

COMPARING THE EFFECTS OF LOCAL, LANDSCAPE, AND TEMPORAL FACTORS ON FOREST BIRD NEST SURVIVAL USING LOGISTIC-EXPOSURE MODELS

MELINDA G. KNUTSON, BRIAN R. GRAY, AND MELISSA S. MEIER

Abstract. We studied the bird communities of Mississippi River floodplain and adjacent upland forests to identify factors associated with nest survival. We estimated daily nest survival for forest-nesting birds using competing logistic-exposure models, that will allow a comparison of multiple possible factors associated with nest survival, measured at different spatial or temporal scales. We compared models representing landscape (upland vs. floodplain and forest cover), edge (nest distance to edge and forest edge density), nest-site (nest height, canopy cover, nest concealment, and shrub density), Brown-headed Cowbird (*Molothrus ater*; parasitism rate and cowbird abundance), and temporal effects (year, nest stage, and Julian date of observations). We found that the temporal effects model had the strongest support, followed by the landscape effects model for most species. Nest survival tended to be highest early in the nesting season (May–June) and late in the nest cycle (nestling stage). For Eastern Wood-Pewees (*Contopus virens*) and Prothonotary Warblers (*Protonotaria citrea*), higher nest survival was associated with lower proportions of forest surrounding the plot. Significant effects of nest placement in upland vs. floodplain locations were not observed for any species. Models representing edge, nest-site, and cowbird effects had less statistical support, although higher nest survival was sometimes associated with dense shrubs and more concealment around the nest. Management implications may include timing management disturbances to avoid the early nesting season (May and June). For shrub nesting species, management to open the canopy and allow the shrub layer to develop may be beneficial.

Key Words: Brown-headed Cowbird, demographic monitoring, floodplain forest, information-theoretic, landbird, landscape, logistic-exposure model, Mississippi River, nest-site, nest survival.

COMPARACIÓN DE LOS EFECTOS DE FACTORES LOCALES, DE PAISAJE Y TEMPORALES EN SOBREVIVENCIA DE NIDOS DE AVES FORESTALES UTILIZANDO MODELOS DE EXPOSICIÓN LOGÍSTICA

Resumen. Estudiamos las comunidades de aves de las planicies inundadas del Río Mississippi y los bosques adyacentes de las tierras altas, para identificar factores asociados con la sobrevivencia de nido. Estimamos la sobrevivencia diaria del nido para aves anidadoras de bosque utilizando modelos competentes de exposición logística, que permitirán comparar posibles factores múltiples asociados a la sobrevivencia de nido medidos a distintas escalas espaciales y temporales. Comparamos modelos representando al paisaje (tierras altas vs. planicies inundadas y cobertura forestal), borde (distancia del nido al borde y la densidad del borde de bosque), sitio del nido (altura de nido, cubierta de dosel, ocultación de nido, y densidad de arbustos), el Tordo Cabeza Café (*Molothrus ater*); tasa de parasitismo o abundancia de tordo), y efectos temporales (año, etapa de nido, y fecha Julian de observaciones). Encontramos que el modelo de efectos temporales tiene el soporte más alto para casi todas las especies, seguido del modelo de efectos de paisaje. La sobrevivencia de nido tendía a ser la mayor en la estación temprana de anidación (Mayo–Junio) y tardía en el ciclo de nido (etapa de volantón). Para los Pibí Oriental (*Contopus virens*) y Chiipe Dorado (*Protonotaria citrea*), estaba asociada mayor sobrevivencia de nido con menores proporciones de bosque rodeando el sitio. Efectos significativos de colocación de nido en tierras altas vs. localidades de planicies inundadas no fueron observadas por muchas especies. Modelos que representan efectos de borde, sitio de nido y tordo, tienen menor soporte estadístico a pesar de que la sobrevivencia de nido estaba algunas veces asociada con arbustos densos y más ocultación alrededor del nido. Las implicaciones en el manejo quizás incluyan la sincronización de disturbios de manejo para evitar el período de anidación temprana (Mayo y Junio). Para especies de anidación de arbusto quizás sea benéfico el manejo para abrir el dosel y para permitir que se desarrolle la capa arbustiva.

Successful landbird conservation requires that managers have an understanding of the major factors affecting nest survival in a region, while also acknowledging that such factors may not act independently. Survival models, including logistic-exposure models (Shaffer

2004a), permit factors associated with nest survival, possibly measured at different spatial or temporal scales; to be compared in a unified information-theoretic modeling framework (Dinsmore et al. 2002). A variety of factors have been shown to affect nest survival, ranging in

scale from landscape variables to factors operating at the scale of a single nest (Faaborg 2002). At large spatial scales, nest survival may be influenced by landscape context, usually represented by the amount of forest in the landscape (Rodewald 2002). Landscapes with fewer edges and less fragmentation are often positively associated with nest survival (Donovan et al. 1997, Stephens et al. 2004). Nests placed near forest edges may have decreased success compared with those placed in the interior of large forests (Batory and Baldi 2004). Factors specific to the nest, such as placement height, canopy cover, vegetation concealment, and shrub density have variable associations with nest survival (Wilson and Cooper 1998, Siepielski et al. 2001). Finally, timing can be important; nest survival often varies annually, by nest-initiation date, or by nest age or stage (laying, incubation, or nestling) (Burhans et al. 2002, Peak et al. 2004, Winter et al. 2004).

We studied the bird community of Mississippi River floodplain and adjacent upland forests to identify factors associated with nest survival for purposes of informing managers of upland and floodplain forests in the region. Our objective was to examine the relative importance of models representing possible major factors affecting nest survival, including landscape, edge, nest-site, Brown-headed Cowbird (*Molothrus ater*), and temporal effects. We expected that temporal, landscape, and edge effects would have a generally stronger association with nest survival than nest-site or cowbird effects for most forest bird species in our study area. However, we also expected that factors affecting nest survival would vary by species or life-history group. Landscape and edge effects were expected to be stronger for area-sensitive species and life history groups. A cowbird-effects model was expected to explain variation in nest success for generalist species, and non-area-sensitive ground species and groups vulnerable to parasitism. Temporal or nest-site effects were expected to better explain variation in nest success for generalist species and non-area-sensitive ground and shrub nesters.

METHODS

The study area was located in the driftless area ecoregion, including portions of the states of Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin (McNab and Avers 1994). Driftless area forests are dominated by oaks (*Quercus* spp.), sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), and basswood (*Tilia americana*) (Curtis 1959, Cahayla-Wynne and Glenn-Lewin 1978). Forests are confined to steep slopes adjacent to streams and rivers and

form a connected, dendritic pattern, while complex topography and erosive soils support a less intensive agriculture than in many parts of the Midwest (McNab and Avers 1994). Forests and agriculture comprise about 12–56% and 2–38% of the landscape, respectively, within 10 km of our study plots (Gustafson et al. 2002, Knutson et al. 2004). The Mississippi River floodplain in this region is unrestricted by levees; forests dominate most islands and main channel borders within the floodplain (Knutson et al. 1996). The floodplain forest-plant community is dominated by silver maple (*Acer saccharinum*), with elm (*Ulmus* spp.), green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), swamp white oak (*Quercus bicolor*), cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*), hackberry (*Celtis occidentalis*), and river birch (*Betula nigra*) as subdominants (Knutson and Klaas 1997).

We assessed factors affecting the nest survival of six forest bird species—American Redstart (*Setophaga ruticilla*), Prothonotary Warbler (*Protonotaria citrea*), American Robin (*Turdus migratorius*), Eastern Wood-Pewee (*Contopus virens*), Blue-gray Gnatcatcher (*Poliophtila caerulea*), and Rose-breasted Grosbeak (*Pheucticus ludovicianus*). We grouped 21 additional species according to similar life history-strategies; these species had insufficient sample sizes individually (Best et al. 1995). The groups were area-sensitive low nesters—Ovenbird (*Seiurus aurocapilla*) and Wood Thrush (*Hylocichla mustelina*); area-sensitive tree nesters—Acadian Flycatcher (*Empidonax virens*), Red-eyed Vireo (*Vireo olivaceus*), Scarlet Tanager (*Piranga olivacea*), and Warbling Vireo (*Vireo gilvus*); ground or shrub nesters: Brown Thrasher (*Toxostoma rufum*), Eastern Kingbird (*Tyrannus tyrannus*), Gray Catbird (*Dumetella carolinensis*), Indigo Bunting (*Passerina cyanea*), Northern Cardinal (*Cardinalis cardinalis*), Song Sparrow (*Melospiza melodia*), and Yellow Warbler (*Dendroica petechia*); and cavity nesters—Black-capped Chickadee (*Poecile atricapillus*), Downy Woodpecker (*Picoides pubescens*), Great Crested Flycatcher (*Myiarchus crinitus*), Hairy Woodpecker (*Picoides villosus*), Red-bellied Woodpecker (*Melanerpes carolinus*), Red-headed Woodpecker (*Melanerpes erythrocephalus*), White-breasted Nuthatch (*Sitta carolinensis*), and Yellow-bellied Sapsucker (*Sphyrapicus varius*). Species with fewer than five nests were not modeled.

NEST SEARCHING AND MONITORING

We monitored nests from May–August on 10 floodplain and 10 upland plots from 1996–1998. We selected upland plots non-probabilistically from state forests that were not recently logged

or grazed. In the floodplain, we randomly selected plots from federal land in the upper Mississippi River, based on forest inventory data (United States Army Corps of Engineers 1990–1997). Study plots were approximately 40 ha in size in the uplands and 20 ha in the floodplain; field effort was similar among all plots.

Nests were located following standard protocols (Martin and Geupel 1993) by following adults and flushing incubating and brooding birds. All active nests were monitored every 2–3 d until the outcome was determined. At each visit, we recorded date, time, parental behavior, nest stage, nest contents, and evidence of cowbird parasitism. Nests were considered successful if they fledged at least one host young. We relied on cues to assess nest success including fledglings seen or heard, adults in the vicinity of the nest with food or scolding, and no evidence of re-nesting. The location of each nest was defined using a global-positioning system.

We measured nest-site variables immediately after the fate of the nest was determined, including nest height, canopy cover, nest concealment, and shrub density. Nest height was the distance (meters) from the ground to the bottom of the nest cup; canopy cover was the total canopy cover above 5 m from the ground, estimated with a densiometer. Nest concealment was the percent of the nest hidden by vegetation 1 m from the nest in each direction, estimated from the side in four cardinal directions and from the top; the mean of the five estimates was used for analysis. Shrub density was the number of shrub stems <8 cm diameter at breast height (dbh) counted at 10 cm above the ground, within a 5-m circle (0.008 ha) centered on the nest.

We estimated Brown-headed Cowbird abundance from point-count data; cowbirds were counted on each plot between 20 May and 30 June at six points spaced ≥ 200 m apart. We recorded birds within 50 m of the observer during a 10-min time period (Ralph *et al.* 1993) and calculated relative abundance as the mean number of cowbirds per survey point, by plot and year.

LANDSCAPE VARIABLES

U.S. Geological Survey gap-analysis program classifications were used to represent land cover (Scott *et al.* 1993). We calculated and summarized landscape metrics for each plot, including the percentage of the landscape in forest cover and forest edge density using a 5-km radius circle (7,854 ha) centered on the plot. The distance (meters) of each nest to the nearest forest edge was measured using land-cover maps of the

study plots digitized from 1:15,000 scale aerial photographs taken in 1997 (Owens and Hop 1995). Edge density was defined as the linear distance of forest edge per unit area (meters per hectare) for each plot, represented by the 5-km radius circle (McGarigal and Marks 1995). A 5-km radius was selected because it approximates the home range of cowbirds (Thompson 1994) from breeding to feeding areas.

STATISTICAL ANALYSES

We used survival analysis (Shaffer 2004a) to model nest survival as a function of nest-specific predictor variables and to estimate daily nest-survival rates. This logistic-exposure approach (Shaffer 2004a) accommodates varying exposure periods, continuous, categorical, and time-specific predictor variables, and random effects. We used a modified logit link function, $(\log_e(\theta^{1/t})/[1 - \theta^{1/t}])$, where θ is the interval survival rate and t is the interval length in days (Peak *et al.* 2004, Shaffer 2004a), and assumed survival and predictor variables to be constant within a nest-observation interval. Models were fitted using the SAS generalized linear modeling procedure (PROC GENMOD; SAS Institute 2003).

For each species and group we evaluated models representing landscape, edge, nest-site, cowbird, and temporal effects. Specifically, we evaluated a landscape-effects model with forest type (upland or floodplain) and percent forest cover; an edge-effects model with distance to forest edge and forest edge density; a nest-site-effects model with nest height, canopy cover, nest concealment, and shrub density; a cowbird-effects model with parasitism of the nest (parasitized or not parasitized) and cowbird relative abundance; and a temporal-effects model with year, nest stage, and Julian observation date (midpoint between two successive nest visits). We also evaluated a global model with all effects, and an intercept-only (null) model. We dropped the cowbird model for species not vulnerable to cowbird parasitism (American Robins and cavity nesters) and the nest-concealment model for cavity nesters and forest type for species found only in one forest type (Prothonotary Warblers, floodplain; Ovenbird and Wood Thrushes, uplands). For some species and groups, we combined laying and incubation stages because models with too few intervals failed to converge.

We evaluated the candidate models using a small sample variant of the Akaike information criterion (AIC_c) and the associated Akaike weight, w_i (Burnham and Anderson 2002). Akaike information criterion for small sample

sizes is defined as $-2 \log \text{likelihood} + 2 \times K$ (the number of estimated parameters) \times (small sample correction factor), where the correction factor = $N/(N - K - 1)$ and N = number of observation intervals (Hurvich and Tsai 1989). Differences between the AIC_c values for the i^{th} model and that of the model with the smallest AIC_c value were denoted ΔAIC_{ci} ; a ΔAIC_{ci} of 2–5 units was considered evidence of stronger support (Burnham and Anderson 2002). A given w_i indicates the weight of evidence in favor of model i being the best supported model (among those considered), and was defined as $e^{-\Delta AIC_{ci}/2}$. For convenience, ΔAIC_{ci} is hereafter denoted ΔAIC_c .

We presented odds ratios for predictor variables with confidence intervals that excluded 1 from the model with the smallest AIC_c value. To clarify the interpretation, an odds ratio of 1.5 for year 1996 vs. 1998 indicates that the odds of daily nest survival were 50% higher in 1996 than in 1998. A predictor was included in only one model per species or species group.

Daily nest survival for each species was estimated using the model with the smallest AIC_c value. The predicted probabilities represent the probability of a nest surviving 1 d, are comparable to Mayfield daily nest survival estimates (Mayfield 1961, Johnson 1979), and are conditional on median (continuous) or mean (categorical) covariate values. Conditional interval nest survival was estimated using the model with the smallest AIC_c value and the literature-based mean number of laying, incubation, and nestling days (Ehrlich et al. 1988). For the life history groups of species, we used a weighted average of the appropriate number of laying, incubation, and nestling days (Baicich and Harrison 1997). Nest survival was estimated for all species in the study. For species in the life-history groups, nest-

survival estimates were conditional on temporal effects (day, stage, and year) only.

RESULTS

We monitored 1,142 nests among all the species. Nests tended to be located in areas with relatively high canopy cover (79%), high stem counts of shrubs, and 50–110 m from an edge (Table 1). Predictor means often varied substantially by species (Table 2). For example, Prothonotary Warbler nests were found closer to the forest edge (24 m) than other species; in contrast, area-sensitive low nesters placed their nests in forest interiors (263 m from an edge; Table 2).

As expected, the models with strongest support varied among the species and life history groups (Table 3). The temporal model had the most general support in explaining nest survival across species; it was the best supporting model for American Redstarts, Rose-breasted Grosbeaks, and cavity nesters and had moderate support ($\Delta AIC_c < 10$) for all other species and groups (Table 3). The landscape model was the best supporting model for Eastern Wood-Pewees and had moderate support for American Robins, Blue-gray Gnatcatchers, area-sensitive low nesters, area-sensitive tree nesters, and ground and shrub nesters.

The edge-, nest-site-, and cowbird-effects models received less support among the species and groups we studied (Table 3). The global model was the best model for Prothonotary Warblers and ground and shrub nesters and had moderate support for American Redstarts, Eastern Wood-Pewees, and Rose-breasted Grosbeaks (Table 3). American Robins, Blue-gray Gnatcatchers, area-sensitive low nesters, and area-sensitive tree nesters had the null model as their best model. In each case, a second

TABLE 1. PREDICTOR VARIABLES USED TO EVALUATE NEST SURVIVAL OF BIRDS BREEDING IN FLOODPLAIN AND UPLAND FORESTS OF THE DRIFTLESS AREA, 1996–1998.

Variable ^a	Scale	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max
Day	day	5,507	169.5 ^b	15.3	169.5 ^b	130.0 ^c	223.8 ^d
Edge (meters)	nest	1,142	109.1	132.0	50.2	0.2	794.5
Nest height (meters)	nest	1,142	7.2	5.6	5.7	0.0	31.5
Canopy cover (percent)	nest	1,142	78.6	22.1	86.0	0.0	100.0
Concealment	nest	1,142	66.3	28.4	70.0	0.0	100.0
Shrub	nest	1,142	76.1	105.9	41.0	0.0	914.0
Forest (percent)	plot	20	41.0	11.9	45.0	12.0	56.1
Edge density (meters/hectare)	plot	20	56.2	15.2	54.3	19.7	75.2
Cowbird abundance	plot	20	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.0	1.0

^a Day = Julian day midpoint between two successive nest visits; Edge = distance in meters from nest to forest edge; Nest height = nest height in meters; Canopy cover = percent total canopy cover >5m in height; Concealment = nest concealment calculated as the mean of side cover and overhead cover values; Shrub = number of shrub stems >10 cm above the ground and <8 cm dbh within a 5-m radius circle centered on the nest; Forest = percentage of landscape made up of forest within a 5-km radius circle centered on the plot; Edge density = forest-edge density measured in meters/hectare within a 5-km radius circle centered on the plot; Cowbird abundance = mean relative abundance of cowbirds per survey point, across all plots.

^b Corresponds to approximately June 18.

^c Corresponds to approximately May 10.

^d Corresponds to approximately August 11.

TABLE 2. PREDICTOR VARIABLES (MEAN ± SE) AND COUNTS OF CATEGORICAL VARIABLES USED TO EVALUATE NEST SURVIVAL, BY SPECIES AND LIFE-HISTORY GROUPINGS OF BIRDS NESTING IN FLOODPLAIN AND UPLANDS FOREST OF THE DRIFTLESS AREA, 1996–1998.

Variable ^a	American Redstart (<i>Setophaga ruticilla</i>)	American Robin (<i>Turdus migratorius</i>)	Blue-gray Gnatcatcher (<i>Poliophtila caerulea</i>)	Eastern Wood-pewee (<i>Contopus virens</i>)	Prothonotary Warbler (<i>Protonotaria citrea</i>)	Rose-breasted Grosbeak (<i>Pheucticus ludovicianus</i>)	Area-sensitive tree nesters	Area-sensitive low nesters	Cavity nesters	Ground/shrub nesters
Day	167.8 (0.5)	168.1 (0.8)	163.2 (0.8)	184.8 (0.5)	168.3 (0.5)	164.2 (0.6)	171.6 (0.6)	169.7 (1.1)	165.5 (0.6)	168.4 (0.6)
Edge (meters)	121.0 (7.7)	81.6 (10.4)	82.7 (12.9)	168.3 (14.0)	23.5 (2.2)	164.3 (20.5)	146.0 (13.7)	263.0 (33.7)	109.2 (12.2)	73.4 (7.2)
Nest height (meters)	6.0 (0.2)	6.3 (0.5)	13.5 (0.6)	14.7 (0.4)	2.9 (0.2)	8.3 (0.7)	9.4 (0.4)	2.2 (0.5)	8.3 (0.4)	3.2 (0.3)
Canopy cover (percent)	85.3 (1.1)	82.4 (1.7)	79.9 (2.0)	87.5 (1.0)	71.7 (2.3)	72.2 (3.2)	83.7 (1.3)	88.4 (1.7)	79.6 (1.7)	63.5 (2.4)
Concealment	56.6 (1.4)	58.7 (2.1)	50.8 (2.6)	25.8 (2.3)	96.5 (0.6)	67.2 (2.1)	59.8 (2.1)	51.4 (4.8)	97.2 (0.8)	69.1 (1.9)
Shrub	64.9 (6.0)	59.0 (6.1)	62.2 (13.9)	62.2 (6.6)	19.1 (4.2)	111.8 (13.4)	73.1 (9.5)	87.4 (11.8)	69.7 (9.0)	152.6 (11.9)
Forest (percent)	39.1 (0.7)	34.5 (1.2)	43.2 (1.0)	42.2 (1.0)	42.1 (0.6)	39.0 (1.4)	43.3 (1.0)	46.6 (1.0)	38.4 (0.9)	31.7 (1.2)
Edge density (meters/hectare)	59.1 (0.8)	53.9 (1.7)	61.3 (1.3)	57.7 (1.3)	64.2 (0.8)	53.6 (1.8)	59.9 (1.4)	53.6 (1.7)	54.7 (1.1)	47.7 (1.5)
Cowbird abundance	0.8 (0.1)	1.0 (0.1)	1.1 (0.1)	1.2 (0.1)	0.9 (0.1)	1.2 (0.1)	1.1 (0.1)	1.2 (0.1)	0.9 (0.1)	1.0 (0.1)
Floodplain/upland	164/32	91/18	32/34	37/63	134/0	20/53	39/82	0/34	89/59	116/45
1996/1997/1998	31/79/86	22/35/52	7/32/27	11/39/50	39/44/51	9/39/25	16/54/51	9/19/6	25/50/73	21/62/78

^a Day = Julian day midpoint between two successive nest visits; Edge = distance in m from nest to forest edge; Nest height = nest height in m; Canopy cover = percent total canopy cover >5 m in height; Concealment = percent concealment calculated as the mean of side cover and overhead cover values; Shrub = number of shrub stems >10 cm above the ground and <8 cm dbh within a 5-m radius circle centered on the nest; Forest = percentage of landscape made up of forest within a 5-km radius circle centered on the plot; Edge density = forest edge density measured in meters/hectare within a 5-km radius circle centered on the plot; Cowbird abundance = relative abundance of cowbirds on plot within a year; numbers of nests by treatment (floodplain and upland) and year (1997, 1998, 1999).

TABLE 3. CANDIDATE MODELS EXPLAINING NEST SURVIVAL IN FLOODPLAIN AND UPLAND FORESTS OF THE DRIFTLESS AREA, 1996–1998, BY SPECIES AND LIFE-HISTORY GROUP.

Species	Model	K	ΔAIC_c	w_i
American Redstart (<i>Setophaga ruticilla</i>) (N = 825)	Temporal effects	6	0.0	0.98
	Global	16	9.3	0.01
American Robin (<i>Turdus migratorius</i>) (N = 512)	Null	1	0.0	0.66
	Landscape effects	3	3.1	0.14
	Edge effects	3	3.4	0.12
	Nest-site effects	5	5.3	0.05
	Temporal effects	6	7.2	0.02
	Global	14	7.5	0.02
Prothonotary Warbler (<i>Protonotaria citrea</i>) (N = 629)	Global	14	0.0	0.79
	Temporal effects	5	2.8	0.20
	Nest-site effects	5	8.8	0.01
Eastern Wood-Pewee (<i>Contopus virens</i>) (N = 622)	Landscape effects	3	0.0	0.90
	Temporal effects	6	6.8	0.03
	Null	1	7.1	0.03
	Edge effects	3	7.6	0.02
	Global	16	9.1	0.01
	Nest-site effects	5	9.4	0.01
	Global	16	9.1	0.01
Blue-gray Gnatcatcher (<i>Poliophtila caerulea</i>) (N = 354)	Null	1	0.0	0.38
	Temporal effects	5	0.4	0.31
	Cowbird effects	3	2.3	0.12
	Edge effects	3	2.4	0.12
	Landscape effects	3	3.7	0.06
	Nest-site effects	5	6.5	0.02
Rose-breasted Grosbeak (<i>Pheucticus ludovicianus</i>) (N = 318)	Temporal effects	6	0.0	0.96
	Null	1	8.5	0.01
	Edge effects	3	9.0	0.01
	Global	16	9.0	0.01
Area-sensitive low nesters (N = 146)	Null	1	0.0	0.44
	Landscape effects	2	0.8	0.30
	Edge effects	3	2.7	0.11
	Cowbird effects	3	2.8	0.11
	Temporal effects	5	5.2	0.03
	Nest-site effects	5	7.9	0.01
Area-sensitive tree nesters (N = 565)	Null	1	0.0	0.33
	Temporal effects	6	0.1	0.32
	Landscape effects	3	1.5	0.16
	Nest-site effects	5	2.5	0.09
	Cowbird effects	3	3.7	0.05
	Edge effects	3	3.8	0.05
Ground and shrub nesters (N = 714)	Global	16	0.0	0.45
	Nest-site effects	5	0.9	0.29
	Edge effects	3	2.8	0.11
	Temporal effects	6	3.8	0.07
	Landscape effects	3	4.8	0.04
	Null	1	5.7	0.03
	Cowbird effects	3	7.2	0.01
	Global	16	7.2	0.01
Cavity nesters (N = 702)	Temporal effects	5	0.0	0.99

Notes: Models are ranked by ΔAIC_c ; K = number of parameters including the intercept, N = number of observation intervals. For the sake of brevity, models with $\Delta AIC_c > 10$ are not shown.

model was a close competitor (within 1 ΔAIC_c unit and model weight >30%), with the exception of American Robins, a generalist species.

Among the predictor variables associated with nest survival, those representing temporal, landscape, and nest-site effects had the most support (Table 4; Fig. 1a–s). Nest concealment and shrub density were supported for Prothonotary Warblers and nest height and concealment were supported for ground and shrub nesters (Table 4; Fig. 1a–s). Nest stage, year, or

Julian day were supported for seven species and groups. Daily nest-survival estimates from the best model for each species ranged from a low of 0.938 for Song Sparrows to a high of 0.994 for Red-headed Woodpeckers (Table 5).

DISCUSSION

The logistic-exposure modeling approach allowed us to evaluate a variety of factors that could influence nest survival in the driftless area

TABLE 4. CONDITIONAL ODDS RATIOS AND 95% CONFIDENCE INTERVALS (CI) FOR SELECTED PREDICTOR VARIABLES FROM MODELS WITH SMALLEST AIC_c VALUES FOR INDIVIDUAL SPECIES AND LIFE HISTORY GROUPINGS FOR BIRDS NESTING IN FLOODPLAIN AND UPLAND FORESTS OF THE DRIFTLESS AREA, 1996–1998.

Species	Predictor variable ^a	Odds ratio	CI
American Redstart ^b (<i>Setophaga ruticilla</i>)	Laying + incubation vs. nestling	0.477	0.309, 0.734
	1996 vs. 1998	1.871	1.003, 3.492
	1997 vs. 1998	1.518	1.014, 2.271
Prothonotary Warbler ^b (<i>Protonotaria citrea</i>)	Day	0.955	0.929, 0.982
	Laying + incubation vs. nestling	0.401	0.209, 0.769
	Concealment	1.059	1.016, 1.104
	Shrub	1.015	1.001, 1.029
Eastern Wood-Pewee ^b (<i>Contopus virens</i>)	Forest	0.828	0.712, 0.962
	Forest	0.940	0.901, 0.980
Blue-gray Gnatcatcher (<i>Poliophtila caerulea</i>)	Day	0.970	0.944, 0.996
	1996 vs. 1998	5.478	1.049, 28.606
Rose-breasted Grosbeak ^b (<i>Pheucticus ludovicianus</i>)	Day	0.939	0.906, 0.974
	Laying + incubation vs. nestling	0.380	0.179, 0.805
	Shrub	1.004	1.000, 1.008
Area-sensitive tree nesters	Day	0.969	0.944, 0.994
	Incubation vs. nestling	0.489	0.270, 0.886
Cavity nesters ^b	Day	0.972	0.946, 0.999
	1997 vs. 1998	0.345	0.156, 0.765
Ground-shrub nesters	1996 vs. 1998	2.714	1.092, 6.744
	Concealment	1.015	1.006, 1.024
	Nest height	1.103	1.022, 1.191

Note: for the sake of brevity, values are shown only for species and variables with CI's that exclude 1, the null value.

^aDay = Julian day midpoint between two successive nest visits; Nest height = nest height in meters; Concealment = nest concealment calculated as the mean of side cover and overhead cover values; Shrub = number of shrub stems >10 cm above the ground and <8 cm dbh within a 5-m radius circle centered on the nest; Forest = percentage of landscape made up of forest within a 5-km radius circle centered on the plot.

^bFor these species, intervals for the nesting stage of laying were included with incubation intervals for analysis.

ecoregion. Many a priori expectations were supported by the data. For example, temporal and, to a lesser extent, landscape factors were confirmed as having strong support across species, but edge effects appeared less important than expected. We also confirmed that factors affecting nest survival varied by species or life history group and that none of the models were supported for a generalist species like American Robins.

The strong support for the temporal-effects model across species suggests that nest survival in general varies more by year, nest stage, and timing during the nesting season than by any of the other modeled sets of factors. Our observation that nest survival tended to be higher early in the nesting season and late in incubation is in agreement with other studies of temporal effects on nest survival (Pescador and Peris 2001, Dinsmore et al. 2002, Peak et al. 2004, Winter et al. 2004). The strong annual variation in nest survival that we observed is commonly identified in nesting studies (Fauth 2000, Sillett et al. 2000, Winter et al. 2005a).

Species with the strongest support for landscape effects had higher nest survival with less forest cover in the landscape, not more, contrary to our expectations (Hartley and Hunter 1998). Our finding that Eastern Wood-Pewees had higher nest survival in plots with less landscape forest cover fits with general habitat

associations for the species; it is not known to be sensitive to forest fragmentation (Rodewald and Smith 1998). Our finding that Prothonotary Warblers also benefited from less landscape forest cover was unexpected; this species is heavily dependent upon large floodplain and wetland forests (Hoover 2006). This apparent contradiction remains unexplained. We found only weak support for our expectation that landscape effects would be important for area-sensitive species like Blue-gray Gnatcatchers and Rose-breasted Grosbeaks (Best et al. 1996, Burke and Nol 2000), as well as area-sensitive low nesters and tree nesters. Others have also observed Blue-gray Gnatcatchers breeding in narrow floodplains (Kilgo et al. 1998). We were surprised to find little support for differences in nest survival between floodplain and upland plots for species that nested in both habitats. Tree species composition, humidity, and other environmental factors are quite different between these two habitat types; bird relative abundances are twice as high in the floodplain as in the uplands (Knutson et al. 1996, Knutson et al. 2006).

The nest-site-effects model had more support than we expected for most species, although it failed to rank as the best model for any species or group. Eastern Wood-Pewees tend to respond positively to management that opens the canopy




FIGURE 1A-F. Effects of predictor variables on daily survival rates of individual species and groups of birds nesting in floodplain and upland forests of the driftless area, 1996-1998. Day = Julian day midpoint between two successive nest visits; Nest height = nest height in m; Conceal = nest concealment calculated as the mean of side cover and overhead cover values; Shrub = number of shrub stems >10 cm above the ground and <8 cm dbh within a 5-m radius circle centered on the nest; Forest = percentage of landscape made up of forest within a 5-km radius circle centered on the plot; Year = 1996, 1997, 1998; Stage = laying, incubation, nestling. For continuous variables, survival rates are estimated at their 10th, 50th (median) and 90th percentiles. *Figure 1 is continued on the next page.*




FIGURE 1G-L. *Continued.* Effects of predictor variables on daily survival rates of individual species and groups of birds nesting in floodplain and upland forests of the driftless area, 1996–1998. Day = Julian day midpoint between two successive nest visits; Nest height = nest height in m; Conceal = nest concealment calculated as the mean of side cover and overhead cover values; Shrub = number of shrub stems >10 cm above the ground and <8 cm dbh within a 5-m radius circle centered on the nest; Forest = percentage of landscape made up of forest within a 5-km radius circle centered on the plot; Year = 1996, 1997, 1998; Stage = laying, incubation, nestling. For continuous variables, survival rates are estimated at their 10th, 50th (median) and 90th percentiles. *Figure 1 is continued on the next page.*




FIGURE 1M-R. *Continued.* Effects of predictor variables on daily survival rates of individual species and groups of birds nesting in floodplain and upland forests of the driftless area, 1996-1998. Day = Julian day midpoint between two successive nest visits; Nest height = nest height in m; Conceal = nest concealment calculated as the mean of side cover and overhead cover values; Shrub = number of shrub stems >10 cm above the ground and <8 cm dbh within a 5-m radius circle centered on the nest; Forest = percentage of landscape made up of forest within a 5-km radius circle centered on the plot; Year = 1996, 1997, 1998; Stage = laying, incubation, nestling. For continuous variables, survival rates are estimated at their 10th, 50th (median) and 90th percentiles. *Figure 1 is continued on the next page.*




FIGURE 1S. *Continued.* Effects of predictor variables on daily survival rates of individual species and groups of birds nesting in floodplain and upland forests of the driftless area, 1996–1998. Day = Julian day midpoint between two successive nest visits; Nest height = nest height in m; Conceal = nest concealment calculated as the mean of side cover and overhead cover values; Shrub = number of shrub stems >10 cm above the ground and <8 cm dbh within a 5-m radius circle centered on the nest; Forest = percentage of landscape made up of forest within a 5-km radius circle centered on the plot; Year = 1996, 1997, 1998; Stage = laying, incubation, nestling. For continuous variables, survival rates are estimated at their 10th, 50th (median) and 90th percentiles.

and understory (Rodewald and Smith 1998, Artman et al. 2001), but we found only weak support for nest-site effects for this species. Ground and shrub nesters showed moderate support for nest-site effects, as expected, but the global model was their best model, indicating that this group of birds is responding to multiple factors across all the models. Our finding that concealment was supported for ground and shrub nesters is in agreement with previous studies of shrub-nesting species (Murphy 1983, Weidinger 2002, Albrecht 2004), while nest height for ground-shrub nesters has also been observed as a factor in nest survival of roadside bird communities (Shochat et al. 2005b) and Bell's Vireos (*Vireo bellii*) (Budnik et al. 2002). To our knowledge, concealment and shrub density has not been previously reported in association with nest survival for Prothonotary Warblers.

The two models with relatively weak support in our study (cowbird and edge effects) have been intensively studied in dozens of other research studies with mixed results. Comprehensive reviews indicate that cowbirds and landscape edges are factors that can affect nest survival in biologically important ways; however, negative effects are not observed in every study (Thompson et al. 2000, Batary and

Baldi 2004, Lloyd et al. 2005). The relatively weak support we observed for the cowbird-effects model suggests that parasitism was not a major factor affecting nest survival in our study. Low rates of parasitism are unusual for the midwestern US, although the heaviest cowbird effects typically come from landscapes with even lower forest cover than our study area (Fauth 2000). Species-specific comparative data on edge effects is difficult to find because much of the literature is based on artificial nest studies or focuses on general effects on the bird community rather than species-specific vulnerability (Batary and Baldi 2004, Moore and Robinson 2004). However, other studies in the midwestern U.S. have identified negative effects of fragmented (high-edge) landscapes on landbird nest survival (Donovan et al. 1997).

The ability to directly assess the relative importance of a wide variety of factors that may affect nest survival, measured at multiple-spatial scales, has major implications for the management of bird populations. With this information, managers will be able to allocate resources more efficiently and identify when the major factors associated with nest survival are beyond their control. For example, landscape-scale factors respond to changes in public policy and economics, whereas local-scale variables associated with the nest site itself are modified by silvicultural methods and other site-scale habitat management (Duguay et al. 2000, Bettinger et al. 2005).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank T. J. Fox, R. K. Hines, C. Sveum, E. Anderson, S. Anderson, G. Amsrud, D. Baker, C. Fylling, S. Hoffman, S. Houdek, W. Klouda, C. E. Korschgen, J. E. Lyon, K. Max, D. McClellan, L. McColl, M. Mullaney, J. C. Nelson, T. Nolan, L. R. Robinson, K. Skroch, G. Stern, L. Thomas, B. Tomica, and L. Zebechazy for their assistance. T. L. Shaffer, F. R. Thompson, III, and R. G. Peak provided consultation on the analyses. Four anonymous reviewers provided helpful comments that improved the paper. Project support was provided by the U.S. Geological Survey, Breeding Biology Research Database (BBIRD) program; the USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 3 Nongame Bird Program; the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources; the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; and the Iowa Department of Natural Resources. Identification of commercial equipment and software in the text does not imply endorsement by the U.S. government.

TABLE 5. CONDITIONAL MEDIAN DAILY NEST-SURVIVAL ESTIMATES AND INTERVAL-SURVIVAL ESTIMATES WITH ASSOCIATED 95% CONFIDENCE INTERVALS (CI) FROM BEST MODELS FOR SPECIES AND LIFE-HISTORY GROUPINGS OF BIRDS NESTING IN FLOODPLAIN AND UPLAND FORESTS OF THE DRIFTLSS AREA, 1996-1998.

Species	Nests found	Nests successful	Exposure days	Nesting cycle (N of days)	Daily survival estimate (CI)	Interval survival estimate (CI)
American Redstart (<i>Setophaga ruticilla</i>)	196	66	2,488.5	24	0.949 (0.940, 0.958)	0.262 (0.182, 0.348) ^a
American Robin (<i>Turdus migratorius</i>)	109	68	1,785.5	30	0.974 (0.966, 0.981)	0.458 (0.352, 0.559)
Blue-gray Gnatcatcher (<i>Poliophtila caerulea</i>)	66	26	1,315.0	28	0.973 (0.961, 0.981)	0.460 (0.326, 0.585)
Eastern Wood-Pewee (<i>Contopus virens</i>)	100	50	2,131.5	33	0.975 (0.966, 0.981)	0.428 (0.323, 0.528)
Prothonotary Warbler (<i>Protonotaria citrea</i>)	134	82	2,095.0	28	0.981 (0.966, 0.990)	0.558 (0.325, 0.740) ^b
Rose-breasted Grosbeak (<i>Phenicticus ludovicianus</i>)	73	33	1,063.0	27	0.960 (0.946, 0.971)	0.300 (0.157, 0.458) ^c
Area-sensitive low nesters	34	18	474.0	29	0.968 (0.947, 0.981)	0.388 (0.208, 0.565)
Ovenbird (<i>Seiurus aurocapilla</i>)	12	7	174.5	26	0.971 (0.932, 0.988)	0.463 (0.160, 0.727)
Wood Thrush (<i>Hylocichla mustelina</i>)	22	11	299.5	30	0.966 (0.938, 0.982)	0.356 (0.147, 0.574)
Area-sensitive tree nesters	121	58	1,890.5	29	0.968 (0.957, 0.976)	0.446 (0.128, 0.672) ^d
Acadian Flycatcher (<i>Empidonax virens</i>)	15	11	225.5	32	0.982 (0.953, 0.993)	0.559 (0.214, 0.804)
Red-eyed Vireo (<i>Vireo olivaceus</i>)	24	10	339.5	28	0.957 (0.929, 0.975)	0.294 (0.127, 0.485)
Scarlet Tanager (<i>Piranga olivacea</i>)	43	21	676.0	28	0.967 (0.950, 0.978)	0.391 (0.240, 0.539)
Warbling Vireo (<i>Vireo gilvus</i>)	39	16	649.5	29	0.961 (0.942, 0.973)	0.312 (0.179, 0.456)
Cavity nesters	148	132	2,453.5	40	0.990 (0.983, 0.994)	0.661 (0.500, 0.782)
Black-capped Chickadee (<i>Poecile atricapillus</i>)	27	23	341.5	35	0.982 (0.961, 0.992)	0.531 (0.246, 0.753)
Downy Woodpecker (<i>Picoides pubescens</i>)	20	18	270.0	37	0.989 (0.966, 0.996)	0.658 (0.275, 0.874)
Great Crested Flycatcher (<i>Myiarchus crinitus</i>)	20	15	461.5	33	0.985 (0.968, 0.993)	0.601 (0.345, 0.785)
Hairy Woodpecker (<i>Picoides villosus</i>)	21	21	231.0	46	0.969 (0.936, 0.985)	0.232 (0.048, 0.500)
Red-bellied Woodpecker (<i>Melanerpes carolinus</i>)	14	12	332.5	42	0.988 (0.968, 0.995)	0.599 (0.257, 0.825)
Red-headed Woodpecker (<i>Melanerpes erythrocephalus</i>)	6	5	170.5	44	0.994 (0.956, 0.999)	0.772 (0.162, 0.964)
White-breasted Nuthatch (<i>Sitta carolinensis</i>)	5	4	90.5	46	0.989 (0.925, 0.998)	0.597 (0.028, 0.930)
Yellow-bellied Sapsucker (<i>Sphyrapicus varius</i>)	35	34	556.0	44	0.989 (0.976, 0.995)	0.619 (0.344, 0.806)
Ground-shrub nesters	161	66	2,338.5	26	0.951 (0.917, 0.972)	0.271 (0.104, 0.474)
Brown Thrasher (<i>Toxostoma rufum</i>)	9	5	167.0	28	0.976 (0.937, 0.991)	0.504 (0.163, 0.774)
Eastern Kingbird (<i>Tyrannus tyrannus</i>)	6	4	178.5	37	0.983 (0.948, 0.995)	0.528 (0.140, 0.815)
Gray Catbird (<i>Dumetella carolinensis</i>)	53	21	797.5	27	0.962 (0.946, 0.973)	0.347 (0.221, 0.478)
Indigo Bunting (<i>Passerina cyanea</i>)	17	7	217.0	27	0.953 (0.914, 0.974)	0.271 (0.089, 0.496)
Northern Cardinal (<i>Cardinalis cardinalis</i>)	22	7	283.5	25	0.945 (0.912, 0.967)	0.246 (0.099, 0.431)
Song Sparrow (<i>Melospiza melodia</i>)	7	3	67.5	27	0.938 (0.846, 0.977)	0.178 (0.011, 0.528)
Yellow Warbler (<i>Dendroica petechia</i>)	47	19	627.5	24	0.954 (0.935, 0.968)	0.325 (0.197, 0.461)

^a Assuming 4-, 11-, and 9-d laying, incubation, and nestling period, respectively.

^b Assuming 5-, 13-, and 10-d laying, incubation, and nestling period, respectively.

^c Assuming 4-, 13-, and 10-d laying, incubation, and nestling period, respectively.

^d Assuming 4-, 13-, and 12-d weighted average laying, incubation, and nestling period, respectively.

LITERATURE CITED (SAB No. 34, all papers)

- AEBISCHER, N. J. 1999. Multi-way comparisons and generalised linear models of nest success: extensions of the Mayfield method. *Bird Study* 46: S22–S31.
- AGRESTI, A., AND B. FINLAY. 1986. *Statistical methods for the social sciences*. 2nd ed. Dellen Publishing Company, San Francisco, CA
- AKAIKE, H. 1973. Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. Pp. 267–281 in B. N. Petran, and F. Csaki (editors). *International symposium on information theory*, 2nd ed. Budapest, Hungary.
- ALBRECHT, T. 2004. Edge effect in wetland-arable land boundary determines nesting success of Scarlet Rosefinches (*Carpodacus erythrinus*) in the Czech Republic. *Auk* 121:361–371.
- ALDRIDGE, C. L., AND R. M. BRIGHAM. 2001. Nesting and reproductive success of Greater Sage-Grouse in a declining northern fringe population. *Condor* 103:537–543.
- ALLISON, P. D. 1999. *Logistic regression using the SAS system, theory and application*. SAS Institute, Cary, NC.
- ANDERSON, D. R., AND K. P. BURNHAM. 2002. Avoiding pitfalls when using information-theoretic methods. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 66:912–918.
- ANDERSON, D. R., W. A. LINK, D. H. JOHNSON, AND K. P. BURNHAM. 2001. Suggestions for presenting the results of data analyses. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 65:373–378.
- ANDERSON, P. K., O. BORGAN, R. D. GILL, AND N. KEIDING. 1992. *Statistical models based on counting processes*. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- ANDERSON, P. K., J. P. KLEIN, K. M. KNUDSEN, AND R. T. PALACIOS. 1997. Estimation of variance in Cox's regression model with shared gamma frailties. *Biometrics* 53:1475–1484.
- ANONYMOUS. 1981. Correction. *Ibis* 123:595.
- ARMSTRONG, D. P., E. H. RAEBURN, R. G. POWLESLAND, M. HOWARD, B. CHRISTENSEN, AND J. G. EWEN. 2002. Obtaining meaningful comparisons of nest success: data from New Zealand Robin (*Petroica australis*) populations. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 26:1–13.
- ARTMAN, V. L., E. K. SUTHERLAND, AND J. F. DOWNHOWER. 2001. Prescribed burning to restore mixed-oak communities in southern Ohio: effects on breeding-bird populations. *Conservation Biology* 15: 1423–1434.
- BAICICH, P. J., AND J. O. HARRISON. 1997. *A guide to the nests, eggs, and nestlings of North American birds*, 2nd ed. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.
- BANERJEE, S., M. M. WALL, AND B. P. CARLIN. 2003. Frailty modeling for spatially correlated survival data, with application to infant mortality in Minnesota. *Biostatistics* 4:123–142.
- BART, J., AND D. S. ROBSON. 1982. Estimating survivorship when the subjects are visited periodically. *Ecology* 63:1078–1090.
- BATARY, P., AND A. BALDI. 2004. Evidence of an edge effect on avian nest success. *Conservation Biology* 18:389–400.
- BEAUCHAMP, W. D., R. R. KOFORD, T. D. NUDDS, R. G. CLARK, AND D. H. JOHNSON. 1996. Long-term declines in nest success of prairie ducks. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 60:247–257.
- BELETSKY, L. D. 1996. *The Red-winged Blackbird. The biology of a strongly polygynous songbird*. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.
- BERGER, J. O., V. DE OLIVEIRA, AND B. SANS. 2001. Bayesian analysis of spatially correlated data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 96:1361–1374.
- BERGSTROM, P. W. 1982. *Ecology of incubation in Wilson's Plover (Charadrius wilsonia)*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.
- BERGSTROM, P. W. 1988. Breeding biology of Wilson's Plovers. *Wilson Bulletin* 100:25–35.
- BEST, L. B., K. E. FREEMARK, J. J. DINSMORE, AND M. CAMP. 1995. A review and synthesis of habitat use by breeding birds in agricultural landscapes of Iowa. *American Midland Naturalist* 134:1–29.
- BEST, L. B., K. E. FREEMARK, B. S. STEINER, AND T. M. BERGIN. 1996. Life history and status classifications of birds breeding in Iowa. *Journal of the Iowa Academy of Science* 103:34–45.
- BETTINGER, P., M. LENNETTE, K. N. JOHNSON, AND T. A. SPIES. 2005. A hierarchical spatial framework for forest landscape planning. *Ecological Modelling* 182:25–48.
- BISHOP, Y. M. M., S. E. FIENBERG, AND P. W. HOLLAND. 1975. *Discrete multivariate analysis*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- BOYD, R. L. 1972. *Breeding biology of the Snowy Plover at Cheyenne Bottoms Waterfowl Management Area, Barton County, Kansas*. M.S. thesis, Emporia State University, Emporia, KS.
- BRESLOW, N. 1974. Covariance analysis of censored survival data. *Biometrics* 30:89–99.
- BRESLOW, N. E., AND D. G. CLAYTON. 1993. Approximate inference in generalized linear mixed models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 88:9–25.
- BRITTON, J. C., AND B. MORTON. 1989. *Shore ecology of the Gulf of Mexico*. University of Texas Press, Austin, TX.
- BROMAGHIN, J. F., AND L. L. McDONALD. 1993a. Weighted nest survival models. *Biometrics* 49:1164–1172.

- BROMAGHIN, J. F., AND L. L. McDONALD. 1993b. A systematic-encounter-sampling design for nesting studies. *Auk* 110:646-651.
- BROOKS, S. P., E. A. CATCHPOLE, B. J. T. MORGAN, AND S. C. BARRY. 2000. On the Bayesian analysis of ring-recovery data. *Biometrics* 56:951-956.
- BROOKS, S. P., E. A. CATCHPOLE, B. J. T. MORGAN, AND M. P. HARRIS. 2002. Bayesian methods for analyzing ringing data. *Journal of Applied Statistics* 29:187-206.
- BROWN, S., C. HICKEY, B. HARRINGTON, AND R. GILL (EDITORS). 2001. *The U.S. Shorebird Conservation Plan*, 2nd ed. Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences, Manomet, MA.
- BUDNIK, J. M., F. R. THOMPSON III, AND M. R. RYAN. 2002. Effect of habitat characteristics on the probability of parasitism and predation of Bell's Vireo nests. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 66:232-239.
- BURHANS, D. E., D. DEARBORN, F. R. THOMPSON III, AND J. FAABORG. 2002. Factors affecting predation at songbird nests in old fields. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 66:240-249.
- BURKE, D. M., AND E. NOL. 2000. Landscape and fragment size effects on reproductive success of forest-breeding birds in Ontario. *Ecological Applications* 10:1749-1761.
- BURNHAM, K. P., AND D. R. ANDERSON. 2002. Model selection and multi-model inference: a practical information-theoretic approach, 2nd ed. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- BURNHAM, K. P., AND D. R. ANDERSON. 2004. Multimodel inference—understanding AIC and BIC in model selection. *Sociological Methods and Research* 33: 261-304.
- BURNHAM, K. P., D. R. ANDERSON, G. C. WHITE, C. BROWNIE, AND K. H. POLLOCK. 1987. Design and analysis experiments for fish survival experiments based on capture-recapture. *American Fisheries Society Monograph* No. 5.
- CACCAMISE, D. F. 1976. Nesting mortality in the Red-winged Blackbird. *Auk* 93:517-534.
- CACCAMISE, D. F. 1977. Breeding success and nest site characteristics of the Red-winged Blackbird. *Wilson Bulletin* 89:396-403.
- CACCAMISE, D. F. 1978. Seasonal patterns of nesting mortality in the Red-winged Blackbird. *Condor* 80:290-294.
- CAHAYLA-WYNNNE, R., AND D. C. GLENN-LEWIN. 1978. The forest vegetation of the driftless area, northeast Iowa. *American Midland Naturalist* 100:307-319.
- CAI, T., AND R. A. BETENSKY. 2003. Hazard regression for interval-censored data with penalized spline. *Biometrics* 59:570-579.
- CAM, E., W. A. LINK, E. G. COOCH, Y.-A. MONNAT, AND E. DANCHIN. 2002. Individual covariation in life-history traits: seeing the trees despite the forest. *American Naturalist* 159:96-105.
- CANFIELD, R. H. 1941. Application of the line interception method in sampling range vegetation. *Journal of Forestry* 38:388-394.
- CAO, J., AND C. Z. HE. 2005. Bias adjustment in Bayesian estimation of bird nest age-specific survival rates. *Biometrics* 61:877-878.
- CAO, J., C. Z. HE, AND T. D. MCCOY. In press. Bayesian estimation of age-specific bird nest survival rates with categorical covariates. *Environmental and Ecological Statistics*.
- CAREY, J. R. 1989. The multiple decrement life table: a unifying framework for cause-of-death analysis in ecology. *Oecologia* 78:131-137.
- CASELLA, G., AND R. L. BERGER. 1990. *Statistical inference*. Duxbury Press, Belmont, CA.
- CASELLA, G., AND E. I. GEORGE. 1992. Explaining the Gibbs sampler. *American Statistician* 46:167-174.
- CHIANG, C. L. 1968. *Introduction to stochastic process in biostatistics*. Wiley, New York, NY.
- CLARK, J. S. 2005. Why environmental scientists are becoming Bayesians. *Ecology Letters* 8:2-14.
- CLARK, R. G., AND D. SHUTLER. 1999. Avian habitat selection: pattern from process in nest-site use by ducks. *Ecology* 80:272-287.
- COOCH, E., AND G. C. WHITE. 2005. Program MARK: a gentle introduction. 4th ed. <<http://www.phidot.org/software/mark/docs/book/>> (15 November 2006).
- COOPER, A. B., R. HILBORN, AND J. W. UNSWORTH. 2003. An approach for population assessment in the absence of abundance indices. *Ecological Applications* 13: 814-828.
- COPAS, J. B. 1989. Unweighted sum of squares test for proportions. *Applied Statistics* 38:71-80.
- CORBAT, C. A. 1990. Nesting ecology of selected beach-nesting birds in Georgia. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.
- CORBAT, C. A., AND P. W. BERGSTROM. 2000. Wilson's Plover (*Charadrius wilsonia*). In A. Poole, and F. Gill (editors). *The Birds of North America*, No. 516. The Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, PA and The American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, DC.
- COULSON, J. C. 1956. Mortality and egg production of the Meadow Pipit with special reference to altitude. *Bird Study* 3:119-132.
- COX, D. R. 1972. Regression models and life tables (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 34:187-220.
- COX, D. R. 1983. Some remarks on overdispersion. *Biometrika* 70:269-274.
- CRESSWELL, W. 1997. Nest predation: the relative effects of nest characteristics, clutch size and parental behaviour. *Animal Behaviour* 53:93-103.
- CRUMPTON, W. G. 1993. Establishment of an experimental wetland research complex. *Leopold Center Progress Reports* 2:9-12.
- CURTIS, J. T. 1959. *The vegetation of Wisconsin: an ordination of plant communities*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, WI.
- DAVIS, S. K. 2003. Nesting ecology of mixed-grass prairie songbirds in southern Saskatchewan. *Wilson Bulletin* 115:119-130.

- DAVIS, S. K. 2005. Nest-site selection patterns and the influence of vegetation on nest-survival of mixed-grass prairie passerines. *Condor* 107:605-616.
- DEMPSTER, A. P., N. M. LAIRD, AND D. B. RUBIN. 1977. Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 39:1-38.
- DIENI, J. S., AND S. L. JONES. 2003. Grassland songbird nest site selection patterns in north-central Montana. *Wilson Bulletin* 115:388-396.
- DINSMORE, S. J., G. C. WHITE, AND F. L. KNOPF. 2002. Advanced techniques for modeling avian nest survival. *Ecology* 83:3476-3488.
- DION, N., K. A. HOBSON, AND S. LARIVIRE. 2000. Interactive effects of vegetation and predators on the success of natural and simulated nests of grassland songbirds. *Condor* 102:629-634.
- DIXON, P., AND A. M. ELLISON. 1996. Bayesian inference. *Ecological Applications*. 6:1034-1035.
- DO, K. 2002. Biostatistical approaches for modeling longitudinal and event time data. *Clinical Cancer Research* 8:2473-2474.
- DONOVAN, T. M., P. W. JONES, E. M. ANNAND, AND F. R. THOMPSON III. 1997. Variation in local-scale edge effects: mechanisms and landscape context. *Ecology* 78:2064-2075.
- DOW, D. D. 1978. A test of significance for Mayfield's method of calculating nest success. *Wilson Bulletin* 90:291-295.
- DUGUAY, J. P., P. B. WOOD, AND G. W. MILLER. 2000. Effects of timber harvests on invertebrate biomass and avian nest success. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 28:1123-1131.
- DUPIS, J. A. 1995. Bayesian estimation of movement and survival probabilities from capture-recapture data. *Biometrika* 82:761-772.
- DUPIS, J. A. 2002. Prior distributions for stratified capture-recapture models. *Journal of Applied Statistics* 29:225-237.
- DYER, M. I., J. PINOWSKI, AND B. PINOWSKA. 1977. Population dynamics. Pp. 53-105 in J. Pinowski, and S. C. Kendeigh (editors). *Granivorous birds in ecosystems, their evolution, populations, energetics, adaptations, impact, and control*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- EFRON, B. 1988. Logistic regression, survival analysis, and the Kaplan-Meier curve. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 83:414-425.
- EFRON, B. 1995. Business statistics center interviews. Irwin/McGraw-Hill Company. <<http://www.mhhe.com/business/opsci/bstat/efron.mhtml>> (11 April 2006).
- EHRlich, P. R., D. S. DOBKIN, AND D. WHEYE. 1988. *The birder's handbook*. Simon and Schuster, New York, NY.
- ELLISON, A. M. 1996. An introduction to Bayesian inference for ecological research and environmental decision-making. *Ecological Applications* 6:1036-1046.
- ENNIS, D. M. 1998. The beta-binomial model: accounting for inter-trial variation in replicated difference and preference tests. *Journal of Sensory Studies* 13:389-412.
- ETHERIDGE, B., R. W. SUMMERS, AND R. E. GREEN. 1997. The effects of illegal killing and destruction of nests by humans on the population dynamics of the hen harrier *Circus cyaneus* in Scotland. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 34:1081-1105.
- ETTERSON, M. A., AND R. S. BENNETT. 2005. Including transition probabilities in nest survival estimation: a Mayfield Markov chain. *Ecology* 86:1414-1421.
- ETTERSON, M., AND R. BENNETT. 2006. The effects of uncertainty about age of transition on bias in the Mayfield family of estimators. *Ecological Modelling* 199:253-260.
- ETTERSON, M. A., L. R. NAGY, AND T. RODDEN-ROBINSON. 2007. Partitioning risk among different causes of nest failure. *Auk* 124:432-443.
- FAABORG, J. 2002. *Saving migrant songbirds: developing strategies for the future*. University of Texas Press, Austin, TX.
- FAN, X., A. FELSEVALYI, S. A. SIVO, AND S. C. KEENAN. 2003. *SAS for Monte Carlo studies: a guide for quantitative researchers*. SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC.
- FARNSWORTH, G. L., K. C. WEEKS, AND T. R. SIMONS. 2000. Validating the assumptions of the Mayfield method. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 71:658-664.
- FAUTH, P. T. 2000. Reproductive success of Wood Thrushes in forest fragments in northern Indiana. *Auk* 117:194-204.
- FILLIATER, T. S., R. BREITWISCH, AND P. M. NEALEN. 1994. Predation on Northern Cardinal nests: does choice of nest-site matter? *Condor* 96:761-768.
- FITZMAURICE, G. M. 1997. Model selection with overdispersed data. *Statistician* 46:81-91.
- FLINT, P. L., K. H. POLLOCK, D. THOMAS, AND J. S. SEDINGER. 1995. Estimating pre fledging survival: allowing for brood mixing and dependence among brood mates. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 59:448-455.
- FOWLKES, E. B. 1987. Some diagnostics for binary logistic regression via smoothing methods. *Biometrika* 74:503-515.
- GELMAN, A., J. B. CARLIN, H. S. STERN, AND D. B. RUBIN. 1995. *Bayesian data analysis*. Chapman and Hall, London, UK.
- GILMER, D. S., I. J. BALL, L. M. COWARDIN, AND J. H. RIECHMANN. 1974. Effects of radio packages on wild ducks. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 38:243-252.
- GOC, M. 1986. A new method of estimating nest success in birds. *Vår Fågelvärld (Supplement)* 11:33-34.
- GÖRANSSON, G., AND J. LOMAN. 1976. Predation på konstgjorda fasanreden (predation on simulated pheasant's nests). *Anser* 15:195-200.

- GORE, J. A., AND C. A. CHASE III. 1989. Snowy Plover breeding distribution. Final performance report. Nongame Wildlife Section, Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, Tallahassee, FL.
- GÖTMARK, F. 1992. The effects of investigator disturbance on nesting birds. *Current Ornithology* 9:63-104.
- GÖTMARK, F., D. BLOMQUIST, O. C. JOHANSSON, AND J. BERGKVIST. 1995. Nest site selection: a trade-off between concealment and view of the surroundings? *Journal of Avian Biology* 26:305-312.
- GRAND, J. B., T. F. FONDELL, D. A. MILLER, AND R. M. ANTHONY. 2006. Nest survival in Dusky Canada Geese (*Branta canadensis occidentalis*): use of discrete-time models. *Auk* 123:198-210.
- GRANT, T. A., T. L. SHAFFER, E. M. MADDEN, AND P. J. PIETZ. 2005. Time-specific variation in passerine nest survival: new insights into old questions. *Auk* 122:661-672.
- GRAY, R. J. 1992. Flexible methods for analyzing survival data using splines, with applications to breast cancer prognosis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 87:942-951.
- GREEN, M. T., P. E. LOWTHER, S. L. JONES, S. K. DAVIS, AND B. C. DALE. 2002. Baird's Sparrow (*Ammodramus bairdii*). In A. Poole, and F. Gill (editors). *The Birds of North America*, No. 638. Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, PA and The American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, DC.
- GREEN, R. E. 1989. Transformation of crude proportions of nests that are successful for comparison with Mayfield estimates of nest success. *Ibis* 131: 305-306.
- GREEN, R. F. 1977. Do more birds produce fewer young? A comment on Mayfield's measure of nest success. *Wilson Bulletin* 89:173-175.
- GREENBERG, R. 2003. The use of nest departure calls for surveying Swamp Sparrows. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 74:12-16.
- GREENBERG, R., C. ELPHICK, J. C. NORDBY, C. GJERDRUM, H. SPAUTZ, G. SHRIVER, B. SCHMELING, B. OLSEN, P. MARRA, N. NUR, AND M. WINTER. 2006. Flooding and predation: trade-offs in the nesting ecology of tidal-marsh sparrows. *Studies in Avian Biology* 32:96-109.
- GROSS, A. J., AND V. A. CLARK. 1975. Survival distributions: reliability applications in the biomedical sciences. Wiley, New York, NY.
- GUSTAFSON, E. J., M. G. KNUTSON, G. J. NIEMI, AND M. A. FRIBERG. 2002. Evaluation of spatial models to predict vulnerability of forest birds to brood parasitism by cowbirds. *Ecological Applications* 12:412-426.
- HALUPKA, K. 1998. Vocal begging by nestlings and vulnerability to nest predation in Meadow Pipits *Anthus pratensis*: to what extent do predation costs of begging exist? *Ibis* 140:144-149.
- HAMMOND, M. C., AND W. R. FORWARD. 1956. Experiments on causes of duck nest predation. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 20:243-247.
- HARDLE, W. 1990. Applied nonparametric regression. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- HARTLEY, M. J., AND M. L. HUNTER, JR. 1998. A meta-analysis of forest cover, edge effects, and artificial nest predation rates. *Conservation Biology* 12: 465-469.
- HAZLER, K. R. 2004. Mayfield logistic regression: a practical approach for analysis of nest survival. *Auk* 121:707-716.
- HE, C. Z. 2003. Bayesian modeling of age-specific survival in bird nesting studies under irregular visits. *Biometrics* 59:962-973.
- HE, C. Z., D. SUN, AND Y. TRA. 2001. Bayesian modeling of age-specific survival in nesting studies under Dirichlet priors. *Biometrics* 57:1059-1066.
- HEISEY, D. M. 1991. Applications of survival analysis in animal ecology. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI.
- HEISEY, D. M., AND A. P. FOONG. 1998. Modelling time-dependent interaction in a time-varying covariate and its application to rejection episodes and kidney transplant failure. *Biometrics* 54:712-719.
- HEISEY, D. M., AND T. K. FULLER. 1985. Evaluation of survival and cause-specific mortality-rates using telemetry data. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 49:668-674.
- HEISEY, D. M., AND E. V. NORDHEIM. 1990. Biases in the Pollock and Cornelius method of estimating nest survival. *Biometrics* 46:855-862.
- HEISEY, D. M., AND E. V. NORDHEIM. 1995. Modeling age-specific survival in nesting studies, using a general approach for doubly-censored and truncated data. *Biometrics* 51:51-60.
- HENSLE, G. L. 1985. Estimation and comparison of function of daily nest survival probabilities using the Mayfield method. Pp. 289-301 in B. J. T. Morgan, and P.M. North (editors). *Statistics in ornithology*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany.
- HENSLE, G. L., AND J. D. NICHOLS. 1981. The Mayfield method of estimating nesting success: a model, estimators and simulation results. *Wilson Bulletin* 93:42-53.
- HILL, D. P., AND L. K. GOULD. 1997. Chestnut-collared Longspur (*Calcarius ornatus*). In A. Poole, and F. Gill (editors). *The Birds of North America*, No. 288. Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, PA and The American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, DC.
- HILL, L. A. 1985. Breeding ecology of interior Least Terns, Snowy Plovers, and American Avocets at Salt Plains National Wildlife Refuge. M.S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK.
- HINDE, J., AND C. G. B. DEMETRIO. 1998. Overdispersion: models and estimation. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* 27:151-170.
- HINES, J. E., AND J. R. SAUER. 1989. Program CONTRAST: a general program for the analysis of several survival or recovery rate estimates. USDI Fish and Wildlife Service Technical Report 24. Washington, DC.

- HOBBS, N. T., AND R. HILBORN. 2006. Alternatives to statistical hypothesis testing in ecology: a guide to self teaching. *Ecological Applications* 16:5-19.
- HOBERT, J. P., AND G. CASELLA. 1996. The effect of improper priors on Gibbs sampling in hierarchical linear mixed models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 91:1461-1473.
- HOEKMAN, S. T., L. S. MILLS, D. W. HOWERTER, J. H. DEVRIES, AND I. J. BALL. 2002. Sensitivity analyses of the life cycle of midcontinent Mallards. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 66:883-900.
- HOLFORD, T. R. 1976. Life tables with concomitant information. *Biometrics* 32:587-597.
- HOLFORD, T. R. 1980. The analysis of rates and survivorship using log-linear models. *Biometrics* 36:299-306.
- HOOD, S. L. 2006. Nesting ecology of Snowy and Wilson's plovers in the lower Laguna Madre region of Texas. M.S. thesis, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS.
- HOOVER, J. P. 2006. Water depth influences nest predation for a wetland-dependent bird in fragmented bottomland forests. *Biological Conservation* 127:37-45.
- HOOVER, J. P., AND M. C. BRITTINGHAM. 1998. Nest-site selection and nesting success of Wood Thrushes. *Wilson Bulletin* 110:375-383.
- HORVITZ, D. G., AND D. J. THOMPSON. 1952. A generalization of sampling without replacement from a finite universe. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 47:663-685.
- HOSMER, D. W., T. HOSMER, S. LE CESSIE, AND S. LEMESHOW. 1997. A comparison of goodness-of-fit tests for the logistic regression model. *Statistics in Medicine* 16:965-980.
- HOWLETT, J. S., AND B. J. STUTCHBURY. 1996. Nest concealment and predation in Hooded Warblers: experimental removal of nest cover. *Auk* 113:1-9.
- HUBER-CAROL, C., AND I. VONTA. 2004. Frailty models for arbitrarily censored and truncated data. *Lifetime Data Analysis* 10:369-388.
- HURVICH, C. M., AND C. L. TSAI. 1989. Regression and time series model selection in small samples. *Biometrika* 76:297-307.
- HYDE, J. 1977. Testing survival under right censoring and left truncation. *Biometrika* 64:225-230.
- IBRAHIM, J. G., M. H. CHEN, AND D. SINHA. 2001. Bayesian survival analysis. Springer, New York, NY.
- JEFFREYS, H. 1961. *Theory of probability*. 3rd ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- JEHLE, G., A. A. YACKEL ADAMS, J. A. SAVIDGE, AND S. K. SKAGEN. 2004. Nest survival estimation: a review of alternatives to the Mayfield estimator. *Condor* 106:472-484.
- JIANG, H., J. FINE, AND R. J. CHAPPELL. 2005. Semiparametric analysis of survival data with left truncation and dependent right censoring. *Biometrics* 61:567-575.
- JOHNSON, D. H. 1979. Estimating nest success: the Mayfield method and an alternative. *Auk* 96:651-661.
- JOHNSON, D. H. 1990. Statistical comparison of nest success rates. *Proceedings of the North Dakota Academy of Science* 44:67. <<http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource/2000/statcomp/statcomp.htm>> (9 June 2006)
- JOHNSON, D. H. 1991. Further comments on estimating nest success. *Ibis* 133:205-207.
- JOHNSON, D. H. 2002. The role of hypothesis testing in wildlife science. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 66:272-276.
- JOHNSON, D. H., AND A. T. KLETT. 1985. Quick estimates of success rates of duck nests. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 13:51-53.
- JOHNSON, D. H., J. D. NICHOLS, AND M. D. SCHWARTZ. 1992. Population dynamics of breeding waterfowl. Pp. 446-485 in B. D. J. Batt, A. D. Afton, M. G. Anderson, C. D. Ankney, D. H. Johnson, J. A. Kadlec, and G. L. Krapu (editors). *Ecology and management of breeding waterfowl*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- JOHNSON, D. H., A. B. SARGEANT, AND R. J. GREENWOOD. 1989. Importance of individual species of predators on nesting success of ducks in the Canadian prairie pothole region. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 67:291-297.
- JOHNSON, D. H., AND T. L. SHAFFER. 1990. Estimating nest success: when Mayfield wins. *Auk* 107:595-600.
- JOHNSON, D. S., AND J. A. HOETING. 2003. Autoregressive models for capture-recapture data: a Bayesian approach. *Biometrics* 59:341-350.
- JOHNSON, R. G., AND S. A. TEMPLE. 1990. Nest predation and brood parasitism of tallgrass prairie birds. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 54:106-111.
- KALBFLEISCH, J. D., AND R. L. PRENTICE. 1980. *The statistical analysis of failure time data*. Wiley, New York, NY.
- KAPLAN, E. L., AND P. MEIER. 1958. Nonparametric estimation from incomplete observations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 53:457-481.
- KASS, R. E., B. P. CARLIN, A. GELMAN, AND R. M. NEAL. 1998. Markov chain Monte Carlo in practice: a roundtable discussion. *American Statistician* 52:93-100.
- KASS, R. E., AND A. E. RAFTERY. 1995. Bayes factors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 90:773-795.
- KILGO, J. C., R. A. SARGENT, B. R. CHAPMAN, AND K. V. MILLER. 1998. Effect of stand width and adjacent habitat on breeding bird communities in bottomland hardwoods. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 62:72-83.
- KIM, D. K. 1997. Regression analysis of interval-censored survival data with covariates using log-linear models. *Biometrics* 53:1274-1283.
- KLETT, A. T., H. F. DUEBBERT, C. A. FAANES, AND K. F. HIGGINS. 1986. Techniques for studying nest success of ducks in upland habitats in the prairie

- pothole region. Resource Publication 158. USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC. <<http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource/tools/nest/nest.htm>> (20 March 2006).
- KLETT, A. T., AND D. H. JOHNSON. 1982. Variability in nest survival rates and implications to nesting studies. *Auk* 99:77-87.
- KNETTER, J. M., R. S. LUTZ, J. R. CARY, AND R. K. MURPHY. 2002. A multi-scale investigation of Piping Plover productivity on Great Plains alkali lakes, 1994-2000. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 30:683-694.
- KNIGHT, R. L., S. KIM, AND S. A. TEMPLE. 1985. Predation of Red-winged Blackbird nests by mink. *Condor* 87:304-305.
- KNUTSON, M. G., J. P. HOOVER, AND E. E. KLAAS. 1996. The importance of floodplain forests in the conservation and management of neotropical migratory birds in the Midwest. Pp. 168-188 in F. R. THOMPSON (editor). *Management of midwestern landscapes for the conservation of neotropical migratory birds*. USDA Forest Service General Technical Report NC-GTR-187. USDA Forest Service, North Central Research Station. St. Paul, MN.
- KNUTSON, M. G., AND E. E. KLAAS. 1997. Declines in abundance and species richness of birds following a major flood on the upper Mississippi River. *Auk* 114:367-380.
- KNUTSON, M. G., G. J. NIEMI, W. E. NEWTON, AND M. A. FRIBERG. 2004. Avian nest success in midwestern forests fragmented by agriculture. *Condor* 106:116-130.
- KNUTSON, M. G., L. A. POWELL, M. A. FRIBERG, G. J. NIEMI, AND R. K. HINES. 2006. An assessment of bird habitat quality using population growth rates. *Condor* 108:301-314.
- KORSCHGEN, C. E., K. P. KENOW, W. L. GREEN, D. H. JOHNSON, M. D. SAMUEL, AND L. SILEO. 1996. Survival of radiomarked Canvasback ducklings in northwestern Minnesota. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 60:120-132.
- LAIRD, N., AND D. OLIVER. 1980. Covariance analysis of censored survival data using log-linear analysis techniques. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 86:899-909.
- LAWLESS, J. F. 1982. *Statistical models and methods for lifetime data*. Wiley, NY.
- LE CESSIE, S., AND J. C. VAN HOUWELINGEN. 1991. A goodness-of-fit test for binary regression models, based on smoothing methods. *Biometrics* 47:1267-1282.
- LEBRETON, J. D., K. P. BURNHAM, J. COLBERT, AND D. R. ANDERSON. 1992. Modeling survival and testing biological hypotheses using marked animals: a unified approach with case studies. *Ecological Monographs* 62:67-118.
- LEE, Y., AND J. A. NELDER. 2000. Two ways of modeling overdispersion in non-normal data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C-Applied Statistics* 49:591-598.
- LELE, S., AND M. L. TAPER. 2002. A composite likelihood approach to estimation of (co)variance components. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 103:117-135.
- LIEBEZEIT, J. R., AND T. L. GEORGE. 2002. Nest predators, nest-site selection, and nesting success for the Dusky Flycatcher in a managed ponderosa pine forest. *Condor* 104:507-517.
- LINDGREN, B. W. 1976. *Statistical theory*. 3rd ed. MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc. New York, NY.
- LINDSEY, J. C., AND L. M. RYAN. 1998. Tutorial in biostatistics: methods for interval-censored data. *Statistics in Medicine* 17:219-238.
- LINK, C. L. 1984. Confidence intervals for the survival function using Cox's proportional hazards model with covariates. *Biometrics* 40:601-609.
- LINK, W. A., E. CAM, J. D. NICHOLS, AND E. G. COOCH. 2002. Of BUGS and birds: Markov chain Monte Carlo for hierarchical modeling in wildlife research. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 66:277-291.
- LITTELL, R. C., G. A. MILLIKEN, W. W. STROUP, AND R. D. WOLFINGER. 1996. *SAS system for mixed models*. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC.
- LLOYD, J. D., AND T. E. MARTIN. 2005. Reproductive success of Chestnut-collared Longspurs in native and exotic grassland. *Condor* 107:363-374.
- LLOYD, P., T. E. MARTIN, R. L. REDMOND, U. LANGNER, AND M. M. HART. 2005. Linking demographic effects of habitat fragmentation across landscapes to continental source-sink dynamics. *Ecological Applications* 15:1504-1514.
- LOKEMOEN, J. T., AND R. R. KOFORD. 1996. Using candlers to determine the incubation stage of passerine eggs. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 67:660-668.
- LONGFORD, N. T. 1993. *Random coefficient models*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, UK.
- LUDWIG, D. 1996. Uncertainty and the assessment of extinction probabilities. *Ecological Applications* 6:1067-1076.
- LUNN, D. J., A. THOMAS, N. BEST, AND D. SPIEGELHALTER. 2000. WinBUGS—a Bayesian modeling framework: concepts, structure, and extensibility. *Statistics and Computing* 10:325-337.
- LYNDEN-BELL, D. 1971. A method of allowing for known observational selection in small samples applied to 3CR quasars. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomy Society* 155:95-118.
- MABEE, T. J. 1997. Using eggshell evidence to determine nest fate of shorebirds. *Wilson Bulletin* 109:307-313.
- MANLY, B. F. J., AND J. A. SCHMUTZ. 2001. Estimation of brood and nest survival: comparative methods in the presence of heterogeneity. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 65:258-270.
- MANOLIS, J. C., D. E. ANDERSEN, AND F. J. CUTHBERT. 2000. Uncertain nest fates in songbird studies and variation in Mayfield estimation. *Auk* 117:615-626.

- MARTIN, T. E. 1993. Nest predation among vegetation layers and habitat types: revising the dogmas. *American Naturalist* 141:897-913.
- MARTIN, T. E. 1998. Are microhabitat preferences of coexisting species under selection and adaptive? *Ecology* 79:656-670.
- MARTIN, T. E., AND G. R. GEUPEL. 1993. Nest-monitoring plots: methods for locating nests and monitoring success. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 64:507-519.
- MARTIN, T. E., AND J. J. ROPER. 1988. Nest predation and nest-site selection of a western population of the Hermit Thrush. *Condor* 90:51-57.
- MARTIN, T. E., AND S. J. MENGE. 2000. Nest predation increases with parental activity: separating nest site and parental activity effects. *Proceedings Royal Society London B* 267:2287-2293.
- MATHWORKS. 2004. MATLAB, Version 7.0, R14. The Mathworks, Inc., Natick, MA.
- MAYFIELD, H. 1960. The Kirtland's Warbler. Cranbrook Institute of Science, Bloomfield Hills, MI.
- MAYFIELD, H. 1961. Nesting success calculated from exposure. *Wilson Bulletin* 73:255-261.
- MAYFIELD, H. F. 1975. Suggestions for calculating nest success. *Wilson Bulletin* 87:456-466.
- MCCULLAGH, P., AND J. A. NELDER. 1989. *Generalized linear models*, 2nd ed. Chapman and Hall, New York, NY.
- MCGARIGAL, K., AND B. J. MARKS. 1995. FRAGSTATS: spatial pattern analysis program for quantifying landscape structure. USDA Forest Service General Technical Report PNW-GTR-351. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR.
- MCNAB, W. H., AND P. E. AVERS. 1994. Ecological subregions of the United States. USDA Forest Service WO-WSA-5. USDA Forest Service, Washington, DC. <<http://www.fs.fed.us/land/pubs/ecoregions/index.html>> (15 November 2006).
- MCPHERSON, R. J., T. W. ARNOLD, L. M. ARMSTRONG, AND C. J. SCHWARZ. 2003. Estimating the nest-success rate and the number of nests initiated by radiomarked Mallards. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 67:843-851.
- MEIER, P., T. KARRISON, R. CHAPPELL, AND H. XIE. 2004. The price of Kaplan-Meier. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 99:890-896.
- MILLER, H. W., AND D. H. JOHNSON. 1978. Interpreting the results of nesting studies. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 42:471-476.
- MILLER, R. G. JR. 1981. *Survival analysis*. Wiley, New York, NY.
- MILLER, R. G. JR. 1983. What price Kaplan-Meier? *Biometrics* 39:1077-1081.
- MOORE, R. P., AND W. D. ROBINSON. 2004. Artificial bird nests, external validity, and bias in ecological field studies. *Ecology* 85:1562-1567.
- MORRISON, M. L., W. M. BLOCK, M. D. STRICKLAND, AND W. L. KENDALL. 2001. *Wildlife study design*. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- MORTON, M. L., K. W. SOCKMAN, AND L. E. PETERSON. 1993. Nest predation in the Mountain White-crowned Sparrow. *Condor* 95:72-82.
- MURPHY, M. T. 1983. Nest success and nesting habits of Eastern Kingbirds and other flycatchers. *Condor* 85:208-219.
- MURPHY, M. T., C. L. CUMMINGS, AND M. S. PALMER. 1977. Comparative analysis of habitat selection, nest site and nest success by Cedar Waxwings (*Bombycilla cedrorum*) and Eastern Kingbirds (*Tyrannus tyrannus*). *American Midland Naturalist* 138:344-356.
- NATARAJAN, R., AND C. E. MCCULLOCH. 1999. Modeling heterogeneity in nest survival data. *Biometrics* 55: 553-559.
- NATIONAL CLIMATIC DATA CENTER. 2003. Climatological data, Texas: March-July. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. <<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/ncdc.html>> (6 November 2006).
- NATIONAL CLIMATIC DATA CENTER. 2004. Climatological data, Texas: March-July. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. <<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/ncdc.html>> (6 November 2006).
- NICHOLS, J. D., H. F. PERCIVAL, R. A. COON, M. J. CONROY, G. L. HENSLER, AND J. E. HINES. 1984. Observer visitation frequency and success of Mourning Dove nests: a field experiment. *Auk* 101:398-402.
- NISBET, I. C. T., K. J. WILSON, AND W. A. BROAD. 1978. Common Terns raise young after death of their mates. *Condor* 80:106-109.
- NÜR, N., A. L. HOLMES, AND G. R. GEUPEL. 2004. Use of survival time analysis to analyze nesting success in birds: an example using Loggerhead Shrikes. *Condor* 106:457-471.
- OAKES, D. 1972. Discussion of the paper by D. R. Cox. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 34:208.
- OWENS, T., AND K. D. HOP. 1995. Long term resource monitoring program standard operating procedures: photointerpretation. LTRMP 95-P008-1. (NTIS # PB95-264610) National Biological Service, Environmental Management Technical Center, Onalaska, WI.
- PAGE, G. W., J. S. WARRINER, J. C. WARRINER, AND P. W. C. PATON. 1995. Snowy Plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus*). In A. Poole, and F. Gill (editors). *The Birds of North America*, No. 154. The Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, PA and The American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, DC.
- PAGE, G. W., L. E. STENZEL, AND C. A. RIBIC. 1985. Nest site selection and clutch predation in the Snowy Plover. *Auk* 102:347-353.
- PAGE, G. W., D. W. WINKLER, AND C. W. SWARTH. 1983. Spacing out at Mono Lake: breeding success, nest density and predation in the Snowy Plover. *Auk* 100:13-24.
- PAN, W., AND R. CHAPPELL. 1999. A note on inconsistency of NPMLE of the distribution function from left truncated and case I interval censored data. *Lifetime Data Analysis* 5:281-291.

- PAN, W., AND R. CHAPPELL. 2002. Estimation in the Cox proportional hazards model with left-truncated and interval-censored data. *Biometrics* 58:64-70.
- PAN, Z., AND D. Y. LIN. 2005. Goodness-of-fit methods for generalized linear mixed models. *Biometrics* 61:1000-1009.
- PANKRATZ, V. S., M. DE ANDRADE, AND T. M. THERNEAU. 2005. Random-effects Cox proportional hazards model: general variance components methods for time-to-event data. *Genetic Epidemiology* 28: 97-109.
- PATON, P. W. C. 1995. Breeding biology of Snowy Plovers at Great Salt Lake, Utah. *Wilson Bulletin* 107:275-288.
- PEAK, R. G., F. R. THOMPSON III, AND T. L. SHAFFER. 2004. Factors affecting songbird nest survival in riparian forests in a midwestern agricultural landscape. *Auk* 121:726-737.
- PEAKALL, D. B. 1960. Nest records of the Yellowhammer. *Bird Study* 7:94-102.
- PESCADOR, M., AND S. PERIS. 2001. Effects of land use on nest predation: an experimental study in Spanish croplands. *Folia Zoologica* 50:127-136.
- PETTIT, L. J., AND D. K. PETTIT. 1996. Factors governing habitat selection by Prothonotary Warblers: field test of the Fretwell-Lucas models. *Ecological Monographs* 66:367-387.
- PIETZ, P. J., AND D. A. GRANFORS. 2000. Identifying predators and fates of grassland passerine nests using miniature video cameras. *Journal of Wildlife Management*. 64:71-87.
- PINHEIRO, J. C., AND D. M. BATES. 2000. Mixed-effects models in S and S-plus. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- POLLOCK, K. H., AND W. L. CORNELIUS. 1988. A distribution-free nest survival model. *Biometrics* 44: 397-404.
- POLLOCK, K. H., S. R. WINTERSTEIN, C. M. BUNCK, AND P. D. CURTIS. 1989. Survival analysis in telemetry studies: the staggered entry design. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 53:7-15.
- PRENTICE, R. L., AND L. A. GLOECKLER. 1978. Regression analysis of grouped survival data with application to breast cancer data. *Biometrics* 34:57-67.
- PURDUE, J. R. 1976. Thermal environment of the nest and related parental behavior in Snowy Plovers, *Charadrius alexandrinus*. *Condor* 78:180-185.
- RABE-HESKETH, S., A. SKRONDAL, AND A. PICKLES. 2002. Reliable estimation of generalized linear mixed models using adaptive quadrature. *Stata Journal* 2:1-21.
- RALPH, C. J., G. R. GEUPEL, P. PYLE, T. E. MARTIN, AND D. F. DESANTE. 1993. Handbook of field methods for monitoring landbirds. USDA Forest Service General Technical Report PSW-GTR-144. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Albany, CA.
- RECKHOW, K. H. 1990. Bayesian inference in non-replicated ecological studies. *Ecology* 71:2053-2059.
- REMES, V. 2005. Nest concealment and parental behaviour interact in affecting nest survival in the Blackcap (*Sylvia atricapilla*): an experimental evaluation of the parental compensation hypothesis. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 58:326-332.
- RENNER, M., AND L. S. DAVIS. 2001. Survival analysis of Little Penguin *Eudyptula minor* chicks on Motuara Island, New Zealand. *Ibis* 143:369-379.
- RICKLEFS, R. E. 1969. An analysis of nesting mortality in birds. *Smithsonian Contributions in Zoology* No. 9. Washington, DC.
- ROBBINS, M. B. 1998. Display behavior of male Sprague's Pipits. *Wilson Bulletin* 110:435-438.
- ROBEL, R. J., J. N. BRIGGS, A. D. DAYTON, AND L. C. HULBERT. 1970. Relationships between visual obstruction measurements and weights of grassland vegetation. *Journal of Range Management* 23:295-298.
- ROBINSON, D. H., AND H. WAINER. 2002. On the past and future of null hypothesis significance testing. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 66:263-271.
- RODEWALD, A. D. 2002. Nest predation in forested regions: landscape and edge effects. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 66:634-640.
- RODEWALD, P. G., AND K. G. SMITH. 1998. Short-term effects of understory and overstory management on breeding birds in Arkansas oak-hickory forests. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 62: 1411-1417.
- RODRIGUEZ, G., AND N. GOLDMAN. 1995. An assessment of estimation procedures for multilevel models with binary responses. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society A* 158:73-89.
- ROTELLA, J. J. 2005. Nest survival models. Chapter 14 in E. Cooch, and G. C. White (editors). Program MARK: a gentle introduction. 4th ed. <<http://www.warnercnr.colostate.edu/~gwhite/mark/mark.htm>> (15 November 2006).
- ROTELLA, J. J., S. J. DINSMORE, AND T. L. SHAFFER. 2004. Modeling nest-survival data: a comparison of recently developed methods that can be implemented in MARK and SAS. *Animal Biodiversity and Conservation* 27:187-205.
- ROTELLA, J. J., M. L. TAPER, AND A. J. HANSEN. 2000. Correcting nesting-success estimates for observer effects: maximum-likelihood estimates of daily survival rates with reduced bias. *Auk* 117:92-109.
- ROTELLA, J. J., M. L. TAPER, S. E. STEPHENS, AND M. L. LINDBERG. 2006. Code for extending methods for modeling heterogeneity in nest-survival data using generalized mixed models. Montana State University, Bozeman, MT. <<http://www.montana.edu/rotella/nestsurv>> (28 November 2006).
- ROTH, R. R. 1976. Spatial heterogeneity and bird species diversity. *Ecology* 57:773-782.
- ROYAMA, T. 1981. Evaluation of mortality factors in insect life table analysis. *Ecological Monographs* 51:495-505.

- RUPERT, J. R. 1997. The brood-rearing habitat, brood home range, and fecundity of the Snowy Plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus*) in coastal southern Texas. M.S. thesis, University of Texas-Pan American, Edinburg, TX.
- SAS INSTITUTE INC. 2004. SAS onlinedoc 9.1.2. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC. <<http://support.sas.com/onlinedoc/912/docMainpage.jsp>> (12 January 2007).
- SAUER, J. R., AND B. K. WILLIAMS. 1989. Generalized procedures for testing hypotheses about survival or recovery rates. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 53:137-142.
- SAWIN, R. S., M. W. LUTMAN, G. M. LINZ, AND W. J. BLEIER. 2003. Predators on Red-winged Blackbird nests in eastern North Dakota. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 74:288-292.
- SCHMIDT, K. A., AND C. J. WHELAN. 1999. Nest placement and mortality: a random event in space and time. *Condor* 101:916-920.
- SCOTT, J. M., F. DAVIS, B. CSUTI, R. NOSS, B. BUTTERFIELD, C. GROVES, H. ANDERSON, S. CAICCO, F. D'ERCHIA, T. C. EDWARDS, JR., J. ULLIMAN, AND R. G. WRIGHT. 1993. Gap analysis: a geographic approach to protection of biological diversity. *Wildlife Monographs* 123:1-41.
- SEARCY, W.A., AND J. YASUKAWA. 1995. Polygyny and sexual selection in Red-winged Blackbirds. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- SEBER, G. A. F. 1982. The estimation of animal abundance and related parameters. 2nd ed. Macmillan, New York, NY.
- SEDINGER, J. S. 1990. Effects of visiting Black Brant nests on egg and nest survival. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 54:437-443.
- SERVICE, P. M. 2000. Heterogeneity in individual mortality risk and its importance for evolutionary studies of senescence. *American Naturalist* 156:1-13.
- SHAFFER, T. L. 2004a. A unified approach to analyzing nest success. *Auk* 121:526-540.
- SHAFFER, T. L. 2004b. Logistic-exposure analyses of nest survival. Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center, Jamestown, ND. <<http://www.npwr.usgs.gov/resource/birds/nestsurv/index.htm>> (27 November 2006).
- SHOCHAT, E., M. A. PATTEN, D. W. MORRIS, D. L. REINKING, D. H. WOLFE, AND D. K. SHERROD. 2005a. Ecological traps in isodars: effects of tallgrass prairie management on bird nest success. *Oikos* 111:159-169.
- SHOCHAT, E., D. H. WOLFE, M. A. PATTEN, D. L. REINKING, AND S. K. SHERROD. 2005b. Tallgrass prairie management and bird nest success along roadsides. *Biological Conservation* 121:399-407.
- SIEPIELSKI, A. M., A. D. RODEWALD, AND R. H. YAHNER. 2001. Nest site selection and nesting success of the Red-eyed Vireo in central Pennsylvania. *Wilson Bulletin* 113:302-307.
- SILLETT, T. S., R. T. HOLMES, AND T. W. SHERRY. 2000. Impacts of a global climate cycle on population dynamics of a migratory songbird. *Science* 288:2040-2042.
- SIMPSON, E. H. 1951. The interpretation of interaction in contingency tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 13:238-241.
- SNEE, R. D. 1977. Validation of regression models: methods and examples. *Technometrics* 19:415-428.
- SNIJDERS, T. A. B., AND R. J. BOSKER. 1999. Multilevel analysis: an introduction to basic and advanced multilevel modeling. Sage Publications, London, UK.
- SNOW, D.W. 1955. The breeding of Blackbird, Song Thrush and Mistle Thrush in Great Britain, Part III. nesting success. *Bird Study* 2:169-178.
- SPIEGELHALTER, D. J., A. THOMAS, N. G. BEST, AND W. R. GILKS. 1995. BUGS: Bayesian inference using Gibbs Sampling. MRC Biostatistics Unit and Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine, Cambridge, UK.
- STANLEY, T. R. 2000. Modeling and estimation of stage-specific daily survival probabilities of nests. *Ecology* 81:2048-2053.
- STANLEY, T. R. 2004a. Estimating stage-specific daily survival probabilities of nests when nest age is unknown. *Auk* 121:134-147.
- STANLEY, T. R. 2004b. When should Mayfield model data be discarded? *Wilson Bulletin* 116:267-269.
- STEPHENS, S. E. 2003. The influence of landscape characteristics on duck nesting success in the Missouri Coteau Region of North Dakota. Ph.D. dissertation, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT.
- STEPHENS, S. E., D. N. KOONS, J. J. ROTELLA, AND D. W. WILLEY. 2004. Effects of habitat fragmentation on avian nesting success: a review of the evidence at multiple spatial scales. *Biological Conservation* 115:101-110.
- STEPHENS, S. E., J. J. ROTELLA, M. S. LINDBERG, M. L. TAPER, AND J. K. RINGELMAN. 2005. Duck nest survival in the Missouri Coteau of North Dakota: landscape effects at multiple spatial scales. *Ecological Applications* 15:2137-2149.
- STERN, M. A., K. A. KRISTENSEN, AND J. F. MORAWSKI. 1990. Investigations of Snowy Plovers at Albert Lake, Lake Co., Oregon. The Nature Conservancy, Portland, OR.
- STURDIVANT, R. X. 2005. Goodness-of-fit in hierarchical logistic regression models. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.
- STURDIVANT, R. X., AND D. W. HOSMER. In press. A smoothed residual based goodness-of-fit statistic for logistic hierarchical regression models. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*.
- STURDIVANT, R. X., J. J. ROTELLA, AND R. E. RUSSELL. 2006. Code for a smoothed residual based goodness-of-fit statistic for nest-survival models. Montana State University, Bozeman, MT. <<http://www.montana.edu/rotella/nestsurv/>> (30 November 2006).

- SUTTER, G. C. 1997. Nest-site selection and nest-entrance orientation in Sprague's Pipit. *Wilson Bulletin* 109:462-469.
- TAPER, M. L., AND S. R. LELE. 2004. The nature of scientific evidence: a forward-looking synthesis. Pp. 527-551 *in* M. L. Taper, and S. R. Lele (editors). *The Nature of Scientific Evidence: Empirical, Statistical, and Philosophical Considerations*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- TEWKSBURY, J. J., L. GARNER, S. GARNER, J. D. LLOYD, V. SAAB, AND T. E. MARTIN. 2006. Tests of landscape influence: nest predation and brood parasitism in fragmented ecosystems. *Ecology* 87:759-768.
- THERNEAU, T. M., AND P. M. GRAMBSCH. 2000. *Modeling survival data: extending the Cox model*. Springer, New York, NY.
- THOMPSON, F. R., III. 1994. Temporal and spatial patterns of breeding Brown-headed Cowbirds in the midwestern United States. *Auk* 111:979-990.
- THOMPSON, F. R., AND D. E. BURHANS. 2004. Differences in predators of artificial and real songbird nests: evidence of bias in artificial nest studies. *Conservation Biology* 18:373-380.
- THOMPSON, F. R., III, S. K. ROBINSON, T. M. DONOVAN, J. R. FAABORG, D. R. WHITEHEAD, AND D. R. LARSEN. 2000. Biogeographic, landscape, and local factors affecting cowbird abundance and host parasitism levels. Pp. 271-279 *in* J. N. M. SMITH, T. L. COOK, S. I. ROTHSTEIN, S. K. ROBINSON, and S. G. SEALY (editors). *Ecology and management of cowbirds and their hosts*. University of Texas Press, Austin, TX.
- THOMPSON, W. A. 1977. On the treatment of grouped observations in life studies. *Biometrics* 33: 463-470.
- TOMKINS, I. R. 1965. Wilson's Plover: some egg weights. *Oriole* 30:67-68.
- TOWNSEND, G. H. 1966. A study of waterfowl nesting on the Saskatchewan River delta. *Canadian Field-Naturalist* 80:74-88.
- TRENT, T. T., AND O. J. RONGSTAD. 1974. Home range and survival of cottontail rabbits in southwestern Wisconsin. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 38: 459-472.
- TSAI, W. Y., N. P. JEWELL, AND M. C. WANG. 1987. A note on the product-limit estimator under right-censoring and left truncation. *Biometrika* 74: 883-886.
- TURNBULL, B. W. 1976. The empirical distribution function with arbitrarily grouped, censored and truncated data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 38:290-295.
- UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS. 1990-1997. Forest inventory field data for Corps fee title lands of the Mississippi River 9-foot channel navigation project. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Paul District, La Crescent, MN.
- UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR. 1993. *Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: determination of threatened status for the Pacific coast population of the western Snowy Plover*. Federal Register 58:12864-12874.
- VICKERY, P. D., M. L. HUNTER, AND J. V. WELLS, JR. 1992. Evidence of incidental nest predation and its effects on nests of threatened grassland birds. *Oikos* 63:281-288.
- VOUNATSOU, P., AND A. F. M. SMITH. 1995. Bayesian analysis of ring-recovery data via Markov chain Monte Carlo simulation. *Biometrics* 51:687-708.
- WADE, P. R. 2000. Bayesian methods in conservation biology. *Conservation Biology* 14:1308-1316.
- WALTERS, C., AND D. LUDWIG. 1994. Calculations of Bayes posterior probability distributions for key population parameters. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 51:713-722.
- WAND, M. P., AND M. C. JONES. 1995. *Kernel smoothing*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL.
- WARRINER, J. S., J. C. WARRINER, G. W. PAGE, AND L. E. STENZEL. 1986. Mating system and reproductive success of a small population of polygamous Snowy Plovers. *Wilson Bulletin* 98:15-37.
- WEHTJE, W., AND T. BARON. 1993. Population size and breeding success of the Western Snowy Plover on San Nicholas Island, 1993. *Western Foundation for Vertebrate Zoology*, Camarillo, CA.
- WEIDINGER, K. 2002. Interactive effects of concealment, parental behaviour and predators on the survival of open passerine nests. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 71:424-437.
- WELLER, M. W. 1956. A simple field candler for waterfowl eggs. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 20: 111-113.
- WESTERSKOV, K. 1950. Methods for determining the age of game bird eggs. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 14:56-67.
- WESTERSKOV, K. 1956. Age determination and dating nesting events in the Willow Ptarmigan. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 20:274-279.
- WHITE, G. C. 2005. Program MARK. Mark and recapture survival rate estimation. (Version 4.2). <<http://www.warnercnr.colostate.edu/~gwhite/mark/mark.htm>> (15 November 2006).
- WHITE, G. C., AND K. P. BURNHAM. 1999. Program MARK: survival estimation from populations of marked animals. *Bird Study* 46 (Supplement):120-138.
- WILLIAMS, B. K., J. D. NICHOLS, AND M. J. CONROY. 2002. *Analysis and management of animal populations: modeling, estimation, and decision making*. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.
- WILLIS, E. O. 1973. Survival rates for visited and unvisited nests of Bicolored Antbirds. *Auk* 90:263-267.
- WILLIS, E. O. 1981. Precautions in calculating nest success. *Ibis* 123:204-207.
- WILSON, R. R., AND R. J. COOPER. 1998. Acadian Flycatcher nest placement: does placement influence reproductive success? *Condor* 100:673-679.
- WILSON-JACOBS, R., AND E. C. MESLOW. 1984. Distribution, abundance, and nesting characteristics of Snowy

- Plovers on the Oregon Coast. *Northwest Scientist* 58:40-48.
- WINTER, M. 1999. Nesting biology of Dickcissels and Henslow's Sparrows in southwestern Missouri prairie fragments. *Wilson Bulletin* 111:515-527.
- WINTER, M., S. E. HAWKS, J. A. SHAFFER, AND D. H. JOHNSON. 2003. Guidelines for finding nests of passerine birds in tallgrass prairie. *Prairie Naturalist* 35:197-211.
- WINTER, M., D. H. JOHNSON, AND J. A. SHAFFER. 2005a. Variability in vegetation effects on density and nesting success of grassland birds. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 69:185-197.
- WINTER, M., D. H. JOHNSON, J. A. SHAFFER, AND W. D. SVEDARSKY. 2004. Nesting biology of three grassland passerines in the northern tallgrass prairie. *Wilson Bulletin* 116:211-223.
- WINTER, M., J. A. SHAFFER, D. H. JOHNSON, T. M. DONOVAN, W. D. SVEDARSKY, P.W. JONES, AND B. R. EULISS. 2005b. Habitat and nesting of LeConte's Sparrows in the northern tallgrass prairie. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 76:61-71.
- WINTON, B. R., D. M. LESLIE, JR., AND J. R. RUPERT. 2000. Breeding ecology and management of Snowy Plovers in north-central Oklahoma. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 71:573-584.
- WOLFINGER, R. D., AND M. O'CONNELL. 1993. Generalized linear mixed models: a pseudo-likelihood approach. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation* 48:233-243.
- WOLFSON, L. J., J. B. KADANE, AND M. J. SMALL. 1996. Bayesian environmental policy decisions: two case studies. *Ecological Applications* 6:1056-1066.
- WOODROOFE, M. 1985. Estimating the distribution function with truncated data. *Annals of Statistics* 13: 163-177.
- YASUKAWA, J., AND W. A. SEARCY. 1995. Red-winged Blackbird (*Agelaius phoeniceus*). In A. Poole, and F. Gill, editors. *The birds of North America*, No. 184. The Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, PA and The American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, DC.