

adults (2 years old or older) (Blohm, M.S. thesis, Univ. Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, 1977). Eggs were aged to the nearest day to determine the stage of incubation when moved. No relationship appeared to exist between clutch-size, stage of incubation, or age of the female and the occurrence of egg moving in this study. Lorenz and Tinbergen (*Z. Tierpsychol.* 2:1-29, 1938), Sows (Prairie Ducks, Stackpole Co., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania and Wildl. Manage. Inst., Washington, D.C., 1955:101), Oring (*Auk* 81:88-89, 1964) and Prevet and Prevet (*Auk* 90:202-204, 1973) have observed other species of waterfowl retrieving displaced eggs with the ventral portion of the bill. I suspect that this behavior is not uncommon in the Gadwall, especially in situations in which it is necessary to move all or portions of the clutch short distances because of natural or man-made disturbances.

Fieldwork was supported by the Delta Waterfowl Research Station and the University of Wisconsin. I thank R. A. McCabe for his comments on this note. I am indebted to the owners of East Meadows Ranch, the Peter Curry and Arthur Vincent families and to Lawrence King, manager, for their generosity during my stay at Marshy Point, Manitoba. I owe special thanks to all those who assisted me in the field during this study.—ROBERT J. BLOHM, *Dept. Wildlife Ecology, Univ. Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.* (Present address: *Office of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Laurel, Maryland 20811.*)  
*Accepted 27 May 1980.*

*Wilson Bull.*, 93(2), 1981, pp. 277-278

**Mallard using moving vehicles for predator avoidance.**—Distraction displays are often-cited adaptations for predator avoidance in a variety of vertebrate organisms (see Eibl-Eibesfeldt, *Ethology—the Biology of Behavior*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York, 1975). Examples of such behavior commonly relate to use of body appurtenances (i.e., feather-ruffling, break-away tail) and less often to use of extrinsic environmental features. We report here an apparent attempt by a duck to use moving vehicles as a distraction during predator avoidance.

In mid-afternoon on 21 January 1977, we were driving south-west on Interstate Highway 90 about 12 km NE of Vantage, Grant Co., Washington, when a female Mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*) appeared suddenly over the left front of the car, flying about 2 m above the roadway. We were traveling 80-85 km/h when the duck passed us rocking slightly from side-to-side as if preparing to land on the roadway. Within 2 or 3 sec a Prairie Falcon (*Falco mexicanus*, age and sex unknown) stooped at the duck from a position above and to the left rear. This stoop was aborted and the Mallard continued flying along the highway 1-4 m above the surface, weaving left to right between several cars, very close to the vehicles. The falcon appeared to hit the duck during the second stoop because the duck tumbled to the ground on the right side of the highway. This attack occurred about 2 km from the point where we initially saw the duck.

The downed duck moved to unmowed roadside vegetation dominated by big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*), Russian thistle (*Salsola kali*) and cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*) during which time the falcon made several more stoops without contacting the duck. As we approached and stopped near where the duck had gone down, the falcon flew across the highway from the downed duck and perched on a high voltage pole about 80 m away. We left the car and walked perhaps 15 or 20 m when the Mallard flushed from under a big sagebrush and flew NE with no visible injuries or flight impairment. While we looked for the duck, the falcon left its perch in an unknown direction and did not initiate another attack before the duck flew out of our sight.

It is possible that the Mallard was never hit by the falcon as Dekker (Can. Field-Nat. 94:371-382, 1980) has suggested that erratic plunging flight routinely exhibited by waterfowl when pursued by falcons may appear like a "hit" when in fact no contact is made. The lack of apparent injury to the duck seemingly supports Dekker's suggestion. However, the Mallard was definitely harassed during this episode as evidenced by its speed which approached the maxima of 80-96 km/h previously reported by Cottam (Wilson Bull. 54:121-131, 1942) and Cooke (U.S. Dept. Agric. Circ. 428, 1937). The weaving among cars likely reduced the opportunities for stoops by the falcon for an extended distance along the roadway. Thus, the combination of rapid flight and maneuvering among cars at least prolonged the predator avoidance for this duck and aided its survival (albeit we were the final distracting factor). Whether the cars were used by the duck as a surrogate "flock" is a matter for speculation.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Contract No. DACW68-76-C-0184 supported travel during which this observation was made. R. K. Stocker and C. Taylor also witnessed this event. A. J. Erskine and G. Barber provided helpful comments on earlier drafts.—BRUCE C. THOMPSON AND JAMES E. TABOR, *Washington Dept. Game, Olympia, Washington 98504*. (Present address BCT: *Dept. Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences, Texas A&M Univ., College Station, Texas 77843*.) Accepted 24 Apr. 1980.

*Wilson Bull.*, 93(2), 1981, pp. 278-279

**Ochraceous Wren fails to respond to mobbing calls in an heterospecific flock.**—On 6 October, 1970, I was following a mixed-species foraging-flock through a tract of Lower Montane Wet Forest at Monteverde, Puntarenas Province, Costa Rica (see Buskirk and Buskirk, *Am. Midl. Nat.* 95:288-298, 1976; Powell, *Auk* 96:375-390, 1979 for descriptions of this location). The flock had just passed me when 2 Common Bush-Tanagers (*Chloro-pingus ophthalmicus*), trailing behind the flock, discovered a tree viper (*Bothrops lateralis*) and began giving high-intensity, rapid twitters. Within 30 sec 2 Golden-crowned Warblers (*Basileuterus culicivorus*) and 2 Slate-throated Redstarts (*Myioborus miniatus*), all of which had recently passed the snake, returned and joined the mobbing bush-tanagers 0.5-1.0 m from the snake. Within another 30 sec a Black-and-White Warbler (*Mniotilta varia*), a Wilson's Warbler (*Wilsonia pusilla*) and 2 Ochraceous Wrens (*Troglodytes ochraceus*) arrived. The warblers actively joined the mob. But the wrens remained a few meters away and foraged normally, searching the surfaces of major branches. The behavior of a wren in my line of vision gave no indication that it recognized the presence of the snake or the meaning of the mobbing activity. When the wren approached within 1.5 m of the snake, the wren looked up from its foraging and at the snake. The wren froze for an instant and then began uttering high-intensity calls and joined the mobbing. Immediately the second wren joined the group. The wrens had returned with the flock but had not reacted to the predator until one of them saw it. In all, the mobbing lasted only about 3 min before the flock moved away from the snake.

This incident demonstrates different responses among species to the mobbing calls of other species with which they flock. The wren had not shown unusual excitation or orientation toward the viper prior to its own discovery of the snake. The immediate response of the second wren once the first gave mobbing calls demonstrates intraspecific recognition of such a signal. That wrens returned with the flock suggest they do respond positively to visual and/or auditory cues of the other species. However, the behavior of their associates elicited gregariousness, not alarm.