



# FABRICATION OF MOBILE ULTRASONIC BIRD REPELLER

\*V.Arun pandiyan , J.Murugan@Senthamilan , D.Udayakumar , V.Vinithkumar \*

Guided by

S.Arul, Assistant Professor

Department of Mechanical Engineering,

Sengunthar College of Engineering, Tiruchengode, Namakkal.

[arunnivas63@gmail.com](mailto:arunnivas63@gmail.com), [sentha1996@gmail.com](mailto:sentha1996@gmail.com), [udayamech98@gmail.com](mailto:udayamech98@gmail.com), [vinith87@gmail.com](mailto:vinith87@gmail.com)

## Manuscript History

Number: IJIRAE/RS/Vol.06/Issue03/Special Issue/SI.MRAE10080

Received: 20, February 2019

Final Correction: 05, March 2019

Final Accepted: 20, March 2019

Published: **March 2019**

**Editor:** Dr.A.Arul L.S, Chief Editor, IJIRAE, AM Publications, India

Copyright: ©2019 This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, Which Permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited

**Abstract** - The threat posed by birds to economic crops in the farms or at storage facilities requires the deployment of an effective bird deterrent in such locations. Many attempts have been made to develop successful bird deterrent systems with only a few achieving desired results. The ultrasonic frequency range 15-25 kHz is known to be disturbing to birds and a device operating at that range was developed. The output of the integral oscillator was fed to 4 piezo transducers, placed 900 to each other to produce a dispersion of overlapping fans of sound for full 360o coverage. The power of the first device was 7.98W and the intensity of the sound pressure at 1m was calculated to be  $6.35 \times 10^{-1} \text{W/m}^2$  at 118dB. A second device was constructed which had a power of 23.98W and intensity of the emitted sound at 1m,  $1.91 \text{W/m}^2$  at 123dB. The devices were tested and the results obtained showed that the ultrasonic beam from the piezo speakers was able to drive birds away from designated areas. Further tests conducted with the unit showed a wider reach of the waves on a dull day than on a sunny day. About 5-6 of the second device is expected to cover one hectare of field. The device is solar powered, eliminating the cost of fuel, the inconvenience of regular attention and its protection from environmental perturbation. It is environmentally friendly.

**Keywords:** Pest birds; Bird repeller; Solar powered; Ultrasonic; Frequency range; environmentally friendly;


## INTRODUCTION

Birds exist in our natural environment. Though some of these birds are beneficial to man, a few species of them can be detrimental to human beings. Birds can be a nuisance when they cause damage and health problems. A survey of the New Zealand farmers by the nation's Plant Protection Society, revealed that large percentage of them had encountered crop damage from birds (Coleman & Spurr 2001). In Nigeria, farmers especially those located in the northern region encounter damage to their crop from bird pests. The magnitude of destruction caused by these bird pests can sometimes be really great. Catastrophic crop losses resulted in many African countries within nearly 2 decades (1955 to well into the 1970's) from the highly gregarious quelea birds' (Quelea quelea) sporadic attacks despite diverse control measures adopted then (Schmutterer 1978, Ward 1979 ). In Nigeria, this same pest destroyed about 45,000 hectares of rice farm under the Bakalori Irrigation scheme (located in Sokoto State Nigeria) in 2005 prompting a lot of money to be spent on procuring avicides for their control (Ezeonu 2009). Transmission ([wikipedia.org/wiki/transmission\\_Site](http://wikipedia.org/wiki/transmission_Site)), fouling of the environment with birds dropping plus the attendant insect infestation and the damage of vehicles and glass structures from bird strikes, inter alia, are other nuisance factors of birds to man. Several devices have been used to control the menace of birds both at the airports and farms but the use of electronic scarecrows is a relatively new invention.

While seeking the protection of human concerns from avian menace, the researchers adopted an environmentally friendly-bird protection technique like ultrasonic so as to preserve the role of birds in global environmental balance. Some studies have been carried out to evaluate objectively the effect of ultrasonics on birds (Meylan 1978, Martins & Martins 1984, Kerns 1985). Apart from Meyhan's (1978) whose device operated below the ultrasonic frequency (16kHz), these studies have not demonstrated effectiveness in the use of ultrasonics in repelling birds (Woronecki 1988). Meylan (1978) reported that an ultrasonic device was used successful in reducing damage to sunflower by greenfinches (*Carduelis Moris*) in Switzerland in 1977. Meylan (1978) reported that the damage during the one month the unit operated was low but increased considerably after the unit was removed. Meylan subsequently noted that the unit operated at only about 16,000 Hz (Woronecki, 1988). Thus, the sound waves that deterred the birds were considerably below ultrasonic frequency. Nankinov D et al (2007) tested a commercial ultrasonic unit of Conrad Company aimed at scaring rodents against some species of birds. The investigation was carried out using a specially prepared feeding place at Bulgarian ornithological center which was visited by doves, starlings and sparrows. The device produced an output of 30 kHz. Nankinov D et al (2007) reported that the ultrasonic sound produced by the device has no noticeable effect on the birds but observed that the number of birds visiting the feeding station reduced significantly after the 10th day. This development was related to the influence of the device as well as to the advancing period for nesting for the majority of the birds (Nankinov D et al, 2007). Hamershock (1992) and Bomford and O'Brien (1990) in their reviews of published research in ultrasonic repeller reported that there was no evidence that ultrasonic devices had any effect on avian behavior, including dispersal. Ultrasonic sound, defined with man as reference, has frequencies above those heard by man (20Hz - 20 kHz). Most birds hear about the same range as human beings (Encarta 2003), some small birds however, do not hear low frequency sounds but can detect sound of high frequencies that human beings cannot. Generally birds have ultrasonic limit lower than that of man (Frings 1964). The aim of the study is to fabricate a solar-powered ultrasonic device to scare birds away from designated areas.

#### DEVICE CONSTRUCTION

The block diagram of the circuit device consists of the frequency scanner, the frequency generator, the power drive and the output transducer. The design of the scarer is as shown in its circuit diagram drawn below. The major components of the designed and manufactured scarer are a photovoltaic (PV) panel (BP Solar SX20M and dimensions: 41.5x50 cm), dry-cell battery, converter, MP3 player, amplifier and a loudspeaker (8fi, 30 W). Photovoltaic panel converts solar beam radiation into DC electricity during the day. Battery is charged by PV panel and the electricity stored in this device. The domestic bird's predators' calls was loaded to MP3 by using a PC. The amplifier increases the signal level (predators' calls level) for loudspeaker. The working voltage of battery, amplifier and speaker is 12V, but the MP3 needs 1.5V. In order to reduce the voltage from 12 to 1.5V for MP3, a converter was used. The study was conducted in an area (about 75x75 m) where covered with full of poplar trees which is located in the Campus of honourable Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Marathwada University, Aurangabad, and Maharashtra. This area is intensively used by domestic birds for their roosts. The test of the scarer was performed on crows, pigeons, sparrows, starlings and blackbirds etc but the major focus was on crows as they are the most damage causing bird species in India. The bird scarer was tested about 1 month during July - August 2015. Tests were arranged into 4 experiments. 22 different sounds from Falcon (*Falco eleonorae*), Falcon (*Buteolagopus*), Eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), Montagu's sharrow (*Circus pygargus*), Owl (*Glaucidium passerinum*) etc. of domestic birds were selected for the audible scarer. The approximate percentage of the bird number to leave or not to leave from the trees during the predators' calls played throughout loudspeaker was counted to determine the effect of the scarer on the birds.



The block diagram of the ultrasonic bird repeller

#### WORKING PRINCIPLE

Ultrasonic bird deterrents emit high-frequency sound waves that keep pests away, but are silent to humans. Ultrasonic frequencies are used to confuse, disorient and frighten birds within range. Pest birds are not harmed by ultrasound, but they do "feel the pressure" of the high-frequency sound waves from these electronic bird deterrents.


This causes severe discomfort and can even affect the birds' ability to detect the earth's magnetic field; this may interfere with their sense of direction. Birds quickly learn to avoid areas where they have experienced an ultrasonic attack. To increase the efficiency of this system, frequency of ultrasonic oscillator has to be continuously varied between 30 kHz to 50 kHz. As some pests get repelled at 36 kHz, some others get repelled at 37 to 42 kHz or even higher frequencies. The device is solar powered, so it is environmentally friendly and it eliminates the fuel cost.

**DESCRIPTION OF THE COMPONENTS**

1. **ULTRASONIC TRANSDUCER:** They are used to generate the ultrasonic sound the production sound range is more than 30000 Hz-50000 Hz.
2. **MICROCONTROLLER** Microcontrollers are mainly used to controlling the both wireless rover and ultrasonic transducers they passes the instructions and powers supply to entire circuit's.
3. **ROVER WITH WIRELESS REMOTE CONTROLLER:** The remote control rovers are the main components and that's plays the major roll of this experiment they are used to carry the ultrasonic transducers.
4. **ELECTRIC CIRCUITS :** The electrical circuits where used to connect all the system to communicating and power supplying this are the main work of transducer

**FREQUENCY SCANNER**

The frequency scanner consists of an IC 555 timer and a decade counter, (figure 2). The frequency of the ultrasonic oscillator was continuously varied between 15-25kHz automatically. Five steps of variation were used. The 555 timer used as a low frequency square wave oscillator was biased to give an output frequency of 250Hz (such that the output of each division of the counter represented 50Hz). The output frequency of the timer (see figure 3) was used as a clock input of a decade counter. For each clock pulse output from the timer, the logic 1 output of the decade counter shifts from Q0 to Q4. Five preset variable resistors- VR1 – VR5 (each connected at Q0 to Q4 output pins) are set at different values. The VR6 was used to change the clock pulse rate.




**THE FREQUENCY GENERATOR**


This consists of another 555 timer and a dual D flip flop, (see figure 4). The voltages from the five outputs of the decade counter are connected through D1-D5 and VR1- VR5 respectively to this 555 timer wired as an astable multivibrator operating at a high frequency. This timer oscillates in the ultrasonic frequencies generated by the five presets. The frequency outputs of this 555 timer is not symmetrical but is fed to a dual D flip flop which delivers symmetrical signals at its outputs.

**THE POWER DRIVE**

This consists of a push-pull type amplifier.




The amplifier was used to magnify the output signal from the dual D flip flop. Here complementary transistors (NPN and PNP) were used to obtain a full cycle output across a load using half cycles of operation from each transistor. A single input was applied to the base of both transistors. The transistors, being of opposite types, conduct on opposite half cycles of the input. The NPN transistor was biased into conduction by the positive half cycle of the signal, with the resulting positive half cycle across the load. During the negative half cycle of the signal the PNP transistor was equally biased into conduction giving also a negative output. During a complete cycle of the input, a complete cycle of the output signal was developed across the load. The load was driven as the output of an emitter follower so that the load resistance is matched by the low output resistance of the driving source (Boylestad & Nashelsky 1996) and this buffers the signal. The output power of the amplifier is 7.98W.



### THE OUTPUT TRANSDUCERS

The symmetrical outputs from the dual D flip flop are amplified in push-pull mode by transistors Q1 - Q4 to drive the four high frequency piezo tweeters. When the quartz plate of the transducer is subjected to an alternating electric field, the reverse piezoelectric effect causes it to expand and contract at the field frequency. If this field frequency is made to coincide with the natural elastic frequency of the crystal, the plate resonates. This physical displacement propagates sound waves. The combination of the subsections' circuits constituted the complete circuit of the ultrasonic bird repeller, (see figure 6). In constructing the device, a printed circuit board was used. The printed circuit board was produced using the toner transfer method (Gootee 2003). The device was powered by a 12V solar panel. The picture of the repeller is shown in figure 7, with its solar photovoltaic panel power source. The output power of the device was 7.98watts. The intensity (I) of the sound emitted by the device at a distance of 1m was calculated to be  $6.35 \times 10^{-1} \text{W/m}^2$  using the inverse square law ( $I = P / 4\pi r^2$ ), where P is the power and r is the distance covered. The sound pressure level is given as  $\text{SPL(dB)} = 10 \log (I/I_r)$  Where  $I_r$  is the reference intensity and is equivalent to  $10^{-12} \text{W/m}^2$ . This gave a calculated sound pressure level of 118dB. Another ultrasonic repeller with a higher power was constructed. Its power was 23.98watts; three times the output power of the first one. The intensity of its emitted sound at 1m distance was also calculated to be  $1.908 \text{w/m}^2$ , and the sound pressure level 123dB.



## TESTING AND RESULTS

The circuit constructed was tested. When the circuit was powered, an electric signal was generated and this signal generated was converted to ultrasound by the piezo transducer. Ultrasonic level detector (instrument) was used for detecting the signals propagated from these devices. Detection test for signals produced showed that the arrangement of the four piezo ceramic speakers placed at 90° to each other produced 360° sound dispersion coverage. The frequency of the emitted ultrasound varied continuously between 15 kHz and 25 kHz automatically. Observations of birds' reactions to the broadcasted waves were made. For experimental control, the birds' response in portions of the field where the broadcasted waves did not reach was observed. Simple average was employed in evaluating the signal reach from the raw data obtained. All tests were arranged into 4 groups to determine the most effective predators call. Observations regarding these tests are given in Table 1. In the first experiment 22 different sounds were experimented for 12 days and out of those 7 sounds were found more effective than the others. In the second experiment those 7 sounds were experimented for 10 days out of which 3 were found more effective. In the third experiment, out of 3 sounds 1 sound from Falcon (*Buteo lagopus*) was found the most effective when compared with other predators. Besides, in order to define the effectiveness of the selected call, the scarer was tested 05 days as given in experiment 4, Table 1. The average number of crows roosted in trees was counted before test starting and after loudspeaker playing period and the average percentage was calculated. The success of the bird scarer is increasing from experiment 1 to experiment 4 because of the selected appropriate calls and periods. In last experiment, the success reached at 85%. It can be said that this is coming from choosing the ideal predators call, loudspeaker play, and scarer camouflage. In addition, it was also seen during tests that birds try to see the speaker when it play to be sure that it is real predator or any other artificial material before moving away. If it is possible for birds to see clearly the speaker, they prefer not to move away.

The birds where create more disturbance to human beings and especially destroy the agriculture crops and aircraft runways. During the flight take-off and landing time the birds were interrupted the flight engine and boy its cause's saviour damages the aircrafts and its leads to accident. Whether using any poison are pesticides they are kill the particular bird and while spraying chemical substance is temporary solution and that kind of activities are not good for humans and birds also they are difficult to daily so only we move to ultrasonic repellers. This are the main challenges that were very difficult and also the birds where destroy the agriculture crops. In this problem are caused by pests and birds. Thus things there is availability of bird repellers are available in markets but they are not movable manner so we depends more quantities of ultrasonic repellers were required to controlling larger areas. Whether using large number of quantities the maintenance where difficult and they gets easily repaired due to improper maintenance and weather climatic conditions. When they gets repaired means the system are not functioned, while using this application there is many chances to birds can enter into restricted areas and also the efficiency range also cover very short distance. And its gets easily failed. This is the main criteria while using non movable ultrasonic transducer.

## SIGNAL ATTENUATION DUE TO ATMOSPHERIC EFFECT

It was noted that the high frequency sound waves produced by the piezo speakers attenuated in intensity with increasing distance from the sound source at a specific rate as shown in figure 8. This was true for sunny, rainy and dull days. It can be observed in figure 8 that the ultrasound generated by the device traveled slightly farther in moist air (7.0m reach) than in dry air (less than 6m reach). This is primarily due to the lower concentration of Carbon (IV) Oxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) in moist air due to its solubility in water and of dust particulate matter in moist air. These and the higher concentration of water vapour mean a lower air density. Conversely, on sunny days, the dry air is of comparatively higher density and contains entrained dust particles; such air will therefore vibrate less readily. Sound travels more slowly through such a medium. This explains why the attenuation was less on a rainy day than on a sunny day. This phenomenon is an advantage since the device will be very useful to farmers especially during the rainy season; when fruits of rain-fed cereal crops develop and granivorous birds' nuisance pervades

## EFFECT OF GADGET ELEVATION ON THE SIGNAL REACH

The performance of the two ultrasonic devices were compared when placed on three different heights (viz: 0.79m depicted as 1, 1.38m as 2 and 1.86m as 3) on both sunny and dull days. On the average, the first device covered an area of 45.02 square meters while the second device covered an area of 232.26 square meters when placed on an elevation of 0.79m, while when placed on an elevation of 1.86m, they covered an area of 175.83 and 429.53 square meters respectively. Thus about 5-6 pieces of the second device will effectively cover a hectare. The effect of gadget's power and elevation on the reach of the generated signals is shown in figure 9.

From figure 9, the following can be observed:-

- (i) When the power of the device increases (from 7.98W to 23.98W), the distance the sound travelled also increases (from 5.8m to 12.5m on a sunny day and from 6.5m to 17.5m on a dull day for a device elevation of 0.79m). This is hardly surprising.

- (ii) As the gadget elevation increases (from 0.79m to 1.38m, and 1.86m), the reach of the sound increases: (from 5.8m to 7.6m, and 12m for device 1 and from 12.5m to 16.5m, and 18.6 for device 2 respectively on a sunny day). Similar trend was obtained for a dull day test. This should most likely be as a result of less obstacles interference with the transmission.
- (iii) The sound travels farther on a dull day than on a sunny day; (from a reach of 5.8m to 6.5m, 7.6m to 12.8m and 12m to 14.7m for a sunny and dull day respectively with device 1 placed at corresponding heights of 0.79m, 1.38m and 1.86m). A similar result was obtained for device 2 whose reach increased from 12.5m to 17.7m, 16.5m to 19m and 18.6m to 22.9m for given weather conditions and heights as in device 1, in the same order. The reason is as was explained earlier on.

The birds where create more disturbance to human beings and especially destroy the agriculture crops and aircraft runways. During the flight take-off and landing time the birds were interrupted the flight engine and boy its cause's saviour damages the aircrafts and its leads to accident. Whether using any poison are pesticides they are kill the particular bird and while spraying chemical substance is temporary solution and that kind of activities are not good for humans and birds also they are difficult to daily so only we move to ultrasonic repellers .This are the main challenges that were very difficult and also the birds where destroy the agriculture crops. In this problem are caused by pests and birds. Thus things there is availability of bird repellers are available in markets but they are not movable manner so we depends more quantities of ultrasonic repellers were required to controlling larger areas. Whether using large number of quantities the maintenance where difficult and they gets easily repaired due to improper maintenance and weather climatic conditions. When they gets repaired means the system are not functioned, while using this application there is many chances to birds can enter into restricted areas and also the efficiency range also cover very short distance. And its gets easily failed. This is the main criteria while using non movable ultrasonic transducer.

#### **FIELD TESTING**

Observations showed that the birds' activity would be greatest early in the morning and gradually decline as the day progresses. This corroborated with the findings of Schmutterer (1978) that quelea birds feed early in the mornings and late afternoon, but rest and drink in-between. Consequently the field testing was conducted between 7am and 12noon. The whole exercise lasted for 7 days. The field testing of the device was carried out in the outskirts of Birnin Kebbi, Kebbi State in northern Nigeria. The test was carried out in fields planted with cereal crops at fruiting stage with adjoining savannah bush. The targeted bird species were black birds, weaver birds (a Ploceida) and Quelea birds. The weaver birds and quelea birds' flocks were on the average of 80 and over 400 in order but the black birds do not move in flock.

#### **REPELLANT IMPACT OF THE DEVICE ON THE BIRDS**

- i) During the tests both the blackbirds and weaverbirds responded to the stimulus occasioned by the generated waves. The birds that responded usually move some meters away from their perch but did not leave the area entirely. This observation may be due to the fact that when ultrasound is broadcast over wide open spaces, the sound waves lose their intensity rapidly with distance and dissipate.
- ii) Quelea birds on the other hand were a species that it was difficult to elicit good noticeable response to the stimulus from the device. They did not respond like the other birds and seemed to be unaffected much by the ultrasonic waves. The reason needs understanding but was thought to be the enormity of their flock size.
- iii) During the experiment, it was also observed that the resting and loafing birds are easily dispersed than the feeding birds since it is always difficult to break the habit once they are feeding as reported by (Bishop et al 2003). A break in the signals broadcast was ensured when the birds have given their maximum response to the stimulus so as to avoid the birds' habituation to the device signal.



### **ADVANTAGES**

1. Unfortunately, but it is true that sometimes the most attractive bird species cause the annoyance to many home owners.
2. If you are also interested in keeping your property disease free and safe.
3. Consider solving your bird pest problems by seeking help from professional bird control companies.
4. Reputed Bird Repellent Devices Supplier Company provides the user with cost effective and humane methods to rid your concern caused by pesky birds. There are number of benefits of using bird repellents.
5. Have a look- Highly safe and effective: Bird repellents come in spray, gel and spikes forms. These are safe to use and all offer great results.
6. The spray is biodegradable and can be used on almost any outside surface, including walls, roofs, plants, trees, decks, statues and even nests. It is a bitter and foully substance which deters birds from the area without harming them.
7. Long lasting results: Bird Repellent Devices Supplier Company supplies best devices in the market. These devices are suitable for all weather conditions and can be re-applied as needed. Thus, have long-life and offer better results.

### **SIGNAL ATTENUATION DUE TO ATMOSPHERIC EFFECT:**

It was noted that the high frequency sound waves produced by the piezo speakers attenuated in intensity with increasing distance from the sound source at a specific rate as shown in figure 8. This was true for sunny, rainy and dull days. It can be observed in figure 8 that the ultrasound generated by the device travelled slightly farther in moist air (7.0m reach) than in dry air (less than 6m reach). This is primarily due to the lower concentration of Carbon (IV) Oxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) in moist air due to its solubility in water and of dust particulate matter in moist air. These and the higher concentration of water vapour mean a lower air density.

### **EFFECT OF GADGET ELEVATION ON THE SIGNAL REACH**

The performance of the two ultrasonic devices were compared when placed on three different heights (viz: 0.79m depicted as 1, 1.38m as 2 and 1.86m as 3) on both sunny and dull days. On the average, the first device covered an area of 45.02 square meters while the second device covered an area of 232.26 square meters when placed on an elevation of 0.79m, while when placed on an elevation of 1.86m, they covered an area of 175.83 and 429.53 square meters respectively

### **FIELD TESTING**

Observations showed that the birds' activity would be greatest early in the morning and gradually decline as the day progresses. This corroborated with the findings of Schmutterer (1978) that quelea birds feed early in the mornings and late afternoon, but rest and drink in-between. Consequently the field testing was conducted between 7am and 12noon. The whole exercise lasted for 7 days. The field testing of the device was carried out in the outskirts of Birnin Kebbi, Kebbi State in northern Nigeria. The test was carried out in fields planted with cereal crops at fruiting stage with adjoining savannah bush.

### **FUTURE SCOPE**

A combined unit operating on both solar as well as wind energy can be designed to overcome the major climatic disadvantage of the solar operated scarer. This unit will store the energy obtained through the wind turbine into the storage battery along with the solar power which can further be used in a dull climate. This type of scarer will work on both Solar as well as Wind power and hence the fluctuations in the climate make a minimal impact on the scarers efficiency and can be called a "SOLAR CUM WIND POWERED BIRD SCARER".

### **CONCLUSION**

The use of ultrasonic waves; which human ears do not detect, but are perceived by small birds is a novel technology that can effectively repel such birds from designated places. Ultrasonic waves was successfully generated, with automatically varied frequency (between 15 kHz and 25 kHz), amplified and broadcast at high enough sound pressure level from a locally fabricated solar powered electronic device. The 7.98W device produced an ultrasound of 118dB, on the average will cover a distance of 45.02m<sup>2</sup> while the 23.98W with an ultrasound of 123dB will cover a distance of 232.26m<sup>2</sup> when placed on the elevation of 0.78m but when placed on the elevation of 1.86m, their average area coverage will be 175.83m<sup>2</sup> and 429.53m<sup>2</sup> respectively. The ultrasonic waves created a hostile environment for the pest birds and had a repulsive influence on them, though they have a small radius of action but eventually drove the birds away from the designated locations. Response to the ultrasonic wave stimulus broadcasted from the environmentally friendly gadget was visibly demonstrated by targeted weaver birds and black birds but not quelea birds. The waves travelled farther with increasing power of the gadget and for wet days than for dry days. This is advantageous as rain-fed cereal crops fruit during the rainy season and will need the deployment of the gadget more at such a period. About 5-6 pieces of the 23.98W device will be needed to cover a hectare sized field.

- 1) Out of the 22 sounds, the sound from Falcon (*Buteo lagopus*) was seen most effective.
- 2) Camouflage of bird scarer, sound quality and volume was seen important on crows.
- 3) All crows changed their roosted places when bird scarer was playing during 1 month of experiment.
- 4) If it is possible for the birds to clearly see the speaker, they prefer not to move (fly) away.
- 5) The performance of the scarer depends on the climatic characteristics of the day (dull or sunny).
- 6) It is concluded that the audible bird scarer designed, manufactured and tested in this study was seen enough efficient.

#### REFERENCES

1. Bishop J, McKay H, Parrot D & Allan J (2003). Review of International Research Literature Regarding the Effectiveness of Auditory Bird Scaring Techniques.
2. Bomford, M and O'Brien, R H (1990). "Sonic Deterrents in Animal damage Control: A Review of Device Tests and Effectiveness". *Wild. Soc. Bull* 18:411-422.
3. Boylestad, R.L and Nashelsky, L (1996) *Electronics and Circuit theory*, (6th ed), Prentice Hall, New Jersey, USA. 72.
4. Coleman, J and Spurr, E (2001) *Farmers Perceptions of Bird damage and Control in Arable Crops*. The New Zealand Plant Protection Society Incorporated.
5. Encarta Encyclopedia 1993-2003 Microsoft Corporation.
6. Ezeonu S.O (2009). The solar powered ultrasonic and sonic bird repellers. An unpublished PhD thesis, Dept of Physics/Industrial Physics, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.
7. Frings, H. (1964). Sound in vertebrate pest control. *Proc. Vert. Conf.* 2:50-56.
8. Gootee T.(2003). <http://www.fullnet.com/u/tomg/gooteepc.htm>. Retrieved 6th July, 2005.
9. Hamershock, D M (1992). "Ultrasonic as a Method of Bird Control" Flight Dynamics Directorate, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, 42.
10. Kerns, J. D. (1985). "Evaluation of the effectiveness of the 'Ultrason ET' ultrasonic device as a means of cliff swallow control" In: Woronecki, P.P. Effects of ultrasonic, visual, and sonic devices on pigeon numbers in a vacant building. *Proc. Vert. Pest Conf. Monterey, California* 13:266-272.
11. Martin, L. R. and P. C. Martin. (1984). "Research Indicates Propane Cannons can Move Birds" In: Woronecki, P.P. Effects of ultrasonic, visual, and sonic devices on pigeon numbers in a vacant building. *Proc. Vert. Pest Conf. Monterey, California* 13:266-272.
12. Meylan, A (1978). Granivorous birds in sunflower crops. *Proceedings of Vertebrate Pests Conference* 8:73-77, Sacramento, California.
13. Nankinov, D, Ivanov N, Nikolov B, Dalakchieva S, Gluhchev G and Trifonov D (2007). "Electro-Acoustic Influence on Birds" *Bularian Academy of Sciences (Cybernetics and Information Technologies)* 7:106-111.
14. Schmutterer, H. (1978). Birds. In: Kranz, J.; Schmutterer, H. and Koch, W. (Editors) *Diseases, Pests and Weeds In Tropical Crops*. John Willey and Sons New York: 532-536.
15. Ward, P. (1979). Rational strategies for the control of queleas and other migrant bird pests in Africa. *Strategy and Tactics of Control of Migrant Pests*. A Royal Society Discussion held on 29 and 30 June 1977. The Royal Society London: 289-300.
16. Woronecki, P.P. (1988). Effects of ultrasonic, visual, and sonic devices on pigeon numbers in a vacant building. *Proc. Vert. Pest Conf. Monterey, California* 13:266-272
17. Wikipedia (indated). Transmission and infection of H5N1. Wikipedia the Free Encyclopedia [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/transmission\\_](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/transmission_) Site visited on 9/2/2012.