

Canid vs. canid: insights into coyote–dog encounters from social media

ERIN E. BOYDSTON, U.S. Geological Survey, Western Ecological Research Center, 401 W. Hillcrest Drive, Thousand Oaks, CA 91360, USA eboydston@usgs.gov

ERIC S. ABELSON¹, La Kretz Center for California Conservation Science, Institute of the Environment and Sustainability, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA

ARI KAZANJIAN, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, 621 Young Drive South, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1606, USA

DANIEL T. BLUMSTEIN, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, 621 Young Drive South, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1606, USA

Abstract: While the relationship between coyotes (*Canis latrans*) and house cats (*Felis catus*) may be characterized as one between predators and their prey, coyote interactions with domestic dogs (*C. lupus familiaris*) appear to be more varied and may include behaviors associated with canid sociality. While encounters between coyotes and dogs are difficult to observe, we capitalized on publicly available video recordings of coyote–dog encounters to observe canid behaviors and examined 35 video clips downloaded from YouTube during fall 2014. We identified coyote–dog interactions that were playful, agonistic, or predatory; those that we could not clearly categorize were labeled as other/undetermined. We found that both species were recorded directing play to the other species, which led to mutual play bouts. We observed a similar number of agonistic encounters, which included dogs biting coyotes and coyotes biting dogs. The main difference in agonistic behavior was that coyotes usually showed defensive aggression while dogs did not show defensive aggression. We also observed coyotes ambushing and bite-shaking small dogs in 3 video clips, from which the dogs escaped, but we did not see predatory behavior of dogs toward coyotes. Dog size may be related to types of interactions. No small dogs were involved in agonistic interactions, and only 1 small dog was observed playing with a coyote. From these videos, we conclude that the relationship between coyotes and dogs cannot be simply described as predator–prey; indeed, much of it appears to be social behavior divided between playful and agonistic. Future work that aims to explain the proximate correlates of play and aggression would provide more information for managers who wish to educate humans to reduce human–wildlife conflicts.

Key words: agonistic, *Canis latrans*, coyote, domestic dog, human–wildlife interactions, interspecific, play, predator–prey, social media

THE FEAR OF PETS being injured or killed by coyotes (*Canis latrans*) can be a cause for pet-owner concern when coyotes are seen in neighborhoods, parks, or open spaces where pets range on or off-leash. While the risk of attack or predation to outdoor pets from coyotes is unknown, domestic dogs (*C. lupus familiaris*) and domestic cats (*Felis catus*) have been found as food items in coyote diet studies. Pets appear to be a low percentage of coyote diet in urban areas (<3%; Lukasik and Alexander 2012, Poessel et al. 2017b), but Quinn (1997) estimated cats were 13% of urban coyote diet, and cat remains have been found in 8% (Santana and Armstrong 2017) and 22% of coyote scats (Larson et al. 2015). Domestic dogs have generally been detected with <1%

frequency of occurrence in coyote scats, suggesting predation is relatively rare (Morey et al. 2007, Larson et al. 2015, Murray et al. 2015, Santana and Armstrong 2017). Dogs may not be prevalent in coyote diets, but several studies that have compiled reports of coyote conflicts with pets from the public, print media, and other sources include numerous reports of coyotes attacking or killing dogs (Grinder and Krausman 1998, Gehrt and Riley 2010, Alexander and Quinn 2011, Poessel et al. 2013).

Coyote interactions with dogs, importantly, do not consist solely of coyotes attacking or killing dogs. Kamler et al. (2003) observed 3 large dogs killing a coyote, and Andelt and Mahan (1980) observed a radio-collared male coyote playing with dogs on several occasions.

¹Present address: USFS Pacific Southwest Research Station, 1731 Research Park Drive, Davis, CA 95618, USA

Andelt and Mahan (1980) also saw the collared coyote attempting to mount a female dog in estrus and being chased away by a dog. Evidence of coyote and dog hybridization indicates that mating can occur (Adams et al. 2003), and anecdotal reports of coyote–dog encounters further suggest that the range of interactions Andelt and Mahan (1980) observed are not limited to the single coyote studied.

Thus, coyote–dog interactions may include behaviors associated with a predator–prey relationship and a range of social behaviors, including play. As congeners, coyotes and dogs share evolutionary history and have characteristics in common with other Canidae species. Canids are territorial, social, and generally more aggressive to nongroup members than to group members (King 1954, Mech 1970, Bowen 1982, Bekoff and Wells 1986). Wild canids are capable of capturing and killing prey, an ability that varies in domestic dogs with breed and opportunity. Intraguild competition may explain some relationships of dogs with other carnivores (Vanak and Gompper 2009), but interspecific killing (with or without consumption) among carnivore species is often predictable based on relative sizes of the species (Polis et al. 1989, Creel and Creel 1996, Palomares and Caro 1999, Fedriani et al. 2000). African lions (*Panthera leo*) kill spotted hyenas (*Crocuta crocuta*; Cooper 1991, Trinkel and Kastberger 2005), wolves (*C. lupus*) kill coyotes (Arjo and Pletscher 2000, Berger and Gese 2007), and coyotes kill foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*; Cypher and Spencer 1998, Sovada et al. 1998, Farias et al. 2005). Dogs vary greatly in size with some individuals much larger than coyotes and some much smaller, and interactions between the species may vary with dog size, breed, and traits associated with domestication. Furthermore, dogs are usually partially or wholly dependent on humans with movements restricted by their owners (Vanak and Gompper 2009, Bateman and Fleming 2012), and the dog–human relationship likely factors into coyote–dog encounters whether or not a person is present.

Although carnivores are typically elusive and avoid humans, there is great potential for humans, dogs, and coyotes to overlap and directly encounter each other. Dogs are abundant in human communities and widely

distributed (Wandeler et al. 1993, Young et al. 2011), and coyotes are found across North America following a recent range expansion (Laliberte and Ripple 2004, Sacks et al. 2004, Thornton and Murray 2014, Heppenheimer et al. 2018) and increasing occupation of urban areas (Gompper 2002, Lawrence and Krausman 2011, Poessel et al. 2017a). With >60% of people in the United States living in cities (Cohen 2015) and 44% of U.S. residents owning dogs (Newport et al. 2006), coyote interactions with dogs are an important part of the equation of human–coyote conflicts, but scientific studies offer limited insights for successful coexistence. Studying encounters between dogs and free-ranging, wild coyotes is a challenging research task, and published studies with direct observations of coyote–dog encounters such as Andelt and Mahan (1980) are rare.

Because coyote–dog interactions are difficult to systematically observe, we sought insights into interspecific encounters from videos shared through social media platforms. The popularity of video-sharing and prevalence of camera phones, small personal video cameras, and surveillance cameras have led to people opportunistically recording footage of animals and posting clips online, offering new opportunities for animal behavior research (Nelson and Fijn 2013). We expected that videos of coyote–dog encounters might capture a range of predatory and social behaviors. We characterized the behavior of canids in videos to examine for predatory behavior, aggression, play, or mating attempts between domestic dogs and free-ranging coyotes, and identified factors associated with coyote–dog encounters. We further suggest how this method may be used to develop and address hypotheses about coyote behavior with respect to people and their pets.

Study area

The study area was the range of extant coyote populations, where they intersect with people with the potential for interactions with dogs to be recorded on video. The final dataset included information from the United States and Canada.

Methods

To describe interactions between dogs and free-ranging coyotes, we used videos posted to

Table 1. Interspecific interactions were categorized based on a captive coyote (*Canis latrans*) ethogram (Way et al. 2006), wolf (*C. lupus*) ethogram (Packard 2003), wolf hunting ethogram (MacNulty et al. 2007), and descriptions of domestic dog (*C. l. familiaris*) behaviors (Coppinger and Coppinger 2002).

Category	Subcategory
Predatory	Stalk/ambush and attack with presumed intent to capture with a vigorous bite-shake to head or neck
Agonistic	Aggression/fighting: bite/lunge (with or without contact), possibly including chase run, barking, growling Defensive/mixed fight-or-flight: defensive/submissive postures of crouching, tail tucked, ears back, open mouth/teeth bared, plus defensive snapping, growling/snarling, chase and/or flee
Social play	Play-chase, play-flee, play-bow, other play-invitation (flop on ground, quick-pivot/invite chase)
Other/undetermined	Low-intensity interest or avoidance; an absence of behaviors clearly falling into another category

YouTube (San Bruno, California, USA), a social media platform for sharing digital videos. We looked for videos of coyote–dog encounters, where coyotes and dogs were aware of and responded to each other or had the potential to be aware of each other due to proximity in time and space. We conducted Internet searches from October 19, 2014 through December 23, 2014 for YouTube video clips containing at least 1 dog and at least 1 coyote, using the search term “dog coyote.” We viewed the first 400 videos ranked by relevance to the query and examined the posted titles and written descriptions of the videos to determine whether dogs and coyotes were both present at the scene. From this first search, we identified 40 videos with at least 1 dog and 1 coyote. In combination with “dog coyote,” we next queried 1 of 5 additional keywords: play, attack, fight, fun, and aggressive. We looked through 60 videos for each added keyword and found 3 more videos containing both dogs and coyotes. We repeated the search of “dog coyote” and examined the first 60 videos ranked by number of views instead of relevance, and found 1 new video.

We next omitted “dog” as a search term and conducted searches pairing the keyword “coyote” with 1 of the top 5 breeds of dogs in the United States: Labrador retriever, German shepherd, golden retriever, bulldog, and beagle (American Kennel Club 2015). After searching through 60 videos for each breed, 1 new video was found. We searched other dog breed terms, including pit bull and terrier, in combination with “coyote,” and found 1 additional video, for

a total of 46 candidate videos. We also queried Vimeo (New York City, New York, USA), another social media website hosting videos, but found no additional videos. After further review of the 46 videos, we excluded 7 videos that showed intentional pursuit of coyotes by people with dogs, and 4 videos of coyotes that were pets or were confined in large enclosures. We analyzed coyote and dog behavior in the 35 remaining clips that appeared to depict free-ranging coyotes interacting with dogs in unplanned, spontaneous encounters.

For each of the 35 video clips of coyote–dog encounters, we recorded the number of coyotes and dogs, whether dogs were leashed, and where the video was recorded. We also estimated sizes of dogs relative to the stature of coyotes in the same video: small (noticeably smaller than its coyote counterpart), medium (about the same size as a coyote), or large (noticeably larger than a coyote). We looked for characteristics suggesting whether canids were pups, but we could not reliably estimate older age classes. We also could not reliably identify sex, reproductive state, or whether dogs were neutered. In our tallies, we did not include dogs or coyotes that were not visible in the footage.

Behaviors of dogs toward coyotes and coyotes toward dogs were identified and grouped into categories based primarily on a wolf (*Canis lupus*) ethogram (Packard 2003) and a captive coyote ethogram (Way et al. 2006), plus descriptions of wolf hunting behavior (MacNulty et al. 2007) and domestic dog behavior (Coppinger and Coppinger 2002). From the range of behaviors

Table 2. Numbers (and percentages) of coyote–dog (*Canis latrans*, *C. lupus familiaris*) dyadic interactions per ethogram category (see Table 1) for a total of 49 coyote–dog dyads involving 39 coyotes and 45 dogs (30 large, 7 medium, 8 small). Dyadic interactions were observed in 35 video clips containing 1–3 dyads per video. Number of videos here sums to 36, because 1 video contained a predatory and an agonistic dyad.

Ethogram category	# Dyads (%)	# Coyotes	# Dogs			# Videos
			Large	Medium	Small	
Predatory	5 (10.20)	5	0	1	3	4
Agonistic	13 (26.53)	10	11	1	0	9
Social play	13 (26.53)	9	9	3	1	11
Other/undetermined	18 (36.73)	15	10	2	4	12

observed, we conservatively scored behaviors or suites of behaviors as falling into categories of hunting/predatory, agonistic (aggression or defensive aggression), social play, or other/undetermined (Table 1). We looked for sexual behaviors but did not see mounting or other clear reproductive behaviors. Further, because we could not reliably sex coyotes and dogs, determine sexual maturity, or whether dogs had intact reproductive organs, we categorized potential sexual interest as other/undetermined.

Because videos did not necessarily capture the entire sequence of an encounter, we did not estimate rates of behavior per time and individual. Instead, we scored whether a behavior occurred at least once during a video by a dog toward or in response to a coyote, or by a coyote toward or in response to a dog, for each dog–coyote dyad in a video. For example, if there were 2 dogs and 1 coyote in a clip, and each dog chased the coyote, we counted 2 dog–coyote chases and 2 cases of a coyote fleeing for that video. The potential total number of occurrences of a behavior category was the number of pairwise combinations of dogs and coyotes (i.e., dyads) per video, summed across 35 video clips. From the behaviors observed, we categorized each dyad as predatory, agonistic, play, or other/undetermined.

We summarized numbers of dyads in which dogs or coyotes engaged in a behavior or behavior category, and numbers of videos according to behavioral categories. We used chi-square tests to compare occurrence of behaviors of dogs toward coyotes and coyotes toward dogs, and if sizes of dogs influenced occurrence of behaviors.

Results

In the 35 video clips of coyote–dog encounters, 16 (45.71%) occurred in backyards or other yards next to houses in rural or urban residential areas, 9 (25.71%) in landscaped areas (city parks, cemeteries, and a golf course), 8 (22.86%) in natural or wildland areas, and 2 (5.71%) in agricultural fields away from buildings. Eight clips were <1 minute in duration, and 27 were 1–8 minutes long. Thirty-one video clips were filmed by a person holding a digital recording device, usually the dog's owner as indicated by narration or written comments associated with the posted clip; 3 videos were recorded by surveillance cameras with no people present; and 1 video was from a video camera placed on an off-leash dog. One surveillance video and 1 video filmed by a person were nighttime footage; the other 33 clips were filmed in daylight. Two dogs were leashed for the duration of the video, 2 other dogs were leashed after a coyote arrived, and 1 dog in a surveillance camera video was tethered.

There were up to 3 dogs and up to 3 coyotes visible per video clip, but no clips with multiple dogs and multiple coyotes. Twenty-four clips (68.57%) showed 1 dog and 1 coyote, 8 (22.86%) had 2 or 3 dogs and 1 coyote, and 3 (8.57%) had 1 dog and 2 or 3 coyotes. These combinations yielded a total of 49 possible pairwise or dyadic interactions between 45 dogs and 39 coyotes, with a maximum of 3 dyads per video. One additional dog that arrived on screen in the last 2 seconds of a clip, and was not near other canids, was excluded.

Thirty dogs (66.67%) were large in size, 7 (15.56%) were medium, and 8 (17.78%) were

small. No dogs or coyotes appeared to be pups, although some may have been sub-adults. We did not recognize any individual dog as being in >1 video clip, but 3 clips that were filmed on different days at a small urban park in Chicago, Illinois, may have included the same coyote, based on comments posted by the videographers. Otherwise it is unlikely that individual coyotes were in >1 clip.

Videos did not show dogs engaged in predatory behavior toward coyotes, but 4 videos showed predatory behavior of 5 coyotes in 5 dyads (10.20% of 49; Table 2). Three videos showed coyotes engaged in predatory “head-shakes,” or “bite-shakes,” on small dogs that all escaped during the video sequences. In 1 case, the coyote dropped the small dog and fled when a large dog rushed in and lunged at the coyote. All 3 of these clips were surveillance footage, recorded remotely and with no evidence that people were present at the scene. A bystander filmed the fourth video that showed a coyote with apparent predatory interest in a medium-sized dog on a leash; the coyote sat observing, then stalked for a few yards and stopped without further pursuit as the owner and dog left the scene.

Thirteen coyote–dog dyads (26.53% of 49) that occurred in 9 videos (Table 2) were characterized as agonistic encounters, based primarily on biting, lunging, snarling, defensive snapping, or crouching with bared teeth. These dyads involved 10 coyotes and 12 dogs. Dogs involved in agonistic dyads were more often large in size (11 of 12) than medium (1 of 12) or small (0 of 12), and tended to be larger in size than dogs across all 49 dyads ($\chi^2 = 4.71$, $df = 2$, $P = 0.09$).

Injury during agonistic encounters seemed likely in only 1 video, in which 3 dogs attacked a coyote in a river. In 2 other videos, a dog lunged and bit or attempted to bite a coyote, with 1 coyote responding with defensive aggression before fleeing and the other immediately fleeing from the dog. Coyotes lunged and bit or attempted to bite dogs in 3 of 13 agonistic dyads. In each case, a lone coyote approached a lone dog that was facing away, quickly snapped at the dog’s hind leg, and immediately backed off. Each dog whirled around and briefly chased the coyote. Overall, there was no clear difference between dogs and coyotes in frequency of biting during encounters; dogs lunged to bite coyotes in 5 of 13 dyads, and coyotes lunged

to bite dogs in 3 of 13 dyads ($\chi^2 = 0.72$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.40$). Each species also aggressively chased the other with similar frequency; dogs aggressively chased coyotes in 7 dyads, and coyotes chased dogs in 4 dyads ($\chi^2 = 1.42$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.23$). However, there was a difference in the occurrence of defensive aggression; coyotes showed defensive aggression in 10 of 13 agonistic dyads while dogs did not exhibit defensiveness ($\chi^2 = 16.25$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.01$).

Thirteen dogs and 9 coyotes engaged in playful behaviors in 13 dyads (26.53% of 49) and 11 videos (Table 2). The occurrence of play was similar between the species with dogs playing in all 13 dyads and coyotes in 12 of the 13 dyads. Sizes of dogs involved in play (9 large, 3 medium, and 1 small dog) did not appear to differ from dog sizes across the 49 dyads ($\chi^2 = 2.06$, $df = 2$, $P = 0.36$). Play between dogs and coyotes mostly involved a series of short chases with participants mutually stopping and sometimes reversing roles when resuming. Dogs playfully chased or fled in 12 of 13 play dyads with coyotes, and coyotes in 11 dyads. Dogs exhibited play-bows in 5 dyads, coyotes in 5 dyads, and both the dog and coyote play-bowed in 3 dyads. Only 1 playful interaction included play-biting, in which both participants engaged.

No aggressive/agonistic behavior was observed in dyads or videos in which play occurred, and no play occurred in agonistic dyads or in videos with agonistic dyads. There was 1 dyad in which play was not mutual. In this case, a playful dog approached a coyote that did not reciprocate; the coyote gave a brief mild chase and moved away from the dog.

We classified a total of 18 dyads (36.73%) as other/undetermined, because there was no clear indication of play, agonistic, or predatory behavior by dogs or coyotes, and no mounting in these or any dyads. These 18 dyads, in 13 videos, were mostly characterized by a lack of heightened social behaviors, and instead featured some mild interest, avoidance, and deterrence. There were, however, 3 dyads with possible predatory interest by coyotes watching a small dog, from at least 10 m away and without stalking or exhibiting other hunting behavior before the coyotes or dogs left the area. Another dyad showed possible sexual behavior, with a coyote that appeared to be a

male following what appeared to be a female golden retriever. They walked slowly with the coyote following to within 5 m, twice stopping to sniff the ground and once lifting its leg to urinate.

Discussion

Published literature suggests interactions between coyotes and dogs are often conflicts in which coyotes threaten, attack, or kill dogs (Gehrt and Riley 2010, Alexander and Quinn 2011, Poessel et al. 2013) but that other interactions can occur (Andelt and Mahan 1980, Kamler et al. 2003). We turned to publicly available videos posted to YouTube to examine a sample of the range of interactions between coyotes and dogs. Among the coyote–dog dyadic interactions in the videos we examined, over half were playful or agonistic. Coyotes showed predatory stalking or bite-shakes in 10% of dyads, but dogs did not show predatory behavior toward coyotes. Another third of interactions did not appear agonistic, playful, or predatory, but 1 video recorded apparent sexual interest of a male coyote toward a female dog. No videos showed coyotes killing dogs or dogs killing coyotes, and there were few cases of direct contact with the potential to inflict injury.

Domestic dogs may play with a variety of other species (Nelson and Fijn 2013), and here we found mutual play between dogs and coyotes. We saw no dyads where 1 canid species was agonistic while the other was playful, but we did find behavioral differences between the species in agonistic dyads. Coyotes in agonistic interactions tended to exhibit defensive aggression toward domestic dogs, whether or not dogs escalated encounters to the point of biting. Coyotes may have used defensiveness as an alternative strategy to fleeing, possibly because they had prior injuries or felt cornered by dogs, humans, and surrounding physical structures.

Relative size appears to be a factor in coyote–dog interactions (Grinder and Krausman 1998, Gehrt and Riley 2010, Alexander and Quinn 2011). Here dogs were clearly larger than coyotes in all but 1 agonistic interaction, in which we conservatively scored a dog as medium-sized that may have been bigger than its coyote counterpart. Dogs involved in playful encounters were large or medium, except

for 1 small dog, and coyote predatory bite-shakes were directed only at small dogs. These patterns for relative sizes of canids suggest that encounters between coyotes and small dogs primarily resemble predator–prey interactions. Coyotes and medium or large dogs engaged in playful, agonistic, or mild/neutral interactions and possible reproductive behavior.

A variety of other factors beyond simply size could influence the likelihood and nature of interactions between coyotes and domestic dogs. For instance, from the dog's perspective, breed-specific behavioral differences might influence the likelihood of interacting with coyotes (Borchelt 1983, Coppinger and Coppinger 2002, Duffy et al. 2008). Whether or not dogs were on a leash, under voice-control, or near their owner could influence the nature of an interaction. Based on studies of other carnivores, the number of individual dogs and coyotes as well as the encounter history between dogs and coyotes could influence the nature of interactions (Cooper 1991, Atwood and Gese 2010). Finally, the age, health, reproductive status (e.g., estrus or not, neutered or not), and sex of the individuals involved might influence both the likelihood and consequences of interactions (Pal et al. 1998, MacLean et al. 2017, Murray and St Clair 2017).

While additional video-recorded observations could allow testing of some factors, we recognize limitations to this method. Similar to reports of coyote–human encounters (Poessel et al. 2013), videos recorded directly by people represent the times of day when people were active and the places where people were with their pets. In a given area or during a particular time of year, coyote activity patterns may or may not overlap those of humans, altering the likelihood of interactions. Further, these videos represent what people were willing and able to record, and motivated to post publicly. However, while there are sampling biases (e.g., people may be more likely to record play than aggression if they felt it was important to intervene to try to stop an aggressive interaction), there is important information contained in these opportunistic videos (Nelson and Fijn 2013). By sampling from times and settings of potential human–coyote encounters, the results provide valuable insights into interactions between a widespread wild canid and pet dogs. Finally, it might be

effective to encourage citizens to post videos and descriptions of encounters on a bespoke site, along with key details (time of day, relative size, sex, reproductive status, spayed/neutered status, etc.). The larger database derived from such postings could be very useful for generating key educational messages.

This study also helps identify ways to study behaviors of coyotes that have been rarely documented in the literature, such as predatory attacks on dogs that were recorded by security cameras, and play with dogs. Such information will be particularly useful to managers tasked with educating the public about the potential consequences of these interspecific interactions. Ultimately, public education will be an essential part of the solution to reduce and manage human/pet–wildlife conflicts.

Acknowledgments

E. Abelson was supported by the UCLA La Kretz Center for California Conservation Science and U.S. Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station. D. Blumstein was supported by the National Science Foundation. E. Boydston was supported by the U.S. Geological Survey Ecosystems Mission Area. We thank S. N. Frey, HWI associate editor, and the reviewers who provided comments that improved the manuscript. Any use of trade, product, or firm names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply an endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Literature cited

- Adams, J. R., J. A. Leonard, and L. P. Waits. 2003. Widespread occurrence of a domestic dog mitochondrial DNA haplotype in southeastern US coyotes. *Molecular Ecology* 12:541–546.
- American Kennel Club. 2015. Most popular dog breeds in America. American Kennel Club, New York, New York, USA, <<https://www.akc.org/press/most-popular-dog-breeds-in-america/>>. Accessed February 2, 2015.
- Alexander, S. M., and M. S. Quinn. 2011. Coyote (*Canis latrans*) interactions with humans and pets reported in the Canadian print media (1995–2010). *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 16:345–359.
- Andelt, W. F., and B. R. Mahan. 1980. Behavior of an urban coyote. *American Midland Naturalist* 103:399–400.
- Arjo, W. M., and D. H. Pletscher. 2000. Behavioral responses of coyotes to wolf recolonization in northwestern Montana. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 77:1919–1927.
- Atwood, T. C., and E. M. Gese. 2010. Importance of resource selection and social behavior to partitioning of hostile space by sympatric canids. *Journal of Mammalogy* 91:490–499.
- Bateman, P. W., and P. A. Fleming. 2012. Big city life: carnivores in urban environments. *Journal of Zoology* 287:1–23.
- Bekoff, M., and M. C. Wells. 1986. Social ecology and behavior of coyotes. *Advances in the Study of Behavior* 16:251–338.
- Berger, K. M., and E. M. Gese. 2007. Does interference competition with wolves limit the distribution and abundance of coyotes? *Journal of Animal Ecology* 76:1075–1085.
- Borchelt, P. L. 1983. Aggressive behavior of dogs kept as companion animals: classification and influence of sex, reproductive status and breed. *Applied Animal Ethology* 10:45–61.
- Bowen, W. D. 1982. Home range and spatial organization of coyotes in Jasper National Park, Alberta. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 46:201–216.
- Cohen, D. T. 2015. Population trends in incorporated places: 2000 to 2013. Population estimates and projections. Current population reports. U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, D.C., USA, <<https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2015/demo/p25-1142.pdf>>. Accessed April 16, 2017.
- Cooper, S. M. 1991. Optimal hunting group size: the need for lions to defend their kills against loss to spotted hyaenas. *African Journal of Ecology* 29:130–136.
- Coppinger, R., and L. Coppinger. 2002. Dogs: a new understanding of canine origin, behavior and evolution. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, USA.
- Creel, S., and N. M. Creel. 1996. Limitation of African wild dogs by competition with larger carnivores. *Conservation Biology* 10:526–538.
- Cypher, B. L., and K. A. Spencer. 1998. Competitive interactions between coyotes and San Joaquin kit foxes. *Journal of Mammalogy* 79:204–214.
- Duffy, D. L., Y. Hsu, and J. A. Spencer. 2008. Breed differences in canine aggression. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 114:441–460.
- Farias, V., T. K. Fuller, R. K. Wayne, and R. M. Sauvajot. 2005. Survival and cause-specific

- mortality of gray foxes (*Urocyon cinereoargenteus*) in southern California. *Journal of Zoology* 266:249–254.
- Fedriani, J. M., T. K. Fuller, R. M. Sauvajot, and E. C. York. 2000. Competition and intraguild predation among three sympatric carnivores. *Oecologia* 125:258–270.
- Gehrt, S. D., and S. P. D. Riley. 2010. Coyotes (*Canis latrans*). Pages 79–95 in S. D. Gehrt, S. P. D. Riley, and B. Cypher, editors. *Urban carnivores: ecology, conservation, and conflict*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland, USA.
- Gompper, M. E. 2002. Top carnivores in the suburbs? Ecological and conservation issues raised by colonization of north eastern North America by coyotes: the expansion of the coyote's geographical range may broadly influence community structure, and rising coyote densities in the suburbs may alter how the general public views wildlife. *BioScience* 52:185–190.
- Grinder, M. I., and P. R. Krausman. 1998. Ecology and management of coyotes in Tucson, Arizona. Proceedings of the 18th Vertebrate Pest Conference, University of California, Davis, California, USA.
- Heppenheimer E., D. S. Cosio, K. E. Brzeski, D. Caudill, K. Van Why, M. J. Chamberlain, and J. W. Hinton. 2018. Demographic history influences spatial patterns of genetic diversity in recently expanded coyote (*Canis latrans*) populations. *Heredity* 120:183–195.
- Kamler, J. F., K. Keeler, G. Weins, C. Richardson, and P. S. Gibson. 2003. Feral dogs, *Canis familiaris*, kill coyote, *Canis latrans*. *Canadian Field-Naturalist* 117:123–124.
- King, J. A. 1954. Closed social groups among domestic dogs. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 98:327–336.
- Laliberte, A. S., and W. J. Ripple. 2004. Range contractions of North American carnivores and ungulates. *Bioscience* 54:123–138.
- Larson, R. N., D. J. Morin, I. A. Wierzbowska, and K. R. Crooks. 2015. Food habits of coyotes, gray foxes, and bobcats in a coastal southern California urban landscape. *Western North American Naturalist* 75:339–347.
- Lawrence, S. E., and P. R. Krausman. 2011. Reactions of the public to urban coyotes (*Canis latrans*). *Southwestern Naturalist* 56:404–409.
- Lukasik, V. M., and S. M. Alexander. 2012. Spatial and temporal variation of coyote (*Canis latrans*) diet in Calgary, Alberta. *Cities and the Environment* 4:1–23.
- MacLean, E. L., L. R. Gesquiere, M. E. Gruen, B. L. Sherman, W. L. Martin, and C. S. Carter. 2017. Endogenous oxytocin, vasopressin, and aggression in domestic dogs. *Frontiers in Psychology* 8:1613.
- MacNulty, D. R., L. D. Mech, and D. W. Smith. 2007. A proposed ethogram of large-carnivore predatory behavior, exemplified by the wolf. *Journal of Mammalogy* 88:595–605.
- Mech, L. D. 1970. *The wolf: ecology and behaviour of an endangered species*. Natural History Press, Garden City, New York, USA.
- Morey, P. S., E. M. Gese, and S. Gehrt. 2007. Spatial and temporal variation in the diet of coyotes in the Chicago metropolitan area. *American Midland Naturalist* 158:147–161.
- Murray, M., A. Cembrowski, A. D. M. Latham, V. M. Lukasik, S. Pruss, and C. C. St Clair. 2015. Greater consumption of protein-poor anthropogenic food by urban relative to rural coyotes increases diet breadth and potential for human–wildlife conflict. *Ecography* 38:1235–1242.
- Murray, M. H., and C. C. St Clair. 2017. Predictable features attract urban coyotes to residential yards. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 81:593–600.
- Nelson, X. J., and N. Fijn. 2013. The use of visual media as a tool for investigating animal behaviour. *Animal Behaviour* 85:525–536.
- Newport, F., J. M. Jones, L. Saad, and J. Carroll. 2006. Americans and their pets. Gallup News Service, Princeton, New Jersey, USA, <<http://www.gallup.com/poll/25969/Americans-Their-Pets.aspx>>. Accessed April 16, 2017.
- Packard, J. M. 2003. Wolf behavior: reproductive, social and intelligent. Pages 35–65 in L. D. Mech and L. Boitani, editors. *Wolves: behavior, ecology and conservation*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, USA.
- Pal, S. K., B. Ghosh, and S. Roy. 1998. Agonistic behaviour of free-ranging dogs (*Canis familiaris*) in relation to season, sex and age. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 59:331–48.
- Palomares, F., and T. M. Caro. 1999. Interspecific killing among mammalian carnivores. *American Naturalist* 153:492–508.
- Poessel, S. A., S. W. Breck, T. L. Teel, S. Shwiff, K. R. Crooks, and L. Angeloni. 2013. Patterns of human–coyote conflicts in the Denver Metropolitan Area. *Journal of Wildlife Management*

- 77:297–305.
- Poessel, S. A., E. M. Gese, and J. K. Young. 2017a. Environmental factors influencing the occurrence of coyotes and conflicts in urban areas. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 157:259–269.
- Poessel, S. A., E. C. Mock, and S. W. Breck. 2017b. Coyote (*Canis latrans*) diet in an urban environment: variation relative to pet conflicts, housing density, and season. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 95:287–297.
- Polis, G. A., C. A. Myers, and R. D. Holt. 1989. The ecology and evolution of intraguild predation: potential competitors that eat each other. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 20:297–330.
- Quinn, T. 1997. Coyote (*Canis latrans*) food habits in three urban habitat types of Western Washington. *Northwest Science* 71:1–5.
- Sacks, B. N., S. K. Brown, and H. B. Ernest. 2004. Population structure of California coyotes corresponds to habitat-specific breaks and illuminates species history. *Molecular Ecology* 13:1265–1275.
- Santana, E. M., and J. B. Armstrong. 2017. Food habits and anthropogenic supplementation in coyote diets along an urban-rural gradient. *Human–Wildlife Interactions* 11:156–166.
- Sovada, M. A., C. C. Roy, J. B. Bright, and J. R. Gillis. 1998. Causes and rates of mortality of swift foxes in western Kansas. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 62:1300–1306.
- Thornton, D. H., and D. L. Murray. 2014. Influence of hybridization on niche shifts in expanding coyote populations. *Diversity and Distributions* 20:1355–1364.
- Trinkel, M., and G. Kastberger. 2005. Competitive interactions between spotted hyenas and lions in the Etosha National Park, Namibia. *African Journal of Ecology* 43:220–224.
- Vanak, A. T., and M. E. Gompper. 2009. Dogs as carnivores: their role and function in intraguild competition. *Mammal Review* 39:265–283.
- Wandeler, A. I., H. C. Matter, A. Kappeler, and A. Budde. 1993. The ecology of dogs and canine rabies: a selective review. *Revue Scientifique et Technique. Office International des Epizootics* 12:51–71.
- Way, J. G., D. L. M. Szumylo, and E. G. Strauss. 2006. An ethogram developed on captive eastern coyotes *Canis latrans*. *Canadian Field-Naturalist* 120:263–288.
- Young, J. K., K. A. Olson, R. P. Reading, S. Amgalanbaatar, and J. Berger. 2011. Is wildlife going to the dogs? Impacts of feral and free-roaming dogs on wildlife populations. *BioScience* 61:125–132.


Associate Editor: S. Nicole Frey

ERIN E. BOYDSTON is a research ecologist with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Western Ecological Research Center. She received her B.S. degree from Duke University and Ph.D. degree from Michigan State University. Prior to graduate school, she worked at the Dallas Zoo and National Zoo, and she studied lemurs, monkeys, and elephants in captive and field settings. For her Ph.D., she studied spotted hyenas in Kenya, documenting the impacts of human activity on their behavior. She joined USGS in 2001 and is based in Southern California.



ERIC S. ABELSON (photo unavailable) worked on the research presented in this manuscript while a postdoctoral fellow with the University of California, Los Angeles' La Brea Tar Pits and Research Center for California Conservation Science. He is currently a postdoctoral scholar with the Pacific Southwest Research Station (U.S. Forest Service). His research is broadly focused on wildlife ecology, conservation biology, and animal behavior. Central themes in his research program address wildlife movement at large landscape scales, the role of wildlife behavior on movement ecology, and wildlife persistence in anthropogenic landscapes.

ARI KAZANJIAN is a recent graduate of the University of California, Los Angeles, completing his B.S. degree in psychobiology. While interested in the use of social media in research, his primary research focus has been studying the effects of reduced nicotine cigarettes on cognition in young adults, in efforts to influence policymaking. Currently, he intends to pursue an MBA degree to incorporate his research experience in the healthcare industry.



DANIEL T. BLUMSTEIN is a professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at the University of California, Los Angeles. He received his Ph.D. degree from the University of California–Davis and was a DAAD postdoctoral fellow in Marburg, Germany, NIH NRSA fellow at the University of Kansas, and ARC postdoc at Macquarie University in Sydney. He has studied animal behavior and conservation biology around the world, has worked to develop the field of conservation behavior, works to use insights from behavior to manage human–wildlife conflicts, and is a Fellow of the Animal Behavior Society.



Supplemental Information. List of videos with a video identification, numbers of dogs (*Canis lupus familiaris*) and coyotes (*C. latrans*) on screen, general behavior category assigned to each video, and web address (last accessed on December 1, 2017).

Video ID#	# Dogs	# Coyotes	Link to video	Behavior category
2	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G5AUIVCtSG8	Other
3	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n7QfsACEUkK	Agonistic
4	2	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TQbXSI1ReuQ	Agonistic/ predatory
6	1	2	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GTtLSYdC4OE	Predatory
7	2	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-QO-ndm9m_Q	Agonistic
8	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CvrGxR9aLTY	Agonistic
9	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MUGc8aAPLjQ	Agonistic
10	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v1E9RxLUAxY	Agonistic
11	3	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m4BpZuybuMM	Agonistic
13	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sh5RwZJpoP4	Other
17	1	3	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZCyUuIMFAro	Other
18	1	2	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E9vmpgzF8sU	Agonistic
20	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=53ZY7B6oYKE	Predatory
21	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MFfDXp9K3Bk	Play
22	2	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cY-wfu2L3NU	Other
23	3	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZcJNjoLgV2U	Other
24	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L-RRa7X2Gig	Other
25	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vgHu-BpZ0MA	Other
26	2	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v-MLzwx4G3Q	Other
28	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EuCBdpqZp2o	Play
30	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ljx8nY64jps	Other
31	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fCnNp_fogaA	Play
32	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JW_U_-5wpYs	Play
33	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=adB9i1f9hWw	Other
34	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LCgRmpG2nwU	Other
35	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=48Z3611X3LM	Play
36	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3hYgUqeLsRg	Other
37	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tFW4w-61hic	Play
38	2	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ltgcpXs3pAg	Play
39	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=58vBPTG8_10	Play
42	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C0qpJtMskyA	Predatory
45	2	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T806C43ybUM	Play
46	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H3uxiXHteio	Play
47	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HIo1d9BeXjA&spfreload=1	Play
48	1	1	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3y6jod-c3bo	Agonistic