



***COMPARISON OF ARTHROPOD RICHNESS AND ABUNDANCE
BETWEEN THREE DIFFERENT AGRICULTURAL HABITATS***

INTAN FARHA SHAMIM BINTI KAMARUZZAMAN

FH 2019 36

**COMPARISON OF ARTHROPOD RICHNESS AND ABUNDANCE
BETWEEN THREE DIFFERENT AGRICULTURAL HABITATS**

By

INTAN FARHA SHAMIM BINTI KAMARUZZAMAN

**A Project Reported Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Bachelor of Forestry Science in the
Faculty of Forestry
Universiti Putra Malaysia**

2019

DEDICATION

Thanks and praise to Allah S.W.T. for giving me better life and these chances.

Dedicated this thesis to:

For my beloved family:

Kamaruzzaman Bin Mokhtar, Rosmiha Binti Mohamed Nor
and also, my siblings.

For my respected supervisor,

Dr. Badrul Azhar Bin Md. Sharif

Who has encouraged me, helped and give so much support during
conducting this research and in my study.

For my supportive friends,

Afifah, Ruby, Mohsin, Mizan, Lijan, Syafiq, Iffah

Thank you for everything. May Allah Bless All of us.

ABSTRACT

The conversion of natural forests into agricultural landscapes in Southeast Asia has been caused by the high global demand for rubber and oil palm. This results in a negative impact on overall biodiversity. The study aimed to examine the arthropods abundance between three different habitat types, namely fruit orchards, monoculture rubber plantations and oil palm plantations. This study was conducted at Kampung Ulu Sepri, Kampung Empang Batu and Kampung Batang Sepri located in Pedas, Negeri Sembilan. Arthropod sampling was carried out using pitfall trap at 90 sampling points with 100 meters distance between points in each habitat. Overall, a total of 12,942 arthropods made up of 14 different orders were recorded. Fruit orchards recorded the highest number of individuals (5011 individuals), followed by rubber plantation (4546 individuals) and oil palm plantations (3385 individuals). The fruit orchards were characterised by greater habitat heterogeneity. A variety of plant species provide food sources and habitats for arthropods. Fruit orchards can maintain greater arthropod diversity than monoculture habitats. Management of agricultural habitats is crucial for arthropod community and conservation.

ABSTRAK

Penukaran hutan semula jadi ke landskap pertanian di Asia Tenggara adalah disebabkan oleh permintaan global yang tinggi untuk getah dan kelapa sawit. Hal ini demikian, menghasilkan kesan negatif ke atas keseluruhan kepelbagaian biodiversiti. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji kelimpahan arthropod antara tiga jenis habitat yang berbeza, iaitu dusun buah, ladang getah monokultur dan ladang kelapa sawit. Kajian ini dijalankan di Kampung Ulu Sepri, Kampung Empang Batu dan Kampung Batang Sepri yang terletak di Pedas, Negeri Sembilan. Pensampelan arthropoda dilakukan menggunakan lubang perangkap di 90 titik pensampelan yang mempunyai jarak 100 meter antara titik di setiap kawasan perladangan. Secara keseluruhannya, sejumlah 12942 individu Arthropoda yang terdiri daripada 14 order yang berbeza telah direkodkan. Bagi kajian ini, dusun buah-buahan mencatatkan bilangan individu Arthropoda yang tertinggi (5011 individu), diikuti dengan perladangan getah (4546 individu) dan ladang kelapa sawit (3385 individu). Oleh itu, dusun buah dicirikan oleh heterogeniti habitat yang lebih besar. Pelbagai spesies tumbuhan menyediakan sumber makanan dan habitat untuk arthropoda. Dusun buah-buahan dapat mengekalkan kepelbagaian arthropoda yang lebih besar daripada habitat monokultur. Pengurusan habitat pertanian adalah penting untuk komuniti dan pemuliharaan arthropoda.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Alhamdulillah and thanks to Allah S.W.T with all His Gracious and His Merciful for giving me strength and the ability to accomplish this project successfully. First of all, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere and gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Badrul Azhar Md Sharif for his support, guidance, constructive and useful advice throughout my study. Also, I would like to thanks to my examiners Dr. Norhisham Razi and Dr. Puan Chong Leong for their opinions, positive comment and suggestion about this project.

My greatest appreciation also goes to the people that have been involved directly or indirectly in making this research project paper success. They are residents of Kampung Ulu Sepri, Kampung Empang Batu and Kampung Batang Sepri, Kampung Sungai Lalah, Negeri Sembilan. Their cooperation really helped me to make this project success.

Lastly, to my beloved family, special thanks are given to them. Appreciation and gratitude are also expressed to my friends and colleagues for their help and constructive suggestion through this study, especially to Nor Afifah, Sathiyarubini, Muhammad Mohsin, Nurul Iffah Nadhirah, Lijan John, Muhammad Mizan and many others. Last but not least, for those I did not mentioned their names, I wish to express my special thanks for their helps in one way or another during this project.

APPROVAL SHEET

I certify that this research project report entitled “Comparison of Arthropod Richness and Abundance between Three Different Agricultural Habitats” by Intan Farha Shamim Binti Kamaruzzaman has been examined and approved as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Forestry Science in the Faculty of Forestry, Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Dr. Badrul Azhar Bin Md Sharif
Faculty of Forestry
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Supervisor)

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Zakaria Bin Hussin
Dean
Faculty of Forestry
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: June 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
DEDICATION	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ABSTRAK	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
APPROVAL SHEET	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xii

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION	
1.0 Background of Study	1
1.1 Problem Statement	3
1.2 Justification	4
1.3 Research Objectives	4
1.4 Research Questions	5
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.0 Forest Fragmentation	6
2.1 Agroforestry Systems	7
2.2 Polyculture and Monoculture Systems	7
2.3 Fruit Orchard	8
2.4 Oil Palm Plantations	9
2.5 Rubber Plantations	9
2.6 Bio-indicator	11
2.7 Arthropods as Biological Indicator	11
2.8 Hymenoptera as Bioindicator	12
2.9 Araneae as Bioindicator	12
2.10 Ecosystem Services Provided by Arthropods	13
3. METHODOLOGY	
3.0 Study Sites	15
3.1 Sampling Design	16
3.2 Arthropod Sampling	18
3.3 Habitat Quality Assessment	19
3.4 Data Analysis	19
4. RESULTS	
4.0 Introduction	20
4.1 Arthropod Abundance between Different Agricultural Habitats	21
4.1.1 Post hoc Tukey-test of Arthropod Abundance	22
4.1.2 Partial eta squared of Arthropod Abundance	23

4.2	Number of Orders between Different Agricultural Habitats	23
4.2.1	Post hoc Tukey-test of Number of Orders	24
4.2.2	Partial eta squared of Number of Orders	25
4.3	Environmental Assessment on Study Site	25
4.4	Canopy Closure between Agricultural Habitats	27
4.4.1	Post hoc Tukey-test of Canopy Closure	28
4.5	Light Intensity between Agricultural Habitats	29
4.5.1	Post hoc Tukey-test of Light Intensity	29
4.6	Relative Humidity between Agricultural Habitats	30
4.6.1	Post hoc Tukey-test of Relative Humidity	31
4.7	Tree Abundance between Agricultural Habitats	32
4.7.1	Post hoc Tukey-test of Tree Abundance	32
4.8	Tree Height between Agricultural Habitats	33
4.8.1	Post hoc Tukey-test of Tree Height	34
4.9	Undergrowth Coverage between Agricultural Habitats	35
4.9.1	Post hoc Tukey-test of Undergrowth Coverage	35
4.10	Undergrowth Height between Agricultural Habitats	36
4.10.1	Post hoc Tukey-test of Undergrowth Height	37
4.11	Temperature between Agricultural Habitats	38
4.11.1	Post hoc Tukey-test of Temperature	38
4.12	Most common Abundance of Number of Order of Arthropod	39
4.12.1	Orthoptera Abundance	39
4.12.1.1	Post hoc Tukey-test of Orthoptera Abundance	40
4.12.2	Araneae Abundance	41
4.12.2.1	Post hoc Tukey-test of Araneae Abundance	41
4.12.3	Diptera Abundance	42
4.12.3.1	Post hoc Tukey-test of Diptera Abundance	43
4.12.4	Coleoptera Abundance	44
4.12.4.1	Post hoc Tukey-test of Coleoptera Abundance	44
4.12.5	Hymenoptera Abundance	45
4.12.5.1	Post hoc Tukey-test of Hymenoptera Abundance	46
5.	DISCUSSION	
5.0	Arthropod Abundance and Number of Orders between Monoculture and Polyculture Systems	47
5.1	Effect of Canopy Openness on Arthropod Abundance	48
5.2	Effect of Relative Humidity on Arthropod Abundance	49
5.3	Effect of Vegetation Structure on Arthropod Abundance	49
5.4	Effect of Temperature on Arthropod Abundance	50

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
6.0 Conclusion	51
6.1 Recommendations	51
REFERENCES	53
APPENDICES	
Appendix A	58
Appendix B	61
Appendix C	63



LIST OF TABLES

TABLES	PAGES
4.0 Arthropod abundance and number of orders for terrestrial arthropod between agricultural habitats	20
4.1 Arthropod order recorded throughout the study with relation to habitat	21
4.2 Analysis of variance for arthropod abundance between agricultural habitats	22
4.3 Post hoc Tukey-test for arthropod abundance between agricultural habitats	22
4.4 Analysis of variance for number of arthropod orders between agricultural habitats	24
4.5 Post hoc Tukey-test for number of arthropod orders between agricultural habitats	24
4.6 Summary statistics of environmental assessment in orchard	26
4.7 Summary statistics of environmental assessment in rubber plantation	26
4.8 Summary statistics of environmental assessment in oil palm plantation	27
4.9 Analysis of variance for canopy openness between agricultural habitats	27
4.10 Post hoc Tukey-test for canopy openness between agricultural habitats	28
4.11 Analysis of variance for light intensity between agricultural habitats	29
4.12 Post hoc Tukey-test for light intensity between agricultural habitats	29
4.13 Analysis of variance for relative humidity between agricultural habitats	30
4.14 Post hoc Tukey-test for relative humidity between agricultural habitats	31
4.15 Analysis of variance for tree abundance between agricultural habitats	32
4.16 Post hoc Tukey-test for tree abundance between agricultural habitats	32
4.17 Analysis of variance for tree height between agricultural habitats	33
4.18 Post hoc Tukey-test for tree height between agricultural habitats	34
4.19 Analysis of variance for undergrowth coverage between agricultural habitats	35

4.20	Post hoc Tukey-test for undergrowth coverage between agricultural habitats	35
4.21	Analysis of variance for undergrowth height between agricultural habitats	36
4.22	Post hoc Tukey-test for undergrowth height between agricultural habitats	37
4.23	Analysis of variance for temperature between agricultural habitats	38
4.24	Post hoc Tukey-test for temperature between agricultural habitats	38
4.25	Analysis of variance for Orthoptera abundance	39
4.26	Post hoc Tukey-test for Orthoptera abundance	40
4.27	Analysis of variance for Araneae abundance	41
4.28	Post hoc Tukey-test for Araneae abundance	41
4.29	Analysis of variance for Diptera abundance	42
4.30	Post hoc Tukey-test for Diptera abundance	43
4.31	Analysis of variance for Coleoptera abundance	44
4.32	Post hoc Tukey-test for Coleoptera abundance	44
4.33	Analysis of variance for Hymenoptera abundance	45
4.34	Post hoc Tukey-test for Hymenoptera abundance	46

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURES	PAGES
3.0 Map of Kampung Ulu Sepri and Kampung Empang Batu	15
3.1 The location of different agricultural habitats	16
3.2 Data collection of 15 sampling point in each agricultural habitat	17
3.3 Data collection of 15 sampling point in each agricultural habitat	17
3.4 Illustration of the sampling points with distance between each point was 100 m	18
4.0 Box plot of arthropod abundance in different agricultural habitat	23
4.1 Box plot of number of arthropod orders in different agricultural habitat	25
4.2 Box plot of canopy openness in different agricultural habitat	28
4.3 Box plot of light intensity in different agricultural habitat	30
4.4 Box plot of relative humidity in different agricultural habitat	31
4.5 Box plot of tree abundance in different agricultural habitat	33
4.6 Box plot of tree height in different agricultural habitat	34
4.7 Box plot of undergrowth coverage in different agricultural habitat	36
4.8 Box plot of undergrowth height in different agricultural habitat	37
4.9 Box plot of temperature in different agricultural habitat	39
4.10 Box plot of Orthoptera abundance in different agricultural habitat	40
4.11 Box plot of Araneae abundance in different agricultural habitat	42
4.12 Box plot of Diptera abundance in different agricultural habitat	43
4.13 Box plot of Coleoptera abundance in different agricultural habitat	45
4.14 Box plot of Hymenoptera abundance in different agricultural habitat	46

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
HSD	Honestly Significant Difference
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background of Study

The Global Forest Resources Assessment (2015) stated that deforestation has decreased and afforestation has expanded in 1990-2015 (Sloan & Sayer, 2015). Nonetheless, forest lost at a global scale reach 13 million hectares annually (FAO, 2010a) with 200 km² each day (IUCN, 2015). The major cause of tropical deforestation is mainly due to forest conversion into agriculture land. In Malaysia, agriculture was divided into two categories which are food crops (vegetables, fruit and grain crops) and industrial crops (oil palm, rubber, tea) (Ng, 2016).

In major oil palm producing countries forest conversion is estimated to cover 270000 ha from 2000-2011 (Vijay et al., 2016). Conversion of oil palm is one of the major factors causing biodiversity declining. However, agricultural management and practices can be improved to ensure biodiversity conservation. For example, the forested habitats in tropical landscapes represents coffee agroforestry shaded by a diversity of natural or planted trees. Diversity of trees supports a high variety of birds, including species that depend on closed canopies and endangered migratory birds by shaded of coffee, which can be found in coffee plantations in higher densities than in natural forest (Tscharntke et al., 2005).

Earlier studies have shown that the local biodiversity decreases due to intensification of agricultural management as seen in monoculture systems (Bengtsson et al., 2005). The post war transformation of traditional to modern causes main biodiversity losses and then, declining of biodiversity may affect ecosystem functioning and yield (Russell 1989; Daily 1997). The intensification of agricultural practices and simplification of agroecosystem may affect significant ecological services via the loss of biodiversity (Tscharntke et al., 2005). This can be seen by crop production, pest control, pollination and decomposition processes (Daily 1997; Altieri 1999; Schläpfer et al. 1999; Tilman et al. 2002; Wilby & Thomas 2002). The potential for disservices from agriculture also affect management practices, including loss of habitat for preserving biodiversity, nutrient runoff, sedimentation of waterways, and pesticide poisoning of humans and non-target species (Zhang et al. 2007). In effort to accomplish environmentally sustainable, ecological intensification has been promoted to buildup ecosystem functions that regulate and support production (Pywell et al., 2015). The ecosystem functioning was influenced by the functional characteristics of species such as their traits directly by mediating changes in biotic controls and indirectly through responses to changes in local environment (Wood et al., 2015).

Tropical forest is well known for its diverse insect colonies. Insects dominate the food web of these forests from terrestrial to aquatic ecosystem. The threat to tropical ecosystem is well expressed because of forest degradation and land conversion to agriculture lead to population decline of tropical insects (Lowe et

al., 2005). Insects consist of the most diverse and successful group of multicellular organisms on the planet, and they commit significantly to vital ecological functions such as pollination, pest control, decomposition, and maintenance of wildlife species (Losey & Vaughan, 2006).

In agricultural land, habitat heterogeneity is lower compared to forest area, but agricultural land still supports few insect communities for food resources and pollination. Arthropods can become a crucial ecological indicator to measure biodiversity friendly practices in agricultural landscapes such as ants and bee (Hymenoptera), beetles (Coleoptera), spiders (Araneae) and true bugs (Heteroptera) species (Hendrickx et al., 2007). The ecological processes on local environment influence local species diversity and also affect with land-use intensity (Tscharntke et al., 2005).

1.1 Problem Statement

Natural forest area has been converted into agricultural lands which lead to arthropod biodiversity loss (Ewers et al., 2009). Arthropods provide ecosystem services such as pollination, natural predator and decomposer. Deforestation and unsustainable agriculture negatively affect ecosystem services provisioned by arthropods. Assessment effort to investigate the effect of land used changes on arthropod biodiversity is still lacking. Arthropods community can become a significant ecological indicator to promote agricultural management and practices that can support biodiversity conservation.

1.2 Justification

Arthropods represent an ideal model organism to determine agricultural system that is biodiversity-friendly. Complex habitats such as polyculture system such as fruit orchard, may have more niches and diverse environmental resources compared to monoculture system (Bazzaz, 1975). Thus, this can increase species diversity and habitat heterogeneity in polyculture system due to complex vegetation structure. However, different monoculture plantations such as rubber and oil palm plantations may support different arthropod communities. This study will provide more information about arthropod community between monoculture and polyculture systems.

1.3 Research Objectives

This study set out to determine arthropod abundance at three different agriculture habitats. The specific objective was to compare the number of arthropod orders between monoculture (oil palm and rubber plantations) and polyculture (fruit orchard) systems.

1.4 Research Questions

The present study asks the following questions; (i) Is there any differences in abundance of arthropod between monoculture crop plantations and agroforestry farms (ii) Is there any differences in vegetation structure between monoculture crop plantations and agroforestry farms.



References

- Andersen, A. N. (2018). Responses of ant communities to disturbance: five principles for understanding the disturbance dynamics of a globally dominant faunal group. *Animal Ecology*, 88(3), 350 - 362.
- Anderson, A., McCormack, S., Helden, A., Sheridan, H., Anne, K., & Purvis G. (2010). The potential of parasitoid hymenoptera as bioindicators of arthropod diversity in agricultural grasslands. *Applied Ecology*, 48(2), 382 - 390.
- Ashraf, M., Zulkifli, R., Sanusi, R., Tohiran, K. A., Terhem, R., Moslim, R., Norhisham, A. A., Ashton, A., & Azhar, B. (2018). Alley-cropping system can boost arthropod biodiversity and ecosystem functions in oil palm plantations. *Agriculture, Ecosystem & Environment*, 260, 19 - 26.
- Bruning, L. Z., Krieger, M., Pelayo, E., Eisenhauer, N., Pinilla, M. P. R., Reu, B., & Ernst, R. (2018). Land-use heterogeneity by small-scale agriculture promotes amphibian diversity in montane agroforestry systems of northeast Colombia. *Agriculture, Ecosystem & Environment*, 264, 15 - 23.
- Brussaard, L. (1997). Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning in Soil. *Ambio*, 26(8), 563 - 570.
- Bruyn, L. A. (1999). Ants as bioindicators of soil function in rural environments. *Agriculture, Ecosystem & Environment*, 74, 425 - 441.
- Casimiro, M. S., Sansevero, J. B., & Queiroz, J. M. (2019). What can ants tell us about ecological restoration? a global meta-analysis. *Ecological Indicator*, 102, 593 - 598.
- Classen, A., Peters, MK., Ferger, SW., Helbiq-Bonitz, M., Schmack, JM., Maassen, G., Schluening, M., Kalko, EK., Bohning-Gaese, K., & Steffan-Dewenter, I. (2014). Complementary ecosystem services provided by pest predators and pollinators increase quantity and quality of coffee yields. *Biological Sciences*, 281(1997), 1 - 7.
- Daily, G. C. (1997). Nature's services: social dependence on natural ecosystems. *Animal Conservation*, 1(1), 75 - 76.
- Dattilo, W., & Dyer, L. (2014). Canopy openness enhances diversity of ant-plant interactions in the brazilian amazon rain forest. *Biotropica*, 46(6), 712 - 719.
- Duelli, P. & Obrist, M. K. (2003). Biodiversity indicators: the choice of values and measures. *Agriculture, Ecosystem & Environment*, 98(1-3), 87 - 98.
- Fisher, J. & Lindenmayer, D. B. (2007). Landscape modification and habitat fragmentation: a synthesis. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 16(3), 265 - 280.

- Ganser, D., Denmead, L. H., Clough Y., Buchori, D., & Tscharntke T. (2016). Local and landscape drivers of arthropod diversity and decomposition processes in oil palm leaf. *Agricultural and Forest Entomology*, 19 (1), 60 - 69.
- Gardner, T. A., Barlow, J., Chazdon, R., Ewers, R. M., Harvey C. A., Peres, C. A., & Sodhi, N. S. (2009). Prospects for tropical forest biodiversity in a human-modified world. *Ecology Letter*, 12(6), 561 - 582.
- Ghazali, A., Asmah, S., Syafiq, M., Yahya, M. S., Aziz, N., Peng, T. L., Norhisham, A. R., Puan, C. L., Turner, E. C., & Azhar, B. (2016). Effects of monoculture and polyculture farming in oil palm smallholdings on terrestrial arthropod diversity. *Asia-Pacific Entomology*, 19(2), 415 - 421.
- Gurr, G. M., Wratten, S. D., Landis, D. A., & You, M. (2017). Habitat management to suppress pest populations: progress and prospects. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 62, 91 - 109.
- Hendrickx, F., Maelfait, J.-P., Wingerden, W. V., Schweiger, O., Speelmans, M., Aviron, S., Augenstein, I., & Billeter, R. (2007). How landscape structure, land-use intensity and habitat diversity affect components of total arthropod diversity in agricultural landscapes. *Applied Ecology*, 44(2), 340 - 351.
- Hill, J. K., Gray, M. G., Khen, C. V., Benedick, S., Tawatao, N., & Hamer, K. C. (2011). Ecological impacts of tropical forest fragmentation: how consistent are patterns in species richness and nestedness?. *Biological Sciences*, 366(1582), 3265 - 3276.
- Isaacs, R., Tuell, J., Fiedler, A., Gardiner, M., & Landis, D. (2008). Maximizing arthropod-mediated ecosystem services in agricultural landscapes: the role of native plants. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 7(4), 196 - 203.
- Kerfahi, D., Tripathi, B. M., Dong, K., Go, R., & Adams, J. M. (2016). Rainforest conversion to rubber plantation may not result in lower soil diversity of bacteria, fungi, and nematodes. *Microbial Ecology*, 72(2), 359 - 371.
- Koh, L. P. & Wilcove, D. S. (2008). Is oil palm agriculture really destroying tropical biodiversity?. *Conservation Letters*, 1(2), 60 - 64.
- Kremen, C., Colwell, R. K., Erwin, T. L., Murphy, D. D., Noss, R. F., & Sanjayan, M. A. (1993). Terrestrial arthropod assemblages: their use in conservation planning. *Conservation Biology*, 7(4), 796 - 808.
- Kremen, C., & Miles, A. (2012). Ecosystem services in biologically diversified versus conventional farming systems: benefits, externalities, and trade-offs. *Ecology and Society*, 17, 1 - 25.
- Lam, M. K., Tan, K. T., Lee, K. T., & Mohamed, A. R. (2009). Malaysian palm oil: surviving the food versus fuel dispute for a sustainable future. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 13(6-7), 1456 - 1464.

Lichtenberg, E. M., Kennedy, C. M., Kremen, C., Batary, P., Berendse F., Bommarco, R., Bosque-Perez, N. A., Carvalheiro, L. G., & Snyder, W. E. (2017). A Global Synthesis of The Effects of Diversified Farming Systems on Arthropod Diversity Within Fields and Across Agricultural Landscapes. *Global Change Biology*, 23(11), 4946 - 4957.

Liu, W., Wu, Y., DuBay, S. G., Zhao, C., Wang, B., & Ran, J. (2019). Dung-associated arthropods influence foraging ecology and habitat selection in black-necked cranes (*grus nigricollis*) on the qinghai–tibet plateau. *Ecology and Evolution*, 9(4), 2096 - 2105.

Losey, J. E. & Vaughan M. (2006). The economic value of ecological services provided by insects. *BioScience*, 56(4), 311 - 323.

Lowe, A. J., Boshier, D., Ward, M., Bacles, C. F. E., & Navarro, C. (2005). Genetic resource impacts of habitat loss and degradation; reconciling empirical evidence and predicted theory for neotropical trees. *Heridity*, 95(4), 255 - 273.

Magintan, D., Nor, S. M., Ean, T. P., Lencher, A. M., & Azhar, B. (2017). The conservation value of unlogged and logged forests for native mammals on the east coast of peninsular malaysia. *Nature Conservation*, 40, 113 - 119.

Mashavakure, N., Mashingaidze, A. B., Musundire, R., Nhamo, N., Gandiwa, E., Thierfelder, C., & Muposhi, V. K. (2019). Soil dwelling beetle community response to tillage, fertilizer and weeding intensity in a sub-humid environment in Zimbabwe. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 135, 120 - 128.

Masika, F. B., Masanza, M., Aluana, G., Barrigossi, J. A. F., & Kizito, E. B. (2017). Abundance, distribution and effects of temperature and humidity on arthropod fauna in different rice ecosystems in Uganda. *Entomology and Zoology Studies*, 5(5), 964 - 973.

Meng, L. Z., Martin, K., Weigel, A., & Liu, J. X. (2012). Impact of rubber plantation on carabid beetle communities and species distribution in a changing tropical landscape (southern Yunnan, China). *Insect Conservation*, 16(3), 423 - 432.

Morrison, L. W., Smith, D. R., Young, C., & Nichols, D. W. (2008). Evaluating sampling designs by computer simulation: a case study with the missouri bladderpod. *Population Ecology*, 50(4), 417 - 425.

Ng, C. (2016). What it means to be a farming smallholder in Malaysia. *Agriculture Science*, 2, 40 - 48.

Oliver, T. H., Isaac, N. J. B., August, T. A., Woodcock, B. A., Roy, D. B., & Bullock, J. M. (2015). Declining resilience of ecosystem functions under biodiversity loss. *Nature Communications*, 6, 10122.

- Philpott, S. M., & Armbrrecht, I. (2006). Biodiversity in tropical agroforests and the ecological role of ants and ant diversity in predatory function. *Ecological Entomology*, 31(4), 369 - 377.
- Power, A. G. (2010). Ecosystem services and agriculture: tradeoffs and synergies. *Biological Science*, 365(1554), 2959 - 2971.
- Pryke, J. S., & Samways, M. J. (2012). Ecological networks act as extensions of protected areas for arthropod biodiversity conservation. *Applied Ecology*, 49(3), 591 - 600.
- Pywell, R. F., Heard, M. S., Woodcock, B. A., Hinsley, S., Ridding, L., Nowakowski, M., & Bullock, J. M. (2015). Wildlife-friendly farming increases crop yield: evidence for ecological intensification. *Biological Science*, 282(1816), 1 - 8.
- Rajeswaran, J., Duraimurugan, P., and Shanmugam, P. S. (2005). Role of Spiders in Agriculture and Horticulture Ecosystem. *Food, Agriculture and Environment*, 3(3 & 4), 147-152.
- Russell, E. P. (1989). Enemies hypothesis: a review of the effect of vegetational diversity on predatory insects and parasitoids. *Environmental Entomology*, 18, 590 – 599.
- Schowalter, T. (2017). Arthropod diversity and functional importance in old-growth forests of North America. *Forests*, 8(97), 1 - 17.
- Sloan, S., & Sayer, J. (2015). Forest resources assessment of 2015 shows positive global trends but forest loss and degradation persist in poor tropical countries. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 352, 134 - 145.
- Sipos, J., Drozdova, M., & Drozd, P. (2012). Effect of canopy openness on the pressure of predatory arthropods and birds on epigeic insects. *Central European Journal of Biology*, 7(6), 1021 - 1029.
- Spulerova, J., Piscova, V., Gerhatova, K., Baca, A., Kalivoda, H., & Kanka, R. (2015). Orchards as traces of traditional agricultural landscape in Slovakia. *Agriculture, Ecosystem & Environment*, 199, 67 - 76.
- Tews, J., Brose, U., Grimm, V., Tielborger, K., Wichmann, M. C., Schwager, M., & Jeltsch, F. (2003). Animal species diversity driven by habitat heterogeneity/diversity: the importance of keystone structures. *Biogeography*, 31(1), 79 - 92.
- Thomas, E. W., Dolman, P. M., & Edwards, D. P. (2015). Increasing demand for natural rubber necessitates a robust sustainability initiative to mitigate impacts on tropical biodiversity. *Conservation Letters*, 8(4), 230 - 241.

Tscharntke, T., Klein, A. M., Kruess, A., Dewenter, I. S., & Thies, C. (2005). Landscape perspectives on agricultural intensification and biodiversity – ecosystem service management. *Ecology Letters*, 8(8), 857 - 874.

Underwood, E. C. & Fisher, B. L. (2006). The role of ants in conservation monitoring: if, when, and how. *Biological Conservation*, 132(2), 166 - 182.

Vijay, V., Pimm, S. L., Jenkins, C. N., & Smith, S. J. (2016). The impacts of oil palm on recent deforestation and biodiversity loss.

Wood, S. A., Karp, D. S., DeClerck, F., Kremen, C., Naeem, S. and Palm, C. A. (2015). Functional traits in agriculture: agrobiodiversity and ecosystem services. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 30(9), 531 - 539.

Zangerl, A. R., Miresmailli, S., Nabity, P., Lawrance, A., Yahanan, A., Mitchell, C. A., Anderson-Teixeira, K. T., David, M. B., Berenbaum, M. R., and DeLucia, E. H. (2013). Role of arthropod communities in bioenergy crop litter decomposition. *Insect Science*, 20, 671 - 678.