1 **High winter site fidelity in a long-distance migrant: implications for wintering**
2 **ecology and survival estimates**

3

4 EMMA BLACKBURN* & WILL CRESSWELL

5

6 School of Biology, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, Fife KY16 9TS, UK & A.P.

7 Leventis Ornithological Research Institute, Jos, Nigeria

8

9 Keywords: Palearctic migrant, non-breeding period, territoriality, Whinchat

10

11 * email: emma.blackburn05@alumni.imperial.ac.uk

Abstract

The decision for a migratory animal to be site faithful in its non-breeding season has profound implications for migratory connectivity, resilience to winter habitat loss and population dynamics through carry-over effects on future breeding success and fitness. Knowledge of the temporal and spatial scale of site fidelity and dispersal is also central to accurate survival estimates. We established the observed spatial and temporal scale of site fidelity and the ability to detect small-scale dispersal within and between years for a wintering long-distance Palearctic migrant, the Whinchat *Saxicola rubetra*, by comparing predicted and observed detection rates within the study site. Across two years, 54% of birds returned to the study site and all returning birds reoccupied the territories they used in the previous winter. Observed dispersal was very low despite the high probability of detecting any local dispersal, suggesting that return rates are indicative of true between-winter survival rates for this population. In any winter, 50% of returning individuals had a previously occupied but now empty territory that was less than one territory-span away from the centre of their current territory; high site fidelity was therefore very unlikely to be because of limited territory availability. Over-winter residency time (defined by departure month) differed significantly across sites and with age, but did not determine the probability of whether a bird returned in the following year. This suggests the use of more than one wintering site for some individuals, rather than reduced over-winter survival. This study is one of the first to comprehensively document site fidelity at the territory scale in a Palearctic system, although less comprehensive studies or anecdotal evidence suggest that high winter site fidelity may be relatively common. Here we provide evidence for the serial residency hypothesis, where selection acts for individual migrants to have generalist habitat requirements, allowing them to survive in and remain site faithful to even relatively low quality, but sufficient and familiar sites. Lower dispersal and higher site fidelity compared to that during breeding suggest that annual survival estimates are more accurate when measured on the wintering grounds. This study supports previous findings that wintering conditions do not limit Whinchat populations.

Introduction

The non-breeding period is a significant part of the yearly cycle for migrant birds and wintering ecology has significant carry-over effects for many aspects of survival and reproduction (Baillie and Peach 1992; Sherry and Holmes 1996; Norris et al. 2004; Both et al. 2006; Newton 2006; Pulido 2007; Studds et al. 2008; Reudink et al. 2009; Newton 2010a). A key decision for non-breeding migrants is whether to maintain a winter territory and return to that same wintering site between years. Many migrants have been shown to be site faithful in the non-breeding season to some degree (McNeil 1982; Holmes and Sherry 1992; Sauvage et al. 1998; Marra 2000; Salewski et al. 2000; King and Hutchinson 2001; Cresswell 2014). The scale of this site fidelity has substantial consequences for population dynamics and migratory connectivity (Newton 2010a; Cresswell 2014), because how dependent a migrant is on specific wintering areas will determine how susceptible (or resilient) that species is to the loss or alteration of those wintering sites. Migrants that rely upon a larger number of wintering sites run the greater risk of being impacted by site loss or alteration, for example, because the chance that one of their wintering sites will be impacted by environmental change is greater when more sites are used (known as the 'multiple jeopardy' hypothesis (Newton 2004)).

The amount of suitable winter habitat that may be available and the ability to stay resident in a territory of poorer quality is likely to be greater for migrants with more generalist wintering requirements within their wintering habitats (Cresswell 2014). Migrant birds, particularly passerines wintering within Africa, are likely to be habitat generalists during winter and to be faithful to any site that promotes their survival because of the stochastic nature of site selection on a very large scale by birds in their first winter (the 'serial residency hypothesis': Cresswell, 2014). If wintering sites are lost or change considerably, individuals with a low dependency on specific sites or those that can use a wider range of winter habitat conditions can avoid the high costs and unpredictability of moving long distances, and should have higher survival as a result (Warkentin and Hernandez 1996; Cresswell 2014).

At a finer spatial scale, maintaining a territory during the winter as opposed to being itinerant instils knowledge of local food resources and aids territory defence and predator avoidance (Brown and Long 2007; Förschler et al. 2010). Whether birds shift territories within winters or occupy a different territory upon return may suggest how important winter territory quality is for survival and future fitness. Within or between winter territory switching suggests competition for higher quality territories (i.e. dominance-based territory occupancy) and that territory quality influences survival or future reproductive success (Marra and Holmes 2001). Wintering in sub-optimal habitats has been shown to lower reproductive success for some migrants (Norris et al. 2004; Reudink et al. 2009), and this has implications at the population level if habitat loss forces a higher proportion of individuals into lower-quality habitats. Furthermore, if the degree of site fidelity differs with age or sex, any resulting differential survival may lead to skewed population dynamics and related population declines (Sherry and Holmes 1996; Marra 2000; Marra and Holmes 2001; Steifetten and Dale 2006).

The scale of site fidelity is also an essential component of survival estimates, because measuring the scale of site fidelity allows the estimation of “true” survival as opposed to “apparent survival”, the latter being a function of the scale and intensity of monitoring and is less valuable for population management (Anders and Marshall 2005; Gilroy et al. 2012; Ergon and Gardner 2013; Schaub and Royle 2013). If migrants exhibit some degree of wintering site fidelity, survival can always be estimated from return rates, at least to some extent (Sauvage et al. 1998; Salewski et al. 2000; King and Hutchinson 2001); yet determining true survival is problematic because the chance of resighting an individual depends on a combination of survival and dispersal plus the ability to detect returning individuals (Marshall et al. 2000; Marshall et al. 2004; Anders and Marshall 2005; Schaub and Royle 2013). Distinguishing between survival and dispersal is challenging, especially when exploring population dynamics between years (Marshall et al. 2004; Ergon and Gardner 2013), and the ability to detect individuals is often a function of the size of the study area and resighting effort (Baker et al. 1995; Marshall et al. 2000; Marshall et al. 2004). Consequently, survival estimates based on return rates often

underestimate true survival (Gilroy et al. 2012; Ergon and Gardner 2013; Schaub and Royle 2013). Determining both where a species lies on the continuum between 100% between-year survival and 100% site fidelity and the degree of any dispersal are therefore fundamental to establishing the value of survival estimates calculated from return rates. This can be essential to understanding population dynamics. Winter site fidelity appears to be relatively common amongst migrants (Skilleter 1995; Sauvage et al. 1998; Salewski et al. 2000; Koronkiewicz et al. 2006; Barshep et al. 2012; Cresswell 2014), implying that true survival estimates can be obtained from return rates, but only if detection probability is high because return rates are the product of both apparent survival probability and detection probability. Studies of this detail during winter are lacking, however, especially for Palearctic migrants (Vickery et al. 2014). Furthermore, accurate between-winter return rates and the temporal scale of within-winter site fidelity are essential to understanding whether short-term residency at any one wintering site is due to mortality or dispersal to other areas.

In this study we aimed to establish the degree of site fidelity and quantify the ability to detect any dispersal during winter for a declining long-distance Palearctic migrant, the Whinchat *Saxicola rubetra*. This species exhibits varying degrees of fidelity in both the breeding and non-breeding seasons (Bastian 1992; Barshep et al. 2012; Shitikov et al. 2012). Some breeding populations have declined significantly over the past few decades, as illustrated by the 53.1% decline in breeding abundance documented over the past 40 years (1970 to 2010) (BirdLife International 2004; Henderson et al. 2004; Henderson et al. 2015). Similar population trends have been shown for many long-distance Palearctic migrants, the causes of which are often poorly understood (Berthold et al. 1998; Sanderson et al. 2006; Thaxter et al. 2010; Vickery et al. 2014), and so establishing whether migrants are flexible on the wintering grounds and the degree of site fidelity has profound implications for the conservation of migrants. This is particularly relevant given the increasing pressure of anthropogenic habitat loss in Africa (Vickery et al. 2014).

We ask: (1) do individuals return to the same wintering area and do return rates differ with age and sex; (2) what is the power to detect retuning individuals and within and between-year dispersal over different spatial scales, and what opportunities are there for individuals to disperse; (3) what is the spatial scale of site fidelity and dispersal observed; and (4) what is the temporal scale of site fidelity and does this differ with age and sex?

Methods

Study site

The study took place over three consecutive winters (hereby referred to chronologically as winter 1, 2 and 3) from January 2011 to March 2014 on the Jos Plateau in the guinea savannah zone of central Nigeria, West Africa (N09°53', E08°59', approximately 1250 m altitude; Figure 1). The region experiences wet and dry seasons, with the majority of the wintering period for migrants (early September to late April) within the dry season. Study sites were primarily open scrubland with varying degrees of degradation due to human habitation, arable farming and livestock grazing, the latter two often increasing in intensity as the dry season progresses (see Hulme and Cresswell 2012). Sites with high densities of Whinchats were chosen and are typical of wintering habitat for this species in the area. Three study sites were used in all winters: site A, site B, and site C, and two sites D and E were added at the end of the winter 2 (Figure 1). Birds were captured at two additional sites in winter 3 (marked 'x' Figure 1) but are only included in analyses exploring age and sex ratios across sites. Note that sites represent logistic areas, rather than biologically different distinct areas identified a priori: we therefore consider site effects as a potentially confounding nuisance variable (e.g. sampling effort may have varied across sites) rather than representing anything likely to have been correlated with Whinchat biology. Sites in any case were very close together and site boundaries only existed as defined by us during the study.

Study subjects

Birds were captured with spring traps and mist nets using conspecific playback and live bait. In winter 1, birds were captured from late January to mid-February; in

winter 2, birds were captured from late September until mid-November, and from mid-February to early March. Additional birds were captured in winter 3 but are excluded from analyses involving return rates and territory size because return rates were unknown and resightings were less precise in winter 3 (see below). Each bird was uniquely colour ringed, sexed and aged as either first-winter or adult (Jenni and Winkler 2004), and biometric information (maximum wing cord, tarsus, mass) and moult score were recorded. The age and sex of birds caught did not differ between the study sites (Chi squared tests on all birds captured across study: age: $\chi^2 = 2.7$, $df = 5$, $p = 0.75$, $n = 409$; sex: $\chi^2 = 5.9$, $p = 0.32$, $n = 407$). In total, 176 birds were captured in winters 1 and 2, of which 154 were resighted at least once after capture.

Resighting individuals

Individuals were resighted throughout winters to determine 1) the location and size of territories (winters 1 and 2), and 2) the degree of residency and site fidelity within and between winters (all years). In winters 1 and 2, resighting efforts focussed on obtaining undisturbed resightings to gain accurate estimates of territory size and location and winter residency. In winter 3, resightings were less precise because focus shifted to just relocating birds. Resightings were carried out from dawn (~06:00) until 11:00 and 16:00 until dusk (~18:30). Because whinchats typically perch on shrubs and other structures where they are easily visible and make frequent sallies to fly-catch and feed from the ground, birds were easily detected if they were present. For winter 2 (for which we later determined departure month and resighting probability, see below), all territories were visited at least weekly from late September to mid-May (but often more frequently) until a bird was considered to have departed, as determined by not resighting an individual after four territory visits. Note that because territories were spread throughout the study site and were close together, we often continued to visit territories of departed birds (i.e. when visiting other territories). We are therefore confident that departure month could be accurately determined. Whinchats were located with binoculars (Swarovski SV 8x32) and colour combinations read using a spotting scope (Zeiss Diascope 65 mm with 25x eyepiece). Locations of ringed individuals were recorded with a GPS device (Garmin GPSMAP 64). To enable unbiased estimates of the territory location, and to

determine territory size and use, each sighting was scored for confidence regarding whether the bird was undisturbed before being sighted, and we recorded the date and time to the nearest minute of each resighting. A Whinchat could travel across its territory within seconds and the time between observations was found to have no influence on the spatial independence of resightings (general linear model (LM) of distance between resightings ~ observation time (controlling for individual): $F_{1,762} = 0.02$, $p = 0.90$; 765 observations of 119 individuals). Coordinates were converted to UTM units (Zone 32N) for analyses to give position in metres on the globe. Resightings were viewed and edited where necessary in ArcMAP 10.1 (ERSI 2012) and Garmin BaseCamp software (version 4.2.4; Garmin International, Inc., Olathe, KS, USA).

Calculating territory size

The conventional method of determining territory or range size for animals is with Minimum Convex Polygons (MCP), but this method requires many resightings for accurate descriptions of space use and is subject to several biases (see Hansteen et al. 1997; Börger et al. 2006). Our aim was to determine the area a bird used over winter and the size and location of its territory, rather than exact territory boundaries. Therefore we determined an index of territory size from resightings scored as undisturbed for birds resighted in winters 1 and 2. For each individual, the territory centre was determined by averaging the position of all resightings. The mean distance between each resighting and the territory centre was then calculated and doubled to give an estimate of territory diameter. This was used as a measure of territory size. Territory size was calculated for individuals with at least five undisturbed resightings from winters 1 and 2. Five was chosen as a minimum number in order to reduce the influence of increasing resighting sample size on estimates of territory size (Börger et al. 2006), whilst still maintaining adequate sample sizes. Of the 35 and 67 birds resighted after capture in winters 1 and 2, respectively, 33 and 39 individuals had at least five independent resightings, respectively. If the minimum number of resightings required to calculate territory size was increased to 10, the average territory diameter was altered by 4 m (6%) and the result of all analyses including territory size were unchanged, suggesting that five

resightings were adequate for analyses. We used an individual's average territory diameter across years when its territory size was measured in multiple winters. Coordinates recorded with GPS devices have an error of approximately ± 5 m (our device gave an accuracy of approximately $\pm 2 - 3$ m in Nigeria), which may have influenced our measures of territory size; however we assume here that this error was similar across territories and should affect each individual measure of territory size similarly. We therefore did not adjust for GPS inaccuracy when calculating territory size.

Establishing the scale of site fidelity

To determine the degree of observed site fidelity for winter 1 birds returning in winter 2, we compared the distance between territory centres between years with territory size. Because territory size was not calculated in winter 3 for birds returning from winter 2 due to the less precise resighting methodology, we compared the distances between the mean central point of resighting locations in winter 3 and the mean central point of all available resighting locations in winter 2 to establish the degree of site fidelity in winter 3. Some individuals that were ringed as first-winter birds in winter 1 returned in both winters 2 and 3. When calculating return rates, these birds were considered as first-winter birds between winters 1 and 2 and as adults between winters 2 and 3. When modelling predictors of return rates, any birds from winter 1 that returned in multiple years were only considered in return rates between winters 1 and 2 to avoid pseudoreplication. As with calculating territory size, we did not adjust for any GPS inaccuracy because we assume this error to be unbiased and similar across all territories and years.

Establishing resighting effort and detectability

Resighting effort was determined from 94 resighting visits to sites between 1st November 2012 and 24th April 2013 when resighting routes were recorded. Note that many more resighting visits were made to all territories both outside and within this period where effort was not recorded. Visits were either partial (<50% of all territories at the site visited) or complete visits ($\geq 50\%$ of all territories visited). A territory was considered visited if the observer walked across at least 30% of the

known territory area. Across all sites, resighting effort was recorded for 33 partial and 25 complete site visits with 82 territories visited in total during this time.

The percentage probability of resighting a bird was calculated as the number times a bird was seen out of the total visits to its territory for individuals that were resighted at least once during the above period. The probability of detecting an individual across years, should that individual disperse at increasing spatial scales, was estimated for all birds resighted in winter 2 by calculating the proportion of their territory that would still be included in the study area in winter 3 after dispersal. Territory diameter was used as territory size. For birds resighted in both winters 1 and 2, territory diameter from winter 2 was used. For birds where the territory location was known but territory diameter not calculated due to an insufficient number of resightings ($n = 52$ birds), we used the mean territory diameter across all individuals ($64 \text{ m} \pm 1.8 \text{ m}$, range 11 – 106 m, $n = 113$). A GIS analysis was used to determine detection probability after dispersal (ArcMAP 10.1 (ERSI 2012)). To do this, possible territory locations after dispersal were determined using a combination of the 'buffer' tool (to create new territories of multiples of the territory size for each individual) and the 'union' feature in the Overlay Analysis Toolbox to calculate the location of territories after dispersal and the proportion still within the study area.

Within-winter residency

There was a negative relationship between capture date and residency time if individual residency time was calculated as the period from capture date to last resighting ($b = -1.22$, $t_{55} = -2.9$, $R^2 = 0.12$, $F_{1,53} = 8.5$, $p < 0.01$, $n = 55$: i.e. birds caught late in the year could only be resident for shorter periods). Furthermore, the probability of resighting a bird was not 100% for one territory visit. This meant that neither capture date or departure day could not be used as a biologically meaningful predictor of how long Whinchats chose to spend in a wintering territory. Because of this uncertainty in arrival times and relatively low resolution of measuring departure times, we investigated variation in residency within a winter simply by scoring the month of departure of all birds, as determined by not resighting an individual after

four territory visits. Departure month was then used as a response variable in a model with sex and age as predictors, and site included as a potential confounding variable, and their interactions. This method was adopted rather than the mark-recapture survival analysis initially attempted because resighting and capture effort varied across the three study winters. To determine whether shorter residency was due to mortality, return rates for the following winter were compared between individuals that left sites early (short residency) and those that remained for at least 50% of the winter (long residency). Resightings over four winters suggest that Whinchats arrive in mid-September and depart until late-April, and so we defined short residency as departure within September, October, November or December, and long residency as departure from 1st January onwards.

Sample sizes and statistical analyses

Birds were only included in the study if they had been resighted at least once after capture. Birds from sites A, B and C are included in all analyses, whereas birds from sites D and E were excluded from analyses involving territory size or winter residency because resighting locations recorded for these individuals were less accurate and none of these birds were ringed within the period required to calculate departure month (see below). One individual was excluded from analyses exploring the probability of detection because its territory was visited too infrequently. Birds which could not be confidently aged or sexed were excluded from models including age and sex as predictors. We modelled month of departure and residency time (short or long) within winter 2 only, i.e. when resighting effort was highest, and only for birds captured either in winter 2 before December, or birds returning from winter 1 and resighted before December. To exclude any transient birds or any capture effects (e.g. relocation after capture), all of these individuals had been resighted at least 30 days after capture. The numbers of individuals included in this study are shown in Table 1, with test-specific sample sizes given within 'Results'.

Aspects of wintering ecology were explored with general and generalised linear models carried out in R version 3.0.1 (R Development Core Team 2013) and RStudio Version 0.98.507. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to explore differences in

resighting probability across sites. Logistic regression (GLM) was used for exploring predictors of return rates and the influence of residency period on the probability of return in the following winter. A general linear model (LM) was used to explore predictors of departure month. Paired *t*-tests were used to explore differences in territory size between years. Multiple regression model simplification was based on Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) (Bozdogan 1987) for dredge analyses (see below), where a value of $\Delta AIC_c \geq 2$ was used to identify distinct models. For models with fewer variables, we used an ANOVA comparison between models to remove variables that failed to add a significant contribution. For models of the same or similar sample size, a 'dredge' analysis was used to identify the best, simplest models (Bartoń 2012): cases with missing values were removed from the dataset as required for dredge analyses, and resulting best models were produced using complete datasets. When presenting top models from dredge analyses, we presented models within four AIC of the top model. Model fits were evaluated from diagnostic model plots and models were presented if assumptions were reasonably met (Crawley 2007). Data were checked for normality when necessary and for multicollinearity with variance inflation factors in the CARS package (Fox and Weisberg 2010). Mean values are presented as means $\pm$ one standard error in all cases. A statistical significance level of $p < 0.05$ was chosen to reject null hypotheses.

Results

1. Return rates to the study site and influence of age and sex

Return rates were 58% in winter 2 and 52% in winter 3, averaging 54% across the two winters. In no cases did a bird fail to return in its second winter but then return in its third winter. A bird's age or sex did not influence the probability of resighting that individual in the following winter (Logistic regression: model averaged parameters of top 11 models within four AIC of top model: age: $z = 0.7$, $p = 0.47$; sex: $z = 0.04$, $p = 0.97$; body size at time of capture, winter and site also included within main model (all terms including interaction terms between age, sex and site not significant); $n = 88$).

2. Power to detect dispersal and opportunity for dispersal

Probability of detection within winters

Across all individuals, the probability of resighting an individual that was seen at least once after ringing if its territory was visited once was 63% ($\pm 2.4\%$, range 11 – 100%, $n = 81$). Each time a site was visited, 59% of birds on average were detected out of all birds whose territories were visited ($\pm 3.3\%$, range 0 – 100% detected, $n = 77$). For the period for which resighting effort was known, on average each territory was visited nine times (± 0.51 , range 1 – 18, $n = 81$) – note that further visits were made to territories where resighting effort was not recorded. When accounting for the probability of encountering a bird when its territory was visited, there was a probability of almost 100% of detecting a resident individual during a study winter.

The probability of resighting an individual did not vary between sites ($F_2 = 2.6$, $p = 0.08$, $n = 81$), nor with the number of days into the study ($F_{1,78} = 0.5$, $p = 0.47$, $n = 81$; Figure 2a). Similarly, the proportions of individuals resighted each visit did not differ between sites ($F_{2,74} = 0.5$, $p = 0.63$, $n = 77$), nor with number of days into the study ($F_{1,75} = 0.6$, $p = 0.44$, $n = 77$; Figure 2b).

Probability of detecting dispersal between years

The average territory diameter across all birds in both years was 64 m (± 1.8 m, range 11 – 106 m, $n = 113$, Figure 3). Across all birds, shifting one territory upon return reduced the probability of remaining in the study area by on average 7%, and a returning bird could disperse up to eight territories from the previous winter before the chance of it remaining within the study area dropped below 50% ($n = 130$; Table 2, Figure 3). At least 80% of the territory would remain in the study area for 25% of all birds ($n = 32$) after shifting as many as six territories (Figure 3). For birds resighted in winter 2, a 500 m shift from the previous winter's territory resulted in a 44% probability of a bird staying in the study area. No birds would have been within the study area if they dispersed 10 km or more in the following year (Table 2).

Overall power of estimating larger-scale dispersal

Overall, 89 individuals were known to be resident in winter 2. With observed return rates of 54% and site fidelity at the territory level, 48 individuals returned to their territories in the following year. Of the remaining 41 individuals, assuming all survived, eight, four and two birds should have been found within the study site if they dispersed 0.5 km, 1 km or 5 km respectively (Figure 4). If only 50% ($n = 20$) of these individuals had survived and dispersed, four, two and one birds respectively should have been detected away from their territories.

Opportunity for local dispersal

Across all returning birds, the average distance between their territory centre in the first year and the centre of the nearest unoccupied territory in the following year (i.e. a territory that was occupied in the previous winter but now empty) was 107 m (± 10.0 m, range 7 – 538 m, $n = 76$, Figure 5). On average, each individual had at least one known unoccupied territory within 100 m, and three unoccupied territories within 200 m of the centre of the territory in the previous year ($n = 80$). For birds for which the location of the territory centre was accurately known in both years, 50% of individuals had unoccupied territories that were closer to the territory centre than their average territory diameter ($n = 19$).

3. Scale of spatial site fidelity and levels of dispersal detected

Winter 1 vs. winter 2

The average movement between territory centres in winter 1 vs. winter 2 was 30 m (± 4.0 m, range = 6 – 58 m, $n = 19$; Figure 5). The furthest movement was 58.3 m. For all individuals, any movement in the centre of the territory between years was less than the territory size for that individual in winter 1 (average difference between movement across years and territory size in winter 1 = -35.5 ± 3.4 m, range = -61 – -2 m; Figure 5), showing that individuals returned to the same territory in winter 2 and that “movements” observed were likely due to the resolution at which data were collected (e.g. stochasticity from using a limited number of locations to estimate territory size index and GPS accuracy) rather than actual territory shifts.

Birds returning from winter 1 used a similar sized territory in winter 2 (paired t -test: $t = -0.07$, $df = 17$, $p = 0.95$, $n = 18$; Figure 5).

Winter 2 vs. winter 3

Across all individuals, birds were resighted on average 21 m from where they were seen in the previous year (± 3.2 m, range = 1 – 118 m, $n = 54$) and none were resighted further than 118 m from any one known location in the previous year. In terms of range size, the average difference between the maximum range in winter 2 (as determined by the furthest distance between known locations) and the distance between the furthest resighting in winter 3 from a known location in winter 2 was 55 m (± 5.5 m, range = 2 – 165 m), equal to less than the width of one territory (Figure 3).

4. Temporal scale of fidelity

Degree of residency and predictors of residency period

The minimum number of days a bird was known to be resident at a site (i.e. from capture until last resighting for birds ringed in winter 2, and from first to last resighting for birds returning from the previous winter) was 31 to 180 days (mean 107 ± 4.9 days, $n = 67$). Departure month varied from November to March (12%, 9%, 28%, 24%, 27% departing Nov, Dec, Jan, Feb and Mar respectively, $n = 67$ birds). Departure month differed significantly across sites and with age, with birds spending less of the winter at sites B and C relative to site A, and departing later if they were first-winter birds (Table 3, Figure 6).

Relationships between residency period and probability of return

Ten of 14 birds (71%) with short residency periods and 33 of 53 birds (62%) with long residency periods returned in the following winter ($n = 67$). Return rates did not differ between birds with short or long residency periods when controlling for site (Table 4); i.e. birds which were resighted for only a short duration of the winter were just as likely to return in the following winter as birds that were resident for most of the winter. We also tested month of departure as a continuous variable to see if departure date was a proxy for within winter survival (i.e. early departures were in

fact more likely to be deaths), but departure month was not a significant predictor when included in the same model ($\beta = -0.31 \pm 0.46$, $z = -0.7$, $p = 0.50$).

Discussion

Return rates, dispersal and the ability to estimate 'true' survival

The lack of local dispersal, high detection probability and low probability that large-scale dispersal occurred suggests that a 54% return rate across the study closely mirrors true between-winter survival for Whinchats. Although we are not aware of another study documenting between-winter return rates or overwinter survival for Whinchats, our return rates in both years are higher or similar to return or survival rates documented for Whinchats on the breeding grounds (return rates of 11 – 47% (Schmidt and Hantge 1954; Bezzel and Stiel 1977; Bastian 1992) and apparent survival estimates of 48% in adult males, 21% in adult females and 17% in juveniles in Switzerland (Müller et al. 2005), and 27% in Russia (Shitikov et al. 2015). Our return rates are also generally similar or higher than those documented for other site-faithful Palearctic migrants (true survival rates of adult passerines are reported to be 30 – 60% (Karr et al. 1990; Payevsky et al. 1997; Siriwardena et al. 1998)), for example Great Reed Warbler *Acrocephalus arundinaceus*: return rate of 55% (Bensch and Hasselquist 1991); Garden Warbler *Sylvia borin*: apparent survival estimates of 11 – 44% (Shitikov et al. 2013), Yellow Wagtail *Motacilla flava*: apparent survival estimates of 20 – 100% and 53% in Russia and Britain, respectively (Siriwardena et al. 1998; Shitikov et al. 2012); Barn Swallow *Hirundo rustica*: survival estimates of 36 – 42% (Møller and Szép 2005; Robinson et al. 2008); Sand Martin *Riparia riparia*: survival estimates of 29 – 31% (Cowley and Siriwardena 2005; Robinson et al. 2008); Common House Martin *Delichon urbicum*: survival estimate of 42% (Robinson et al. 2008), Common Whitethroat *Sylvia communis*: survival estimates of 9 – 39% (Shitikov et al. 2013); Reed Warbler *Acrocephalus scirpaceus*: survival estimates of 33 – 60%, and also many Neotropical migrants (Desante et al. 1995). That winter return rates are higher than documented in the breeding season is not surprising given the high site fidelity we documented and our ability to detect dispersal on the wintering grounds. If this is generally true across migrants, annual survival estimates from the wintering grounds are likely to be more accurate than those estimated on the

breeding grounds because dispersal is frequently reported during the breeding season (Paradis et al. 1998; Newton 2010b; Shitikov et al. 2015). Consequently, our results suggest that studies aiming to accurately measure true annual survival for migrants should focus on winter return rates. Most importantly, high overwinter survival (suggested by no evidence of departure month or residency time influencing between-year survival) supports previous findings that the decline in breeding populations is not a result of wintering conditions in Whinchats (Hulme and Cresswell 2012).

We are confident that our findings of extremely high site fidelity are a true representation of wintering behaviour because of our ability to detect any dispersal occurring on a number of scales. There was a high probability of encountering locally dispersing birds – at least 50% of ‘missing’ individuals would have been detected if they had dispersed up to eight territories upon return, and nine individuals would have been detected if they moved 0.5km – yet observed dispersal was extremely low. When we were able to compare territory locations between years, all individuals returned to the same territory they held in the previous winter and no bird was resighted more than 118 m from where it had been seen in the previous year. Therefore, if dispersal did occur, this was only on a larger scale (i.e. greater than 5 km). As we did not have the ability to detect these movements we cannot rule out that this population could be comprised of both highly resident and widely dispersing individuals. However, the similarity between observed return rates and those expected when comparing studies of other migrants and return rates on the breeding grounds (see above) plus extremely high site fidelity at the territory-scale implies that any large-scale dispersal was unlikely.

Site fidelity and wintering strategy

To our knowledge, this is one of the first studies to document site fidelity for a Palearctic migrant on the wintering grounds and to further explore the influence of local dispersal on this. Our results support previous observations that Whinchats are site faithful and territorial (Barshep et al. 2012), but at a much finer scale than originally thought. Although a shift of on average 30 m occurred between years,

territory centres were always within the boundaries of the old territories, and these shifts are likely an artefact of the resolution at which data were recorded and the inherent inaccuracy of GPS devices. Repeat occupancy of winter territories has been documented in several other migrants (Kricher and Davis 1986; Holmes et al. 1989; Kelsey 1989; Cuadrado 1992; Holmes and Sherry 1992; Dejaifve 1994; Skilleter 1995; Sauvage et al. 1998; Marra 2000; Salewski et al. 2000; Koronkiewicz et al. 2006), along with territoriality over winter (Kelsey 1989; Bates 1992; Brown et al. 2000; Latta and Faaborg 2001; Salewski et al. 2002; Rappole et al. 2003), indicating that high site fidelity may be relatively common across long-distance migrants.

Our findings suggest that the benefits of winter territoriality and site fidelity outweigh the benefits of competing for or moving to higher quality territories during winter. High site fidelity most likely results in site familiarity and greater predictability of foraging opportunities, plus more efficient territory defence and predator avoidance, all of which will promote survival (Brown and Long 2007; Förschler et al. 2010). Moving during winter or not holding a territory, on the other hand, is often associated with reduced survival (Rappole et al. 1989; Winker 1998). Furthermore, the benefits of high site fidelity both within and between years may be greater during winter than during the breeding season because the potential benefits of dispersing to find a mate or a suitable nesting location are absent. Site fidelity on the breeding grounds is often lower than winter, even for species with high winter site fidelity (Herremans et al. 1995; Koronkiewicz et al. 2006; Tryjanowski et al. 2007). Evidence suggests that this may also be true for Whinchats (Bezzel and Stiel 1977; Bastian 1992; Shitikov et al. 2012), with territory fidelity often reported to be lower on the breeding grounds than what we document here for winter (Bastian 1992 and references therein; I. Henderson and J. Taylor, unpublished data). Most likely, the additional pressure of mate acquisition reduces any benefits of very high fidelity at the territory-scale on the breeding grounds because both individuals would have to survive if either is to breed, and dispersal is also required to prevent inbreeding. Breeding site fidelity may therefore only benefit individuals if it occurs at a larger scale, such as fidelity to a larger breeding region. In short: there may be many reasons that force a breeding bird to move – death or movement of a

partner, lack of nesting habitat, lack of resources to raise chicks etc. (e.g. Beheler et al. 2003; Middleton et al. 2006) – while a wintering bird likely requires only a relatively low level of resources to ensure daily survival and therefore has fewer reasons to move.

Evidence for a generalist wintering strategy

High site fidelity, especially within winters, should demand a generalist wintering strategy to prevent survival and future reproduction being significantly influenced by fine-scale variation in territory characteristics. As conditions often alter during winter (Blackburn and Cresswell 2015a), a wide range of conditions must be utilised and individuals must be flexible to changing conditions if a winter territory is to be maintained. For example, Salewski et al. (2002) hypothesised that winter territoriality in Pied Flycatchers *Ficedula hypoleuca* was a result of a more diverse and generalist foraging strategy, enabling individuals to reside in and defend small areas over the winter. Other migrant species have also been suggested to be winter generalists (Latta and Faaborg 2002).

Our results indicate a lack of dominance-based territory occupancy during winter, suggesting that individual Whinchats do not compete much, if at all, for territories of higher quality. Returning Whinchats always returned to the same winter territory, regardless of the proximity of an alternative territory, and neither residency nor wintering ecology differed with age and sex. This suggests that there may be little benefit from shifting small distances (i.e. to a nearby territory). That residency differs only with site, and not with demographics, suggests that larger movements outside of the study area (i.e. to a different wintering site) are likely due to reasons other than competition between birds, and for reasons that are not spatially independent. The degradation of a wintering site, for example, would likely affect all individuals and result in the spatial differences in residency that we found. The lack of small-scale movements suggests that 1) territories did not differ greatly regarding their influence on survival, or 2) that Whinchats have few specialist wintering requirements. Consequently, variation in winter territory habitat characteristics may have few carry-over effects on migration success and future survival, and a ‘good’

winter territory is simply one that promotes survival through the winter. For example, some whinchats may be able to fatten for migration in a range of conditions, or may fatten for migration at other sites between leaving the winter territory and crossing the Sahara. We cannot disregard the theory that a lack of territory relocation within or between winters may be the result of historic wintering conditions (i.e. before anthropogenic degradation), and that birds are now simply unable or unwilling to relocate even under increasing levels of degradation (Bourn and Wint 1994). However, if this were the case we would expect low overwinter survival and reduced winter survival in more degraded habitats due to carry-over effects, but neither is the case for this population (Blackburn and Cresswell 2015a; Blackburn and Cresswell 2015b). In contrast to our results, dominance-based winter habitat occupancy has been documented for wintering Red-backed Shrikes *Lanius collurio* (Herremans 1997), Eastern Great Reed Warblers *Acrocephalus orientalis* (Nisbet and Medway 1972) and European Robins *Erithacus rubetra* (Catry et al. 2004), and for many Neotropical migrants, such as American Redstarts *Setophaga ruticilla* (Marra 2000; Marra and Holmes 2001), Prairie Warblers *Setophaga discolor* (Latta and Faaborg 2001), Hooded Warblers *Setophaga citrina* (Lynch et al. 1985; Morton 1990; Stutchbury 1994) and Black-Throated Blue Warblers *Setophaga caerulescens* (Wunderle Jr 1995), amongst others (Ornat and Greenberg 1990). In contrast to the winter, higher territory fidelity has been shown on the breeding grounds for adult Whinchats over first years and for males over females, along with higher return rates for adults over first years (Bastian 1992 and references therein).

Difference in residency times

Only whether birds had short or long residency times, and not the degree of territoriality (i.e. age or sex-specific variation in the degree of territory defence) varied across sites, as is seen also in wintering Pied Flycatchers (Salewski et al. 2002). Even though some Whinchats were resident for only short residency, these individuals were just as likely to return in the following winter, suggesting that some individuals may have multiple wintering sites. Multiple site use by individuals has been described for several migrants in both the Neotropical and Palearctic system (Belda et al. 2007; McKinnon et al. 2013). Some migrants may move southward

during the winter (Cresswell et al. 2009), possibly in response to changing conditions (Jones 1995). The early departure of these individuals may provide territories for winter floaters, the presence of which has been suggested by some studies (Winker 1998), principally because birds that disappear during winter are replaced by new individuals (Morton et al. 1987; Holmes et al. 1989; Brown and Long 2007). As already suggested, any reasons for relocating appear to be linked by site only, and not because of competition between individuals for territories of varying quality, suggesting that Whinchats may relocate if a wintering site becomes unsuitable over the winter. Observations made during this study suggest that whilst some empty territories were reoccupied, others remained empty for the remainder of the winter, even though they had been used previously. Further studies involving more intensive monitoring or tracking with geolocators would be needed to determine the extent of any movements. Because individuals do not appear to compete for territories and do not relocate upon return, even when given the opportunity, and likely have generalist wintering requirements, winter territories are probably plentiful, and therefore not all suitable territories are occupied.

In summary, we documented extremely high site fidelity by individuals both between and within-winters, and a lack of dominance-based territory occupancy for a declining long-distance migrant. We provide strong evidence for a generalist wintering strategy and suggest that winter territory quality may have little influence on future survival and thus population declines. This study supports the serial residency hypothesis (Cresswell 2014), where selection acts for most migrants to have generalist habitat requirements, allowing them to survive in and remain faithful to even relatively low quality, but adequate and familiar sites. Due to lower dispersal and higher site fidelity during winter compared to breeding, the ability to accurately measure annual survival rates may be highest on the wintering grounds. Furthermore, generalist wintering requirements and the seemingly high availability of suitable wintering territories may provide some resilience to the on-going habitat degradation occurring throughout Africa (Bourn and Wint 1994).

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the Leventis Conservation Foundation. We thank the staff and associates of the A.P. Leventis Ornithological Research Institute who made this study possible and who assisted with data collection, and the referees who helped to improve this manuscript. This is paper number (XX – *number to be added in proof stage*) from the AP Leventis ornithological Research Institute. This study complies with the current ethic regulations of Nigeria and the A.P. Leventis Ornithological Research Institute.

References

- Anders A.D., Marshall M.R. (2005) Increasing the accuracy of productivity and survival estimates in assessing landbird population status. *Conserv Biol.* 19:66-74. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00543.x.
- Baillie S.R., Peach W.J. (1992) Population limitation in Palearctic-African migrant passerines. *Ibis.* 134:120-132. doi:10.1111/j.1474-919X.1992.tb04742.x.
- Baker M., Nur N., Geupel G.R. (1995) Correcting biased estimates of dispersal and survival due to limited study area: theory and an application using wrentits. *The Condor.* 97:663-674. doi:10.2307/1369175.
- Barshep Y., Ottosson U., Waldenstroem J., Hulme M., Svensson S. (2012) Non-breeding ecology of the Whinchat *Saxicola rubetra* in Nigeria. *Ornis Svec.* 22:25-32.
- Bartoń K. (2012) MuMIn: multi-model inference. R package version. 1.
- Bastian H.V. (1992) Breeding and natal dispersal of Whinchats *Saxicola rubetra*. *Ring Migration.* 13:13-19. doi:10.1080/03078698.1992.9674010.
- Bates J.M. (1992) Winter territorial behavior of Gray Vireos. *Wilson Bull.* 104:425-433.
- Beheler A.S., Rhodes Jr O.E., Weeks Jr H.P., Moore F. (2003) Breeding site and mate fidelity in Eastern Phoebe (Sayornis phoebe) in Indiana. *The Auk.* 120:990-999. doi:10.1642/0004-8038(2003)120[0990:BSAMFI]2.0.CO;2.
- Belda E.J., Barba E., Monros J.S. (2007) Resident and transient dynamics, site fidelity and survival in wintering Blackcaps *Sylvia atricapilla*: evidence from capture-recapture analyses. *Ibis.* 149:396–404. doi:10.1111/j.1474-919X.2007.00657.x.

680 Bensch S., Hasselquist D. (1991) Territory infidelity in the polygynous great reed
681 warbler *Acrocephalus arundinaceus*: the effect of variation in territory
682 attractiveness. *J Anim Ecol.* 60:857-871.

683 Berthold P., Fiedler W., Schlenker R., Querner U. (1998) 25-year study of the
684 population development of central European songbirds: a general decline,
685 most evident in long-distance migrants. *Naturwissenschaften.* 85:350-353.
686 doi:10.1007/s001140050514.

687 Bezzel E., Stiel K. (1977) The biology of the whinchat *Saxicola rubetra* in the bavarian
688 alps. *Anzeiger der Ornithologischen Gesellschaft in Bayern.* 17:1-9.

689 BirdLife International (2004) Birds in Europe: population estimates, trends and
690 conservation status. BirdLife Conservation Series No. 12.

691 Blackburn E., Cresswell W. (2015a) Generalist winter habitat requirements for a
692 declining over- wintering migrant. Manuscript submitted for publication.

693 Blackburn E., Cresswell W. (2015b) High overwinter and annual survival for a
694 declining Palearctic migrant: evidence that wintering conditions may not limit
695 migrant populations. Manuscript submitted for publication.

696 Börger L. et al. (2006) Effects of sampling regime on the mean and variance of home
697 range size estimates. *J Anim Ecol.* 75:1393-1405. doi:10.1111/j.1365-
698 2656.2006.01164.x.

699 Both C. et al. (2006) Pied Flycatchers *Ficedula hypoleuca* travelling from Africa to
700 breed in Europe: differential effects of winter and migration conditions on
701 breeding date. *Ardea.* 94:511-525.

702 Bourn D., Wint W. (1994) Livestock, land use and agricultural intensification in sub-
703 Saharan Africa. Pastoral Development Network Paper 37a. Overseas
704 Development Institute (ODI), London.

705 Bozdogan H. (1987) Model selection and Akaike's information criterion (AIC): The
706 general theory and its analytical extensions. *Psychometrika.* 52:345-370.
707 doi:10.1007/BF02294361.

708 Brown D.R., Long J.A. (2007) What is a winter floater? Causes, consequences, and
709 implications for habitat selection. *The Condor.* 109:548-565.
710 doi:10.1650/8351.1.

711 Brown D.R., Stouffer P.C., Strong C.M. (2000) Movement and territoriality of
 712 wintering hermit thrushes in Southeastern Louisiana. *Wilson Bull.* 112:347-
 713 353. doi:10.1676/0043-5643(2000)112[0347:MATOWH]2.0.CO;2.

714 Catry P., Campos A., Almada V., Cresswell W. (2004) Winter segregation of migrant
 715 European robins *Erithacus rubecula* in relation to sex, age and size. *J Avian*
 716 *Biol.* 35:204-209. doi:0.1111/j.0908-8857.2004.03266.x.

717 Cowley E., Siriwardena G.M. (2005) Long-term variation in survival rates of Sand
 718 Martins *Riparia riparia*: dependence on breeding and wintering ground
 719 weather, age and sex, and their population consequences. *Bird Study.*
 720 52:237-251. doi:10.1080/00063650509461397.

721 Crawley M.J. (2007) *The R Book*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester.

722 Cresswell W. (2014) Migratory connectivity of Palaearctic-African migratory birds
 723 and their responses to environmental change: the serial residency
 724 hypothesis. *Ibis.* 156:493-510. doi:10.1111/ibi.12168.

725 Cresswell W., Boyd M., Stevens M. (2009) Movements of Palearctic and Afrotropical
 726 bird species during the dry season (November–February) within Nigeria. In:
 727 Harebottle DM, Craig AJFK, Anderson MD, Rakotomanana, H. Muchai. (eds)
 728 *Proceedings of the 12th Pan African Ornithological Congress, 2008.* 2008 edn.
 729 Animal Demography Unit, Cape Town, South Africa, pp 8–28.

730 Cuadrado M. (1992) Year to year recurrence and site-fidelity of blackcaps *sylvia*
 731 *atricapilla* and robins *erithacus rubecula* in a mediterranean wintering area.
 732 *Ring Migration.* 13:36-42. doi:10.1080/03078698.1992.9674013.

733 DeJaifve P.A. (1994) Ecology and behavior of a palearctic migrant in Africa. The
 734 wintering of the winchat *Saxicola rubetra* in Zaïre and its winter distribution
 735 in Africa. *Rev Ecol Terre Vie.* 49:35-52.

736 Desante D.F., Burton K.M., Saracco J.F., Walker B.L. (1995) Productivity indices and
 737 survival rate estimates from MAPS, a continent-wide programme of constant-
 738 effort mist-netting in North America. *J Appl Statist.* 22:935-948.
 739 doi:10.1080/02664769524720.

740 Ergon T., Gardner B. (2013) Separating mortality and emigration: modelling space
 741 use, dispersal and survival with robust-design spatial capture-recapture data.
 742 *Methods Ecol Evol.* doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12133.

743 ERSI (2012) ArcGIS Desktop: Release 10 vol 2. California, Environmental Systems
744 Research Institute, Redlands.

745 Förschler M.I., del Val E., Bairlein F. (2010) Extraordinary high natal philopatry in a
746 migratory passerine. J Ornithol. 151:745-748. doi:10.1007/s10336-010-0495-
747 y.

748 Fox J., Weisberg H.S. (2010) An R companion to applied regression. Sage
749 Publications, California.

750 Gilroy J.J., Virzi T., Boulton R.L., Lockwood J.L. (2012) A new approach to the
751 “apparent survival” problem: estimating true survival rates from mark-
752 recapture studies. Ecology. 93:1509-1516. doi:10.1890/12-0124.1.

753 Hansteen T.L., Andreassen H.P., Ims R.A. (1997) Effects of spatiotemporal scale on
754 autocorrelation and home range estimators. J Wildl Manage. 61:280-290.
755 doi:10.2307/3802583.

756 Henderson I., Calladine J., Massimino D., Taylor J.A., Gillings S. (2015) Evidence for
757 contrasting causes of population change in two closely related, sympatric
758 breeding species the Whinchat *Saxicola rubetra* and Stonechat *Saxicola*
759 *torquata* in Britain. Bird Study. 61:553-565.
760 doi:10.1080/00063657.2014.962482.

761 Henderson I.G., Fuller R.J., Conway G.J., Gough S.J. (2004) Evidence for declines in
762 populations of grassland-associated birds in marginal upland areas of Britain.
763 Bird Study. 51:12-19. doi:10.1080/00063650409461327.

764 Herremans M. (1997) Habitat segregation of male and female Red-backed shrikes
765 *Lanius collurio* and Lesser Grey Shrikes *Lanius minor* in the Kalahari basin,
766 Botswana. J Avian Biol. 28:240-248. doi:10.2307/3676975.

767 Herremans M., Herremans-Tonnoeyr D., Borello W.D. (1995) Non-breeding site-
768 fidelity of Red-backed Shrikes *Lanius collurio* in Botswana. Ostrich. 66:145-
769 147.

770 Holmes R.T., Sherry T.W. (1992) Site fidelity of migratory warblers in temperate
771 breeding and Neotropical wintering areas: Implications for population
772 dynamics, habitat selection, and conservation. In: J. M. Hagan I, Johnston DW
773 (eds) Ecology and Conservation of Neotropical Migrant Landbirds.
774 Smithsonian Institution Press., Washington D.C., pp 563-575.

775 Holmes R.T., Sherry T.W., Reitsma L. (1989) Population structure, territoriality and
 776 overwinter survival of two migrant warbler species in Jamaica. *The Condor*.
 777 91:545-561. doi:10.2307/1368105.
 778 Hulme M.F., Cresswell W. (2012) Density and behaviour of Whinchats *Saxicola*
 779 *rubetra* on African farmland suggest that winter habitat conditions do not
 780 limit European breeding populations. *Ibis*. 154:680-692. doi:10.1111/j.1474-
 781 919X.2012.01258.x.
 782 Jenni L., Winkler R. (2004) Moults and ageing of European passerines. Academic
 783 Press, London.
 784 Jones P.J. (1995) Migration strategies of Palearctic passerines in Africa. *Isr J Zool*.
 785 41:393-406. doi:10.1080/00212210.1995.10688809.
 786 Karr J.R., Nichols J.D., Klimkiewicz M.K., Brawn J.D. (1990) Survival rates of birds of
 787 tropical and temperate forests: will the dogma survive? *Am Nat*. 136:277-
 788 291. doi:10.1086/285098.
 789 Kelsey M.G. (1989) A comparison of the song and territorial behaviour of a long-
 790 distance migrant, the Marsh Warbler *Acrocephalus palustris*, in summer and
 791 winter. *Ibis*. 131:403-414. doi:10.1111/j.1474-919X.1989.tb02788.x.
 792 King J.M.B., Hutchinson J.M.C. (2001) Site fidelity and recurrence of some migrant
 793 bird species in The Gambia. *Ring Migration*. 20:292-302.
 794 doi:10.1080/03078698.2001.9674255.
 795 Koronkiewicz T.J., Sogge M.K., Van Riper III C., Paxton E.H. (2006) Territoriality, site
 796 fidelity, and survivorship of Willow Flycatchers wintering in Costa Rica. *The*
 797 *Condor*. 108:558-570. doi:10.1650 / 0010-5422 (2006) 108 [558: TSFASO]
 798 2.0.CO; 2.
 799 Kricher J.C., Davis W.E., Jr. (1986) Returns and winter-site fidelity of North American
 800 migrants banded in Belize, Central America. *J Field Ornithol*. 57:48-52.
 801 doi:10.2307/4513089.
 802 Latta S.C., Faaborg J. (2001) Winter site fidelity of Prairie Warblers in the Dominican
 803 Republic. *The Condor*. 103:455-468. doi:10.1650/0010-
 804 5422(2001)103[0455:WSFOPW]2.0.CO;2.

805 Latta S.C., Faaborg J. (2002) Demographic and population responses of Cape May
 806 Warblers wintering in multiple habitats. *Ecology*. 83:2502-2515.
 807 doi:10.2307/3071810.

808 Lynch J.F., Morton E.S., Van der Voort M.E. (1985) Habitat segregation between the
 809 sexes of wintering Hooded Warblers (*Wilsonia citrina*). *The Auk*. 102:714-721.

810 Marra P.P. (2000) The role of behavioral dominance in structuring patterns of habitat
 811 occupancy in a migrant bird during the nonbreeding season. *Behav Ecol*.
 812 11:299-308. doi:10.1093/beheco/11.3.299.

813 Marra P.P., Holmes R.T. (2001) Consequences of dominance-mediated habitat
 814 segregation in American Redstarts during the nonbreeding season. *The Auk*.
 815 118:92-104. doi:10.1642/0004-8038(2001)118[0092:CODMHS]2.0.CO;2.

816 Marshall M.R., Diefenbach D.R., Wood L.A., Cooper R.J. (2004) Annual survival
 817 estimation of migratory songbirds confounded by incomplete breeding site-
 818 fidelity: study designs that may help. *Anim Biodivers Conserv*. 27:59-72.

819 Marshall M.R., Wilson R.R., Cooper R.J., Bonney R., Pashley D.N., Cooper R.J., Niles L.
 820 (2000) Estimating survival of Neotropical-Nearctic migratory birds: are they
 821 dead or just dispersed. In: R. Bonney, D. N.Pashley, R. J.Cooper, Niles L (eds)
 822 US Forest Service General Technical Report RMRS-P-16. U.S. Department of
 823 Agriculture Forest Service, Ogden, Utah, .

824 McKinnon E.A., Fraser K.C., Stutchbury B.J.M. (2013) New discoveries in landbird
 825 migration using geolocators, and a flight plan for the future. *The Auk*.
 826 130:211-222. doi:10.1525/auk.2013.12226.

827 McNeil R. (1982) Winter resident repeats and returns of austral and boreal migrant
 828 birds banded in Venezuela. *J Field Ornithol*. 53:125-132.

829 Middleton H.A., Morrissey C.A., Green D.J. (2006) Breeding territory fidelity in a
 830 partial migrant, the American dipper *Cinclus mexicanus*. *J Avian Biol*. 37:169-
 831 178. doi:10.1111/j.2006.0908-8857.03514.x.

832 Møller A.P., Szép T. (2005) Rapid evolutionary change in a secondary sexual
 833 character linked to climatic change. *J Evol Biol*. 18:481-495.
 834 doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2004.00807.x.

835 Morton E.S. (1990) Habitat segregation by sex in the hooded warbler: experiments
836 on proximate causation and discussion of its evolution. *Am Nat.* 135:319-333.
837 doi:10.1086/285048.

838 Morton E.S., Lynch J.F., Young K., Mehlhop P. (1987) Do male Hooded Warblers
839 exclude females from nonbreeding territories in tropical forest? *The Auk.*
840 104:133-135.

841 Müller M., Spaar R., Schifferli L., Jenni L. (2005) Effects of changes in farming of
842 subalpine meadows on a grassland bird, the whinchat (*Saxicola rubetra*). *J*
843 *Ornithol.* 146:14-23. doi:10.1007/s10336-004-0059-0.

844 Newton I. (2004) Population limitation in migrants. *Ibis.* 146:197-226.
845 doi:10.1111/j.1474-919X.2004.00293.x.

846 Newton I. (2006) Can conditions experienced during migration limit the population
847 levels of birds? *J Ornithol.* 147:146-166. doi:10.1007/s10336-006-0058-4.

848 Newton I. (2010a) Bird migration. Collins, London, UK.

849 Newton I. (2010b) The migration ecology of birds. Academic Press, London.

850 Nisbet I.C.T., Medway L. (1972) Dispersion, population ecology and migration of
851 eastern great reed warblers *Acrocephalus orientalis* wintering in Malaysia.
852 *Ibis.* 114:451-494. doi:10.1111/j.1474-919X.1972.tb00850.x.

853 Norris D.R., Marra P.P., Kyser T.K., Sherry T.W., Ratcliffe L.M. (2004) Tropical winter
854 habitat limits reproductive success on the temperate breeding grounds in a
855 migratory bird. *Proc R Soc Lond B.* 271:59-64. doi:10.1098/rspb.2003.2569.

856 Ornat A.L., Greenberg R. (1990) Sexual segregation by habitat in migratory warblers
857 in Quintana Roo, Mexico. *The Auk.* 107:539-543.

858 Paradis E., Baillie S.R., Sutherland W.J., Gregory R.D. (1998) Patterns of natal and
859 breeding dispersal in birds. *J Anim Ecol.* 67:518-536. doi:10.1046/j.1365-
860 2656.1998.00215.x.

861 Payevsky V., Vysotsky V., Yefremov V., Markovets M., Morozov Y., Shapoval A. (1997)
862 Sex-specific survival rates in birds. *Zhurnal obshchei biologii.* 58:5-20.

863 Pulido F. (2007) Phenotypic changes in spring arrival: evolution, phenotypic
864 plasticity, effects of weather and condition. *Clim Res.* 35:5-23.
865 doi:10.3354/cr00711.

866 R Development Core Team (2013) R: A language and environment for statistical
867 computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL
868 <http://www.R-project.org/>.

869 Rappole J.H., King D.I., Diez J. (2003) Winter vs. breeding-habitat limitation for an
870 endangered avian migrant. *Ecol Appl.* 13:735-742. doi:10.1890/1051-
871 0761(2003)013[0735:WVBLFA]2.0.CO;2.

872 Rappole J.H., Ramos M.A., Winker K. (1989) Wintering Wood Thrush movements and
873 mortality in southern Veracruz. *The Auk.* 106:402-410.
874 doi:dx.doi.org/10.1676/13-187.1.

875 Reudink M.W., Marra P.P., Kyser T.K., Boag P.T., Langin K.M., Ratcliffe L.M. (2009)
876 Non-breeding season events influence sexual selection in a long-distance
877 migratory bird. *Proc R Soc Lond B.* 276:1619-1626.
878 doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.1452.

879 Robinson R.A., Balmer D.E., Marchant J.H. (2008) Survival rates of hirundines in
880 relation to British and African rainfall. *Ring Migration.* 24:1-6.
881 doi:10.1080/03078698.2008.9674375.

882 Salewski V., Bairlein F., Leisler B. (2000) Recurrence of some palaeartic migrant
883 passerine species in West Africa. *Ring Migration.* 20:29-30.
884 doi:10.1080/03078698.2000.9674224.

885 Salewski V., Bairlein F., Leisler B. (2002) Different wintering strategies of two
886 Palearctic migrants in West Africa - a consequence of foraging strategies?
887 *Ibis.* 144:85-93. doi:10.1046/j.0019-1019.2001.00007.x.

888 Sanderson F.J., Donald P.F., Pain D.J., Burfield I.J., Van Bommel F.P.J. (2006) Long-
889 term population declines in Afro-Palearctic migrant birds. *Biol Conserv.*
890 131:93-105. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2006.02.008.

891 Sauvage A., Rumsey S., Rodwell S. (1998) Recurrence of Palaeartic birds in the lower
892 Senegal river valley. *Malimbus.* 20:33-53.

893 Schaub M., Royle J.A. (2013) Estimating true instead of apparent survival using
894 spatial Cormack-Jolly-Seber models. *Methods Ecol Evol*:doi: 10.1111/2041-
895 1210X.12134.

896 Schmidt K., Hantge E. (1954) Studien an einer farbig beringten Population des
 897 Braunkehlchens (*Saxicola rubetra*). J Ornithol. 95:130-173.
 898 doi:10.1007/BF01951433.

899 Sherry T.W., Holmes R.T. (1996) Winter habitat quality, population limitation, and
 900 conservation of Neotropical-Nearctic migrant birds. Ecology. 77:36-48.
 901 doi:10.2307/2265652.

902 Shitikov D., Fedotova S., Gagieva V., Fedchuk D., Dubkova E., Vaytina T. (2012)
 903 Breeding-site fidelity and dispersal in isolated populations of three migratory
 904 passerines. Ornis Fenn. 89:53-62.

905 Shitikov D.A., Morozova M.M., Yurchenko Y.A., Anashina A.D. (2013) Apparent
 906 survival rates of two *Sylvia* warbler species in northwestern Russia. Ringing
 907 Migration. 28:16-20. doi:10.1080/03078698.2013.810858.

908 Shitikov D.A., Vaytina T.M., Gagieva V.A., Fedchuk D.V. (2015) Breeding success
 909 affects site fidelity in a Whinchat *Saxicola rubetra* population in abandoned
 910 fields. Bird Study. 62:96-105. doi:10.1080/00063657.2014.988120.

911 Siriwardena G.M., Baillie S.R., Wilson J.D. (1998) Variation in the survival rates of
 912 some British passerines with respect to their population trends on farmland.
 913 Bird Study. 45:276-292. doi:10.1080/00063659809461099.

914 Skilleter M. (1995) Winter site fidelity of Redstart *Phoenicurus phoenicurus* in N.
 915 Nigeria. Malimbus. 17:101-102.

916 Steifetten Ø., Dale S. (2006) Viability of an endangered population of ortolan
 917 buntings: the effect of a skewed operational sex ratio. Biol Conserv. 132:88-
 918 97. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2006.03.016.

919 Studds C.E., Kyser T.K., Marra P.P. (2008) Natal dispersal driven by environmental
 920 conditions interacting across the annual cycle of a migratory songbird. Proc
 921 Natl Acad Sci. 105:2929–2933. doi:10.1073/pnas.0710732105.

922 Stutchbury B.J. (1994) Competition for winter territories in a Neotropical migrant:
 923 the role of age, sex and color. The Auk. 111:63-69.

924 Thaxter C.B., Joys A.C., Gregory R.D., Baillie S.R., Noble D.G. (2010) Hypotheses to
 925 explain patterns of population change among breeding bird species in
 926 England. Biol Conserv. 143:2006-2019. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2010.05.004.

927 Tryjanowski P., Goławski A., Kuźniak S., Mokwa T., Antczak M. (2007) Disperse or
 928 stay? Exceptionally High breeding-site infidelity in the Red-Backed Shrike
 929 *Lanius collurio*. *Ardea*. 95:316-320. doi:10.5253/078.095.0214.
 930 Vickery J.A., Ewing S.R., Smith K.W., Pain D.J., Bairlein F., Škorpilová J., Gregory R.D.
 931 (2014) The decline of Afro-Palaeartic migrants and an assessment of
 932 potential causes. *Ibis*. 156:1-22. doi:10.1111/ibi.12118.
 933 Warkentin I.G., Hernandez D. (1996) The conservation implications of site fidelity: a
 934 case study involving nearctic-neotropical migrant songbirds wintering in a
 935 Costa Rican mangrove. *Biol Conserv*. 77:143-150. doi:10.1016/0006-
 936 3207(95)00146-8.
 937 Winker K. (1998) The concept of floater. *Ornitol Neotropical*. 9:111-119.
 938 Wunderle Jr J.M. (1995) Population characteristics of Black-throated Blue Warblers
 939 wintering in three sites on Puerto Rico. *The Auk*. 112:931-946.
 940
 941

TABLES & FIGURES

Table 1 Numbers of birds involved in the study each year which were resighted at least once and known to be resident, separated by winter and age. Figures show numbers of individuals, with percentages in brackets. Birds ringed as first-winter birds are included in adult totals for subsequent years if they returned after their ringing year. Birds of unknown age (winter 1: $n = 1$, winter 2: $n = 2$) are excluded from age-specific totals but are shown in brackets in the study total column. In four cases a bird was only resighted after capture in the following winter (two in winter 1 and two in winter 2).

	First-winter	Adult	Study total (+ age unknown)
<i>Winter 1</i>	12 (33%)	24 (67%)	36 (1)
<i>Winter 2</i>	36 (42%)	50 (58%)	88 (2)
<i>Winter 3</i>	48 (34%)	94 (66%)	142 (0)
<i>Total</i>			195 (3)

952 **Table 2** The detectability of birds should they relocate varying distances away from their
953 territories, as determined by the proportion of the new territory that would remain within
954 the study area after that movement ($n = 130$).

Small movements				Large movements	
No. territories moved	Mean distance ($\pm$ SE)	Mean proportion of territory in study area ($\pm$ SE)	No. birds with $\geq 50\%$ probability of detection	Distance moved	Mean probability of remaining in study area ($\pm$ SE)
1	96 (1.9)	1.00 (0.002)	130 (100%)	500 m	0.44 (1.9)
2	160 (3.1)	0.98 (0.005)	130 (100%)	1 km	0.16 (0.8)
3	224 (4.4)	0.96 (0.005)	130 (100%)	5 km	0.02 (0.2)
4	288 (5.6)	0.81 (0.02)	120 (92%)	10 km	0
5	352 (6.9)	0.73 (0.02)	109 (84%)		
6	416 (8.1)	0.64 (0.02)	96 (74%)		
7	480 (9.4)	0.54 (0.02)	78 (60%)		
8	544 (10.6)	0.47 (0.02)	68 (52%)		

955 **Table 3** Results from general linear models (LM) exploring predictors of departure month.
956 The first model (initial full model of: departure month ~ age + sex + site + age*site + sex*site,
957 where September = month 1; $n = 63$) is presented as the results from averaging the top four
958 models (within 4 AIC of the top model), along with the top model. SE for top model = 1.0 on
959 61 df; multiple R-squared = 0.45; $F_{3,61} = 16.8$; overall p -value = <0.0001 , $n = 65$. Note that site
960 A and age = adult are the reference categories. Significant terms are shown in bold.
961

All models within 4 AIC of top model

Model	df	LogLik	AICc	ΔAIC_c	Weight
Site + age	5	-86.03	183.10	0.00	0.49
Site + age + site:age	7	-84.48	185.00	1.90	0.19
Site + age + sex	6	-85.92	185.33	2.23	0.16
Site	4	-88.39	185.47	2.37	0.15

Full model			All models delta AIC < 4			Top model			
Variable	z	p	Model-averaged parameter estimate	SE	Relative weight	Parameter estimate	SE	t	p
(Intercept)	24.4	<0.0001	6.1	0.2		6.1	0.2	30.0	<0.0001
Age FW	1.8	0.067	0.5	0.3	0.85	0.5	0.2	2.1	0.04
Site B	4.0	<0.0001	-1.2	0.3	1.00	-1.2	0.3	-4.5	<0.0001
Site C	4.7	<0.0001	-2.5	0.5		-2.3	0.4	-6.5	<0.0001
Age FW:site B	0.4	0.70	-0.2	0.6	0.19				
Age FW:site C	1.4	0.16	1.1	0.8					
Sex M	0.4	0.66	0.1	0.3	0.16				

Table 4 Results from logistic regression analyses (GLM) exploring the influence of residency time (short or long) on the probability of return in the following year, from the model of: returned next year ~ residency time (short or long) + site. The Null model was the top model (all terms NS); residual deviance for full model = 86.2 on 63 df. Note that site A and long residency time are the reference categories; $n = 67$.

Variable	Estimate	SE	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	0.70	0.39	1.9	0.063
Residency (S)	0.55	0.75	0.7	0.46
Site B	-0.56	0.56	-0.8	0.42
Site C	-0.51	0.83	-0.6	0.54

FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig. 1 Map of the six study sites and their location within Nigeria in West Africa (•). Sites A, B and C were used in all three winters; sites D and E in winters 2 and 3, and sites marked x used in winter 3 only (see *Methods*). Note sites exist for logistical reasons rather than representing biologically distinct areas, although they are considered because of variation in sampling time and effort with site.

Fig. 2 a) The percentage chance of resighting a bird if its territory was visited, and **b)** the proportion of birds resighted out of the number of territories visited during a site visit, across the three study sites. There was no difference in the probability of seeing a bird, or in the proportion of birds detected, during visits across sites.

Fig. 3 The probability of detecting a returning bird within the study site in the following year if small scale dispersal occurred from the territory location in the previous year (grey points, as determined by the proportion of the study area that could contain the territory after dispersal), and the maximum distance individuals were actually observed to move the following year (grey bars; $n = 54$). The shade of each point represents the frequency of individuals with that value, where darker shades represent higher frequencies, starting from black (furthest left data point). The mean proportion of the new territory within the study area should dispersal occur is also shown (solid black line) with upper and lower CIs (dashed lines).

Fig. 4 The number of birds estimated to be within the study area if dispersal occurred of 0.5 km, 1 km and 5 km upon return to the study site the following winter assuming a return rate of 54%, as a function of the total number of birds studied in a year. The actual number of individuals we studied – i.e. where territory diameter was measured – is also shown (♦; $n = 112$).

Fig. 5 Map of study site A showing the territories in both years of birds ringed in winter 1 that returned in winter 2, birds that did not return in winter 2, and birds newly ringed in winter 2, identified by age. Each circle represents a whinchat territory in either winter 1 or winter 2, the radius of which is equal to the individual's index of territory size (m). Connecting lines joins territories belonging to the same individual in winters 1 and

winter 2. Note that territories of birds ringed in winter 2 were not necessarily unoccupied in winter 1. Stippled areas show areas of thick scrub; areas with tree symbols show wooded patches. All territories of non-returning birds and territories occupied in winter 2 by first year birds represent territories available to birds returning from winter 1. The inset figure shows the average territory size in each winter and the average distance between territories of a returning individual in winters 1 and 2. Overall the figure illustrates birds returned to the same territory used in the previous year despite many empty territories being available close by.

Fig. 6 Departure month (from September, where September = month 1) according to age (first-winter or adult) and site. Values are predicted from the model: LM of departure month ~ site + age (Table 3, $n = 63$). Departure month differed significantly between sites and with age.

Fig. 1

Fig. 2

Fig. 3

Fig. 4

Fig. 5

Fig. 6