(5) more exaggerated Head Down displays were common when given toward a female on a limb but not when given to a female on the ground; (6) males did not threaten the stuffed female.

Thus, nine out of 15 reactions to female models were different from natural ones. This is in part due to the stationary position of the model in a constant strong Soliciting posture. Also, the males were presented with a continuous supernormal sexual stimulus during the period when their own females give only brief sexual responses, and are often aggressive toward the male when he directs precopulatory display (Head Down) toward them.

The two males which reacted by establishing a large territory around the model were completely dominant in this area. Moreover, they defended it by adopting a threat posture which was never seen in other situations but was more effective in elicting withdrawal than any of their threat displays. Perhaps these were unmated males with unusually strong aggressive-sexual motivation.

Experiments in nature are the only way of obtaining proof of numerous important assumptions. However, the results of these tests point out the need to interpret them in the light of normal behavior. Moreover, the natural situation should be duplicated as closely as possible.—ROBERT W. FICKEN, *Laboratory of Ornithology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. (Present address: Department of Zoology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.)* *13 April 1965.*

Dickcissel in Utah.—In recent years the Dickcissel (*Spiza americana*) has been reported from California and from several states west of the Rocky Mountains (California: Stager, 1949. *Condor*, 51:44; Northern Arizona: Bryant, 1952. *Condor*, 54:320; Nevada: Pulich and Gullion, 1953. *Condor*, 55:215; Western Colorado: Scott, 1957. *Audubon Field Notes*, 11:47). The four records above, plus the sight record in Utah noted below, were during the months of September and October. It is known that young birds disperse in many directions from their nesting grounds in the late summer and early fall. This random or vagrant migration (Wallace, 1963. "Introduction to Ornithology," Macmillan, New York, p. 260) might be one explanation for these scattered records.

On 1 October 1959 a sight record of five Dickcissels was reported in Salt Lake City (Scott, 1960. *Audubon Field Notes*, 14:60). Mr. Gleb Kashin, who saw the birds, stated that this "may be one of the first records for Utah." I have searched the literature and cannot find any earlier record. Thus, I consider the 1959 report as the first record of the Dickcissel in Utah.

On 25 May 1964 a Dickcissel was brought to me by a student who had seen the bird fly into the front window of a business establishment in Provo. This bird was an adult male (B.Y.U. No. 4752) with an ossified skull and enlarged testes (right 7.2 × 6.8 mm, left 9.4 × 6.1 mm). Although the feathers did not show signs of wear, the bird appeared to be in poor physical condition. There was no integumentary fat, and its weight of 19.6 grams was considerably less than the average weight of six individuals (33.5 grams) reported by Gross (1921. *Auk*, 38:15–17) from Illinois. The weight distinction could be due to the difference in the season since the Illinois birds were taken in August after nesting had been completed. Apparently the specimen I am reporting had just completed a migratory flight from its wintering locality in South America which could also account for the weight difference.—HERBERT H. FROST, *Department of Zoology and Entomology, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah,* *19 March 1965.*