

Biodiversity and Conservation

Are changes in breeding habitat responsible for population declines of the characteristic long-distance migrant birds of upland oakwoods?

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Full Title:	Are changes in breeding habitat responsible for population declines of the characteristic long-distance migrant birds of upland oakwoods?
Article Type:	Original Research
Keywords:	Repeat Woodland Bird Survey; Phylloscopus sibilatrix; Anthus trivialis; Ficedula hypoleuca; Phoenicurus phoenicurus; Afro-Palearctic migrants
Corresponding Author:	Paul Bellamy Royal Society for the Protection of Birds Sandy, Bedfordshire UNITED KINGDOM
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	John Mallord
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	John Mallord Ken Smith Paul Bellamy Elisabeth Charman Richard Gregory
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Abstract:	<p>Abstract</p> <p>Recent population declines have highlighted the problems faced by long-distance migrant birds, although the causes of such declines are unknown for most species. One such possible driver is habitat degradation on the breeding grounds and in this paper we have investigated whether change in woodland structure is associated with the UK population declines of four Afro-Palearctic migrants: Wood Warbler <i>Phylloscopus sibilatrix</i>, Tree Pipit <i>Anthus trivialis</i>, Pied Flycatcher <i>Ficedula hypoleuca</i>, and Common Redstart <i>Phoenicurus phoenicurus</i>, in one of their core breeding habitats, the upland oakwoods of western and northern Britain. Using data collected during a nationwide survey of woodland bird population and habitat changes, we report that all four species underwent population declines between 1982/84 and 2003/04: Wood Warbler, -37%, Tree Pipit, -56%, Pied Flycatcher, -9%, and Common Redstart, -32%. Over the same time period, there were also small but significant increases in ground cover and a 112%, 181% and 828% increase in understorey cover at 0.5-2m, 2-4m, and 4-10m, respectively, which could impact upon habitat suitability for these birds. However, we demonstrate that such changes in habitat were not adequate to explain the change in the number of birds, nor that the modelled effects of changes in habitat on bird numbers were consistent with overall population trends. Despite there being no evidence that change in habitat is driving population declines, it remains important to maintain habitat suitability of woodland within the core of these species' range, as further degradation may result in the greater loss of birds. Future work on these species, along with other long-distance migrants, should focus across the whole of the migratory flyway, elucidating the needs of these species on their breeding, stopover and wintering sites.</p>
Suggested Reviewers:	Catrina Morrison

	British Trust for Ornithology catriona.morrison@bto.org
	Marc-Andre Villard University of Moncton marc-andre.villard@umoncton.ca
	Shelley Hinsley Centre for Ecology and Hydrology sahi@ceh.ac.uk
	Mark Wilson University College Cork mark.wilson@ucc.ie

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **Are changes in breeding habitat responsible for population declines**
2 **of the characteristic long-distance migrant birds of upland**
3 **oakwoods?**

4 John W. Mallord, Ken W. Smith, Paul E. Bellamy, Elisabeth C. Charman and Richard D.
5 Gregory.

6
7 Conservation Science, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, The Lodge, Sandy,
8 Bedfordshire, SG19 2DL, UK

9
10 Short Title: Breeding habitat change and long-distance migrants

11 Keywords: Repeat Woodland Bird Survey; *Phylloscopus sibilatrix*; *Anthus trivialis*; *Ficedula*
12 *hypoleuca*; *Phoenicurus phoenicurus*; Afro-Palearctic migrants.

13 Corresponding author: john.mallord@rspb.org.uk

1
2
3
4 **1 Abstract**

5
6 2 Recent population declines have highlighted the problems faced by long-distance migrant birds,
7
8 3 although the causes of such declines are unknown for most species. One such possible driver is
9
10 4 habitat degradation on the breeding grounds and in this paper we have investigated whether
11
12 5 change in woodland structure is associated with the UK population declines of four Afro-
13
14 6 Palearctic migrants: Wood Warbler *Phylloscopus sibilatrix*, Tree Pipit *Anthus trivialis*, Pied
15
16 7 Flycatcher *Ficedula hypoleuca*, and Common Redstart *Phoenicurus phoenicurus*, in one of their
17
18 8 core breeding habitats, the upland oakwoods of western and northern Britain. Using data
19
20 9 collected during a nationwide survey of woodland bird population and habitat changes, we
21
22 10 report that all four species underwent population declines between 1982/84 and 2003/04: Wood
23
24 11 Warbler, -37%, Tree Pipit, -56%, Pied Flycatcher, -9%, and Common Redstart, -32%. Over the
25
26 12 same time period, there were also small but significant increases in ground cover and a 112%,
27
28 13 181% and 828% increase in understorey cover at 0.5-2m, 2-4m, and 4-10m, respectively, which
29
30 14 could impact upon habitat suitability for these birds. However, we demonstrate that such
31
32 15 changes in habitat were not adequate to explain the change in the number of birds, nor that the
33
34 16 modelled effects of changes in habitat on bird numbers were consistent with overall population
35
36 17 trends. Despite there being no evidence that change in habitat is driving population declines, it
37
38 18 remains important to maintain habitat suitability of woodland within the core of these species'
39
40 19 range, as further degradation may result in the greater loss of birds. Future work on these
41
42 20 species, along with other long-distance migrants, should focus across the whole of the migratory
43
44 21 flyway, elucidating the needs of these species on their breeding, stopover and wintering sites.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **Introduction**

2 Anthropogenic alteration of habitats globally has lead to the beginning of what has been termed
3 the 'sixth great extinction' (Wilson 1992), and widespread population declines of many taxa, at
4 various scales, have been reported (Ceballos & Ehrlich 2002; Thomas *et al.* 2004; Conrad *et al.*
5 2006). In recent decades it has emerged that populations of long-distance migrant land birds
6 may be under particular threat having declined more rapidly than either resident or short-
7 distance migrant species (Robbins *et al.* 1989; Sanderson *et al.* 2006, Vickery *et al.* in press).
8 The causes of decline are unknown for most species, but could involve factors operating in
9 different habitats on a trans-continental scale (Newton 2008; Sheehan & Sanderson 2012,
10 Vickery *et al.* in press). These include phenological mismatch between predator and prey (Both
11 *et al.* 2006; Möller *et al.* 2008), nest predation (Thompson 2007), reduced availability of
12 invertebrate food (Krebs *et al.* 1999) and a reduction in habitat quality at wintering, stopover and
13 breeding sites (Holt *et al.* 2010; Peach *et al.* 1991; Ockendon *et al.* 2012).

14 Although in UK and elsewhere in Europe there have been significant population declines of bird
15 species associated with farmland (Donald *et al.* 2001; Wilson *et al.* 2009), it has more recently
16 become apparent that in UK in particular similar declines have been occurring in woodland
17 habitats (Hewson *et al.* 2007), especially of long-distance migrants (Gregory *et al.* 2007;
18 Hewson & Noble 2009). Unlike farmland, where many of the declines can be attributed to a
19 single, albeit multi-faceted cause, agricultural intensification (Wilson *et al.* 2009), the causes of
20 woodland bird declines may be diverse and are largely unknown (Fuller *et al.* 2005). As part of a
21 wider investigation into the declines of woodland birds, the Royal Society for the Protection of
22 Birds (RSPB)/British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) Repeat Woodland Bird Survey (RWBS; Amar
23 *et al.* 2006; Hewson *et al.* 2007) measured changes in breeding bird numbers in a large sample
24 of broadleaved woods across Great Britain between 1982/84 and 2003/04. A total of 406 woods
25 were included in the survey and comparable habitat data were collected in both periods from

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 249 of these in order to relate changes in bird numbers to changes in habitat. From these data,
2 it was clear that there have been major changes in woodland structure since the 1980s (Amar *et*
3 *al.* 2010), including an increase in sub-canopy cover above 2m across all geographical regions.
4 However, other changes showed regional variation. In the south and east of England there were
5 reductions in both field-layer and understorey cover below 2m, possibly due to browsing by
6 increasing populations of deer (Dolman *et al.* 2010). Meanwhile, in woods in western and
7 northern regions, such cover increased (Amar *et al.* 2010), possibly as a result of a reduction in
8 grazing pressure from sheep (Hopkins & Kirby 2007).

9 Upland oakwoods, also referred to as Western Atlantic Oakwoods in the UK, are limited in their
10 distribution to the western fringes of Europe, being found in northern Iberia, France, Ireland and
11 the British Isles, and within the latter mainly in the western counties of England, Wales and
12 north-west Scotland (Baarda 2005). They are woods dominated by Oak *Quercus* (mainly *Q.*
13 *petraea* in the UK), with a temperate, wet maritime climate and an open structure maintained by
14 sheep grazing (Quelch 2005), and are noted for their bryophyte and lichen communities
15 (Rothero 2005). In Britain, they support a specialised breeding bird community including a suite
16 of four long-distance migrants, Wood Warbler *Phylloscopus sibilatrix*, Tree Pipit *Anthus trivialis*,
17 Pied Flycatcher *Ficedula hypoleuca* and Common Redstart *Phoenicurus phoenicurus* (hereafter
18 Redstart), which are less common or absent in other woodland habitats or regions (Fuller 1992).
19 All these species favour an open woodland structure (Cramp & Simmons 1983; Stowe 1987;
20 Smart *et al.* 2007; Mallord *et al.* 2012b), so could be negatively affected by the changes in
21 woodland structure reported since the 1980s (Amar *et al.* 2010). The land-use and land
22 management of the UK uplands is strongly influenced by agricultural and forestry policies, which
23 impact on all upland habitats, and have lead to difficulties in managing upland oak woods for
24 biodiversity (Mitchell and Kirby 1990, Reed *et al.* 2009).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The UK breeding populations of two of these four species have been in decline in recent years
2 with national declines between 1995-2010 of 65% for Wood Warbler and 50% for Pied
3 Flycatcher. Over the same period, Tree Pipit (-5%) and Redstart (+19%) populations have been
4 relatively stable, although both species were previously more abundant and underwent steep
5 declines in during the 1970's and 1980's (Baillie *et al.* 2012; Eaton *et al* 2012). As these
6 declines have occurred over a similar period to changes in woodland structure, the possibility
7 arises that such changes in habitat may be driving the population declines of these four bird
8 species. Our aims in this paper are to use RWBS data to i) calculate population change of these
9 four migrant species in one of their priority habitats, ii) measure changes in woodland structure,
10 iii) define habitat associations of each species, and iv) assess whether the change in habitat is
11 likely to have driven the observed population changes.

12

13 **Methods**

14 *Study sites*

15 As part of the RWBS (Amar *et al.* 2006; Hewson *et al.* 2007) a total of 406 woodland sites were
16 surveyed in 2003/4, repeating surveys in the same plots first carried out in the 1980s and
17 earlier. Although the RWBS was UK-wide, for the purposes of this study, we have focussed on
18 oakwoods within those regions that fall within the range of Western Atlantic Oakwoods (Figure
19 1). We have selected woods in these regions dominated by Oak *Quercus* sp. and supporting at
20 least one of the target species. This resulted in a total of 125 woodlands although the number
21 varied between species (Table 1).

22

23 *Bird abundance*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Estimates of bird abundance were obtained using point counts of five minutes' duration, and
2 carried out twice in each period (April / early May and late May / early June). There were usually
3 10 points per wood, but this varied according to the size of the wood, especially in the first
4 period (mean \pm SE, range; 1980s, 10.4 ± 0.2 , 5-20; 2000s, 9.7 ± 0.1 , 4-10). There was a
5 minimum of 100m between points, and none were within 50m of the edge of a wood. The
6 maximum count across the two visits (and across the two years if a site was surveyed in both)
7 was taken as the abundance estimate for each species (Hewson *et al.* 2007).

8
9 *Habitat surveys*

10 We used a restricted set of habitat variables which were measured using comparable methods
11 in both the 1980s and 2003/4. Habitat measurements were taken from 25m-radius circular plots
12 centred on each point used for bird counts. Measurements were taken at one of two scales,
13 either at the plot centre or in 5m radius sub-plots centred 12.5m from the main plot centre in
14 each of the four cardinal directions. Estimates were made of the percentage cover of field layer
15 vegetation (and bare ground); percentage cover of canopy at 0.5-2m, 2-4m, 4-10m and above
16 10m; and the number of standing trees, living and dead, and dead limbs on live trees. Those
17 variables measured in both periods, along with a description of how the data were collected, can
18 be found in Table 2. All habitat surveys were carried out between mid-May and mid-June in both
19 periods, when shrub and canopy foliage was fully developed (Amar *et al.* 2006). In one region,
20 the Forest of Dean, in the first period, field-layer vegetation was measured on a 0-5 scale; to
21 enable a more complete analysis, these values were converted to their corresponding
22 percentages: 0 = absent, 1 = <1%, 2 = 1-10%, 3 = 11-49%, 4 = 50-79%, 5 = 80-100%, taking
23 the mid-point value for each category. Additionally, in the first period, standing dead trees were
24 recorded only as being present or absent, therefore counts from the second period were also

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 converted to either '0' (absent) or '1' (present) at each point when modelling the change in bird
2 numbers as a function of change in habitat. Mean wood-scale values were calculated for all
3 habitat variables.

4 All variables included in our analyses are ecologically relevant to the species of concern (e.g.
5 Cramp *et al.* 1983; Stowe 1987; Smart *et al.* 2007; Mallord *et al.* 2012b), although one variable,
6 the presence / absence of dead trees has only been included in models for Pied Flycatcher and
7 Redstart as dead trees have the potential to provide nest cavities for these two species.
8 Although many of the habitat variables were interrelated, correlations were not strong (all $r <$
9 0.5), except for cover at 0.5-2m and 2-4m ($r = 0.56$) and 2-4m and 4-10m ($r = 0.53$). Therefore,
10 as habitat structure and composition at different layers within the woodland are likely to be
11 important for the four bird species, all variables were included in our models.

12
13 **Statistical analysis**

14 *Changes in bird population and woodland structure between survey periods*

15 The change in the number of birds between the two time periods was modelled within a
16 generalised linear mixed model framework (PROC GLIMMIX in SAS 9.2), with bird abundance
17 in each period as the response variable, and 'period', 'region' and a 'period x region' interaction
18 as predictors, the last to test whether there was regional variation in population trends. As
19 counts were made at the same sites in two different periods, 'site' was included as a random
20 effect. Models had a Poisson error structure with log link function, the log of the number of
21 points was included as an offset and the degrees of freedom were estimated using the
22 Satterthwaite approximation. Changes in counts between survey periods within each region and
23 their statistical significance from zero change were derived from the 'lsmeans' function in SAS.
24 After square root arcsine transforming percentage cover variables, the change in cover of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 habitat variables between the two periods was modelled as for the change in bird numbers,
2 except with a normal error structure.

3

4 *Species habitat associations*

5 We investigated habitat associations of each of the four species by modelling bird abundance
6 from 2003/04 against habitat variables in that period. To maintain consistency between the
7 habitat association and population change models, only those variables measured in both
8 periods were included in the analyses. These variables were the field-layer cover of Bramble
9 *Rubus fruticosus*, Bracken *Pteridium aquilinum*, and other herbaceous species, understorey
10 cover at 0.5-2m, 2-4 and 4-10m, the presence / absence of standing dead trees, and tree
11 canopy cover (Table 2). 'Region' (a six-level factor, AR (Argyll), DS (Devon & Somerset), FD
12 (Forest of Dean), GW (Gwynedd), PO (Powys) and WM (the Welsh Marches)) was retained as
13 a fixed effect to allow for regional variation. All habitat variables, along with their quadratic
14 terms, were entered together, before stepwise removal of the least significant until all remaining
15 variables were significant at $P < 0.05$. All non-significant variables were re-entered to check for
16 their lack of effect. Modelling was carried out in PROC GENMOD in SAS 9.2 (SAS Institute Inc
17 2002-08), with a Poisson error structure and log link function; the natural log of the number of
18 points was included as an offset, so effectively the number of birds per point was being
19 modelled.

20

21 *Impact of habitat quality and habitat change on bird population changes*

22 To the model of bird population change, measures of habitat in 1982-84, plus their quadratic
23 effects, and the change in habitat (habitat values from 1982-84 subtracted from 2003/04) were

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 entered, before stepwise removal as described above. Given that there is evidence for regional
2 variation in both bird population trends (Amar *et al.* 2005) and changes in habitat (Amar *et al.*
3 2010), interactions between each habitat variable and 'region' were also included. As canopy
4 cover was not retained in any species' habitat association model, and was not measured on all
5 sites in 1982-84, we did not include it in models of population change.

6
7 **Results**

8 *Changes in bird populations and woodland structure between survey periods*

9 Populations of all four species declined within the study woods from 1982-84 to 2003-04, all
10 significantly except Pied Flycatcher; however, there was much regional variation in both the
11 direction and extent of the trends for each species (Table 3). The cover of all habitat variables
12 increased between the two time periods, except for a reduction in canopy cover and no change
13 in the cover of herbaceous species or the presence of dead trees (Table 4). All variables
14 showed regional variation in the extent to which they have changed since the 1980s.

15
16 *Species habitat associations*

17 All habitat variables except canopy cover were included in at least one of the habitat association
18 models (Table 5). The abundance of Wood Warblers in 2003/04 was associated with
19 intermediate levels of understorey cover at 0.5-2m (optimum estimated from model, 17.2%
20 cover) and with lower cover of Bramble and other herbaceous species. Tree Pipit abundance
21 was associated with intermediate understorey cover at 4-10m (optimum, 56%), lower cover of
22 Bramble and understorey cover at 2-4m, and greater cover of Bracken. Pied Flycatcher
23 abundance was positively associated with the presence of dead trees. Redstart abundance was

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 positively associated with the cover of Bracken, understorey at 0.5-2m and the presence of
2 dead trees.

3

4 *Impact of habitat quality and habitat change on bird population changes*

5 In addition to largely significant effects of survey period, region and their interaction, all seven
6 habitat variables were included in at least one model of population change (Table 6), and the
7 change in abundance of all four species was associated with both habitat in 1982/4, and the
8 change in habitat between 1982/4 and 2003/4. The change in Wood Warbler abundance was
9 negatively associated with the cover of herbaceous species and understorey cover at 0.5-2 m
10 and 4-10m, and with intermediate Bramble cover and understorey cover at 2-4m in 1982/4.
11 Additionally, there were regional interactions with the change in Bramble cover and understorey
12 cover at 0.5-2m (Fig 2a) and a negative association with the change in herbaceous cover (Fig
13 3a). The change in Tree Pipit abundance was negatively associated with the cover of Bramble,
14 herbaceous species and understorey at 0.5-2m, and with intermediate Bracken cover, in
15 1982/4, as well as positively with the change in Bracken cover (Fig 3b). The change in Pied
16 Flycatcher abundance was negatively associated with Bramble and understorey cover at 2-4m,
17 and positively with Bracken cover in 1982/4. There were regional interactions with the change in
18 understorey cover at 0.5-2m and the presence of dead trees (Fig 3c). The change in Redstart
19 abundance was positively associated with the cover of Bracken and negatively with understorey
20 cover at 4-10m in 1982/4. There were regional interactions with the change in Bracken cover
21 and understorey cover at 2-4m (Fig 3d).

22

23 **Discussion**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 We have shown that all four species have declined since the 1980s, significantly so except for
2 Pied Flycatcher, although the overall trend of this species was strongly influenced by the data
3 from one region (Devon and Somerset) in which there had been a large increase, possibly due
4 to the provision of nest boxes (Marchant *et al.* 1990; Burgess & Barrimore 2012). We have also
5 provided evidence of significant changes in vegetation cover and structure within these oak
6 woods over the same period.

7 However, there is little evidence that change in habitat has driven the observed bird population
8 declines. Our approach in this study has been, first, to determine which habitat features are
9 favoured by the four migrant species characteristic of upland oak woods in the UK, and
10 secondly to test whether changes in such habitat since the 1980s is related to changes in
11 abundance of each bird species. For each of the species, there was a degree of consistency
12 between the models with at least one habitat variable retained in habitat association models
13 also retained in the change models. Some habitat variables were retained in the latter only, but
14 as they were not associated with abundance were unlikely to be driving population change.

15 The consistency between the habitat association models and the effects of habitat on the trend
16 in bird numbers suggests that we have identified key habitat features for these species. That the
17 change in bird numbers between the two periods was related to habitat measured in 1982/4
18 may be due to birds responding to population declines by redistributing to the most suitable
19 habitat (i.e. density-dependent habitat selection; Fretwell & Lucas 1970). Given the long-
20 distance movements that they undertake, migrants may be especially able to track habitat
21 suitability, and respond to reduced interspecific competition by settling in more favourable areas
22 (Fuller *et al.* 2007). All four species have shown a contraction of their ranges, with populations
23 most stable in western Britain (Balmer *et al.* 2013), although Pied Flycatcher has always had a
24 predominantly western distribution (Hollaway 1996)). However, our results indicate that there

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 have also been significant declines within this core range, although this does not preclude
2 redistribution based on fine-scale variation in habitat quality (Chamberlain & Fuller 1999).
3 Based on existing knowledge of the habitat preferences of the four bird species (Cramp &
4 Simmons 1983; Stowe 1987; Smart *et al.* 2007; Martinez *et al.* 2010; Mallord *et al.* 2012b), the
5 change in habitat observed in this study, i.e. increases in the cover of all but one variable
6 (canopy cover) between 1982/4 and 2003/4, could be predicted to have a negative impact on
7 these species' population trends. Indeed, there were significant relationships between the
8 changes in abundance of all species with the change in at least one habitat variable (Table 6).
9 However, this does not prove there is a causative link between the two, and additional questions
10 can be asked to assess the likelihood that habitat change has driven the population declines of
11 these species. Firstly, by comparing the magnitude of change in habitat to predicted optimal
12 habitat from our habitat association models (Table 5), we can assess whether the change is
13 sufficient to explain the observed bird population trends. Although statistically significant, the
14 mean increase in Bramble and herbaceous cover (9.5-12.8% and 14-16.6% respectively) is
15 unlikely to be large enough to explain the decline of Wood Warblers, the only species to show a
16 negative association with these habitat types. The negative relationship with herbaceous cover
17 is due to particularly large increases in cover on a relatively small number of sites (Fig. 3a).
18 Larger increases were observed for the cover of Bracken (11.1-22.1%), but this should have
19 been beneficial for Tree Pipit and Redstart, both of which showed positive relationships with
20 cover, and may reflect selection of preferred nest-sites (Burton 2007, 2009) or foraging areas
21 (Martinez *et al.* 2010), respectively. However, the direction of population change for Tree Pipit
22 was still largely negative for sites with increasing habitat suitability (Fig 3b). From the parameter
23 estimates in Table 5, the optimum value of understorey cover at 0.5-2m for Wood Warblers was
24 predicted to be ca.17%, while cover at 4-10m for Tree Pipits was 56%. Table 4 shows that
25 mean understorey cover at 0.5-2m has increased from 9.3% in the 1982/3 to 19.7% in 2003/4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 and cover at 4-10m from 4.6% to 38.1%. Therefore, although there were very large increases in
2 understorey cover, the current mean values are similar to optimal levels for each species. In
3 fact, larger values for optimal habitat have been previously estimated for Wood Warbler (Mallord
4 *et al.* 2012b), supporting our contention that such changes in habitat are unlikely to have a
5 negative impact. It is likely that habitats are recovering from overgrazing, which in the past lead
6 to impoverished understorey and reduced tree regeneration (Mitchell and Kirby 1990).

7 Secondly, is the regional variation in the predicted effects of change in several of the habitat
8 variables consistent with the regional population trends reported in Table 3? If habitat change
9 were driving the declines of bird populations, we would expect a positive correlation between
10 the estimated effects from our change models and the observed change in bird abundance
11 (Table 3). However, this was only the case for the effect of understorey cover at 0.5-2m on
12 Wood Warbler abundance, whereas the relationships of the other species/habitat combinations
13 were either non-existent or negative (Fig 2). Although the one positive correlation is suggestive,
14 we have already discussed (see previous paragraph) that the increase in understorey cover
15 since the 1980s is unlikely to have been sufficient to have a negative impact on Wood Warbler
16 abundance. What these figures suggest is that, within declining populations, on sites where
17 habitat quality improved, trends in the number of birds were more positive / less negative. Along
18 with the significant effect of habitat measured in the 1980s, this could be explained by birds
19 redistributing into the best quality habitat in response to population declines, rather than there
20 being a causative role for habitat change (Fuller *et al.* 2007).

21 We should also bear in mind that in these analysis we have only been able to use a limited set
22 of habitat variables measured in a consistent way in the two survey periods. Not only were
23 these measured in a relatively crude way but they are also very limited in their scope focussing
24 mainly on simple structural variables. Woodland habitats are notoriously difficult to measure in a

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 quantitative and ecologically meaningful way. Our variables are ones that are likely to be
2 important for these birds as shown by other studies and, although we think it unlikely, we cannot
3 rule out the possibility that there are subtle changes to the habitat that are important for the
4 birds that we have not detected.

5 In the UK where these species are at the edge of their range, upland oak woods and the regions
6 in which they are found, constitute the core breeding range of each of these species, with the
7 exception of Tree Pipit (Gibbons *et al.* 1993), and their densities are substantially higher here
8 than found in other habitats and regions (Bibby 1989; Bibby *et al.* 1989; Fuller 1992; Fuller &
9 Crick 1992). Despite the lack of evidence linking habitat and population change, further habitat
10 changes could result in the loss of birds from woods. Concern has been expressed over the
11 increase in the number of sheep in upland regions of the UK (Fuller & Gough 1999), including
12 upland oak woods (Palmer *et al.* 2004). However, in recent decades sheep grazing in many of
13 these woods has declined as a result of conservation efforts to ensure adequate natural
14 regeneration, and this has led to an increase in cover of palatable species such as Bramble,
15 and greater sapling regeneration, resulting in increased sub-canopy cover (Hopkins & Kirby
16 2007). Thus, the reduction in overgrazing by sheep has potentially improved breeding habitat for
17 some of these species, but populations have continued to decline. Further reductions in sheep
18 grazing are likely to be detrimental to this specialised bird community (Bibby *et al.* 1989; Mallord
19 *et al.* 2012b), as well as to other taxa for which this habitat is renowned (Rothero 2005), and the
20 regeneration of the oak woodland itself (Mitchell & Kirby 1990). Therefore, there is a need from
21 a conservation standpoint, as well as a legal obligation (Maddock 2008; JNCC 2012), to
22 maintain the suitability of upland oak woods for these four species and prevent further
23 degradation of the habitat.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 We have shown that the magnitude of the changes in habitat may not have been sufficient to
2 drive the observed population declines, and may even have been beneficial, and that the
3 modelled effects on bird numbers were not consistent with the overall population trends. So
4 what else could account for the decline of all four species? On the breeding grounds, predation
5 is the main cause of failure of nests (Ricklefs 1969), but there was no evidence that predation
6 rates had changed in a Wood Warbler population in the UK between the 1980s and 2000s
7 (Mallord *et al.* 2012a). Resource asynchrony due to differential shifts in phenology of predator
8 and prey has been related to the decline of Pied Flycatcher populations in the Netherlands
9 (Both *et al.* 2006), but the effects have been shown to vary according to habitat (Burger *et al.*
10 2012). Greater flexibility in the diet of Wood Warblers (Maziarz & Wesołowski 2010; Mallord *et al.*
11 *in press*) suggests this species may be at less risk of such phenological mismatch. Of
12 course, all four species are long-distance migrants wintering in sub-Saharan Africa; all, except
13 Redstart, winter in the humid zone, and all utilise wooded habitats, which have both been
14 correlated with negative population trends (Ockendon *et al.* 2012). This may implicate land-use
15 change in West Africa in the declines (Morel & Morel 1992) but more data on their ecology there
16 is urgently needed. Future work on this suite of species, as with other long-distance migrants,
17 must incorporate information from all periods of the annual cycle, at breeding, stopover and
18 wintering sites (Sheehan & Sanderson 2012).

19

20 **Acknowledgements**

21 We would like to thank the hundreds of landowners who allowed access to their woodland, and
22 the numerous volunteers who carried out the survey work. The original RWBS was funded by
23 Forestry Commission England, Scotland and Wales, Natural England, Defra, RSPB, BTO, and
24 the Woodland Trust.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1

2 **References**

3 Amar, A, Smith, K & Lindsell, J (2005) Population Changes of Some Bird Species in Scottish
4 and Welsh Atlantic Oakwoods between the 1980s and 2003/4 Using Data From the Repeat
5 Woodland Bird Survey. *Bot J Scot* 57: 179-185

6 Amar, A, Hewson, CM, Thewlis, RM, Smith, KW, Fuller, RJ, Lindsell, JA, Conway, G, Butler, S
7 & MacDonald, MA (2006) What's Happening to our Woodland Birds? Long-term Changes in the
8 Populations of Woodland Birds. RSPB Research Report No 19, Sandy, Bedfordshire

9 Amar, A, Smith, KW, Butler, S, Linsell, JA, Hewson, CM, Fuller, RJ & Charman, EC (2010)
10 Recent patterns of change in vegetation structure and tree composition of British broadleaved
11 woodland: evidence from large-scale surveys. *Forestry* 83: 345-356

12 Baarda, P (2005) Atlantic Oakwoods in Great Britain: Factors Influencing their Definition,
13 Distribution and Occurrence. *Bot J Scot* 57: 1-20

14 Baillie, SR, Marchant, JH, Leech, DI, Renwick, AR, Eglington, SM, Joys, AC, Noble, DG,
15 Barimore, C, Conway, GJ, Downie, IS, Risely, K & Robinson, RA (2012) Bird Trends 2011. BTO
16 Research Report No 609, BTO, Thetford, <http://www.bto.org/birdtrends>

17 Balmer, D., Gillings, S., Caffrey, B., Swann, B., Downie, I. & Fuller, R. 2013. *Bird Atlas 2007-11.*
18 *The breeding and wintering birds of Britain and Ireland.* BTO, Birdwatch Ireland, Scottish
19 Ornithologists Club, UK.

20 Bibby, CJ (1989) A survey of breeding wood warblers *Phylloscopus sibilatrix* in Britain, 1984-85.
21 *Bird Study* 36: 56-72

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Bibby, CJ, Bain, CG & Burges, DJ (1989) Bird communities of highland birchwoods. *Bird Study*
2 36: 123-133

3 Both, C, Bouwhuis, S, Lessells, CM & Visser, ME (2006) Climate change and population
4 declines in a long-distance migratory bird. *Nature* 441: 81-83

5 Burger, C, Belskii, E, Eeva, T, Laaksonen, T, Mägi, M, Mänd, R, Qvarnström, A, Slagsvold, T,
6 Veen, T, Visser, ME, Wiebe, KL, Wiley, C, Wright, J & Both, C (2012) Climate change, breeding
7 date and nestling diet: how temperature differentially affects seasonal changes in pied flycatcher
8 diet depending on habitat variation. *J Anim Ecol* 81: 926-936.

9 Burgess, M & Barrimore, C (2012) The Southwest pied flycatcher monitoring network. *Devon*
10 *Birds* 65: 3-9

11 Burton, NHK (2007) Influences of restock age and habitat patchiness on Tree pipits *Anthus*
12 *trivialis* breeding in Breckland pine plantations. *Ibis* 149: 193-204

13 Burton, NHK (2009) Reproductive success of Tree Pipits *Anthus trivialis* in relation to habitat
14 selection in conifer plantations. *Ibis* 151: 361-372.

15 Ceballos, G & Ehrlich, PR (2002) Mammal Population Losses and the Extinction Crisis. *Science*
16 296: 904-907

17 Chamberlain, DE & Fuller, RJ (1999) Density-dependent habitat distribution in birds: issues of
18 scale, habitat definition and habitat availability. *J Avian Biol* 30: 427-436

19 Conrad, KF, Warren, MS, Fox, R, Parsons, MS & Woiwod, IP (2006) Rapid declines of
20 common, widespread British moths provide evidence of an insect biodiversity crisis. *Biol Cons*
21 132: 279-291

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Cramp, S & Simmons, KEL (1983) Handbook of the Birds of Europe, the Middle East and North
2 Africa. Oxford University Press, Oxford

3 Donald, PF, Green, RE & Heath, MF (2001) Agricultural intensification and the collapse of
4 Europe's farmland bird populations. Proc R Soc Lond B 268: 25-29.

5 Dolman, P, Fuller, R, Gill, R, Hooton, D & Tabor, R (2010) Escalating ecological impacts of deer
6 in lowland woodland. Br Wildl 21: 242-254

7 Eaton, MA, Cuthbert, R, Dunn, E, Grice, PV, Hall, C, Hayhow, DB, Hearn, RD, Holt, CA, Knipe,
8 A, Marchant, JH, Mavor, R, Moran, NJ, Mukhida, F, Musgrove, AJ, Noble, DG, Opper, S, Risely,
9 K, Stroud, DA, Toms, M & Wotton, S (2012) *The state of the UK's birds 2012*. RSPB, BTO,
10 WWT, CCW, NE, NIEA, SNH and JNCC. Sandy, Bedfordshire, UK.

11 Fretwell, SD & Lucas, HL (1970) On territorial behaviour and other factors influencing habitat
12 distribution in birds. Acta Biotheor 19: 16-36

13 Fuller, RJ (1992) Bird Habitats in Britain. T & AD Poyser

14 Fuller, RJ (2000) Relationships between recent changes in lowland agriculture and farmland
15 bird populations: an overview. In Aebischer, NJ, Evans, AD, Grice, PV & Vickery, JA (eds),
16 Ecology and Conservation of Lowland Farmland Birds, BOU, Tring

17 Fuller RJ & Crick, HQP (1992) Broad-scale patterns in geographical and habitat distribution of
18 migrant and resident passerines in Britain and Ireland. Ibis 134 (Suppl 1) 14-20

19 Fuller, RJ & Gough, SJ (1999) Changes in sheep numbers in Britain: implications for bird
20 populations. Biol Cons 91: 73-89

- 1
2
3
4 1 Fuller, RJ, Noble, DG, Smith, KW, Vanhinsbergh, D (2005) Recent declines in populations of
5
6 2 woodland birds in Britain: a review of possible causes. Br Birds 98: 116-143
7
8
9
10 3 Fuller, RJ, Gaston, KJ & Quine, CP (2007) Living on the edge: British and Irish woodland birds
11
12 4 in a European context. Ibis 149 (Suppl 2): 53-63
13
14
15 5 Gregory, RD, Vorisek, P, van Strien, A, Gmelig Meyling, AW, Jiguet, F, Fornasari, L, Reif, J,
16
17 6 Chylarecki, P & Burfield, I (2007) Population trends of widespread woodland birds in Europe.
18
19 7 Ibis 149 (Suppl 2): 78-97
20
21
22
23 8 Hewson, CM & Noble, DG (2009) Population trends of breeding birds in British woodlands over
24
25 9 a 32-year period: relationships with food, habitat use and migratory behaviour. Ibis 151: 464-486
26
27
28
29 10 Hewson, CM, Amar, A, Linsell, JA, Thewlis, RM, Butler, S, Smith, K & Fuller, RJ (2007) Recent
30
31 11 changes in bird populations in British broadleaved woodland. Ibis 149 (Suppl 2): 14-28
32
33
34 12 Holloway, S (1996) The Historical Atlas of Breeding Birds in Britain and Ireland: 1875-1900. T &
35
36 13 AD Poyser, London
37
38
39
40 14 Holt, CA, Fuller, RJ & Dolman, PM (2010) Experimental evidence that deer browsing reduces
41
42 15 habitat suitability for breeding Common Nightingales *Luscinia megarhynchos*. Ibis 152: 335-346
43
44
45 16 Hopkins, JJ & Kirby, KJ (2007) Ecological change in British broadleaved woodland since 1947.
46
47 17 Ibis 149 (Suppl 2): 29-40
48
49
50
51 18 JNCC (2012) Old sessile oak woods with *Ilex* and *Blechnum* in the British Isles. Habitat
52
53 19 Accounts: Forests.
54
55 20 <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/protectedsites/sacselection/habitat.asp?FeatureInCode=H91A0>
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Krebs, JR, Wilson, JD, Bradbury, RB & Siriwardena, GM (1999) The second Silent Spring?
2 Nature 400: 611-612

3 Maddock, A (2008) Upland Oakwood. UK Biodiversity Action Plan; Priority Habitat Descriptions,
4 http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/ukbap_baphabitats-63-uplandoakwood.pdf

5 Mallord, JW, Orsman, CJ, Cristinacc, A, Butcher, N, Stowe, TJ & Charman, EC (2012a)
6 Mortality of Wood Warbler *Phylloscopus sibilatrix* nests in Welsh oakwoods: predation rates and
7 the identification of nest predators using miniature nest cameras. Bird Study 59 286-295

8 Mallord, JW, Charman, EC, Cristinacce, A & Orsman, CJ (2012b) Habitat associations of Wood
9 Warblers *Phylloscopus sibilatrix* breeding in Welsh oakwoods. Bird Study 59: 403-415

10 Mallord, JW, Orsman, CJ, Cristinacce, A, Stowe, T, Charman, EC & Gregory, RD (in press) Diet
11 flexibility of a declining long-distance migrant allows it to escape the consequences of
12 phenological mismatch. Ibis

13 Marchant, JH, Hudson, R, Carter, SP & Whittingham, PA (1990) Population trends in British
14 breeding birds. BTO, Tring

15 Martinez, N, Jenni, L, Wyss, E & Zbinden, N (2010) Habitat structure versus food abundance:
16 the importance of sparse vegetation for the common redstart *Phoenicurus phoenicurus*. J Ornithol
17 151: 297-307

18 Maziarz M & Wesolowski, T (2010) Timing of breeding and nestling diet of Wood Warbler
19 *Phylloscopus sibilatrix* in relation to changing food supply. Bird Study 57: 540-552

20 Mitchell, FJG & Kirby, KJ (1990) The impact of large herbivores on the conservation of semi-
21 natural woods in the British uplands. Forestry 63: 333-353

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Möller, AP, Rubolini, D & Lehikoinen, E (2008) Populations of migratory bird species that did not
2 show a phenological response to climate change are declining. Proc Natl Acad Sci 105: 16195-
3 16200

4 Morel, GJ & Morel, M-Y (1992) Habitat use by Palearctic migrant passerine birds in West Africa.
5 Ibis 134 (Suppl 1): 83-88

6 Newton, I (2008) The Migration Ecology of Birds. Academic Press

7 Ockendon, N, Hewson, CM, Johnston, A & Atkinson, PW (2012) Declines in British-breeding
8 populations of Afro-Palearctic migrant birds are linked to bioclimatic wintering zone in Africa,
9 possibly via constraints on arrival time advancement. Bird Study 59: 111-125

10 Palmer, SCF, Mitchell, RJ, Truscott, AM & Welch, D (2004) Regeneration failure in Atlantic
11 oakwoods: the roles of ungulate grazing and invertebrates. For Ecol Manage 192: 251-265

12 Peach, W, Baillie, SR & Underhill, L (1991) Survival of British Sedge Warblers *Acrocephalus*
13 *schoenobaenus* in relation to West African rainfall. Ibis 133: 300-305

14 Quelch, PR (2005) Structure and Utilisation of the Early Oakwoods. Bot J Scot 57: 99-105

15 Reed, M. S., Bonn, A., Slee, W., Beharry-Borg, N., Birch, J., Brown, I., Burt, T. P., Chapman, D.,
16 Chapman, P. J., Clay, G. D., Cornell, S. J., Fraser, E. D. G., Glass, J. H., Holden, J., Hodgson,
17 J. A., Hubacek, K., Irvine, B., Jin, N., Kirkby, M. J., Kunin, W. E., Moore, O., Moseley, D., Prell,
18 C., Price, M. F., Quinn, C. H., Redpath, S., Reid, C., Stagl, S., Stringer, L. C., Termansen, M.,
19 Thorp, S., Towers, W. & Worrall, F. 2009. The future of the uplands. *Land Use Policy*, **26**,
20 **Supplement 1: S204-S216.**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Ricklefs, RE (1969) An analysis of nesting mortality in birds. *Smithson Contrib Zool* 9: 1-48

2 Robbins, CS, Sauer, JR, Greenberg, RS & Droege, S (1989) Population declines in North

3 American birds that migrate to the neotropics. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 86: 7658-7662

4 Rothero, GP (2005) Oceanic Bryophytes in Atlantic Oakwoods. *Bot J Scot* 57: 135-140

5 Sanderson, FJ, Donald, PF, Pain, DJ, Burfield, IJ & van Bommel, FPJ (2006) Long-term

6 population declines in Afro-Palearctic migrant birds. *Biol Cons* 131: 93-105

7 SAS Institute Inc (2002-2008) SAS/STAT Software. Release 9.2. SAS Institute Inc, Cary, North

8 Carolina

9 Sheehan, DK & Sanderson, FJ (2012) Seeing the bigger picture: how anthropogenic landscape

10 modification in Africa affects declining migratory birds and the need for trans-continental

11 research and conservation. *Ibis* 154: 659-662

12 Smart, J, Taylor, E, Amar, A, Smith, K, Bierman, S, Carpenter, J, Grice, P, Currie, F & Hewson,

13 C (2007) *Habitat Associations of Woodland Birds: Implications for Woodland Management for*

14 *Declining Species*. RSPB Research Report, No 26, RSPB, Sandy

15 Stowe, TJ (1987) The habitat requirements of some insectivorous birds and the management of

16 sessile oakwoods. Unpublished PhD thesis, The Botany School, University of Cambridge,

17 Cambridge

18 Thomas, JA, Telfer, MG, Roy, DB, Preston, CD, Greenwood, JJD, Asher, J, Fox, R, Clarke, RT

19 & Lawton, JH (2004) Comparative Losses of British Butterflies, Birds, and Plants and the Global

20 Extinction Crisis. *Science* 303: 1879-1881

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Thompson, FR (2007) Factors affecting nest predation on forest songbirds in North America.
2 Ibis 149 (Suppl 2): 98-109
3 Vickery, JA, Ewing, SR, Smith, KW, Pain, DJ, Bairlein, F, Škorpilová, J & Gregory, RD (in press)
4 The decline of Afro-Palearctic migrants and an assessment of potential causes. Ibis
5 Wilson, EO (1992) The Diversity of Life. Penguin Press, London
6 Wilson, JD, Evans, AD & Grice, PV (2009) *Bird conservation and agriculture: the bird life of*
7 *farmland, grassland and Heathland*. Cambridge University Press, UK.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1 The number of woods in each region used in the study.

Region	Number of woods in sample	Number with Wood Warbler	Number with Tree Pipit	Number with Pied Flycatcher	Number with Redstart
Argyll	13	13	13	0	13
Devon & Somerset	18	18	8	15	16
Forest of Dean	15	14	9	4	5
Gwynedd	25	25	24	25	25
Powys	25	25	25	25	25
Welsh Marches	29	27	23	25	25
Total	125	122	102	94	109

1
2
3
4 1
5
6 2
7
8 3
9
10 4
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 5
34
35 6
36
37 7
38
39 8
40
41 9
42
43 10
44
45 11
46
47 12
48
49 13
50
51 14
52
53 15
54
55 16
56
57 17
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 2 A list of habitat variables measured.

Variable	Level / Units	Description
Field-layer vegetation	Sub-plot / % cover	% cover below 0.5m: Bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> , Bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> and other herbaceous species
Understorey	Plot centre / % cover	% cover as if viewed from above of canopy at height: 0.5-2m, 2-4, 4-10m
Canopy cover	Sub-plot / no.	No. of 2cm squares in 4x4 grid in which at least 50% occupied by canopy >10m height. The grid was held horizontally 60cm above observer's head using a marked stick and plumb line
Dead trees	Plot centre / no.	Number of standing dead trees within 25m-radius plot

Table 3 Estimates of the change in the number of birds of four species in upland oakwoods between 1982/4 and 2003/4 in six UK regions: Argyll (AR), Devon & Somerset (DS), Forest of Dean (FD), Gwynedd (GW), Powys (PO) and the Welsh Marches (WM). Estimates are derived from a generalised linear mixed model containing 'period', 'region' and 'period*region' interaction, with 'site' declared as a random factor, and a Poisson error structure with log link function. Estimates are taken from back-transformed values from the 'lsmeans' function in SAS (SAS Institute 2002-2008). $P < ^+, 0.1; *, 0.05; **, 0.01; ***, 0.001; ****, 0.0001$. Pied Flycatchers were not present within the Argyll (AR) region.

Species	Region						
	AR	DS	FD	GW	PO	WM	All
Wood Warbler	-11	-64****	-61****	-28**	-19*	-12	-37****
Tree Pipit	-6	+52	-76***	-46****	-64****	-89****	-56****
Pied Flycatcher	-	+49**	-26	-9	-15*	-27+	-9
Redstart	-10	-1	-76***	+9	-37****	-28*	-32****

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **Table 4** Changes in the cover of habitat variables between 1983/4 and 2003/4 in upland
 2 oakwoods. N = 125 woods, except for canopy cover which was only recorded in 82 sites in
 3 Period 1. Percentage cover values of field layer vegetation, understorey and canopy cover were
 4 first square root arcsine transformed before testing for effects of period and region. Counts of
 5 dead trees were converted to a presence / absence score (0/1). + denotes an increase in cover
 6 between the two periods, - a decline; $P < *0.05$, $**0.01$, $****0.0001$.

Habitat variable	Period 1 (1983/4)		Period 2 (2003/4)		Period	Region	Period x Region
	Mean	Range	Mean	Range			
Bramble	9.5	0-67.5	12.8	0-66.0	+****	****	****
Bracken	11.1	0-45.5	22.1	0-72.5	+****	****	****
Herb	14.0	0-65.5	16.6	0-82.5	ns	**	****
Cover 0.5-2m	9.3	0-55.0	19.7	0-57.6	+****	****	****
Cover 2-4m	8.5	0-62.0	23.9	2.1-65.8	+****	ns	**
Cover 4-10m	4.6	0-44.0	38.1	2.0-86.5	+****	****	****
Dead trees	0.6	0-1	0.6	0-1	ns	****	**
Canopy cover	71.4	27.8-94.0	65.2	19.5-89.0	-****	****	*

8
9
10
11

Table 5 Final models of habitat associations of Wood Warblers, Tree Pipits, Pied Flycatchers and Redstarts in upland oakwoods. Maximum counts of birds in the second period (2003/4) modelled against habitat variables measured in the same period.

Wood Warbler					Tree Pipit			
Variable	df	est.	χ^2	P	df	est.	χ^2	P
Region	5,112		15.3	0.009	5,91		47.5	<0.0001
Bramble	1,112	-0.0174	6.2	0.013	1,91	-0.038	5.0	0.025
Bracken					1,91	0.013	4.9	0.027
Herb	1,112	-0.0295	18.6	<0.0001				
cov_2	1,112	0.0930	13.1	0.0003				
cov_2 ²	1,112	-0.0027	16.3	<0.0001				
cov_4					1,91	-0.023	5.4	0.02
cov_10					1,91	0.056	6.9	0.009
cov_10 ²					1,91	-0.0005	5.3	0.021
Deadtree								

Pied Flycatcher					Redstart			
Variable	df	est.	χ^2	P	df	est.	χ^2	P
Region	4,88		76.6	<0.0001	5,100		69.8	<0.0001
Bramble								
Bracken					5,100	0.017	10.3	0.001
Herb								
cov_2					5,100	0.019	6.8	0.009
cov_2 ²								
cov_4								
cov_10								
cov_10 ²								
Deadtree	1,88	0.092	4.7	0.03	5,100	0.13	8.8	0.003

Table 6 The effects of habitat quality and habitat change on the change in numbers of Wood Warblers, Tree Pipits, Pied Flycatchers and Redstarts in upland oakwoods between the 1980s and 2003/4. The table shows final GLMM models with 'Period' (1980s / 2000s), 'Region' (AR, DS, FD, GW, PO, WM) and 'Period*Region' interaction retained in all models to allow for regional variation in initial population size and population trends, and 'site' declared as random as individual woods are being compared between time periods. Prefix 'i' refers to habitat in 1982-84, 'c' to change in habitat, and superscript suffix ² to quadratic relationships. The effect of dead trees was tested in relation to those species for which they are relevant, i.e. as potential nest sites for Pied Flycatcher and Redstart.

Variable	Wood Warbler			Tree Pipit			Pied Flycatcher			Redstart		
	Estimate	F	P	Estimate	F	P	Estimate	F	P	Estimate	F	P
Period	1 > 2	67.3	<0.0001	1 > 2	42.0	<0.0001	0.8	0.37		1 > 2	10.9	0.001
Region		2.0	0.08		16.6	<0.0001	10.6	<0.0001			11.0	<0.0001
Period*Region		10.1	<0.0001		11.9	<0.0001	3.7	0.007			3.2	0.01
i_bramble	0.023	1.9	0.17	-0.015	6.8	0.01	-0.01	4.7	0.032			
i_bramble ²	-0.0004	4.3	0.04									
c_bramble		4.2	0.04									
“ x region		4.1	0.002									
i_bracken				0.053	10.8	0.002	0.012	6.6	0.014	0.012	7.4	0.01
i_bracken ²				-0.0009	6.1	0.016						
c_bracken				0.008	4.2	0.046					8.9	0.003
“ x region											2.6	0.03
i_herb	-0.019	14.2	0.0003	-0.013	7.5	0.008						
c_herb	-0.013	8.4	0.005									
i_cov_2	-0.064	8.0	0.006	-0.033	12.3	0.0006						
i_cov_2 ²	0.002	7.2	0.008									
c_cov_2		2.8	0.1					1.1	0.29			
“ x region		3.3	0.009					4.6	0.002			
i_cov_4	0.082	12.8	0.0005				-0.02	7.1	0.01			
i_cov_4 ²	-0.004	24.0	<0.0001									
c_cov_4											1.2	0.28
“ x region											2.8	0.02
i_cov_10	-0.041	3.5	0.065							-0.027	9.0	0.003
i_cov_10 ²	0.003	12.4	0.0006									
c_deadtree								0.01	0.94			
“ x region								4.6	0.002			

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **Figure legends**

2 **Fig. 1** The distribution of upland oakwood study sites and the regions in which they are found

3 **Fig. 2** Relationship between the predicted effect of change in habitat, derived from significant
4 interactions between habitat and region (Table 6; 1 = no change), and the change in numbers of
5 Wood Warbler (a-b), Pied Flycatcher (c-d) and Redstart (e-f) derived from model parameter
6 estimates (Table 6). Region abbreviations are: Argyll (AR), Devon & Somerset (DS), Forest of
7 Dean (FD), Gwynedd (GW), Powys (PO) and the Welsh Marches (WM)

8 **Fig. 3** Relationship between change in (a) herb and (b) bracken cover and log population
9 change ($\log(n_2+0.1/n_1+0.1)$) of Wood Warbler and Tree Pipit respectively. The log ratio is used
10 to provide a simple graphical representation of the results of the Poisson models

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24




1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Fig. 1



2


1
2
3
4 **1 Fig. 2**
5
6
7
8
9





1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **Fig. 2 (cont'd)**

2
3



4
5
6
7




8
9
10
11
12

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **Fig. 2 (cont'd)**

2




3

4

5

6



7


8

9

10

11

12




1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **Fig. 3**


2
3

(a)



4
5
6
7
8

(b)



11