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ABSTRACT


This study was conducted on four plots having a cluster of different combinations of forest, wetland, and agricultural land, as well as a single marshland habitat near the river Hooghly. We obtained 17,817 counts for 150 species in 32 days of year-round sampling. The wetland-agricultural land associated with forest had the highest species diversity (132 species, Shannon $H$ – 1.63), heterogeneity (Shannon $J'$ – 0.773), and number of unique species (33 species), and the lowest dominance (Simpson Index $1/D$ – 39.35), in contrast with the marsh, which had the lowest diversity (41 species, Shannon $H$ – 1.39), highest homogeneity (Shannon $J'$ – 0.863), and a lack of uniqueness. The plot with secondary forest patches between an agricultural field and human settlements showed the highest species dominance (Simpson's Diversity $1/D$ – 17.465). Species rarity ranged from 68.2% to 77.6% within the area under study. There were 25 species common to all plots, which formed six distinct groups based on their abundance. Carnivores were found to be the dominant foraging guild throughout the habitats. Thirty-two per cent of the species are migratory, with the families Scolopacidae and Motacillidae predominating. The Jaccard and Sorensen indices reveal the greatest species similarity between the wetlandpisciculture plot and the marshland. These indices together with the hierarchical cluster analysis indicate the uniqueness of the plot of open forest habitat adjoining the wetland, which offers the best living conditions for migratory species. Our study concludes that when a wetland is surrounded by agriculture rather than fisheries, avifaunal diversity increases, whereas forest-associated wetland-farmland maximizes species richness with minimum dominance and hence imparts greater stability to the overall community structure.
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INTRODUCTION

Drastic changes in global land usage patterns without consideration of their impact on ecosystems is an emerging problem for conservation strategies, especially in South Asia (Tilman et al. 2001, Camp et al. 2001, Brooks et al. 2003, Sodhi et al. 2004, Koh and Gardner 2010). Continuous pristine habitats such as forests and wetlands are interrupted by agricultural lands, fisheries, and human artefacts such as urban constructions and industries (Findlay and Bourdages 2000, Verma et al. 2001, Koh and Wilcove 2008, Goodale et al. 2014, Gopi Sundar et al. 2015). This increasing human activity has rapidly transformed the previous large continuous habitat structure into multiple small adjoining habitat clusters forming a mosaic pattern (Bassi et al. 2014, Mandal and Shankar Raman 2016). Avian diversity of one native habitat is influenced by adjoining altered habitats (Raman 2006, Peh et al. 2006). The size and location of adjoining native forest patches have a strong influence on the community composition of urban avifauna (Gavareski 1976, Dale 2018). The quality, size and complementarities among adjoining patches are the key parameters of biodiversity (Law and Dickman 1998, Dunford and Freemark 2005, Kupfer et al. 2006, Smith et al. 2011).

The Indian subcontinent has the highest cropland cover among Asian countries, and India sustains the fastest growing, second largest global human population through its cropland production (Ramankutty et al. 2002). The fertile soil of the Indo-Gangetic plain contributes 22% of the rice produced by the country (Frolking et al. 2006). The habitat comprising the ancient river-based cultural civilization of India along the Ganges basin constitutes 26% of the country’s land mass, supporting 43% of the Indian population (Indian Institute of Technology 2011). The Hooghly district on the bank of the Ganges has a high population density of 1753/km² (Census of West Bengal and Kolkata 2011). West Bengal has a total of 147,826 wetlands, the highest number in India (Bassi et al. 2014). The wetlands, including marshlands, along the banks of the Hooghly River can be classified as riverine and palustrine based on their hydrological and ecological parameters (Cowardin et al. 1979). Some parts of the wetlands become seasonal crop fields during the dry season, whereas during the rainy season rice is cultivated in many of the adjoining areas. The wetlands on the banks of the Ganges are immensely important from the perspective of avifaunal conservation, and according to BirdLife International, the Farraka Barrage and adjoining wetland area (IBA site code-IN-WB-02, criteria-A1, A4i, A4iii) and Naya Bandh Wetland complex (IBA site code-IN-WB-08, criteria A1) are important bird and biodiversity areas located on the Ganges in the Malda district, West Bengal (Rahamani et al. 2016). Wetlands are becoming degraded all over the world despite the fact that they sustain large numbers of waterfowl. As wetland areas gradually shrink, expanding agricultural fields become a complementary habitat for them (Fasola 1997, Elphick 2000, Fraser and Keddy 2005). Nearly one third of bird species exploit agricultural fields for their activity globally (Sekercioglu et al. 2007).

Over 1450 species of birds are found in South Asia, of which India has 1263 species belonging to 23 orders and 107 families. This is 12% of the world’s avifaunal diversity (Rasmussen and Anderton 2012, Praveen et al. 2016). A total of 351 species of
birds are reported to use agricultural lands and their associated habitats on the Indian Subcontinent (Sundar and Subramanya 2010). The occurrence of wetlands, including marshlands, and agricultural lands side-by-side is a very common regional feature of the Gangetic flood plains of West Bengal. Crop composition and farming intensity determine the species richness and abundance in the agricultural lands (Cunningham et al. 2013). Both wetlands and their associated marshland are presently facing deterioration, as wetlands are being used as dumping grounds and for construction of dams, and in the absence of proper management strategies these factors contribute to the alteration of the hydrological cycle and consequent reduction in the supply of water (Turner et al. 2000, Verma et al. 2001, Kumar et al. 2012).

The present study was conducted on five plots in the Hooghly district, West Bengal, India. Each spatially isolated individual plot was composed of a combination of different adjoining habitats: (1) a strip of forest with adjoining wetland-associated temporary agricultural fields, (2) secondary forest accompanying human settlements surrounded by cultivation fields, (3) a wetland adjoining a rice field beside a freshwater canal, and (4) a wetland cum agricultural land combined with fish farms. A single perennial marshland habitat was also included in our investigation as a reference plot to judge the alterations to the wetlands caused by human activity. The habitats were chosen so that one is located some distance away from the Hooghly River, while the rest lie closer and parallel to the river. We determined the impact of different habitat patterns, composed of various kinds and proportions of natural and seminatural habitats within the framework of a landscape, on community characteristics such as diversity, dominance, heterogeneity, foraging structure, and the occurrence of migratory species. The effects, positive or negative, of human-mediated modifications and activity on the bird community composition in the wetland-based ecosystems were measured based on the species turnover from one plot to another. The extent of plot utilization by different bird species was estimated by observing their presence or absence on the five plots during our investigation period. This observation is important for estimating the sustainability of species in the face of the changing pattern of global land usage. The current population status of individual species in each plot can be seen based on their relative abundance and the abundance-rarity index that we determined from the threshold value of average species abundance. We have also attempted to prioritize the plots or habitat patches for conservation, in order to preserve the overall integrity of the community and the ecosystem. These could be a starting base for future monitoring.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study sites

Five plots distinguished within a landscape of 120 square kilometres were surveyed for bird counting. The landscape was located west of the Hooghly River bank in rural West Bengal (Fig. 1). This portion of southern West Bengal, which is part of a tropical moist deciduous biotope, contains seasonal wetlands, perennial marshland,
agricultural fields, man-made water bodies for fishery industries called ‘bheries’, isolated forest patches, and villages. Our study follows two areas, one parallel and close to the Hooghly River and the other at a distance away from it. The area that is parallel to the river is a zone of wetland and marshland, depending upon the water depth and topographical features. Between the plots and the river there is an urbanized zone along both sides of the river course. The other area, located some distance away from the Hooghly River, follows a gradient from a wetland to a permanent cultivation field. The intensity of cultivation increases along this gradient from east to west. The population density also thins out along this gradient, creating an urban to rural polarity. The plots were chosen in such a way that an individual plot contains either a combination of more than one adjacent habitat or a single habitat.

Four plots are located in the Singur block, designated as WFA – wetland-forest-agricultural land; WA1 and WA2, which are both wetland-agricultural land with no forest patches; and W, a perennial marshland. WFA is a mosaic plot with an isolated forest patch (1.04 km$^2$) and a large adjacent temporary wetland (1.18 km$^2$), which becomes an agricultural field in the dry season of winter and summer. The agricultural usage follows a gradient from forest to wetland depending upon the seasonal water stagnancy of the land (Fig. 2 Upper panel). Areas immediately adjacent to the forest have crop fields on which two crops are grown over the year, one of which is rice. The lands adjacent to this but away from the forest are rice fields cultivated once a year.

Fig. 1. General location of the study area: Hooghly district in West Bengal, India (right panels). Boxes within the Hooghly district boundary (left panel) indicate the study areas; the smaller one indicating FA and the larger one including the other four (see text for abbreviation details). Water channels are shown traversing the district (blue lines).
The lands adjoining the forest patch are the site of high agricultural usage, diminishing gradually along the forest-wetland gradient and ultimately leading to marshlands with no agricultural activity. The mixed forest patch of WFA is dominated by mango (*Mangifera*) and bamboo (*Bambusa*), mixed at the periphery with banana (*Musa*). WA1 includes two blocks (Fig. 2 Upper panel). The first has an area of 1.39 km², with many man-made water bodies used for commercial fish farming by private owners under government subsidy, and the other is an adjacent agricultural wetland block of 1.39 km², with the same agriculture-wetland gradient. In the latter block, however, harvest is only once a year. Some of the land is used exclusively for onion, and other parts for jute or paddy. The land away from the cultivation field is typical wet grassland with *Vetiveria zizanioides* at the periphery. WA2 is essentially a wetland, located nearest to the Hooghly River of all the plots, with a rice field block (1.24 km²) which is cultivated once a year. A perennial water canal is located adjacent to the field block connected to the Hooghly River nearby. The part of the canal we investigated has an area of about 0.22 km². The canal adjoining the lowland area has a wetland character, dominated by grasses such as *Schoenoplectus corymbosus, S articulates* and *Juncellus inundates*. WA1 and WA2 are wetland-based agricultural lands and were distinguished because the agricultural wetland block of WA1, associated with human-managed water bodies, is used in commercial carp production, whereas the natural perennial canal associated with rice fields in WA2 is not manipulated by human activity. However, plot WA2 is only about 100-200 metres from the urbanized areas along the river (Fig. 1 and 2 Upper panel). Plot W (0.38 km²) is part of natural marshland located at the southern periphery of the Singur block (Fig. 1 and 2 Upper Panel), typically with tall reed beds and grasses, and maintains a critical water level to sustain its marshland character. The predominant vegetation includes floating vegetation, *Eichhornia* and *Neptunia*, rooted floating vegetation, *Nymphoides hydrophylla* and *Nymphaea pubescens*, and rooted standing vegetation, *Ipomoea fistulosa, Saccharum, narenga, Phragmites karka, Typha angustifolia, Aeschynomene, Sagittaria* spp., *Schoenoplectus articulatus, Polygonum, Coix lacryma*, and *Sesbania bispinosa*. All four plots beside the Hooghly River, i.e. WFA, WA1, WA2 and W, are sample areas of a once existing continuous wetland running parallel to the Hooghly River and bear traces of human activity; they have been transformed partly into a permanent rice field, temporary crop fields, and a man-made fish farming zone. Only W is a permanent marshland located at the extreme end of this wetland axis. The FA plot consists of fragmented forest patches associated with agricultural fields undergoing intense cultivation three times a year. This plot encloses an area of 1.61 km² located in the village of Porabazar, Dhanakhal block. It is the farthest of the plots from the Hooghly River and contains sparsely distributed secondary forest patches with human habitation, ponds, roads and ditches (Fig. 1 and 2 Upper panel).

**Counting methodology**

The line transect and point transect methods were used for bird counting, based on the method’s suitability for a given habitat (Shankar Raman 2003, Chatterjee 2013). Both transect methods follow predefined routes with predetermined sample
survey areas (Gregory et al. 2004). For uniform habitats such as wetlands and agricultural fields with an open field of view, we used the line transect method. The line transect method consisted in continuous counting along the axis of the observer’s linear pathway of movement with a more or less constant walking speed on either side of the line. The point transect method was used for forest patches, because in forested areas the field of view is restricted by dense vegetation. In this method, the observer has to travel along a transect and stop at regular intervals of 50 metres, allow the birds to settle for two minutes, and record their numbers for 20 minutes (Gregory et al. 2004). The predefined route for the point transect was chosen in such a way that microhabitats such as bamboo groves, mango forest patches and other vegetation-based forest patches had equal chances of coming within the purview of sample counting. All the birds seen or heard were counted. Observations were conducted in each plot for three hours after sunrise per day with good visibility conditions. Bird counting was carried out on separate days for each of the plots.

A year-round study was conducted from February 2017 to April 2018 (Table 1). Study seasons were broadly divided into two phases – summer and winter – and suitable times were chosen for each plot to encompass maximum species variety occurring due to winter, summer and passage migration.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plots</th>
<th>Time distribution of sampling over the seasons</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA1</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA2</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFA</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Materials

Olympus 8×40 binoculars (DPS I field 8.2, Porro prism type, 182 × 139 × 58 mm, Olympus Corporation, India) were used for bird watching and counting. Photos of birds were taken with the Panasonic Lumix FZ28 and FZ 150 and the Nikon B700 (compact cameras) and the Nikon D750 Body (dSLR) with a Nikkor 300 f/2.8 prime lens and Nikon 2x teleconverter (only used when species identification was in doubt).
Species account

Birds were identified by taking photographs and subsequent confirmation using field guide books by Grimmett (Grimmett et al. 2011), and Kazmierczak (Kazmierczak 2000). The sequence of birds in the appendix is largely based on Dickinson (2003), and order names are adopted from Ali and Ripley (Ali and Ripley 1980, Grimmett et al. 2011). Common names, taxonomic notations from family to species, species distribution and migration pattern are based on Rasmussen (Rasmussen and Anderton 2012). Some changes in distribution were made as per Grimmett, as on a few occasions it matched the local migration pattern in the study areas. Foraging groups are broadly classified into phytophagous-carnivorous, granivorous, frugivorous, carnivorous, insectivorous and omnivorous based on field observations and on Ali and Ripley (Ali and Ripley 1980, Chatterjee et al. 2013).

Data analysis

BioDiversity Pro software (McAleece 1997, Biodiversity Professional, Scottish Association for Marine Science and the Natural History Museum, London, UK) was used to analyse biodiversity indices and the rank abundance curve. Estimation of whether a species was rare or abundant within a plot was based on a base value set as the average number of individuals per species divided by the total number of individuals seen during sampling in a given plot [Average count per species = Total number of individuals found or Total count/Total number of species, Base value = average count per species/Total count]. Put simply, it is the average expected abundance of individual species among all those occurring in a given plot (Aditya et al. 2010). The observed relative abundance value of each species was compared with this average abundance value to designate a species as ‘rare’ or ‘abundant’. The similarity between two communities in terms of species composition was estimated by the Jaccard and Sorensen coefficients: \[ \text{Jaccard coefficient} = \frac{M}{M+N} \] and \[ \text{Sorensen coefficient} = \frac{2M}{M+N} \]. The number of species common to two communities is designated as \( M \), whereas the total number of unique species present in both communities is designated \( N \). Classical cluster analysis was used to verify the similarity measurement between plots. The distance of similarities between habitats is expressed by a dendrogram based on the Euclidean similarity index. Relative abundance values of the generalist species in the five plots are used for principal component analysis in PAST v. 3.0, and the percentage of variance for component 1 (WFA) is plotted against component 2 (WA1). Component analyses between other plots yielded similar results (data not shown). The scattered plot analysis was based on the variance-covariance matrix between the groups. The projection map, drawing, and area measurement of the plots were done in QGIS software v. 2.18 using a Google satellite map.
RESULTS

Species diversity and abundance

We identified 150 species belonging to 16 orders and 55 families in the plots studied over the year. WA1, W, FA, WA2, and WFA were observed to have 61, 41, 76, 85 and 132 species, respectively (Appendix).

The Shannon diversity indices ($\hat{H}$, $H_{\text{max}}$ and Shannon $J'$) showed that plot WFA had the highest $\hat{H}$ (1.638) and $H_{\text{max}}$ (2.121) (Table 2). $\hat{H}$ is the measure of the sum of the relative abundance of all species found, while $H_{\text{max}}$ is the highest species number found during the observational period. Shannon $J'$ is the ratio of $\hat{H}$ to $H_{\text{max}}$, a measure of species evenness $[e]$. The marshland (W) avian community was the most homogeneous (Shannon $J'$ 0.863). Species heterogeneity expressed by the $J'$ value was higher in WFA (0.773) and WA2 (0.776) than in the other plots, due to the greater number of unique habitat species found in these two plots. The Simpson indices measure dominance, with higher values corresponding to greater dominance and lower values to greater diversity (Odum and Barrett 2005). Dominance was highest in FA ($D = 0.057$), followed by $W$ (0.047). In comparison to the other plots, WFA had a markedly lower value (0.025), signifying the lowest dominance.

Table 2
Shannon and Simpson’s diversity indices for the five study areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>WA1</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>WA2</th>
<th>WFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shannon $H'$, Log Base 10</td>
<td>1.446</td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>1.440</td>
<td>1.497</td>
<td>1.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon $H_{\text{max}}$, Log Base 10</td>
<td>1.778</td>
<td>1.613</td>
<td>1.881</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>2.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon $J'$</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>WA1</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>WA2</th>
<th>WFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simpson’s Diversity ($D$)</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The species count, when plotted in descending order for all the species (Fig. 3), was highest in WFA, followed by WA2. Plot $W$ had the lowest species count. The area under the curve was greater for WFA and WA2, as they had the highest $H_{\text{max}}$. However, as this does not show the proportional contribution of each species to the community, we plotted a species abundance curve (Fig. 4). It shows two aspects of species diversity; the steepness of the curve is negatively correlated with the species diversity of a community and positively correlated with the dominance (Odum and Barrett 2005). WFA had the flattest curve of the five, so it was obviously the most diverse and had the lowest species dominance. FA, the agricultural field associated with fragmented secondary forest surrounding human habitation, showed the highest dominance and
the lowest diversity. As dominance and diversity are inversely proportional, the three remaining plots, \(W\), \(WA1\) and \(WA2\), showed intermediate diversity and dominance.

![Map of plots west of the Hooghly River](image)

Fig. 2. Upper panel: four plots lie west of and parallel to the Hooghly River (blue). WFA and WA2 (see text for abbreviation details) are shown in boxes. WFA contains two blocks, a continuous mixed forest patch (deep green) and an adjoining wetland-associated agricultural field. A gradient of green to yellow indicates the polarity of the usage of the wetland – from the agricultural field in green to the wetland in yellow. The wetland block of \(WA1\) is shown using the same gradient, with the adjoining pisciculture block in sky blue. WA2 has a green block correlating with stable usage of this wetland-associated landmass as rice fields with a perennial river canal (sky blue). \(W\) (orange) is a single perennial marshland habitat. Black areas along the west of the Hooghly River bank indicate high population density. Lower panel: plot \(FA\) with agricultural land (yellow) and associated secondary forest patches (deep green) and human habitation (black). Unshaded regions within the shaded landscape are ponds or roads.
Based on the average count per species, we determined a critical value of average species abundance per count for the plots (Appendix). These critical values were 0.0166, 0.0243, 0.0131, 0.0117 and 0.0075 for WA1, W, FA, WA2 and WFA, respectively. Species showing relative abundance equal to or greater than this value are 'abundant' and those with lower values are 'rare'. This makes it easy to differentiate rare and abundant species for each plot. Based on the data, WFA had 34 abundant species and 98 rare species (74.2%). The WA1 and WA2 habitats had 43 (70.5%) and 66 (77.6%) rare species, respectively. The marshland (W) habitat had 28 (68.2%) rare species, while 58 (76.3%) species were rare in the human-associated rural forest patch and agricultural lands. Hence rarity varies from 68.2% to 77.6% for all habitat types or mosaic habitats under observation; on average 7 of 10 bird species found in the habitat/combination of habitats were rare.

Species turnover and habitat associations

We found 25 species (16.67%) in all five of the plots, confirming that they are highly flexible in habitat utilization and most common in wetland and agricultural lands. On the other hand, 48 species (32%) were found in only one plot or in any particular habitat. Although there is no hard and fast rule that they cannot be found in other plots or habitats, the chances of their occurrence in any habitat are lower. At the same time they are rarer than the others, with a very low chance of encounter. Among the 48 species found in a single habitat association, 33 of the species (68.75%) are found in the WFA plot association, 11 in WA2 (22.91%) and 4 (8.34%) in FA (Fig. 5). Strikingly, neither the perennial marshland nor WF1 had any unique species. Diversity of habitats seems to be important for the sustenance of rare species (Anderson 2001).

Species that were found in all the plots did not exploit the habitats equally; a species could be abundant in one habitat but rare in another (Fig. 6). Among the 25 generalist species found, only House Crow (Corvus splendens) and Asian Pied Starling...
(Gracupica contra) were relatively abundant in all sites studied (Fig. 6). Six species, Asian Openbill (Anastomus oscitans), Indian Pond-heron (Ardeola grayii), Eastern Cattle Egret (Bubulcus coromandus), Spotted Dove (Spilopelia chinensis), Black Drongo (Edolius macrocercus), and Common Myna (Acridotheres tristis), showed population abundance in four of the five plots. Rock Pigeon (Columba livia), Red-vented Bulbul (Pycnonotus cafer), Plain Prinia (Prinia inornata), and White Wagtail (Motacilla alba) were abundant in three of the sites, while Wood Sandpiper (Tringa glareola), Eurasian Collared-dove (Streptopelia decaocto), and Citrine Wagtail (Motacilla citreola citreola) were abundant in only two habitats. Little Cormorant (Microcarbo niger), White-throated Kingfisher (Halcyon smyrnensis), Bengal Bushlark (Mirafra assamica),
Common Tailorbird (Orthotomus sutorius), and Western Yellow Wagtail (Motacilla flava) were abundant in only one of the plots. Five species, i.e. Black Kite (Milvus migrans migrans/govinda), White-breasted Waterhen (Amaurornis phoenicurus), Greater Coucal (Centropus sinensis), Common Kingfisher (Alcedo atthis), and Brown Shrike (Lanius cristatus cristatus), were found to be relatively rare in all plots. Although these five species were rarely found in the plots, they did contribute to species diversity as generalists. Six classes were thus found for the 25 generalist species. Species abundant in all five, four, three, two, one and none of the plots are designated as class 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0, respectively. The six classes of generalist species groups form six spatially distinct clusters (Fig. 7). Species belonging to class 5 (Fig. 7) are located on the right side of the graph. This group comprises House Crow (Corvus splendens) and Asian Pied Starling (Gracupica contra). The relative distance between the points of these two species shows that they are the most abundant species, and their numbers fluctuate from one plot to another much more than other member species of the communities. The association of the species for the rest of the classes increases in principal component analysis from right to left. The relative abundance of the species constituting class 0 is relatively stable. Thus classes 0, 1, and 2 are the most stable population group among the six classes in terms of consistency in relative abundance. The sum of the relative abundance for the 25 species in the plots reveals the highest percentage contribution in W (76%), followed by WA1 (71.20%) (Table 3). This is obvious, because these two communities are the least diverse. WFA (55.4%) and WA2 (47.4%) thus contribute least to abundance. The paired independent t-test shows (at a 5% significance level) no significant differences in the sample mean, but the standard deviation is high for WA1, FA and W. Hence fluctuation in relative abundance within the abundance class is higher in these three plots.

![Fig. 6. Extent of plot occupancy by 25 generalist species](image-url)
Table 3

Relative percentage contribution of 25 species common to the plots studied to community composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitats</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA1</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA2</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFA</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Migratory species assemblage

We found 48 species exploiting the habitats around the study areas, mainly raptors, waders, shrikes, swallows, warblers, chats, flycatchers and wagtails. The families were Anatidae (1), Threskiornithidae (2), Ardeidae (1), Falconidae (2), Accipitridae (2), Charadriidae (2), Scolopacidae (6), Glareolidae (1), Cuculidae (2), Upupidae (1), Meropidae (1), Picidae (1), Campephagidae (1), Laniidae (3), Dicruridae (1), Oriolidae (2), Hirundinidae (3), Acrocephalidae (3), Phylloscopidae (2), Sturnidae (1), Muscicapidae (6) and Motacillidae (4). WFA has the highest number of migrants (37), while WA1 and WA2 plots are utilized by 14 and 24 migrant species, respectively (Fig. 8). FA and the single habitat W can provide refuge for 12 and 9 migratory species, respectively. WA1 and WA2 are very similar plots, differing only in the presence of a managed fishery in WA1 and a natural river canal in WA2, but there is a huge difference in the number of migratory species. The reason may be that human-controlled habitats become more homogeneous than natural habitats and hence offer less diversity of food and shelter, leading to low species diversity. We found 23 migratory species that were restricted to a single plot. Among these, 14 species are associated strictly with WFA, seven were found in WA2, and two exploited FA.

Habitat similarity assessment

Four of the plots, WA2, WFA, WA1 and W, are parts of a wetland beside the bank of the Hooghly River. The first three are modified by human activities such as agriculture and fisheries. W, the perennial marshland, is more or less undisturbed, and can be used as a yardstick to assess the community alteration in other wetland-associated habitats. FA is an example of an avian community structure surrounding intensive agricultural activity and human habitation in a rural context. To determine the changes in habitat features, we assess the similarity of the avian community composition between plots. Bird assemblage studies are used as an ecological indicator to measure ecosystem alteration (Bradford et al. 1998, Canterbury et al. 2000). The perennial marshland (W) and wetland associated with fisheries (WA1) were the habitat clusters with the most similar species composition. The Jaccard and Sorensen similarity coefficients for these two study areas were 0.159 and 0.274, respectively (Table 4). In contrast, the perennial wetlands (W) and agricultural fields with a small forest patch in
a human-dominated area (FA) had Jaccard and Sorensen similarity coefficients of 0.114 and 0.205, respectively, and were the least similar in terms of species composition. Hierarchical cluster analysis based on community assemblage revealed the uniqueness of WFA in comparison with the other habitat clusters (Fig. 9). The dendrogram put the WFA uniquely aside, whereas W and WA1 form a monotypic plot closely associated with FA. WA2, on the other hand, is a plot with a transitional relationship between WFA and the other plots, i.e. FA, W and WA1. The strip of forest associated with the wetland thus formed a uniquely diversified regime among the habitat clusters investigated.

![Graph](image)

Fig. 7. Principal component analysis of the relative abundance of generalist species found at all the sites. Generalist species are grouped into six classes (using contours of a rectangle and ellipses) based on their abundance in plots. The numerical values correspond to the number of plots where the species concerned are abundant. ‘0’ indicates that the species are rare at all the sites. Three letter abbreviations with the first generic letter and first two specific letters are used. AOS – Anastomus oscitans, AGR – Ardea grayii, BCO – Bubulcus coromandus, MMI – Microcarbo niger, APH – Amaurornis phoenicurus, TGL – Tringa glareola, CLI – Columba livia, SDE – Streptopelia decaocto, SCH – Spilopelia chinensis, CSI – Centropus sinensis, HSM – Halcyon smyrnensis, AAT – Aledo atthis, LCR – Lanius cristatus, EMA – Edolius macrocercus, CSP – Corvus splendens, MAS – Mirafra assimica, PCA – Pycnonotus cafer, PIN – Prinia inornata, OSU – Orithomis sutorius, ATR – Acridotheres tristis, GCO – Grapapica contra, MFL – Motacilla flava, MCI – Motacilla citreola, MAL – Motacilla alba.

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WA1</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>WA2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA1</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA2</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jaccard’s (J) and Sorensen’s (S) similarity indices between plots
Study of foraging guilds

Among the 150 species observed, one in three species was found to be carnivorous (33.3%), 28% were omnivorous, and 23.3% were insectivorous (Table 5). Purely vegetarian species – granivores and frugivores – constituted only 9.3% of the total species. The phytophagous-carnivorous (Ph-Cr) species found here (6%) mainly exploited water bodies or areas adjoining them. In WFA, carnivorous and omnivorous species were equally common (31.1%). Carnivores were dominant in both the W (36.5%) and WA2 (37.6%) habitats. Omnivores, with 34.4% and 34.2%, were dominant over carnivores in WA1 and FA, with 31.1% and 30.2%, respectively. Insectivorous species were found in the lowest proportion (15.7%) in FA and the highest in WFA (24.2%). Frugivorous species were entirely absent in W. Among migratory species, 20 carnivorous, 20 insectivorous, seven omnivorous and one phytophagous-carnivorous species were found to be distributed throughout the habitats. The majority of the migratory species exploiting open cultivated fields and wetland-associated habitats were raptors, ibises, waders, shrikes, swallows, warblers, chats and wagtails. Among the 25 generalist species, there were nine carnivores, eight omnivores, four insectivores, three granivores and one phytophagous carnivore. When we compared the numbers of generalist species among all the species found within one foraging guild, three of the eight species of granivores were found to be generalist (37.5%), and they were proportionately dominant over carnivores (18%), omnivores (19%), and insectivores (11.4%). Frugivores were the most sensitive guild, as they were rare in the communities. Five winter migrants were found at all five sites, of which three were wagtails.
Table 5
Foraging guilds across five plots. The percentage of each foraging guild is given in parentheses for each plot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guild</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>WA1 (61)</th>
<th>W (41)</th>
<th>FA (76)</th>
<th>WA2 (85)</th>
<th>WFA (132)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phytophagous-Carnivorous (Ph-Cr)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>2 (4.9)</td>
<td>5 (6.6)</td>
<td>6 (7.1)</td>
<td>7 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granivorous (Gr)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 (6.5)</td>
<td>5 (12.2)</td>
<td>5 (6.6)</td>
<td>5 (5.9)</td>
<td>6 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frugivorous (Fg)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (6.6)</td>
<td>6 (7.1)</td>
<td>5 (3.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnivorous (Cr)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19 (31.1)</td>
<td>15 (36.6)</td>
<td>23 (30.2)</td>
<td>32 (37.6)</td>
<td>41 (31.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insectivorous (In)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13 (21.3)</td>
<td>9 (15.9)</td>
<td>12 (15.8)</td>
<td>17 (20)</td>
<td>32 (24.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnivorous (Om)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21 (34.4)</td>
<td>10 (24.4)</td>
<td>26 (34.2)</td>
<td>19 (22.3)</td>
<td>41 (31.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

The concept of habitat patchiness has two aspects. On the one hand, it results in increasing spatial heterogeneity and thus contributes to community stability (Den Boer 1968, Levins and Culver 1971), but on the other hand, patchiness resulting in the fragmentation of a large pristine habitat generally has a negative effect on the former existing community (Villard and Metzger 2014, Hanski 2015). Forest patches, agricultural lands, wetlands (temporary or permanent), and man-made or modified ecosystems all have a mosaic pattern within the landscape. The question of whether the association of certain habitats provides additional benefits to the adjoining communities has not been well studied in tropical Asia, especially in the case of wetland-based habitats (Dudgeon 2003). India is facing a population explosion, and as a consequence the conversion of forests and wetlands for housing, industries and cultivation has become common, conflicting with the sustainability of pristine habitats. The avian community structure of marshland changes after a threshold limit alteration for the habitat (DeLuca et al. 2004). The conversion of pristine habitats into rice fields and adjacent secondary habitats results in increased abundance of 64 bird species at the expense of 45 bird species that existed in the former undisturbed habitat (Sundar and Subramanya 2010).
West Bengal, which is the fourth most populated state in India and ninth in the world, faced population growth of 13.8% with a density of 1,028 km² during the years 2001-2011 (Census of West Bengal and Kolkata 2011). The continuous wetland along the sides of the River Ganges was disrupted by human settlement, growing industries, developing fishery industries, and cultivated lands. The area of wetland was reduced by 52% in Haryana, India between 1970 and 2000 (Sundar et al. 2015). Our study has shown that wetland or marshland alone is less diverse, but if there are agricultural lands in the vicinity, the mosaic pattern thus created increases the diversity of bird species. While agricultural expansion certainly affects the community composition of a former habitat that previously consisted mainly of forests (Newbold et al. 2015), it does support rich faunal diversity and can play a critical role in future conservation management (Wright et al. 2012, Sutcliffe et al. 2015). The combination of diffuse secondary forests with agricultural fields (FA) when present beside human settlements seems to increase the dominance of some bird species, most of which have the capability to exploit all sorts of habitats, thereby reducing diversity. Intensification of rice cultivation in a natural woodland habitat increases many common species of birds (Parasharya et al. 2006) while at the same time threatening numerous endemic species (Gaston 1984, Rahamani and Soni 1997). FA, the site most distant from the Hooghly River and an intensely cultivated field, can be categorized as a multi-crop cultivation field. Agricultural intensity and crop composition determine the biodiversity of agricultural fields (Fahrig 2013, Cunningham et al. 2013). Lands with intensive crop production are less diverse (Tryjanowski et al. 2011, Durán et al. 2014). An agricultural land configuration, for example, increases the patchiness of the landscape and is thus more suitable for species that can exploit two or more adjacent habitats (Perfecto et al. 2008, Fahrig et al. 2011). On the other hand, if agricultural lands become larger, resulting in smaller patches of natural habitats, the diversity of specialist species that used to live in the natural habitat may decline (Devictor et al. 2008). Our data reveal that the habitat features and the nature of human exploitation of a temporary wetland can determine avifaunal diversity. If we compare WA1 and WA2, plot WA1 contains private pisciculture fields where the water level can be artificially controlled, independently of the seasonal hydrological cycle, and nutrients are provided artificially as well. Such human-made altered habitats show low species diversity compared to WA2. WA2 is essentially a wetland with a natural irrigation canal connected to the Hooghly River, and contains wetland-based agricultural fields where only paddy is cultivated once a year. With this low level of human-mediated disturbances and crop composition, it shows fairly high diversity of birds (Colwell and Dodd 1995). Rice is established as a crop to increase diversity in Asia (Maeda 2001, Sundar and Subramanaya 2010). The hierarchical cluster analysis showed marshland (W) and wetland-associated fisheries (WA1) to be very similar in the bird assemblages, both showing higher dominance and evenness than the other plots with different regimes. WA2 is the next most similar plot type, but with less dominance. Hence marshland alone is not very diverse in terms of avifauna. The addition of water bodies changes the scenario somewhat without changing other aspects, such as dominance and overall species composition. A wetland containing an irrigational canal and rice fields unquestionably changes community composition in a positive direction.
Sundar and Kittur (2013) have observed 99 bird species in a wetland-associated agri-cultural landscape in North India, which is thought to be the most diverse of any wetland-associated habitat patch in South Asia. Private fish farms receiving government subsidies have become a growing business in India, which is believed to decrease bird abundance and diversity (Chand Gupta and Kaushik 2012). Detailed long term study is required to determine the impact of these artificial water bodies located in unprotected wetlands (Chester and Robson 2013).

The average abundance value determines species rarity and abundance itself. This explains that wetland birds have higher average abundance than rest of the four plots. WA1 is second after W with respect to average abundance. The Shannon $J'$ index also established that $W (J' = 0.863)$ and $WA1 (J' = 0.813)$ were the most homogenous in community composition. Numbers of rare species, however, did not vary greatly among plots, with the wetland and WA1 showing fewer rare species than the others. On average, approximately 73% of species were found to be rare in all plots studied. These included Black-headed Ibis ($Threskiornis melanocephalus$), a near-threatened species, and Indian Spotted Eagle ($Aquila hastata$), a vulnerable species, in FA and WFA, respectively. There are still over 13,000 species of birds on Earth, but unfortunately one of eight bird species has become globally threatened. Alarmingly, we have lost 161 species of birds in the last 500 years (HBW and BirdLife International 2017, BirdLife International 2018). India has 96 threatened species and 55 endemic species (IUCN 2017). Checklist preparation and avian taxonomy have become increasingly important, as many global case study reports show that many bird species and their unique habitats have been completely wiped out only because they were mistakenly treated as conspecific to a closely related extant cousin (BirdLife International 2018). An estimated 10% of bird diversity has been ignored due to taxonomic error. The IUCN Red List Index (RLI) reveals a steep decline in the bird population in the years 1988-2016, while the Wild Bird Index has shown a massive decline in the population of farmland birds in Europe since 1980 (Donald et al. 2006).

In one of the five plots we found 48 species considered unique for that habitat, although there are many species known to be much more widespread than our observations might suggest (authors’ personal observations). These include Cotton Teal ($Nettapus coromandelianus$), Black-headed Ibis ($Threskiornis melanocephalus$), Cinnamon Bittern ($Ixobrychus cinnamomeus$), Grey Heron ($Ardea cinerea$), most raptors, Common Hoopoe ($Upupa epops epops$), Blue-tailed Bee-eater ($Merops philippinus$), Red-rumped Swallow ($Cecropis daurica$), Oriental Skylark ($Alauda gulgula$), and Pale-billed Flowerpecker ($Dicaeum erythrorhynchos$). This problem arose due to time-bound sampling and the counting method we used. During our survey we found Glossy Ibis as an abundant species in some of the locations, but this finding could be highly biased. Glossy ibises are winter visitors and their roosting and feeding locations are random (Rasmussen and Anderton 2012). Most activity is in large flocks, so during counting the flock was considered as a whole. Very few flocks enter the Gangetic plains and are nomadic to the region studied (Ali and Ripley 1980). During the first week of April we encountered a large number of western yellow wagtails ($Motacilla flava$) and citrine wagtails ($Motacilla citreola citreola$) in WFA. This is due to their flocking behaviour, which occurs for a few days before their return migration. Many species are encoun-
tered in low frequency due to their elusive habits, but they may not be as rare as they seem. The five study plots were of different size; in particular, plot W was smaller than the others. As W was a perennial marshland, most of its area was inaccessible.

Although we measured indices based on relative abundance, as the species number and frequencies were highly biased, the calculated indices were also affected to some extent. Penetration and visibility through reed grasses are two common problems encountered in marshland studies, and this may have contributed to the lack of rare species in our data. A long-term assessment for marshland is thus required to establish the uniqueness of its species composition. The study was conducted during the day, so obviously nocturnal birds such as bitterns, night herons, owls and nightjars were encountered less frequently. Many species may be rare or even absent in the data simply because they were not encountered in the areas around the transect line or point during the period of observation.

During our sampling study we identified five winter migrants among the 25 generalist species showing the lowest fidelity to any particular habitat. White Wagtail (*Motacilla alba*), Citrine Wagtail (*Motacilla c. citreola*) and Western Yellow Wagtail (*Motacilla flava*) were abundant in three, two, and one plot, respectively. Wood Sandpiper (*Tringa glareola*) is abundant in WFA and WA 2 and Brown Shrike (*Lanius cristatus cristatus*) is relatively rare among the habitats. WFA also plays a major role in holding the migratory species (77.08 %) followed by WA 2 (50%). The 14 migratory species that specifically exploited WFA included Indian Cuckoo (*Cuculus micropterus*), Black-headed Cuckoo-shrike (*Lalage melanoptera*), Ashy Drongo (*Dicrurus leucophaeos*), Black-naped Oriole (*Oriolus chinensis diffusus*), Greenish Warbler (*Phylloscopus trochiloides viridanus*), Green-crowned Warbler (*Seicercus burkii*), Verditer Flycatcher (*Eumyias thalassinus*), and Blue-throated Flycatcher (*Cyornis rubeculoides*), which are exclusive forest species only found in woodland forests (authors’ personal observation) in India. The presence of habitat-sensitive, migratory forest species in an urban area depends upon the native forest space (Dale 2018). Eurasian Wigeon (*Mareca penelope*), Little Ringed Plover (*Charadrius dubius curonicus*), Common Greenshank (*Tringa nebularia*), Green Sandpiper (*Tringa ochropus*), and Little Stint (*Ereunetes minutus*) are among the seven exclusive migrant species found in WA2, and these normally prefer to exploit river-associated wetland habitats in the Indo-Gangetic Plain (authors’ personal observation). Thus WFA and WA2, due to the inclusion of forest and riverine systems in their respective plots, became important for sustaining exclusive migratory species. The foraging guild composition over the area shows the dominance of carnivores and omnivores. Dominance of carnivores is a by-product of agricultural intensification on the Indian Subcontinent (Sundar and Subramanya 2010). The proportion of insectivores in WFA was greater (24.2%) than in the other plots, as many of the insectivores were found exclusively in the continuous forest patch included in this plot. These are the Indian Cuckoo (*Cuculus micropterus*), Plain-tailed Cuckoo (*Cacomantis meralinus*), Large-tailed Nightjar (*Caprimulgus macrurus*), Blue-tailed Bee-eater (*Merops philippinus*), White-throated Fantail (*Rhipidura albicollis*), Black-naped Blue Monarch (*Hypothymis azurea*), Greenish Warbler (*Phylloscopus trochiloides viridanus*), Green-crowned Warbler (*Seicercus burkii*), Verditer Flycatcher (*Eumyias thalassinus*), and Blue-throated Flycatcher (*Cyornis ru-
beculoides). Dominance of insectivores has also been seen in studies conducted in Sub-Himalayan broadleaf forests (Chatterjee et al. 2013).

Four of the plots, WA1, FA, WA2 and WFA, have multiple adjoining blocks of different habitats. These plots unquestionably have distinct margins or ecotones, the transition between two dissimilar ecosystems. The impact of the ecotone is fairly prominent in bird community studies (Odum 1958, Sisk and Margules 1993). We have two clear boundaries between forest and wetland (WFA plot) and between secondary forest and agricultural land (FA plot). The margin between the wetland and agricultural block of both WA1 and WA2 has a narrow treeline or grass line demarcating the two blocks. Among the 150 species identified, we examine the ecotone effect by considering 74 species with at least a 40% encounter rate in any of the four plots (Baker et al. 2002). Among these, 18 species are found in the forested block of plot WFA, the secondary patchy forest within the human habitation block (plot FA), and the treeline between the wetland and agricultural field of plots WA1 and WA2. These are Yellow-footed Green Pigeon (Treron p. phoenicopterus), Lineated Barbet (Megalaima lineata), Blue-throated Barbet (Megalaima asiatica), Black-rumped Goldenback (Dinopium benghalense), Golden Oriole (Oriolus kundoo), Black-hooded Oriole (Oriolus xanthornus), Rufous Treepie (Dendrocitta vagabunda), Cinereous Tit (Parus cinereus), Jungle Babbler (Turdoides striata), Oriental Magpie Robin (Copsychus saularis), Asian Koel (Eudynamys scolopaceus), Rose-ringed Parakeet (Psittacula krameri), Spotted Owlet (Athene brama), Blyth’s Reed Warbler (Acrocephalus dumetorum), Red-throated Flycatcher (Ficedula albicilla), Purple-rumped Sunbird (Cinnyris asiaticus), and Bronzed Drongo (Chaptia aenea). Plots WA1 and WA2 undoubtedly gained some additional species due to the ecotonal vegetation. Four species, Little Cormorant (Microcarbo niger), Indian Shag (Phalacrocorax fuscicollis), Stork-billed Kingfisher (Pelargopsis capensis), and Common Kingfisher (Alcedo atthis), are found in the wetland blocks of plot WA and/or around the waterbodies and canals in the human-dominated patchy forest of plot FA. A single species, Pheasant-tailed Jacana (Hydrophasianus chirugus), in the wetland block of WA2 and seven species in the wetland block of WA1, i.e. Little Grebe (Tachybaptus ruficollis), Grey Heron (Ardea cinerea), Common Greenshank (Tringa nebularia), Green Sandpiper (Tringa ochropus), Lesser Pied Kingfisher (Ceryle rudis), Indian Reed Warbler (Acrocephalus stentoreus brunneiceps), and Siberian Rubythroat (Calliope calliope), are wetland species. Twenty-six species were found to exploit both the wetland and agricultural block of WFA, WA and/or FA. Seventeen species were found to be ecotone-neutral species, as they were found in all types of blocks studied. House sparrow (Passer domesticus) was found in the agricultural block of FA and not in any other block, although this type of habitat is very common near human settlements. No species was found that was observed by other authors to be ecotone-specific (Sisk and Margules 1993, Baker et al. 2002).

It can be concluded from our data that the combination of temporary wetlands with light cultivation activity and an adjacent forest strip (WFA) away from human settlement provides the greatest diversity and the lowest abundance. Conservation of healthy forest patches is an important requirement to maintain high species diversity and migratory species assemblages. Low-intensity farming and distance from human
settlement may result in such relatively rich diversity (Sutcliffe et al. 2015). The Sarus Crane, a globally threatened species, prefers wetlands for breeding in the vicinity of cultivation fields, especially rice, and avoids human-mediated disturbances (KS Gopi 2009). The intensified farming and increasing human settlement in FA increases species dominance but also decreases the proportion of insectivores, which cannot be sustained in severely fragmented vegetation patches. Fish farms within the wetland did not alter community composition as much as we expected in our comparison of W1 and W, but a detailed long-term assessment of marshland is required to observe the effect of this habitat alteration. Species diversity increases with increasing habitat complexity, and two or more adjoining habitats obviously provide broader niches for species, including some specialists, to thrive (Remsen and Parker 1983, Jullien and Thiollay 1996, Laska 1997). Our study gives a rough description of habitat heterogeneity in the area. Avifaunal diversity increases with habitat heterogeneity, which is evident from the comparison of species dominance and evenness in the five sites.
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Species account. The percentage of relative abundance is given for each species in respective plots and based on the average species abundance value; abundant species are marked in bold; migratory species are designated with their mode of migration in the migration status column: WV – Winter visitor; TM – Two- season migrant, BV – Breeding visitor, SM – Spring migrant; others are resident and not designated. Birds are divided into six foraging guilds: Ph-Cr, Cr, Om, Gr, In and Fg, as described in the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Migration Status</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Foraging Guild</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order: Anseriformes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Whistling-duck (<em>Dendrocygna javanica</em>)</td>
<td>×  ×  × 1.13</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton Teal (<em>Nettapus coromandelianus</em>)</td>
<td>×  ×  ×</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurasian Wigeon (<em>Mareca penelope</em>)</td>
<td>WV  ×  ×  × 0.1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Ph-Cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order: Podicipitiformes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podicipedidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Grebe (<em>Tachybaptus ruficollis</em>)</td>
<td>×  ×  × 0.29</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order: Ciconiiformes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciconidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Openbill (<em>Anastomus oscitans</em>)</td>
<td>10.2 2.84 1.24 3.18 7.06</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>Cr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threskiornithidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-headed Ibis (<em>Threskiornis melanocephalus</em>)</td>
<td>WV  ×  × 0.22</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossy Ibis (<em>Plegadis falcinellus</em>)</td>
<td>WV  ×  × 1.19</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ardeidae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Bittern (<em>Ixobrychus sinensis</em>)</td>
<td>×  ×  ×</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinnamon Bittern (<em>Ixobrychus cinnamomeus</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Bittern (<em>Dupetor flavicollis</em>)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-crowned Night Heron (<em>Nycticorax nycticorax</em>)</td>
<td>×  ×</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Pond-heron (<em>Ardeola grayii</em>)</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Migration Status</td>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Foraging Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Heron (Ardea cinerea)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Heron (Ardea purpurea)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cattle Egret (Bubulcus coromandus)</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Egret (Egretta alba)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Egret (Egretta intermedia)</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Egret (Egretta garzetta)</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order: Pelecaniformes**

Phalacrocoracidae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Foraging Guild</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Cormorant (Microcarbo niger)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Shag (Phalacrocorax fuscicollis)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order: Falconiformes**

Falconidae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Foraging Guild</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Kestrel (Falco tinnunculus)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peregrine Falcon (Falco peregrinus calidus)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accipitridae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Foraging Guild</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black-winged Kite (Elanus caeruleus)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Kite (Milvus migrans/govinda)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Honey Buzzard (Pernis ptilorhynchus)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crested Serpent-eagle (Spilornis cheela)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Marsh Harrier (Circus aeruginosus)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shikra (Accipiter badius)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Spotted Eagle (Aquila hastata)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booted Eagle (Hieraaetus pennatus)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changeable Hawk Eagle (Nisaetus limaetus)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order: Gruiformes**

Turnicidae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Foraging Guild</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barred Buttonquail (Turnix suscitator)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Genus/Species</td>
<td>WA1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rallidae</td>
<td>White-breasted Waterhen (<em>Amaurornis phoenicurus</em>)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watercock (<em>Gallicrex cinerea</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eurasian Coot (* Fulica atra*)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacanidae</td>
<td>Pheasant-tailed Jacana (<em>Hydrophasianus chirurgus</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grey-headed Lapwing (<em>Vanellus cinereus</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red-Wattled Lapwing (<em>Vanellus indicus</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Ringed Plover (<em>Charadrius dubius curonicus</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rostratulidae</td>
<td>Greater Painted Snipe (<em>Rostratula benghalensis</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scolopacidae</td>
<td>Common Snipe (<em>Gallinago gallinago</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Greenshank (<em>Tringa nebularia</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Sandpiper (<em>Tringa ochropus</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wood Sandpiper (<em>Tringa glareola</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Sandpiper (<em>Actitis hypoleucos</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Stint (<em>Ereunetes minutus</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glareolidae</td>
<td>Oriental Pratincole (<em>Glareola maldivarum</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbidae</td>
<td>Rock Pigeon (<em>Columba livia</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- WA: Weighted Average
- FA: Frequency Average
- W: Weight
- WFA: Weighted Frequency Average
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Migration Status</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Foraging Guild</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eurasian Collared-dove (Streptopelia decaocto)</td>
<td>0.73 1.91 0.73 2.94 1.07</td>
<td>Gr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Collared Dove (Streptopelia tranquebarica)</td>
<td>× × × ×</td>
<td>Gr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotted Dove (Spilopelia chinensis)</td>
<td>3.57 4.53 4.13 2.62 2.29</td>
<td>Gr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-footed Green Pigeon (Teron p. phoenicopterus)</td>
<td>× × 2.38 0.39 0.81</td>
<td>Fg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order: Psittaciformes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose-ringed Parakeet (Psittacula krameri)</td>
<td>× × 0.28 0.58 0.12</td>
<td>Fg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum-headed Parakeet (Psittacula cyanocephala)</td>
<td>× × × 0.1 ×</td>
<td>Fg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order: Cuculiformes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobin Cuckoo (Clamator jacobinus)</td>
<td>B 0.11 × 0.11 × 0.02</td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Hawk-cuckoo (Hierococcyx varius)</td>
<td>× × 0.11 × 0.01</td>
<td>Om</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Cuckoo (Cuculus micropterus)</td>
<td>B × × × × 0.01</td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaintive Cuckoo (Cacomantis merulinus)</td>
<td>× × × × 0.03</td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Koel (Eudynamys scolopaceus)</td>
<td>0.11 × 0.79 0.02 0.11 0.11 0.02</td>
<td>Om</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Coucal (Centropus sinensis)</td>
<td>0.05 0.23 0.4 0.02 0.23</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order: Strigiformes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Owl (Tyto alba)</td>
<td>× × × × × 0.01</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order: Caprimulgiformes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Scops Owl (Otus bakkamoena)</td>
<td>× × × × × 0.01</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotted Owlet (Athene brama)</td>
<td>× × 0.11 0.08 0.02</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Hawk Owl (Ninox scutulata)</td>
<td>× × × × × 0.02</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order: Caprimulgidae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-tailed Nightjar (Caprimulgus macrurus)</td>
<td>× × × × × 0.02</td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Migration Status</td>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Foraging Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order: Apodiformes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apodidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Palm Swift (Cypsiurus balasiensis)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order: Coraciiformes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upupidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Hoopoe (Upupa epops epops)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coracidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Roller (Coracias benghalensis benghalensis)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alecdinidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stork-billed Kingfisher (Pelargopsis capensis)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-throated Kingfisher (Halcyon smyrnensis)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Kingfisher (Alcedo atthis)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Pied Kingfisher (Ceryle rudis)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order: Piciformes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megalaimidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lineated Barbet (Megalaima lineata)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-throated Barbet (Megalaima asiatica)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppersmith Barbet (Xantholaema haemacephala)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurasian Wryneck (Jynx torquilla)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufous Woodpecker (Micropterus brachyrurus)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulvous-breasted Pied Woodpecker (Dendrocopos macei)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streak-throated Woodpecker (Picus xanthopygaeus)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Migration Status</td>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Foraging Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WA1</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-rumped Goldenback (<em>Dinopium benghalense</em>)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Flameback (<em>Chrysocolaptes gutacristatus</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order: Passeriformes**

**Artamidae**
- Ashy Woodswallow (*Artamus fuscus*)
  - Migration Status: × × 0.05 × 0.11
  - Plot: In

**Campephagidae**
- Black-headed Cuckoo-shrike (*Lalage melanoptera*)
  - Migration Status: TM × × × × 0.01
  - Plot: Om

**Aegithinidae**
- Common Iora (*Aegithina tiphia*)
  - Migration Status: × × 0.17 × 0.04
  - Plot: In

**Laniidae**
- Brown Shrike (*Lanius cristatus cristatus*)
  - Migration Status: WV 0.05 1.43 0.11 0.1 0.17
  - Plot: Cr
- ‘Black headed’ Long-tailed Shrike (*Lanius schach tricolor*)
  - Migration Status: WV × 0.95 × 0.08
  - Plot: Cr
- Grey-backed Shrike (*Lanius tephronotus*)
  - Migration Status: WV × × 0.05 × 0.02
  - Plot: Cr

**Dicuridae**
- Black Drongo (*Edolius macrocercus*)
  - Migration Status: 5.1 5.25 3.5 0.92 2.88
  - Plot: Om
- Ashy Drongo (*Edolius leucophaeus*)
  - Migration Status: WV × × × × 0.05
  - Plot: Om
- Bronzed Drongo (*Chapthia aenea*)
  - Migration Status: 0.05 × 0.45 × 0.12
  - Plot: Om

**Oriolidae**
- Indian Golden Oriole (*Oriolus kundoo*)
  - Migration Status: WV 0.06 × 0.06 × 0.07
  - Plot: Om
- Black-naped Oriole (*Oriolus chinensis diffusus*)
  - Migration Status: WV × × × × 0.06
  - Plot: Om
- Black-hooded Oriole (*Oriolus xanthornus*)
  - Migration Status: 0.22 × 0.8 0.23 0.7
  - Plot: Om

**Rhipiduridae**
- White-throated Fantail (*Rhipidura albicollis*)
  - Migration Status: × × × × × 0.03
  - Plot: In

**Monarchidae**
- Asian Paradise Flycatcher (*Terpsiphone paradisi*)
  - Migration Status: × × 0.34 0.02 0.04
  - Plot: In
- Black-naped Blue Monarch (*Hypothymis azurea*)
  - Migration Status: × × × × × 0.08
  - Plot: In
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Migration Status</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Foraging Guild</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WA1</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufous Treepie (<em>Dendrocitta vagabunda</em>)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Jungle Crow (<em>Corvus [macrorhynchos] culminatus</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Crow (<em>Corvus splendens</em>)</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>18.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paridae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinereous Tit (<em>Parus cinereus</em>)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paridae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streak-throated Swallow (<em>Petrochelidon fluvicola</em>)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Swallow (<em>Hirundo rustica</em>)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>12.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-rumped Swallow (<em>Cecropis daurica</em>)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaudidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BengalBushlark (<em>Mirafra assamica</em>)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Skylark (<em>Alauda gulgula</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pycnonotidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-whiskered Bulbul (<em>Pycnonotus jocosus</em>)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-vented Bulbul (<em>Pycnonotus cafer</em>)</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisticolidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-bellied Prinia (<em>Prinia flaviventris</em>)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Prinia (<em>Prinia inornata</em>)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zitting Cisticola (<em>Cisticola juncidis</em>)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Tailorbird (<em>Orthotomus sutorius</em>)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrocephalidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Reed Warbler (<em>Acrocephalus stentoreus brunneescens</em>)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddyfield Warbler (<em>Acrocephalus agricola</em>)</td>
<td>TM</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyth's Reed Warbler (<em>Acrocephalus dumetorum</em>)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Migration Status</td>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Foraging Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phylloscopidae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenish Warbler (Phylloscopus trochiloides viridanus)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green-crowned Warbler (Seicercus burkii)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timaliidae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungle Babbler (Turdoides striata)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zosteropidae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental White-eye (Zosterops palpebrosus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sturnidae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungle Myna (Acridotheres fuscus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Myna (Acridotheres tristis)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pied Starling (Gracupica contra)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey-headed Starling (Sturnia malabarica)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosy Starling (Pastor roseus)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turdidae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange-headed Thrush (Geokichla citrina)</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muscicapidae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluethroat (Luscinia svecica svecica)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberian Rubythroat (Calliope calliope)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Magpie-robin (Copsychus saularis)</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberian Stonechat (Saxicola maurus maurus/indicis)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-throated Flycatcher (Ficedula albicilla)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verditer Flycatcher (Eumyias thalassinus)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-throated Flycatcher (Cynomis rubeculoides)</td>
<td>TM</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dicaeidae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pale-billed Flowerpecker (Dicaeum erithrophynchos)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Migration Status</td>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Foraging Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA1</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>WA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nectariniidae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple-rumped Sunbird (Leptocoma zeylonica)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple Sunbird (Cinnyris asiaticus)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passeridae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Sparrow (Passer domesticus)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ploceidae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-breasted Weaver (Ploceus benghalensis)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Baya Weaver (Ploceus philippinus philippinus)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fringillidae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Silverbill (Euodice malabarica)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Avadavat (Amandava amandava)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaly-breasted Munia (Lonchura punctulata)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricoloured Munia (Lonchura malaca)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motacillidae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Yellow Wagtail (Motacilla flava)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrine Wagtail (Motacilla citreola citreola)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey Wagtail (Motacilla cinerea)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Wagtail (Motacilla alba)</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddyfield Pipit (Anthus rufulus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive-backed Pipit (Anthus hodgsoni hodgsoni)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>