**Out on their own: a test of adult-assisted dispersal in fledgling brood parasites reveals
solitary departures from hosts**

Matthew I. M. Louder^{1,2*}, Michael P. Ward^{1,2}, Wendy M. Schelsky², Mark E. Hauber³, Jeffrey P. Hoover²

¹Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

²Illinois Natural History Survey, Prairie Research Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

³Department of Psychology, Hunter College and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York

*Current address: Department of Biology, East Carolina University. Correspondence:
mckimlouder@gmail.com

Title: Out on their own: a test of adult-assisted dispersal in fledgling brood parasites reveals solitary departures from hosts

ABSTRACT

Brood parasitic offspring sexually (mis)imprinting on the foster parents is considered one of the greatest constraints to the evolution of interspecific avian brood parasitism. While most non-parasitic juvenile birds learn the behaviours and mate choice preferences from their own parents, social parasites must avoid misimprinting on their host species' phenotype in order to accurately recognize conspecifics. One mechanism to assure accurate species recognition by juvenile parasites is to begin to associate with adult parasitic conspecifics, known as the 'first contact' scenario, whereby adult female parasites facilitate the dispersal of their offspring away from hosts, thus providing accurate referents for conspecific recognition. Using an automated radio telemetry system, we determined the presence or absence (every 1-2 minutes during 3 breeding seasons; 516 315 search occasions) of radio-tagged parasitic adult female brown-headed cowbirds (*Molothrus ater*), and compared their departures from a forest study site with those of genetic offspring or experimentally transplanted (non-related) juvenile cowbirds within the female's egg-laying range. Contrary to our predictions, we found no support for the facilitation of juvenile cowbird dispersal by adult female cowbirds. Juvenile cowbirds typically were not located within their mother's home range when departing the forest and, likewise, departure events for neither natal nor experimentally transplanted juveniles (< 2%) overlapped temporally with the departure of the genetically assigned mother or other, local radio-tagged female cowbirds. Surprisingly, we found that juvenile cowbirds primarily depart from the host's territory at sunset, when adult female cowbirds are infrequently present within the forest. Our results suggest that a solitary nocturnal roosting behaviour of juvenile cowbirds may facilitate independence from their hosts, thus minimizing the risk of misimprinting on heterospecific phenotypes. This strategy may also indirectly promote conspecific interactions, providing further evidence for the importance of host- and conspecific independent social preferences in the evolution of avian brood parasitism.

INTRODUCTION

Interspecific avian brood parasites exploit the parental care of host species and avoid the energetic demands of raising offspring by laying their eggs in host species' nests. Obligate brood parasitism has served as a 'model system' influencing our understanding of both the coevolutionary process (Feeney, Welbergen, & Langmore, 2014; Rothstein, 1990; Soler, 2014) and the social recognition systems (Göth & Hauber, 2004) of hosts and parasites. Similarly, with opportunities to readily quantify the costs and benefits of this intriguing form of reproduction, avian host-parasite systems provide an opportunity to understand some constraints on the evolution of life-history strategies, including parental investment (Kruger, 2007).

Obligate avian brood parasitism has proven to be a persistent reproductive strategy, having evolved independently at least seven times from non-parasitic, parental ancestors (Rothstein, 1990; Yom-Tov & Geffen, 2006). Yet brood parasitism is rare (~ 1 % of all bird species) (Payne, 1977), likely reflecting the complications that arise during the initial evolution of interspecific brood parasitic behaviours. In nearly every test where the offspring of two bird parental species are switched early in the nestling phase, cross-fostered juveniles learn the behaviours and mate-choice decisions of their foster species (i.e. sexual imprinting: ten Cate & Vos, 1999); including facultative interspecific parasites: (Sorenson, Hauber, & Derrickson, 2010). While sexual imprinting has significant implications for speciation by influencing the process of the recognition of suitable mates in many sexually reproducing species (Irwin & Price, 1999; Laland, 1994), including African brood parasites (Payne, Payne, Woods, & Sorenson, 2000), sexual imprinting is conversely one of the greatest constraints on the evolution of brood parasitism (Davies, 2000; Slagsvold & Hansen, 2001; Sorenson et al., 2010). This leads to the question of how juvenile brood parasites avoid sexually misimprinting on their host species (Hauber, Russo, & Sherman, 2001).

Misimprinting would result in hybridization between hosts and parasites; however, hybridization is rarely documented within the ~100 species of extant obligate brood parasites (e.g. Payne & Sorenson, 2004). While genetically based preferences for conspecific phenotypes likely guide species recognition,

learning strongly contributes to recognition systems in both parasitic and non-parasitic bird species (Hauber et al., 2001; Payne et al., 2000; Price, 2008). When raised in isolation, the obligate brood parasitic brown-headed cowbird (*Molothrus ater*) will respond with copulatory displays to conspecific songs (King & West, 1977) and even as nestlings will increase begging in response to conspecific calls (Hauber et al., 2001), indicating the earliest onset of conspecific recognition capabilities. Yet by experimentally extending social contact with heterospecific species in aviaries, both male cowbirds and Redheads (*Aythya Americana*; a facultative interspecific parasitic duck), preferred to sexually display to their hosts over conspecifics (Freeberg, King, & West, 1995; Sorenson et al., 2010). Thus, laboratory experimentation has revealed a species recognition paradox, whereby brood parasites incorporate learned phenotypic components for conspecific recognition and mate choice, in spite of being raised by inappropriate referents (i.e. their host species) (Göth & Hauber, 2004). However, by spatially segregating from the host prior to critical periods for song learning and mate choice, typical in the development of young songbirds (Bateson, 1979; Brainard & Doupe, 2002; Hensch, 2004), juvenile brood parasites could avoid sexually imprinting on their host. Here we set out to test this hypothesis of early spatial segregation from the host by juveniles of an obligate brood parasite.

Adult brood parasites are generally thought to relinquish all forms of parental care after laying their eggs, but adult parasites could influence the dispersal of their offspring away from their hosts ('first contact' hypothesis; Hauber, 2002). The guidance of juvenile brood parasites away from hosts would not only reduce the chance of misimprinting, but the interaction with the adult cowbird would directly provide salient conspecific songs and behaviours suitable for appropriate sexual imprinting and survival. Female-assisted dispersal of offspring provides a mechanism to explain why Hahn and Fleischer (1995) reported 36% of female-juvenile cowbird pairs captured while feeding together were closely related. Similarly, some evidence indicates that juvenile brood parasitic great spotted cuckoos (*Clamator glandarius*) potentially learn to recognize conspecifics by imprinting on adult cuckoos that have maintained contact throughout the nestling and fledgling period (Soler & Soler, 1999). Adult female brood parasites may have played an important role in the evolution of brood parasitism by facilitating

post-fledging dispersal and initiating species recognition in their own offspring, thereby circumventing the constraint of sexually imprinting on the host species (Hauber & Dearborn, 2003). Critically, the juvenile parasitic spatial segregation from hosts and the conspecifically assisted avoidance of sexual misimprinting hypotheses make specific predictions about the social developmental trajectory of brood parasitic young, which can be tested by extensively tracking the location of juvenile and adult parasites in space and time.

We employed an automated radio telemetry system (ARTS), where the study site occupancy of female brown-headed cowbirds and their offspring could be estimated every 1-2 minutes, to investigate whether adult females facilitate the departure of juvenile cowbirds from their hosts. Adult female cowbirds approach conspecific juveniles in the laboratory and conspecific calls broadcasted in the wild, over heterospecifics (Hauber, 2002) and likewise, juvenile cowbirds prefer to spatially associate with adult conspecific female calls over heterospecifics in laboratory (Hauber 2002) and field choice trials (Hauber et al., 2001), providing support for the hypothesis of female-assisted departure of their offspring. Adult female cowbirds are typically spatially faithful to a breeding area throughout the season (Dufty, 1982; Hahn, Sedgwick, Painter, & Casna, 1999; Hauber, Strausberger, Feldheim, Lock, & Cassey, 2012; Raim, 2000; Rivers et al., 2012), and monitor the content of recently parasitized nests (Hoover & Robinson 2007), further presenting female cowbirds with the opportunity to facilitate the necessary dispersal of juvenile cowbirds. We predicted that (i) juvenile cowbirds are located within their mother's home-range when juveniles depart from their host, and (ii) juvenile departures should coincide with the mother's movement away from the host. We further predicted that departure events of juvenile cowbirds experimentally transplanted within a different female's home range would correlate with the departure times of the local female, suggestive of conspecific bias in juvenile cowbirds' following behaviours. We also investigated general patterns of juvenile departure events and female study site occupancy to determine if juvenile dispersal is guided by non-related females.

METHODS

Species and study system

We studied the movements of brown-headed cowbirds during four breeding seasons within a long-term (20+ years) nest box study system located within the Cache River watershed, southern Illinois USA; which supports investigations of the host-parasite interactions between prothonotary warblers (*Protonotaria citrea*) and cowbirds (e.g. Hoover, 2003). The prothonotary warbler, a Neotropical migratory songbird that breeds in bottomland swamps throughout the southeastern USA, is the only species regularly parasitized by brown-headed cowbirds that will nest in artificial nest boxes (Petit, 1999). Adult brown-headed cowbirds forage socially in pastures and agriculture, and female cowbirds subsequently parasitize the songbirds within the surrounding landscape (Thompson, 1994), particularly forests (Hahn & Hatfield, 1995).

The warblers are able to successfully raise cowbird nestlings (Hoover 2003), and their nest boxes are commonly parasitized (~ 70%; Hoover & Hauber, 2007; Hoover, Yasukawa, & Hauber, 2006). We placed nest boxes 50-100m apart within suitable habitat on greased conduit poles, and upon hatching, surrounded the nest box with wire to eliminate the chance for nest predation. To reduce the effects of nest ectoparasites, such as bird blowfly maggots (*Protocalliphora spp.*) on nestling and fledgling survival (e.g. Streby, Peterson, & Kapfer, 2009), we replaced the nesting material every 3-5 days with Spanish moss after hatching. Each active nest box was checked every 1-2 days during the egg laying stage and then monitored every 3-5 days until fledging. Most cowbird chicks are raised in the absence of conspecifics (Hauber, 2001; Lowther, 1993); however, occasionally more than one cowbird are raised in a brood (e.g. Rivers et al. 2012; Hoover, 2003; McLaren et al. 2003). Being raised with cowbird nestmates could theoretically impact the recognition system (Soler & Soler, 1999), therefore, we limited each parasitized nest to a single cowbird nestling (labeled “natal” nest box/chick hereafter). We experimentally added a single cowbird nestling (labeled “transplanted” hereafter), collected from outside of the study sites > 1 km, to non-parasitized warbler nests and parasitized nests that failed to hatch cowbird offspring. In multiply-parasitized nests where > 1 cowbird nestling hatched, additional cowbird nestlings (1-4 days post-hatching) were moved to a nest box on a different study site with appropriately aged non-parasitized nests or where cowbird eggs failed to hatch.

Radio telemetry

During 2011-2014, we captured adult female cowbirds within the study sites by broadcasting cowbird calls adjacent to a mist net or by inserting trap doors within active warbler nest boxes prior to cowbird egg laying in the early morning (1 hour before sunrise); trap doors were then removed after cowbird capture and prior to warbler egg laying. Adult female cowbirds were captured during the first weeks of egg-laying within our study site, and prior to the fledging of the juveniles. We attached radio-transmitters to adult female and juvenile cowbirds (transmitter mass = 1.6 and 0.9 g, respectively; < 5% body mass) within two distinct study sites (ABC and HB, separated by ~ 1 km; Fig. 1).

Figure 1. The study system depicting the locations of each nest box study site (ABC and HB; gray polygons), the automated radio telemetry system (ARTS) towers (stars), the baited fly-in trap (denoted by an X). The study site HB is within the ARTS coverage.

Using the figure-8 harness method (Rappole & Tipton, 1991), we affixed transmitters to the cowbird's lower back connected to elastic nylon beading cord looped around each thigh. Harnesses were made in advance to minimize handling time, and nylon was chosen as it deteriorates over time and will fall off the individual (~ 3-6 months; Streby et al. 2015). We attached transmitters to juvenile cowbirds on the morning of post-hatch day 10, the mean age of fledging (Woodward, 1983). Using a handheld 3-element Yagi antennae and receiver, we searched for each cowbird within the study sites throughout the transmitter lifespan (adult transmitter = ~ 12 weeks; juvenile transmitter = 3-5 weeks; Holohil Systems

Ltd., Ontario, Canada; JDJC Corp., Fisher, IL, USA), or until the cowbird was not detected for 5 days. We identified locations for radio-tagged individuals within the forest by visual detection, or when not observed due to dense vegetation, we inferred the location based on the strength of the telemetry signal at several angles from the suspected location. We did not detect any additional noticeable stress or mortality caused by radio telemetry on juveniles or adult females. Locations determined by radio-tracking were recorded using a handheld global positioning system receiver (GPS 3, Garmin, Olathe, KS, USA). We estimated the distance (m) each juvenile cowbird location was from their fledging nest box (Euclidean straight-line). Radio-telemetry and sampling of brown-headed cowbirds was approved by the University of Illinois Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (Permit Numbers: 09107, 12079, and 12080), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Permit Number: MB815400-0), and the U.S. Geological Survey (Banding Permit Number: 06507).

We liberally estimated forest home-ranges for female cowbirds based on 100% minimum convex polygons (MCP), the smallest polygon that encompasses all recorded radio-tracked locations for each female within the forest for a given year. As opposed to home-range estimation techniques such as kernel estimators, MCPs have the tendency to overestimate home-range size (Powell, 2000), because the polygon likely includes areas seldom used by the animal. However, we think that MCPs provides the best test of our hypothesis for the potential area of overlap where juveniles have the greatest potential to encounter the female cowbird in question. If, in turn, our hypothesis is not supported, we provide a very conservative test.

Automated radio telemetry system

To estimate the timing of adult and juvenile cowbird's occupancy and departure from the study sites, we deployed an automated radio telemetry system in 2012 (ARTS; Kays et al., 2011; M. P. Ward, Alessi, Benson, & Chiavacci, 2014; M. P. Ward, Sperry, & Weatherhead, 2013). We placed three towers adjacent to one study site (HB; Fig. 1): two tall towers (18 m) placed to the north/south borders and one short tower (5 m) positioned within the study site. Each tower holds six directional antennas spaced by 60° to give 360° coverage and an automated recording unit (ARU; JDJC Corp. Fisher, IL, USA), which

systematically recorded the signal strength (in dBm) for individual radio frequencies programmed at ~1-2 minute intervals. To quantify study site occupancy, we derived signal strength thresholds, where an individual was considered present within the forest if the signal strength was greater than -130 dBm for any south antennas (120° and 180°) for tower 1, north antennas (0°, 60° and 300°) for tower 2 and any antenna on tower 3. This signal strength threshold was derived from comparisons of signal strength of juveniles and adults when known to occur within the forest from hand-tracked observations. This threshold was also considered conservative in that relatively weak transmitter signals detected by the ARTS, either from individuals sitting on the ground or short-distance departures, would be considered present within the forest under this criterion. To account for electromagnetic noise, which can obscure occupancy data from apparent signals that appear to be from the radio transmitter, we estimated noise by measuring the signal strength between transmitter pulses and dismissed the data when noise was greater than -130 dBm.

We pooled binomial (yes/no) occupancy data into 30-minute intervals for analysis, and individuals were considered present within the forest if detected > 2 times during a given interval. We assumed the individual departed the forest if not detected in the subsequent 30-minute interval. In other words, we classified departure events when individuals transitioned from present to absent for at least 30-minutes. Intervals with < 3 observations, typically due to electromagnetic noise from lighting, were removed from the analysis. For analysis and presentation, we grouped time observations into distinct groups: sunrise = 1.5 hour buffer around sunrise (4:00-7:00); morning = 7:00-12:00; afternoon = 12:00-18:30; sunset = 1.5 hour buffer around sunset (18:30-21:30); night = 21:30-4:00. To determine the reliability of ARU-detected occurrence and departure events, we compared the presence/absence data with known occurrences within the forest determined by hand-tracked locations.

Maternity analysis

To determine maternity of natal and transplanted radio-tracked juveniles, we collected blood samples with sterile needles (~ 50 µL) from the brachial vein of juvenile and adult cowbirds, both males and females captured within the forest and at a feeder trap (see below), and stored in lysis buffer at

209 ambient temperatures or at 4⁰C. We used DNeasy Blood and Tissue kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA, USA) to
210 extract DNA from all blood samples. We did not observe any significant harm (e.g. infection, excessive
211 clotting) caused by the collection of blood samples. We used nine microsatellite primer pairs for
212 genotyping and followed PCR amplification described in previous studies: three loci (CB 1, CB 12, and
213 CB 15) described in Longmire et al. (2001), three loci (Map 10, Map 25, and Map 29) described in
214 Alderson, Gibbs and Sealy (1999), two loci (Map 101 and Map 104) described in Strausberger and
215 Ashley (2001), and one (Map 102) described in Strausberger and Ashley (2003). The forward primer for
216 each locus was fluorescently labeled (6-FAM, HEX, or NED) and analyzed on an AB 3730xl DNA
217 analyzer (Biotechnology center, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL, USA) to determine fragment sizes.
218 Genotypes were assigned, both manually and automatically, using GeneMapper 3.7 (Applied Biosystems,
219 Foster City, CA, USA).

220 Deviations from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) of the 9 microsatellite loci were tested
221 using Genepop'007 (Rousset, 2008). For maternity analysis, we used a likelihood-based approach
222 implemented in CERVUS 3.0 (Kalinowski, Taper, & Marshall, 2007) to assign genotyped mothers to
223 their putative offspring. Because parentage assignment from program CERVUS depends largely on the
224 genetic variability of the loci used and their resulting power to exclude potential parents, we attempted to
225 increase the accuracy of allele frequencies for the study population by including the genotypes of male
226 and female cowbirds captured at a feeder trap in addition to the adults captured within the study sites. The
227 fly-in trap, located ~ 1 km from the study sites (Fig. 1), was baited with a corn-sunflower seed mixture
228 and watched continually during trapping attempts. To determine the statistical confidence of maternity
229 assignments, we performed a simulation of 10 000 tests based on observed genotype frequencies,
230 assuming 90% of candidate mothers were sampled, a breeding population of 20 adult females among the
231 study sites and 0.01 error rate for all loci. Mother identity to radio-tagged juveniles was assigned with $\geq$
232 95% confidence, as determined by the likelihood-odds ratios (Kalinowski et al., 2007).

233 **Statistical analyses**

We used a linear mixed-effect model (LMM) to determine if the distance (m; response variable) from the natal or transplanted box was influenced by post-fledging age. To determine if the duration of time spent out of the forest after a departure event varies throughout the day, we used a LMM and included time intervals (sunrise, morning, afternoon, sunset and night) as an explanatory variable and the time after departure as the response variable. Because the duration of time and distance tended to be right-skewed, we used an exponential response distribution; results were qualitatively similar when compared to log-transformed response variables. For binary response variables, we used generalized linear mixed models (GLMM) with a binomial response, logit link function, and Laplace likelihood approximation (Bolker et al., 2009). We included whether the juvenile hand-tracked location was inside the respective female's home range (binomial response variable) with post-fledging age as an explanatory variable. To analyze the probability of juvenile departure (binomial response) we included time intervals. Similarly, we included time intervals as an explanatory variable to predict the probability of forest occupancy for adult females (binomial response). We included only those juveniles that were continually located for more than 10 days post-fledging, assuming that cowbirds disperse from their natal site 20-30 days after fledging (Woodward, 1983). Juvenile models included whether or not the individual was transplanted (categorical) as an explanatory variable. Our data only include females that were present within the forest at least once for a given day thus we were unable to analyze seasonal occupancy data for adult females. All models included animal identity as a random effect to account for potential issues associated with pseudoreplication. All statistical analyses were performed in SAS 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA) and parameter estimates are presented with $\pm$ 95% confidence intervals (CI) or standard errors (SE).

RESULTS

Maternity

We included the microsatellite genotypes of 101 known adults (54 females 47 males) captured within and adjacent to the nest box study sites for maximum-likelihood simulations and to estimate confidence of maternity assignments. The allelic frequencies for each loci were in HWE (Chi-squared test: all $X^2 < 4.41$, $P > 0.11$), with the exception of CB 1 ($X^2 = 13.29$, $P < 0.01$). Therefore, we eliminated

CB 1 from maternity assignment analyses. We included all 54 females as candidate mothers for radio-tagged juvenile cowbirds. Of the 15 radio-tagged juveniles reared in their natal nest box, we assigned 9 (60%) to a radio-tagged mother for the given year and 2 juveniles to female cowbirds captured in subsequent years. The radio-tagged transplanted juveniles ($n = 5$) were not assigned to any local females.

Forest locations

We recorded locations for juveniles every 1-2 days (mean = 17 ± 0.08 SE locations for each individual post-fledging), to determine the effects of age on the distance juveniles travelled from their natal nest. Results from a LMM indicated that juveniles ($n = 20$) were located at greater distances from the fledging nest box with increasing post-fledging age (Fig. 2; LMM: $n = 345$, $\beta = 0.13 \pm 0.01$ SE, $F_{1,324} = 190.93$, $P < 0.001$) and we found no difference in mean distance between transplanted ($n = 5$) and natal ($n = 15$) juveniles ($F_{1,324} = 0.61$, $P = 0.44$).

Figure 2. The relationship between the distance of radio-tracked locations from the natal nest box and the post-fledging age of juvenile cowbirds ($n = 20$). Mean predicted distance ($\pm$ 95% C.I.) for a given post-fledging age shown from results of a LMM ($n = 345$ locations) with an exponential response distribution; animal identity included as a random effect.

To determine the likelihood that juveniles would come into contact with their genetic mothers, or associated female for transplanted juveniles, we calculated the MCP as an estimate of the home range for each female cowbird. Within the two study sites, we captured and radio-tagged 15 adult females, of which

3 were radio-tagged in multiple years. One juvenile cowbird was transplanted into an area lacking a radio-tagged female cowbird, and was removed from this analysis. We found that both transplanted juveniles ($n = 4$) and natal juveniles assigned to a radio-tagged mother ($n = 9$) were more likely to be located outside of the respective female's home-range with increasing post-fledging age (Fig. 3; GLMM: $n = 220$; $\beta = -0.16 \pm 0.03$ SE, $F_{1,206} = 30.97$, $P < 0.001$) and found no difference between the mean probabilities of being outside the foster/natal nest's female's home-range for transplanted vs. natal juveniles ($F_{1,206} = 0.05$, $P = 0.83$).

Figure 3. A comparison between the probability to be located within the maternal, or when transplanted,

the local female cowbird's home range and the post-fledging age of radio-tagged juvenile cowbirds ($n=9$). Predicted probabilities presented ($\pm$ 95% C.I.) from a GLMM ($n = 220$ juvenile locations), with animal identity included as a random effect.

Forest occupancy and departure

To determine the

probability of forest occupancy and identify departures from the forest, we used data collected from the ARTS during the summers of 2012-2014 within a single study site (HB: Fig. 1) bordered by radio-telemetry towers. The ARTS recorded the signal strength for adult female and juvenile radio frequencies on 516 315 occasions with 227 665 identified detections (> -130 dBm). Data were binned into 30-minute intervals ($n = 23$ 925) and the ARTS 'searched' for the given transmitter every 1-2 minutes (mean = 21.2 times per 30-minute period). By comparing the observations collected via hand-tracking adult and

juvenile cowbirds ($n = 327$), only 3 observations (1%) were discordant with the occupancy data; in each case the recorded times may have conflicted between the hand-tracked and ARTS data as occupancy was detected by the ARTS ~10 minutes after the recorded hand-tracked observation. Therefore, the occupancy estimations derived from the ARTS data appear reliable.

We tracked 10 juveniles with ARTS for the 7 296 time intervals, of which, we identified juveniles to be present within the forest on 6 718 (92%) intervals. Adult females ($n = 11$) were present in the forest 40% of the 16 629 time intervals available for detection. Assuming that a lack of detection for at least 30-minutes subsequent to being detected represents a departure from the forest, we identified 58 departure events for juvenile cowbirds (range 0-16 per individual). We found that the probability of detecting at least one departure event increased with post-fledging age (Fig. 4; GLMM: $n = 163$; $\beta = 0.25 \pm 0.04$ SE, $F_{1,152} = 34.28$, $P < 0.001$) and we did not find a difference between transplanted and natal juveniles ($F_{1,152} = 0.17$, $P = 0.83$). We found that the probability a juvenile left the forest varied throughout the day (Fig. 5a; GLMM: $n = 787$, $F_{4,773} = 6.55$, $P < 0.001$). Juvenile departures were most likely to occur (0.11 ± 0.04 SE) within 1.5 hours of sunset (18:30-21:30), twice the likelihood of afternoon mean departure probability (0.05 ± 0.02 SE). The probability of occurrence within the forest for adult female cowbirds varied throughout the day (Fig. 5b; GLMM: $n = 1443$, $F_{4,1431} = 123.12$, $P < 0.001$). Yet, we found that the probability of occurrence for adult females to be relatively low (0.20 ± 0.04 SE) within 1.5 hours of sunset, indicating that most juvenile departure events took place when females were unlikely to be present

within the forest.
Figure 4. A comparison of the probability of departure (detected by ARTS) and the post-fledging age of radio-tagged juvenile cowbirds

337 (n=10). Predicted probabilities presented ($\pm$ 95% C.I.) from a GLMM (n = 163 observation days), with
338 animal identity included as a random effect.

339

340

Figure 5. A comparison between the (A) probability of forest departure for juvenile cowbirds (n=787 observations), (B) the probability of forest occupancy for 8 adult female cowbirds (n=1443 observations) in relation to time intervals, (C) and the duration (minutes) of absence during excursions outside of the forest for juvenile cowbirds (n = 54 departures) and time of day. Predicted probabilities ($\pm$ SE) are presented from results of GLMMs while including animal identity as a random effect.

The duration that juveniles were not detected within the forest varied among time periods (Fig. 5c; GLMM: $n = 54$, $F_{4,43} = 19.30$, $P < 0.001$), and the average duration was greatest following sunset departure events (500 minutes $\pm$ 116 SE). In concordance with the departure events detected by ARTS,

we documented 3 radio-tagged juveniles (range 20-30 days post-fledge) departing the forest while hand tracking within 1 hour of sunset. We were able to locate the destination for 2 of these juveniles, each roosting in grassy fields 0.1-0.5 km from the forest for a total of 7 evenings. On both occasions, we did not observe any warbler host or other cowbirds in proximity to the recently departed juveniles. All 3 juveniles were observed within the forest the following morning, returning near where they left from and receiving parental care from their host. We located two additional radio-tagged juveniles ~ 1 km outside of the HB study site during the afternoon, and each subsequently returned to their host parents within the forest; although we were unable to determine if any juvenile or adult cowbirds accompanied the two juveniles during their departures.

Temporal correlation in departure events

Of the 58 juvenile departure events identified by ARTS, 35 (70%) occurred on days when the assigned radio-tagged mother, or associated female for transplanted juveniles, was detected within the forest. We found a negative correlation between the time of juvenile dispersal and the presence of the associated female cowbird (logistic regression: $n = 35$; $\beta = -0.78 \pm 0.36$ SE, $X^2 = 4.39$, $P = 0.03$), with only 14 (31%) juvenile departures occurring at times when the associated female was present within the forest. Indeed, we only detected 4 (6.8%) juvenile departure events occurring during the same 30-minute interval as when any radio-tagged adult female cowbird was detected departing the forest. We detected 1 juvenile departure event that overlapped with the departure of the genetically assigned mother, yet there were 24 minutes separating the specific departure times as determined by raw (i.e. not binned into 30-minute periods) ARTS data. The three additional temporally correlated departure events were those of transplanted juveniles, each coinciding with the departure of radio-tagged female cowbirds whose home-range did not include the respective transplanted juvenile. Additionally, we identified a single pair of juveniles that departed during the same time interval, each located outside of their respective female's home-range and located back within the forest on the following morning. Although our study design prohibited an accurate estimate for the random co-occurrence of juvenile-female departures, we found

juvenile departures to rarely overlap with any female, and we directly observed juveniles dispersing solitarily; thus, we concluded that simulations to estimate a random expectation would be extraneous.

DISCUSSION

Contrary to our predictions, we found no support for facilitation by adult female cowbirds being the primary way juvenile cowbirds disperse from their hosts. Juvenile cowbirds typically are not located within their mother's home range when departing the forest and likewise, we detected only one brief (~30 min.) juvenile departure event that temporally overlapped with the departure of the genetically assigned mother. As observed in some cowbird populations (e.g. Hahn & Fleischer, 1995; Hauber, 2002; Hauber et al., 2001), female cowbirds in this study were found inhabiting the forest during the post-fledging period of juvenile cowbirds, thus providing the opportunity for juveniles to follow female cowbirds out of the natal habitat to social foraging flocks. Critically, we found no statistical differences between natal and transplanted juveniles' and the local adult females' behaviours in this study, implying a lack of direct kin recognition in parasitic cowbird mothers. The ARTS detection analyses identified only 4 (out of 58 total) temporally correlated departures among juveniles and any radio-tagged adult female. Although, an unknown proportion of adult females inhabiting the forest were not radio-tagged, the ARTS system monitored the occupancy of 11 females and 60% of radio-tagged juveniles were genetically assigned to a radio-tagged female cowbird, indicating that a substantial proportion of females inhabiting the forest were radio-tagged. In some instances, juvenile cowbirds may have followed females without radio-tags, but we think that this is an unlikely explanation for the lack of juvenile departures coinciding with female cowbirds observed in this study. For example, we detected multiple departure events from the forest for most juvenile cowbirds, increasing in probability and duration with age. In particular, we found the greatest probability for juvenile departure near sunset (18:30-21:30), when adult female cowbirds (whether radioed or not) are unlikely to occur within the forest. Visual observations of juvenile cowbirds departing the forest and subsequently roosting solitarily within grasslands provided support for the departure pattern identified by the ARTS data.

Post-fledging excursions at sunset and subsequent roosting may initiate independence from the host, thereby minimizing the possibility of sexually imprinting on the host species' phenotype. Solitary roosting has been demonstrated to increase with post-fledging age in a few non-parasitic species, such as the mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*; Hitchcock & Mirarchi, 1984) and eastern screech-owl (*Megascops asio*; Belthoff & Ritchison, 1990), suggesting its potential importance for achieving independence from parental care and initiating natal dispersal. Juvenile birds are not fed during the night, which decreases their reliance on the natal habitat and (foster) parents. Therefore, departing at sunset may represent an optimal time to initiate exploratory excursions. Our study suggests support for a little explored alternative to maternally mediated conspecific recognition mechanisms in brood parasites (Hahn and Fleischer 1995, Hauber 2002): namely genetic predisposition for specific roosting habitats that could induce juvenile cowbirds to depart from the natal habitat, thus initiating the process of independence from the foster parents (as we discuss below).

In addition to promoting spatial segregation from the host, juvenile excursions outside of the forest at sunset may also provide opportunities to locate conspecifics. Experimental manipulations of captive cowbirds have demonstrated that the production and recognition of cowbird song, and the development of appropriate social behaviours, are considerably experience-dependent (Freed-Brown & White, 2009; King & West, 1983; O'Loughlen & Rothstein, 2010; West & King, 1988). Thus, the rapid discovery and joining of conspecific foraging flocks is critical for appropriate development. Adult cowbirds routinely fly to communal roosts in groups during the evening (Thompson, 1994; pers. obs.), and juvenile cowbirds departing the forest prior to sunset would have the opportunity to locate conspecifics and potentially accompany adult cowbirds to a communal roost. Within the breeding season, brood parasitic Viduidae (Payne, 2010) and *Molothrus* cowbirds (Ortega, 1998) routinely roost with conspecifics, potentially revealing the importance of communal roosting to the evolution of brood parasitism. Therefore, roosting communally may not only enable individuals to find suitable foraging locations—'information-center hypothesis' (P. Ward & Zahavi, 1973; Weatherhead, 1983)—but may also enable juveniles to adopt the songs and behaviours of conspecifics. Although we were unable to hand-

track any radio-tagged juvenile cowbirds to communal roosts, numerous adult females were observed associating with juveniles (all without radio-tags) at a communal roost during July 2014 (pers. obs.), indicating that departing at sunset may play a role in the juvenile cowbird's ability to locate conspecifics.

Post-fledging birds typically disperse to specific habitat types, often dissimilar to breeding locations of the adults (Cox, Thompson, Cox, & Faaborg, 2014). Post-fledging habitats therefore, could promote the prevalence of conspecific interactions if habitat selection is largely innate (e.g. Grosch, 2004; Partridge, 1974), and shared among juvenile cowbirds and adults. Upon interaction with conspecifics within this habitat (e.g. grass pasture), genetically guided preferences for conspecific vocalizations (i.e. "passwords"; Hauber et al., 2001) and learned components such as self-referent phenotype matching (Hauber, Sherman, & Paprika, 2000) would facilitate conspecific recognition and subsequently enable the acquisition of appropriate behaviours. Although juveniles cowbirds are unlikely to follow adult females to foraging areas (this study), related juvenile-adult pairings could occur at a non-negligible baseline rate in specific habitat configurations and at specific local densities of cowbirds, as found by Hahn and Fleischer (1995) in upstate New York's fragmented landscape. Under this scenario, juveniles would disperse out of their natal area (alone) and locate a conspecific foraging flock—with the probability that the flock contains the genetic mother related to the number of accessible foraging flocks, the distance to foraging flock and the density of local cowbirds.

Spatial segregation from hosts may be an important process in the development of juvenile brood parasites and the origin of brood parasitism. As in most cross-fostering experiments (ten Cate & Vos, 1999), captive juvenile brood parasites will sexually imprint on their host's phenotype when the associations are extended beyond the typical timeframe observed in nature (Freeberg et al., 1995; Sorenson et al., 2010). The redhead, an interspecific parasitic duck, primarily migrates to different wintering habitats than its host, which may enable parasitic offspring to avoid imprinting or reverse preferences acquired from interactions with the host (Sorenson et al., 2010). In support of this hypothesis, the lack of sexual imprinting observed in non-parasitic, but experimentally cross-fostered pied flycatchers (*Ficedula hypoleuca*), may reflect the flycatcher's migratory behaviour and resultant limitation of social

interactions with experimental foster species (Slagsvold, Hansen, Johannessen, & Lifjeld, 2002). While segregation behaviours of juvenile brood parasites may reduce the likelihood of misimprinting on host's phenotype, it does not explain how juvenile brood parasites locate and recognize conspecifics. Genetic predispositions for habitat and phenotypic characteristics shared among conspecifics, in combination with cues learned from social interactions and self-inspection, are all likely involved with obligate parasite's species recognition ontogeny (Göth & Hauber, 2004; this study). Furthermore, selection has likely favored other mechanisms, such as delayed onsets or password-triggered flexibility in the sensitive periods of brood parasite offspring and future research investigating these factors will help increase our understanding of the origins and evolution of brood parasitism and its complex impact on social recognition and ontogeny.

LITERATURE CITED

- Alderson, G. W., Gibbs, H. L., & Sealy, S. G. (1999). Determining the reproductive behaviour of individual brown-headed cowbirds using microsatellite DNA markers. *Animal Behaviour*, 58(4), 895-905. doi: 10.1006/anbe.1999.1220
- Bateson, P. (1979). How do sensitive periods arise and what are they for? *Animal Behaviour*, 27, 470-486.
- Belthoff, J. R., & Ritchison, G. (1990). Roosting behavior of postfledging eastern screech-owls. *The Auk*, 107(3), 567-579. doi: 10.2307/4087921
- Bolker, B. M., Brooks, M. E., Clark, C. J., Geange, S. W., Poulsen, J. R., Stevens, M. H. H., & White, J. S. S. (2009). Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and evolution. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 24(3), 127-135. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2008.10.008
- Brainard, M. S., & Doupe, A. J. (2002). What songbirds teach us about learning. *Nature*, 417(6886), 351-358.
- Cox, W. A., Thompson, F. R., Cox, A. S., & Faaborg, J. (2014). Post-fledging survival in passerine birds and the value of post-fledging studies to conservation. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 78(2), 183-193. doi: 10.1002/jwmg.670

494 Davies, N. B. (2000). *Cuckoo, cowbirds and other cheats*. London: T. & A. Poyser.

495 Dufty, A. M. (1982). Movements and activities of radio-tracked brown-headed cowbirds. *Auk*, 99(2), 316-

496 327.

497 Feeney, W. E., Welbergen, J. A., & Langmore, N. E. (2014). Advances in the study of coevolution

498 between avian brood parasites and their hosts. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and*

499 *Systematics*, 45, 227-246. doi: 10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-120213-091603

500 Freeberg, T. M., King, A. P., & West, M. J. (1995). Social malleability in cowbirds (*Molothrus ater*

501 *artemisiae*): species and mate recognition in the first 2 years of life. *Journal of Comparative*

502 *Psychology*, 109(4), 357-367. doi: 10.1037/0735-7036.109.4.357

503 Freed-Brown, G., & White, D. J. (2009). Acoustic mate copying: female cowbirds attend to other females'

504 vocalizations to modify their song preferences. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*

505 *Sciences*, 276(1671), 3319-3325. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2009.0580

506 Göth, A., & Hauber, M. E. (2004). Ecological approaches to species recognition in birds through studies

507 of model and non-model species. *Annales Zoologici Fennici*, 41(6), 823-842.

508 Grosch, K. (2004). Hybridization between redstart *Phoenicurus phoenicurus* and black redstart *P.*

509 *ochruros*, and the effect on habitat exploitation. *Journal of Avian Biology*, 35(3), 217-223. doi:

510 10.1111/j.0908-8857.2004.03128.x

511 Hahn, D. C., & Fleischer, R. C. (1995). DNA fingerprint similarity between female and juvenile brown-

512 headed cowbirds trapped together. *Animal Behaviour*, 49(6), 1577-1580.

513 Hahn, D. C., & Hatfield, J. S. (1995). Parasitism at the landscape scale: cowbirds prefer forests.

514 *Conservation Biology*, 9(6), 1415-1424. doi: 10.1046/j.1523-1739.1995.09061415.x

515 Hahn, D. C., Sedgwick, J. A., Painter, I. S., & Casna, N. J. (1999). A spatial and genetic analysis of

516 cowbird host selection. In M. L. Morrison, L. S. Hall, S. K. Robinson, S. I. Rothstein, D. C. Hahn

517 & T. D. Rich (Eds.), *Research and management of the brown-headed cowbird in western*

518 *landscapes* (Vol. 18, pp. 204-217).

519 Hauber, M. E. (2001). Site selection and repeatability in brown-headed cowbird (*Molothrus ater*)
520 parasitism of eastern phoebe (*Sayornis phoebe*) nests. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 79(8), 1518-
521 1523. doi: 10.1139/z01-091

522 Hauber, M. E. (2002). First contact: a role for adult-offspring social association in the species recognition
523 system of brood parasites. *Annales Zoologici Fennici*, 39(4), 291-305.

524 Hauber, M. E., & Dearborn, D. C. (2003). Parentage without parental care: what to look for in genetic
525 studies of obligate brood-parasitic mating systems. *Auk*, 120(1), 1-13.

526 Hauber, M. E., Russo, S. A., & Sherman, P. W. (2001). A password for species recognition in a brood-
527 parasitic bird. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, 268(1471), 1041-1048.

528 Hauber, M. E., Sherman, P. W., & Paprika, D. (2000). Self-referent phenotype matching in a brood
529 parasite: the armpit effect in brown-headed cowbirds (*Molothrus ater*). *Animal Cognition*, 3(2),
530 113-117. doi: 10.1007/s100710000071

531 Hauber, M. E., Strausberger, B. M., Feldheim, K. A., Lock, J., & Cassey, P. (2012). Indirect estimates of
532 breeding and natal philopatry in an obligate avian brood parasite. *Journal of Ornithology*, 153(2),
533 467-475. doi: 10.1007/s10336-011-0762-6

534 Hensch, T. K. (2004). Critical period regulation. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 27, 549-579.

535 Hitchcock, R. R., & Mirarchi, R. E. (1984). Duration of dependence of wild fledgling mourning doves
536 upon parental care. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 48(1), 99-108. doi: 10.2307/3808457

537 Hoover, J. P. (2003). Multiple effects of brood parasitism reduce the reproductive success of prothonotary
538 warblers, *Protonotaria citrea*. *Animal Behaviour*, 65, 923-934. doi: 10.1006/anbe.2003.2155

539 Hoover, J. P., & Hauber, M. E. (2007). Individual patterns of habitat and nest-site use by hosts promote
540 transgenerational transmission of avian brood parasitism status. *Journal of Animal Ecology*,
541 76(6), 1208-1214. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2007.01291.x

542 Hoover, J. P., Yasukawa, K., & Hauber, M. E. (2006). Spatially and temporally structured avian brood
543 parasitism affects the fitness benefits of hosts' rejection strategies. *Animal Behaviour*, 72, 881-
544 890. doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2006.02.011

545 Hoover, J. P., & Robinson, S. K. (2007). Retaliatory mafia behavior by a parasitic cowbird favors host
 546 acceptance of parasitic eggs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(11), 4479-
 547 4483. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0609710104

548 Irwin, D. E., & Price, T. (1999). Sexual imprinting, learning and speciation. *Heredity*, 82(4), 347-354.
 549 doi: 10.1038/sj.hdy.6885270

550 Kalinowski, S. T., Taper, M. L., & Marshall, T. C. (2007). Revising how the computer program cervus
 551 accommodates genotyping error increases success in paternity assignment. *Molecular Ecology*,
 552 16(5), 1099-1106. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-294X.2007.03089.x

553 Kays, R., Tilak, S., Crofoot, M., Fountain, T., Obando, D., Ortega, A., . . . Wikelski, M. (2011). Tracking
 554 animal location and activity with an automated radio telemetry system in a tropical rainforest. *The*
 555 *Computer Journal*, 54(12), 1931-1948. doi: 10.1093/comjnl/bxr072

556 King, A. P., & West, M. J. (1977). Species identification in the North American cowbird: appropriate
 557 responses to abnormal song. *Science*, 195(4282), 1002-1004. doi: 10.1126/science.841321

558 King, A. P., & West, M. J. (1983). Epigenesis of cowbird song—a joint endeavour of males and females.
 559 *Nature*, 305(5936), 704-706.

560 Kruger, O. (2007). Cuckoos, cowbirds and hosts: adaptations, trade-offs and constraints. *Philosophical*
 561 *Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, 362(1486), 1873-1886. doi:
 562 10.1098/rstb.2006.1849

563 Laland, K. N. (1994). On the evolutionary consequences of sexual imprinting. *Evolution*, 48(2), 477-489.

564 Longmire, J. L., Roach, J. L., Maltbie, M., White, P. S., Tatum, O. L., Makova, K. D., & Hahn, D. C.
 565 (2001). Tetranucleotide microsatellite markers for the brown-headed cowbird *Molothrus ater*.
 566 *Journal of Avian Biology*, 32(1), 76-78. doi: 10.1034/j.1600-048X.2001.320111.x

567 Lowther, P. E. (1993). Brown-headed cowbird (*Molothrus ater*). In A. Poole, Gill, F. (Ed.), *The Birds of*
 568 *North America*. Ithaca: Cornell Lab of Ornithology.

569 McLaren, C. M., Woolfenden, B. E., Gibbs, H. L. & Sealy, S. G. (2003). Temporal patterns of multiple
 570 parasitism by brown-headed cowbirds (*Molothrus ater*) on song sparrows (*Melospiza melodia*).
 571 *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 81(2), 281–286.

572 O'Loughlen, A. L., & Rothstein, S. I. (2010). Delayed sensory learning and development of dialect songs
 573 in brown-headed cowbirds, *Molothrus ater*. *Animal Behaviour*, 79(2), 299-311. doi:
 574 10.1016/j.anbehav.2009.10.029

575 Ortega, C. P. (1998). *Cowbirds and other brood parasites*: University of Arizona Press.

576 Partridge, L. (1974). Habitat selection in titmice. *Nature*, 247(5442), 573-574. doi: 10.1038/247573a0

577 Payne, R. B. (1977). The ecology of brood parasitism in birds. *Annual Review of Ecology and*
 578 *Systematics*, 1-28. doi: 10.1146/annurev.es.08.110177.000245

579 Payne, R. B. (2010). Viduidae (whydahs and indigobirds). In J. Del Hoyo, A. Elliot & D. Christie (Eds.),
 580 *Handbook of the birds of the world* (Vol. 15, pp. 198-232). Barcelona: Lynx edicions.

581 Payne, R. B., Payne, L. L., Woods, J. L., & Sorenson, M. D. (2000). Imprinting and the origin of parasite-
 582 host species associations in brood-parasitic indigobirds, *Vidua chalybeata*. *Animal Behaviour*,
 583 59(1), 69-81. doi: 10.1006/anbe.1999.1283

584 Payne, R. B., & Sorenson, M. D. (2004). Behavioral and genetic identification of a hybrid vidua:
 585 Maternal origin and mate choice in a brood-parasitic finch. *The Auk*, 121(1), 156-161. doi:
 586 10.2307/4090064

587 Petit, L. J. (1999). Prothonotary warbler, *Prothonotaria citrea*. In A. Poole, Gill, F. (Ed.), *The Birds of*
 588 *North America* (Vol. 408). Ithaca: Cornell Lab of Ornithology.

589 Powell, R. A. (2000). Animal home ranges and territories and home range estimators. In L. Boitani & T.
 590 K. Fuller (Eds.), *Research techniques in animal ecology: controversies and consequences* (pp.
 591 65-110). New York: Columbia University Press.

592 Price, T. (2008). *Speciation in birds*. Greenwood Village, CO: Roberts and Company

593 Raim, A. (2000). Spatial patterns of breeding female brown-headed cowbirds on an Illinois site. In J. N.
 594 M. Smith, T. L. Cook, S. I. Rothstein, S. K. Robinson & S. G. Sealy (Eds.), *Ecology and*

management of cowbirds and their hosts: studies in the conservation of North American
passerine birds. (pp. 87-99): University of Texas Press.

Rappole, J. H., & Tipton, A. R. (1991). New harness design for attachment of radio transmitters to small
passerines. *Journal of Field Ornithology*, 62(3), 335-337. doi: 10.2307/20065798

Rivers, J. W., Young, S., Gonzalez, E. G., Horton, B., Lock, J., & Fleischer, R. C. (2012). High levels of
relatedness between brown-headed cowbird (*Molothrus ater*) nestmates in a heavily parasitized
host community. *The Auk*, 129(4), 623-631.

Rothstein, S. I. (1990). A model system for coevolution: avian brood parasitism. *Annual Review of
Ecology and Systematics*, 21, 481-508. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.21.1.481

Rousset, F. (2008). genepop'007: a complete re-implementation of the genepop software for Windows
and Linux. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, 8(1), 103-106. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-8286.2007.01931.x

Slagsvold, T., & Hansen, B. T. (2001). Sexual imprinting and the origin of obligate brood parasitism in
birds. *American Naturalist*, 158(4), 354-367. doi: 10.1086/321994

Slagsvold, T., Hansen, B. T., Johannessen, L. E., & Lifjeld, J. T. (2002). Mate choice and imprinting in
birds studied by cross-fostering in the wild. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B-
Biological Sciences*, 269(1499), 1449-1455. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2002.2045

Soler, M. (2014). Long-term coevolution between avian brood parasites and their hosts. *Biological
Reviews*, 89(3), 688-704. doi: 10.1111/brv.12075

Soler, M., & Soler, J. J. (1999). Innate versus learned recognition of conspecifics in great spotted cuckoos
Clamator glandarius. *Animal Cognition*, 2(2), 97-102. doi: 10.1007/s100710050029

Sorenson, M. D., Hauber, M. E., & Derrickson, S. R. (2010). Sexual imprinting misguides species
recognition in a facultative interspecific brood parasite. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-
Biological Sciences*, 277(1697), 3079-3085. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2010.0592

Strausberger, B. M., & Ashley, M. V. (2001). Eggs yield nuclear DNA from egg-laying female cowbirds,
their embryos and offspring. *Conservation Genetics*, 2(4), 385-390. doi:

10.1023/A:1012526315617

Strausberger, B. M., & Ashley, M. V. (2003). Breeding biology of brood parasitic brown-headed
 cowbirds (*Molothrus ater*) characterized by parent-offspring and sibling-group reconstruction.
The Auk, 120(2), 433-445. doi: 10.1642/0004-8038(2003)120[0433:BBOBPB]2.0.CO;2

Streby, H. M., Peterson, S. M., & Kapfer, P. M. (2009). Fledging success is a poor indicator of the effects
 of bird blow flies on Ovenbird survival. *Condor*, 111(1), 193-197. doi:
 10.1525/cond.2009.080095

Streby, H. M., McAllister, T. L., Peterson, S. M., Kramer, G. R., Lehman, J. A., & Andersen, D. E.
 (2015). Minimizing marker mass and handling time when attaching radio-transmitters and
 geolocators to small songbirds. *Condor*, 117(2) 249-255. doi: 10.1650/CONDOR-14-182.1

ten Cate, C., & Vos, D. R. (1999). Sexual imprinting and evolutionary processes in birds: a reassessment.
Advances in the Study of Behavior, 28, 1-31.

Thompson, F. R. (1994). Temporal and spatial patterns of breeding brown-headed cowbirds in the
 Midwestern United States. *Auk*, 111(4), 979-990.

Ward, M. P., Alessi, M., Benson, T. J., & Chiavacci, S. J. (2014). The active nightlife of diurnal birds:
 extraterritorial forays and nocturnal activity patterns. *Animal Behaviour*, 88(0), 175-184. doi:
 10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.11.024

Ward, M. P., Sperry, J. H., & Weatherhead, P. J. (2013). Evaluation of automated radio telemetry for
 quantifying movements and home ranges of snakes. *Journal of Herpetology*, 47(2), 337-345. doi:
 10.1670/12-018

Ward, P., & Zahavi, A. (1973). The importance of certain assemblages of birds as “information-centres”
 for food-finding. *Ibis*, 115(4), 517-534. doi: 10.1111/j.1474-919X.1973.tb01990.x

Weatherhead, P. J. (1983). Two principal strategies in avian communal roosts. *The American Naturalist*,
 121(2), 237-243. doi: 10.2307/2461125

West, M. J., & King, A. P. (1988). Female visual displays affect the development of male song in the
 cowbird. *Nature*, 334(6179), 244-246.

- 646 Woodward, P. W. (1983). Behavioral ecology of fledgling brown-headed cowbirds and their hosts.
647 *Condor*, 85(2), 151-163.
- 648 Yom-Tov, Y., & Geffen, E. (2006). On the origin of brood parasitism in altricial birds. *Behavioral*
649 *Ecology*, 17(2), 196-205. doi: 10.1093/beheco/arj013

650

651

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank V. Kichline, A. Albores, C. Buerke, C. Carreau, and J. York, for help collecting cowbird data and S. Chiavacchi and A. Celis-Murillo for their help with constructing the ARTS. Our manuscript was greatly improved by the comments from A. Suarez, R. Schooley and two anonymous reviewers. The staff from the Illinois Natural History Survey, Cypress Creek National Wildlife Refuge and Cache River State Natural Area provided logistical support. Financial support was provided by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (INT 1448-0003-95-1007), The Nature Conservancy, the Illinois Department of Natural Resources Wildlife Preservation Fund, the University of Illinois, the Animal Behavior Society, the American Ornithologists' Union, and the University of Illinois. During the analysis and writing, MML and MEH were supported by NSF/IOS grant: 1456524.