MORNING AND EVENING WEIGHTS OF NESTLING BIRDS

рд

Deborah Allen Claiborne
Richmond, Virginia

A report of an original field study conducted as a requirement for Advanced Ornithology (Zoology 119) University of Michigan Biological Station

Submitted August 19, 1944

CONTENTS

| • | Page | , |
|------|-----------------------------------|---|
| I. | Introduction and Acknowledgements | |
| II. | Habitat | |
| III. | Nests | |
| | A. Nesting boxes | |
| | B. Nesting Success | |
| IV. | Young | |
| v. | Behavior of Parents | |
| VI. | Conclusions | |
| VII. | Bibliography | |

LIST OF TABLES AND GRAPHS

| | Pa |
|-------|---|
| I. | Tables 1 - 16Weights of Nestling Bluebirds and Tree Swallows |
| II. | Graphs 1 - 16Illustration of Fluctuations and Variations in Tables 1 - 16 |
| III. | Average Weights of Nestling Tree Swallows |
| IV. | Average Weights of Nestling Bluebirds |
| ٧. | Comparison of Weights of Passerine Birds |
| VI. | Comparison of 1st and Last Weights Recorded |
| VII. | Comparison of Average Losses of Tree Swallows and Bluebirds |
| /III. | Comparison of Losses of Nests with 4 Young and Nests with 5 Young |
| IX. | Graphs 7 - 32 Morning and Evening Weights Compared |

INTRODUCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was made at the University of Michigan Biological Station from June 28 to August 19, 1944. It was conducted to point out the variations in the morning and evening weights of nestling birds of different species and of the same species as well as the fluctuations and variations of weights of the individual bird.

Only birds of the order Passireformes were observed. he fre frist feeders Tree Swallow They are:

Iripoprocene bicolor

E. Bluebird

Sialia sialis sialis.

A total of 96 hrs. were spent in the field, all weights included were taken between 5:00-7:00 A.M. and 9:30 and 7:30 P.M. The early morning hours were chosen to secure the minimum weight and the late evening hours to secure the maximum weight of the bird. 471 weights were taken during this period not more than 33 on a single bird. A set of portable Triple-Beam balances, sensitive to 1/10 gm., fitted into a convenient case were carried from one nest to the other. A small brown paper bag was weighed at each nest, the nestling placed in it, weighed and the weight of the bag subtracted from the total weight to find the weight of the

bird. The bag was used because here the birds usually remained quiet and still. A small cover was placed over the scales to eliminate interference of wind.

The weight of the bird is just as important as its length. There are numerous biological problems on which weights of birds will throw light. Variation and fluctuations of these weights furnish criteria of much importance in the understanding of physiological and ecological reactions of birds as living organisms. The physiology of the bird, its behavior and the influence of the environment are all interacting factors no one of which can be understood without a knowledge of the other.

For the privilege of carrying out this study as well as for helpful guidance I am indebted to Dr. Olin Sewell Pettingill, Jr., Ornithology Professor, at University of Michigan Biological Station.

Due to my arrival at the Biological Station at the end of the nesting season and as the work was reduced to 8 weeks, this report is by no means complete but rather a small portion of an interesting and informative study.

HABITAT

The physical conditions of any region have some effect on the habitat and behavior of the birds living in that region. In the case of the species studied such activities as choice of nesting sight, length of incubation period, length of nesting life as well as increase and decrease in weight are modified in some way by the environmental conditions. For the purpose of correlating such facts the chart on climatic conditions of the Douglas Lake region has been compiled from.

The birds nested in boxes along the shore of Douglas
Lake. The map on the following page has been prepared to
indicate the direct location of each nest. Birds seen in
the area were chiefly Passerine birds. The small trees
and bushes along the shore include the Aspen (Populus
tremeloides), white pine (Pinus strobius), red oak (Quercus
borealis), and various species of cherries (Prunus sp.).
Often before entering the box the birds would perch in a
near by tree or shrub. The trees served as a means of
safety for the parents. Many insects were observed in the
area, these serving as the chief source of food for the
birds.

NESTING BOXES

All nests studied were located in nesting boxes on posts 5 - 6 ft. in height placed along the edge of the shore line from 81 - 187 ft. apart. The boxes were of the standard type dimensions approximately 9 x 5 in, 7 1/2 x 5 in. and the top which sloped slightly 7 3/4 in. square. The opening

was about 1 1/2 inches in diameter and located about 5 inches from the bottom of the box. The front of the box was removable, fitting tightly by means of a hook on each side. This made it convenient for study.

NESTING SUCCESS

The number of swallows and bluebirds nesting in the area seemed to be somewhat reduced this year, in spite of the ideal location of the boxes. Only 5 nests were in use during the study, 2 bluebirds and 3 tree swallows. The tree swallows were 100% successful, 13 eggs being laid among the 3 nests and 13 hatching and 13 young being fledged. The bluebirds were only 66 1/3% successful, 6 eggs laid among the 2 nests, 6 hatching but only 4 being fledged.

YOUNG

All birds under observation hatched between June 28 and July 4, 1944. The young of tree swallows and blue birds are altricial at birth being born with eyes closed and only a tiny bit of down and unable to secure their own food. They are pokioliothermic and must be brooded constantly by the parent for the first few days. The bluebirds differ from the tree swallows in that their feathers covered with a rather gray blue down while the tree swallows have a clear

white down.

When the nestlings were removed from the nest on mornings and evenings they would become quite cool for at least the first five days. The exposure to light and the cooling perhaps had some effect upon the weight and accounts for a portion of the variations shown in graphs

On the second night after the bluebirds hatched,

4 easter kingbirds whose parent had deserted were placed
in the nest by a fellow student. This resulted in a slight
drop in weight for that night. After the king birds were
removed the nestling bluebirds continued to gain normally.

The sixth day in the nest, the eyes were half open and the young were well covered with down. By this time they had gained approximately 5 gms. and were increasing at the rate of two gms. per day and losing approximately 1 gm. per night.

The ninth day they began to notice their surroundings and the juvenal plumage had already made its appearance along the principal feather tracks.

The temperature of the region made a decidedly great drop from 70° to 54° min. night recording for July 12, 1944. This was either the 14th, 15th, or 16th day for each of the birds being studied. It was on this day that I observed a greater decrease in weight during the neight than on any other night. The decrease can no doubt be accounted for by

the inability of the parent to secure food on this day as the drop in temperature was accompanied by increase in wind velocity and a heavy rain throughout the day.

The birds when removed from the nest deposited a bit of fecal material. This was particularly true at the removal from the nest during evening observations. As there was no record kept of fecal deposits, I cannot say definitely but I am quite sure it must have had some effect upon the variations in weights of the bird.

The nests of the tree swallows was not kept very clean. The last 5 days it contained many fecal deposits causing it to have a very pungent odor. The bluebirds kept a much cleaner nest although there was a small bit of fecal material in it.

On July 9, 1944 on my morning trip to the nests I found Bird I and IV to be heavily parasitized by fly larva (probably Protocalliphora--inidentified in the Station Laboratory). Three about 5/10 mm. long were attached to the hand portion of the wing of Bird I and 2 to the under surface of the left foot of Bird IV. These parasites were well gorged with blood and doubtless had been there for some time causing fluctuation in the weights. The other 2 birds in the nest were not parasitized at the time but 4 larva were picked from the nest. All of the nests became infested before the study was terminated, two or three parasites being picked from a single nestling at one time.

REACTIONS OF THE PARENTS

As the sexes of the tree swallows are very much alike it is quite difficult to distinguish between the male and the female. The female seemed to be less beautiful than her mate, a little browner. With the bluebirds the female is quite a bit paler than the male and it is not nearly so difficult to distinguish between them. With each species studied both parents took part in the incubation and care of the young, first one and then the other bringing food and both protecting the young.

On my approach to Nest III Tree Swallows on several occasions I was attacked by both parents who persisted in diving at me time after time in an effort to drive me away from the nest. The parents of the other two nests of the Tree Swallows were not so upset at the interference and often perched on an adjacent aspecn and watched the procedure, while waiting to feed the young.

The bluebirds parent would always leave the nest when I was about 10 ft. away and fly to the pine tree nearby, there flying from limb to limb quietly until I was through. When the nestlings were about 13 days the parents seemed more upset from the interference than at any other time each diving at me several times.

The following graphs indicate the morning and evening weights of the birds from the first evening or morning after

hatching to the last evening or morning before the bird left the nest. Here I have indicated the tremendous amount of variation that exists in the weights of nestling birds. It should be noted that there is a gradual increase in the birds' weight from the time of hatching to the time of leaving the nest. The increase averages about 2 gms. and the decrease during the night about 1 gm. During the period of nestling life between 9 and 11 days there was a more rapid increase in the weight during the day and the amount of decrease at night remained approximately the same.

CONCLUSIONS

From the weights collected in this study I have come to the following conclusions:

I. The average weight of a tree swallow at the time of hatching is 1.82 gms. and the average weight at the time the bird leaves the nest is 21.50 gms. The bird gains an average of 19.69 gms. during the nesting life. These data were compiled from weights of 13 species distributed among 3 nests.

II. The average weight of a bluebird at the time of hatching is 2.19 gms. and the average weight at the time the bird leaves the nest is 26.62 gms. The bird gains an average of 24.47 gms. during the nesting life.

III. Bluebirds weigh .37 gms. or 16.8 % more than tree swallows at the time of hatching. Bluebirds weigh 5.16 or 19% more than tree swallows at the time they leave the nest. The increase in weight among tree swallows is 19% or 4.78 less than increase among bluebirds during the nesting stage.

IV. Out of 159 loss and gain records for night weights recorded of tree swallows I found 36 cases of night gain and 123 cases of night losses. The highest amount lost by a tree swallow was 3.23 gms. lost by Bird I in Nest III which contained 5 young. This loss took place on the 12th night of the bird in the nest. On this night the loss of all the tree swallows weighed was higher than any other night.

V. More tree swallows lost weight on the 16th night which was in 8 out of 13 cases represented the last or next to the last night the bird was in the nest.

VI. Few tree swallos lost weight on the 8th night of nesting life than any other night. The average loss on this night was 1.07 gms. This weight ranked 6th from the lowest amount of average losses and 10 below the highest amount of average losses.

VII. A comparison of nests of tree swallows with 4 young and nests with 5 young showed the average loss during the nesting period to be slightly lower for the nest containing 5 young than for the nests containing 4.

VIII. From the weights of bluebirds recorded I found them to lose more weight on their 10th night of nesting life than on any other night. The average loss on this night was 1.63 gms. Less weight was lost on the 4th night The average weight loss for this night was .12 gms. In only one instance was there recorded a case of night gain among this species. This occurred on the 7th night after hatching when the average loss for the other two bluebirds in the same nest was .58 gms.

IX. Weights of birds included conformed to a general rule. There was a gradual increase from day to day from the date of hatching until 5 days old, then a more rapid increase followed by a fairly stationary weight and then a gradual decrease just before leaving the nest.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Weaver, Richard Lee 1942 Growth and Development of English Sparrows. Wilson Bull., 54: 183-191.

Kendeigh, Charles S. 1934

The Role of Environment in the Life of Birds. Ecological Monographs, Vol. 4, No. 3.

Low, Seth H. 1933

Further Notes on the Nesting of Tree Swallows... Bird Banding, Vols. 3-4, 1932-33.

Kuerzi, Richard Gottron. 1941

Life Histories of the Tree Swallow. Proceedings of the Linnean Society of New York, Nos. 52-53, 1940-41.

Krug, Howard H. 1941

Bluebird Banding at Chesley, Ontario. Bird Banding, Vol. 11-12, 1940-41.

Nice, Margaret M. 1938

The Biological Significance of Bird Weights. Bird Banding, Vol. 9: 1-11, 1938.

Baldwin, S. P. and S. C. Kendeigh--Variations in the Weights of Birds.

Auk, 55: 416-467.

Comparison of Nisoht Losses of Blue birds

| i | | | | | |
|--------|------|------------------------|------|-------------|----|
| Night. | BI | <i>1</i> 3. I I | BI | Au. Loss | |
| 1 | .51 | :49 | ,38 | .42 | |
| 2 3 | 1.07 | 70 | .88 | .91 | |
| 4 | .23 | .78 | .03 | | *2 |
| 5 | .50 | .12 .49 | .80 | .59+ | 72 |
| 6 | 1.45 | ,39 | -60 | .8/+ | |
| 7 | .57 | 11111111111 | .59 | 58 | |
| 8 | .77 | .94 | .82 | .84 + | , |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | 2.62 | 1.66 | .63 | 1.63+ | *, |
| " | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| /3 | 1.67 | 1.51 | 1.08 | 1.42 | |
| 14 | 1.96 | 2.52 | 1.81 | 1.09+ | |
| | | | - | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| , | | } | | | · |
| | 4 | | | - | |

Conclusion - From the weight of Bluebish recorded I find them to lose more weight on their tenth night of meeting life them anyother might. The overage loss for this night was 1.63 gross. Less weight was loss on the fourth night This weight was .12 gross. In only one instance was there recorded a case of night gain among this species. This occurred on the seventh night after hatching when the average weight for the other two bluebirds in the some meet was .58

| Night | B.I N.I | B-II N.I | | BILL | 1 | B.I | | BIL | BI | BJ | B.II | B.III | BILL |
|----------|------------|---|-------------|-----------|-----------|-------|---------|-------|-------------|---------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| , | | | | | NII | N.II | NJIL | N.III | N.III | NI | N.TO | N.II | N.II |
| 1 | .42 | . 84 | .06 | 1/////// | MINNIN | MARKE | mmili | | Munnil | | | | |
| 2 | .27 | | | | MIMM | | 1.86 | 1 | Millimilill | | 111111111 | 111111111 | 116:944 |
| 3 | A 6 / | 11/1/1837 | | | .05 | | | 1 | 1111111111 | | | | |
| 4 | 2.36 | .55 | .03 | | 111211112 | | | | Millian | 1.69 | 1.30 | 1.74 | 1.42 |
| | #15435 | 11///////////////////////////////////// | 1111111111 | ,33 | | , 3/ | Milling | .54 | | | | | |
| 4 | .06 | .51 | 17/10/11/11 | .3/ | | | | | 11111111 | 1111111 | .40 | .89 | -29 |
| 7 | #791.1 | | | 111111111 | MUINI | .22 | .43 | .13 | | 1.85 | 2.3. | | |
| 1 - 1 | 131:10:1 |) | | ,41 | | | | • | | | 2.54 | | 2.// |
| 9 | _ | | | .41 | ì | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | ł | | , | | | | | 2.18- | 1.93 | 1.94 | 1.62 | 1.37 |
| 10 | | 1.14 | | MAMI | 2.57 | 3.10 | 1 25 | 2.27 | .60 | 77 | 435 | 1.113 | 1.13 |
| 11 | Willey Car | | 10000 | 11/11/11 | 1.57 | .91 | 11521 | 211 | | 1.51 | 155 | 601 | 1.56 |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | 1.64 | 3.23 | 2.76 | 3.07 | 1.96 | 2.11 | 2.03 | <i>/.3</i> 3 | 2.12 |
| 13 | | 1.75 | | | ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ | | | | .53 | 1.23 | .85 | 1.12 | |
| | 5 CS | | | | | | | | . 33 | 1.20 | ,00 | 1163 | 1.43 |
| 14 | ٦٠٥٠ | .08 | 3.86 | 2.87 | 1.29 | .62 | .80 | .58 | | | | | |
| 15 | , | ŧ | | • • | | | 1 | ٠٦8 | i | | | | |
| 1, | | | 2.44 | | | | | | 1.97 | | | | |
| 16 | 1.73 | | 2.59 | 2.49 | | | | | 1.72 | 1.75 | 2.68 | 1.83 | 2.70 |
| 17 | 1.69 | | | | 1.72 | .01 | 1.44 | 1.45 | .18 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | |) | 2.70.74 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 1 | i de | | | | | | | | |
| <u> </u> | | | | L | | i | | | | | | , | |

B. = Bird

N. = Nest ----- Norcord oflow or gain 11111 - Dain dwing right

Comparison of Bluebird and Tree Swallow Au. Losses.

| Night | Blue bird | TreeSwe Nows. |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| ļ | · 4 2gzs. | .4/8ms. |
| 2 | | .608ms. |
| 3 | $.91_{8ms}$ | Ear 869. |
| 4 | ·12870s. | 1.298795 |
| 5 | $\cdot 59_{8ms}$ | .398ms |
| 6 | ·8/gms. | ·4/8ms. |
| 7 | . 58gmg | 1.098ms |
| 8 | ·8420s | 1.038 |
| 9 | | 1.65gms. |
| 10 | 1, 63gmg | 1.75gms. |
| // | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | 1.4200 | 1.22 gms. |
| 14 | 1.09 | 1.57gms |
| Total | 7. 4. 18 ms. | 12.088ms |
| N. of Wts | 16 | 12 |
| Au. Loss Species | .748ms | 1.00 gms |

Conclusion: - average losses of tree swallows Nigher than average losses of kluebirds.

average night dorses of Tree Swallows.

| ************************************** | | |
|--|----------|----|
| Night | Loss | |
| First | .418ms | |
| Second | .60gms. | |
| Third | ,638ms. | |
| Fourth | 1.298ms. | |
| FIFTH | ·39875. | *4 |
| S:x+h | ·418m3. | |
| Seventh | 1.09875. | |
| Elghth | 1.078ms. | *3 |
| n:nth | 1.65gms. | |
| Tenth | 1.75gms. | |
| Eleventh | 11458ms. | |
| Twelth | 2,258ms. | *1 |
| Thirteenth | 1 | |
| Fourteenth | | |
| Fifteenth | | |
| Sixteenth | 2.198ms. | #2 |
| Scuentaent | 1 | |
| | | 1 |
| | | |
| | | 1 |
| • | | |
| | 1 | 1 |
| | | 1 |

of weight last was higher there any other night, and one the fifth night the amount of weight last was higher there any other night, and

* More birds losts weight on the pipternth neight which wording 8 and of 13 cases represented the last are mext to the last night the bird was in the mest. The ant. lost on this night was 2, 1980. just six gms. below the highest average loss.

*3 Fewer firds lost on the eighth night of mesthing life then any other night. The average loss fasthis night was 1.07 ms. His weight Pankel pipth from the lowest amt. of average losses and ten Relew the Righest Hoss.

Comparison of losses in Nestwith Four Young and Nest with Five Young

Tree Swallows

| | Maryland Comment | | |
|----------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Night | NestI | Nest II | Nest I |
| 101811 | 4 young | 5400mg | 4 Young |
| , | .428 | .308 | |
| 2 | .50g. | .698 | .55 g. |
| 3 | 1.49g. | ∙ <i>05</i> g. | |
| 4 ' | .98g. | | 1.31g. |
| 5 | ,33 € . | ,43 _€ . | |
| 6 | .888. | | .528. |
| 7 | .58 3 . | .288. | 2.108. |
| 8 | 1.60g. | | |
| 9 | 2.088. | 2.188 | 1.71g. |
| 10 | 1.798. | 2.218. | 1.178 |
| // | 1.758 | 1.498. | 1.428. |
| 12 | ~ | 2.55g. | 1.928. |
| /3 | | .53g. | 1-288. |
| 14 | 2.238. | ,828. | r |
| 15 | 1.829. | 1.978. | |
| 16 | 2.279. | 2.119. | 2.288. |
| 17 | 1.69g. | ·96g. | |
| Total | 20.418. | 16.378. | 14.268. |
| No. Wts. | 15 | 14 | 10 |
| AJ.Loss | 1,468. | 1.16g. | 1.428 |
| | | - | Colombia Colombia |

Conclusion: The av. loss during the meeting period was lover in the next containing five young then was the loss in the next containing forer young.

Comparison of First and Last Tree Swallow Weights in Nest

| Nest | Bird | First Wt. | Last Wt. |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| 日日日日 日日日日日 日日日日 | 工工用型工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工工 | 1.98 gms. 1.95 gms. 2.23 gms. 2.23 gms. 2.12 gms. 1.91 gms. 1.71 gms. 2.14 gms. 1.79 gms. 1.78 gms. 1.57 gms. 1.51 gms. | 24.436ms. 24.496ms. 18.836ms 21.918ms. 21.918ms. 20.876ms. 20.086ms. 18.316ms. 22.968ms. 22.968ms. 22.968ms. 22.968ms. 22.968ms. 22.968ms. 22.968ms. |
| IIL | XIII | 23.608ms | 279.608 |
| | | 13/23.60 | 13/279.60 |
| TIL | XIII | 1.82 Gms. | 21.50gms. |

Conclusion - The average wt. of a tree evallow at the time of hetching is 1.82 ams. and the average wt. at the time the bird leaves the mest is 21.50 gms. The bird gains an average of 19.69 gms. during the meeting life. This data was gathered from 13 openies distributed among 3 mests.

test birs territ to mostragmod

| 26,632 26,020 | eagh, S zeoravo | <u></u> | エ |
|------------------|-----------------------|---------|------|
| 201821.22 | sw8#1.2 | 711 | I |
| :80864.92 | . 23 3 Sp. 2. | 卫 | エ |
| 27.378ms. | ज्य ⁸ 91.2 | 工 | エ |
| .am teod | First WE. | P+!8 | 123N |

Conclusion. The average weight of a Reebird of the time of hateling is 2.19 gms. and the average weight at the time the bird bower the most is 36.66 zm 3. The hide gain an average of 24.47825.

Temperature of Douglas Lake Region Summer 1944

| Day Night | | | | | | |
|--------------|------|------------|--------|----------|--|--|
| Date | Max | Mini | Max. | Min. | | |
| June 29 | 60 | 58 | 80 | 56 | | |
| " 30 | 76 | 5 6 | 60 | 47 | | |
| 2017 1 | 80 | 56 | 76 | 53 | | |
| " 2 | 80 | 58 | 80 | 55 | | |
| " 3 | 82 | 56 | 80 . | 56 | | |
| " 4 | 82 | 59 | 86 | 60 | | |
| " 5 | 84 | 61 | 73 | 61 | | |
| " 6 | 88 | 66 | 83 | 65 | | |
| " 7 | 82 | 67 | 88 | 63 | | |
| " 8 | 86 | 64 | 81 | 64 | | |
| " 9 | 80 | 60 | 85 | 60 | | |
| " 10 | 78 | 63 | 75 | 62 | | |
| " 1/ | 79 | 63 | 76 | 63 | | |
| 12 | 70 | 62 | 80 | 63 | | |
| " /3 | 73 | 54 | 70 | 5年 | | |
| " 14 | 79 | 5/ | 71 | 51 65 | | |
| "15 | 81 | 65 | 71 | | | |
| " 16 | 79 | 54 | 70 | 54 | | |
| 17 | 79 | 53 | 177 | 51 | | |
| " 18 | 79 | 57 | 74 | 56 | | |
| " 19 | 78 | 61 | 79 | 60 | | |
| "20 | 61 | 55 | 69 | 56 | | |
| "21 | 77 | 53 | 41 | 52 | | |
| 22 | 2 81 | 56 | 73 | 56 | | |
| " 1 3 | 85 | 57 | 79 | 57 | | |
| "24 | 834 | 64 | 84 | 60 | | |
| i | | , - | 19 | | | |
| " 25 | | 53 | 69 | 58 | | |
| "26 | I | 58 | 80 | 58 | | |
| 27 | 1 - | 58 | 69 | 58 | | |
| " 28 | | 58 | 71 | 57 | | |
| " 29 | , , | 58 | 61 | 1 | | |
| . 30 | 74 | 57 | 67 | 58 58 | | |
| "31 | 84 | 57 | 73. | ı | | |
| L | 1 '7 | | 11 / 3 | 56 | | |

Average Weights of Bluebirds

| Age | BirdI | B:+dI | BirdII | Average |
|---------|--------|-------|--------|---------|
| Iday | 2.50 | 2.36 | 2.00 | 228. |
| Adays | 3.55 | 3.44 | 3.47 | 3.48 |
| 3da42 | 7.82 | 7.41 | 6.94 | 7.39 |
| 4 days | 9.36 | 9.15 | 8.98 | 9.16 |
| 5d cys | 12.82 | 12.61 | 12.50 | 12.64 |
| 6days | 16.75. | 14.79 | 14.76 | 15.43 |
| 7days | 18.16 | 17.46 | 17.30 | 17.64 |
| 8days | 20.36 | 18.87 | 18.68 | 19.31 |
| 9days | 12.63 | 21.99 | 20.41 | 21.67 |
| 10days | 24.38 | 23.06 | 21.89 | 23.11 |
| Ildays | 23.75 | 23.56 | 21.55 | 22.95 |
| 12days | | | | |
| 13days | 25.02 | 24.57 | 23.94 | 24.51 |
| 14 days | | 25.47 | 24.76 | 25.44 |
| 15days | 27.37 | 26.49 | 26.12 | 26.66 |

Average Weights of Some Passerine Birds

| Ase | Trae | Blockird | English * Sporrow | |
|---------|------|----------|-------------------|---|
| Iday | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.8 | |
| 2days | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.8 | |
| 3days | 5.2 | 7.4 | 6.9 | |
| 4 days | 6.9 | 9. 2 | 10.2 | |
| 5 days | 9.9 | 12.6 | 11.7 | |
| bdays | 13.2 | 15.4 | 13.8 | |
| 7days | 14.0 | 17.6 | 16.4 | |
| 8days | 17.4 | 19.3 | 18.0 | |
| 9 days | 18.5 | 21.7 | 20.3 | |
| lodays | 20.3 | 23.1 | 20.4 | |
| Ildays | 22.1 | 22.9 | 22.7 | |
| 12 days | 21.7 | | 22.7 | |
| 13days | 22.1 | 24.5 | 25.6 | |
| 14 days | 22.7 | 25.4 | 25.2 | · |
| 15days | 22.3 | 26.7 | 23.9 | |
| 16 days | 21.9 | | 26.0 | |
| 17days | 21.5 | | 22.5 | |

| i 4 1 | NestI BirdI | NestI BirdII | NestI BindII | NestI Bird [] | BirdI | NestII BirdI | NestIII Bi td[[[| NestII Bird I <u>U</u> | Nest III Bird I | NestII. BirdI | Mest []. B:rd[| Vest II. BirdII | Birdia | ase Wt. |
|--------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------|------------|
| Iday | 1.98 | 2.36 | 2.23 | 146 | 3.14 | 3.00 | 2,62 | 3.58 | 2.47 | 1.78 | 1.57 | 1.45 | 1.51 | 2.34 |
| | 1.84 | 3.68 | 2.55 | 1 | ì | 1 | | | 4.42 | i | , | 2.75 | 2.15 | 3.30 |
| 390043 | 4.84 | 5.06 | | 1 | 7.07 | | | | | | 4.50 | 4.42 | 4.20 | 5.23 |
| 4 days | 8.71 | 7.64 | 3.07 | 2.96 | 9.57 | 8.99 | 7.98 | 8.85 | 8.99 | 8.76 | 7.92 | 7.85 | 7.40 | 6.97 |
| | 10.53 | | 6.01 | 6.17 | 11911 | 1102 | 10.20 | 11 01 | 1170 | i i | | | | 9,99 |
| 1 | /3.85 | 14. 22 | ,,,, | 1.72 | 15.14 | 13.88 | 13.33 | 12.47 | 1.1.10 | 12.19 | 12.52 | 12.21 | 11.51 | 13,15 |
| Ideys | 16.78 | 14.18 | 10.12 | 7.60 | 17.6.8 | 16.13 | 15.06 | 16.02 | 16.61 | 16.41 | 14.36 | 12.42 | - 12,39 | 14.04 |
| 89mhz | 19,48 | 17.73 | 13.28 | 12.61 | 20.81 | 18.24 | 17.86 | 17.99 | | 19.84 | 17.32 | 17.26 | 16.94 | 17.44 |
| 9days | 21.34 | | 16.14 | 15.58 | | | | | 19.61 | 20,70 | 20.40 | 17.68 | 17.26 | , 18.52 |
| | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | L . | 3 | 1 | 1 | 21.30 | 1 | | | 20.34 |
| Ildays | 23.98 | 23.63 | | | 24,30 | 20.87 | 19.84 | 20.79 | 19.77 | 23.54 | 23.38 | 21.95 | 21.2 | 2 22.11 |
| TRACYS | 24.19 | | 20.18 | 2011 | 24.07 | 21.67 | 2064 | 2111 | 2 | 2260 | 20.40 | 2010 | - 12000 | 2 11/2 |
| 13days | | 24.48 | 20.37 | 18.73 | 25.92 | 23.00 | 2205 | 21.00 | 20,15 | 7390 | 7 22 1 | did | 2 40.0 | 8 22.04 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 1 | | t . | | 1000 | 10110-2 | コンコ ハス | 1/1 /4 // | | i | i | 3 20.4 | 4 22.66 |
| 1 | I | 1 - 1 | | | 1 | 1 - | 120010 | 1717 | 11171.79 | 1 1 1 7.5 | 1120010 | / | 1 1 1 | 5 22.27 |
| 16days | 25.40 | | 21.31 | 18.97 | 24.38 | 24.00 | 22.15 | 22.32 | 19.0 | 5 23.30 | 22.62 | 2 21.3 | 37 18.1 | 8 21.90 |
| Mays | | 24.39 | 22.52 | 19.69 | 21.68 | 19.51 | 19.48 | 19.36 | 18.9 | 8 22.9 | 6 22.7 | 3 22. | 51 20: | 7221.50 |
| 18days | 24.43 | | | | 20.20 | 20.25 | 20.16 | 19.85 | 18.3 | / | | | | - 722.21 |