

1981

## MOBBING CALLS OF THE PHAINOPEPLA

Daniel W. Leger

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, [dleger1@unl.edu](mailto:dleger1@unl.edu)

Laura F. Carroll

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/psychfacpub>



Part of the [Psychiatry and Psychology Commons](#)

---

Leger, Daniel W. and Carroll, Laura F., "MOBBING CALLS OF THE PHAINOPEPLA" (1981). *Faculty Publications, Department of Psychology*. 533.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/psychfacpub/533>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications, Department of Psychology by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

## MOBBING CALLS OF THE PHAINOPEPLA

DANIEL W. LEGER

AND

LAURA F. CARROLL

**ABSTRACT.**—When mobbing potential predators, male Phainopeplas (*Phainopepla nitens*) utter smoothly upswept vocalizations, unlike the harsh, staccato mobbing calls of other birds and mammals. A Phainopepla repeats this call as it approaches the bottom of its diving arc over the predator. We suggest that these calls do not serve to attract additional mobbers to the scene. Rather, they appear to emphasize the diving attacks directed toward the predator.

Birds and mammals commonly call while harassing or "mobbing" potential predators. Mobbing calls are usually characterized by wide frequency-spectra, sharp onset and termination, and rapid repetition, giving them harsh or click-like qualities (Marler 1955, 1969). These acoustic characteristics enhance the ability of potential mobbers (and predators) to locate the source of the sound (Marler 1955, Konishi 1973, Owens and Goss-Custard 1976, Shalter and Schleidt 1977, Shalter 1978).

Most published discussions of mobbing calls emphasize the interspecific similarity in their acoustic structure, especially when compared to the songs of the same species (e.g., Marler and Hamilton 1966). Indeed, the emphasis on presumed convergence on a single acoustic structure for mobbing calls even extends to non-avian species, including a primate (Vencl 1977) and sciurid rodents (see references in Owings and Leger 1980). In spite of these widespread similarities, we should not expect all birds to arrive at the same acoustic structure in their mobbing calls. First, the average proximity of the caller to other individuals that may be recruited to the mobbing assemblage can vary widely among species, thus favoring long-distance sound conduction in some species but not in others. When communicating over long distances, habitat structure (e.g., vegetation density) and meteorological variables (e.g., air turbulence) may act as selection pressures favoring certain acoustic features over others (for details see Morton 1975, Marten and Marler 1977, Wiley and Richards 1978). Second, the function of mobbing calls may vary across species (Curio 1978). For example, mobbing calls may serve to attract others to the predator so that group action may drive it away. However, mobbing calls can also be predator-directed, that is, a means of harassing or distracting the predator in a man-

ner analogous to the diving attacks commonly performed by mobbers. If mobbing calls are in fact predator-directed, the acoustic structure may reflect this use and one might expect less emphasis on features that enhance their localization.

We describe here a mobbing call that appears to differ from those typical of most birds and mammals. The calls are those of male Phainopeplas (*Phainopepla nitens*) in central California (see Walsberg 1977, 1978, and Willis 1976, for discussions of *Phainopepla* breeding habits and ecology).

### METHODS

We recorded mobbing calls of Phainopeplas in May 1979 from a blind at the San Joaquin Experimental Range in the Sierra Nevada foothills, Madera County, California. The habitat is hilly oak and annual-grass savannah at an elevation of about 330 m (see Hutchinson and Kotak 1942, for a detailed description). Recordings were made with a Uher 4400 tape recorder equipped with an AKG microphone (with CE-1 capsule) at 19 cm/s.

Sonograms were made of 16 calls using a Kay 6061B Sound Spectrograph on both narrow- and wide-band settings. The following variables were measured from the sonograms: (1) durations of the fundamental, second and third harmonics, (2) starting and ending frequencies of the fundamental and the higher harmonics, (3) frequency ranges for each harmonic (i.e., highest frequency minus lowest frequency). Because the calls are simple upsweeps (see Fig. 1), the lowest frequency was invariably the starting frequency, and the highest frequency was invariably the ending frequency. Finally, (4) the sweep rate for each harmonic was calculated by dividing the harmonic's frequency range (in kHz) by its duration (in ms), thus expressing frequency change over time.

The Phainopeplas were probably breeding during this period. We did not attempt to check for eggs or nestlings, yet the birds were building nests and chasing away conspecifics.

### RESULTS

#### MOBBING BEHAVIOR

Male Phainopeplas mobbed Scrub Jays (*Aphelocoma coerulescens*) and other potential predators by repeatedly swooping to-




FIGURE 1. Ink tracing of a sonogram of a typical *Phainopepla nitens* mobbing call.

ward them from above and behind, or from the side. Mobbing flights were U-shaped arcs beginning about 1 to 1.5 m above the target. While mobbing, a male's white wing patches were conspicuous against his glossy-black body.

The *Phainopepla* emitted one call each time it reached the nadir of an arc, just above its target; the call was not given during other portions of the arc. Seven tape-recorded mobbing bouts lasted an average of 93 s (range = 21 to 172 s). During those bouts swooping flights and calls occurred an average of 28.4/min (range = 11.5–48.6/min).

Scrub Jays appeared to be distracted by the mobbing; they usually crouched as the *Phainopepla* closed in, and they seldom remained long in one place once mobbing commenced. If the jay flew only a short distance, the *Phainopepla* usually followed and continued its mobbing behavior. However, a longer flight by the Scrub Jay, which may have taken it out of the *Phainopepla*'s home range, usually led to cessation of harassment.

Although mobbing calls were most commonly directed toward Scrub Jays, we heard (but did not record) what sounded like identical calls as *Phainopeplas* harassed flying Red-tailed Hawks (*Buteo jamaicensis*), and

during agonistic interactions with male conspecifics. In the latter case, the calls were emitted as the apparent territory-holder and intruder were stationary or moving short distances in the same tree. During intraspecific interactions the vocalization was not always associated with the swooping flight as it was during interactions with other species.

*Phainopeplas* engaged in mobbing were occasionally joined by pairs of Western Kingbirds (*Tyrannus verticalis*); then both species would vocalize (see Fig. 2). Kingbird mobbing behavior differed from that of *Phainopeplas* in that kingbirds called even while perched near the Scrub Jay or while hovering near it. Also, both members of a kingbird pair joined in the mobbing whereas only male *Phainopeplas* were seen mobbing (see Davis 1941, and Smith 1977 for descriptions of *Tyrannus* agonistic behavior).

#### ACOUSTIC STRUCTURE

A typical *Phainopepla* mobbing call is illustrated in Figure 1, and data on mobbing-call acoustic parameters are provided in Table 1. *Phainopepla* mobbing calls consist of three harmonics (rarely four) that sweep up in frequency from beginning to end. There were no abrupt frequency deflections in the calls. Progressively higher harmonics, however, swept up faster than the lower harmonics, owing to the shorter durations and greater frequency ranges of successively higher harmonics (see Table 1). These calls sounded like mellow, brief whistles, not at all harsh, raspy or click-like.

#### DISCUSSION

The mobbing call of *Phainopepla nitens* appears to be unusual in at least three ways. First, its low repetition rate contrasts sharply with that of a sympatric passerine, the Western Kingbird (see Fig. 2), and with other birds. Second, predator-directed *Phainopepla* calls are associated with a specific component of their mobbing behavior, namely, the swooping flight toward the target, whereas kingbird calls (and apparently

TABLE 1. Acoustic parameters of *Phainopepla nitens* mobbing calls. Data are means and standard deviations (in parentheses) for 16 sonographed calls.

	Fundamental	Second harmonic	Third harmonic
Duration (ms)	163 (16)	114 (15)	104 (13)
Starting frequency (kHz)	1.50 (0.10)	2.91 (0.12)	4.72 (0.15)
Ending frequency (kHz)	2.38 (0.12)	4.45 (0.26)	6.62 (0.17)
Frequency range (kHz)	0.88 (0.13)	1.55 (0.24)	1.90 (0.27)
Sweep rate (kHz/ms)	0.0054 (0.001)	0.0136 (0.003)	0.0183 (0.003)




FIGURE 2. Sonogram of mobbing calls of Western Kingbirds and a Phainopepla while mobbing a Scrub Jay. The Phainopepla calls are pointed out with arrows below the time axis.

those of other birds) occur in a wider variety of situations during mobbing, such as while hovering or flying near the predator, flying toward it, or while perched nearby. Finally, the Phainopepla calls lack the sharp frequency deflections (“chevrons”) often found in mobbing calls of other species and readily seen in the kingbird calls of Figure 2. The lack of deflections may contribute to the calls’ “smooth” sound.

The low repetition rate and the absence of sharp frequency deflections might reduce the ability of recipients to localize the caller from relatively great distances. This may not be important, however, because the vocalizations may serve to warn only the mobber’s mate (who would normally be nearby) of the presence of a potential enemy (either predator or rival male). Alternatively, the call could be directed at the predator. Because the call is given only as the Phainopepla closes in, the sound may increase the effectiveness of the swooping flight component of mobbing, thus driving the predator away faster. Of course, both mate-warning and predator-harassment functions could operate concurrently; our data are inadequate to discriminate between these or other possible functions (Curio 1978).

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Recordings were obtained during research funded by NSF Grant BNS 78-17770 (Donald H. Owings, principal investigator). We thank Robert Rudd for use of his sonograph, Don A. Duncan for permission to work at the San Joaquin Experimental Range, and John P. Capitanio, Donald D. Jensen, Millicent S. Ficken and

Douglas H. Shedd for commenting on earlier versions of the manuscript.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- CURIO, E. 1978. The adaptive significance of avian mobbing. 1. Teleonomic hypotheses and predictions. *Z. Tierpsychol.* 48:175-183.
- DAVIS, D. E. 1941. The belligerency of the kingbird. *Wilson Bull.* 53:157-168.
- HUTCHINSON, C. B., AND E. I. KOTAK. 1942. The San Joaquin Experimental Range. *Univ. Calif. Agric. Exp. Sta. Bull.* #663.
- KONISHI, M. 1973. Locatable and nonlocatable acoustic signals for birds. *Am. Nat.* 107:775-785.
- MARLER, P. 1955. Characteristics of some animal calls. *Nature* 176:6-8.
- MARLER, P. 1969. Tonal qualities of bird sounds, p. 5-18. *In* R. A. Hinde [ed.], *Bird vocalizations*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.
- MARLER, P., AND W. J. HAMILTON, III. 1966. Mechanisms of animal behavior. Wiley, New York.
- MARTEN, K., AND P. MARLER. 1977. Sound transmission and its significance for animal vocalization. 1. Temperate habitats. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 2:271-290.
- MORTON, E. S. 1975. Ecological sources of selection on avian sounds. *Am. Nat.* 109:17-34.
- OWENS, N. W., AND J. D. GOSS-CUSTARD. 1976. The adaptive significance of alarm calls given by shorebirds on their winter feeding grounds. *Evolution* 30:397-398.
- OWINGS, D. H., AND D. W. LEGER. 1980. Chatter vocalizations of California Ground Squirrels: Predator- and social-role specificity. *Z. Tierpsychol.* 54:163-184.
- SHALTER, M. D. 1978. Localization of passerine seet and mobbing calls by Goshawks and Pygmy Owls. *Z. Tierpsychol.* 46:260-278.
- SHALTER, M. D., AND W. M. SCHLEIDT. 1977. The ability of Barn Owls *Tyto alba* to discriminate and localize avian alarm calls. *Ibis* 119:22-27.
- SMITH, W. J. 1977. The behavior of communicating: An ethological approach. Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, MA.

- VENCL, F. 1977. A case of convergence in vocal signals between marmosets and birds. *Am. Nat.* 111:777-782.
- WALSBERG, G. E. 1977. Ecology and energetics of contrasting social systems in *Phainopepla nitens* (Aves: Ptilonotidae). *Univ. Calif. Publ. Zool.* #108.
- WALSBERG, G. E. 1978. Brood size and the use of time and energy by the *Phainopepla*. *Ecology* 59:147-153.
- WILEY, R. H., AND D. G. RICHARDS. 1978. Physical constraints on acoustic communication in the atmosphere: Implications for the evolution of animal vocalizations. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 3:69-94.
- WILLIS, E. O. 1976. Similarity of a tyrant-flycatcher and a silky-flycatcher: Not all character convergence is competitive mimicry. *Condor* 78:553.
- Department of Psychology, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588. Accepted for publication 23 February 1981.*