

1 Fiona M. Caryl, Australian Research Centre for Urban Ecology, School of Botany, University of
2 Melbourne, Parkville 3010, Victoria, Australia. Tel: + 61 3 8344 9981. Fax: +61 3 9347 9123.
3 Email: fcaryl@unimelb.edu.au

4

5 Marten in highly fragmented landscapes.

6

7 **MARTEN in the matrix: the importance of non-forested habitats for forest carnivores in**
8 **fragmented landscapes.**

9

10 Fiona M. Caryl, Christopher P. Quine and Kirsty J. Park.

11

12 *Australian Research Centre for Urban Ecology, c/o School of Botany, University of Melbourne,*
13 *Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia. (FMC)*

14 *Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA, Scotland, UK.*
15 *(FMC, KJP)*

16 *Forest Research, Centre for Human and Ecological Sciences, Northern Research Station, Roslin,*
17 *Midlothian, EH25 9SY, Scotland, UK. (CPQ)*

18 This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced version of an article accepted for publication in Journal of Mammalogy following peer review. The version of record Fiona M. Caryl, Christopher P. Quine, Kirsty J. Park; Martens in the matrix: the importance of nonforested habitats for forest carnivores in fragmented landscapes. J Mammal 2012; 93 (2): 464-474: is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1644/11-MAMM-A-149.1>

19 The intervening landscape between patches of forest (i.e. the ‘matrix’) has enormous potential to
20 mitigate the negative effects of forest fragmentation. However, to release this potential requires
21 greater understanding how individual species perceive the matrix. Here we investigated use of
22 the matrix by pine marten *Martes martes* in a region with low forest cover (Scotland). We radio-
23 tracked 11 marten to determine their habitat preferences, then combined our data with those
24 published from 5 additional Scottish landscapes to examine how home-range size and diet varied
25 with forest edge density, i.e., fragmentation. Our tracking showed that although mature forest
26 was the most preferred habitat, certain matrix habitats (scrub and tussock grassland) were also
27 consistently selected. These 2 habitats provided marten with fundamental resources that are of
28 limited availability within intensively managed plantation forests: den sites and primary prey
29 (*Microtus voles*). The smaller-bodied female marten were more risk-averse than males, avoiding
30 habitats that lacked structural cover near the ground (moorland, agricultural pastures and closed-
31 canopy forest), suggesting that structural complexity is important in maintaining functional
32 connectivity within landscapes. Our synthesis of data across landscapes indicated that marten
33 benefit from supplemental resources in matrix habitats; consumption of small mammals
34 increased with fragmentation and coincided with an initial increase in marten density. However,
35 marten population densities decreased once fragmentation passed a threshold level. Our results
36 demonstrate that habitat complementation at the landscape-scale is essential for some forest-
37 associated species. Resource supplementation from the matrix may be particularly important in
38 regions with a long history of low forest cover or where forest cover is now dominated by
39 afforested plantations, which may lack essential resources.

40 **Keywords** afforestation, functional connectivity, habitat complementation, habitat selection,
41 home range, *Martes martes*, foraging ecology, plantation, resource subsidy, Scotland.

42 * *Correspondent: fcaryl@unimelb.edu.au*

43 Conceptual models of forest fragmentation that contrast ‘habitat’ patches with a uniformly
44 unsuitable ‘matrix’ (i.e. the ‘non-habitat’ surrounding habitat patches) ignore the importance of
45 heterogeneity within the matrix (Kupfer et al. 2006). While binary fragmentation models may be
46 appropriate for some forest-specialists, for many species the matrix forms a continuum of
47 habitats of varying permeability (Haila 2002; Fischer et al. 2004). Matrix permeability is
48 determined by the structural similarity between matrix habitats and remnant habitats, the
49 perception of which is both species- and context-dependent (Kupfer et al. 2006). As ecological
50 processes within remnants (such as dispersal and foraging) vary as a function of their
51 surroundings, the matrix has great potential to mitigate the negative effects of habitat loss and
52 fragmentation (Dunford and Freemark 2004). Functional connectivity may be maintained even
53 within highly fragmented landscapes depending on how an organism perceives and responds to
54 the intervening matrix between remnants (Ricketts 2001; Bélisle 2005). In some cases, the
55 matrix may provide alternative or supplementary resources (e.g., food or nest sites) that support
56 greater population densities than would be expected within remnants alone ('habitat
57 complementation' e.g., Andrén 1994). Ignoring the ecological qualities of the matrix may
58 therefore result in a gross underestimation of its importance to organisms within remnants, and
59 its potential to serve as functional habitat. To better understand how wildlife populations persist
60 within fragmented landscapes, it is necessary to determine if, how and why animals utilize
61 matrix habitats.

62 The European pine marten *Martes martes* is often described as a forest-dependent
63 specialist of late-successional forests, an association that may be partly due to a large number of
64 marten-habitat studies occurring within the forest-dominated landscapes of Fennoscandia
65 (Lindström 1989; Brainerd 1990; Storch et al. 1990; Kurki et al. 1998), and to implied
66 similarities with congeneric American marten (*M. americana*) within the equally forested regions
67 of North America and Canada (e.g., Buskirk and Powell 1994). The landscapes of western
68 Europe are much less forested however (FAO 2003), yet marten are present here, occurring in
69 landscapes with as little as 4 % forest cover (Balharry 1993). Though their habitat preferences
70 are much less studied, research has indicated that marten in this region are less dependent on
71 forests than marten elsewhere in their range (e.g. Pereboom et al. 2008). In Scotland for instance,
72 where forest covers just 17 % of land area (Malcolm et al. 2001), the marten's primary prey are
73 *Microtus agrestis* (Lockie 1961; Balharry 1993; Caryl 2008), a species of vole that is
74 characteristic of open tussock grassland and is absent from forest interiors (Hansson 1978). By
75 contrast, forest-dwelling *Clethrionomys* voles are regarded as the marten's most important prey
76 throughout the more forested regions of temperate and boreal Europe (Zalewski 2004).
77 Understanding how marten utilize different matrix habitats may facilitate conservation
78 management of this species in regions where forest cover is low. Yet despite this dietary
79 indication that marten are utilizing the non-forested matrix, previous research on habitat use by
80 Scottish marten has focused on their use of forest habitats while treating the matrix as uniformly
81 unsuitable (Balharry 1993; Halliwell 1997).

82 In this study we investigated how both forest and matrix habitats are utilized by marten
83 by measuring the structural and trophic components of habitats occupied by marten. Predation

84 and winter severity are major limiting factors to European marten populations that directly
85 influence marten habitat selection (Helldin 1998; Zalewski and Jędrzejewski 2006). We therefore
86 predicted that marten would select structurally complex habitats, regardless of whether forest or
87 matrix, which provide protective cover from predators and temperature extremes (Buskirk and
88 Powell 1994). We also predicted that marten would select habitats in which their preferred prey
89 was found (i.e., tussock grassland: Caryl 2008). Matrix permeability is often related to the body
90 size; smaller-bodied species tend to be more prone to predation in the matrix, while large-bodied
91 species view the matrix as less of a barrier to movement (Gehring and Swihart 2003). As there is
92 considerable sexual size dimorphism among *Martes* species, we predicted that the smaller-
93 bodied females would be more risk-averse than males and would avoid those habitats that
94 offered the least structural protection from predators.

95 Habitat loss and fragmentation are landscape-scale processes, yet few studies of their
96 effects on populations of European mammals have been conducted at an appropriate scale (i.e.,
97 where individual landscapes are the study units: Mortelliti et al. 2010). To better understand the
98 landscape-level effects of habitat loss and fragmentation on marten populations, we compiled
99 data from previous studies to investigate how marten diet and population density varied among
100 landscapes with differing amounts of forest cover and forest edge densities (the latter as a
101 measure of fragmentation). Marten populations are vulnerable to fragmentation (Bright 2000),
102 yet increased foraging opportunities in forest gaps may allow population densities to increase
103 with low levels of fragmentation provided that forest habitats remain sufficiently connected,
104 though a sharp population decline is expected once fragmentation reaches a threshold level
105 (Brainerd 1990; Thompson and Harestad 1994).

106

107

MATERIALS AND METHODS.

108 *Study area.*— The 6000 ha study area was located around Morangie forest, a managed
109 coniferous plantation in NE Scotland, UK (57.8°N, 4.1°W). The surrounding landscape has a
110 low human population density (5 people per km²) and comprises farmland, woodland and open
111 heath uplands, with elevations ranging 0-400 m a.s.l. The region has an oceanic climate with
112 cool, wet summers (July mean = 13°C) and mild winters (February mean = 0°C: MetOffice,
113 2008). The forest, which covers around 3000 ha, is dominated by first rotation stands planted on
114 formerly bare ground (61 %) with fewer stands on historically wooded land (34 %, of which just
115 4% has been continuously forested since c.1900). Lowland areas are dominated by thinned
116 stands of native *Pinus sylvestris* that contain dense ground cover by *Calluna vulgaris* -
117 *Vaccinium myrtillus* heath. Exposed uplands are dominated by unthinned stands of exotic
118 conifers (e.g., *Pinus contorta*, *Picea sitchensis*) managed on a large-scale clear-fell and replant
119 system. Deciduous trees (e.g., *Betula pendula*, *Sorbus acuparia*) are patchily distributed
120 throughout the forest. Shrubby species (e.g., *Ulex europeaus*, *Rhododendron ponticum*, *Salix*
121 spp.) frequently encroach into open areas. Unplanted areas are dominated by heaths of blanket
122 bogs (e.g., *C. vulgaris* - *Eriophorum vaginatum*) and moorland grasses (e.g. *Nardus stricta*,
123 *Molinia caeruleae*) at higher elevations, and by damp grasslands (e.g. *Holcus lanatus* -
124 *Deschampsia cespitosa*: all communities according to Rodwell 1998) at lower elevations.

125 *Marten capture and telemetry.*— Between January 2006 and July 2007 we set cage traps
126 (Tomahawk Live Trap Co., WI, USA) at pre-baited locations along forest roads throughout the

127 study area. Captured marten were immobilized with an intramuscular injection of Ketalar and
128 Domitor, antagonized by Antisedan (Pfizer Inc. NY, USA), using dosage rates recommended for
129 similarly sized mustelids (Fournier-Chambrillon et al. 2003). Captured animals were weighed
130 and aged (juvenile or adult ≥ 1 year) according to body size and tooth wear. Adult marten were
131 fitted with VHF-collars (TW-3, Biotrack Ltd., Dorset, UK) and uniquely identified with a
132 passive transponder implanted subcutaneously to the neck. All trapping and handling was carried
133 out under license from Scottish Natural Heritage (Scientific License No.6146) and the British
134 Home Office (PIL60/10174). One animal was tracked per night, on foot or by car, for up to 16
135 hours. Marten locations were estimated at intervals of at least 20 minutes with simultaneous
136 triangulations. Preliminary tests showed the mean accuracy of this method was 55 m (SE = 9 m)
137 and mean bearing error was 12° (SD = 10° : Zimmerman and Powell 1995). We used Locate III
138 software (Nams 2006) to estimate animal locations and 95 % confidence ellipses from
139 triangulations. Locations with confidence ellipses > 10 ha were excluded from further analysis.
140 Remaining locations had confidence ellipses of 2 ± 0 ha, 58 % of which were ≤ 1 ha. We entered
141 marten locations into ArcView[®] GIS (ESRI, California, USA) for analysis with the Home Range
142 Extension (Rodgers and Carr 1998). We used a 95 % minimum convex polygon (MCP: Harris et
143 al. 1990) to estimate the home range of each marten. Marten were tracked until plots of home-
144 range size over time reached an asymptote; those that did not were excluded from further
145 analysis.

146 *Habitat mapping.*— We defined the study area as the MCP containing the home ranges
147 of all marten buffered by a distance equal to the average length of female home ranges (1.8km).
148 Within the 5902 ha study area land-cover was classified into 7 habitat types based upon ground,

149 shrub and canopy vegetation using forest inventory maps (Forestry Commission, UK), digital
150 land classifications (LCM2000: Land Cover Map 2000, Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, UK),
151 orthorectified aerial photographs (0.5 m² resolution taken 2005: Forestry Commission, UK)
152 before being ground-truthed with field visits. We defined 4 matrix habitats where tree canopy
153 <30% (scrub, tussock, heath, agriculture), and 3 forest habitats where tree canopy >30 % (closed-
154 canopy forest, mature coniferous forest, deciduous woodland: Table 1).

155 *Marten habitat selection.*— We determined marten habitat use at 2 spatial scales; first
156 comparing the proportion of habitats found within individual home ranges to their availability
157 within the study area based on the number of hectares of each habitat, referred to herein as
158 ‘home-range level’ selection (Design II: Thomas and Taylor 1990); then comparing the
159 proportion of locations in each habitat with their availability within home ranges, referred to
160 herein as ‘location level’ selection (Design III: Thomas and Taylor 1990). Locations were
161 differentiated into ‘active’ and ‘static’ depending on the marten’s physical state when that location
162 was recorded and separate analyses were conducted for each. To ensure independence of static
163 locations, only one static location was recorded per denning event and subsequent locations were
164 disregarded until the animal moved again. Home ranges were defined by the 95 % MCP buffered
165 by a distance of 55 m (our mean telemetry error). Locations were treated as an ellipse rather than
166 a single point, with the habitat of greatest proportional cover considered that ‘used’ at that
167 location (Nams 1989). As female martens are morphologically and energetically more constrained
168 than males, they may be more selective (Buskirk and Powell 1994). We therefore examined sex-
169 specific habitat selection rather than pooling data across sexes (Garshelis 2000). Habitat
170 preferences and differences in preferences between sexes were examined with Bonferroni-

171 adjusted 90% confidence limits (Cherry 1998). To avoid unequal weighting, we randomly
172 selected an equal number of active locations (males: $n = 22$; females: $n = 28$) and static locations
173 ($n = 8$ for both sexes) from each individual (Thomas and Taylor 2006). Selection of critical
174 resources are likely to be less variable than others, so we determined variability in individual
175 selection strategies by calculating resource selection indices (RSI: % habitat use - % habitat
176 available) from non-pooled data (Thomas and Taylor 1990). We used t-tests to determine sex-
177 related differences in home range size and body mass. We also used t-tests to evaluate
178 intersexual differences in the distance travelled by individual marten into the matrix after
179 measuring the mean and maximum distance of locations outside forest habitats. A chi-square test
180 was used to compare the frequency with which each sex was located outside forest habitats.

181 *Forest fragmentation, home range size and marten diet across Scotland.*— We examined
182 marten diet and home range size in relation to forest cover and forest edge-density and extent
183 among Scottish landscapes. We used home range data from studies that have investigated marten
184 spatial ecology in Scotland (Balharry 1993; Bright and Smithson 1997; Halliwell 1997), each of
185 which provided dietary data from scat-content analysis conducted simultaneously with tracking
186 within each landscape. In total, we had home range and dietary data for marten in 6 landscapes
187 across Scotland (including our data from Morangie, dietary data for which came from Caryl,
188 2008: Table 2, Fig. 1).

189 We standardized the dietary importance of small mammals in each landscape as the
190 frequency of small mammal occurrences in scats divided by the number of scats analyzed within
191 that landscape to account for inconsistencies in reporting results. We provide a relative measure
192 of the density of resident adult marten in each landscape using the mean sex-specific home range

193 size (100% MCP). We take this measure to be the approximate inverse of breeding marten
194 population density assuming that marten display inter-sexual territoriality; that only adult marten
195 defend territories, and that home ranges within each sex abut each other contiguously (Balharry
196 1993, Caryl 2008). We recognize that high population density does not necessarily indicate high
197 habitat quality (van Horne 1983), but by focusing on adult resident marten we effectively ignore
198 the juvenile, dispersing or transient individuals that often artificially inflate population densities
199 in poor quality habitat.

200 Forested extent (%) was calculated within a 9.77 km radius (300 km² area) from the
201 centre of each site. Data on forest cover were obtained from the LCM2000 digital land-use layer
202 (Fuller et al. 2005). We included land classified as clear-felled to account for changes to forest
203 cover between the year that this data layer was created (2000) and when marten data were
204 collected among studies. We then calculated the density of forest edges per hectare of forest (m
205 ha⁻¹) as an index of forest fragmentation within each landscape. General Linear Models were
206 used to examine relationships between measures of forest cover and fragmentation with small
207 mammal consumption and marten home range sizes among landscapes. For each analysis a
208 quadratic function of forest cover or edge density was included in the starting model to assess
209 whether this provided a better fit than a linear function; this was removed if non-significant. All
210 statistical tests were conducted in SPSS 17.0 for Windows (SPSS, USA) and MS Excel 2007
211 (Microsoft Corporation, USA). Data were transformed where necessary to achieve normality and
212 equal variance. All averages and coefficients are presented as means with standard errors unless
213 otherwise stated.

214

RESULTS

215
216 We captured and collared 16 adult pine marten (8 males, 8 females), of which sufficient
217 data were collected for 4 males and 7 females to allow home range estimation. A total of 594
218 locations were obtained, with 50 ± 4 locations per female, and 54 ± 8 locations per male. Female
219 home ranges reached an asymptote after 29 ± 3 locations and males' after 40 ± 7 locations. Un-
220 buffered female home ranges (95 % MCP) were significantly smaller than those of males,
221 measuring 50 ± 1 ha and 353 ± 7 ha respectively ($t_6 = -4.405$, $P = 0.026$). There was considerable
222 body size dimorphism between the sexes; males weighed 1.88 ± 0.7 kg (range = 1.60–2.30 kg),
223 almost 1.4 times heavier than females (1.37 ± 0.4 kg, range = 1.21–1.55 kg; $t_{14} = 6.195$, $P <$
224 0.001).

225 *Habitat selection.*— Marten clearly selected their home ranges from the landscape in a
226 non-random pattern (Table 3; Fig. 2). Both sexes selected the same 3 habitats at the home range
227 level (mature forest, tussock grassland and scrub), while avoiding the same 2 habitats (closed-
228 canopy forest and agriculture: Table 3). In addition, females strongly avoided heath moorland at
229 the home range level, while males avoided deciduous woodland. Individual selection strategies
230 suggested that female aversions to closed-canopy forest, heath and agriculture at the home range
231 scale were universal to all females (Fig. 2a). Males were more variable in their selection patterns,
232 yet agricultural land was universally avoided (Fig. 2b). No universal preferences were apparent
233 at the home range level except that of female selection for tussock grassland.

234 There were few significant preferences at the location level, suggesting that once habitats
235 were selected from the landscape they were generally used in accordance to their availability

236 (Table 3). Exceptions to this were that stationary females avoided heath within home ranges,
237 while stationary males avoided deciduous woodland and active males avoided tussock grassland.
238 Individual selection strategies concur that there was much less selection by active marten than at
239 the home range level, with most resources selection indices lying near zero (Fig. 2a). However,
240 there does appear to be an indication of selection by stationary marten, with females having
241 positive RSI for mature forest and scrub and males having positive RSI for mature forest and
242 closed-canopy forest (Fig. 2).

243 There were intersexual differences in habitat utilization for all habitats at the home range
244 level except scrub and tussock grassland (Table 3). Scrub and tussock grassland were equally
245 selected by both sexes despite their low availability within the study area. Use of all other
246 habitats appeared to follow a general pattern in which females made greater use of forested
247 habitats than males (63.5 ± 5.0 % of home range forested), while males made greater use of
248 matrix habitats than females (47.2 ± 10.5 % of home range forested). For example, females
249 utilized mature forest and deciduous woodland significantly more than males at the home range
250 level, whereas males used heath and agriculture significantly more than females (Table 3).
251 Within home ranges, active females utilized tussock grassland more than males, and active males
252 utilized heath more than females. There were no significant differences in habitat use at
253 stationary locations.

254 The males' greater proclivity for open spaces was reflected by significant intersexual
255 differences in both the mean and maximum distance travelled outside forest habitats by
256 individuals ($t_9 = -2.601$, $P < 0.05$ and $t_9 = -2.405$, $P < 0.05$ respectively). Males typically
257 travelled 75.1 ± 18.6 m outside forests habitats, up to an average maximum of 199.6 ± 46.3 m,

258 whereas females typically travelled just 30.4m into the matrix, up to an average maximum
259 distance of 93.7 ± 21.1 m. Males also travelled outside forested habitats more frequently than
260 females, 46 % of male locations occurred outside forests compared with just 33 % of female
261 locations ($\chi^2_{1} = 8.786$, $P < 0.005$).

262 *Forest fragmentation, home range size and marten diet across Scotland.*— There was
263 considerable variation in the amount of forest cover among landscapes across Scotland, with an
264 order of magnitude between the least (4 %) and most (47 %) forested, which corresponded to an
265 equally variable degree of fragmentation among landscapes (Table 2). Similarly, there was an
266 order of magnitude difference between the largest (33 km²) and smallest (3 km²) male marten
267 home ranges. The frequency of consumption of small mammals varied from 0.34 occurrences
268 per scat to 0.93. Small mammal remains were not identified to species at Minnoch and Glen
269 Trool (Bright and Smithson 1997), but *Microtus agrestis* formed an average 80 % (SE = 5%) of
270 small mammals in the diet within the other 4 landscapes. The relationship between small
271 mammal consumption and forest fragmentation demonstrated a strong positive correlation,
272 indicating that as landscapes became more fragmented, small mammals constituted a greater part
273 of the marten diet ($F_{1,4} = 56.77$, $P = 0.002$, $\beta = 0.007 \pm 0.0009$, $R^2 \text{ adj} = 91.8\%$; Fig. 3a). A
274 strong positive correlation existed between the extent of forest cover and forest edge-density
275 within landscapes (Pearson correlation $r = -0.83$, $P = 0.042$, $n = 6$). Henceforth we only present
276 results in reference to the latter, as edge-density had a greater functional significance in relation
277 to the consumption of small mammals. Male home ranges were logged prior to analysis. As
278 predicted, the relationship between fragmentation and home range size of female marten was
279 non-linear (edge density $F_{1,3} = 25.53$, $P = 0.015$; edge density² $F_{1,3} = 26.23$, $P = 0.014$, $R^2 \text{ adj} =$

280 82.9%; $n = 6$; Fig. 3b) as what that of males (edge density $F_{1,3} = 13.43$, $P = 0.035$; edge density²
281 $F_{1,3} = 14.06$, $P = 0.035$, R^2 adj = 71.1%, $n = 6$; Fig 3c). Marten home ranges were smallest at
282 intermediate levels of landscape fragmentation (where the forested extent lay between 25 and
283 30%), and increased in size at higher and lower levels of fragmentation. However, we
284 acknowledge that owing to the small sample size these patterns are sensitive to individual points,
285 particularly at the lowest and highest edge densities, and should be viewed with caution.

286

287

DISCUSSION

288 Our results add support to the suggestion that European pine marten, like other marten
289 species (e.g. Hearn et al. 2010), may be less forest-dependent than previously believed
290 (Pereboom et al. 2008; Mortelliti et al. 2010). Though marten demonstrated a strong preference
291 for mature forest, both sexes showed strong selective preferences for 2 matrix habitats within
292 their home ranges: tussock grassland and scrub. The consistent selection of these habitats
293 suggests that the matrix is not only penetrable but utilized by marten. Furthermore, matrix
294 habitats may provide key resources that are unavailable within forest habitats; the most notable
295 of which being *Microtus* voles, the marten's primary prey (Lockie 1961; Balharry 1993;
296 Halliwell 1997, Caryl 2008), which are absent from forest interiors (Caryl 2008).

297 Matrix habitats that have a high degree of structural contrast with remnant vegetation are
298 less penetrable to species than low-contrast habitats (e.g. Forman 1995). Marten are commonly
299 described as specialists of old-growth forest (Lindström 1989; Brainerd 1990; Storch et al.
300 1990), and as such all non-forested habitats have typically been considered to be equally hostile.

301 Yet evidence increasingly suggests that it is the structural elements within forests rather than
302 forest composition or age that most influences marten habitat selection (Brainerd et al. 1994;
303 Payer and Harrison 2003; Poole et al. 2004; Hearn et al. 2010). Many of the structural features
304 associated with old-growth forests (e.g. multi-layered tree canopies, large diameter trees,
305 standing and fallen deadwood, dense understory vegetation) are required by marten because they
306 help to reduce predation threats (Storch et al. 1990), increase foraging efficiency (Thompson and
307 Harestad 1994; Andruskiw et al. 2008), and offer thermally insulated resting sites (Zalewski
308 1997). However, these structural legacies are often not available in regions of the marten's
309 geographic range in which much of the original forest cover was removed many centuries ago.
310 For instance, the majority (76 %) of British forests are secondary, i.e. they occupy ground that
311 has not been wooded until recently, and so possess few of the structural features of old-growth
312 forest (Humphrey 2005). In the absence of suitable structural features it seems that marten in our
313 study area were supplementing the resources required to avoid predation, den, and forage from
314 complementary, low-contrasting habitats within the matrix.

315 Predator avoidance is an important determinant of marten habitat use (Helldin 1998), and
316 structure near the ground is known to provide protective cover for marten (e.g., Slauson et al.
317 2007). Female marten are smaller than males and subject to greater predation risk and energetic
318 costs, and are thus likely to be more selective in their habitat choice. We found that females were
319 more reluctant to leave forest habitats than males, and typically moved no more than 100 m
320 outside forest edges. Marten have 2 extant predators within Scotland - the red fox *Vulpes vulpes*
321 and golden eagle *Aquila chrysaetos* (Helldin 1998) – both of which were present within the study
322 area (*pers. obs.*). One similarity among those habitats strongly avoided by female marten (i.e.,

323 closed-canopy forest, heath moorland and agricultural fields) was that cover near the ground was
324 either absent or greatly reduced in stature. The high shading beneath closed-canopy stands
325 restricts understory vegetation resulting in a ground cover dominated by bryophytes and needle
326 litter (Hill 1986); exposure and heavy grazing of upland heath often results in compact, low-
327 lying vegetation (Grant and Hunter 1962), while continuous grazing has obvious impacts on
328 agricultural pastures. By contrast, ground vegetation was well established in habitats that were
329 preferred by female marten. Thinning to reduce stem density within mature stands (one of our
330 defining criteria) increases irradiance to the ground resulting in a dense understory similar to that
331 found in semi-natural forests (Wallace and Good 1995; Ferris et al. 2000). Scrub habitats provide
332 essential structural features for many small carnivore species within the agriculturally-dominated
333 landscapes of western Europe (Virgós 2001; Rondinini and Boitani 2002; Pereboom et al. 2008;
334 Matos et al. 2009; Santos and Santos-Reis 2010), and so it is not surprising that this habitat is
335 important for marten within our study area. While the *Holcus-Deschampsia* communities that are
336 typical of ungrazed tussock grassland form characteristic tussocks up to a meter in height
337 (Rodwell 1998).

338 Resource-limited animals may expose themselves to greater risks in order to acquire
339 resources across habitat boundaries (Bélisle 2005). That marten utilized 2 matrix habitats in
340 addition to mature forest suggests that matrix habitats may provide resources that are unavailable
341 within mature forests alone. The most important prey of Scottish marten are *Microtus* voles
342 (Balharry 1993; Caryl, 2008), which is unusual given that *Clethrionomys* voles are numerically
343 dominant within marten home ranges (Balharry 1993; Caryl 2008) and form the bulk of their diet
344 throughout the marten's range (Zalewski 2004). *Microtus* voles are denizens of ungrazed tussock

345 grassland (Caryl 2008), which undoubtedly accounts for the selection of this habitat by marten
346 within our study area. Interestingly, females made significantly greater use of this habitat while
347 active than males, which may be indicative of resource partitioning between the sexes. A dietary
348 preference for *Microtus* voles may indicate a behavioral trait that has adapted in response to
349 Scotland's highly fragmented past during which forest-dwelling *Clethrionomys* would have been
350 scarce. Alternatively, low volumes of coarse woody debris (CWD) within plantations may mean
351 that *Clethrionomys* remain unavailable to marten despite their abundance, as CWD is needed to
352 provide sensory cues to marten as to the location of forest rodents (Thompson and Harestad
353 1994; Andruskiw et al. 2008). Despite management steps to retain CWD within plantations, even
354 volumes of CWD within mature forest stands remain low relative to old-growth forests (Kirby et
355 al. 1998; Humphrey 2005). It is unclear whether further restoration of CWD within plantations
356 will change the vole preference of Scottish marten, but at present they are supplementing their
357 prey resources with subsidies from the matrix. Marten in our study area also seemed to be
358 supplementing den sites from the matrix. Plantation forests have few of the arboreal cavities that
359 are commonly used as den sites by marten in old-growth forests to provide protection from foxes
360 (Birks et al. 2005). Instead, we found that scrub habitat was being used more at female resting
361 locations (23 ± 6 %) than at active locations (13 ± 8 %), which suggests that it may provide
362 important resting habitat. Ground level dens are unusual for maternal dens (*J. Birks pers.*
363 *comm.*), yet we observed 4 of the 7 females we tracked (3 of which had young) denning within
364 scrub habitat; specifically 2 beneath dense shrubs (*Ulex europeaus* and *Rhododendron ponticum*)
365 and 2 beneath wind-thrown trees or clear-felled debris, such as piles of branches.

366 Spatially-subsidized predators (i.e. those that gain resources across habitat boundaries)
367 often have abundances that exceed what local resources would otherwise support (e.g. Andr n
368 1994). The strong positive correlation we found between the consumption of small mammals and
369 forest edge-density among Scottish landscapes suggests that foraging opportunities for small
370 mammal prey increases where fragmentation results in increased availability of edge habitat. As
371 predicted, this initially supported higher marten population densities, as evidenced by smaller
372 home range sizes. Once forest fragmentation passed a threshold level however, marten
373 populations became limited and their population densities decreased (i.e., home ranges
374 expanded). Unfortunately, because of the small sample size of studies used in our synthesis we
375 were not able to investigate the effect of different land-uses within the matrix. However, the
376 composition and configuration of the matrix will undoubtedly influence processes within
377 landscapes. Previous studies into the effects of forest fragmentation on marten population density
378 in Fennoscandia (Kurki et al. 1998) and North America (Chapin et al. 1997; Hargis et al. 1999)
379 have also not accounted for variation within the matrix. Yet as our results demonstrate, the non-
380 forested matrix is not homogenous from a pine marten's perspective. In fact complementary
381 resources from the matrix may be essential for the completion of their life phases depending on
382 local conditions. Fragmentation effects in landscapes composed of matrix habitats that contrast
383 strongly with remnant vegetation are likely to be worse than those in which the matrix is
384 structurally similar (Forman 1995). Therefore to gain greater insight into the landscape
385 requirements of marten (and indeed other forest-dwelling species) we need to account for a more
386 complex perception of habitats than 'forest vs. matrix'. This is particularly so where the length of

387 time since habitat loss has impacted faunal life-histories, or where remaining forest habitats are
388 secondary.

389 Much of the forest cover in Scotland today comprises afforested plantations in the closed-
390 canopy stage (Malcolm et al. 2001; Mason 2007), which make poor-quality habitat for marten. In
391 addition, a large proportion of the Scottish landscape is dominated by inhospitable matrix
392 habitats (i.e. moorland and agriculture). The marten's reluctance to cross large areas without
393 cover means that even relatively nearby forest remnants may not be used if they are isolated by
394 unsuitable intervening habitats (Ricketts 2001), and as slow-breeding mammals, marten are
395 particularly vulnerable to local extinctions should functional connectivity be lost (Bright 2000).
396 Strategies for conserving marten in these highly fragmented landscapes should seek to restore
397 old-growth conditions within existing forest stands whilst managing the surrounding matrix to
398 ensure that complementary (i.e., low-contrast) habitats are available. As our results have shown,
399 the matrix has enormous potential to mitigate some of the negative effects of habitat loss and
400 fragmentation that should not be overlooked.

401

402

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

403 We thank Scottish Natural Heritage, Forest Research and the University of Stirling for providing
404 funding for this work; Forest Enterprise Scotland for logistical support; numerous volunteers
405 who assisted with field work; A. Peace for statistical advice and R. Raynor, R. Coope and D.
406 Balharry for invaluable advice and discussion. The manuscript was greatly improved by
407 suggestions from two anonymous reviewers.

408

LITERATURE CITED

- 409
410 ANDRÉN, H. 1994. Effects of habitat fragmentation on birds and mammals in landscapes with
411 different proportions of suitable habitat: A review. *Oikos* 71:355-366.
- 412 ANDRUSKIW, M., J. M. FRYXELL, I. D. THOMPSON AND J. A. BAKER 2008. Habitat-mediated
413 variation in predation risk by the american marten. *Ecology* 89:2273-2280.
- 414 BALHARRY, D. 1993. Factors affecting the distribution and population density of pine martens
415 (*Martes martes*) in scotland. PhD dissertation, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen,
416 Scotland.
- 417 BÉLISLE, M. 2005. Measuring landscape connectivity: The challenge of behavioral landscape
418 ecology *Ecology* 86:1988-1995.
- 419 BIRKS, J. D. S., J. E. MESSENGER AND E. C. HALLIWELL 2005. Diversity of den sites used by pine
420 martens *Martes martes*: A response to the scarcity of arboreal cavities? *Mammal Review*
421 35:313-320.
- 422 BRAINERD, S. M. 1990. The pine marten and forest fragmentation: A review and general
423 hypothesis. Pp. 421-434 in Transactions of the 19th international congress of game
424 biologists (S. MYRBERGET). Trondheim, Norway.
- 425 BRAINERD, S. M., J. O. HELLDIN, E. LINDSTROM AND J. ROLSTAD 1994. Eurasian pine martens
426 and old industrial forest in southern boreal Scandinavia. Pp. 343-354 in Martens, sables
427 and fishers: Biology and conservation. (S. W. BUSKIRK, A. S. HARESTAD, M. G. RAPHAEL
428 AND R. A. POWELL). Cornell University Press, London, UK.
- 429 BRIGHT, P. W. 2000. Lessons from lean beasts: Conservation biology of the mustelids. *Mammal*
430 *Review* 30:217-226.

- 431 BRIGHT, P. W. AND T. J. SMITHSON 1997. Species recovery programme for the pine marten in
432 england: 1995-1996. Pp. 1-64. in English Nature Research Report P. ENGLISH NATURE,
- 433 BUSKIRK, S. W. AND R. A. POWELL 1994. Habitat ecology of fishers and American martens. Pp.
434 283-296 in Martens, sables and fishers: Biology and conservation. (S. W. BUSKIRK, A. S.
435 HARESTAD, M. G. RAPHAEL AND R. A. POWELL). Cornell University Press, London, UK.
- 436 CARYL, F. M. 2008. Pine marten diet and habitat use within a managed coniferous forest. PhD
437 dissertation, University of Stirling, Stirling, Scotland.
- 438 CHAPIN, T. G., D. J. HARRISON AND D.M. PHILLIPS 1997. Seasonal habitat selection by marten in
439 an untrapped forest preserve. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 61:707-717.
- 440 CHERRY, S. 1998. Statistical tests in publications of the Wildlife Society. *Wildlife Society*
441 *Bulletin* 26:947-953.
- 442 DUNFORD, W. AND K. FREEMARK 2005. Matrix matters: Effects of surrounding land uses on
443 forest birds near Ottawa, Canada. *Landscape Ecology* 20:497-511
- 444 FAO 2003. State of the world's forests. Pp. in R. FAO, ITALY,
- 445 FERRIS, R., A. J. PEACE, J. W. HUMPHREY AND A. C. BROOME 2000. Relationships between
446 vegetation, site type and stand structure in coniferous plantations in Britain *Forest*
447 *Ecology and Management* 136:35-51.
- 448 FISCHER, J., D. B. LINDENMAYER AND I. FAZEY 2004. Appreciating ecological complexity:
449 Habitat contours as a conceptual landscape model. *Conservation Biology* 18:1245-1253
- 450 FORMAN, R. T. T. 1995. *Land Mosaics: The ecology of landscapes and regions*. Cambridge
451 University Press, Cambridge, UK.

- 452 FOURNIER-CHAMBRILLON, C., J. CHUSSEAU, J. DUPUCH, C. MAIZERET AND P. FOURNIER 2003.
453 Immobilization of free-ranging European mink (*Mustela lutreola*) and polecat (*Mustela*
454 *putorius*) with medetomidine-ketamine and reversal by atipamezole. *J Wildl Dis* 39:393-
455 399.
- 456 FULLER, R. M., R. COX, R. T. CLARKE, P. ROTHERY, R. A. HILL, G. M. SMITH, A. G. THOMSON,
457 N. J. BROWN, D. C. HOWARD AND A. P. STOTT. 2005. The UK land cover map 2000:
458 Planning, construction and calibration of a remotely sensed, user-oriented map of broad
459 habitats. *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation* 7:202-
460 216.
- 461 GARSHELIS, D. L. 2000. Delusions in habitat evaluation: Measuring use, selection, and
462 importance. Pp. 111-164 in *Research techniques in animal ecology: Controversies and*
463 *consequences.* (L. BOITANI and T. K. FULLER). Columbia University Press, New York.,
- 464 GEHRING, T. M. AND R. K. SWIHART 2003. Body size, niche breadth, and ecologically scaled
465 responses to habitat fragmentation: Mammalian predators in an agricultural landscape.
466 *Biological Conservation* 109:283-295.
- 467 GRANT, S. AND R. HUNTER 1962. Ecotypic differentiation of *Calluna vulgaris* (L.) in relation to
468 altitude. *New Phytologist* 61:44-55.
- 469 HAILA, Y. 2002. A conceptual genealogy of fragmentation research: From island biogeography
470 to landscape ecology. *Ecological Applications* 12:321–334.
- 471 HALLIWELL, E. C. 1997. The ecology of red squirrels in Scotland in relation to pine marten
472 predation. PhD dissertation, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, Scotland.

- 473 HARGIS, C.D., J. A. BISSONETTE AND D. L. TURNER 1999. The influence of forest fragmentation
474 and landscape pattern on American marten. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 36:157-172.
- 475 HARRIS, S., W. J. CRESSWELL, P. G. FORDE, W. J. TREWHELLA, T. WOOLLARD AND S. WRAY
476 1990. Home-range analysis using radio-tracking data—a review of problems and
477 techniques particularly as applied to the study of mammals. *Mammal Review* 20:97-123.
- 478 HEARN, B. J., D. J. HARRISON, A. K. FULLER, C. G. LUNDRIGAN AND W. J. CURRAN 2010.
479 Paradigm shifts in habitat ecology of threatened Newfoundland martens. *Journal of*
480 *Wildlife Management* 74:719-728.
- 481 HELLDIN, J. O. 1998. Pine marten (*Martes martes*) population limitation: Food, harvesting of
482 predation? PhD dissertation, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Upsala,
483 Sweden.
- 484 HILL, M. O. 1986. Ground flora and succession in commercial forests. Institute of Terrestrial
485 Ecology, Cambridge.
- 486 HUMPHREY, J. W. 2005. Benefits to biodiversity from developing old-growth conditions in
487 british upland spruce plantations: A review and recommendations. *Forestry* 78:33-53.
- 488 KIRBY, REID, THOMAS AND GOLDSMITH 1998. Preliminary estimates of fallen dead wood and
489 standing dead trees in managed and unmanaged forests in britain. *Journal of Applied*
490 *Ecology* 35:148-155.
- 491 KUPFER, J. A., G. P. MALANSON AND S. B. FRANKLIN 2006. Not seeing the ocean for the islands:
492 The mediating influence of matrix-based processes on forest fragmentation. *Global*
493 *Ecology and Biogeography* 15:8-20.

- 494 KURKI, S., A. R. I. NIKULA, P. HELLE AND H. LINDEN 1998. Abundances of red fox and pine
495 marten in relation to the composition of boreal forest landscapes. *Journal of Animal*
496 *Ecology* 67:874-886.
- 497 LINDSTRÖM, E. 1989. Food limitation and social regulation in a red fox population. *Holarctic*
498 *Ecology* 12:70-79.
- 499 LOCKIE, J. D. 1961. The food of the pine marten *Martes martes* in West Ross-shire, Scotland.
500 *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* 136:187-195.
- 501 MALCOLM, D. C., W. L. MASON AND G. C. CLARKE 2001. The transformation of conifer forests
502 in Britain -- regeneration, gap size and silvicultural systems. *Forest Ecology and*
503 *Management* 151:7-23.
- 504 MASON, W. L. 2007. Changes in the management of British forests between 1945 and 2000 and
505 possible future trends. *Ibis* 149:41-52.
- 506 MATOS, H., M. SANTOS, F. PALOMARES AND M. SANTOS-REIS 2009. Does riparian habitat
507 condition influence mammalian carnivore abundance in mediterranean ecosystems?
508 *Biodiversity and Conservation* 18:373-386.
- 509 METOFFICE 2008. Mapped climate averages for Northern Scotland 1971-2000 accessed June
510 2008 at: www.metoffice.gov.uk/climate/uk/averages/
- 511 MORTELLITI, A., G. AMORI, D. CAPIZZI, C. RONDININI AND L. BOITANI 2010. Experimental
512 design and taxonomic scope of fragmentation studies on european mammals: Current
513 status and future priorities. *Mammal Review* 40:125-154.
- 514 NAMS, V. O. 1989. Effects of radiotelemetry error on sample size and bias when testing for
515 habitat selection. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 67:1631-1636.

- 516 NAMS, V. O. 2006. Locate iii. Pacer Computer Software, Tatamagouche, Nova Scotia, Canada.
- 517 PAYER, D. C. AND D. J. HARRISON 2003. Influence of forest structure on habitat use by American
518 marten in an industrial forest. *Forest Ecology and Management* 179:145-156.
- 519 PEREBOOM, V., M. MERGEY, N. VILLERETTE, R. HELDER, J. F. GERARD AND T. LODÉ 2008.
520 Movement patterns, habitat selection, and corridor use of a typical woodland-dweller
521 species, the european pine marten (*Martes martes*), in fragmented landscape. *Canadian*
522 *Journal of Zoology* 86:983-991.
- 523 POOLE, K. G., A. D. PORTER, A. DE VRIES, C. MAUNDRELL, S. D. GRINDAL AND C. CASSADY ST.
524 CLAIR 2004. Suitability of a young deciduous-dominated forest for american marten and
525 the effects of forest removal. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 80:423-435.
- 526 RICKETTS, T. H. 2001. The matrix matters: Effective isolation in fragmented landscapes. *The*
527 *American Naturalist* 158:87-99.
- 528 RODGERS, A. R. AND A. P. CARR 1998. Home range extension here for arcview. Ontario Ministry
529 of Natural Resources, Ontario, Canada.
- 530 RODWELL, J. S. 1998. Grasslands and montane communities.
- 531 RONDININI, C. AND L. BOITANI 2002. Habitat use by beech martens in a fragmented landscape.
532 *Ecography* 25:257-264.
- 533 SANTOS, M. AND M. SANTOS-REIS 2010. Stone marten (*Martes foina*) habitat in a Mediterranean
534 ecosystem: Effects of scale, sex, and interspecific interactions. *European Journal of*
535 *Wildlife Research* 56:275-286.
- 536 SLAUSON, K. M., W. J. ZIELINSKI AND J. P. HAYES 2007. Habitat selection by American martens
537 in coastal California. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 71:458-468.

- 538 STORCH, I., E. LINDSTRÖM AND J. DE JOUNGE 1990. Habitat selection and food habits of the pine
539 marten in relation to competition with the red fox. *Acta Theriologica* 35:311-320.
- 540 THOMAS, D. L. AND E. J. TAYLOR 1990. Study designs and tests for comparing resource use and
541 availability. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 54:322-330.
- 542 THOMAS, D. L. AND E. J. TAYLOR 2006. Study designs and tests for comparing resource use and
543 availability ii. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 70:324-336.
- 544 THOMPSON, I. D. AND A. S. HARESTAD 1994. Effects of logging on American martens and
545 models for habitat management. Pp. 355-367 in *Martens, sables and fishers: Biology and
546 conservation*. (S. W. BUSKIRK, A. S. HARESTAD, M. G. RAPHAEL and R. A. POWELL).
547 Cornell University Press, London, UK.
- 548 VAN HORNE, B. 1983. Density is a misleading indicator of habitat quality. *Journal of Wildlife
549 Management* 47:893-901.
- 550 VIRGÓS, E. 2001. Relative value of riparian woodlands in landscapes with different forest cover
551 for medium-sized iberian carnivores. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 10:1039-1049.
- 552 WALLACE, H. AND J. GOOD 1995. Effects of afforestation on upland plant communities and
553 implications for vegetation management. *Forest Ecology and Management* 79:29-46.
- 554 ZALEWSKI, A. 1997. Patterns of resting site use by pine marten *Martes martes* in bialowieza
555 national park (Poland). *Acta Theriologica* 42:153-168.
- 556 ZALEWSKI, A. 2004. Geographical and seasonal variation in food habits and prey size of
557 european pine martens. Pp. 78-98 in *Martens and fishers in human-altered environments:
558 An international perspective* (D. J. HARRISON, A. K. FULLER and G. PROULX). Springer,
559 London, UK.

560 ZALEWSKI, A. AND W. JĘDRZEJEWSKI 2006. Spatial organisation and dynamics of the pine marten
561 *martes martes* population in białowieża forest (e poland) compared with other european
562 woodlands. *Ecography* 29:31-43.

563 ZIMMERMAN, J. W. AND R. A. POWELL 1995. Radiotelemetry error: Location error method
564 compared with error polygons and confidence ellipses. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*
565 73:1123-1133.

566

567

568 Figure 1. Left: Outline of Scotland showing pine marten distribution (shaded) and locations of 6
569 landscapes used to examine differences in fragmentation, diet and marten population density: 1.
570 Kinlochewe (Balharry 1993), 2. Strathglass (Balharry 1993), 3. Novar (Haliwell 1997), 4.
571 Morangie (present study: Caryl 2008), 5. Glen Trool (Bright & Smithson 1997), 6. Minnoch
572 (Bright & Smithson). Right: Detail of forest fragmentation shown as forest (black) against matrix
573 (white). Each landscape covers a circular area of 300 km².

574

575 Figure 2. Individual selection strategies of habitats at the home range level (white bars), at active
576 locations (pale grey bars) and at static locations (dark grey bars) by female (a) and male marten
577 (b). A reference line ($y = 0$) indicates habitats are used according to their availability (i.e., no
578 selection), data below this line indicate avoidance; data above indicate preference. Boxes show
579 the median (Q2) and interquartile range (IQR: Q3 – Q1). Whiskers indicate the smallest
580 observation within 1.5 IQR of Q1 and the largest observation within 1.5 IQR of Q3. Points lying
581 outside of this range are considered to be outliers (circle) and extreme outliers (star).

582

583 Figure 3. The effect of forest edge density (i.e., forest fragmentation) on marten diet and
584 population density among landscapes ($n = 6$). A positive correlation exists between forest edge
585 density ($m\ ha^{-1}$) and an index of small mammal consumption (a). The mean (\pm SE) home range
586 size of female (b) and male (c) marten is plotted against forest edge density for six 300 km²
587 landscapes. Parabolic trendlines are shown for each relationship which fit the data better than

588 linear trendlines. Owing to the small sample size however, these patterns are highly sensitive to
589 individual points and should be viewed with caution.