Wilson Bull., 98(2), 1986, p. 319

Downy Woodpecker feeds on insects in a spider's web.—The taking of prey from spider webs is a rarely reported form of interspecific prey theft. Recent reviews of this phenomenon (Waide and Hailman, Wilson Bull. 89:345, 1977; Brockmann and Barnard, Anim. Behav. 27:487–514, 1979) have documented its occurrence in six avian families: Vireonidae, Trochilidae, Emberizidae, Troglodytidae, Fringillidae, and Bombycillidae. I report this behavior for the Picidae.

On 26 April 1982 at 15:31 (CDT) in the Thunderbird Recreation Area in Walworth County, Wisconsin, I observed a male Downy Woodpecker (*Picoides pubescens*) perched on one branch of a fork atop a ca 10-m snag. Observations were made from the base of the tree with 7 × 35 binoculars. Suspended across the fork was the spider's orb-web that contained numerous small winged insects (ca 2 mm in length). No spider was seen. The woodpecker plucked from the web and ate at least eight of the insects. It then tore down the rest of the web and disappeared behind the branch. It reappeared several seconds later with strands of the web still hanging from its bill and flew from sight. Prior to tearing the web down, the bird did not appear to be entangled in the web, nor did it appear to have webbing in its bill.

Brockmann and Barnard (1979) suggested that collecting of spider webs for nesting material by trochilids may have led birds to stealing prey from webs. Unlike the six families previously reported as feeding on prey in spider webs, *P. pubescens* is not known to collect webs or fibrous material for its nest (Bent, U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull. 174, 1939; Harrison, A Field Guide to Birds' Nests, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, Massachusetts, 1975). Thus, there is no link between web-gathering for nesting material and web-feeding in this species, and why the woodpecker tore down the web remains unknown.

Acknowledgments.—Research at Thunderbird Recreation Area was funded by the Wilkie Brothers Foundation and the Department of Wildlife Ecology, University of Wisconsin at Madison. I thank R. N. Conner and D. R. Petit for reviewing the manuscript.—HARRY M. TIEBOUT, III, *Dept. Zoology, Univ. Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611.* *Received 28 Aug. 1985, accepted 22 Oct. 1985.*

Wilson Bull., 98(2), 1986, pp. 319–320

Nest-building behavior in a young American Robin.—On 21 June 1985, in Lawrence, Kansas, I saw a young American Robin (*Turdus migratorius*) at a robin's nest, unused since it was depredated after egg laying in early May. The robin was in fresh juvenal plumage, with a heavily spotted breast and wing coverts; its tail was about full length. The robin crouched in the nest with wings and tail drooping and body feathers fluffed out, and pushed its breast against the nest rim, while kicking backward with its feet. The bird stood up repeatedly and repositioned itself in the nest. These movements closely resembled those used by adults for cup formation and lining the inside of the nest with mud. The bird also stood several times on a branch near the nest edge, pulling at strands of nest material and making tucking movements with them without dislodging any. There was a striking similarity between the movements made by this bird and those of an unmarked adult female building a nest that I had watched several times about 6 weeks earlier. The young robin made nest-building movements at the nest for approximately 15 min. No activity was seen near the nest from 21 June until the nest's destruction in late August.

This appears to be the first record of nest-building behavior in young robins. Hand-reared

young Mistle Thrushes (*T. viscivorus*) showed abortive nest-building behavior in an aviary (Goodwin, Br. Birds 47:81–83, 1953), and a captive 17-day-old Swainson's Thrush (*Catharus ustulatus*) made nest-building movements when held in cupped hands (Dilger, Wilson Bull. 68:157–158, 1956). All three observations of nest-building behavior in young thrushes occurred when the stimulus of an object of appropriate form was present. Juvenile robins have been reported to show other adult reproductive behavior including incubation (D'Agostino et al., Condor 84:342, 1982) and feeding nestlings (Favell, *in* Nice, Trans. Linn. Soc. N.Y. 6:79, 1943).

Acknowledgments.—I thank P. S. Humphrey, R. M. Mengel, D. Siegel-Causey, J. P. Hailman, and P. A. Gowaty, for reading and improving the manuscript, and K. McManness for typing.—PAMELA C. RASMUSSEN, *Museum of Natural History and Dept. Systematics and Ecology, Univ. Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, 66045.* *Received 26 Aug. 1985, accepted 31 Oct. 1985.*

Wilson Bull., 98(2), 1986, pp. 320–321

The hiss-display of nestling Black-capped Chickadees in captivity.—Hissing occurs in many hole-nesting birds (Sibley, Wilson Bull. 67:128–132, 1955), but it is especially prevalent in parids (Hinde, Behav. Suppl. II, 1952). Gompertz (Vogelwelt 88:165–169, 1967) observed the "hiss-display" of a captive adult female Great Tit (*Parus major*) in a nest box. Adult female Black-capped Chickadees (*P. atricapillus*) hissed while being held in a swaying sock (Ficken et al., Auk 95:34–48, 1978) and while in a wire mesh trap (Dixon, Wilson Bull. 95:313–314, 1983). Nocturnal hissing has been reported in nestling Blue Tits (*P. caeruleus*) and Coal Tits (*P. ater*) (Winkel, Vogelwelt 93:68–71, 1972). Nestling chickadees begin hissing at about 12 days of age (Odum, Auk 58:518–535, 1941; pers. obs.). Here we describe hissing by nestling Black-capped Chickadees in the context of nest defense.

From 1979 to 1981 we hand raised four broods of chickadees taken from nest cavities in southeastern Wisconsin. The young hissed on numerous occasions when the cloths covering their bowl "nests" were lifted, and once when one brood was being transported in a swaying mosquito-net hat. Hissing also occurred when one nestling jostled another, sometimes during the night.

Hisses were recorded both in the field and in captivity with a Uher 4200 Report Stereo tape recorder and an Electro-Voice Soundspot 644 or Sennheiser MKH 104 microphone; the calls were analyzed on a Kay 7800 Digital Sona-Graph. The call resembles white noise extending from about 0.5 to 6.0 kHz or more. The mean duration of the hiss in nestlings both in captivity and in natural cavities was 0.90 sec (N = 44, range = 0.30–1.32 ± 0.24 [SD]); this was more than 5 times longer than that reported for adult chickadees ($\bar{x}$ = 0.159 ± 0.072 sec [Ficken et al., 1978]; and $\bar{x}$ = 0.16 ± 0.02 sec, N = 3 [pers. obs.]).

Gradations in intensity were evident in the hiss-displays of the captive nestling chickadees. For example, a nestling sometimes hissed and lunged forward with wings spread, often jumping out of the nest. In other cases, the hiss was accompanied by the wings being spread very quickly in an arc-like fashion forward and downward, with the tail spread and crest raised. This pattern, like that described by Pickens (Auk 45:302–304, 1928), Löhrl (J. Ornithol. 105:153–181, 1964), and Gompertz (1967), often ended with the bird in a posture with the head tucked down and tail up. Hisses were also heard in the absence of any apparent wing-spreading or lunging. On those occasions, the bird hissed and cowered, with its head tucked down and tail up. Nestlings also cowered silently and sometimes hissed without any discernible visual display. These variations in the hiss-display may have been due to one