

Movement Patterns and Habitat use for Sympatric Species

Elizabeth McAlpine-Bellis

University of California Berkeley

Kaera L Utsumi

University of California Berkeley

Kelly M Diamond

Clemson University

Janine Klein

University of California Davis

Sophia Gilbert-Smith

KU: The University of Kansas

Grace E Garrison

KU: The University of Kansas

Maria A Eifler

Erell Institute

Douglas A Eifler (✉ deifler@erell.ngo)

Erell Institute <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2919-4318>

Research

Keywords: Chemosensory predator, Great Basin Desert, Path segmentation, Resource partitioning, Visual predator

Posted Date: August 30th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-827045/v1>

License:   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background: Movement is an important characteristic of an animal's ecology, reflecting perception of and response to environmental conditions. To effectively search for food, movement patterns likely depend on habitat characteristics and the sensory systems used to find prey. We examined movements associated with foraging for two sympatric species of lizards inhabiting the Alvord Basin in the Great Basin Desert of southeastern Oregon. The two species have largely overlapping diets but find prey via different sensory cues, which link to their differing foraging strategies – the long-nosed leopard lizard, *Gambelia wislizenii*, is a visually-oriented predator, while the western whiptail, *Aspidoscelis tigris*, relies heavily on chemosensory cues to find prey.

Methods: Using detailed focal observations, we characterized the habitat use and movement paths of each species. We placed markers at the location of focal animals every minute for the duration of each 30-min observation. Afterwards, we recorded whether each location was in the open or in vegetation, as well as the movement metrics of step length, path length, net displacement, straightness index, and turn angle, and then made statistical comparisons between the two species.

Results: The visual forager spent more time in open areas, moved less frequently over shorter distances, and differed in patterns of plant use compared to the chemosensory forager. Path characteristics of step length and turn angle differed between species.

Conclusions: The visual predator moved in a way that was consistent with the notion that they require a clear visual path to stalk prey whereas the movement of the chemosensory predator increased their chances of detecting prey by venturing further into vegetation. Sympatric species can partition limited resources through differences in search behavior and habitat use.

Introduction

For ambulant organisms, movement involves dynamic interactions that balance the animal's capabilities and ecological preferences with local environmental conditions. Their ability to move can depend not only on their locomotor structures, but also on their ability to detect and respond to current conditions [1]. On large spatiotemporal scales, movement patterns influence population distributions as well as interactions among species and their environment [2–4]. At the individual level, when and where organisms move can directly influence survival and ultimately fitness [5, 6]. Fine-scale locality data coupled with movement path analyses can identify the factors influencing movement as well as how individual animals perceive and respond to their environment [2, 7–9].

Over the past several decades, studies on animal movement have provided insights into the evolutionary biology, ecology, and physiology of many different taxa [10–14]. Examining spatiotemporal movement has led to significant insights into social behavior [15]. Movement indices reveal intraspecific variation [11, 14, 16–18] or behavioral flexibility [19–22] in foraging. Additionally, variation in habitat structure and resource use can lead to changes in movement patterns [23–28]. Using a fine-scale spatial approach to

studying movement patterns, we aim to elucidate how two sympatric lizard species can partition overlapping food resources.

In the Alvord Basin in southeastern Oregon, two sympatric species of lizard, the long-nosed leopard lizard (*Gambelia wislizenii*) and the western whiptail (*Aspidoscelis tigris*), present an interesting contrast. While phylogenetically in distant clades (Iguania vs Scleroglossa) [29], *G. wislizenii* and *A. tigris* provide an opportunity to compare how two cohabitating species behaviorally partition largely overlapping resources. A previous comparison of these species in the same location showed differences in behavior between the lizards, with *G. wislizenii* spending less time moving than *A. tigris* [30]. We build on their comparison of overall movement levels by analyzing movement patterns and resource acquisition from a habitat-use perspective.

In the southwestern United States, the two species largely overlap in desert habitats with finite resources where the harsh environment requires animals to take maximal advantage of any available food or shelter [31, 32]. Their opportunistic nature, as well as their limited food and habitat resources allowed us to make an interspecies comparison of movement ecology. The two species share an overlapping diet consisting of grasshoppers, beetles, spiders, antlions, and caterpillars but differ somewhat in their food choices, as *G. wislizenii*, with their larger body size, can prey on small lizards while *A. tigris* are proficient at digging for termites and buried larvae [33–37].

Despite sharing habitat and consuming similar prey, the species vary in their foraging strategies and rely differently on sensory modalities for prey detection [34, 35, 38, 39]. Leopard lizards primarily use visual cues for finding food, pursuing prey that moves within their visual detection range (≤ 10 m away) [18, 40–42]. The movement rate for leopard lizards can vary with environmental conditions and among individuals [18, 41]. In contrast, whiptail movement is wide-ranging and can vary with habitat structure [43, 44]. Further, whiptails primarily locate prey (even below the surface) through chemical sampling, only sometimes using vision to detect food items [35, 43, 45].

When compared to strictly visual hunters, chemosensory foragers move more frequently and spend a higher proportion of time moving [46, 47]. However, search strategy does not necessarily indicate the size of the area searched or the path traveled. Our overarching hypothesis is that differences in prey detection are associated with the species' space use and movement patterns. Our goal was to determine if there were consistent differences in habitat use and movement patterns between animals that generally use different prey detection cues: visual long-nosed leopard lizards and chemosensory western whiptails. We predicted that a more visually-oriented predator would move along straighter paths, travel less, and make more use of open spaces than a chemosensory forager. Finding associations between prey detection strategies and differences in movement patterns can help identify the importance of sensory systems in shaping both foraging strategies and interactions between potential competitors.

Methods

Our study was conducted in desert scrub habitat of the Alvord Basin, located in the Great Basin Desert, southeastern Oregon (42°18'N, 118°37'W; datum = WGS 84; elevation 1295 m) from 20 June – 14 July 2017. The study site was a 16-ha gridded plot characterized by open desert sand and hardpan interspersed with patches of shrubs, mainly sage (*Artemisia tridentata*) and greasewood (*Sarcobatus vermiculatus*). We conducted observations on the long-nosed leopard lizard, *G. wislizenii* (visual predator; N = 61), and the western whiptail, *A. tigris* (chemosensory predator; N = 51), during their morning activity period (0800 – 1030 h). Each observation was conducted by a pair of observers at a distance that allowed for clear observation without disturbing foraging behavior (ca. 2–5 m) [35, 44, 48]. Observations lasted 30 min with one observer tracking lizard movements and the other observer placing markers at the lizard's location at each 1-min interval. To minimize disturbance, markers were placed after the animal left the immediate area where a marker was to be placed. For each marker, we recorded whether the location was in vegetation or in the open. When the location was in vegetation, we recorded the plant species. Unmarked lizards were captured using a lasso attached to an extendable pole, measured (sex, body mass, snout vent length (SVL)), and marked with a unique paint code before being released at the capture site. We recorded movement data only once for each individual animal.

Habitat And Movement Analysis

A full observation generated 31 location-time points for each animal, consisting of x-y coordinates and associated vegetation measurements. From the sequence of locations, we calculated the path characteristics of *step length*, *path length*, *net displacement*, *straightness index*, and *turn angle* (Table 1). Several observations did not last the full 30 min, in which case

Table 1
Definitions of the movement characteristics we measured.

Measurement	Definition
Step Length	The straight-line distance between consecutive 1-min locations.
Path Length	The sum of all step lengths for an observation period.
Net Displacement	The straight-line distance between initial and final locations.
Straightness Index	The ratio of net displacement to path length (value from 0 to 1).
Turn Angle	The change in direction between consecutive steps (value from 0° to 180°, with 0° = orientation of the focal animal at the previous step).

we did not calculate path length and net displacement. In addition, we calculated a *visibility index*, measured as the proportion of locations from which the next location was visible to the lizard. We deemed a location to be visible to the lizard from the previous location if the line between the two locations was free of vegetation at the ground level (i.e., from the lizard's line of sight). To measure

visibility, a researcher sighted along the horizon just above the substrate over one location marker in the direction of the next location marker, allowing us to assess what the animal could see from each vantage point, and assess whether the direction taken had a clear or obstructed view. We recorded each sequential step in the lizard's path as either clear or obstructed, then determined the proportion of locations that were clear for each observation (i.e., visibility index). We used air temperature and wind speed measures obtained from a weather station adjacent to our site to estimate local conditions at each 1-min interval of an observation.

Data Analyses

We used Minitab 18 (College Park, PA) for most analyses and R [49] for circular statistics, applying a significance level of $P \leq 0.05$ to all tests. To examine the distributions of step length and turn angle as well as habitat use patterns, we pooled the measurements by species. We tested data for normality and applied non-parametric Mann-Whitney tests to pairwise comparisons of data that were not normally distributed. We tested for species differences in habitat use and the distribution of step lengths and turn angles using chi-square analyses. We applied circular statistics to comparisons of mean turn angles, and to test for uniformity and conformity to von Mises distributions [50]. We examined within species variation in step length using a mixed-effects model with lizard id as a random factor and sex, body size (SVL), and weather variables as fixed factors. We did not observe any behavioral change in the lizards during the duration of our observations in the field. We tested for a possible observer effect by using a general linear model (GLM) to examine if animal movements varied over the course of the observation period, with time in the observation period as our independent variable.

Results

Movement patterns

The two species differed in most characteristics of their movement paths including turn angle, straightness index, step length, and path length (Table 2). The distribution of turn angles for both species was significantly different from a uniform circular distribution (Rayleigh's uniformity test: visual predator (long-nosed leopard lizards, *G. wislizenii*): $z = 69.1$, $df = 568$, $P < 0.001$; chemosensory predator (western whiptails, *A. tigris*): $z = 81.85$, $df = 1004$, $P < 0.001$). The distribution of turn angles and median turn angle differed between the species (Chi-square test $X^2 = 10.6$, $df = 3$, $P = 0.014$; Fig. 1; Table 2), with the visual predator making a greater proportion

Table 2

Summary of movement parameters (median (range)) for *G. wislizenii* (visual forager) and *A. tigris* (chemosensory forager), compared using Mann-Whitney tests.

Measurement	<i>G. wislizenii</i>	<i>A. tigris</i>	U	P
Step Length (m)	2.1 (0.02–45.3)	4.2 (0.01–42.8)	1120731	< 0.0001
Path Length (m)	28.9 (0.0–203.1)	92.3 (2.2–251.3)	2537	< 0.001
Net Displacement (m)	16.6 (0.0–116.5)	21.5 (1.3–126.3)	2005	0.243
Straightness Index	0.663 (0.09–1.00)	0.308 (0.02–0.92)	1095	< 0.001
Turn Angle	44° (0–180)	53° (0 – 180)	820076	0.010

of forward-directed movements and having smaller median turn angles. The strength of directionality (mean vector length) was 0.34 for the visual predator and 0.28 for the chemosensory predator. Leopard lizards moved less frequently than whiptails (visual predator: 44% vs chemosensory predator: 75% of intervals had movement; $z = 16.97$, $P < 0.001$). During intervals of movement, median step length was shorter for the visual predator (Table 2) and the distribution of step lengths differed between the species, with the visual predator being less likely to have longer step lengths (Chi-square test: $\chi^2 = 188.6$, $df = 5$, $P < 0.001$; Fig. 2).

Median path length also was shorter for the visual predator than for the chemosensory predator (Table 2), indicating that our chemosensory lizard moved greater overall distances during observations. However, median net displacement was comparable for both species (Table 2), indicating similarity in search area. Path straightness varied by species, with the visual predator traveling straighter paths (Table 2; Fig. 3). Turn angle and step length were not correlated for either species (visual predator: $r = 0.055$, $P = 0.090$; chemosensory predator: $r = -0.031$, $P = 0.474$). Step length for the chemosensory predator was greater for larger animals (SVL: $F_{1,41} = 9.77$, $P = 0.003$) and unrelated to sex, wind speeds or air temperatures. For the visual predator, step length was unrelated to sex, SVL or weather variables.

The movement pattern of an individual, as indicated by step lengths and turn angles, did not vary for either species over the course of an observation, indicating that our presence did not affect lizard behavior (GLM; *G. wislizenii* step length: $F_{1,1714} = 0.02$, $P = 0.875$ and turn angle: $F_{1,476} = 0.4$, $P = 0.529$; *A. tigris* step length: $F_{1,1446} = 0.3$, $P = 0.583$ and turn angle: $F_{1,911} = 0.43$, $P = 0.511$).

Habitat Use

The two species varied in time spent under cover, with the visual predator occurring more frequently in the open than the chemosensory predator ($\chi^2 = 308.0$, $df = 2$, $P < 0.001$; Fig. 4). Based on differences in the visibility index, the visual predator was more likely than the chemosensory predator to move to locations visible from the previous location ($\chi^2 = 392.9$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.001$). In addition, the two species made use of

different species of plants. When under cover, the visual predator primarily used greasewood (*Sarcobatus vermiculatus*), but the chemosensory predator frequented both sage (*Artemisia tridentata*) and greasewood in roughly equal measure ($\chi^2 = 82.1$, $df = 6$, $P < 0.001$; Fig. 5).

Discussion

Organisms occurring in sympatry must share or partition limiting resources to coexist. Frequently, sympatry involves species differing slightly in microhabitat, activity, or food usages. Our study shows a clear distinction between the movements and nuances in habitat use of a visual predator (*G. wislizenii*) that co-occurs with a predator foraging primarily by using chemical cues (*A. tigris*), demonstrating that movement can play a large role in facilitating sympatry and resource partitioning. Although both species exhibited similar net displacement in movement, their use of habitat and patterns of movement varied consistently along the lines of their differing prey detection strategies. The visually-oriented animals positioned themselves in areas where they were able to see prey from a distance, whereas the chemical-sensing species followed pathways indicative of a reliance on close inspection of chemical cues in and around bushes to acquire prey, differences that do not immediately follow traditional classifications of visual and chemosensory prey detection strategies.

In terms of min-to-min spatial advancement, the visually-oriented *G. wislizenii* showed different movement patterns compared to the chemosensory-oriented *A. tigris*. Specifically, the visual predator followed our prediction by moving in more direct paths and spending more time in the open when compared to the sympatric chemosensory species, a result consistent with the notion that visually-oriented predators require a clear visual path to stalk prey. In addition to different movement patterns, we found differences in vegetation use associated with the differing prey detection cues used by our two focal species. For visually-oriented predators, inhabiting more open areas of the habitat allows for visual scans of the edges of many plants, as well as the open area itself, which can increase their prey detection range. Chemosensory predators, by contrast, increase their chances of detecting prey by venturing further into vegetation. We recorded our chemosensory predator spending equal time in sage and greasewood bushes, climbing in brush to pursue insect prey, and digging for insect larva under vegetation, indicating that vegetation can harbor more prey opportunities than open areas but also requires more time to search. The equal occurrence of the chemosensory predator in both shrub types, combined with a consistently less direct trajectory, indicates that the whiptails were detecting chemosensory cues while moving from bush to bush, opportunistically searching each bush for prey. For our visual predator, the choice of vegetation might be related to the types of prey likely to be found therein, coupled with the vantage associated with chosen plants. Greasewood, for example, seemed to have a higher branch ceiling than sage (personal observation), possibly proving less of an impediment to visual scanning from a distance.

Our Alvord Basin study site allowed us to make comparisons of two species and draw novel insights into the interplay between movement and ecology for two sympatric species. While our approach of studying behavioral ecology through an assessment of movement patterns provides a template for examining

differences in behavior attributable to species, sex, body size, or season, we acknowledge that our observations might not generalize to other populations or have larger, species-level implications. Comparing the behavior of the same species in other locations where they occur would promote a more general appraisal of the factors affecting their behavior and sympatry.

Conclusions

Path segmentation combined with habitat analyses provides new insight into the ecology of visual and chemosensory prey detection. Individuals of our two species were commonly in proximity to each other, indicating a lack of spatial segregation by species. Yet, they used the same area in very different ways. Landscape features can present a continuum of corridor-barrier patches acting as functional areas whose use varies by species [51]. While *G. wislizenii* moved along a straight path to places that readily could be seen from the previous location (high visibility index), *A. tigris* moved more circuitously through vegetation where visibility was lower, demonstrating how landscape features and movement can interact to promote sympatry. Landscape features that facilitate movement for one species can impede movement for the other [51]. Depending on overlap in diet, differences in sensory priorities might not, by themselves, prevent competition between species. Their movement, however, could represent a form of resource partitioning that facilitates coexistence.

Abbreviations

GLM
general linear model
SVL
snout-to-vent length

Declarations

Ethics approval

All applicable national and institutional guidelines for the care and use of animals were followed under the approval of Erell Institute's Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC proposal no. F2017-02).

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

Our research was made possible by financial support from Erell Institute and grants by the University of Kansas Honors Program to SGS and the Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology Summer Funding Program to GG. Funding agencies played no role in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Author contributions

MAE and DAE conceived and designed the study, collected and analyzed data and helped write the manuscript. EMB, KLU, JK, and KMD contributed to project design and all aspects of data collection and manuscript preparation, SGS and GEG collected data, contributed to field logistics, and provided editorial input on the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We thank R. Anderson and the Western Washington University 2017 Ecological Field Methods course for logistical assistance. A. Underwood and G. Ramon assisted with field work. C. Olson was our communication liaison and resident expert on all things botanical.

References

1. Higham TE. The integration of locomotion and prey capture in vertebrates: morphology, behavior, and performance. *Integr Comp Biol.* 2007;47:82–95.
2. Nathan R, Getz WM, Revilla E, Holyoak M, Kadmon R, Saltz D, Smouse PE. A movement ecology paradigm for unifying organismal movement research. *P Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2008;105:19052–9.
3. Smouse PE, Focardi S, Moorcroft PR, Kie JG, Forester JD, Morales JM. Stochastic modelling of animal movement. *Philos T R Soc B.* 2010;365:2201–221.
4. Krauel JJ, Brown VA, Westbrook JK, McCracken GF. Predator-prey interaction reveals local effects of high-altitude insect migration. *Oecologia.* 2018;186:49–58.
5. Cooper WE Jr, Frederick WG. Optimal flight initiation distance. *J Theor Biol.* 2007;244:59–67.
6. Wearmouth VJ, McHugh MJ, Humphries NE, Naegelen A, Ahmed MZ, Southall EJ, Reynolds AM, Sims DW. Scaling laws of ambush predator ‘waiting’ behaviour are tuned to a common ecology. *P Roy Soc B-Biol Sci.* 2014;281:20132997.
7. Schick RS, Loarie SR, Colchero F, Best BD, Boustany A, Conde DA, Halpin PN, Joppa LN, McClellan CM, Clark JS. Understanding movement data and movement processes: current and emerging directions. *Ecol Lett.* 2008;11:1338–50.
8. Kays R, Crofoot MC, Jetz W, Wikelski M. Terrestrial animal tracking as an eye on life and planet. *Science.* 2015;348:aaa2478.

9. Edelhoff H, Signer J, Balkenhol N. Path segmentation for beginners: an overview of current methods for detecting changes in animal movement patterns. *Movement Ecol.* 2016;4:1–21.
10. Sunquist ME, Montgomery GG. Activity patterns and rates of movement of two-toed and three-toed sloths (*Choloepus hoffmanni* and *Bradypus infuscatus*). *J Mammal.* 1973;54:946–54.
11. Huey RB, Pianka ER. Ecological consequences of foraging mode. *Ecology.* 1981;62:991–9.
12. O'Brien JW, Howard BI, Barbara EI. Search strategies of foraging animals. *Am Sci.* 1990;78:52–160.
13. Miles DB, Losos JB, Irschick DJ. Morphology, performance and foraging mode. In: Reilly SM, McBrayer LD, Miles DB, editors. *Lizard ecology: the evolutionary consequences of foraging mode.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2007. pp. 49–93.
14. Perry G. Movement patterns in lizards: measurement, modality and behavioral correlates. In: Reilly SM, McBrayer LD, Miles DB, editors. *Lizard ecology: the evolutionary consequences of foraging mode.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2007. pp. 13–48.
15. Leu ST, Jackson G, Roddick JF, Bull CM. Lizard movement tracks: variation in path re-use behaviour is consistent with a scent-marking function. *PeerJ.* 2016;4:e1844.
16. Eifler DA, Eifler MA, Eifler EN. Habitat use and movement patterns for the lizard, *Pseudocordylus capensis*. *Afr Zool.* 2007;42:152–7.
17. Childers JL, Eifler DA. Intraspecific behavioural variation in the lacertid lizard *Meroles cuneirostris* (Strauch, 1867) (Sauria:Lacertidae). *Afr J Herpetol.* 2015;64:54–66.
18. Garrison GE, Zecchini Gebin JC, Penner JF, Jacobson FE, Eifler MA, Eifler DA. Intraspecific variation in habitat use and movement in long-nosed leopard lizards, *Gambelia wislizenii*. *Southwest Nat.* 2017;62:187–92.
19. Durtsche RD. Feeding time strategies of the fringe-toed lizard, *Uma inornata*, during breeding and non-breeding seasons. *Oecologia.* 1992;89:85–9.
20. Eifler DA, Eifler MA. The influence of prey distribution on the foraging strategy of the lizard *Oligosoma grande* (Reptilia: Scincidae). *Behav Ecol Sociobiol.* 1999;45:397–402.
21. Greeff J, Whiting MJ. Foraging-mode plasticity in the lizard *Platysaurus broadleyi*. *Herpetologica.* 2000;56:402–7.
22. Eifler DA, Eifler MA, Harris B. Foraging under the risk of predation in desert grassland whiptail lizards, *Aspidoscelis uniparens*. *J Ethol.* 2008;26:219–23.
23. Attum OA, Eason PK. Effects of vegetation loss on a sand dune lizard. *J Wildlife Manage.* 2006;70:27–30.
24. Wasiolka B, Blaum N, Jeltsch F, Henschel J. Behavioral responses of the lizard (*Pedioplanis l. lineocellata*) to overgrazing. *Acta Oecol.* 2009;35:157–62.
25. Wasiolka B, Jeltsch F, Henschel J, Blaum N. Space use of the spotted sand lizard (*Pedioplanis l. lineocellata*) under different degradation states. *Afr J Ecol.* 2009;48:96–104.
26. Morice S, Pincebourde S, Darboux F, Kaiser W, Casas J. Predator-prey pursuit-evasion games in structurally complex environments. *Integr Comp Biol.* 2013;53:767–79.

27. Colombo M, Indermaur A, Meyer BS, Salzburger W. Habitat use and its implications to functional morphology: niche partitioning and the evolution of locomotory morphology in Lake Tanganyikan cichlids (Perciformes: Cichlidae). *Biol J Linn Soc Lond.* 2016;118:536–50.
28. Donihue CM. Aegean wall lizards switch foraging modes, diet and morphology in a human-built environment. *Ecol Evol.* 2016;6:7433–42.
29. Pianka ER, Vitt LJ. *Lizards: windows to the evolution of diversity.* Oakland: University of California Press; 2003.
30. McElroy EJ, McBrayer LD, Williams SC, Anderson RA, Reilly SM. Sequential analyses of foraging behavior and attack speed in ambush and widely foraging lizards. *Adapt Behav.* 2011;20:16–31.
31. Hammerson GA. *Gambelia wislizenii*. The IUCN Red list of Threatened Species. 2007;e.T64015A12735686. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2007.RLTS.T64015A12735686.en>. Accessed 26 March 2020.
32. Hammerson GA, Frost DR, Santos-Barrera G. *Aspidoscelis tigris*. The IUCN Red list of Threatened Species. 2007;e.T64290A12754666. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2007.RLTS.T64290A12754666.en>. Accessed 26 March 2020.
33. Hotton N III. A survey of adaptive relationships of dentition to diet in the North American Iguanidae. *Am Midl Nat.* 1955;53:88–114.
34. Pianka ER. Comparative autecology of the lizard *Cnemidophorus tigris* in different parts of its geographic range. *Ecology.* 1970;51:703–20.
35. Anderson RA. An analysis of foraging in the lizard, *Cnemidophorus tigris*: salient features and environmental effects. In: Wright JW, Vitt LJ, editors. *Biology of whiptail lizards.* Norman: Oklahoma Museum of Natural History; 1993. pp. 83–114.
36. Germano DJ, Smith PT, Tabor SP. Food habits of the blunt-nosed leopard lizard (*Gambelia sila*). *Southwest Nat.* 2007;52:318–24.
37. Steffen JE, Anderson RA. Abundance of the long-nosed leopard lizard (*Gambelia wislizenii*) is influenced by shrub diversity and cover in southeast Oregon. *Am Midl Nat.* 2006;156:201–7.
38. Montanucci RR. Further studies on leopard lizards, *Crotaphytus wislizenii*. *Herpetologica.* 1967;23:119–26.
39. Parker WS, Pianka ER. Ecological observations on the leopard lizard (*Crotaphytus wislizenii*) in different parts of its range. *Herpetologica.* 1976;32:95–114.
40. Tollestrup K. The social behavior of two species of closely related leopard lizards, *Gambelia silus* and *Gambelia wislizenii*. *Ethology.* 1983;62:307–20.
41. Pietruszka RD. Search tactics of desert lizards: how polarized are they? *Anim Behav.* 1986;34:1742–58.
42. Anderson RA. Food acquisition modes and habitat use in lizards: questions from an integrative perspective. In: Reilly SM, McBrayer LD, Miles DB, editors. *Lizard ecology: the evolutionary consequences of foraging mode.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2007. pp. 1–10.

43. Cooper WE Jr. Foraging mode, prey chemical discrimination, and phylogeny in lizards. *Anim Behav.* 1995;50:973–85.
44. Utsumi K, Kusaka C, Pedersen R, Staley C, Dunlap L, Gilbert Smith S, Eifler MA, Eifler DA. Habitat dependent search behavior in the Colorado checkered whiptail (*Aspidoscelis neotesselata*). *West N Am Naturalist.* 2020;80:11–8.
45. Anderson RA, Karasov WH. Energetics of the lizard *Cnemidophorus tigris*, and life history consequences of food acquisition mode. *Ecol Monogr.* 1988;58:79–110.
46. Cooper WE Jr, Whiting MJ. Ambush and active foraging mode both occur in the scincid genus *Mabuya*. *Copeia* 2000;2000:112–118.
47. Baeckens S, Van Damme R, Cooper WE Jr. How phylogeny and foraging ecology drive the level of chemosensory exploration in lizards and snakes. *J Evolution Biol.* 2017;30:627–40.
48. Eifler DA, Eifler MA, Liu EF, Luyanda B, Utsumi K, Muradzikwa T, Kanyanga MK, Buchanan CA. Slip slidin’ away: Demographic variation in movement behavior of the dune-dwelling lizard *Meroles anchietae*. *J Arid Environ.* 2020;183:104286.
49. R Development Core Team. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2017.
50. Batschelet E. Circular statistics in biology. New York: Academic Press; 1981.
51. Panzacchi M, Van Moorter B, Strand O, Saerens M, Kivimäki I, St. Clair CC, Herfindal I, Boitani L. Predicting the *continuum* between corridors and barriers to animal movements using step selection functions and randomized shortest paths. *J Anim Ecol.* 2016;85:32–42.

Figures




Figure 1

Distribution of turn angles for *G. wislizenii* (visual forager; black) and *A. tigris* (chemosensory forager; grey), separated into bins of 45°.





Figure 2

Distribution of step lengths for *G. wislizenii* (visual forager; black) and *A. tigris* (chemosensory forager; grey).

A)

Gambelia wislizenii



B)

Aspidoscelis tigris





Figure 4

Use of habitat by *G. wislizenii* (visual forager; A) and *A. tigris* (chemosensory forager; B)

A)

♦

Gambelia wislizenii



B)

♦

Aspidoscelis tigris




Figure 5

Use of vegetation by *G. wislizenii* (visual forager; A) and *A. tigris* (chemosensory forager; B). Species of plants are in the families Chenopodiaceae (greasewood: *Sarcobatus vermiculatus* and shadscale: *Atriplex confertifolia*), Asteraceae (sage: *Artemisia tridentata*, rabbit brush: *Ericameria* sp., and horse brush: *Tetradymia glabrata*), and Poaceae (rye grass: *Leymus cinereus*).