Evolution of vocal production learning in parrots

Krasheninnikova A[1,2], Smeele SQ[3,4,5], Snijders M[2,8], Haldar E[1,2,9], Carpenter J[6], Zamora R[7], Naguib M[8], Wolf JBW[1,9], Gahr M[1], von Bayern AMP[1,2]

[1]Max-Planck-Institute for Biological Intelligence, Seewiesen, Germany

[2]Max-Planck Comparative Cognition Research Group, Loro Parque Fundación, Tenerife, Spain

[3]Cognitive and Cultural Ecology Research Group, Max Planck Institute of Animal Behavior, Radolfzell, Germany

[4]Department of Human Behavior, Ecology and Culture, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, Germany

[5]Department of Ecoscience, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark

[6]Department of Neurobiology and Behavior, Cornell University, Ithaca, USA.

[7]Loro Parque Fundación, Puerto de la Cruz, Tenerife, Spain

[8]Behavioural Ecology Group, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen, The Netherlands

[9]Division of Evolutionary Biology, LMU Munich, Planegg-Martinsried, Germany

Corresponding authors' contact: akrasheninnikova@bi.mpg.de; auguste.bayern@bi.mpg.de

Abstract

Vocal production learning (VPL), the capacity to imitate sounds, is a crucial, but not exclusive

component of human language. VPL is rare in animals but common in birds, where it evolved

independently in songbirds, hummingbirds, and parrots. Parrots (Psittaciformes) learn new

vocalizations throughout their lives and exhibit astonishing vocal flexibility and imitation capacity.

They can copy allospecific sounds, e.g., human words and learn their associated meanings. Parrots,

therefore, present an intriguing model to shed light on how VPL evolved and how it may relate to

other language-relevant traits. How widely VPL is distributed across Psittaciformes and to what

extent (qualitative) species differences exist, remains unknown. Here, we provide the first

comprehensive overview of the phylogenetic distribution of (allospecific) VPL in this clade by

conducting surveys of publicly available video footage. Out of the 398 currently recognized extant

species, we found videos for 163, of which 136 showed evidence of VPL. Phylogenetic analyses

suggest secondary losses and reacquisitions of VPL covarying with socioecological parameters

(gregariousness), life-history (longevity), and morphological (body size) traits. This study provides the

first insights into interspecific variation in vocal learning across all parrot species and reveals

potential socio-ecological drivers of its evolution.

Keywords: Vocal Learning, Imitation, Evolution, Bayesian phylogenetic models, Parrots, Ancestral

State Reconstruction

Significance: Little is known about the selective forces that favor the evolution of vocal production

learning (VPL), a rare trait in animals and a prerequisite for the evolution of human language. We

provide the first insights into interspecific variation in VPL in the evolutionary history of parrots and

uncover candidate evolutionary drivers. The current data suggest that the evolution of VPL within

parrots has been highly dynamic, with multiple secondary losses and reacquisitions. Our model

showed that VPL most likely was the ancestral state. Sociality, longevity and body size explain

variation in VPL together with a highly uncertain effect of brain size. The findings may motivate

comparative work in other taxa and contribute to research into the evolutionary origins of human

language.

Introduction

Vocal production learning (also referred to as imitative learning or vocal mimicry) is the capacity to learn vocalizations outside of the "innate" vocal repertoire (Carouso-Peck et al. 2021), and is a prerequisite for human spoken language (Jarvis 2006). Without the ability to generate and acquire a large, open-ended vocabulary, the flexible, expressive power of language would be very limited (Tyack 2020). Vocal production learning (VPL hereafter) is a rare trait found in only five distantly related groups of mammals (humans, bats, cetaceans, pinnipeds, and elephants) and three distantly related groups of birds (songbirds, hummingbirds, and parrots). Given the scarce evidence for VPL in non-human primates (Petkov and Jarvis 2012), research has focused on songbirds as the dominant model for studying the developmental processes, mechanisms of acquisition, and evolutionary history of VPL over the past few decades (Bolhuis et al. 2010; Petkov and Jarvis 2012; Tyack 2020; Tyack 2016). While Petkov and Jarvis (2012) suggest that striking neurogenetic underpinnings of VPL have convergently evolved in humans and songbirds, this interpretation is contentious. Critics argue that the parallels may be superficial and call for more detailed comparative studies to substantiate claims of convergent evolution (e.g., Berwick et al. 2011). Despite these debates, parallels between song development of birds and human language development have been suggested, as reviewed by Aamodt et al. (2020). For example, most vocally learning songbirds acquire their ability to sing similarly to how infants learn to speak, i.e., going through sensitive learning and "babbling" (i.e., practicing) phases (Beckers et al. 2014; Bolhuis et al. 2010; Cahill et al. 2021).

Parrots are one of the most versatile avian vocal production learners (Chakraborty et al. 2015; Fitch et al. 2010; Pepperberg 2010) and, in fact, resemble humans more in their VPL traits than songbirds (Bradbury and Balsby 2016; Carouso-Peck et al. 2021; Colbert-White et al. 2014). Like humans, most parrots are open-ended vocal learners, i.e., their VPL is not limited to a particular sensitive period like in many songbirds, but they modify their vocal repertoires throughout life (Bradbury and Balsby 2016). Moreover, in parrots, both sexes use learnt vocalizations, rather than just males, as is the

case in most songbirds (Bradbury and Balsby 2016). Another crucial aspect is that parrots use their

learnt vocalizations in a wide variety of social contexts (Aamodt et al. 2020; Bradbury and Balsby

2016; Colbert-White et al. 2014) rather than primarily for territorial defense or mate attraction

(Carouso-Peck et al. 2021), even though song also functions beyond those contexts (Loning et al.

2023). Recent research revealed that parrots also possess developmental babbling phases analogous

to human prelinguistic development (Eggleston et al. 2022). In addition, parrots share several

general life history traits with humans, such as longevity, slow development or extended parental

care, and also live in complex, individualized societies (Bradbury and Balsby 2016). Finally, they stand

out among vertebrates for their large relative brain sizes (Kabadayi et al. 2016; Olkowicz et al.

2016), high neuron densities (Herculano-Houzel 2017) and remarkable socio-cognitive abilities that

make them more prone to complex communication (see Lambert et al. 2018; Auersperg and Bayern

2019 for reviews). These similarities between parrots and humans make them a suitable model for

studying VPL evolution, possible origins, and selection pressures for language-relevant traits

(Bradbury and Balsby 2016).

Parrots are also well known for their ability to imitate human speech and represent one of the few

animal taxa in which referential signaling has been demonstrated (Pepperberg 2002). Alex, the

famous African grey parrot *(Psittacus erithacus)*, learned over a hundred human words which he

associated with meaning (Pepperberg 2006). A possible reason why parrots can mimic human

speech is that their acoustic range of auditory perception and call production appears to overlap

with that of humans (Lohr et al. 2003; May 2004; Pepperberg 2010; ten Cate and Spierings 2019;

Zdenek et al. 2015). Like humans, they also use tongue and beak movements for vocal articulation

(Beckers et al. 2014; Ohms et al. 2012; Pepperberg 2010). The capacity of parrots to imitate sounds

of human speech well outside the species-typical repertoires provides an opportunity to study VPL

capacity (Benedict et al. 2022) and inter-specific variation therein (Carouso-Peck et al. 2021).

The most likely function of VPL in parrots is to enable social communication within flocks, for

example, when mediating flock exchanges during social foraging (Bradbury and Balsby 2016;

Thomsen et al. 2019). Parrots have one or multiple types of contact calls designed explicitly for social

communication and, in some species, contain clear individual signatures (e.g., Berg et al. 2012;

Thomsen et al. 2019). There is even evidence of a voice print going across call types, enabling

individuals to remain recognizable, even during flexible exchanges (Smeele et al. 2023). Contact calls

can also be modified in social groups. For example, budgerigars (*Melopsittacus undulatus*) converge

on the call of conspecifics (Hile et al. 2000) leading to additional social signatures, and spectacled

parrotlets (*Forpus conspicillatus*) may use distinct contact calls (Wanker et al. 2005) to selectively

'address' specific individuals directly. It has been pointed out that the complex social systems of

many parrot species, their highly complex and dynamic social fission-fusion foraging cultures

(considered a result of their extraordinarily challenging diet of toxic, unripe seeds), and their

possible dependency on social learning may select for acoustic individual recognition, vocal

communication and exchange of information (Bradbury and Balsby 2016; Carouso-Peck et al. 2021).

Consequently, many aspects of the socioecology and life history of different parrot species may

account for possible inter-specific variation in VPL capacity across parrots. For example, continuous

VPL may be vital for species with high longevity (Stoeger and Manger 2014), fluid social dynamics

and social foraging (Bradbury and Balsby 2016; Sewall 2015). Furthermore, parrots vary enormously

in body mass, a morphological trait that can shape some acoustic features of parrots' vocalizations

(e.g., peak frequency and duration (Medina-García et al. 2015)), thus leading to various levels of

vocal plasticity in differently sized species. Finally, the recently discovered shell regions unique to the

parrots' brain tend to be larger in larger-brained species that are also typically considered to have

more advanced vocal and cognitive abilities (Chakraborty et al. 2015). Therefore, parrots as open-

ended vocal learners and highly diverse avian taxon with 398 extant species that vary in body size

(between 10g, *Microspitta pusio*, and 2250g, *Strigops habroptilus*, Dunning 2007), life history

parameters and socio-ecological variables, represent an ideal model system for studying the

evolution of VPL. Given that the most striking evidence for VPL in parrots comes from individuals

kept as pets mimicking human speech or other anthropogenic sounds from their environment (Ten

Cate 2021), and considering that the majority of parrots are kept as pets or in zoos, a focus on

parrots kept in human care may provide a fruitful first venue for research on vocal mimicking

capacities across parrot species.

In this study, we took advantage of the social media platform YouTube to gain first insights into the

phylogenetic distribution of and interspecific variability in VPL of parrots. We examined the ability of

all 398 parrot species to imitate human speech and anthropogenic sounds and thus the yet untested

prediction that vocal learning is ubiquitous among all parrots and evolved at the base of the

Psittaciformes radiation 29 Mio years ago (Suh et al. 2011; Chakraborty et al. 2015).

In order to examine potential evolutionary drivers, we considered four variables that we predicted

to select for increased VPL (longevity, social complexity, body size, and relative brain size) and made

the following specific predictions for each of them. Parrots learn new vocalization throughout their

life, therefore, long life spans may entail more opportunities for vocal learning (Carouso-Peck et al.

2021). Also, longer-lived species are more likely to face social and environmental changes, which

may select for greater flexibility in communication. We thus expected longer-lived species to be

more likely to exhibit VPL or to be better at VPL than shorter-lived species. Furthermore, we

predicted that they would exhibit larger learnt vocal repertoire sizes than shorter-lived species.

Similarly, complex social dynamics may select for VPL, e.g., by facilitating mediation during flock

exchanges (Carouso-Peck et al. 2021). We took gregariousness (defined as nesting close together or

being colonial) as an available proxy for social complexity and expected highly gregarious species to

exhibit (better) VPL more likely but also to show larger learnt vocal repertoire than less gregarious

species. Furthermore, larger parrots produce lower fundamental frequencies with longer

wavelengths than smaller parrots; thus, we expected larger species to show a higher range of

imitations of human words. Finally, vocal learning is often considered a cognitively demanding

capacity that requires a relatively high brain processing capacity (Tyack 2020; Mercado et al. 2014,

but see Jarvis 2019). Moreover, relative brain size is correlated with key features that support VPL,

such as increased longevity, which provides a longer time span for learning and utilizing complex

vocalizations (Smeele et al. 2022). Additionally, it is linked to the unique neuroanatomical features of

the parrot brain, particularly the shell structures. Research by Chakraborty et al. (2015) revealed

significant plasticity in the relative sizes of song nuclei among parrot species, with the shell regions

being larger in species with larger brains, which are typically considered to possess more advanced

vocal and cognitive abilities. This pattern demonstrates that as brain size increases, the relative size

of shell regions also increases, albeit slower, suggesting a complex relationship between brain size

and vocal learning capacities. Thus, we expected larger-brained species (relative to body size) to be

better at VPL.

Results

We collected data on the occurrence of VPL in all 398 extant parrots and found videos for 163

species, of which 162 could be considered to be in human care (i.e., they were either reported in

international trade by CITES and/or found in captivity, see Tab. 1 and Supplementary Information A,

for more explanation and an overview). In total, 136 species showed evidence of VPL, i.e., produced

at least one mimicked allospecific vocalization. For the remaining 235 species no videos were found,

but 192 of these species were kept in human care. Assuming that the capacity to mimic human

speech or anthropogenic sounds is sufficiently conspicuous to be captured on video when exhibited

by a human companion, the absence of evidence of VPL in the 192 species kept in human care was,

with all due caution, scored as tentative evidence of absence for VPL (see Methods and Discussion).

In contrast, the 43 species not kept in human care were treated as missing data points (regarding

VPL capacity of these species).

Table 1: Overview of the number of species for which YT videos were present or absent, species that
were reported in human care, and for which VPL ability was present/absent, or data was lacking.

YT videos 163 species				No YT videos 235 species		
In human care 162		NOT in human care 1*[a]		In human care 192		NOT in human care 43[a]
VPL 135	No VPL 27	VPL 1	No VPL 0	VPL 0[b]	No VPL 192[b]	Missing data[a]

[a]These species are excluded from the evaluation of the effects of longevity, relative brain size,
sociality and body size on the likelihood of a species exhibiting VPL.
[b]Since the absence of evidence in the species that occur in human care (i.e., in international trade and/or
captivity) appears reliable, as the ability to mimic anthropogenic sounds or human speech is likely to be
captured on video if it occurs, we did not exclude these species when assessing the effects of longevity,
relative brain size, sociality and body size on the likelihood of a species exhibiting VPL. However, we also
re-ran the analyses with only the subset of species for which we found YT videos. The effects found
remained stable for this subset of data as well.
*Prioniturus verticalis
183

Based on the available data, the ancestral state reconstruction revealed an early presence of VPL in

parrots (for the full distribution, see Figure 1 and Supplementary Information B, Figure SB1). There

was a strong phylogenetic signal, with closely related species showing a similar expression of VPL.

The signal was much weaker further down the tree (see Supplementary Information B, Figure SB2).

We ran four phylogenetically controlled models to test the total effect of longevity, relative brain

size, sociality, and body size on the probability that a species possessed VPL (excluding the 44

species not reported in human care). All variables had a positive total effect, although the effect of

relative brain size was highly uncertain (see Figure 2).

Next, we recorded "VPL total repertoire size" (i.e., scored as the number of distinct mimicked

vocalizations an individual produced, see methods and Supplementary Information A for details) for

843 individuals across 136 species (i.e., between a minimum of 1 and up to 25 individuals per

species). Again, we ran four phylogenetically controlled models to test for the total effect of

longevity, relative brain size, sociality and body size on repertoire size. Longevity had no effect,

relative brain size had a highly uncertain effect, while sociality and body size had small positive

effects (see Figure 3). The within-species variability of the VPL total repertoire size was low

(Supplementary Information B, Figure SB3).

Last, we tested the influence of the four variables on a measure of "VPL anthropophonic repertoire

size" (i.e., measured as the number of distinct recognizable human words an individual produced in

a video; see Figure 4). Longevity had a clear total effect. Relative brain size had no clear effect.

Sociality and body size had small and uncertain effects. In contrast, an analysis of qualitative

measures of the "VPL quality" (i.e., scored as how recognizable the mimicked vocalizations were:

low - babbling, no clear words or melodies recognizable, medium - words/melodies recognizable but

not highly defined, high - mimicked words/melodies very well defined and recognizable) revealed a

small effect of longevity and strong effect of body size (Supplementary Information B, Table SB1).

Figure 1: Phylogenetic tree of all parrot species indicating the presence and absence of VPL

ability and species for which VPL data are lacking. Colors represent the reconstructed state of VPL of

ancestral lineages ranging from blue = no VPL detected to red = VPL detected. The grey squares

indicate the species reported to be in human care. Missing grey squares indicate the 44 species not

reported in human care. Note that for 43 out of these 44 species, VPL ability remains unknown

(=missing data points).

Figure 2: Variables influencing a species' probability of exhibiting VPL (excluding 44 species not

reported in human care). Lefthand side: posterior densities of the effect of longevity (red), relative

brain size (green), gregariousness (blue), and body size (orange). For gregariousness, the contrast

between a non-gregarious and a gregarious species is shown. For all other variables, the slope is

shown. Righthand side: scatterplots of the raw data (grey) and 20 posterior predictions (colored

lines) per variable.

Figure 3: Variables influencing the number of distinct mimicked vocalizations an individual produced (i.e., VPL total repertoire size). Lefthand side: posterior densities of the effect of longevity (red), relative brain size (green), gregariousness (blue) and body size (orange). For gregariousness, the contrast between a non-gregarious and a gregarious species is shown. For all other variables, the slope is shown. Righthand side: scatterplots of the raw data (grey) and 20 posterior predictions (colored lines) per variable.

Figure 4: Variables influencing the number of distinct human words an individual produced (i.e.,

"VPL anthropophonic repertoire size"). Lefthand side: posterior densities of the effect of longevity

(red), relative brain size (green), gregariousness (blue) and body size (orange). For gregariousness,

the contrast between a non-gregarious and a gregarious species is shown. For all other variables, the

slope is shown. Righthand side: scatterplots of the raw data (grey) and 20 posterior predictions

(colored lines) per variable.

Discussion

The phylogenetic distribution of vocal learning in parrots

This study reveals an early presence of VPL among *Psittaciformes*. We show that the kaka (*Nestor*

meridionales), one of the most basal parrot species, is capable of VPL. The finding that VPL capacity

is present in this very basal group of parrots suggests that it probably derived from a common

ancestor of all parrots. This is in line with previous studies on the neural underpinnings of VPL in

parrots, suggesting that the specialized brain areas associated with vocal learning and song

production (song nuclei) have evolved early on in parrot diversification, at least 29 million years ago,

before the genus *Nestor* split from the other parrot lineages (Chakraborty et al. 2015). The

phylogenetic map of VPL we obtained not only suggests that VPL is ancestral in parrots. It also

uncovers intriguing evolutionary scenarios for vocal production learning (VPL) within the

Psittacoidea superfamily, offering two potential narratives. Firstly, it is possible that the superfamily

Psittacoidea lost VPL secondarily, meaning that the great majority of VPL species (i.e., 122 species in

Psittacoidea) actually exhibit a derived, loss-of-function trait (Porter and Crandall 2003).

Alternatively, the pattern might indicate that VPL is not originally ancestral within Psittacoidea, with

the trait having arisen independently multiple times across various species. The frequent

independent emergence of VPL under this scenario would suggest a strong adaptive advantage in

certain ecological and social environments, counterbalanced by many secondary losses where the

evolutionary costs of maintaining VPL outweigh its benefits (Sewall 2015). Note that even though

secondary losses of social behavior are quite rare in animals, they have been noted in birds

previously (e.g., reversed solitary roosting in communally roosting clades, Beauchamp 1999). In this

context, the functional learning of vocalizations and species recognition are crucial aspects that

merit further exploration. When the function of VPL is no longer adaptive, evolutionary pressures

might favor the suppression of this complex capability, allowing individuals to revert to simpler,

more recognizable calls.

This point underscores the complex interplay between genetic, ecological, and social factors that

shape the evolution of vocal learning in parrots. It suggests that the adaptive value of VPL is

intricately linked to the specific social and environmental demands faced by a species. As such,

understanding the functional implications of VPL in different ecological contexts is essential for

elucidating the reasons behind its evolutionary persistence or loss in certain lineages.

Hence, according to the first scenario, an unexpected evolutionary pattern arises; the two

superfamilies *Strigopoidea* (3 sp.) and *Cacatuoidea* (21 sp.) apparently kept the ancestral VPL,

whereas the much bigger superfamily *Psittacoidea* (True parrots, 350 sp.) lost VPL, except for the

sub-family *Psittacinae* of afrotropical parrots (12 sp.; sister group to the neotropical *Arinae*). In some

Psittacoidea genera (e.g., in *Forpus, Pyrrhura)*, the majority of species lack evidence for VPL, whereas

a few species exhibit VPL (in *Forpus*, 1 out of 8 species, and in *Pyrrhura*, 10 out of 31 species). This

indicates that those few species seem to have newly and possibly independently evolved VPL

(reversal) which their ancestors had lost according to the current data. However, it is important to

consider the distinction between the independent evolution of a trait and the reactivation of a

previously existing trait. Analogous to flight in certain flightless birds, which might more readily re-

evolve due to the pre-existence of wings, parrots likely retain much of the necessary brain structure

for VPL even after millions of years without active use of the trait. This residual capacity suggests

that reactivating VPL in parrots could be less challenging than evolving such complex behaviors de

novo in other species lacking any foundational brain structures for vocal learning. In other

Psittacoidea groups, e.g., in all genera from the neotropical Arini tribe, (except for the *Pyrrhua*

genus), most species exhibit VPL, while few species lack it. For example, all eight species belonging

to the *Ara* genus exhibit VPL, whereas 2 out of 6 Eupsittula species, 2 out of 6 *Aratinga* species lack

VPL. This suggests in turn that in this taxonomic group VPL has re-evolved (reversal) but then was

lost a third time in several species. Tertiary loss of a trait in evolution is only known from eye

evolution in cave-dwelling organisms (Porter and Crandall 2003).

On the other hand, in the Loriini group, the Lorius and Glossopsitta branches appear to have VPL but

that some have secondarily lost it, advocating for a second scenario that assumes losing VPL is more

likely than (re-)evolving VPL. Our main result suggests the absence of VPL in the last common

ancestor of Lorinii, but we found also that their two closest relatives have VPL. It could therefore

also be that VPL was present in the last common ancestor and was lost multiple times in Lorinii, due

to the high cost it incurs.

Potential costs of VPL include developmental costs of the brain tissue due to the need for increased

cognitive capacity (Chakraborty et al. 2015; Mercado et al. 2014) and opportunity costs stemming

from the need for social feedback essential for learning (Sewall 2015). Many open-ended vocal

learners such as elephants, cetaceans, and humans exhibit extended juvenile and adolescent phases

along with prolonged parental care (Carouso-Peck et al. 2021). This extended period facilitates

crucial learning from parents and other conspecifics (Goldstein et al. 2003; Goldstein and Schwade

2008), as seen in human infants whose prelinguistic development is significantly shaped by caregiver

interactions (Varella and Ghazanfar 2021). However, these prolonged care periods can impose

substantial costs on parents by delaying the time their offspring become communicatively

independent and capable of reproducing (Faust et al. 2020). Another potential cost is that

hybridization risk can increase if vocalizations become less stereotyped, since species cannot reliably

use species specific vocalizations to recognize conspecifics for mating (Grant and Grant 1997;

Slabbekoorn and Smith 2002). Finally, while vocal learning allows for the rapid spread of new

vocalizations, meaning might be lost if vocalizations spread too quickly. Referential calls, such as the

alarm calls of vervet monkeys are likely innate, since alarm calls need to be recognized immediately,

and there is no time for social learning (Blumstein 1999). The developmental constraints may limit

the evolution of VPL to species with longer lifespans (Carouso-Peck et al. 2021), and then only to

species that gain a clear advantage from VPL. Yet, given the wide occurrence of VPL across parrots,

including the many species that have secondarily lost and re-evolved VPL according to our current

data, it seems to be highly adaptive in parrots.

Our study strategically utilized proxies for vocal production learning (VPL), which are recognized as

reliable despite inherent challenges. A notable concern might be the misclassification risk,

particularly the assumption that the absence of VPL in YouTube videos equates to a genuine absence

of VPL capabilities. To counteract this, we enhanced our methodological approach by also analyzing

a dataset exclusively comprising individuals in human care (Supplementary Information B, Figure

SB4). This subset is likely more consistently represented on YouTube, thereby reducing bias related

to VPL visibility. The consistency between findings from both datasets underscores the robustness

and reliability of our results. Additionally, we acknowledged the challenges in accurately assessing

sociality and longevity due to the limited documented socio-ecological backgrounds of many parrot

species (Hobson et al. 2014). In response, we utilized the best available proxies (e.g., longevity data,

Smeele et al. (2022), while remaining cautious of their approximative nature. This careful

consideration ensures a more informed interpretation of how these factors might influence the

evolution and expression of VPL, recognizing the varied social structures and lifespan across parrot

species which correlate with cognitive capacities and complex behaviors like VPL. Finally, our use of

publicly available online videos, while presenting its unique challenges, offers substantial benefits

over other citizen science methods such as questionnaires, which can suffer from phrasing biases

(Burn 2014). By employing crowdsourcing on social media platforms, we were able to apply

objective criteria and directly measure behaviors like frequencies and durations (Nelson and Fijn

2013).

Overall, our findings suggest that VPL has evolved and re-evolved within *Psittaciformes* multiple

times making them an even more interesting model system. More comprehensive data, including a

better knowledge of the different species' socio-ecology and further detailed analyses will eventually

reveal the underlying evolutionary dynamics. Some groups, e.g*., Amazona* (18 VPL vs 16 non-VPL

species), *Pionus* (5 VPL vs 4 non-VPL species), and *Psittacula* (7 VPL vs 5 non-VPL species) genera

exhibit substantial variation and will be key to understand the evolutionary forces that select for or

against VPL in better resolution. It needs to be considered that VPL is a complex behavioral

phenotype type likely involving multiple components (Wirthlin et al. 2019). More detailed studies of

the possibly very different VPL phenotypes in different taxonomic groups of Psittaciformes,

combining genetic, neurological, developmental, and behavioral approaches with socio-ecology, will

shed further light on VPL evolution.

Possible evolutionary drivers of VPL ability and VPL repertoire sizes in parrots

Examining potential evolutionary drivers selecting for VPL in parrots, we found that longevity,

sociality, and body size best predicted the species differences in VPL ability: as predicted, the

probability that a species possesses VPL ability was generally higher for long-living, large and

gregarious species. As outlined earlier, long-lived species often have a prolonged developmental

period that is crucial not just for exposure to different vocal models but also for the extensive

practice needed to master VPL (Carouso-Peck et al. 2021; Wright and Derryberry 2021). Our finding

that longer-lived species were more likely to possess VPL and showed higher "VPL anthropophonic

repertoire size" compared to shorter-lived species is in line with the assumption that VPL may be

constrained to long-lived species.

Interestingly, no effect of longevity on VPL total repertoire size was found. This might indicate that

although parrots are open-ended vocal learners, they may not just expand their repertoires over

time like some songbirds do (Nottebohm and Nottebohm 1978), but rather, and similarly to

hummingbirds (Araya-Salas and Wright 2013), "replace" some parts of it with new

vocalizations/adjust to constantly changing socially transmitted group-specific vocalizations. This

does not necessarily imply that vocalizations are "overwritten" but that some sounds are no longer

relevant and need to be updated when socioecological conditions change or when group-specific

vocal traditions are transformed via cultural processes. Given the potential function of learned

vocalizations in mediating social interaction and acceptance into newly formed groups in ever

changing social structures with fission-fusion dynamics, it appears reasonable that sociality but not

longevity affects the repertoire size of learned vocalizations (Wright et al. 2008). These findings align

with the results recently reported by Benedict and colleagues (2022). The authors found that

companion grey parrots expanded their vocal repertoires through the juvenile phase but did not

show reliable expansion among adults, suggesting that the vocal repertoires of adult companion

parrots may change by element replacement rather than addition (Benedict et al. 2022).

In contrast, there was a clear effect of longevity when looking only at the number of distinguishable

human words learnt ("VPL anthropophonic repertoire size"). The correlation between body size and

longevity has been recently confirmed for six taxonomic classes, including birds (Kuparinen et al.

2023), and was accounted for in our statistical analysis (see Supplementary Information C, **Figure**

SC1 Directed Acyclic Graph). This aligns with previous findings by Benedict et al. (2022), showing that

- according to a questionnaire survey conducted on parrot owners - companion parrots' repertoire

size was the largest for human words. In their natural habitat, parrots imitate socially significant

vocalizations such as the individually distinct contact calls of certain group members (e.g., in orange-

fronted conures, (Balsby et al. 2012), spectacled parrotlets, (Wanker et al. 2005), or green-rumped

parrotlets, (Berg et al. 2012)), and are presumed to do so in captivity (Benedict et al. 2022).

Consequently, the verbal interactions and exchanges of words and phrases with their human "flock"

members are likely to represent the most socially relevant cues for parrots. Human words may be

more difficult to imitate than other anthropogenic sounds (whistles or melodies) since they require

finer tongue movement and articulation (Ohms et al. 2012; Pepperberg 2010). Thus, given the

prolonged learning period related to longevity discussed above, it might not surprise that long-lived

species are better at producing human words having prolonged association with human learning

models.

Consistent with the higher probability of finding VPL in more gregarious species, we found that also

the VPL total repertoire size was higher in more gregarious species. This finding aligns with the

hypothesis that VPL of diverse repertoires may be adaptive when facing fluid social dynamics

(Freeberg 2006). It has been speculated that parrots' highly social, fission–fusion foraging culture

may be a result of their uniquely challenging diet of toxic, unripe seed, which may make social

learning and information transfer about foraging sites (availability of riper and less toxic food, clay

sources to neutralize toxins) indispensable (Bradbury and Balsby 2016; Carouso-Peck et al. 2021).

Naive birds need to learn from individuals with knowledge of clay sources (geophagy to neutralize

the toxins) and foraging sites (Bradbury 2003). This social-learning-dependent system promotes

strong social bonds within a group and encourages interaction with as many individuals as possible

to gather information about finding food. This leads to flocks with overlapping areas where they

search for food and frequently exchange individuals with different knowledge (Bradbury and Balsby

2016; Carouso-Peck et al. 2021). Interestingly, we found low intraspecific variation in VPL total

repertoire size; in other words, species was a good predictor of VPL total repertoire size, i.e., of how

many distinct mimicked vocalizations (different human words or anthropogenic sounds/melodies) a

species exhibited. This consistency in VPL total repertoire size suggests a potential cap on memory

capacity within species, implying that species exhibiting larger total repertoire in our dataset may

inherently rely more on vocal mimicry in their natural environments. This could reflect an advanced

cognitive ability to store and recall diverse vocalizations, which could be crucial for managing

complex social interactions within their communities. However, it is important to note that while the

repertoire size obtained in our survey showcases the parrots' capacity for vocal learning, it does not

necessarily translate to functional repertoire size in wild settings. The varied vocalizations likely

represent adaptability to local conditions and interactions with humans and other species, rather

than serving uniform functional roles. The extensive variety of mimicked sounds suggests that these

parrots can adapt their VPL to suit unique environmental stimuli and social contexts, showcasing

their vocal flexibility.

Finally, in accordance with our predictions, larger species were more likely to possess VPL. One

potential explanation for our finding may be that large-sized parrots such as cockatoos and macaws

but also amazons and grey parrots are typically housed as single individuals rather than in groups

with conspecific, increasing the likelihood that they form strong bonds with their human caretakers

and learn anthropogenic sounds vocalizations as part of their social interaction within their human

"flock" (Benedict et al. 2022). Furthermore, body mass shapes certain acoustic features of parrots'

vocalizations (e.g., peak frequency and duration) (Medina-García et al. 2015), potentially affecting

the vocal plasticity of the differently sized species. In fact, we found that larger species had also

larger VPL repertoires (including various anthropogenic sounds, melodies, and clearly distinguishable

words). While small parrotlets and parakeets showed limited VPL repertoires ranging between 1 and

4 distinct vocalizations, larger-sized *Amazona* parrots, African grey parrots, cockatoos, and macaws

tended to have larger VPL repertoires of up to 23 distinct learned vocalizations. This finding aligns

with the neurological correlates of VPL described to date (Chakraborty et al. 2015). For example,

budgerigar, peach-faced lovebirds, and cockatiels, generally considered more limited in their VPL

abilities, have larger and conspicuous core nuclei relative to the shell nuclei. In contrast, those

thought to have considerably more complex communication abilities, such as the blue and gold

macaws, peach-fronted conures, African grey parrots, and *Amazon* sp., have noticeably smaller cores

and correspondingly larger shell regions, a parrot unique brain structure related to their advanced

VPL capacities (Chakraborty et al. 2015). Bigger species may exhibit greater vocal plasticity, but it is

also likely that a large body size makes it easier to imitate the (low) pitch of human vocalizations

compared to smaller species. Given that we used the imitation of human words as proxy for

measuring differences in "VPL anthropophonic repertoire size", we might have underrated the

imitation complexity of small species, yet for determining the existence of VPL, any kind of

allospecific sounds were used (including high frequency sounds, such as whistles, phone ring sounds

etc.) thus providing a reliable indicator of whether a species is a vocal production learner or not.

In contrast to our predictions, relative brain size did not clearly affect VPL presence (neither the VPL

total repertoire size nor VPL anthropophonic repertoire size). It is therefore possible that the

cognitive demands of vocal learning/imitation (Jarvis 2006; Mercado et al. 2014) have been

overestimated or that relative brain size is a very crude proxy for the cognitive capacity required for

VPL, as has been pointed out by several authors (Barron and Mourmourakis 2024; Smeele et al.

2022). The density of forebrain neurons that may accommodate additional song and speech brain

circuits has been proposed as a promising candidate for an alternative proxy (Jarvis 2019).

Conclusions and future directions

Vocal production learning (VPL) was likely an ancestral trait in parrots, present even in the most

basal species. In due consideration of methodological challenges, our study reveals that VPL in

parrots exhibits a complex evolutionary pattern of repeated gains and losses, emphasizing its

adaptive value and the significant costs associated with its maintenance. Our findings also suggest

significant relationships between VPL and key factors like social complexity, longevity, and body size.

These elements shape the sophistication of vocal mimicry abilities in parrots, with larger, longer-

lived species developing more complex vocalization strategies due to extended learning periods and

social interactions. This pattern reflects a dynamic interplay between evolutionary pressures and the

ecological niches occupied by these species, offering a unique lens into how cognitive abilities such

as learning and memory interact with physical traits like brain and vocal tract morphology over

evolutionary timescales. Exploring these changes can illuminate broader mechanisms of adaptability

and resilience across different species.

For instance, investigating the genetic and neurological bases of VPL could elucidate how certain brain

structures associated with vocal learning are preserved or altered amidst environmental pressures and

genetic drift. Similarly, examining changes in vocal tract morphology and their correlation with vocal

learning abilities could provide insights into the physical constraints and capabilities of parrots as they

evolved. Additionally, parrots' ability to reacquire VPL after losing it may help us understand the

conditions under which complex traits can re-emerge in a lineage, offering broader implications for

evolutionary theory. This makes the parrot a compelling model system for studying not just vocal

production learning but also the evolutionary processes that govern the development and loss of

complex behaviors more generally. Ultimately, these insights could spur new research into the

evolutionary origins of human language, providing a valuable comparative framework to explore how

complex communication systems have developed across different evolutionary pathways. This

broadened perspective could significantly enhance our understanding of the mechanisms that underpin

not only animal communication but also human language.

Material and Methods

Data collection

Data was compiled from the online video sharing and social media platform YouTube. We searched

for scientific and common names of each parrot species, combined with words such as "talk",

"imitate", or "sing" in two languages, English and Spanish (see Supplementary Information A, Table

SA1 for further details). Species identified were visually confirmed, and scientific and common

names were standardized using the IOC Bird List version 10.2 (Gill et al. 2020). Data were collected

for all 398 extant parrot species (for a complete data set, see Github repository). We examined the

first 50 hits for in- and exclusion criteria for each search. For a detailed description of the YouTube

settings and in- and exclusion criteria, see Supplementary Information A.

In order to account for the likelihood of species being kept in human care (and thus be recorded on

video when showing conspicuous behavior), we recorded for each species whether it was listed as

being traded internationally. From the CITES homepage (https://trade.cites.org/) we obtained which

of the 398 parrot species were categorized as "traded live" and listed them as "reported in trade".

We also compiled data on each species' status in "captivity" (including on a regional level) from

supplementary literature (Reinschmidt 2006) and verified/complemented the information

whenever possible by additionally consulting the Cornell Lab of Ornithology/Birds of the World

homepage (https://birdsoftheworld.org/. Accordingly, we categorized the status in captivity as

"common", "rare", and "not found" (full data set, GitHub repository). It was important to consider

both variables because a species could be "common" in captivity, e.g., in a particular region where

the parrots occur, but not be traded in the rest of the world. Vice versa, it could also be the case

that, e.g., a critically endangered species might occur in international trade (because being part of

breeding programs for conservation purposes) but remain restricted to few specialized breeders or

facilities rather than being common in human care.

Video analysis

After evaluation for in- and exclusion criteria, we (MS, JC, EH) and two extra coders blind to our

research question analyzed videos that reached our inclusion criteria. For species with less than ten

videos found, all videos were analyzed. In case ten or more videos were found, we analyzed at least

ten videos per species (note that for 12 species *Agapornis fischeri, A. roseicollis, Amazona aestiva, A.*

albifrons, A. amazonica, A. auropalliata, A. autumnalis, A. farinosa, A. finschi, A. ochrocephala, A.

viridigenalis, Anodorhynchus hyacinthinus all videos found were analyzed ranging from 11 to 62

videos). The order of the search terms we used was always the same for each species. For all species

for which videos with evidence for VPL (as described above) were found (163 species), the following

variables were collected: 1) total number of mimicked vocalizations produced in the video (including

repetitions), 2) template presence (yes/no), 3) quality of mimicked vocalizations (low/medium/high),

4) time bird is visible (seconds), 5) type of mimicked vocalization (i.e., a) anthropogenic non-lingual

sounds, b) melodies, c) clearly distinguishable words or d) human-speech like babbling), 6) number

of distinct mimicked vocalizations (i.e., how many different sounds/word were recognizable), 7)

number of mimicked vocalizations for each type of vocalizations, 8) context in which the VPL

occurred (i.e., whether the bird was mimicking while a) being alone, or b) in interaction with a) one

or more human(s) or b) conspecific(s) or c) a combination of both), 9) language wherever possible to

recognize (for all variables and relevant descriptions see Supplementary Information A, Table SA2).

If multiple individuals of the same species appeared in one video and expressed mimicked

vocalizations, the first one who started vocalizing was defined as the subject and was analyzed.

Note that the variables "total number of mimicked vocalizations (1)" and "language (9)" were not

used in the analyses. The variable "number of distinct mimicked vocalizations (6)" was used to

calculate the "VPL total repertoire size". We took the number of distinct human words only to

quantify the "VPL antropophonetic repertoire size". Finally, the variable "quality of mimicked

vocalizations" was used as "VLP quality" measure. The remaining variables (template, time, and

context) were included in the analyses to control for confounding factors (for further description see

Supplementary Information C, Figure SC1 Directed Acyclic Graph).

Phylogeny

We used the phylogenetic supertree for all extant parrots presented recently by Burgio et al. (2019)

to map the occurrence of VPL and tested whether the occurrence of VPL has a random distribution

phylogenetically or is conserved in the phylogeny. The discrete character of VPL was mapped onto

the phylogeny as a basic binary value (present or absent).

Socioecological variables

Given the scarcity of information on social parameters for many parrot species we used data on

gregariousness as a proxy for social complexity. The data on gregariousness were taken from

Carballo et al. (2020). Gregariousness was scored as a categorical variable (1 = 'yes' or 2 = 'no')

according to information from the 'breeding' section of the HBW Alive (Del Hoyo et al. 2017). A

species was classified as gregarious if the description suggested that the breeding pairs nest close

together or if the species was described as colonial. For details on data collection on longevity, body

size, and relative brain size, see Smeele et al. (2022).

Data analysis

Our first goal was to map our findings/the occurrence of VPL in parrot species onto the phylogenetic

tree of parrots (in order to reconstruct its evolutionary pathway within the order). Our second

objective was to examine which variables best explained the presence of VPL across the parrot

order. We ran ancestral state reconstruction with the function *contMap* from the package *phytools*

(Revell 2012). We also ran a Bayesian model to test the strength of the phylogenetic model. We

modeled the probability of a species being able of VPL and included a variance-covariance matrix

with the covariance as a function of the phylogenetic distance using the L2-norm.

551
$$covariance_{ij} = \eta^2 \, exp\left(-\rho^2 p_{ij}^2\right)$$

Where η and ρ are the parameters for the L2-norm and P is the normalized phylogenetic distance

between species i and j (only for cases where i≠j). We used the L2-norm, since it does not assume

Brownian motion, and allows for a non-linear decline in covariance with distance. We used Stan to

define the models (Gelman et al. 2015) and the package *cmdstanr* for model fitting (Gabry and

Češnovar 2022) with four chains, 1000 burn-in and 1000 sample iterations, and *adapt_delta = 0.95*.

We used R-hat to monitor model convergence and report any deviation outside 0.99-1.01 in the

results section.

We were interested in testing the effect of longevity, relative brain size, sociality and body size on

the probability that a species was capable of VPL. To ensure that correlations between these

variables were not spurious, we included several covariates to the models. We used a Directed

Acyclic Graph (DAG) to visualize the assumed causal paths (arrows) (Laubach et al. 2021, see

Supplementary Information C, Figure SC1). We then created a model for each variable of interest

and used the back-door criterion (Pearl et al. 2016) to determine which other variables to include as

de-confounders. The back-door criterion ensures that only arrows pointing from the predictor

variable towards the response variable (be it direct or indirect) are included in the parameter

estimate. De-confounders are those variables that can create spurious correlations, when not

controlled for (they point to the back-door of the predictor variable). All models converged well. The

Rhat value of the rho^2 parameter in the phylogenetic model was ~1.016. All other Rhat values were

within 0.99-1.01.

Longevity

We hypothesized that longevity might affect the presence of VPL since longer-lived species may

need to learn more new vocalizations throughout their lives due to their longer lives and potential

exposure to more changes; also, long life spans may entail more opportunities for vocal learning and

practicing. We included relative brain size, sociality, and body mass as covariates. We also included a

varying effect for the genus to control for potential shared evolutionary history. Since our model

contained missing values and we were interested in the effect of relative rather than absolute brain

size, we ran a structural equation model similar to that suggested by Smeele et al. (2022).

We modeled the presence of VPL with a binomial model (logit link) with the following formula:

VPL ~ (1|genus) + sociality + longevity + relative brain size + body size

For a detailed model with all priors see Supplementary Information D.

Relative brain size

We hypothesized that relative brain size could affect the presence of VPL since VPL has been

suggested to be cognitively demanding (Chakraborty et al. 2015). We included sociality as a

covariate, and the model structure was the same as that of longevity.

Gregariousness

We hypothesized that gregariousness may affect the presence of VPL since VPL can have social

functions and therefore gregarious species might be relying on using learnt vocalizations more than

less gregarious species and may also have more opportunities or greater need to learn new ones

socially. We did not include any covariates, and the model structure was the same as that of

longevity.

Body size

We hypothesized that body size might affect the presence of VPL. Larger species have a larger syrinx,

which might make mimicry of the human voice and speech more likely. Furthermore, we expected

larger species to be more often housed as single individuals, increasing the likelihood that they

mimic the vocalizations of their human caretakers (Benedict et al. 2022). We did not include any

covariates. The model structure was the same as that of longevity.

Interspecific variation in VPL total repertoire size and VPL antropophonic repertoire size

The third goal of our study was to understand what factors drive interspecific variation in VPL,

assessing both total repertoire size and anthropophonic repertoire size. Therefore, we scored the

overall number of distinct mimicked vocalizations (i.e., different learnt vocalizations) and the

number of distinct human words only produced by different species. We did not include the

duration of the recording (i.e., the time the bird was visible) in the model, because this variable did

not create a backdoor path between the variables of interest (longevity, sociality, body size, and

relative brain size) and the response variable (number of distinct mimicked vocalizations). In our

DAG, the duration only affected whether or not a distinct mimicked vocalization was detected, but it

did not affect the other variables and also was not affected by any variables. Therefore, the

parameter estimates should not be biased by duration. We modeled the VPL total repertoire size

with a Poisson model (log link) with the same formula as the VPL presence model. To analyze the

interspecific variation in VPL total repertoire size, we had multiple observations, i.e., from different

individuals per species. Therefore, we expanded the models to include the varying effect of species

and genus. For a detailed model with all priors as well as the detailed hypotheses see Supplementary

Information D.

Ethical statement

Our methodology involved the use of publicly available online videos; no private or restricted content was accessed. We maintained the anonymity of all individuals and entities involved. No personal data was collected, and any potentially identifying information present in the videos was omitted from our analysis and reports to protect the privacy of individuals. We did not attempt to contact video uploaders or subjects, and we refrained from using data for purposes other than those explicitly stated in our research objectives. Consent for the use of these videos in a public domain was presumed based on their publicly accessible status and the nature of social media sharing. However, we acknowledge that the interpretations and analyses presented in this study are solely those of the research team and do not reflect the views of the video creators or subjects.

Data accessibility

All data and code used in this study and all code to reproduce the analyses in this study are publicly available and maintained on GitHub:

https://github.com/simeonqs/Insights_into_the_phylogenetic_distribution_and_evolution_of_vocal _production_learning_in_parrots.

Acknowledgements

We thank the Loro Parque Fundación for their support and advice. We also thank Garance Barbier and Sayuri Diaz for assisting with data collection and scoring. EH received funding from DAAD, Germany in the GSSP program.

References

Aamodt, C. M., Farias-Virgens, M., & White, S. A. (2020). Birdsong as a window into language origins
and evolutionary neuroscience. In *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological*
Sciences (Vol. 375, Issue 1789). Royal Society Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0060

Balsby, T. J. S., & Adams, D. M. (2011). Vocal similarity and familiarity determine response to
potential flockmates in orange-fronted conures (Psittacidae). *Animal Behaviour*, *81*(5), 983–991.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2011.01.034

Balsby, T. J. S., & Bradbury, J. W. (2009). Vocal matching by orange-fronted conures (Aratinga
canicularis). *Behavioural Processes*, *82*(2), 133–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2009.05.005

Balsby, T. J. S., Momberg, J. V., & Dabelsteen, T. (2012). Vocal Imitation in Parrots Allows Addressing
of Specific Individuals in a Dynamic Communication Network. *PloS ONE*, *7*(11).
https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0049747

Balsby, T. J. S., & Scarl, J. C. (2008). Sex-specific responses to vocal convergence and divergence of
contact calls in orange-fronted conures (Aratinga canicularis). *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
Biological Sciences, *275*(1647), 2147–2154. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.0517

Beauchamp, G. (1999). The evolution of communal roosting in birds: origin and secondary losses.
Behavioral Ecology, 10(6), 675-687. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/10.6.675

Beckers, G. J. L., Berwick, R. C., & Bolhuis, J. J. (2014). Comparative analyses of speech and language
converge on birds. In *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* (Vol. 37, Issue 6, pp. 547–548). Cambridge
University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X13003956

Benedict, L., Charles, A., Brockington, A., & Dahlin, C. R. (2022). A survey of vocal mimicry in
companion parrots. Scientific Reports, 12(1), 20271. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-022-
24335-x

Berg, K. S., Delgado, S., Okawa, R., Beissinger, S. R., & Bradbury, J. W. (2011). Contact calls are used
for individual mate recognition in free-ranging green-rumped parrotlets, Forpus passerinus. Animal
Behaviour, 81(1), 241-248.
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0003347210004148

Berg, K. S., Delgado, S., Cortopassi, K. A., Beissinger, S. R., & Bradbury, J. W. (2012). Vertical
transmission of learned signatures in a wild parrot. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological
Sciences, 279(1728), 585-591. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2011.0932

Blumstein, D. T. (1999). The evolution of functionally referential alarm communication: multiple
adaptations; multiple constraints. Evolution of Communication, 3(2), 135-147.
https://doi.org/10.1075/eoc.3.2.03blu

Bolhuis, J. J., Okanoya, K., & Scharff, C. (2010). Twitter evolution: Converging mechanisms in
birdsong and human speech. In *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* (Vol. 11, Issue 11, pp. 747–759).
https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2931

Bradbury, J. W., & Balsby, T. J. S. (2016). The functions of vocal learning in parrots. In *Behavioral*
Ecology and Sociobiology (Vol. 70, Issue 3, pp. 293–312). Springer Verlag.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-016-2068-4

Burgio, K. R., Davis, K. E., Dreiss, L. M., Cisneros, L. M., Klingbeil, B. T., Presley, S. J., & Willig, M. R.
(2019). Phylogenetic supertree and functional trait database for all extant parrots. *Data in Brief*, *24*.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2019.103882

Burn, C. C. (2014). Social media offers new insights into human and animal behavior: how to harness
them scientifically. In Proceedings of Measuring Behavior, pp 254-257.
https://archive.measuringbehavior.org/mb2014/files/2014/Proceedings/Burn,%20C.C.%20-
%20MB2014.pdf

Cahill, J. A., Armstrong, J., Deran, A., Khoury, C. J., Paten, B., Haussler, D., & Jarvis, E. D. (2021).
Positive selection in noncoding genomic regions of vocal learning birds is associated with genes
implicated in vocal learning and speech functions in humans. *Genome Research*, *31*(11), 2035–2049.
https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.275989.121

Carballo, L., Delhey, K., Valcu, M., & Kempenaers, B. (2020). Body size and climate as predictors of
plumage colouration and sexual dichromatism in parrots. Journal of Evolutionary Biology, 33(11),
1543-1557. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/jeb.13690

Carouso-Peck, S., Goldstein, M. H., & Fitch, W. T. (2021). The many functions of vocal learning. In
Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences (Vol. 376, Issue 1836). Royal
Society Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0235

Chakraborty, M., Walløe, S., Nedergaard, S., Fridel, E. E., Dabelsteen, T., Pakkenberg, B., Bertelsen,
M. F., Dorrestein, G. M., Brauth, S. E., Durand, S. E., & Jarvis, E. D. (2015). Core and shell song
systems unique to the parrot brain. *PloS ONE*, *10*(6). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0118496

Colbert-White, E. N., Corballis, M. C., & Fragaszy, D. M. (2014). Where Apes and Songbirds are Left
Behind: A Comparative Assessment of the Requisites for Speech. *Comparative Cognition & Behavior*
Reviews, *9*, 99–126. https://doi.org/10.3819/ccbr.2014.90004

Dahlin, C. R., & Wright, T. F. (2009). Duets in yellow-naped amazons: Variation in syntax, note
composition and phonology at different levels of social organization. *Ethology*, *115*(9), 857–871.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0310.2009.01669.x

Del Hoyo, J., A. Elliott, J. Sargatal, D. A. Christie, and E. de Juana. "Handbook of the birds of the world
alive. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, Spain." (2017).

Dylewski, Ł., Mikula, P., Tryjanowski, P., Morelli, F., & Yosef, R. (2017). Social media and scientific
research are complementary—YouTube and shrikes as a case study. *Science of Nature*, *104*(5–6).
https://doi.org/10.1007/S00114-017-1470-8

Eggleston, R., Viloria, N., Delgado, S., Mata, A., Guerrero, H. Y., Kline, R. J., ... & Berg, K. S. (2022).
Vocal babbling in a wild parrot shows life history and endocrine affinities with human infants.
Proceedings of the Royal Society B, 289(1976), 20220592.
https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2022.0592

Faust, K. M., Carouso-Peck, S., Elson, M. R., & Goldstein, M. H. (2020). The origins of social
knowledge in altricial species. Annual review of developmental psychology, 2, 225-246.
https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/10.1146/annurev-devpsych-051820-121446

Fitch, W. T., Huber, L., & Bugnyar, T. (2010). Social cognition and the evolution of language:
constructing cognitive phylogenies. Neuron, 65(6), 795-814.
https://www.cell.com/action/showPdf?pii=S0896-6273%2810%2900182-0

Gabry, J., & Češnovar, R. (2022). cmdstanr: R Interface to 'CmdStan'.

Gelman, A., Lee, D., & Guo, J. (2015). Stan: A probabilistic programming language for Bayesian
inference and optimization. Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, 40(5), 530-543.
https://doi.org/10.3102/107699861560611

Gill, F., Donsker, D., & Rasmussen, P. (2020). IOC World Bird List. Version 10.1. Website:
www.worldbirdnames.org

Grant, P. R., & Grant, B. R. (1997). Hybridization, sexual imprinting, and mate choice. The American
Naturalist, 149(1), 1-28. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2463528

Jagiello, Z. A., Dyderski, M. K., & Dylewski, Ł. (2019). What can we learn about the behaviour of red
and grey squirrels from YouTube? *Ecological Informatics*, *51*, 52–60.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2019.02.006

Jarvis, E. D. (2006). Selection for and against vocal learning in birds and mammals. *Ornithological*
Science, *5*, 5–14. https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/osj/5/1/5_1_5/_pdf

Jarvis, E. D. (2019). Evolution of vocal learning and spoken language. In *Science* (Vol. 366, Issue 6461,
pp. 50–54). American Association for the Advancement of Science.
https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax0287

Kabadayi, C., Taylor, L. A., von Bayern, A. M., & Osvath, M. (2016). Ravens, New Caledonian crows
and jackdaws parallel great apes in motor self-regulation despite smaller brains. Royal Society Open
Science, 3(4), 160104.
https://www.openphilanthropy.org/files/Research/Moral_Patienthood/Kabadayi_et_al_(2016).pdf

Kuparinen, A., Yeung, E., & Hutchings, J. A. (2023). Correlation between body size and longevity: new
analysis and data covering six taxonomic classes of vertebrates. Acta Oecologica, 119, 103917.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2023.103917

Laubach, Z. M., Murray, E. J., Hoke, K. L., Safran, R. J., & Perng, W. (2021). A biologist's guide to
model selection and causal inference. Proceedings of the Royal Society B, 288(1943), 20202815.
https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.2815

Lohr, B., Wright, T. F., & Dooling, R. J. (2003). Detection and discrimination of natural calls in masking
noise by birds: estimating the active space of a signal. Animal behaviour, 65(4), 763-777.
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0003347203920938

Medina-García, A., Araya-Salas, M., & Wright, T. F. (2015). Does vocal learning accelerate acoustic
diversification? Evolution of contact calls in Neotropical parrots. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*,
28(10), 1782–1792. https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.12694

Mercado III, E., Mantell, J. T., & Pfordresher, P. Q. (2014). Imitating sounds: A cognitive approach to
understanding vocal imitation. Comparative Cognition & Behavior Reviews, 9. https://epe.lac-
bac.gc.ca/100/201/300/comparative_cognition/v16/https@comparative-cognition-and-behavior-
reviews.org/2014/vol9_mercado_mantell_pfordresher/default.htm

Nelson, X. J., & Fijn, N. (2013). The use of visual media as a tool for investigating animal behaviour.
Animal Behaviour, *85*(3), 525–536. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.12.009

Nowicki, S., & Searcy, W. A. (2014). The evolution of vocal learning. In *Current Opinion in*
Neurobiology (Vol. 28, pp. 48–53). Elsevier Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2014.06.007

Ohms, V. R., Beckers, G. J. L., ten Cate, C., & Suthers, R. A. (2012). Vocal tract articulation revisited: the case of the monk parakeet. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, *215*(1), 85–92. https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.064717

Olkowicz, S., Kocourek, M., Lučan, R. K., Porteš, M., Fitch, W. T., Herculano-Houzel, S., & Němec, P. (2016). Birds have primate-like numbers of neurons in the forebrain. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113(26), 7255-7260. https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.1517131113

Pearl, J., Glymour, M., & Jewell, N. P. (2016). Causal inference in statistics: A primer. John Wiley & Sons.

Pepperberg, I. M. (2010). Vocal Learning in Grey Parrots: A Brief Review of Perception, Production, and Cross-Species Comparisons. *Brain and Language*, *15*(1), 81–91. https://www.wellbeingintlstudiesrepository.org/acwp_asie

Petkov, C. I., & Jarvis, E. D. (2012). Birds, primates, and spoken language origins: Behavioral phenotypes and neurobiological substrates. In *Frontiers in Evolutionary Neuroscience* (Vol. 4, Issue AUG). https://doi.org/10.3389/fnevo.2012.00012

Rault, J. L., Elmore, M. R., Biehl, D. J., Russell, M. A., & Garner, J. P. (2013). The world is a natural laboratory, and social media is the new petri dish. Ethology, 119(10), 803-806. https://doi.org/10.1111/eth.12125

Reinschmidt, M., & Lambert, K. H. (2006). Papageien der Welt. Ulmer.

Revell, L. J. (2012). Phytools: An R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other things). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *3*(2), 217–223. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210X.2011.00169.x

Ridley, J., Yu, D. W., & Sutherland, W. J. (2005). Why long-lived species are more likely to be social: the role of local dominance. Behavioral Ecology, 16(2), 358-363. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arh170

Rolland, C., Danchin, E., & Fraipont, M. D. (1998). The evolution of coloniality in birds in relation to food, habitat, predation, and life-history traits: a comparative analysis. The American Naturalist, 151(6), 514-529. https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/286137

Schachner, A., Brady, T. F., Pepperberg, I. M., & Hauser, M. D. (2009). Spontaneous Motor Entrainment to Music in Multiple Vocal Mimicking Species. *Current Biology*, *19*(10), 831–836. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2009.03.061

Schuppli, C., Isler, K., & van Schaik, C. P. (2012). How to explain the unusually late age at skill competence among humans. Journal of human evolution, 63(6), 843-850. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2012.08.009

Sewall, K. B. (2015). Social complexity as a driver of communication and cognition. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, *55*(3), 384–395. https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icv064

Slabbekoorn, H., & Smith, T. B. (2002). Bird song, ecology and speciation. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences, 357(1420), 493-503. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2001.1056

Smeele, S. Q., Conde, D. A., Baudisch, A., Bruslund, S., Iwaniuk, A., Staerk, J., Wright, T. F., Young, A. M., McElreath, M. B., & Aplin, L. (2022). Coevolution of relative brain size and life expectancy in

parrots. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *289*(1971).
https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2021.2397

Smeele, S. Q., Senar, J. C., Aplin, L. M., & McElreath, M. B. (2023). Evidence for vocal signatures and
voice-prints in a wild parrot. Royal Society Open Science, 10(10), 230835.
https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/pdf/10.1098/rsos.230835

Stoeger, A. S., & Manger, P. (2014). Vocal learning in elephants: Neural bases and adaptive context.
In *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* (Vol. 28, pp. 101–107). Elsevier Ltd.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2014.07.001

Suh, A., Paus, M., Kiefmann, M., Churakov, G., Franke, F. A., Brosius, J., ... & Schmitz, J. (2011).
Mesozoic retroposons reveal parrots as the closest living relatives of passerine birds. Nature
communications, 2(1), 443. https://www.nature.com/articles/ncomms1448

ten Cate, C. (2021). Re-evaluating vocal production learning in non-oscine birds. In *Philosophical*
Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences (Vol. 376, Issue 1836). Royal Society
Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0249

Ten Cate, C., & Spierings, M. (2019). Rules, rhythm and grouping: auditory pattern perception by
birds. Animal Behaviour, 151, 249-257.
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003347218303464

Thomsen, H. M., Balsby, T. J., & Dabelsteen, T. (2019). The imitation dilemma: can parrots maintain
their vocal individuality when imitating conspecifics?. Behaviour, 156(5-8), 787-814.
https://brill.com/view/journals/beh/156/5-8/article-p787_13.xml

Tyack, P. L. (2020). A taxonomy for vocal learning. In *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*
B: Biological Sciences (Vol. 375, Issue 1789). Royal Society Publishing.
https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0406

Varella, T. T., & Ghazanfar, A. A. (2021). Cooperative care and the evolution of the prelinguistic vocal
learning. Developmental psychobiology, 63(5), 1583-1588.
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8355020/pdf/nihms-1668839.pdf

Wirthlin, M., Chang, E. F., Knörnschild, M., Krubitzer, L. A., Mello, C. V., Miller, C. T., ... & Yartsev, M.
M. (2019). A modular approach to vocal learning: disentangling the diversity of a complex behavioral
trait. Neuron, 104(1), 87-99.
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0896627319308396

Wright, T. F., & Derryberry, E. P. (2021). Defining the multidimensional phenotype: new
opportunities to integrate the behavioral ecology and behavioral neuroscience of vocal learning.
Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 125, 328-338.
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8628558/