Syntax manipulation changes perception of mobbing call sequences across passerine species

Mylène Dutour, Thierry Lengagne, Jean-Paul Léna

► To cite this version:

Mylène Dutour, Thierry Lengagne, Jean-Paul Léna. Syntax manipulation changes perception of mobbing call sequences across passerine species. *Ethology*, 2019, 125 (9), pp.635-644. 10.1111/eth.12915 . hal-02310401

HAL Id: hal-02310401

<https://univ-lyon1.hal.science/hal-02310401>

Submitted on 16 Nov 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

**Syntax manipulation changes perception of mobbing call
sequences across passerine species**

Short running title: **Syntax in birds**

Mylène Dutour¹ | Thierry Lengagne¹ | Jean-Paul Léna¹

¹ Université de Lyon, UMR5023 Ecologie des Hydrosystèmes Naturels et Anthropisés,
Université Lyon 1, ENTPE, CNRS, 6 rue Raphaël Dubois, 69622 Villeurbanne, France

Author for correspondence:

Mylène Dutour

mylene.dutour@hotmail.com

Phone number: +336.72.18.27.62

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Marion Cordonnier, Michaël Girard and Camille Locatelli for assistance in the field. This work was supported by French Ministry of Research and Higher Education funding (to M.D. PhD grants 2015-2018).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

We have no conflict of interest to declare.

Abstract

Many species approach predators to harass them and drive them away. Both the intensity of this antipredator strategy and its success are positively related to the size of the group that carries out this mobbing. To recruit individuals to the mob, members of prey species produce mobbing calls. In some songbirds – the Japanese tit, *Parus minor*, and the southern pied babbler, *Turdoides bicolor* – mobbing calls are structurally complex and it has been suggested that they convey information by means of compositional syntax, when meaningful items are combined into larger units. These two species combine alert and recruitment calls into an alert and recruitment sequence when attracting conspecifics to cooperate in mobbing a predator. Whether this rudimentary, two-call, compositional structure is used by other bird species in mobbing calls and how it can alter the ability of heterospecifics to adequately recognize mobbing calls is not well understood. Heterospecifics' responses to mobs are critical to the success of the mobbing strategy, so it is of great importance to understand whether and how syntax influences these responses. To address these questions, we conducted two playback experiments. Firstly, we investigated whether the great tit, *Parus major*, extracts different meanings from different individual motifs (i.e., component calls), and from combined motifs in both natural and artificially-reversed order. We found that great tits extract different meanings from the two motifs involved in mobbing calls, and that they also discriminate for motif order reversal in the mobbing calls sequence. Secondly, we investigated whether heterospecifics (the coal tit, *Parus ater*, and the common chaffinch, *Fringilla coelebs*) are sensitive to syntax alteration of great tit mobbing calls. While chaffinches did not respond to great tit mobbing calls, coal tits were sensitive to mobbing calls sequence reversal although they did not react in the same way as conspecific subjects. Overall, whereas our results indicate that tits are sensitive to call reversal, this is not to say that tits actually use compositional syntax to increase the information content.

48   **KEYWORDS**

49   acoustic communication, call combination, interspecific communication, mobbing, syntax, tits

50

1 | Introduction

During the last decades, accumulating evidence has revealed that animal vocalizations share several features with human language (Collier et al., 2014). Duality of patterning, otherwise known as double articulation (Martinet, 1949), is a property of human language that makes possible a combinatorial structure on two levels: (i) phonological syntax, when meaningless sounds called phonemes (syllable or note) are combined to form meaningful acoustic structures called morphemes (motif) and words; and (ii) compositional syntax, which is the combination of meaningful motifs into a larger structure, whose meaning depends on the motifs involved and the syntactical rules used to put them together (Berwick et al., 2013; Marler, 1998; ten Cate & Okanoya, 2012). The involvement of this property in the acoustic signal enables much more information to be conveyed using a finite set of vocal elements (Berwick et al., 2013). In animals, vocalizations involve a far less complex level of organization than human language. Although more and more evidence for syntax is becoming available for some birds and mammals (Coye et al., 2005; Ouattara et al., 2009), the ability of species to use compositional syntax (or compositionality; see Suzuki et al., 2019) is still debated (Bolhuis et al., 2018; Petkov & Jarvis, 2012; Petkov & Wilson, 2012; Suzuki et al., 2018). More recently, three studies have examined this issue by studying mobbing calls produced by the Japanese tit, *Parus minor*, and the southern pied babbler, *Turdoides bicolor* (Engesser et al., 2016; Suzuki et al., 2016; Suzuki et al., 2017). Mobbing calls are particular forms of alarm signals. They are widespread, especially in passerine birds (Klump & Shalter, 1984). They are emitted by animals trying to chase away a predator (Pettifor, 1990). To be efficient, these calls often share particular features allowing listeners to join the mob, features that are thought to be involved in interspecific communication (Dutour et al., 2017a; Hurd 1996; Marler 1955). In this situation, where calling birds and receivers have a certain level of shared interest, and communication should be clear and as detailed as required to bring about

an appropriate response that involves multiple joint behaviours (Cunha et al., 2017), Griesser et al. (2018) have recently suggested from findings from two avian species that compositional syntax may evolve.

Mobbing calls have been well described in the Paridae (Carlson et al., 2017a; Jung & Freeberg, 2017) and are usually composed of combinations of frequency modulated elements (Hetrick & Sieving, 2011) referred to hereafter as FME, followed by a string of a repeated loud broadband elements (Templeton et al., 2005), referred to hereafter as D notes. As suggested by several authors, such a pattern could well arise from a hierarchized organization following a ‘syntactic-like’ rule (Hailman et al., 1985; Hailman & Ficken, 1986; Lucas & Freeberg, 2007). In the Japanese tit, each motif is also used alone in context other than mobbing. The FME motif is used in vigilance situations and it serves as an alarm signal to which receivers respond by scanning for danger (alert calls), while the D notes are involved within foraging flocks and by nest mates to recruit social partners and elicit an approach of the receivers (recruitment calls) (Suzuki et al., 2016; 2017). When the Japanese tits heard the FME motif combined with the D notes as the compound FME-D, which is also a natural vocalization, they showed both scanning and approach behaviours. However, there was little or no response when the call order was artificially reversed to D-FME (i.e. a sequence with unclear or ambiguous meaning; Bolhuis et al., 2018b; Suzuki et al. 2018). From this, authors suggest that compositional syntax is a mechanism for information transmission, although some authors have argued that Suzuki and colleagues do not provide any evidence for genuine compositionality in these bird vocalizations (Bolhuis et al., 2018a; Bolhuis et al., 2018b). One may ask whether the use of a compositional syntax in mobbing calls is specific to *Parus minor* or extends to other Paridae species. Furthermore, using compositional syntax to encode information in mobbing calls with several motifs, including ones involved in social cohesion with conspecifics, could limit the ability of heterospecifics to correctly identify mobbing calls.

101 This is particularly intriguing since mobbing calls can communicate the presence of a predator
102 to heterospecifics as well as conspecifics (Dutour et al., 2016; Dutour et al., 2017a; Hurd,
103 1996), prompting the question whether there is actually a similar underlying compositional
104 structure across bird species, enabling them to decode information in heterospecific mobbing
105 calls (Griesser et al., 2018; Russell & Townsend, 2017). It may also be relevant to ask
106 whether species that do not produce combinatorial calls can nevertheless decode them.

107   The main objectives of the present study were first to test whether the great tit, *Parus*
108 *major*, uses compositional syntax in mobbing calls. The great tit is the closest relative of the
109 Japanese tit (Johansson et al., 2013), and these species have similar calls and similar social
110 structures, and also rely on both conspecifics and heterospecifics during mobbing (Randler &
111 Vollmer, 2013; Suzuki, 2016). We investigated whether receivers extract different meanings
112 from FME or D motif alone, and from combined motifs both natural or artificially-reversed
113 order (i.e., FME-D or D-FME sequences). Secondly, we investigated whether heterospecifics
114 are sensitive to syntax alteration of great tit mobbing calls. In this second experiment, we
115 compared the responses of coal tits, *Periparus ater*, and common chaffinches, *Fringilla*
116 *coelebs*, to playbacks of natural and artificially reversed great tit mobbing calls. We chose
117 coal tits rather than other Paridae species since mobbing calls of this species are particularly
118 complex and composed of multiple motifs (Carlson et al., 2017a; Dutour et al., 2017a), and
119 also because our previous work showed that coal tits are especially prone to respond to
120 heterospecific mobbing calls (Dutour et al., 2017a). We selected the chaffinch as an extra-
121 group member (i.e., non-Paridae species) since it is often found in heterospecific mobs
122 although it is less prone than tits to join heterospecific callers (Dutour et al., 2017a). Since the
123 mobbing calls of the chaffinch were composed of a single “chink” note (Randler & Förschler,
124 2011), we predicted that coal tits would be more sensitive to syntax alteration than
125 chaffinches.

126

127 **2 | METHODS**

128 **2.1 | Experimental design**

129 Data was collected during playback experiments conducted at the onset of the breeding season
130 (experiment 1, February/March 2018) and at the end of the breeding season (experiment 2,
131 July/August 2017) on wild passerines inhabiting mixed deciduous-coniferous forests located
132 in south-east France (45°80'N, 4°52'E). In order to examine whether great tit mobbing calls
133 involve compositional syntax (experiment 1), we used five playback types. First, we
134 examined whether each motif alone (FME calls and D calls) induced a distinct behaviour,
135 whether vigilance and recruitment. We then examined whether tits hearing the combined
136 motifs in the natural order (i.e., FME-D calls, the natural mobbing call sequence) display a
137 combination of the behaviours they exhibit when hearing each motif alone, and we tested
138 whether this is also the case when the combined motifs are presented in the reverse order (i.e.,
139 D-FME calls, artificially reversed mobbing call sequence). Finally, we also performed control
140 tests for which the playback contained only background noise (hereafter referred as BN tests).
141 We conducted these tests with 100 adult great tits (20 individuals for each test type); each bird
142 received a single treatment. The goal of experiment 2 was to test whether heterospecific
143 receivers (coal tits and chaffinches) are sensitive to syntax alteration in the same way as
144 intraspecific receivers (great tits). To this end, we investigated how individuals of each
145 species behave when hearing a playback of natural FME-D calls and artificially reversed D-
146 FME calls of great tits. We also replicated these tests with great tits as receivers in order to
147 permit comparisons across species. This second experiment involved 90 different individuals
148 (15 individuals per test and for each species; each individual received a single treatment).

149

150 **2.2 | Field test procedure**

151 Field tests were done following a similar methodology used by Dutour et al. (2017) to
152 investigate the response of passerine birds to allopatric mobbing calls. After a focal bird was
153 located, a loudspeaker was placed 30 meter away from the bird at the bottom of a tree. An
154 experimented ornithologist and a field assistant were positioned opposite each other at
155 vantage points at least 15 meters from the loudspeaker and the focal bird to avoid any
156 disturbance during the test. Before the beginning of the experiment, the baseline behaviour of
157 the focal bird was observed during a pre-trial period lasting at least 1 minute. If the bird was
158 found to show alarm behaviour (i.e., emit mobbing calls, which happened in less than 5% of
159 the cases) the test was abandoned. Otherwise, the playback was started when no other
160 passerine was observed near the focal individual. Then, during 1 min of playbacks, two
161 behavioural variables were recorded so as to infer vigilance effort and recruitment propensity,
162 respectively: (1) the number of horizontal scans (we counted the number of obvious
163 movements that birds made with their heads from left to right or right to left, approximately a
164 180 turn; Suzuki et al., 2016) and (2) an approach within a radius of 15 m of the loudspeaker.
165 Horizontal scanning is a good indicator of perceived danger in birds (Curio et al., 1978) and
166 both behaviours, i.e. scanning and approaching, are common during mobbing events (Carlson
167 et al., 2017b; Dutour et al., 2017a; Suzuki et al., 2016; Suzuki et al., 2017). Moreover, we set
168 the approach distance to 15m since this approach distance was previously found to be a
169 relevant measure of mobbing propensity (see Dutour et al., 2017a for more details). All
170 observations were carried out with binoculars. The concordance of the number of scanning
171 between observers was evaluated in a complementary study (see Supporting Information S1).
172 Since this study revealed a very high concordance despite a systemic bias between observers
173 (see Table S1 Supporting Information S1), only the records done by the experienced
174 ornithologist who participated to the whole study were used for data analyses. All trials were
175 conducted between 6 a.m. and 1 p.m. during calm and dry weather. All focal animals were

selected to be separated by more than 100 m to minimize pseudo-replication risk. In addition, we never went back twice to the same forest path, and during the breeding season the tits' territories are separated by 50 m in our study area. Once a test was done, we went on more than 100 m before trying to detect another bird which is calling or foraging. No bird was seen following us. Hence, although birds were not individually ringed, the probability of testing the same individual twice was low, and we are confident that our observations were performed on different individuals. Moreover, playback sequences were evenly distributed across the study period to avoid any temporal confounding effect.

2.3 | Playback stimuli and playback materials

We used mobbing calls produced by three great tits previously recorded in response to intraspecific mobbing calls (Dutour et al., 2017a). Calls were recorded with a Fostex FR2LE digital recorder connected to a Sennheiser ME67-K6 microphone (see Dutour et al., 2017a for more details). We also used mobbing calls obtained from the Xeno Canto online database (<http://www.xeno-canto.org>) recorded in different European countries ($n = 6$) located along the species' range in order to encompass the call variation range that a local bird community might experience and to generalize our conclusions. From these recording files, we built 20 unique soundtracks of natural mobbing calls (FME-D sequences) using Avisoft-SASLab software (i.e., 20 soundtracks with 1 individual per soundtrack). Recordings were in 16-bit WAV format (44.1 KHz sampling rate). These soundtracks were then used to construct three others, respectively FME calls, D calls, and D-FME calls as follows: FME and D calls were constructed by removing either D or FME calls from each FME-D calls and the D-FME calls were constructed by reversing the order of the motifs in the original FME-D calls of great tits (Figure 1). Within each sound track, calls were repeated at a rate of 26 calls per minute (this calling rate is within the range of the natural repetition rates, unpubl. data). We used a series

of five to eight D motifs to construct playback (mean $\pm$ SE = 7.11 ± 0.06 ; Figure 1). Each track D notes were placed 82 ± 40 ms before FME (no difference from the time between FME and D notes in the natural sequence; $t = 1.789$, $p > 0.05$). The number of D notes could relate to the perceived level of threat (Templeton et al., 2005) which could artificially bring about variation in the response of focal birds. With this mind, all playback sequences were arranged to adjust the ratio of the D notes over the FME notes in a mobbing call sequence, making this ratio slightly lower in our study (range: 5/8 - 8/11) than in Suzuki et al., (2016, range: 7/10 - 10/13, see Figure 1 in both manuscripts for comparison). We also constructed 20 control soundtracks using the parts where no birds were calling in the same recordings as natural mobbing calls (BN). In order to avoid pseudoreplication (Kroodsma et al., 2001), we played back each soundtrack only once using a Shopinnov 20 W loudspeaker (the probability of testing an individual twice was low, see above). The average amplitude used for these playbacks was obtained with a sound level meter placed 1 m from the loudspeaker (~ 83 dB, Solo 01dB Metravib, Z weighting, re: $20 \mu\text{m Pa}$).

2.4 | Statistical analyses

In the analysis of experiment 1, we used generalized linear mixed models (GLMMs) treating the individual records from which were constructed all subsequent soundtracks (i.e. the test types FME calls, D calls, FME-D calls, D-FME calls and control) as a random effect. The test type was introduced as an explanatory term and the observation duration (i.e., the time during which we could observe the bird) as an adjustment covariate in the fixed part of the model. All analyses performed on the number of scans were performed using a log link function and a generalized Poisson distribution (Proc GLIMMIX; SAS institute inc, 2012) to circumvent the overdispersion of count data relative to a Poisson distribution (see Joe & Zhu, 2005 for justification). For the approaching behaviour, the individual binary response (i.e., approaching

versus not approaching) was introduced as the dependent variable using a logit link and a binomial distribution for the error term. For both response variables, the effect of explanatory terms was examined using a non-sequential F test, and subsequently removed from the model if non-significant. Although the random effect was never found significant (results not shown), it was always kept in the model if possible (see below). Multiple comparisons between test types were performed on least square mean estimates using a Dunnett-Hsu correction in the case of pairwise comparisons against the control situation (i.e. BN test) or the Sidak correction otherwise. Finally, for each test type, we used a Wilcoxon test to determine whether scanning behaviour differed between approaching individuals and those staying away, or conversely whether each approach was associated with scanning. Tests were not performed for the FME and the BN playbacks, given the lack of approaching birds in these sequences (see Results).

We proceeded in a similar way for the analyses of experiment 2. We first verified that the mobbing call sequence reversal resulted in the same behavioural pattern for conspecific receivers as observed in experiment 1. More specifically, we compared the number of scans and propensity to approach using generalized linear mixed models including the test type and the period (the onset of the breeding season i.e., experiment 1, or the end of the breeding season, i.e., experiment 2) as explanatory terms in the fixed part of the model and the individual from whom the recording came as a random effect.

We then compared the responses (scan and approach) of the three species to the great tits mobbing calls presented in the natural order (i.e., FME-D calls) and reversed sequence (i.e., D-FME calls). For this purpose, the receiver species (great tit, coal tit and chaffinch), the test type (FME-D and D-FME calls), and their interactive effect were introduced as explanatory terms in the fixed part of the model and the individual from which the recording came as a random effect. We then performed contrast analyses to test whether each

heterospecific receiver specie (i.e. coal tit and chaffinch) responded differently than the conspecific one (i.e. great tit) to the mobbing calls sequence reversion. Multiple comparisons between test types were subsequently performed on least square mean estimates using a Sidak correction. Concerning the approach behaviour, none of the coal tits approached when exposed to one of the two test types (i.e., D-FME calls; $n = 15$) resulting in a sparse data structure. For this reason, likelihood optimization in the presence of a random effect is made impracticable and all tests based on the standard deviation associated to the estimates are made unreliable. We therefore used a GLM instead of a GLMM to analyse the approaching behaviour, and we used likelihood ratio tests instead of the F test to assess the significance of explanatory terms introduced in the model as well as the significance of contrast analyses. Partial analyses for each heterospecific receiver species were then performed, and in the case of the coal tits, the difference between both test types was examined used a Fisher exact test. We also completed these analyses by Wilcoxon tests to determine for each species whether scanning differed between approaching individuals and those staying away or conversely whether each approach was associated with scanning within each test type (i.e., FME-D and D-FME calls). These tests were not performed for coal tits in response to D-FME calls since no individual approached during the test, and nor for chaffinches since almost none of them approached during the test (see Results).

2.5 | Ethical note

This work was approved by the Prefecture de l'Ain (DDPP01-15-230) and by the ethical rules set by University Lyon 1 in accordance with the current laws in France.

3 | Results

3.1 | Experiment 1: compositional syntax in great tit mobbing calls

Overall, our analyses indicate that the scanning behaviour varied significantly according to the test type (respectively for the effects of the test type and the observation duration: $F_{4,23} = 14.9, p < 0.0001$; $F_{1,85} = 5.65, p < 0.0197$; see Figure 2a). Pairwise comparisons between each test type and the BN control reveal a significantly higher number of scans for the FME calls and FME-D calls tests (respectively for FME, D, FME-D calls and D-FME: $t = 5.28, p < 0.0001$; $t = 0.38, p = 0.98$; $t = 3.96, p = 0.0021$; $t = -0.14, p = 0.99$). There was also no significant difference between FME-D calls and FME calls ($t = 1.80, p = 0.59$) and pairwise comparisons confirm that both FME and FME-D calls triggered significantly more scans than D calls and D-FME ones (all $p < 0.01$). The probability of approaching varied significantly between the test types (respectively for the effects of the test type and the observation duration: $F_{4,23} = 4.17, p = 0.011$; $F_{1,85} = 0.94, p = 0.33$; see Figure 2b). Pairwise comparisons between each test type and the BN control reveal a significantly higher approach propensity for the D and FME-D calls tests (respectively for FME, D, FME-D calls and D-FME: $t = -0.01, p > 0.99$; $t = 3.05, p = 0.0154$; $t = 2.54, p = 0.0464$; $t = 1.99, p = 0.136$). Moreover, there was no significant difference between D calls and FME-D calls tests ($t = 0.96; p = 0.88$) and pairwise comparisons indicate that both D calls and FME-D calls significantly increased the approach propensity when compared to FME calls but not when compared to D-FME calls (D calls *versus* FME calls : $t = 3.16, p = 0.022$; FME-D calls *versus* FME calls : $t = 2.64, p = 0.071$; D calls *versus* D-FME calls : $t = 1.87, p = 0.32$; FME-D calls *versus* D-FME calls : $t = 0.96, p = 0.88$). Finally, regardless of the test type, scanning did not differ between approaching individuals and those staying away (Wilcoxon tests respectively for the D, FME-D, D-FME calls: $W = 49.5, p = 0.78$; $W = 25.5, p = 0.07$; $W = 37, p = 0.52$; test not performed for the FME and the BN playbacks given the lack of approaching birds in these sequences).

3.2 | Experiment 2: effect of syntax alteration on heterospecific perception

As experiments on heterospecific responses to the syntax alteration of great tit mobbing calls were done at the end of the breeding period while experiment 1 was performed at the onset of the breeding season, we first controlled that great tits response to the alteration of conspecific mobbing calls does not vary during the breeding season. Our results indicate that, whatever the study period (i.e. at the onset or at the end of the breeding season), great tits approached the loudspeaker with the same propensity in response to FME-D calls or D-FME calls (period effect: $F_{1,8} = 0.82$; $p = 0.39$; test type effect: $F_{1,8} = 1.44$; $p = 0.26$; interactive effect: $F_{1,8} = 0.01$; $p = 0.94$; see Figure 3a). However, if the study period also did not alter the effect of the mobbing call inversion on their scanning behaviour, great tits exhibited a higher vigilance effort at the end of the breeding season than at the onset (period effect: $F_{1,8} = 5.45$; $p = 0.0478$; test type effect: $F_{1,8} = 32.27$; $p = 0.0005$; interactive effect: $F_{1,8} = 0.01$; $p = 0.93$; see Figure 3b). Moreover, as in the case of experiment 1, scanning did not differ between approaching individuals and those staying away (Wilcoxon test respectively for the FME-D and the D-FME calls: $n = 15$, $W = 29$; $p = 0.86$; $n = 15$, $W = 25$; $p = 0.77$). These results indicate that the intensity of the subjects' reaction to FME-D calls compared to D-FME calls remained unchanged before and after the breeding season for conspecifics, and offers stable ground for interspecific comparison.

Comparing the response to the inversion of great tit mobbing call sequence among receiver species, our results reveal a significant interactive effect of the receiver species and the test type on the number of scans displayed during the test (receiver species effect: $F_{2,16} = 2.32$; $p = 0.131$; test type effect: $F_{1,8} = 9.36$; $p = 0.0156$; interaction term: $F_{2,16} = 4.73$; $p = 0.0243$). As revealed by the contrast analyses, only the difference of the number of scans between the two test types exhibited by chaffinches significantly varied from the one exhibited by the great tits (respectively for chaffinches *versus* great tits and coal tits *versus* great tits : $F_{1,16} = 7.55$; $p = 0.0143$; $F_{1,16} = 0.01$; $p = 0.93$). The difference of approach

propensity between the two test types also varied significantly according to the receiver species (receiver species effect: $\chi^2_2 = 20$; $p < 0.0001$; test type effect: $\chi^2_1 = 2.98$; $p = 0.084$; interaction term: $\chi^2_2 = 6.31$; $p = 0.042$). However, only the difference of approach propensity between the two test types exhibited by the coal tits significantly varied from the one exhibited by the great tits as revealed by the contrast analyses (respectively for chaffinches *versus* great tits and coal tits *versus* great tits: $\chi^2_1 = 0.82$; $p = 0.36$; $\chi^2_1 = 4.16$; $p = 0.0413$). Partial analyses indicate that chaffinches did not scan the surroundings differently according to the order of the mobbing call sequence presented ($F_{1,16} = 0.60$; $p = 0.45$). Chaffinches also rarely approached the loudspeaker, regardless of the sequence order (Figure 3c). In contrast, the coal tits displayed both increased vigilance and a higher propensity to approach the loudspeaker when hearing the FME-D calls than when hearing the D-FME calls (for the number of scans: $F_{1,16} = 9.08$; $p = 0.0082$; for the approach propensity : Fisher exact test $p = 0.042$, see Figure 3b). Finally, unlike the great tits, coal tits approaching the loudspeaker also scanned significantly more intensely (14.2 ± 3.9) than those staying away (8.1 ± 5.2) when hearing the great tit mobbing calls in the natural order (Wilcoxon test: $n = 15$; $W = 8$; $p = 0.042$; test not performed for the D-FME calls given the lack of approaching birds in this sequence).

4 | DISCUSSION

We found that great tits behave distinctively when hearing respectively the FME motifs and the D ones. They scan the environment when hearing the former, and approach the sound source when hearing the latter. As previously seen in the Japanese tits (Suzuki et al., 2016; Suzuki et al., 2017), these results indicate that these two motifs also convey distinct meanings to the great tit. One corresponds to an alarm call (i.e., the FME motif) which elicits increased vigilance from the receiver, while the other corresponds to a recruitment call (i.e., the D

motif) which elicits approach behaviour from the receiver. In response to the naturally ordered mobbing call sequence (i.e., FME-D calls), great tits exhibited both increased vigilance (with a high proportion of scanning) and a rapid approach ($n = 19$; mean $\pm$ SE = 30.22 ± 3.38 seconds) toward the sound source, potentially to support the simulated caller opposing the putative threat, indicating that tits extracted both meanings from the naturally-ordered combination of the two motifs. To confirm that the mobbing sequence constitutes a combination of two individual calls, a second step is to construct combinations by artificially merging both calls (with the calls originating from the same individual) and show that natural and artificial versions elicit the same response. Both the nature and the intensity of the responses we observed in the present study are similar to those obtained for the Japanese tit (Suzuki et al., 2016) and for the pied babbler (Engesser et al., 2016). However, while in the Japanese tits both the vigilance effort and the propensity to approach vanish when tits hear the mobbing call sequence in the reversed order (Suzuki et al., 2016; Suzuki et al., 2017), the results are different in the case of the great tit. The vigilance effort vanishes but the propensity to approach did not change when the combination order was reversed. Although the percentage of trials in which great tits approached the loudspeaker during the D-FME calls is reduced by 14% compared to the FME-D calls, this difference is low when compared to the one reported by Suzuki et al. (2016) on the Japanese tits (i.e. 41.2% of reduction). Since we observed similar responses in both experiments, which were performed in two breeding seasons, this behavioural pattern is reproducible. Our results therefore suggest that great tits are sensitive to the ordered combination of the two motifs. However, as noted by several authors (Berwick et al., 2013; ten Cate & Okanoya, 2012), this is not to say that tits actually exploit compositional syntax to convey more information. To our knowledge, great tits never use reversed mobbing calls sequences in the wild, and several hypotheses could explain a sequence order reversal effect without invoking compositional syntax usage. First, these

results could be explained by the occurrence of a perception bias (Grafe, 1996; Klump & Gerhardt, 1992) when the sequence order is reversed. Indeed, D notes, which are large frequency bandwidths enhancing location, may operate as auditory masking on the FME notes (frequency modulations resistant to degradation; Brown & Handford, 1996; Marler, 1955) given the relative short delay between both sequences. Thus tits could no longer perceive the FME notes when they are artificially placed after the D notes. Such a phenomenon could well explain why great tits reduced vigilance behaviour when hearing the artificially reversed sequence of mobbing calls. This hypothesis could be tested directly by replacing D notes by a distinct high-bandwidth note (e.g., a burst of loud white noise). Auditory masking by D notes could also be the reason why great tits do not produce D-FME calls and, therefore, explain why the ordering rule is the way it is. Mobbing call responsiveness (and/or interpretation) may also depend on the social context, for instance according to the presence of the receiver's mate in the vicinity (Suzuki et al., 2016) or the seasonal activity (Dutour et al., 2017b; Dutour et al., 2019; Lucas et al., 2007). In the Japanese tit, the sequence reversal effect was examined in flock members during the non-breeding season (Suzuki et al., 2016) while in the present study tests were conducted on great tits at the onset and at the end of the breeding season. Since the sensitivity to recruitment calls may vary between these two social contexts, further work is required to examine this point.

Chaffinches were barely sensitive to great tit mobbing calls although this species is regularly observed in heterospecific mobbing groups (Dutour et al., 2016). Moreover, we recently found a very low responsiveness of chaffinches to heterospecific mobbing calls when compared to their own mobbing calls (Dutour et al., 2017a; see also Randler & Vollmer, 2013). We suggested that such a lack of response could have a causal explanation (the strong dissimilarity between mobbing calls of the chaffinch and other species), and a functional explanation (the exploitation of a distinct ecological niche). The second hypothesis cannot

explain our results because chaffinches and great tits usually share the same ecological niche. It is therefore likely that chaffinches are sensitive only to their own species, although the absence of a background noise test in experiment 2 cannot allow us to safely conclude on this point.

Conversely, coal tits were not significantly less responsive than conspecific subjects to the naturally-ordered great tit mobbing call sequence (i.e., FME-D calls) regardless of the behaviour being measured (i.e., vigilance or approach). However, their behaviours differ from that of conspecific great tit subjects since approaching coal tits were also more vigilant than those staying away, whereas approaching great tits were not significantly more vigilant than their counterparts staying away. Furthermore, and above all, when the mobbing call sequence order was reversed, coal tits not only reduced their vigilance effort but also no longer approached the loudspeaker. If these results indicate that coal tits are sensitive to great tit mobbing call sequence reversal, they also suggest that coal tits do not extract the same meaning from the mobbing calls sequence as great tits do. In particular, their responsiveness seems more binary or less versatile than that of great tits. This could indicate that some information (i.e., social information) is present in great tit mobbing calls, inducing conspecific responses, whereas coal tits do not pay attention to it. If auditory masking can explain great tit responses to D-FME calls, we hypothesized that wouldn't the same hold true for coal tits. Coal tits could be indeed more sensitive to FME notes when they are artificially placed after the D notes compared to great tits, because their mobbing calls are more complex (Carlson et al., 2017a), composed of combinations of many different calls; and they are more high pitched (unpublished data). One other hypothesis could be used to explain the behaviour of coal tits. It is possible that coal tits acquire the meaning of FME, D and FME-D calls via associative learning (i.e., coal tits learn to associate these calls emitted by great tits with a vigilance situation, a foraging flock or mobbing; e.g., Potvin et al., 2018) because these signals can be

heard repeatedly in the field. In contrast, coal tits cannot have acquired any meaning for D-FME sequences as they are never heard. This may explain their lack of reaction to these stimuli. This hypothesis would also be consistent with the ‘correlation’ between scanning and approach in coal tits (i.e., the binary response depending on whether the birds have been sufficiently exposed to great tits to associate these calls with a danger, or not). Although coal tits are sensitive to great tits mobbing call sequence reversal, our results did not provide evidence for compositional processing. Additional playbacks to verify coal tits’ and chaffinches’ reactions to FME and D notes, as well as to artificial stimuli starting with an FME- or a D- motif (but finishing with another motif that is normally not used in combination with these motifs) would be most valuable to disentangle this question.

Our results also suggest that the combination order of the repetitive loud and broadband notes (i.e., the D motif) preceded by the frequency modulation notes (i.e., the FME motif) within the mobbing call sequence is of prime importance to elicit a response in the receiver. In this respect, it is particularly striking that, in the few bird species for which the effect of compositional syntax has been investigated, all studies reported that natural mobbing call sequences follow this combination ordering (Engesser et al., 2016; Suzuki et al., 2016; Suzuki et al., 2017; Templeton et al., 2005). Furthermore, as suggested by the present study and recent studies on the Japanese tit (Suzuki et al., 2017), it seems that this rule is more important than the acoustic similarity of each motif between species to enable heterospecific response. Nevertheless, whether this rule applies more broadly to bird communities remains to be established and further studies on a larger set of bird species will be necessary. To this aim, comparisons across allopatric species should be especially informative. Furthermore, as birds may not only eavesdrop on heterospecific communication to extract information about predator threats but also about food resources (Magrath et al., 2015), future work is needed to

450 clarify how each motif alone (i.e., alert calls and recruitment calls) is understood by
451 heterospecifics.

REFERENCES

- Berwick, R. C., Friederici, A. D., Chomsky, N., & Bolhuis, J. J. (2013). Evolution, brain, and the nature of language. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 17, 89–98.
- Bolhuis, J. J., Beckers, G. J., Huybregts, M. A., Berwick, R. C., & Everaert, M. B. (2018a). Meaningful syntactic structure in songbird vocalizations?. *PLoS biology*, 16, e2005157.
- Bolhuis, J. J., Beckers, G. J., Huybregts, M. A., Berwick, R. C., & Everaert, M. B. (2018b). The slings and arrows of comparative linguistics. *PLoS biology*, 16(9), e3000019.
- Brown, T. J., & Handford, P. (1996). Acoustic signal amplitude patterns: a computer simulation investigation of the acoustic adaptation hypothesis. *Condor*, 608–623.
- Carlson, N. V., Healy, S. D., & Templeton, C. N. (2017a). A comparative study of how British tits encode predator threat in their mobbing calls. *Animal Behaviour*, 125, 77–92.
- Carlson, N. V., Pargeter, H. M., & Templeton, C. N. (2017b). Sparrowhawk movement, calling, and presence of dead conspecifics differentially impact blue tit (*Cyanistes caeruleus*) vocal and behavioral mobbing responses. *Behavioral ecology and sociobiology*, 71, 133.
- Collier, K., Bickel, B., van Schaik, C. P., Manser, M. B., & Townsend, S. W. (2014). Language evolution: syntax before phonology?. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 281, 20140263.
- Cunha, F. C. R. D., Fontenelle, J. C. R., & Griesser, M. (2017). Predation risk drives the expression of mobbing across bird species. *Behavioral Ecology*, 28, 1517–1523.
- Curio, E., Ernst, U., & Vieth, W. (1978). The adaptive significance of avian mobbing: II. Cultural transmission of enemy recognition in blackbirds: effectiveness and some constraints. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie*, 48, 184–202.
- Dutour, M., Lena, J. P., & Lengagne, T. (2016). Mobbing behaviour varies according to predator dangerousness and occurrence. *Animal Behaviour*, 119, 119–124.

477 Dutour, M., Léna, J. P., & Lengagne, T. (2017a). Mobbing calls: a signal transcending species
 478 boundaries. *Animal Behaviour*, 131, 3–11.

479 Dutour, M., Lena, J. P., & Lengagne, T. (2017b). Mobbing behaviour in a passerine
 480 community increases with prevalence in predator diet. *Ibis*, 159, 324–330.

481 Dutour, M., Cordonnier, M., Léna, J. P., & Lengagne, T. (2019). Seasonal variation in
 482 mobbing behaviour of passerine birds. *Journal of Ornithology*, 1–6.

483 Engesser, S., Ridley, A. R., & Townsend, S. W. (2016). Meaningful call combinations and
 484 compositional processing in the southern pied babbler. *Proceedings of the National
 485 Academy of Sciences*, 113, 5976–5981.

486 Grafe, T. U. (1996). The function of call alternation in the African reed frog (*Hyperolius
 487 marmoratus*): precise call timing prevents auditory masking. *Behavioral Ecology and
 488 Sociobiology*, 38(3), 149–158.

489 Griesser, M., Wheatcroft, D., & Suzuki, T. N. (2018). From bird calls to human language:
 490 exploring the evolutionary drivers of compositional syntax. *Current Opinion in
 491 Behavioral Sciences*, 21, 6–12.

492 Hailman, J. P., Ficken, M. S., & Ficken, R. W. (1985). The ‘chick-a-dee’ calls of *Parus
 493 atricapillus*: a recombinant system of animal communication compared with written
 494 English. *Semiotica*, 56, 191–224.

495 Hailman, J. P., & Ficken, M. S. (1986). Combinatorial animal communication with
 496 computable syntax: Chick-a-dee calling qualifies as "language" by structural linguistics.
 497 *Animal Behaviour*.

498 Hetrick, S. A., & Sieving, K. E. (2011). Antipredator calls of tufted titmice and interspecific
 499 transfer of encoded threat information. *Behavioral Ecology*, 23, 83–92.

500 Hurd, C. R. (1996). Interspecific attraction to the mobbing calls of black-capped chickadees
 501 (*Parus atricapillus*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 38, 287–292.

502 Joe, H., & Zhu, R. (2005). Generalized Poisson distribution: the property of mixture of
503 Poisson and comparison with negative binomial distribution. *Biometrical Journal:*
504 *Journal of Mathematical Methods in Biosciences*, 47, 219–229.

505 Johansson, U. S., Ekman, J., Bowie, R. C., Halvarsson, P., Ohlson, J. I., Price, T. D., &
506 Ericson, P. G. (2013). A complete multilocus species phylogeny of the tits and
507 chickadees (Aves: Paridae). *Molecular phylogenetics and evolution*, 69(3), 852-860.

508 Jung, H., & Freeberg, T. M. (2017). Variation in chick-a-dee calls of bridled titmice
509 (*Baeolophus wollweberi*): Frequent use of non-combinatorial calls in a combinatorial
510 calling system. *Ethology*, 123, 835–842.

511 Klump, G. M., & Gerhardt, H. C. (1992). Mechanisms and function of call-timing in male-
512 male interactions in frogs. In *Playback and studies of animal communication* (pp. 153-
513 174). Springer, Boston, MA.

514 Klump, G. M., & Shalter, M. D. (1984). Acoustic behaviour of birds and mammals in the
515 predator context. 1. Factors affecting the structure of alarm signals. 2. The functional-
516 significance and evolution of alarm signals. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie*, 66, 189–226.

517 Kroodsma, D. E., Byers, B. E., Goodale, E., Johnson, S., & Liu, W. C. (2001).
518 Pseudoreplication in playback experiments, revisited a decade later. *Animal Behaviour*,
519 61, 1029–1033.

520 Lucas, J. R., & Freeberg, T. M. (2007). *Information and the chick-a-dee call: communicating*
521 *with a complex vocal system. Ecology and behavior of chickadees and titmice.* pp. 199–
522 213. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

523 Lucas, J. R., Freeberg, T. M., Long, G. R., & Krishnan, A. (2007). Seasonal variation in avian
524 auditory evoked responses to tones: a comparative analysis of Carolina chickadees, tufted
525 titmice, and white-breasted nuthatches. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*, 193, 201–
526 215.

527 Magrath, R. D., Haff, T. M., Fallow, P. M., & Radford, A. N. (2015). Eavesdropping on
 528 heterospecific alarm calls: from mechanisms to consequences. *Biological Reviews*, 90,
 529 560–586.

530 Marler, P. (1955). Characteristics of some animal calls. *Nature*, 176, 6–8.

531 Marler, P. (1998). *The Origin and Diversification of Language*. (eds Jablonski NG, Aiello
 532 LC), pp. 1–20. California University Press.

533 Martinet, A. (1949). La double articulation linguistique. *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de*
 534 *Copenhagen*, 5, 30–37.

535 Ouattara, K., Lemasson, A., & Zuberbühler, K. (2009). Campbell's monkeys use affixation to
 536 alter call meaning. *PloS one*, 4, e7808.

537 Petkov, C. I., & Wilson, B. (2012). On the pursuit of the brain network for proto-syntactic
 538 learning in non-human primates: conceptual issues and neurobiological hypotheses. *Phil.*
 539 *Trans. R. Soc. B*, 367, 2077–2088.

540 Petkov, C. I., & Jarvis, E. (2012). Birds, primates, and spoken language origins: behavioral
 541 phenotypes and neurobiological substrates. *Frontiers in evolutionary neuroscience*, 4, 12.

542 Potvin, D. A., Ratnayake, C. P., Radford, A. N., & Magrath, R. D. (2018). Birds learn socially
 543 to recognize heterospecific alarm calls by acoustic association. *Current Biology*, 28,
 544 2632–2637.

545 Pettifor, R. A. (1990). The effects of avian mobbing on a potential predator, the European
 546 kestrel, *Falco tinnunculus*. *Animal Behaviour*, 39, 821–827.

547 Randler, C., & Förschler, M. I. (2011). Heterospecifics do not respond to subtle differences in
 548 chaffinch mobbing calls: message is encoded in number of elements. *Animal behaviour*,
 549 82, 725–730.

550 Randler, C., & Vollmer, C. (2013). Asymmetries in commitment in an avian communication
 551 network. *Naturwissenschaften*, 100, 199–203.

- Russell, A. F., & Townsend, S. W. (2017). Communication: Animal Steps on the Road to Syntax?. *Current Biology*, 27, R753–R755.
- SAS Institute Inc. (2012). SAS/STAT® 12.1 User's Guide. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.
- Stoffel, M. A., Nakagawa, S., & Schielzeth, H. (2017). rptR: Repeatability estimation and variance decomposition by generalized linear mixed-effects models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 8(11), 1639–1644.
- Suzuki, T. N. (2016). Referential calls coordinate multi-species mobbing in a forest bird community. *Journal of Ethology*, 34, 79–84.
- Suzuki, T. N., Wheatcroft, D., & Griesser, M. (2016). Experimental evidence for compositional syntax in bird calls. *Nature communications*, 7, 10986.
- Suzuki, T. N., Wheatcroft, D., & Griesser, M. (2017). Wild birds use an ordering rule to decode novel call sequences. *Current Biology*, 27, 2331–2336.
- Suzuki, T. N., Wheatcroft, D., & Griesser, M. (2018). Call combinations in birds and the evolution of compositional syntax. *PLoS biology*, 16, e2006532.
- Suzuki, T. N., Griesser, M., & Wheatcroft, D. (2019). Syntactic rules in avian vocal sequences as a window into the evolution of compositionality. *Animal Behaviour*.
- Templeton, C. N., Greene, E., & Davis, K. (2005). Allometry of alarm calls: black-capped chickadees encode information about predator size. *Science*, 308, 1934–1937.
- ten Cate, C., & Okanoya, K. (2012). Revisiting the syntactic abilities of non-human animals: natural vocalizations and artificial grammar learning. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 367, 1984–1994.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

FIGURE 1 Spectrograms of calls played to great tit, coal tit and chaffinch: **a** FME-D mobbing call of the great tit showing call with introductory frequency modulated elements (FME) (similar to chickadee A or B elements) and subsequent D notes (D) and **b** D-FME call is a reversed combination of FME and D calls. These calls were produced with Avisoft SASLab©

FIGURE 2 Responses of great tits to playbacks of FME, FME-D, D-FME, D and control (BN) test types. **a** Number of scans made by tits during playback (generalized linear mixed model: $F_{4,23} = 14.9, p < 0.0001$). Horizontal line: median value; box ends: upper and lower quartiles; whiskers: variation range of values. **b** Percentage of trials in which tits approached the loudspeaker (generalized linear mixed model: $F_{4,23} = 4.17, p = 0.011$). Sample size: $n = 100$ individuals. Each individual was exposed to only one per test type, giving $n = 20$ per test type

FIGURE 3 Number of horizontal scans and percentage of trials in which **a** great tits, **b** coal tits and **c** chaffinches approached the loudspeaker during the presentations of the playbacks of FME-D and artificially reversed D-FME motifs of mobbing signals. Horizontal line: median value; box ends: upper and lower quartiles; whiskers: variation range of values. Sample size: $n = 90$ individuals ($n = 30$ per species and 15 per test type)