

Correspondence

Tracking the warriors and spectators of acorn woodpecker wars

Sahas Barve^{1,4,*}, Ally S. Lahey¹,
Rebecca M. Brunner²,
Walter D. Koenig³, and Eric L. Walters¹

Although intergroup conflict is widespread in vertebrates, simultaneous agonistic interactions among several groups are rare [1]. Acorn woodpeckers (*Melanerpes formicivorus*) are cooperatively breeding birds that defend acorn storage facilities ('granaries'), which provide significant survival and reproductive benefits to breeders in the social group [2]. Breeder vacancies in high-quality territories (*i.e.*, large granaries accrued over multiple

generations) elicit violent fights or 'power struggles', among multiple same-sex coalitions from neighboring groups. Here, using an automated radio-telemetry system, we found that individuals in coalitions competing for breeding vacancies — the 'warriors' — invested up to ten hours per day on successive days before one coalition emerged victorious. Power struggles also attracted 'spectators' — acorn woodpeckers not eligible to fill the breeding vacancy. Apparently present only to gain social information, spectators travelled from territories as far as over three kilometers away. Our study reveals the complexity of acorn woodpecker social group networks, demonstrating the significant effort of both warriors and spectators to pursue fitness benefits and obtain social information.

Acorn woodpecker groups live on year-round territories defined by granaries, trees with hundreds to thousands of holes, drilled by the birds, where they store acorns for later

consumption (Figure 1A). Stored acorns are consumed by adults when food is scarce and are also fed to nestlings. Granaries are pilfered by intra- and interspecific competitors and are thus zealously defended by all group members. Large-granary territories are often controlled by polygynandrous groups consisting of multiple male and female breeders and their non-breeding offspring ('helpers'). Same-sex co-breeders are closely related to each other but unrelated to breeders of the opposite sex [3]. In addition to within-group dynamics, acorn woodpeckers recognize associations among individuals outside their group and track membership changes in surrounding territories [4]. This information transfer is likely to occur via numerous daily off-territory forays to neighboring territories [5].

A typical way that non-breeding helpers obtain a breeding position is by filling a breeder vacancy in a non-natal territory. In our California study population, same-sex coalitions of




Figure 1. Acorn woodpecker behavior at power struggles.

(A) 'Spread-wing' display by a female acorn woodpecker on a granary (photo: © Bruce Lyon). (B–E) Variation in individual investment in power struggles. Black points represent the mean for each variable; error bars denote standard errors. Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences. (B) Birds from >3 km away visited power struggle sites. Colored points indicate time spent (min) attending power struggles by each sex-status category as a function of distance to home territory for warriors (yellow = helper females), and spectators (purple = breeder females, green = breeder males, red = helper males). (C) Helper female warriors spent significantly longer times ($P < 0.05$) at power struggles compared to spectators (birds present but not competing). (D) Warriors attending power struggles came from groups significantly closer than spectators. (E) There was no difference ($P > 0.05$) in the duration of attendance (days) by individual warriors and spectators at a power struggle.



helpers will fight against a dozen or more competing coalitions (40 or more birds) for a breeding vacancy, with winners co-breeding at the new territory [6]. Typically, a quarter of the about 50 groups we follow have a breeding vacancy in a given year; although long, violent power struggles that attract a large number of birds tend to happen at territories with big granaries [7]. Such power struggles can last for several days and involve spread-wing displays (Figure 1A), incessant calling, and intense physical — sometimes fatal — fights [6]. A key to understanding the factors driving the success of a coalition in achieving breeding status involves quantifying the effort expended by coalition members that travel to, and fight at, power struggles. However, visually monitoring behavior at power struggles — especially individual investment — is difficult due to the chaotic nature of these conflicts.

Using an automated radio-telemetry system [5], we tracked 36 acorn woodpeckers that attended three power struggles (2018: May, Aug.; 2019: Apr.). Because each power struggle was triggered by a female breeder vacancy, we expected helper females to invest the most effort as warriors [6,7]. Females with a breeding position at another group, as well as any males, were considered spectators, since such individuals were not relevant to the female vacancy. Although not the case with tagged birds in this study, it is possible that such individuals were assisting helper coalitions from their home groups (their own offspring). Given the tradeoff between gaining information at a power struggle vs. defending a home territory [5], we did not expect to detect many spectators at power struggles. We used linear mixed models (Supplemental information) to test whether a bird's role as a warrior or spectator explained variation in time spent at power struggles (*i.e.*, number of minutes a tag was detected by a receiver at the granary), and distance traveled to reach power struggles from home territories.

The three power struggles attracted about a third ($31 \pm 7\%$) of all radio-tagged birds in our study area ($N = 41/61/73$) at the time of each event. Some birds visited power struggles from over three kilometers away, close to the maximum distance between any two groups in our study area (Figure 1B). As

expected, warriors spent the most time at the power struggles: helper females (total $N = 13$) attended power struggles for nearly 113 minutes longer per day (mean \pm SE 112.8 ± 28.5 min) than spectators ($N = 23$, $P < 0.001$, Figure 1C). During one power struggle, two helper female coalition members returned over four consecutive days, staying over ten hours each day (Figure 1C), but did not win the power struggle; an untagged female coalition ultimately won the breeding position. Such a continuous presence at these conflicts demonstrates a remarkable willingness to expend intense short-term effort for potential access to the long-term benefits of a breeding position at a high-quality territory.

Spectators spent almost an hour per day attending power struggles (mean \pm SE = 52.1 ± 10.4 min/day, range 1–462 min; Figure 1B,D). This suggests that maintaining current information within the acorn woodpecker social network is worth leaving a home territory unattended for considerable periods of time. Warriors came from group territories that were significantly closer (mean \pm SE = 644 ± 136 m) than spectators (1432 ± 167 m) ($P < 0.001$, Figure 1D). Additionally, there was no difference in the number of days warriors and spectators visited any one power struggle site ($P > 0.05$, Figure 1E). Spectators are thus clearly willing to repeatedly travel considerable distances, apparently even farther than those competing for the vacancy, to gather social information.

Our study not only demonstrates the significant effort invested by some individuals to ensure long-term fitness benefits, but also reveals that social birds — including those that already have a breeding position — foray well beyond their home territory to gather social information [8]. Automated radio-telemetry is thus a powerful tool that can help reveal individual investment in complex social behaviors like power struggles; future studies should link such social events to the flow of information through social networks [9,10].

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Supplemental Information includes one figure and experimental procedures and can be found with this article online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2020.07.073>.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank David Winkler for help with the radio-telemetry technology. Russell Winter, Emily Goldberg, Megan Massa and Hannah Horowitz assisted with fieldwork. We thank Dr. Brandt Ryder and an anonymous reviewer for constructive comments. We thank the National Science Foundation for funding (grants IOS-1455881 and IOS-1455900).

REFERENCES

1. Kitchen, D.M., and Packer, C. (1999). Complexity in vertebrate societies. In *Levels of Selection in Evolution*, L. Keller, ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press), pp. 176–196.
2. Koenig, W.D., Walters, E.L., Stacey, P.B., Stanback, M.T., and Mumme, R.L. (2020). Acorn Woodpecker (*Melanerpes formicivorus*), version 1.0. In *Birds of the World*, P.G. Rodewald, and B.K. Keeney, eds. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell Lab of Ornithology), <https://doi.org/10.2173/bow.acowoo.01>
3. Koenig, W.D., Walters, E.L., and Haydock, J. (2016). Acorn woodpeckers: helping at the nest, polygyny and dependence on a variable acorn crop. In *Cooperative Breeding in Vertebrates: Studies of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior*, W.D. Koenig, and J.L. Dickinson, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 217–236.
4. Pardo, M.A., Sparks, E.A., Kuray, T.S., Hagemeyer, N.D., Walters, E.L., and Koenig, W.D. (2018). Wild acorn woodpeckers recognize associations between individuals in other groups. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 285, 20181017.
5. Barve, S., Hagemeyer, N.D., Winter, R.E., Chamberlain, S.D., Koenig, W.D., Winkler, D.W., and Walters, E.L. (2020). Wandering woodpeckers: foray behavior in a social bird. *Ecology* 101, e02943.
6. Hannon, S.J., Mumme, R.L., Koenig, W.D., and Pitelka, F.A. (1985). Replacement of breeders and within-group conflict in the cooperatively breeding acorn woodpecker. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 17, 303–312.
7. Koenig, W.D. (1981). Space competition in the acorn woodpecker: power struggles in a cooperative breeder. *Anim. Behav.* 29, 396–409.
8. Schliehe-Diecks, S., Eberle, M., and Kappeler, P.M. (2012). Walk the line—dispersal movements of gray mouse lemurs (*Microcebus murinus*). *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 66, 1175–1185.
9. Ryder, T.B., Dakin, R., Vernasco, B.J., Evans, B.S., Horton, B.M., and Moore, I.T. (2020). Testosterone modulates status-specific patterns of cooperation in a social network. *Am. Nat.* 195, 82–94.
10. Papageorgiou, D., Christensen, C., Gall, G.E., Klarevas-Irby, J.A., Nyaguthii, B., Couzin, I.D., and Farine, D.R. (2019). The multilevel society of a small-brained bird. *Curr. Biol.* 29, R1120–R1121.

¹Department of Biological Sciences, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA 23529, USA.

²Department of Environmental Science, Policy, and Management, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA. ³Hastings Natural History Reservation, University of California Berkeley, Carmel Valley, CA 93924, USA. ⁴Current address: Division of Birds, Department of Vertebrate Zoology, Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History, Washington, DC 20560, USA.

*E-mail: sahasbarve@gmail.com