

1 **The importance of anthropogenic effects in habitat use and territory size of Northern**
2 **Anteater-chats (*Myrmecocichla aeithiops*) near Amurum Forest Reserve, Jos-plateau,**
3 **Nigeria**

4
5 Biplang G. Yadok^{1*}, Yahkat Barshep^{1,2} & Will Cresswell^{1,3**}

6 ¹AP Leventis Ornithological Research Institute, Jos, Nigeria

7 ²Department of Biological Sciences, University of Cape Town, Private Bag, Rondebosch 7701 South
8 Africa

9 ³School of Biology, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 9TS, UK

10 E-mail: * biplang2006@yahoo.com & ** wrlc@st-and.ac.uk

11

12

13 Occurrence of animals in an area and the size of territories they occupy is a function of resource
14 availability and the environmental conditions in that area. Territory location in birds is often determined by
15 availability of nesting habitat and we investigate whether this is the case for the little studied Northern
16 Anteater-chat *Myrmecochila aeithiops*. Territory size and location were mapped over two months in 2012
17 at 25 different sites where the birds occurred in central Nigeria and compared to 25 random sites where
18 they did not, 500m away. Vegetation variables, invertebrate abundance indicators, anthropogenic
19 variables (availability of nest-sites) and bird community components were measured and compared with
20 adjoining areas (500m away) from which the birds were absent in order to determine important factors
21 determining territory location and size. Territories were 1.23 ha (± 0.14 SE) in size and were widely
22 separated and so non-contiguous. Increasing numbers of abandoned wells, ant nests and termite
23 mounds increased the probability of territory occupation. Territory size increased with the number of
24 Anteater-chats but decreased with increasing number of ant nests and overall bird diversity that were
25 probably proxies for habitat quality. Overall, choice of preferred areas for the Northern Anteater-chat was
26 centred on nesting sites and then habitat quality and group size probably determined territory size.

27 According to the habitat selection theory, individuals select the highest quality habitats that are available
28 in a heterogeneous landscape to maximize their fitness returns (Morris 2008). Thus, the territory size in a
29 selected habitat for birds is often a product of resource availability and abundance (Calsbeek & Sinervo
30 2002). The cost of defending a territory may be quite high but benefits usually outweigh the cost: an
31 optimal territory size is one in which net benefits are greatest (Both & Visser 2003). Defended territories
32 are usually characterised by the availability of food, nest sites and roosting sites (Newton 1992). In this
33 study we investigate the factors determining territory size and location of the Northern Anteater-chat
34 (*Myrmecocichla aeithiops*) in Nigeria, as a case study of a tropical bird, where the factors determining
35 territories are relatively little studied compared to temperate species, and because the species is poorly
36 known in West Africa (Mundy & Cook 1972, Mundy & Cook 1974). The West African population of the
37 Northern Anteater-chat is widely spread but only locally common with large areas unoccupied (Del Hoyo
38 *et al.* 2005), the occupied areas can be aggressively defended against conspecifics (pers.obs), therefore
39 we refer to occupied areas, or home ranges, as “territories” throughout this paper.

40 Northern Anteater-chats are described as being dependent on unlined wells or other earth holes for
41 nesting (Keith *et al.* 1992). They are also described as being highly territorial (Keith *et al.* 1992) with
42 several related individuals defending their territories in groups of 2 to 20 individuals (Mundy & Cook
43 1972). This suggests that nesting resources may be of great value and potentially in short supply and
44 thus the most important factor in determining the distribution of territories. Furthermore Northern Anteater-
45 chats may forage frequently in the presence of other species in the same foraging guild (Keith *et al.* 1992)
46 suggesting that food resources are less important in territoriality. We therefore tested the hypothesis that
47 the location and size of Northern Anteater-chat territories is primarily determined by the availability of
48 nesting sites.

49 **Methods**

50 Northern Ant-eater Chats are found mainly in the Sahel and Sudan savannah regions of West Africa.
51 Their range, however, also extends southwards to the Jos-plateau in central Nigeria (Keith *et al.* 1992).
52 The study was carried around the Amurum Forest Reserve and surrounding villages (9°83'-9°91'N and
53 8°93'-9°7' E), on the Jos Plateau, in the central part of Nigeria. The surrounding villages include;

54 Laminga, Kerker, Itsisa, Zarazon, Gwafan, Rizek, Kwanga, Kampala and Furaka, Sabon kaura and
55 Kudedu (Fig. 1). Average rainfall is about 1400mm per year and daytime temperatures range from 20-
56 35°C (Molokwu *et al.* 2008, Ezealor 2002)

57 The area surrounding Amurum Forest Reserve is typical of the Jos-Plateau landscape, comprising
58 scattered granitic outcrops ranging from 1200m-1450m above sea level. The vegetation is scattered bush
59 and grass, grazed by cattle with sparse riparian forests, extensive cultivation and abandoned tin mining
60 sites (Elgood *et al.* 1994, Vickery & Jones 2002). Dry abandoned wells which were formerly used for
61 irrigation are not uncommon because farmers often practice shifting cultivation. In some cases,
62 abandoned wells can be observed close to long-deserted mud houses.

63 Field data were collected between 10 May and 14 July 2012. Sites where the Northern Anteater-chats
64 were known to exist from a reconnaissance survey carried out prior to the experiment were visited; new
65 sites were also found during the study period. 21 Northern Anteater-chats from 10 territories were trapped
66 with mist nets. Playback calls facilitated trapping of Northern Anteater-chats in their territories because
67 the birds showed a high degree of aggression to territory intrusion by conspecifics. Each trapped bird was
68 ringed with a uniquely numbered metal ring and a three-ring combination of plastic colour rings. Although
69 a lot of effort was put into finding new territories within the study area, it cannot be categorically stated
70 that all the territories in the study area were found and sampled. Nevertheless the species is highly
71 detectable and occurs in open habitats, suggesting that few if any territories were missed.

72 Territory size sampling was carried out in the morning between 06h30 and 08h30 and in the evening
73 between 16h00 and 18h00. Individual birds were observed through binoculars for 20 minutes at a distance
74 not less than 150m to avoid observer interference on bird behaviour. Each point where the bird perched,
75 fed or performed any other activity was noted and marked with a Global Positioning satellite System
76 (GPS; Garmin eTrex[®] version 3.10) after the 20 minutes of focal observation. This was carried out for
77 each colour-ringed bird in every recognised territory. Using QGIS[®] version 1.7.4 software, 95% Minimum
78 Convex Polygons (MCP) were generated using the “home range analysis” tool (plugin). The areas of the
79 MCPs were calculated in ARC GIS[®] version 10.0. An average of about 10 separate points where the birds
80 perched and performed other activities were recorded in not less than two observations at every territory.

81 Habitat variables which characterised the environment were categorized as invertebrate abundance
82 indicators, vegetation variables, anthropogenic variables (presence of buildings, roads and wells) and bird
83 community components – see Table 1). They were measured in a 20m x 20m quadrat randomly placed in
84 each Northern Anteater-chat territory and at randomly selected points where Northern Anteater-chats
85 were absent 500m away from each territory. In selecting the random points, random numbers $> 0 < 1$
86 were generated in R[®] version 2.1.4, the generated numbers were multiplied by 360° to give an angle
87 which was traced from the North on a compass (Skalski 1987). Where Northern Anteater-chats were
88 observed within 200m radius of random points, such points were immediately reclassified as “presence”
89 sites, and further random points were added to the study. We estimated abundance of crawling and flying
90 insects by using pitfall traps and sweep nets respectively. At each 20m x 20m quadrat, five pitfall traps
91 were randomly placed at a distance not less than 5m apart. Eighty sweeps using a sweep net 30cm in
92 diameter were carried out at each quadrat. Insect species caught by both methods in every quadrat were
93 sorted according to insect orders and then counted. A five-minute point count was carried out at every
94 territory and random point to determine bird diversity and abundance in the territories and random points.
95 All birds seen and heard were recorded and all records were combined to give a total abundance of all
96 species. Point counts were conducted in very open, sparsely vegetated habitat where detectability was
97 not considered an issue over the relatively small scale of the Northern Anteater-chat territories. The
98 Shannon-Weiner index was used to calculate bird diversity.

99 All data were analysed using R[®] version 2.14.0 statistical software package. Significance of all tests were
100 accepted at $\alpha < 0.05$. Models were checked for violation of assumptions using Quantile-Quantile (Q-Q)
101 plots. A t-test was used to determine differences in habitat qualities between territories of Northern
102 Anteater-chats and the random points to allow simple illustration of differences between selected and
103 non-selected habitats. Then a multivariate Generalised Linear Model (GLM) with a binomial error
104 structure was used to determine which of these habitat variables best predicted habitat selection in
105 Northern Anteater-chats. Presence/absence of the Northern Anteater-chat was set as the dependent
106 variable while the vegetation variables, invertebrate abundance, anthropogenic factors and bird
107 community components were the explanatory variables. A further General Linear Model was used to
108 determine the variables predicting territory size. The areas of the Minimum Convex Polygons for the

109 territories was set as the dependent variable while the vegetation variables, invertebrate abundance,
110 anthropogenic factors and bird community components were set as the explanatory variables. For both
111 model types, the best for each was chosen using the following procedure. Initial models contained all
112 habitat variables as explanatory factors and included all two-way interactions. A final best model was then
113 identified using a step-wise backward elimination method, based on the lowest AIC and highest AIC
114 weight.

115 **Results**

116 The mean MCP area of Northern Anteater-chat territories as obtained from the study was $1.23 \text{ ha} \pm 0.14$
117 ($N=25$, range $0.18 - 2.7 \text{ ha}$). The territories did not overlap and were widely spaced from one another
118 (Figure 1).

119 A total of 25 territories and 25 random points were surveyed. A comparison of the habitat variables using
120 a t-test showed that most of the measured habitat variables at the territories of Northern Anteater-chats
121 were not significantly different from those of the random sites. Percentage bare rock cover, number of
122 termite mounds, number of ant nests, and number of abandoned wells in the territories were significantly
123 different from those of the random sites (Table 1).

124 The number of abandoned wells turned out to be the most significant predictor of territory location for
125 Northern Anteater-chats (Table 2) with the probability of occurrence rising if one or more wells were
126 present in a territory (Figure 2). As the mean number of ant nests and termite mounds increased so too
127 did the probability of occurrence, although the relationship with the number of termite mounds was only
128 marginally significant (Table 2).

129 The number of Northern Anteater-chats was the most significant determinant of territory size in Northern
130 Anteater-chats (Table 3), with territory size increasing with the number of birds (Figure 3). Territory size
131 was significantly smaller for territories with higher bird diversity and there was also a marginally significant
132 decrease in territory size with increasing number of ant nests (Table 3).

133 Discussion

134 Variation in territory size and density is common both within and between bird species (Marshall & Cooper
135 2004, Adams 2001). Territory sizes of Northern Anteater-chats in this study ranged from 0.19 ha to
136 2.77ha. This is similar to the range of territory sizes studied in other tropical passerines, with often large
137 variations in range size (e.g. Chaskda 2011, Pickman 1987). Variability of territory size in Northern
138 Anteater-chat can be partly attributed to group size, with larger groups – almost certainly adults with
139 young or retained young from previous breeding attempts – having larger territories. Most territories of
140 Northern Anteater-chats are usually at very low densities (Keith *et al.* 1992; Mundy & Cook, 1974), and
141 the fact that territories of Northern Anteater-chats are widely spaced and non-adjoining as presented in
142 this study shows that territories can probably be expanded so as to maximize resources for the
143 accommodation of non-breeding juveniles.

144 This study showed that habitat selection of Northern Anteater-chats is likely to depend on availability of
145 nesting sites which are in most cases dry abandoned wells. Furthermore, in four different territories where
146 abandoned wells were not recorded, these were centred on the banks of gullies where nesting tunnels
147 were observed, indicating the importance of habitat that will allow nesting. The choice of territory location
148 for most tropical birds generally largely depends on the availability of nesting sites rather than local
149 variation in food availability (Stutchbury & Morton 2001). Even though resources are abundant, high
150 competition for resources which allow successful reproduction such as safe nesting sites have probably
151 led to a selection for a K life history strategy in Northern Anteater-chats. Nest predation in tropical birds is
152 often very high (c.77%) (Remeš *et al.* 2012) and as a result, selection of habitats that have safer nesting
153 sites is often made by tropical birds in order to maximize their fitness (Remeš *et al.* 2012). Northern
154 Anteater-chats may have such a strong preference for wells rather than digging their own tunnels in
155 gullies because wells may have a much lower predation risk compared to gullies: in our experience nest
156 sites in gullies appeared much more conspicuous and vulnerable to predation but this remains to be
157 tested.

158 This study showed that ant nests and termite mounds, which probably indicate abundance of ants and
159 termites, respectively, are also important factors in habitat choice of Northern Anteater-chat. Abundance

160 of food is frequently of secondary importance in habitat choice of tropical birds (Stuchbury and Morton
161 2001) because tropical birds are generally faced with low starvation risk (Brandt 2006). Nevertheless food
162 abundance still affects territory size in many species (Marshall & Cooper 2004). The negative relationship
163 between diversity of other birds and territory size of Northern Anteater-chat as shown in this study
164 possibly points to the fact that high quality habitats attract a lot of heterospecifics. It is easier to measure
165 diversity of other bird species at Northern Anteater-chat territories than the resource levels for Northern
166 Anteater-chats. Although numbers of ant nests, termite mounds and insects in territories of Northern
167 Anteater-chats have been sampled, there may still remain other un-sampled variables which allow for
168 smaller territory size. Such variables may be indicated by high bird diversity. Therefore, if bird diversity is
169 a proxy for habitat quality, Northern Anteater-chats have larger territories in areas with lower resource
170 availability.

171 Territorial behaviour is important in spacing out birds within a habitat (Newton 1992); as a consequence,
172 local populations of birds are regulated at fairly stable densities especially when territory sizes are not
173 extremely variable (Adams 2001). However, the distribution of territories in this study, suggests that
174 Northern Anteater-chats defend large non-contiguous territories centered on key resources (wells), and
175 these key resources may be in short supply, being widely separated. Therefore territoriality and breeding
176 success may hinge on long term ownership of the nesting sites, rather than defence of an area or
177 boundary per se. Given the short period of research and the relatively large area of study and the rocky
178 undulating terrain of the Jos Plateau, we believe that not all territories will have been sampled. But apart
179 from a few villages where more than two Northern Anteater-chat territories were recorded, we observed
180 that the territories were all widely separated. Northern Anteater-chats also occupied gullies and these
181 may perhaps represent lower quality habitats: gullies appeared to be reasonably available but only
182 occasionally used perhaps suggesting that they may serve as poorer quality or even sink habitats when
183 high quality source habitats are unavailable. However, without breeding data, lacking from the present
184 study, it is impossible to determine whether this is occurring, or whether the anteater chats are at carrying
185 capacity. Further studies on the survival and dispersal of young Northern Anteater-chats may explain the
186 role of territoriality (or home-range behaviour) in population regulation of Northern Anteater-chats.

187 **Acknowledgements**

188 We thank Dr. A.P Leventis for generously funding the Research through the Leventis foundation,
189 Shomboro and Albert Tauje for their assistance in GIS analysis, Dr. Shiiwua Manu making valuable
190 comments and Azi John Idoh for assistance in the field. This is publication number (number to be added
191 at the proof stage) from the A.P. Leventis Ornithological Research Institute.

192 **References**

- 193 Adams ES. 2001. Approaches to the study of territory size and shape. *Annual Review of Ecology and*
194 *Systematics* 32: 277–303.
- 195 Both C, Visser ME. 2003. Density dependence, territoriality, and divisibility of resources: from optimality
196 models to population processes. *American Naturalist* 161:326–336.
- 197 Brandt MJ. 2006. Trade-offs between the risks of predation and starvation in subtropical granivorous
198 finches. PhD Thesis submitted to the School of Biology, University of St. Andrews, UK.
- 199 Calsbeek R, Sinervo B. 2002. An experimental test of the ideal despotic distribution. *Journal of Animal*
200 *Ecology* 71: 513–523.
- 201 Chaskda A A. 2011. Determinants and consequences of territory quality in the Bar-throated Apalis *Apalis*
202 *thoracica*. A Ph.D Thesis submitted to the Department of Zoology, University of Cape Town.
- 203 Del Hoyo J, Elliot A, Christie D, 2005 (eds). *Handbook of the birds of the world*. Volume 10: Cuckoo-
204 Shrikes to Thrushes. Lynx Edicions. Barcelona.
- 205 Elgood JH, Heigham JB, Moore AM, Nason AM, Sharland RE, Skinner NJ. (eds) 1994. *The birds of*
206 *Nigeria*, 2nd ed. BOU Check-list No. 4. Tring: British Ornithologists' Union.
- 207 Ezealor AU. (ed). 2002. *Critical sites for biodiversity conservation in Nigeria*. Nigerian Conservation
208 Foundation, Lagos.
- 209 Keith S, Urban EK, Fry CH. 1992. *Birds of Africa*, vol. 4. Academic press, London
- 210 Marshall MR, Cooper RJ. 2004. Territory size of a migratory songbird in response to caterpillar density
211 and foliage structure. *Ecology* 85: 432–445.
- 212 Mwansat GS, Lohdip YN, Dami FB. 2011. Activities of the A.P. Leventis, the West African foremost
213 ornithological research centre. *Science World Journal* 6:9-11.

214 Molokwu MN, Olsson O, Nilson J, Ottosson U. 2008. Seasonal variation in patch use in a tropical African
215 environment. *Oikos* 117: 892-898.

216 Morris DW. 2003. Towards an ecological synthesis: a case for habitat selection. *Oecologia* 136: 1–13.

217 Mundy PJ, Cook AW. 1972. Birds of Sokoto: Part 2. *Nigerian Ornithologists' Society Bulletin* 9:61-75.

218 Mundy PJ, Cook AW. 1974. Birds of Sokoto, Part 3. *Nigerian Ornithologists' Society Bulletin* 10: 1–28.

219 Newton I. 1992. Experiments on the limitation of bird numbers by territorial behaviour. *Biological Reviews*
220 67:129–73.

221 Pickman J. 1987. Territory establishment, size and tenacity by male Red-winged Blackbirds. *Auk* 104:
222 405–412.

223 Remeš V, Matysioková B & Cockburn A. 2012. Long-term large scale analysis of predation patterns in
224 Australian songbirds and a global comparison of nest predation rates. *Journal of Avian Biology* 43:435-
225 444.

226 Skalski JR. 1987. Selecting a random circle of points in circular field plots. *Ecology* 68:749.

227 Stutchbury BJM, Morton ES. 2001. *Behavioral ecology of tropical birds*. Academic Press, New York.

228 Vickery J, Jones PJ. 2002. A new ornithological research institute in Nigeria. *Bulletin of African Bird Club*
229 9:61-62.

230

231

232

233

234 Table 1: Comparison of habitat variables measured within random sites and Northern Anteater-chat
 235 territories in and around Amurum Forest Reserve. All distances are in meters. Statistically significant
 236 differences in these values as univariate pairs are in bold: the best model from the full multivariate
 237 analysis is in Table 2.

238

Parameter	Mean Number at Random points	Mean Number at Territories	sd	t	df	p
Number of trees	0.8	0.6	1.3	0.6	33.5	0.52
Number of shrubs	20.5	12.2	16.9	1.7	36.1	0.08
Percentage bare ground cover	31.4	34.0	21.5	-0.4	45.3	0.65
Percentage bare rock cover	15.8	0.8	20.5	2.7	24.6	0.01
Mean grass height	18.4	0.9	19.8	1.6	25.9	0.11
Number of termite mounds	0.8	1.8	1.6	-2.2	37.2	0.03
Mean number of ant nests	0.4	0.7	0.5	-2.4	40.9	0.02
Insect abundance	243.9	268.6	227.0	-0.3	46.2	0.70
Distance from nearest building	205.3	178.5	220.0	0.4	45.1	0.67
Distance from nearest farm	76.0	110.6	185.0	-0.6	38.2	0.51
Distance from nearest road	334.3	157.1	251.2	2.8	46.3	0.01
Number of abandoned wells	0.04	1.3	1.3	-3.9	24.8	<0.01
Bird diversity	1.9	1.9	0.8	0.2	47.0	0.77
Bird abundance	19.0	25.3	16.2	-1.4	34.9	0.17

239

240

241 Table 2: Important predictors of territory location of the Northern Anteater-chat. The best model: Presence
 242 or absence = number of termite mounds + mean number of ant nests + number of abandoned wells,
 243 family=binomial, N = 50, degrees of freedom for all terms 1,46. The best model had an AIC-value of 36.0
 244 and AIC weight of 1.0 compared to the second best model with an AIC-value of 42.2 and AIC weight of
 245 0.1.

246

Variable	Estimate	Standard Error	F-value	p
(Intercept)	-3.9	1.2		<0.01
Number of termite mounds	0.6	0.3	8.7	0.06
Mean number of ant nests	3.0	1.1	15.8	0.01
Number of abandoned wells	3.7	1.2	44.7	<0.01

247

248

249

250 Table 3: The relationship between territory size of Northern Anteater-chats with ant nests, bird diversity
 251 and number of Northern Anteater-chats occupying the territory. The best model: Territory size = mean
 252 number of ant nests + bird diversity + number of Northern Anteater-chats, Number of territories = 25.
 253 $F_{3,21}=9.2$. Overall adjusted model $R^2 = 0.51$. Degrees of freedom for all terms 1,21. The best model had
 254 an AIC-value of 504.6 and AIC weight of 0.79 as against the second best model with an AIC-value of
 255 505.1 and AIC weight of 0.11.

256

Parameter	Estimate	SE	T	p
Intercept	13003	4846	2.7	0.01
Mean number of ant nests	-3934	2171	-1.8	0.08
Bird diversity	-3477	1496	-2.3	0.03
Number of Northern Anteater-chats	3740	1190	3.1	<0.01

257

258

259 **Figure Legends**

260 Figure 1: Map of the study area showing territories of Northern Anteater-chats in the villages surrounding
261 Amurum Forest Reserve.


262 Figure 2: The probability of occurrence of Northern Anteater-chats with the number of abandoned wells
263 present. Points are 0 and 1 because they show presence/absence data. The solid line is fitted through the
264 average of the presence and absences, for each value of number of wells (with dashed lines showing one
265 standard error for the fitted average line – see parameter estimates from the model in Table 2). The raw
266 data of the frequency of presence and absences is shown using a sunflower plot: the number of petals
267 indicate the number of points that were scored as either presence (top, Y = 1 axis) or absence (bottom, Y
268 = 0 axis).

269 Figure 3: The size of Northern Anteater-chat territories with number of conspecifics in the territory. The
270 solid line is the predicted relationship (back transformed) from the top model in Table 3 (with dashed lines
271 showing the predicted relationship plus or minus one standard error).

272


273

274 Fig. 1
275
276
277
278
279




280
281
282

283 Fig. 2:



284
285

286



288

289