



**UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**FOREST COMPOSITION, STRUCTURE AND WILDLIFE  
ABUNDANCE IN MIXED-DIPTEROCARP FOREST OF  
SUNGAI LALANG FOREST RESERVE, SELANGOR**

**BOYD SUN FATT**

**FH 2003 19**

**FOREST COMPOSITION, STRUCTURE AND WILDLIFE ABUNDANCE  
IN MIXED-DIPTEROCARP FOREST OF  
SUNGAI LALANG FOREST RESERVE, SELANGOR**

**BOYD SUN FATT**

**MASTER OF SCIENCE  
UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**2003**



**FOREST COMPOSITION, STRUCTURE AND WILDLIFE ABUNDANCE  
IN MIXED-DIPTEROCARP FOREST OF  
SUNGAI LALANG FOREST RESERVE, SELANGOR**

**By**

**BOYD SUN FATT**

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,  
in Fulfilment of The Requirement for the  
Degree of Master Science**

**October 2003**



To both my lovely mum *Beatrice* and three sisters *Doris, Doreen & Donna*

Wonderful and THE MOTIVATOR *Mr. Oswald Supi*

My precious and lovely wife *Shirley Bakansing*

Not to forget

My late father, *Sun Fatt Angih*. The greatest man ever lives in my entire life.

Thank you  
Intensification Research on Priority Areas  
(IRPA)

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia  
In fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science

**FOREST COMPOSITION, STRUCTURE AND WILDLIFE ABUNDANCE  
IN MIXED-DIPTEROCARP FOREST OF SUNGAI LALANG FOREST  
RESERVE, SELANGOR**

By

**BOYD SUN FATT**

**October 2003**

**Chairman : Mohamed Zakaria Hussin, Ph.D.**

**Faculty : Forestry**

Tropical rain forest is among the richest ecosystem in the world in terms of flora and fauna diversity. The forest, however, is depleting caused by the encroachment of the forested area such as forest logging. Peninsular Malaysia is practising selective management system (SMS) as one of the sustainable forest management (SFM) in timber harvesting. Such activity would change the forest composition and structure which might also influence to the habitat of plant and animal species.

A study was conducted in three different compartments namely Compartment 18 (five-year old logged forest), Compartment 33 (ten-year old logged forest) and Compartment 24 (VJR) at Sungai Lalang Forest Reserve mainly to compare the forest composition and structure. A total of three 1-ha plots were made at each compartment and covering three different forest habitats of valley-bottom, mid-slope and ridge-top. All trees  $\geq 5$ cm dbh at the three different compartments were tagged and identified up to species level. Tree parameters (tree dbh, tree height and crown width) were also recorded within the study plots for comparison purposes. However, the selected wildlife's composition (primates, pheasants, small mammals and



understorey birds) was taken from the previous study as a secondary data. The data's was then compared as descriptive whether the changing of the forest composition and structure influence the presence of wildlife within each compartments.

The results showed that dipterocarp trees were distributed mainly at Virgin Jungle Reserve than in the logged forest. In contrast, the non-dipterocarp trees were mainly distributed in logged forest compared to Virgin Jungle Reserve. The tree species was richest in Compartment 24 (VJR) which represented 342 species belong to 54 families and 163 genera, compared to Compartment 33 (46 families, 124 genera and 234 species) and Compartment 18 (45 families, 100 genera and 189 species). The number of tree species was also lower in logged forest than in Virgin Jungle Reserve. The Dipterocarpaceae and Euphorbiaceae were found predominantly among the three different forest types, as well as at all different forest habitats. It showed that these families were still abundant even though the forest was disturbed. The species diversity among three different compartments showed that Compartment 24 (VJR) gave the highest Shannon's index value with  $H' = 5.15$  ( $H_{\max} = 5.85$ ), compared to Compartment 33 ( $H' = 4.85$ ;  $H_{\max} = 5.45$ ) and Compartment 18 ( $H' = 4.46$ ;  $H_{\max} = 5.24$ ). By comparing among different forest habitats at different compartments showed that the species diversity was highest in valley-bottom and concentrated at Compartment 24 (VJR), followed by Compartment 33 and Compartment 18. The species evenness among three different compartments, however, was high in Compartment 33 with  $E_1 = 0.89$ , followed closely by Compartment 24 (VJR) ( $E_1 = 0.88$ ) and lowest in Compartment 18 ( $E_1 = 0.85$ ). In addition, the species evenness was distributed indiscriminately among the three different forest habitats at three different compartments. The Sorensen's Index of Similarity showed that the species

abundance between Compartment 33 and Compartment 18 was almost similar. Whereas, the species abundance in Compartment 24 (VJR) was less similar compared with both logged forests. The availability and diversity of the primary forest trees as food sources for wildlife were also decreased from primary to logged forest. The presence of secondary trees such as *Macaranga* spp. and *Mallotus* spp., however, was highest in Compartment 18 and lowest in Compartment 24 (VJR).

There was a significantly different in the forest structure among the compartments where Compartment 24 (VJR) has the highest mean parameters value of tree dbh, tree height and crown width, followed by Compartment 33 and Compartment 18. Among the three different forest habitats, the results showed that valley-bottom in VJR has the highest forest structure parameters parameters value compared to other forests. The study also found that the forest parameters of trees' dbh, trees' height and crown cover were well disseminated in Compartment 24 (VJR), whereas, less created in Compartment 33 and Compartment 18.

A total of 111 pheasants, 183 primates, 532 small mammals and 1027 understorey birds were recorded in the study area. The observation of selected wildlife showed that most of the primates, small mammals and understorey birds preferred the most in the Compartment 33. Conversely, the pheasants were found more in Compartment 24 (VJR). It showed that some of these animal species could tolerate on the forest composition and structure changes, and the reduction of known primary forest trees as food sources that caused by forest logging. The availability of secondary forest tree species such as *Macaranga* spp. and *Mallotus* spp. in logged forest could initially provide an optional to food choices among the animals. The pheasants that

were known as primary forest species, however, could not tolerate the forest alteration caused by the logging.

Therefore, it can be summarized that the community was species rich in undisturbed forest (VJR) compared to disturbed forest (logged forest). The destruction of forest would eliminate or destroy the floristic compositions and forest architectures which wildlife depended on the forest as habitat for existence. It is crucial to implement proper forest management in order to balance the forest ecosystem between forest as a production and habitat for the forest dwellers.





Abstrak tesis dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains

**KOMPOSISI HUTAN, STRUKTUR DAN KELIMPAHAN HIDUPAN LIAR  
DI HUTAN-CAMPUR DIPTEROKAP HUTAN SIMPAN SUNGAI LALANG,  
SELANGOR**

Oleh

**BOYD SUN FATT**

Oktober 2003

**Pengerusi : Mohamed Zakaria Hussin, Ph.D.**

**Fakulti : Perhutanan**

Hutan hujan tropika adalah di antara ekosistem terkaya di dunia dalam kepelbagaian flora dan faunanya. Walau bagaimanapun, hutan semakin berkurangan disebabkan oleh pencerobohan kawasan hutan seperti pembalakan hutan. Semenanjung Malaysia mengamalkan Sistem Pengurusan Pemilihan (SMS) sebagai salah satu daripada Pengurusan Hutan Mampan (SFM) dalam pembalakan. Maka aktiviti ini boleh merubah komposisi dan struktur hutan sekaligus boleh mempengaruhi habitat tumbuhan dan spesies haiwan.

Satu kajian telah dijalankan di tiga kompartmen berbeza iaitu Kompartmen 18 (lima-tahun dibalak), Kompartmen 33 (sepuluh-tahun dibalak) dan hutan primer Kompartmen 24 (VJR) di Hutan Simpan Sg. Lalang, bertujuan untuk perbandingan komposisi dan struktur hutannya. Sejumlah tiga 1-ha plot telah dibina di setiap kompartmen dan meliputi tiga jenis habitat hutan, iaitu tanah-rendah, tanah-tengah dan permatang. Kesemua pokok  $\geq 5\text{cm}$  dbh di tanda dan diidentifikasi spesiesnya. Parameter pokok (dbh pokok, ketinggian pokok dan keluasan silara) juga dicatat



dalam plot kajian untuk tujuan perbandingan di ketiga-tiga kompartmen. Walau bagaimanapun, komposisi hidupan liar terpilih (primat, ayam hutan, mamalia kecil dan burung bawah naungan) diambil dari kajian lepas sebagai data sekunder. Data ini akan digunakan untuk perbandingan secara diskriptif samada perubahan komposisi dan struktur hutan mempengaruhi kehadiran hidupan liar diantara kompartmen.

Keputusan menunjukkan bahawa pokok dipterokarp tertabur dengan banyak di hutan Hutan Simpan Dara berbanding hutan bekas dibalak. Sebaliknya pokok bukan-dipterokarp didapati banyak tertabur di hutan bekas dibalak berbanding hutan Hutan Simpan Dara. Kompartmen 24 (VJR) kaya dengan spesies pokok merangkumi 342 spesies memiliki 54 famili dan 163 genera, berbanding Kompartmen 33 (46 famili, 124 genera dan 234 spesies) dan Kompartmen 18 (45 famili, 100 genera dan 189 spesies). Jumlah spesies pokok juga rendah di hutan terganggu berbanding di Hutan Simpan Dara. Dipterocarpaceae dan Euphorbiaceae masih dijumpai dengan banyaknya diantara tiga jenis hutan berbeza, dan juga di kesemua habitat hutan berbeza. Ini menunjukkan bahawa famili ini masih dijumpai dengan banyaknya walaupun hutan telah terganggu. Species kepelbagaian diantara tiga kompartmen menunjukkan Kompartmen 24 (VJR) memberi nilai tertinggi bagi Indeks Shannon's dengan  $H' = 5.15$  ( $H_{\max} = 5.85$ ), berbanding dengan Kompartmen 33 ( $H' = 4.85$ ;  $H_{\max} = 5.45$ ) dan Kompartmen 18 ( $H' = 4.46$ ;  $H_{\max} = 5.24$ ). Perbandingan dengan tiga jenis habitat hutan di kompartmen berbeza menunjukkan bahawa spesies kepelbagaian adalah tinggi di tanah-lembah yang mana lebih tertumpu di Kompartmen 24 (VJR), diikuti oleh Kompartmen 33 dan Kompartmen 18. Spesies kesamarataan diantara tiga kompartmen adalah tertinggi di Kompartmen 33 memberikan  $E_1 = 0.89$ , diikuti dekat oleh Kompartmen 24 (VJR) ( $E_1 = 0.88$ ) dan

terendah di Kompatmen 18 ( $E_j=0.85$ ). Manakala, spesies kesamarataan tertabur secara kesembarangan diantara tiga jenis habitat hutan di tiga kompatmen yang berbeza. Indeks Keserupaan Sorensen's menunjukkan bahawa spesies kelimpahan antara Kompatmen 33 dan Kompatmen 18 adalah hampir serupa. Manakala, spesies kelimpahan di Kompatmen 24 (VJR) adalah kurang serupa dibandingkan dengan dua hutan dibalak tersebut. Keperolehan dan kepelbagaian spesies pokok hutan primer sebagai sumber makanan untuk hidupan liar menunjukkan pengurangan dari hutan VJR kepada hutan dibalak. Taburan pokok sekunder seperti *Macaranga* spp. dan *Mallotus* spp. adalah tertinggi di Kompatmen 18 dan terendah di Kompatmen 24 (VJR).

Terdapat kesignifikasi berbeza terhadap struktur hutan diantara kompatmen yang mana memberikan Kompatmen 24 (VJR) taburan nilai min parameter tertinggi bagi dbh pokok, ketinggian pokok dan keluasan silara, diikuti oleh Kompatmen 33 dan Kompatmen 18. Diantara tiga habitat hutan menunjukkan bahawa tanah-rendah di VJR mempunyai nilai parameter struktur hutan tertinggi berbanding hutan lain. Dalam kajian ini juga menunjukkan bahawa parameter hutan bagi dbh pokok, ketinggian pokok dan keluasan silara adalah tersebar elok di Kompatmen 24 (VJR), dan kurang terbentuk di Kompatment 33 dan Kompatmen 18.

Sejumlah 111 ayam hutan, 183 primat, 532 mamalia kecil dan 1027 burung naugan telah direkodkan dalam kawasan kajian. Pemerhatian terhadap hidupan liar terpilih menunjukkan bahawa kebanyakan primat, mamalia kecil dan burung naugan lebih tertumpu di hutan Kompatmen 33. Sebaliknya, ayam hutan lebih ditemui di Kompatmen 24 (VJR). Ini menunjukkan bahawa sebilangan spesies haiwan ini boleh

bertoleransi terhadap perubahan komposisi dan struktur hutan, dan penurunan pokok hutan primer sebagai sumber makanan disebabkan oleh pembalakan hutan. Keperolehan spesies pokok hutan sekunder seperti *Macaranga* spp. dan *Mallotus* spp. yang terdapat di hutan dibalok dapat menyediakan pemilihan sumber makanan secara optional dikalangan haiwan. Ayam hutan yang dianggap sebagai spesies hutan primer, sebaliknya, tidak dapat bertelorensi terhadap gangguan hutan disebabkan oleh pembalakan hutan.

Maka itu, secara ringkasan bahawa komuniti adalah kaya dengan spesies di hutan tak-terganggu (VJR) berbanding dengan hutan terganggu (hutan dibalok). Kemusnahan hutan boleh menghapuskan atau merosakkan komposisi floristik dan arkitektural hutan yang mana hidupan liar bergantung sebagai habitat untuk wujud. Ia adalah sangat kritikal untuk melaksanakan pengurusan hutan yang sesuai bagi menyeimbangi ekosistem hutan diantara hutan sebagai produksi dan habitat untuk penghuni hutan.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, praise to God as due to His blessings that I am able to complete and accomplish through this study.

I wish to express my most sincere thanks and appreciation to my supervisor and Project Leader's on Flora and Fauna Recovery project, Dr. Mohamed Zakaria Hussin for his constructive comments, guidance and advice throughout the course of this study. Without his support, counselling and enthusiastic encouragement, mentally and physically, this study would not been completed.

I am greatly indebted and appreciated also to my committee members, Prof. Madya Dr. Faridah Hanum bt. Ibrahim, Dr. Abdullah Mohd. and Puan Kamziah Kudus for their encouragements, assistances, suggestions and useful comments during the study, especially on research method and statistic matters. Sincere thanks also to our laboratory assistance and Project Coordinator on Flora and Fauna Recovery project, En. Rahim Mudin for his helps and supports.

Profound gratitude is extended to my colleagues who were also involved in this Flora and Fauna Recovery project, Syamsul Herman, Tuah Yusof, Sundai Silang, Sengrath Phirasack, Zamri Rosli, Romeo Lomoljo (from Philippine) and Noor Farikha Naheda (from Indonesia) who were so willingly to help me in finishing this project. Their profoundly attitudes, kindness and laughter's will remain forever in my memories. Without them also, Wildlife Ecological Research (WILDER) unit in Faculty of Forestry will not be exist. My sincere gratitude is also extended to our research assistances: Arman Ismail and Suhairullah Ahmad, and undergraduate students: Ahmad Fadhil Mamat and Noor Amin Hj. Mahbob for their kindness to help me in setting-up study plots, trees reading and tagging. My sincere thanks also go to En. Kamarrudin Salleh and En. Mark from Forest Research Institute of Malaysia (FRIM) in assisting, thus, sharing their knowledge's and experience's on tree identifications in the field and leaf's identification in the herbarium.

Much appreciation goes to all lecturers and staffs of the Faculty of Forestry, whom were direct or indirectly, for their help during the study period. An extended

appreciation also to all my fellow friends: John Tasan, Marinus Domisin, Dunstant Christopher Gissong, Aldrich Richard, Laura Emmie Koroh, Treacy Peter and Rosaria Muji Dagin. Thanks.

Last but not least, my deepest appreciation and thanks to my parents, sisters and uncle for their concerns, inspirations, encouragement and continuous support along my study in the university till the end of this project. Special thanks and deepest appreciation to Shirley Bakansing for her encouragement, love and support in material.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
DEDICATION	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ABSTRAK	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	xii
APPROVAL SHEETS	xiv
DECLARATION	xvi
LIST OF TABLES	xx
LIST OF FIGURES	xxiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxv
 <b>CHAPTER</b>	
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>
1.1	General Review 1
1.2	Status of Malaysia Forest 2
1.3	Degradation of Forest in Peninsular Malaysia 4
1.4	Statement of Problem 5
1.5	Objective of The Study 7
<b>2</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>
2.1	Forest Stands of Indo-Malesia Tropical Rain Forest 8
2.2	Tropical Rain Forest of Peninsular Malaysia 9
2.2.1	Forest Composition 10
2.2.2	Structure of The Forest 12
2.2.3	Tree Dissemination 16
2.3	Wildlife in Peninsular Malaysia Tropical Rain Forest 18
2.3.1	Forest as Wildlife Habitat 18
2.3.2	Preferred Habitats 19
2.3.3	Primary Rain Forest Trees as Food Source 20
2.3.4	Secondary Trees as Food Source 22
2.4	Forest Disturbance in Peninsular Malaysia 24
2.4.1	Impact of Logging on Forest Stands 24
2.4.2	Impact of Logging on Forest Plants 26
2.4.3	Microclimate Changes in The Forest 28
2.5	Wildlife Disturbance in Peninsular Malaysia 29
2.5.1	Impact of Logging on Wildlife Habitat 29
2.5.2	Changes of Wildlife Natural Habitat 31
2.5.3	Effect of Microclimate Changes on Habitat 35
<b>3</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>
3.1	The Study Area 38
3.2	Study Procedure 40
3.2.1	Plot Study 40
3.2.2	Taxonomic Composition 47
3.2.3	Forest Parameters 47
3.2.4	Edibility of Forest Tree Species as Wildlife Food Sources 49

3.2.5 Wildlife Data	50
3.3 Analysis of Data	51
3.3.1 Species Diversity	51
3.3.2 Sorensen's Index of Similarity (SI)	53
3.3.3 Forest Structure Analysis	54
3.3.4 Wildlife Distribution	54
4 RESULTS	
4.1 Primary Forest of Compartment 24 (VJR)	55
4.1.1 Forest Composition	56
4.1.2 Forest Composition at Different Habitats	57
4.1.3 Species Diversity	58
4.1.4 Forest Formation	59
4.2 Ten-years Old Logged Forest of Compartment 33	65
4.2.1 Forest Composition	67
4.2.2 Forest Composition at Different Habitats	67
4.2.3 Species Diversity	69
4.2.4 Forest Formation	70
4.3 Five-years Old Logged Forest of Compartment 18	75
4.3.1 Forest Composition	77
4.3.2 Forest Composition at Different Habitats	77
4.3.3 Species Diversity	79
4.3.4 Forest Formation	80
4.4 Comparison of Primary and Logged Forest	85
4.4.1 Comparison of Forest Composition	85
4.4.2 Comparison of Forest Formation	89
4.4.3 Comparison of Forest Guild's Structure and Tree Crown	91
4.4.4 Comparison of Edible Primary and Secondary Forest Trees Species	94
4.5 Presence of Wildlife at Three Different Compartments	101
4.5.1 Primates	103
4.5.2 Pheasants	103
4.5.3 Understorey Birds	104
4.5.4 Small Mammals	106
4.5.5 Presence of Selected Wildlife According to Forest Composition and Diversity	109
4.5.6 Presence of Selected Wildlife According to Forest Structure	111
5 DISCUSSION	
5.1 Forest Composition	113
5.2 Species Diversity	115
5.3 Forest Formation	117
5.3.1 Tree dbh Classes	118
5.3.2 Tree Guild's Structure and Tree Crown	119
5.4 Edible Primary and Secondary Forest Tree Species	122
5.4.1 Primary Forest Tree Species in Primary and Logged Forest	122
5.4.2 Secondary Forest Tree Species in Primary and Logged Forest	125
5.5 The Presence of Selected Wildlife According To Forest Composition and Structure at Three Different Compartments	128



5.5.1 Primates	128
5.5.2 Pheasants	133
5.5.3 Understorey Birds	137
5.5.4 Small Mammals	143
5.6 Effect of Logging to The Presence of Selected Wildlife	150
6 CONCLUSION	
6.1 Conclusion	151
6.2 Recommendations	153
REFERENCES	155
APPENDIX A	167
APPENDIX B	242
APPENDIX C	254
APPENDIX D	257
APPENDIX E	258
VITA	259



## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>
2.1 Diversity of flora in Indo-Malesia region.	9
2.2 Animal species that can be found in Peninsular Malaysia forest.	18
2.3 The mammals (excluding birds and bats) feeding habits and distributions according to forest layers in Peninsular Malaysia tropical forest.	21
2.4 Peninsular Malaysia mammals usual habitat (excluding bats).	31
2.5 Trophic structure of avifaunas between primary and logged forest.	32
2.6 Living habitats and altitudinal distribution of mammals in Peninsular Malaysia.	33
2.7 Living habitats and altitudinal distribution of avifaunas in Peninsular Malaysia.	34
4.1 Composition and stand densities of three different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 24 (VJR).	56
4.2 Number of dipterocarp and non-dipterocarp trees at different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 24 (VJR).	56
4.3 Comparison of Shannon's index values among three different habitats in Compartment 24 (VJR).	59
4.4 The dbh classes (%) in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 24 (VJR).	60
4.5 Comparison of dbh classes among different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 24 (VJR)(n=100).	60
4.6 The forest guild's structure classes (%) in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 24 (VJR).	62
4.7 Comparison of forest guild's structure classes (%) among different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 24 (VJR)(n=100).	63
4.8 Comparison of crown area (m <sup>2</sup> ) among different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 24 (VJR).	65
4.9 Composition and stand densities of three different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 33.	66



4.10	Number of dipterocarp and non-dipterocarp at different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 33.	66
4.11	Comparison of Shannon's index values among three different habitats in Compartment 33.	69
4.12	The dbh classes (%) in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 33.	70
4.13	Comparison of dbh classes among different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 33 (n=100).	71
4.14	The forest guild's structure classes (%) in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 33.	73
4.15	Comparison of forest guild's structure classes (%) among different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 33 (n=100).	74
4.16	Comparison of crown area (m <sup>2</sup> ) among different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 33.	75
4.17	Composition and stand densities of three different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 18.	76
4.18	Number of dipterocarp and non-dipterocarp trees at different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 18.	76
4.19	Comparison of Shannon's index values among three different habitats in Compartment 18.	79
4.20	The dbh classes (%) in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 18.	80
4.21	Comparison of dbh classes among different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 18 (n=100).	81
4.22	The forest guild's structure classes (%) in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 18.	82
4.23	Comparison of forest guild's structure classes (%) among different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 33 (n=100).	83
4.24	Comparison of crown area (m <sup>2</sup> ) among different habitats in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 18.	85
4.25	Differences in the number of representatives of each family found in primary (Comp 24 (VJR)) and logged (Comp 33 and Comp18) forest (three 1-ha plots).	86
4.26	List of uncommon taxa represented by a single individual at three 1-ha plots.	88

4.27	Comparison of Sorensen's Index of Similarity on species abundance between compartments (three 1-ha plots).	89
4.28	Comparison of dbh classes of three 1-ha plots at three different compartments (n=300).	90
4.29	Comparison of dbh classes in three different forest habitats (1-ha plot) according to compartments (n=100).	91
4.30	Comparison of forest guild's structure classes of three 1-ha plots at three different compartments (n=300).	92
4.31	Comparison of guild's structure classes in three different forest habitats (1-ha plot) according to compartments (n=100).	93
4.32	Comparison of crown diameter (m <sup>2</sup> ) of three 1-ha plots at three different compartments (n=300).	93
4.33	Comparison of crown diameter (m <sup>2</sup> ) in three different forest habitats (1-ha plot) according to compartments (n=100).	94
4.34	Fifteen most abundant primary forest tree species as edible food sources in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 24 (VJR).	95
4.35	Fifteen most abundant primary forest tree species as edible food sources in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 33.	95
4.36	Fifteen most abundant primary forest tree species as edible food sources in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 18.	96
4.37	Comparison of primary forest tree species availability among three different compartments.	96
4.38	Comparison of Shannon's index diversity on edible primary forest trees species among three different compartments.	97
4.39	Comparison of edible primary forest fruit tree species parameters at three different compartments.	98
4.40	The <i>Macaranga</i> and <i>Mallotus</i> individuals at three different compartments (three 1-ha plots).	98
4.41	<i>Macaranga</i> species found at the three different compartments (three 1-ha plots).	100
4.42	<i>Mallotus</i> species found at the three different compartments (three 1-ha plots).	100
4.43	Comparison of <i>Macaranga</i> parameters at three different compartments.	101

4.44	Comparison of <i>Mallotus</i> parameters at three different compartments.	101
4.45	Number of individuals observed at three different compartments.	102
4.46	Number of observations for primate species in different compartments at Hulu Langat Forest Reserve.	103
4.47	Number of observations for pheasant species in different compartments at Hulu Langat Forest Reserve.	104
4.48	Number of observations for top five understorey bird families in different compartments at Hulu Langat Forest Reserve.	105
4.49	Number of observations for understorey bird species according to top five families in different compartments at Hulu Langat Forest Reserve.	107
4.50	Number of observations for top five small mammals families in different compartments at Hulu Langat Forest Reserve.	108
4.51	Number of observations for small mammal species according to top five families in different compartments at Hulu Langat Forest Reserve.	109
4.52a	Comparison between presence of selected wildlife groups and plants diversity among the three different compartments.	110
4.52b	Comparison between presence of selected wildlife groups and fruit trees diversity among the three different compartments.	111
4.53	Comparison between presence of selected wildlife groups and forest parameters among the three different compartments.	112

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
3.1	Annual rainfall (mm) at Sungai Lalang Forest Reserve from January 2000 to January 2002.	40
3.2	The location map of Sungai Lalang Forest Reserve, Selangor, Peninsular Malaysia	42
3.3	Location of study sites in Sungai Lalang Forest Reserve, Selangor	43
3.4	Study plots of Compartment 18 at Sungai Lalang Forest Reserve (Map showing in full scale).	44
3.5	Study plots of Compartment 33 at Sungai Lalang Forest Reserve (Map showing in full scale).	45
3.6	Study plots of Compartment 24 (VJR) at Sungai Lalang Forest Reserve (Map showing in full scale).	46
4.1	The dbh classes (%) in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 24 (VJR).	60
4.2	The tree height classes (%) according to forest guild's structure in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 24 (VJR).	63
4.3	The dbh classes (%) in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 33.	71
4.4	The tree height classes (%) according to forest guild's structure in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 33.	73
4.5	The dbh classes (%) in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 18.	80
4.6	The tree height classes (%) according to forest guild's structure in three 1-ha plots at Compartment 18.	83
4.7	The <i>Macaranga</i> and <i>Mallotus</i> individuals (%) at three different compartments.	99
4.8	Numbers of individuals (%) observed at three different compartments.	103