Food for thought: supplementary feeding as a driver of ecological change in avian populations
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The popularity of bird feeding has increased rapidly in the past few decades. Up to 43% of households in the US regularly feed birds (Martinson and Flashpoler 2003), while in the UK, this figure is close to 75% (Cowie and Hinsely 1988). Food availability is clearly one of the main factors limiting bird populations, and supplementary feeding reduces the risk of starvation and may enhance reproductive performance (Newton 1998). Despite the impressive scale of bird feeding, understanding of the ecological effects of these massive subsidies is minimal. While bird feeding can bring positive benefits, such as increased overwinter survival and enhanced breeding success, there are also a number of potential negative impacts. For example, aggregations of birds around feeders may attract predators or enhance the spread of diseases. Feeders may also act as ecological traps, by providing inaccurate cues regarding habitat quality based on potential food resources.

Experimental studies investigating the potential impacts of supplementary feeding have dealt with a range of species, from small passerines (Figure 1) to birds of prey. Directed feeding experiments do not reflect the large-scale, diffuse nature of backyard feeding, but may provide some indication of the wider impacts. The form of supplementary feeding varies markedly among studies, replicates are few, and treatments often run consecutively, sometimes as single-site, before-and-after comparisons. As a result, meta-analysis of this disparate body of research is challenging. To focus advice and future research, we have drawn together and reviewed the many and varied responses of bird populations to supplementary feeding (Table 1). We begin with the effects on avian demography, starting with egg laying, and then progress through the avian life cycle to effects on adult survival. Finally, we consider the implications for adult behavior, species interactions, and indirect, community-level effects.

In a nutshell:

- Feeding birds is an enormously popular activity that can affect virtually every aspect of bird ecology, from daily survival to large-scale migration.
- Supplementary feeding has the potential to effect long-term changes in the population dynamics and distribution of some bird species.
- Although feeding birds generates mostly positive effects, some negative impacts, such as increased predation pressure and disease transmission, have also been observed.
- Research is required on the wider impacts of feeding and on the interactions between food supply and factors such as climate and predation.

Egg laying

The acute need for energy during egg development and laying means that supplementary feeding is likely to affect...
avian fecundity and resource allocation during reproduction. During the breeding season, time is constrained, and even small shifts toward earlier laying usually bring benefits. In 34 of 59 studies in which laying dates were noted, feeding produced significantly earlier laying dates (Table 2). Such advances were generally less than one week, but, in some cases, were as long as one month. In most instances, earlier broods survive better than late ones (Barba et al. 1995), and extra food has the greatest impact when times are tough (e.g., in cold years [Svensson and Nilsson 1995], on low-quality territories, and in younger birds [Desrochers 1992]). The type of supplement provided also influences timing. For example, in one study, Florida scrub jays (Aphelocoma caerulescens) given a high-fat, high-protein diet were first to lay, while those on high-fat, low-protein supplements came second, and control groups were unaffected (Reynolds et al. 2003). However, the same species also demonstrates the potential costs of an artificially influenced egg-laying time that becomes mismatched with natural food supply. Scrub jays breeding in suburban habitat with access to supplementary food breed earlier, but find themselves out of sync with natural food items that are important when rearing nestlings, potentially leading to decreased rather than increased breeding success (Schoech and Bowman 2001).

**Figure 1.** Great tit (Parus major) on a peanut feeder.

### Table 1. Summary of studies and the various impacts of supplementary feeding on breeding success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Lay date</th>
<th>Clutch size</th>
<th>Egg size/quality</th>
<th>Incubation time</th>
<th>Hatching time</th>
<th>Chick growth rate</th>
<th>Fledging success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds of prey</strong></td>
<td>+ 7</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>+ na</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None 3</td>
<td>None 3</td>
<td>None 3</td>
<td>None na</td>
<td>None 2</td>
<td>None 5</td>
<td>None 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corvids</strong></td>
<td>+ 7</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ na</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None 1</td>
<td>None 6</td>
<td>None 3</td>
<td>None na</td>
<td>None 1</td>
<td>None 1</td>
<td>None 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small passerines</strong></td>
<td>+ 18</td>
<td>+ 12</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td>+ 7</td>
<td>+ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None 9</td>
<td>None 20</td>
<td>None 14</td>
<td>None 5</td>
<td>None 7</td>
<td>None 6</td>
<td>None 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seabirds</strong></td>
<td>+ na</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td>+ na</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None 7</td>
<td>None 4</td>
<td>None 1</td>
<td>None 2</td>
<td>None 2</td>
<td>None 2</td>
<td>None 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waders/ waterfowl</strong></td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td>+ na</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None 4</td>
<td>None 1</td>
<td>None 2</td>
<td>None na</td>
<td>None na</td>
<td>None na</td>
<td>None na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>+ 34</td>
<td>+ 28</td>
<td>+ 14</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>+ 9</td>
<td>+ 17</td>
<td>+ 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– 1</td>
<td>– 1</td>
<td>– 0</td>
<td>– 0</td>
<td>– 0</td>
<td>– 1</td>
<td>– 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None 24</td>
<td>None 34</td>
<td>None 23</td>
<td>None 7</td>
<td>None 11</td>
<td>None 12</td>
<td>None 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** + = positive response; – = negative response; none = no impact; see WebPanel 1 for list of studies included in this summary.
Quantitative and quality

Just as feeding affects the timing of laying, other breeding parameters, such as the number of eggs laid and their size and composition, can also be determined by diet and food availability. Because the size of clutches is subject to phylogenetic constraints and is known to decrease as the season progresses, resolving the effects of earlier laying from direct effects on clutch size is difficult. However, in 44 provisioning studies that dealt with both laying dates and clutch size, 12 reported increases in both, while 16 reported increases in clutch size alone (Table 2).

Supplemented birds may invest in larger or higher quality eggs as an alternative (or in addition) to investing in increased clutch size. Larger eggs are more likely to hatch and cool more slowly when adults are away from the nest (Mackintosh and Briskie 2005). Although egg size is considered a less plastic trait than lay date or clutch size, increases in egg size were reported in 38% of the studies we reviewed (Table 2); for example, fed Nazca boobies (Sula granti) laid substantially larger second eggs with heavier chicks than boobies that were not fed (Clifford and Anderson 2001). Nonetheless, increased egg size does not always lead to increased chick growth rate or survival, suggesting that, for some species, the benefits of increased egg size may be relatively short-lived and confined to the initial pre-and post-hatching period (Svensson and Nilsson 1995).

The effects of supplementary feeding on egg quality have also been reported for several species, and here again, Florida scrub jays have proven excellent models. Female jays provided with high-fat, high-protein supplements were found to lay heavier third eggs, containing more water and protein than the eggs of unsupplemented birds (Reynolds et al. 2003). Many popular supplemental foods (eg peanuts) are also known to be rich sources of macronutrients (such as vitamin E) and birds may benefit from increased uptake of specific nutrients with limited availability in the natural environment. These nutrients have been shown to affect measures of immunocompetence (the capacity to produce an immune response) and breeding parameters (Blount et al. 2002). For example, female lesser black-backed gulls (Larus fuscus) supplemented with high levels of carotenoids have been shown to lay higher quality eggs and are also more likely to produce replacement clutches following the removal of first clutches (Blount et al. 2002). The relative importance of energy versus specific nutrients in driving the effects of supplementary feeding could be investigated relatively easily, by manipulating both the energetic and macronutrient content of supplements.

Provisioning during breeding may extend the season by allowing birds to lay early, decreasing the time needed to raise chicks to fledging, and shortening the interval between clutches (Verbouwen et al. 2001), potentially allowing more pairs to rear second broods. When given food after their first clutch, second broods were initiated by all female black-throated blue warblers (Dendroica caerulescens) in the first year of feeding and by 67% of females in the second year, whereas only half of control pairs produced second broods in the first year and none did so in the second (Nagy and Holmes 2003).

The carry-over effect

There is evidence that effects on both lay date and clutch size are carried over to the year following supplementation. Ural owls (Strix uralensis) given supplementary food in one year layed one week earlier the following spring and also produced larger clutches (Brommer et al. 2004). In contrast, provisioning blue tits (Cyanistes caeruleus) in one year was shown to delay lay date the following year (Grieco et al. 2002).

Brood sex ratio

In birds, females are the heterogametic sex (ie they have two different sex chromosomes) and there is evidence that they are able to control the sex ratio of their offspring at the fertilization stage (Komdeur et al. 1997). Changes in food supply may therefore interact with the selective advantages of having male or female offspring. Adaptive sex ratio manipulation driven by food supplements generated a crisis in the conservation of the kakapo (Strigops habroptilus), a flightless parrot endemic to New Zealand. Reduced to a population of fewer than 70 individuals, supplementary feeding was initiated in an attempt to increase the productivity of female kakapos. Although feeding did increase fecundity rates, resulting sex ratios were strongly male-biased over several years, until it was realized that diet quality was influencing the sex ratio of chicks, and the diet was then altered to address the imbalance (Robertson et al. 2006). By contrast, in Tengmalm’s owls (Aegolius funereus), the sex ratio of chicks was unaffected by additional feeding (Hörnfeldt et al. 2000), possibly because the impact of supplementary feeding may have been suppressed by high
natural food availability. Reduced effects of supplementary feeding during periods of high natural prey availability may help to explain the wide variability among studies.

Survival of young

The provision of additional food may allow breeding females to spend less time foraging, thereby allowing earlier initiation of incubation, better protection of eggs from predation, and earlier fledging, which can lead to higher survival rates (Bollinger et al. 1990). Supplementation during the laying-to-hatching period has been shown to increase both parental attendance and hatching asynchrony in Australian reed warblers (Acrocephalus australis; Eikenaar et al. 2003). Increased hatching asynchrony may itself bring benefits by spreading the time of peak food demand by chicks over a wider period.

Supplemented parents generally have a choice of either using extra food to maximize the delivery of natural prey to their chicks or to reduce foraging effort. In addition, extra food can facilitate more selective foraging (Grieco 2002). Generally, parents opt simply to reduce their foraging effort; however, the differing responses of males and females to supplementation highlight the distinct roles of the sexes during breeding. For example, female American kestrels (Falco sparverius) brought substantially less wild prey to their chicks when extra food was provided within nest boxes, but male provisioning was unaffected (Dawson and Bortolotti 2002); in addition, female European kestrels (Falco tinnunculus) made more use of the supplementary food themselves (Wiehn and Korpimäki 1997).

When supplementary food provided to parents was passed on to chicks, growth rates of chicks were positively impacted in 56% of the studies we reviewed. Surprisingly, however, one study of parasitic jaegers (Stercorarius parasiticus) identified a negative effect on chick growth. The authors suggest two possible explanations. First, the supplementary food may have been of poorer quality than natural food. Alternatively, parents in inferior condition may have depended more heavily upon the supplementary food, and the correlation between reduced growth rate and supplementary food intake may have been driven by lower parental quality and foraging ability (Davis et al. 2005).

Providing nestlings with additional supplementary food may also lead to a reduction in aggression among chicks, thereby increasing the survival of young, as has been observed in Spanish imperial eagle chicks (Aquila adalberti; González et al. 2006). Other studies have reported opposing results; feeding did not reduce sibling aggression in great egret (Casmerodius albus) or great blue heron (Ardea herodias) broods, though overall brood mortality was reduced by the addition of food through the enhancement of survival rates in smaller chicks (Mock et al. 1987).

Not surprisingly, the positive impacts of feeding on the survival of young have found practical application in enhancing the recovery of threatened species. The stitchbird (Notiomystis cinerea), an endangered New Zealand species, has benefited considerably from provisioning, through both increased survival of young and increased productivity. However, at least in the short term, the persistence of these vulnerable island populations may depend upon the continued provision of supplemental food (Castro et al. 2003).

Ultimately, chicks given supplementary food were more likely to fledge than unsupplemented chicks in 64% of the studies we reviewed. In some cases, the effects were dramatic. Black-legged kittiwakes (Rissa tridactyla) given food over 2 years fledged twice as many chicks in the first year and three times as many in the second year (Gill and Hatch 2002). For kittiwakes, the timing of food provision was also found to be important in affecting fledging success: pairs fed throughout the breeding season and, from egg laying onward, had higher fledging success than those provisioned only during the pre-laying and laying stages. Other studies have found that supplementation reduced fledging success due to higher population densities in the provisioned area (Jansson et al. 1981). In that instance, feeders may act as ecological traps, encouraging birds to settle in an area with insufficient natural food during the breeding season, once supplementation has ended (ie feeders create a population level that cannot be sustained by natural levels of food). There is a clear need for more research into this possibility, by manipulation of the amount of food and the period over which food is provided.

Behavior

Given that food availability is one of the most important mediators of intra- and interspecific interactions among birds, particularly during the non-breeding season, it is not surprising that supplementation can influence behavior at a number of levels. The availability of food may influence the social behavior of birds when foraging. For example, supplementary food reduced the degree to which varied tits (Poecile varius) joined mixed-species flocks (Kubota and Nakamura 2000), supporting the hypothesis that mixed flocking helps birds find food in times of scarcity.

Food supplementation should also produce changes in territorial behavior, since this trait is often coupled with resource availability. During winter, flocks of black-capped chickadees defend foraging territories; however, this system often falls apart when food supplements are provided, as flocks frequently cross territorial boundaries to visit feeders (Wilson 2001). Alternatively, territorial behavior can increase with provisioning as the presence of clumped or high-quality food allows birds to engage in costly resource defense behaviors. When provided with food, Carolina wrens (Thryothorus ludovicianus) spend more time defending territories by singing (Strain and Mumme 1998). One of the most likely explanations for these differences among territorial responses to supplements is the defensibility of the resource, as food presented in small amounts in multiple areas will give the opportu-
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Supplementary feeding can also lead to changes in reproductive behavior, and feeding experiments provide a tool for testing theory relating the evolution of mating systems to food availability. For example, providing additional food to house sparrows (Passer domesticus) led to changes in female behavior that allowed mates to spend more time together at the nest and thereby reduced levels of extra-pair paternity (Václav et al. 2003).

Adult survival and range expansion

One of the most intuitive outcomes of overwinter feeding is that it should enhance survival. Indeed, this is probably the main reason that householders provide food for birds. Although survival rates of small passerines are hard to estimate, this expectation is borne out in several experiments showing higher survival probabilities among supplemented populations of species such as willow tits (Parus montanus) and crested tits (Lophophanes cristatus; Jansson et al. 1981). This work represents one of the few examples of diffuse, large-scale supplementary feeding that replicates the manner in which people actually feed birds in their back gardens, and is particularly valuable in that it provides contrast to the direct feeding of targeted individuals that characterizes most studies of supplementary feeding.

Supplementary food may also be responsible for large-scale changes in bird population dynamics and migration strategies, although it is clearly very difficult to make such causal links in an unequivocal manner. The northward expansions of the northern cardinal (Cardinalis cardinalis) and American goldfinch (Carduelis tristis) in the US (Morneau et al. 1999) are probably linked to backyard feeding (Figures 2 a,b). Feeding could also be responsible for the increasing tendency for birds to overwinter in Finland rather than migrating south (Jokimäki et al. 1996). Such changes may also bring large-scale dependency, and in Finland it is thought that some great tit populations are so dependent on supplementary food during winter that they can no longer be sustained by natural food sources alone (Orell 1989), highlighting the need for a greater understanding of the ways in which feeding may create ecological traps. However, there are examples that indicate otherwise: survival rates of black-capped chickadees following the cessation of 25 years of feeding did not differ from those of chickadees in areas where no feeders had been present (Brittingham and Temple 1992).

Few studies have been conducted on non-target species or on the impacts of supplementary feeding at a community level. While individuals that regularly use feeders are almost certainly reaping benefits, there may be negative impacts on other populations. Overwinter feeding can increase the number and density of resident birds that are attracted to an area and remain there to breed (Jansson et al. 1981).
Similarly, corvids (jays, crows, and allies, such as magpies and nutcrackers) living close to settlements spend 75% of their foraging bouts on anthropogenic food sources, and this appears to be linked to population increases (Marzluff 2006). This, in turn, could generate increased predation pressure on other birds, as corvids are known egg predators. In the case of small woodland passerines, high population densities at the end of winter could create competition for ecologically similar migrants returning to those areas during the breeding season, and urbanized areas in particular may eventually be dominated by a reduced number of species, assisted partly by their successful adaptation to artificial food source regimes (Cleargueau et al. 1998).

### Indirect ecological effects

The diseases that birds carry have been of considerable concern in recent years and the role that feeders may play in disease transmission has been highlighted, particularly for pathogens such as *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* or *Salmonella*. In the UK, this has led to the establishment of the Garden bird health initiative, which includes guidelines for feeding to help reduce the spread of disease as well as for the promotion of research into this area.

Disease transmission appears to vary according to the type of feeder used, the number of birds visiting it, and the habitat in which the feeder is located. In a survey of households in Wisconsin, bird mortality was found to be higher around platform feeders (Brittingham and Temple 1986). Bird feeders have also been implicated in the rapid spread of mycoplasmal conjunctivitis through the house finch (*Carpodacus mexicanus*) population in the US (Fischer et al. 1996). Importantly, these examples consider feeders used by the general public rather than small-scale experiments conducted by researchers and, as such, the findings may be more directly relevant to the actual impacts of feeder-related disease transmission.

While feeding may directly influence survival by reducing the risk of starvation, a similar effect might also be mediated through reduction of predation risk. Birds optimize their mass according to the trade-off between the risks of starvation (leading to fat storage) and predation (leading to maintenance of lower mass for quicker escape from predators; Lima 1986). Consistently provisioning a site decreases the perceived starvation risk, shifting the trade-off toward minimizing predation risk and reducing body mass (Gosler 1996).

A serious concern of householders is that birds at feeders may be exposed to increased predation risk, as predators might capitalize on aggregations around feeders. But surprisingly, research has shown that birds at feeders do not appear to bear a higher risk of predation (Dunn and Tessaglia 1994). Where population densities are high, the risk to individual birds is reduced via dilution and/or increased vigilance, and the presence of feeders has been associated with lower levels of predation by domestic cats (Woods et al. 2003). Perhaps most compellingly, Zanette et al. (2003) found that food supplementation had a greater effect on reproductive success in song sparrows when combined with low predator pressure than when predation and food supply were manipulated independently. A final mechanism by which feeding may reduce predation rates is by provisioning the predators themselves; for example, provisioning breeding hen harriers (*Circus cyaneus*, a raptor found in northern parts of Eurasia and North America) at the nest substantially reduced the number of red grouse (*Lagopus lagopus scoticus*) chicks delivered by harrier adults to feed their chicks (Redpath et al. 2001; Figure 3).

Feeding also has the potential to initiate trophic cascades, affecting the distribution and abundance of both prey and predator species. Increasing the number of birds around feeders can lead to hyperpredation of natural prey items in the immediate area (Martinson and Flaspohler 2003). Cascades driven by food provisioning could have serious consequences for some species. However, there have been very few studies on this phenomenon, probably because detecting and identifying cascading effects is notoriously difficult (Borer et al. 2005).

### Conclusions

The popularity of backyard bird feeding is a relatively new phenomenon, but one that has increased markedly over the past three decades. Householders in the US and the UK purchase 500,000 tonnes of birdseed annually (O’Leary and Jones 2006) – enough to support almost...
300 million chickadees feeding on nothing else per year (calculated from daily energy expenditures, based on data in Nagy et al. 1999). This growing market is worth an estimated US$4.5 billion in the US (Fair 2006) and £150–180 million in the UK (Toms 2003). Feeders allow an increasingly urbanized population to “get up close” to nature and, by doing so, may inspire more interest in conservation issues. Irrespective of their ecological impacts, feeders have enormous educational and social value (Cohn 2002).

Assessing the ecological impacts remains a formidable challenge. Until now, much of the research in this area has focused on assessing the impact of supplementation as a single factor. However, interactions between food supply and additional factors, such as predation or weather, will help to explain the variable conclusions among the studies we reviewed. Such work may also help us to understand how bird populations might respond to environmental change.

While the consequences of interactions between food and weather as winter weather conditions shift with climate change may be revealed by well-designed feeding experiments, the importance and impact of anthropogenic interventions in food supply will also shift.

Experimentation with feeding remains problematic for several reasons. First, natural food is not always limiting, and so, in a mild winter, the addition of extra food may not make any difference to the targeted beneficiaries. Temporal variations of this nature do not diminish the importance of supplements: even if supplementation has an effect only once every few years, it may still exert a substantial influence on the demographics of a population. This highlights the importance of running experiments over multiple years in varying natural conditions. The effects of provisioning clearly differ according to the temporal and spatial scale of treatments and evidence of carryover effects also indicates the merits of long-running, multi-seasonal observations at multiple sites.

While failure to publish non-significant results may create bias in reporting effects of supplementary feeding, the impacts at a population level are usually positive (Figure 4). Assessing individual variation in resource use and the extent to which supplements are used by individual birds may add considerable statistical noise to feeding treatments. If some individuals are relying heavily on supplemental food and benefiting, while others are consuming only a small amount and gaining little benefit, there may be variation in the impacts on the population that can be explained only through knowledge of individual resource use. One possible solution is to calculate the proportion of supplementary food in the diet of individuals using stable isotope analysis (Davis et al. 2005). Many of the foodstuffs that are fed to garden birds are likely to have stable isotope signatures that are distinct from “natural” foods. If supplements are not distinct, then there is also the option of using isotopic labels, which would make it possible to trace the uptake of even very small amounts of supplemental food.

Domestic bird feeding is widely perceived as a positive activity and is likely to benefit many species, including some of conservation concern, but we still have only a relatively basic understanding of how it affects bird populations. There are clearly a number of negative impacts that feeding may have, such as the creation of feeder-dependent birds and/or...
ecological traps, the spread of disease, or exposure to increased predation rates. Some of these concerns may be mitigated by following one of the many “good practice” feeding guidelines currently available (e.g., Project Feeder Watch 2007), but such advice is usually based on very few scientific studies. Small-scale supplementary feeding experiments give us some indication of the impacts that may result from widespread backyard feeding. But what is really needed are more large-scale, diffuse provisioning experiments that mimic more closely the manner in which households feed birds. While the available evidence supports the substantial and broadly positive role of feeding birds in avian conservation and increased public awareness of wildlife, assessing the wider impacts of supplementary feeding by well-meaning and big-spending households merits a considerable research effort from ecologists.
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