, the frequency of releases also increased from non-commercial to commercial-1 to commercial-2 estates (where partridges were released every year). Similar significant gradients were found for the number of feeding and water points per km². Additionally, similar gradients but with less marked differences were found for the density and investment in gamekeepers, the number of red foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*) or magpies (*Pica pica*) killed, and the proportion of estates that used game crops as a management tool. Significant differences were mainly found between commercial-2 estates and the other two types, except for density of gamekeepers, where differences were found mainly between non-commercial and both types of commercial estates (Table 2).

Hunting methods, pressure and hunting bags

There were also major differences in relation to the methods of hunting used in each estate type (Table 3). A large majority of non-commercial and commercial-1 estates did not carry driven shooting at all, whereas this was the most common method in commercial-2 estates. The amount of decoy shooting offered was also significantly larger in commercial-2 estates, but was also important in non-commercial ones. The density of hunters was significantly lower in commercial-2 estates but, because the number of hunting days per year was also much higher there, annual hunting pressure was very similar among the three types of estates. Annual harvest was 30-70 times larger in commercial-2 estates, where driven shooting was more common. Annual harvest was twice as large in commercial-1 as in non-commercial estates, although this was not statistically significant (Table 3).

Discussion

Our study demonstrates that there are differences in the physical characteristics, management practices and style of hunting offered between estates managed for commercial and non-commercial reasons: commercial estates are associated with a higher proportion of natural habitats and more intensive management, and are able to offer greater numbers of birds to be

1 shot, although differences for the latter when excluding estates with no restrictions for captive-
2 reared bird releases were not significant. Additionally, differences in management between
3 commercial and non-commercial estates were much less marked when excluding these
4 “intensive” estates, which are thus markedly different from the other estates. We discuss these
5 results below.

6 7 Commercial vs. non-commercial estates.

8
9 Game bird shooting can be a primary source of income, as occurs with grouse shooting in
10 some areas of the uplands in the UK (Sotherton et al., 2009). In contrast, in our study area
11 more than 85 % of even the most intensive estates had agriculture too, which indicates that
12 hunting there is generally a complementary activity to other land uses (Martínez et al., 2002).

13 In general, game management was more intensive in commercial than in non-
14 commercial small game estates, and this was true for most variables even when excluding
15 intensive estates. The management variables that were more frequently employed in
16 commercial estates as compared to non-commercial estates were predator control, partridge
17 releases, supplementary feeders and water points. Commercial estates also employed more
18 gamekeepers per unit surface. These differences are not surprising, as all these management
19 techniques represent a high economic investment for managers (both in infrastructure, salaries,
20 or direct expenses as food or captive-reared birds) and are less likely to occur in those estates
21 that do not produce economic profit. These results suggest that any positive or negative effects
22 on biodiversity of these management techniques would be higher in commercial than not-
23 commercial estates. It is increasingly accepted that farm-reared partridge releases damage
24 biodiversity conservation: supplemental stocking practices may threaten the integrity of the
25 wild partridge population gene pool (Barbanera et al., 2010; Blanco-Aguilar et al., 2008) or
26 may pose a risk to wild populations by introducing parasites (Villanúa et al., 2008), which can
27 threaten other species of conservation concern such as the little bustard (*Tetrax tetrax*;
28 Villanúa et al., 2007). Predator control is a source of social conflict when illegally
29 implemented, and has caused a reduction in the geographic range of several endangered
30 predators (e.g. Rodríguez and Delibes, 2004; Villafuerte et al., 1998; Virgós and Travaini,
31 2005), but it may have positive effects on other species (Fletcher et al., 2010). Supplementary
32 food or water provided for partridges may have also positive effects on other species (authors
33 unpublished data), although this has been scantily studied.

1 Additionally, our results indicate that areas managed for commercial hunting have
2 more scrubland or uncultivated grasslands compared to non-commercial estates, where most
3 of the area was occupied by farmland. Scrubland and uncultivated grasslands are positively
4 associated with higher natural value of farmland in Mediterranean Spain (Olivero et al., 2011).
5 In addition, game crops, which are known to increase biodiversity in farmland (Parish and
6 Sotherton, 2004), were more common in commercial estates. Hunting has been claimed to be
7 associated with the retention of natural habitats (Otero, 2000; Duckworth et al., 2003;
8 Robertson et al., 2001). Our data do not allow us to ascertain whether hunting activities have
9 directly contributed to the retention of natural habitats in small game estates in Spain.
10 However, our results indicate that managing for commercial hunting may have advantages
11 over non-commercial estates in terms of farmland habitat quality. Moreover, land property and
12 hunting rights were more often tied in commercial than in non-commercial estates. In the
13 latter, land ownership was highly fragmented, often not including the owner of the hunting
14 rights, and management decisions about land use including hunting resources are often made
15 by different persons there. In contrast, the owner of the hunting rights in commercial estates
16 was also often the landowner, which suggests that retention of natural habitats in private
17 hunting lands might be a consequence of game management instead of just a reflection of
18 where commercial estates are located, but more research is needed to confirm this.

19 The more intensive management in commercial estates, however, did not necessarily
20 lead to higher abundance of wild stocks or higher annual harvest, and hunting pressure was
21 similar between non-commercial and commercial estates. Annual harvest was significantly
22 higher in intensive estates, which reflects the markedly higher investment in releases (Table 2,
23 and see Díaz-Fernández et al., in press). The fact that summer abundance in intensive estates
24 was similar than in other estates despite the much higher level of released partridges also must
25 reflect the extremely high mortality of released birds (Gortázar et al., 2000; Alonso et al.,
26 2005). Non-intensive commercial estates tended to have higher annual harvest and summer
27 partridge abundances (the highest densities were observed in those types of estates) than non-
28 commercial ones, but differences were not statistically significant, probably due to the high
29 variance of both variables. Further studies should investigate the relationship between
30 abundance and harvest quotas, to assess the sustainability of wild partridge populations under
31 the different management regimes.

32 In summary, our results suggest that non-commercial hunting, due to fewer releases,
33 could contribute to the conservation of the genetic pool of wild partridge populations in Spain.
34 However, commercial hunting was also associated with more natural vegetation within the

farmland matrix, suggesting positive relationships between hunting commercialization and biodiversity. Furthermore, commercial estates generate more jobs than non-commercial estates, and could thus have social benefits in rural communities (Bernabéu, 2002; Caro et al., 2011). It is now urgent to determine the cost-efficiency of management techniques to identify management to promote the optimal combination of social, economic and conservation benefits of hunting.

Intensive vs non-intensive estates

Administratively labelled « *intensive* » estates were indeed more intensive in their management than other commercial estates. Most striking differences related to both the frequency and number of partridge releases, but intensive estates also invested proportionally more in the use of supplementary feeders and water points, as well as in growing crops devoted to game cover. This is not surprising because 1) supplementary food and water are considered necessary to improve the short-term survival in inexperienced recently released partridges (Gortázar et al., 2000); 2) feeders and watering points create “attraction points” to retain released partridges linked to the estate, reducing dispersal, and are also useful as medication points to control diseases associated with farm-reared partridges (Villanúa et al., 2008). The high densities of captive-reared released birds in intensive estates probably attract carnivores, which are a primary cause of death in recently released partridges (Alonso et al., 2005), which may explain why more foxes were killed on intensive estates than on the other two types of estates (either because there are more foxes, or because higher effort is made to control this mortality factor for released birds). The higher level of magpie control in intensive units is however surprising, as these corvids are usually killed because they prey on partridge eggs (Díaz-Ruiz et al., 2010), and consequently do not present a risk for released birds. This suggests that there is a culture of controlling any potential predator as an index of perceived good management that may be not necessarily linked to increasing profitability (authors, unpublished data).

Intensive estates were also different from others in relation to hunting styles. Driven shooting was the main method of hunting partridges there, but secondary on the other two types of estates. It has been suggested that driven shooting is more harmful for wild partridge populations than walked-up shooting (Buenestado et al., 2009), because this form of hunting may be associated with higher disturbance, although the evidence for this is lacking. Intensive estates also offered a much higher number of decoy shooting days than the other estates.

1 Hunting with decoys is controversial because it may interfere with breeding. It would be
2 necessary to know whether birds hunted with decoys in intensive estates are potential breeders
3 or captive-reared released birds, and thus the potential impact of this hunting method on wild
4 populations.

5 The number of birds harvested was notably higher in intensive estates, suggesting that
6 income generated on these estates is higher. Driven grouse shooting in Britain is estimated to
7 generate roughly 10 times the revenue of walked-up shooting (Sotherton et al., 2009),
8 although it is offset to some extent by the cost of employing higher number of gamekeepers
9 and the associated management carried out. Expenditure in intensive estates in central Spain
10 was also much higher than in non-intensive estates for the same reasons. What is now needed
11 is to compare the cost-revenue ratio and the variation in these measures among non-intensive
12 and intensive units.

13 At present, there are still very few intensive game estates in central Spain (3 %; Ríos-
14 Saldaña, 2010), but their economic and social impact could be very high, at least judging from
15 hunting bags or jobs created, and their numbers could thus increase as a way to contribute to
16 rural development. However, our results suggest that this industrialization of hunting is linked
17 to a marked increase in the use of controversial management practices and could lead to
18 conflicts over land management in these areas.

19 Increasingly, there is pressure to develop incentives and support schemes that promote
20 management practices that provide effective conservation and social benefits and enhance
21 employment and economic growth. In order to inform such policies more work is needed to
22 quantify the externalities (environmental or social costs and benefits) of different management
23 techniques, and to integrate them in the economics of hunting estates (Hennart 1986). For
24 example, hunting estates with conservation and social benefits (e.g. those promoting
25 employment and financial benefits, but associated with environmental benefits through
26 preservations of wild stocks and/or natural habitats) could benefit from tax relief or be eligible
27 for financial support through and accreditation scheme were they demonstrate their social,
28 economic and environmental sustainability. Further studies (including socio-economic ones)
29 should be implemented to determine the feasibility and acceptability of such schemes, and
30 thus their efficiency in promoting conservation-friendly hunting and game management.

31 **Acknowledgements**

This work was supported by the European Commission under the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development through project HUNT (212160, FP7-ENV-2007-1), Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología (CGL2008-04282/BOS) and the Consejería de Agricultura of Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha (JCCM). Additionally, this paper uses partial data from a project funded by the Fundación Fauna y Flora. S. Diaz-Fernandez had a predoctoral grant jointly financed by the European Social Fund and by JCCM, in the framework of the Operational Programme PRINCET 2005-2010. M. Delibes-Mateos is currently holding a Juan de la Cierva research contract awarded by the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación and the European Social Fund. We thank all game managers for their collaboration, and ADEMAC and the Asociación de cotos de caza menor Sierra de Alcaraz-Campo de Montiel for facilitating this collaboration with game managers. We thank Steve Redpath, Mick Marquiss, Justin Irvine and two anonymous referees for useful comments on the manuscript.

References

- Alonso, M.E., Pérez, J.A., Gaudioso, V.R., Díez, C. Prieto, R. 2005. Study of survival, dispersal and home range of autumn-released red-legged partridges (*Alectoris rufa*). British Poultry Science 6, 401-406.
- Barbanera, F., Pergams, O.R.W., Guerrini, M., Forcina, G., Panayides, P., Dini, F. 2010. Genetic consequences of intensive management in game birds. Biological Conservation 143, 1259-1268.
- Bernabéu R. 2002. La caza en Castilla La Mancha y sus estrategias de desarrollo. PhD thesis. Universidad de Castilla La Mancha, Ciudad Real, Spain.
- Bibby, C. J., N. D. Burgess, D. A. Hill. 1992. Bird Census Techniques. Academic Press, London.
- Blanco-Aguilar, J.A. 2007. Variación espacial en la biología de la perdiz roja (*Alectoris rufa*): una aproximación multidisciplinar. PhD thesis, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, Spain.
- Blanco-Aguilar, J.A., Gonzalez-Jara, P., Ferrero, M.E., Sanchez-Barbudo, I., Virgos, E., Villafuerte, R., Davila, J.A. 2008. Assessment of game restocking contributions to anthropogenic hybridization: the case of the Iberian red-legged partridge. Animal Conservation 11, 535-545.

- 1 Blondel, J., Aronson, J., 1999. Biology and Wildlife of the Mediterranean Region. Oxford
- 2 University Press, Oxford.
- 3 Buenestado, F., Ferreras, P., Blanco-Aguiar, J.A., Tortosa, F.S., Villafuerte, R. 2009. Survival
- 4 and causes of mortality among wild Red-legged Partridges *Alectoris rufa* in southern
- 5 Spain: implications for conservation. *Ibis* 151, 72-730.
- 6 Caro, J., Díaz-Fernández, S., Viñuela, J., Sunyer, C., Arroyo, B. In press. Contribución de los
- 7 Parques Nacionales al desarrollo rural: estudio comparativo con la caza. In: Proyectos de
- 8 investigación en Parques Nacionales. OAPN, Madrid, Spain.
- 9 Chardonnet, Ph., des Clers, B., Fischer, J., Gerhold, R., Jori, F., Lamarque, F. 2002. The value
- 10 of wildlife. *Revue scientifique et technique de l'Office international des épizooties* 21,
- 11 15-51.
- 12 Delibes-Mateos, M., Ferreras, P., Villafuerte, R. 2008a. Translocations as a risk for the
- 13 conservation of European wild rabbit *Oryctolagus cuniculus* lineages. *Oryx* 42, 259-264.
- 14 Delibes-Mateos, M., Ferreras, P., Villafuerte, R. 2008b. Rabbit populations and game
- 15 management: the situation after 15 years of rabbit haemorrhagic disease in central-
- 16 southern Spain. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 17, 559-574.
- 17 Delibes-Mateos, M., Ferreras, P., Villafuerte, R. 2009. European rabbit population trends and
- 18 associated factors: a review of the situation in the Iberian Peninsula. *Mammal Review*
- 19 39, 124-140.
- 20 Díaz-Fernández, S., Viñuela, J., Arroyo, B. In press. Harvest of red-legged partridge in central
- 21 Spain. *Journal of Wildlife Management*.
- 22 Díaz-Ruiz, F., García, J.T., Pérez-Rodríguez, L., Ferreras, P. 2010. Experimental evaluation of
- 23 live cage-traps for black-billed magpies *Pica pica* management in Spain. *European*
- 24 *Journal of Wildlife Research* 56, 239-248.
- 25 Duckworth, J.C., Firbank, L.G., Stuart, R.C., Yamamoto, S. 2003. Changes in land cover and
- 26 parcel size of British lowland woodlands over the last century in relation to game
- 27 management. *Landscape Research* 28, 171-182.
- 28 The Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the EU (FACE) 2005. Census
- 29 of the number of hunters in Europe. <http://www.faceeurope.org/fs-hunting.htm> (updated
- 30 21.02.2005).
- 31 Fletcher, K., Aebischer, N.J., Baines, D., Foster, R., Hoodless, A.N. 2010. Changes in
- 32 breeding success and abundance of ground-nesting moorland birds in relation to the
- 33 experimental deployment of legal predator control. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 47, 263-
- 34 272.

- 1 Fontoura, A.P. 1992. Importante socio-économique de la chasse à la perdrix rouge (*Alectoris*
2 *rufa*) au Portugal. Gibier Faune Sauvage 9, 871-878.
- 3 Garrido, E.M. 2009. Territorial view of the spanish cinegetic boom, 1970-1989. Boletín de la
4 Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles 51, 325-351 .
- 5 Gortázar, C., Villafuerte, R., Martín, M. 2000. Success of traditional restocking of red-legged
6 partridge for hunting purposes in areas of low density of northeast Spain Aragón.
7 Zeitschrift für Jagdwis-senschaften 46, 23-30.
- 8 Grau, S. 1973. El actual derecho de caza en España. Revista de Estudios Agrosociales 85, 7-
9 32.
- 10 Halladay, P., Gilmour, D.A. (Eds.) 1995. Conserving biodiversity outside protected areas. The
11 role of tradicional agro-ecosystems. IUCN, Cambridge, UK.
- 12 Hennart, J.F. 1986. What is internalization? Review of World Economics 122(4), 791-804.
- 13 López-Ontiveros, A. 1986. Caza y actividad agraria en España y Andalucía: su evolución
14 reciente. Agricultura y Sociedad 40, 67-98.
- 15 Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Medio Rural y Marino (MARM). 2006. Anuario de
16 estadística forestal. Available from [http://www.marm.es/es/biodiversidad/temas/montes-](http://www.marm.es/es/biodiversidad/temas/montes-y-politica-forestal/estadisticas-forestales/indice_estadisticas_forestales_2006.aspx)
17 [y-politica-forestal/estadisticas-forestales/indice_estadisticas_forestales_2006.aspx](http://www.marm.es/es/biodiversidad/temas/montes-y-politica-forestal/estadisticas-forestales/indice_estadisticas_forestales_2006.aspx)
18 (Accessed April 2011).
- 19 Martínez, J., Viñuela, J., Villafuerte, R. 2002. Socio-economic aspects of gamebird hunting,
20 hunting bags, and assessment of the status of gamebird populations in REGHAB
21 countries. Report to the EC. <http://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/8259>
- 22 Mileson, S.A. 2009. Hunting. In: Blair, J., Hamerow, H. (Eds.) Medieval history and
23 archaeology: Parks in medieval England. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp. 15-
24 44.
- 25 Mulero, A. 1991. Turismo y caza en España. Estado de la cuestión. Agricultura y Sociedad 58,
26 147-171.
- 27 Olivero, J., Márquez, A.L., Arroyo, B. 2011. Modelización de las áreas agrícolas y
28 forestales de alto valor natural en España. Report to the Spanish Ministry of
29 Environment (MARM).
- 30 Otero, C. 2000. Patrimonio natural y propiedad rural en España. Exlibris, Madrid, Spain
- 31 Parish, D.M.B., Sotherton, N.W. 2004. Game crops as summer habitat for farmland songbirds
32 in Scotland. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 104, 429-438.

- 1 Rao, M., Htun, S., Zaw, T., Myint, T. 2010. Hunting, livelihoods, and declining wildlife in the
2 Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary, North Myanmar. *Environmental Management* 46, 143-
3 153.
- 4 Reboussin B. 1991. Fonctions et significations sociales de la chasse: exemple de la chasse de
5 Francueil (Indre et Loire). *Bulletin Mensuel de l'Office National de la Chasse* 161, 41-
6 48.
- 7 Reginfo, J.I. 2008. Un segmento del turismo internacional en auge: el turismo de caza.
8 *Cuadernos de Turismo* 22 : 187-210.
- 9 Reynolds, J.C., Tapper, S.C. 1996. Control of mammalian predators in game management and
10 conservation. *Mammal Review* 26, 127-156.
- 11 Ríos-Saldaña, C.A. 2010. Los planes técnicos de caza de Castilla-La Mancha y su aplicación
12 en la gestión y conservación de las especies cinegéticas. PhD thesis, University of
13 Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real, Spain.
- 14 Robertson, P.A., Park, K.J., Barton, A.F. 2001. Loss of heather *Calluna vulgaris* moorland in
15 the Scottish uplands: the role of red grouse *Lagopus lagopus scoticus* management.
16 *Wildlife Biology* 7, 11-16.
- 17 Rodríguez, A., Delibes, M. 2004. Patterns and causes of non-natural mortality in the Iberian
18 lynx during a 40-year period of range contraction. *Biological Conservation* 118, 151-
19 161.
- 20 Rose, A.L. 2001. Social changes and social values in mitigating bushmeat commerce. In:
21 Bakaar, M.I, Fonseca, G.A.B.D., Mittermeier, R.A., Rylands, A.B. & Painemilla, K.W.
22 (Eds.) *Hunting and bushmeat utilisation in the African Rain Forest: perspectives towards*
23 *a blue print for conservation action*. Conservation International, Washington DC, pp. 59-
24 74.
- 25 Sotherton, N., Tapper, S., Smith, A. 2009. Hen harriers and red grouse: economic aspects of
26 red grouse shooting and the implications for moorland conservation. *Journal of Applied*
27 *Ecology* 46, 955-960.
- 28 Tapper, S. C. (Ed.) 1999. A question of balance. Game animals and their role in the British
29 countryside. The Game Conservancy Trust, Fordingbridge, UK.
- 30 Thirgood, S., Redpath, S., Newton, I., Hudson, P. 2000. Raptors and red grouse: conservation
31 conflicts and management solutions. *Conservation Biology* 14, 95-104.
- 32 Villafuerte, R., Viñuela, J., Blanco, J.C. 1998. Extensive predator persecution caused by
33 population crash in a game species: the case of red kites and rabbits in Spain. *Biological*
34 *Conservation* 84, 181-188.

- 1 Villanúa, D., Casas, F., Viñuela, J., Gortázar, C., García De La Morena, E., Morales, M. 2007.
2 First occurrence of *Eucoleus contortus* in a Little Bustard *Tetrax tetrax*: Negative effect
3 of Red-legged Partridge *Alectoris rufa* releases on steppe bird conservation? *Ibis* 149,
4 405-406.
- 5 Villanúa, D., Pérez-Rodríguez, L., Casas, F., Alzaga, V., Acevedo, P., Viñuela, J., Gortázar, C.
6 2008. Sanitary risks of red-legged partridge releases: Introduction of parasites. *European*
7 *Journal of Wildlife Research* 54, 199-204.
- 8 Virgos, E., Travaini, A. 2005. Relationship between small-game hunting and carnivore
9 diversity in central Spain. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 14, 3475-3486.

Table 1. Mean $\pm$ SD (sample size in brackets) values of the variables used to characterize small-game estates in central Spain, and results of tests for statistical differences among groups (GLM tests were used for continuous variables, Chi-square tests for proportions). Similar letters indicate categories that were not significantly different through Tukey LSMeans comparisons.

Physical and economic characteristics		Non-commercial	Commercial-1	Commercial-2	F (* Chi ²)	P
	Surface (km ²)	81.5 $\pm$ 77.9 (14) a	18.0 $\pm$ 25.0 (37) b	34.8 $\pm$ 15.9 (8) a	16.21	0.0001
	% of agricultural habitats	73.5 $\pm$ 25.3 (13) a	39.0 $\pm$ 24.7 (34) b	47.8 $\pm$ 33.4 (6) a	7.42	0.001
	% of annual crops	44.6 $\pm$ 25.8 (13) a	32.6 $\pm$ 22.6 (34) a	32.4 $\pm$ 23.4 (6) a	1.12	0.33
	% of permanent crops	28.8 $\pm$ 18.5 (13) a	6.5 $\pm$ 13.0 (34) b	15.3 $\pm$ 15.9 (6) a	14.1	0.0001
	% natural vegetation (grasslands or scrubland)	20.1 $\pm$ 21.0 (13) a	42.1 $\pm$ 21.8 (34) b	44.6 $\pm$ 27.9 (6) ab	4.78	0.01
	% <i>dehesa</i>	1.3 $\pm$ 2.5 (13) a	11.1 $\pm$ 24.4 (34) a	3.4 $\pm$ 3.3 (6) a	1.31	0.28
	% of the land that belonged to the owner of the hunting rights	20.4 $\pm$ 36 (13) a	68.7 $\pm$ 47 (23) b	45.6 $\pm$ 43 (8) ab	5.81	0.006
	% of estates with agricultural use	92.9 (14)	88.9 (36)	87.5 (8)	0.22*	0.9
	% of estates with livestock use	92.9 (14)	67.6 (37)	42.9 (7)	6.11*	0.05
	% of estates with forestry use	23.1 (12)	10.8 (37)	16.7 (6)	1.23*	0.6
	Partridge abundance estimate (Partridges/observation point)	0.78 $\pm$ 0.79 (13) a	2.40 $\pm$ 3.50 (34) a	1.61 $\pm$ 1.19 (6) a	1.52	0.23

Table 2. Mean $\pm$ SD (sample size in brackets) values of the variables used to characterize small-game estates in central Spain, and results of tests for statistical differences among groups (GLM tests were used for continuous variables, Chi-square tests for proportions). Similar letters indicate categories that were not significantly different through Tukey LSMeans comparisons.

		Non-commercial	Commercial-1	Commercial-2	F (* Chi ²)	P
Management variables	Partridges released per km ²	1.6 $\pm$ 6. (14) a	15.6 $\pm$ 34.1 (37) b	2142.1 $\pm$ 1972.2 (8) c	40.70	0.0001
	Number of years (considering the last 9 years prior to the survey) in which releases were employed	0.7 $\pm$ 2.4 (14) a	2.1 $\pm$ 3.3 (37) a	9.0 $\pm$ 0.0 (8) b	18.98	0.0001
	Density of gamekeepers (gamekeeper/km ²)	0.01 $\pm$ 0.01 (14) a	0.14 $\pm$ 0.17 (37) b	0.11 $\pm$ 0.07 (8) b	4.25	0.01
	Investment in gamekeepers (k€)	12.8 $\pm$ 14.2 (12) a	19.3 $\pm$ 43.6 (33) b	74.1 $\pm$ 57.9 (8) c	6.37	0.003
	Foxes killed/km ²	0.78 $\pm$ 0.8 (13) a	1.64 $\pm$ 4.3 (34) a	2.69 $\pm$ 2.3 (8) b	3.02	0.056
	Magpies killed/km ²	11.4 $\pm$ 31.1 (13) a	15.9 $\pm$ 18.3 (33) b	17.0 $\pm$ 15.3 (8) b	3.96	0.02
	Supplementary feeders/km ²	0.05 $\pm$ 0.16 (14) a	5.3 $\pm$ 5.6 (36) b	29.6 $\pm$ 35.6 (8) c	21.73	0.0001
	Supplementary water points/km ²	0.47 $\pm$ 0.9 (14) a	6.4 $\pm$ 10.7 (34) b	11.7 $\pm$ 11.8 (8) c	14.30	0.0001
	% of estates with crops for game species	28.6 (14)	54.1 (37)	62.5 (8)	3.3*	0.15

Table 3. Mean $\pm$ SD (sample size in brackets) values of the variables used to characterize small-game estates in central Spain, and results of tests for statistical differences among groups (GLM tests were used for continuous variables, Chi-square tests for proportions). Similar letters indicate categories that were not significantly different through Tukey LSMeans comparisons.

		Non-commercial	Commercial-1	Commercial-2	F (* Chi ²)	P
Hunting variables	% of estates offering only driven shooting	14.3 (14)	13.5 (37)	12.5 (8)	0.014*	0.9
	% of estates offering driven and walked-up shooting	7.1 (14)	16.2 (37)	87.5 (8)	21.2*	0.0001
	% of estates offering only walked-up shooting, or walked-up shooting and hunting with decoy	78.6 (14)	70.3 (37)	0.0 (8)	15.8*	0.0001
	Driven shooting days/year	0.7 $\pm$ 1.5 (14) a	1.5 $\pm$ 3.6 (33) a	50.6 $\pm$ 32.3 (8) b	57.08	0.0001
	Walked-up shooting days/year	8.78 $\pm$ 5.26 (14) a	9.43 $\pm$ 8.49 (32) a	13.14 $\pm$ 14.8 (8) a	0.16	0.84
	Decoy shooting days/year	7.61 $\pm$ 11.22 (14) a,b	3.06 $\pm$ 6.08 (32) b	16.7 $\pm$ 15.8 (8) a	4.17	0.02
	Number of hunters/km ² and day	1.23 $\pm$ 0.22 (14) a	1.25 $\pm$ 0.14 (34) a	0.26 $\pm$ 0.30 (8) b	6.56	0.003
	Annual hunting pressure (Hunters/km ² /yr)	18.6 $\pm$ 19.0 (14) a	16.8 $\pm$ 14.5 (34) a	16.8 $\pm$ 9.8 (8) a	0.76	0.47
	Partridges harvested/km ²	18.2 $\pm$ 9.9 (13) a	39.0 $\pm$ 33.8 (33) a	1270.1 $\pm$ 990.0 (8) b	46.90	0.0001
	% of partridges harvested in driven shooting	16.7 $\pm$ 38.9 (12) a	23.7 $\pm$ 41.4 (30) a	95.4 $\pm$ 5.6 (6) b	9.78	0.0001

Figure 1. Municipalities (light grey) where the hunting estates studied are located and their situation in peninsular Spain (top left).

Figure 2. Boxplot of the estimates of summer partridge abundance in the three different types of estates.