

1 RESEARCH ARTICLE

2 **Co-existence between Javan slow lorises (*Nycticebus javanicus*) and humans**
3 **in a dynamic agroforestry landscape in West Java, Indonesia**

4

5 K.A.I. Nekaris^{1,2*}, S. Poindexter¹, K. D. Reinhardt¹, M. Sigaud¹, F. Cabana¹, W. Wirdateti³, V.
6 Nijman^{1,2}

7 *1. Nocturnal Primate Research Group, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, United Kingdom*

8 *2. Oxford Wildlife Trade Research Group, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, United Kingdom*

9 *3. Zoological Division, Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Cibinong, Indonesia*

10

11 *For International Journal of Primatology*

12 Total word count 8022

13

14 ABSTRACT

15 In a world increasingly dominated by human demand for agricultural products, **we need to**
16 understand wildlife's ability to survive in agricultural environments. We studied the
17 interaction between humans and Javan slow lorises (*Nycticebus javanicus*) in Cipaganti, Java,
18 Indonesia. After its introduction in 2013, **chayote (*Sechium edule*), a gourd grown on**
19 **bamboo lattice frames**, became an important cash crop. **To evaluate people's use of this**
20 **crop and to measure the effect of this increase on slow loris behaviour, home ranges, and**
21 **sleep sites, we conducted interviews with local farmers and analysed the above variables in**
22 **relation to chayote expansion between 2011-2015.** Interviews with farmers in 2011, 2013
23 and 2015 confirm the importance of chayote and of bamboo and slow lorises in their
24 agricultural practises. In 2015 chayote frames covered 12% of **land in Cipaganti**, occupying
25 4% of slow loris home ranges, which marginally yet insignificantly increased in size with the
26 increase in chayote. Slow lorises are arboreal and the bamboo frames increased
27 connectivity within their ranges. Of **the** sleep sites we monitored from 2013-2016, 24 had
28 disappeared, and 201 continued to be used by the slow lorises and processed by local
29 people. The fast growth rate of bamboo, and the recognition of the value of bamboo by
30 farmers, allow persistence of slow loris sleep sites. Overall introduction of chayote did not
31 result in conflict between farmers and slow lorises, and once constructed the chayote
32 bamboo frames proved to be beneficial for slow lorises.

33 KEY WORDS: agroforestry, conservation, ethnozoology, chayote, *Sechium edule*, sleep site,
34 *Nycticebus javanicus*

35 INTRODUCTION

36 **Preservation of high quality forest habitats is vital for the conservation of** global biodiversity.
37 Yet, in a world increasingly dominated by humans with their ever-growing demands for
38 agricultural products, an understanding of wildlife's ability to survive and even thrive in
39 agricultural environments is increasingly important (Bhagwat et al. 2008; Estrada et al. 2012;
40 Stafford et al. 2016; **Estrada et al. 2017**). To meet this need, researchers have suggested
41 new approaches to study biodiversity, integrating agricultural matrices into conservation
42 planning for the preservation of rare species that also occur outside of pristine
43 environments (Meijaard and Sheil 2008; Cassano et al. 2014). Farming systems that are
44 intercropped by hedgerows or living fences of trees have often been regarded as vital
45 contributors to alleviation of fragmentation (Michel et al. 2006). In Europe, where
46 deforestation has been occurring for centuries, hedgerows are often the only habitat left for
47 wildlife (Gelling et al. 2007), and have thus been well studied in the context of mammalian
48 density, dispersal ability and behavioural ecology (Michel et al. 2007; Zhang and Usher
49 1991). Even for forest specialists, hedgerows have been shown to be important habitats,
50 making up parts of forest dwelling animals' home ranges and as dispersal vectors (Schlinkert
51 et al. 2016). For tropical mammals, such studies have lagged behind, but are now necessary
52 as **intact** habitats disappear at an alarming rate.

53 Researchers often study tropical mammals, including primates, in 'pristine' habitats,
54 **rather than in disturbed, modified or anthropogenic habitats**, with an idea that evolutionary
55 adaptations can only be studied in such contexts (Hockings et al. 2015). Increasingly,
56 however, the importance of anthropogenic habitats to primate ecology, conservation and
57 evolution are recognized (Asensio et al. 2009, Estrada et al. 2017). For some species,
58 agricultural landscapes may be beneficial not only to primates, but also to humans when
59 primates control pests, pollinate flowers, or simply live peaceably without damaging their
60 crops (Estrada 2006, Williams-Guillén et al. 2006). Although such interactions are not always
61 amicable, primates can show remarkable behavioural flexibility, including dietary and
62 habitat switching, and changes in polyspecific interactions (Tisovec 2014; Moore et al. 2010;
63 Morrogh-Bernard 2014; Nowak and Lee 2013), making the study of the long-term
64 sustainability of such systems important for primate conservation.

65 Agroforestry systems, areas in which trees or shrubs are grown around or among
66 crops or pastureland, are one type of landscape where humans and primates may come
67 together (Estrada et al. 2012). Considering mainly diurnal primates, Estrada et al. (2012)
68 defined a number of ways primates can be useful to these systems, benefits also offered by
69 a number of nocturnal primates. Researchers have recorded the pollination of agricultural
70 plants by nocturnal primates (Javan slow lorises *Nycticebus javanicus* in Java, greater slow
71 loris *N. coucang* in Malaysia) (Nekaris 2014; Wiens et al. 2006). Insect consumption, which is
72 also likely to include agricultural pests, has been observed in agroecosystems among Javan
73 slow loris in Java (Rode-Margono et al. 2015), Mysore slender loris (*Loris lydekkerianus*
74 *lydekkerianus*) in India (Nekaris and Rasmussen 2003; Kumara et al. 2016), Milne-Edward's
75 potto (*Perodicticus edwardsi*) in Cameroon (Pimley et al. 2006), and by Dian's tarsier (*Tarsius*
76 *dianae*) in Sulawesi (Merker et al. 2005).

77 Being able to survive in human-modified landscapes is not enough; a tolerance
78 between humans and primates must exist, in that humans do not trap primates for food or
79 pets, or harm them over conflicts for food resources (Lee 2010). Mantled howler monkeys
80 (*Alouatta palliata*) can feed and persist well in shade coffee plantations if left undisturbed
81 by humans, including capturing them for the pet trade (Williams-Guillén et al., 2006).
82 Additional management by humans may also be required, such as increasing connectivity
83 between planted trees to aid in travel or predator avoidance, such as was observed in
84 Brazil's cacao (*Theobroma cacao*) agroforests for Wied's marmosets (*Callithrix kuhlii*) and
85 golden-headed lion tamarins (*Leontopithecus chrysomelas*) (Tisovec et al. 2014). Several
86 macaque (*Macaca* spp) populations also can persist alongside humans, where being caught
87 for pets or for the biomedical industry is a looming threat (e.g. Shepherd 2010).

88 The island of Java, Indonesia, is one of the most densely populated areas on earth.
89 Java is largely deforested and most of the remaining 10% forest covers (parts of) the
90 numerous volcanoes on the island (Whitten et al. 1996). Forest has been replaced by a
91 mosaic of cities and villages, agricultural land, cash-crop plantations, and forest plantations
92 (e.g., teak *Tectona grandis*, Sumatran pine *Pinus merkusii*, rubber *Hevea brasiliensis*)
93 (Nijman 2013). About 17% of the agricultural land on Java consists of home gardens and
94 agroforest, whose forest-like structure more or less mimic natural forest (Whitten et al.
95 1996), thus greatly increasing connectivity for many species.

96 Javan slow lorises, nocturnal primates endemic to Java, are characterized by fully
97 arboreal slow climbing locomotion (Nekaris 2014). As such, one would expect them to be
98 particularly vulnerable to habitat fragmentation where movement on the ground is often a
99 requirement (c.f. Mortelliti et al. 2013; Vaughan et al. 2007). Slow lorises in general,
100 however, are adapted to life at forest edges where increased sunlight creates a dense
101 network of branches (Chivers 1980). Studies in the village of Cipaganti, Java, an agroforest
102 ecosystem with a particularly high density of this Critically Endangered primate, show that
103 slow lorises enter a sleep site at dawn, where they remain until dusk. As with most other
104 primates (Anderson 1998), slow lorises do not use nests but instead sleep on a branch or
105 tangle of branches, curled in a ball or huddled against group mates, within their chosen
106 sleeping tree (Nekaris 2003). Such sleep sites are generally dense and have been
107 hypothesised to protect them from extreme temperatures and predators (Nekaris 2014).
108 Being territorial, the sleep sites of a slow loris group (male-female pair and offspring) fall
109 exclusively within their own home range. Bamboo stands comprise 96% of sleep sites for
110 Javan slow lorises in Cipaganti, as well as substrates for feeding and avoiding ground
111 movement (Nekaris 2014). Bamboo stands are used (and re-used) as sleep sites daily by
112 slow lorises. Typically, 20 to 40 bamboo sleep sites are present in each slow loris' home
113 range (first author, unpubl. data).

114 Cipaganti is characterized by shifts in agriculture, with the types of crops grown
115 depending on local economic trends. For example in 2012, when tomatoes (*Solanum*
116 *lycopersicum*) were economically valuable, farmers heavily planted this crop. Similarly, in
117 2013, farmers began growing a gourd, chayote (*Sechium edule*), and by 2015 it became the
118 crop of choice. Chayote, locally known as *labu*, relies on a network of bamboo frames in
119 order to grow (Fig. 1). These frames are erected at ~1.6 m in height and can be up to 1 ha in
120 size, and cover what would have been open ground with a network of chayote vines
121 growing on the frames. Due to the increasing interest by farmers in planting chayote, we
122 noted an accelerated rate of cutting of bamboo, possibly impeding on the survival of the
123 Javan slow lorises. Here, we examine the impact of this new agricultural development on
124 the behaviour of slow lorises by addressing five questions. (1) Did farmers' perceptions of
125 slow lorises, slow lorises perceived roles as consumer of agricultural pests and the
126 importance of chayote to farmers change over the study period? We assessed this through

127 informal interviews with farmers over the period 2011-2015. (2) Did the amount of land
128 planted with chayote change, and did chayote frames make up a significant proportion of
129 slow loris home ranges? **We assessed** this by measuring the proportion of land allocated to
130 growing chayote in 2014 and 2015, as well as measuring the proportion of the slow loris
131 home range comprised of chayote, also for 2014 and 2015. (3) Did slow loris home range
132 sizes change or move position? **We assessed this** for 2014 and 2015 through direct
133 observations. (4) How did slow lorises behave in and around chayote frames? **We assessed**
134 **this** through behavioural observations in 2012 through 2016. (5) Did cutting bamboo for
135 chayote affect availability of slow loris bamboo sleep sites? **We assessed this** in 2016 by
136 measuring the presence and intactness of bamboo sleep sites at differing altitudes that had
137 been used in the period 2013 to 2015.

138

139 METHODS

140 *Ethical Note*

141 We conducted all animal research in adherence with RISTEK (Indonesian Ministry of Science
142 and Technology), as well as ethical guidelines provided by the Association for the Study of
143 Animal Behaviour; Oxford Brookes University Animal Ethics Sub-committee **granted our**
144 **research approval**. For the interviews we followed the ethical guidelines proposed by the
145 Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth and that the University
146 Research Ethics Committee of Oxford Brookes University **approved**.

147 *Study site and its changing farming practices*

148 This study forms part of a long-term community conservation project to protect Asia's slow
149 lorises and other imperilled nocturnal animals via ecology, education, and empowerment
150 (Nekaris 2016). We conducted the study in an area of ~60 ha at the outskirts of the village of
151 Cipaganti, Cisurupan, Garut Regency, West Java, Indonesia (7°16'44.30 "S, 107°46'7.80 "E,
152 1200 m asl) (Fig. 2). Cipaganti is home to about 3,000 people, living at a density of 135
153 people km⁻² (Nekaris 2016). The village is located at 1,345 m asl on Gunung Puntang, a
154 mountain that is a part of the Java-Bali Montane Rain Forests ecoregion. The climate is
155 everwet with a mean annual precipitation exceeding 2,500 mm. The habitat around

156 Cipaganti is a mosaic of traditional gardens, where local farmers practice an annual
157 perennial rotating crop system. This system consists of a variety of crop formations, with tall
158 trees planted in rows along farm property boundaries, or interspersed between crop types
159 (Reinhardt et al., 2016). In our study site, **slow lorises heavily** use certain plants including
160 string bamboo (*Gigantochloa atter*), clumping bamboo (*G. pseudoarundinacea*), giant
161 bamboo (*Dendrocalamus asper*), cajeput tree (*Malaleuca leucadendra*), red fairy duster
162 (*Calliandra calothyrsus*), green wattle (*Acacia decurrens*), avocado (*Persea americana*) and
163 Indonesian mahogany (*Toona sureni*) (Rode-Margono et al. 2014). Within the village of
164 Cipaganti, agricultural production provides the main source of household income, yielding
165 crops such as tea (*Camellia sinensis*), coffee (*Coffea robusta*), chayote (*Sechium edule*),
166 carrot (*Daucus carota*), white cabbage (*Pieris brassicae*), tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*),
167 cassava (*Manihot esculenta*) and potato (*Solanum tuberosum*).

168
169 Chayote is a medium- to high-altitude crop (300 to 2,000 m asl) that requires a high relative
170 humidity of around 80 to 85%, high annual precipitation of at least 1,500 without a marked
171 dry season, and 12 hours of daylight to initiate flowering. The temperature should be
172 between 13 and 21°C; temperatures below 13°C damage small and unripe fruits whereas
173 temperature above 28°C leads to excessive growth, loss of flowers and unripe fruit, and
174 ultimately reduced production (Saade 1996). **Cipaganti matches these conditions** extremely
175 well. The Garut Regency in which Cipaganti is situated is an important grower of chayote,
176 both in absolute and relative terms, and the area set aside for growing the crop in Garut has
177 increased from 188 ha in 2012 (22% of the provincial total) to 360 ha in 2015 (33% of the
178 provincial total). Production in 2015 was 14,499 t a year (c.f. Morton 1981). If both the
179 official government figures and the estimates from the farmers in Cipaganti are correct then
180 the wider Cipaganti area (which stretches beyond our study area) is responsible for some
181 60% of the regency's chayote production, suggesting that this crop will at least be around
182 for the foreseeable future with a continuing impact on slow lorises.

183

184 *Interviews with Informants*

185 In June 2011, June 2013, December 2015 and June 2016 we held informal interviews
186 (Newing 2011) with opportunistically selected key informants **with farms** situated within the
187 home ranges of collared slow lorises (six informants in 2011, 16 in 2013, and 17 in 2015).
188 Most informants lived in the village and were long-time residents (and typically born here or
189 had moved into the area during childhood); in addition **we interviewed** five informants from
190 neighbouring villages. In 2011 and 2013 the conversations focussed on the importance of
191 slow lorises to the village, both from a cultural, natural and economic perspective. Given
192 that chayote was not of particular importance at that time, **farmers did not single** out this
193 crop but discussed it in the context of general agricultural crops. In 2015 the topic of
194 discussion was similar to that in 2011 and 2013 but now much of it centred on chayote;
195 given the dominant role of chayote in the agricultural landscape and the village economy,
196 **informants initiated discussions on this topic.**

197 **We held** informal interviews in Bahasa Indonesia, the national language that is very
198 widely spoken on Java (Sneddon 2004), **repeating** key concepts in Bahasa Sunda, the
199 regional language spoken in this part of the island. Informal interviews were open, allowing
200 informants to talk freely about slow lorises, their significance in culture or the beliefs
201 surrounding them, and their role in the agricultural system. To ensure independence of
202 data, we interviewed informants individually; other members of the community sometimes
203 were present, but we used only the responses of the informant in analysis. At the end of
204 each interview, we repeated key points to ascertain whether we captured the essence of
205 the informant's opinions/expressions correctly. Informants did not receive gifts or money
206 for their participation.

207 We asked informants to share any knowledge they had of slow lorises, touching
208 upon any topic they felt to be relevant, without any constraint placed upon them by us
209 (Bernard 2011; Puri 2011). We converted these conversations into freelists, from which we
210 extracted the frequency of occurrence for each item (i.e. what proportion of informants
211 mentioned topics such as 'slow lorises are useful for pest control', 'bamboo', or 'chayote')
212 and the rank for each item (i.e. were they mentioned early on or at the very end of the
213 interview, on a scale from 1 to 4) (Puri 2011). This procedure allowed us to check whether
214 these topics were locally salient or meaningful. Salience was quantified by calculating
215 Smith's S ($S = ((L - R_j + 1)/L)/N$, where L is the number of distinct items listed by the

216 informants, R_j is the rank of item J in the list, and N is the number of lists / informants in the
217 sample). Smith's S ranges from 0 to 1, with topics having values close to 1 being the ones
218 that were mentioned by most informants early on in the conversation, and topics having
219 values close to 0 being the ones that **few informants** mentioned, and if so often late in the
220 conversation (Puri 2011).

221 *Slow loris behavioural observations*

222 To examine the presence of chayote in slow loris home ranges, we surveyed the study site
223 to locate each chayote frame, measuring their perimeters and monitoring change in their
224 presence from January 2014 to May 2015. To examine the behaviour of slow lorises in
225 relation to chayote frames, we analysed behavioural data collected on collared slow lorises
226 from the first time **we saw them** enter a chayote frame in June 2014 until June 2016.
227 Because Javan slow lorises live in stable uni-male uni-female pairs with almost 100% range
228 overlap and share sleep sites (Nekaris 2014), we examined the impact of chayote frames on
229 social groups rather than individuals. We focus on adult individuals belonging to eight focal
230 uni-male uni-female social pairs (Table 1). After catching the slow lorises by hand, we
231 equipped them with 19 g VHF collars (PIP3, Biotrack, Wareham, United Kingdom). With the
232 assistance of local field trackers, we located collared individuals using an antenna (Lintec
233 flexible, Biotrack, Wareham, United Kingdom) and a receiver (Sika receiver, Biotrack,
234 Wareham, United Kingdom), and recorded their location every 15 minutes using a handheld
235 GPS unit (GPS62s, Garmin International, Olathe, USA). For direct observations we used head
236 torches (HL17 super spot, Clulite, Petersfield, UK) fitted with a red filter. To observe the
237 behaviour of slow lorises in chayote, we followed slow lorises for 3199 hours **between**
238 17:00-05:00 hrs, **from** January 2014 to December 2015 **(a mean of 13 ± 7 nights per month)**.
239 We used all occurrences sampling to record each instance one of the 16 focal lorises
240 entered chayote using a modified version of the Rode-Margono et al. (2014) behavioural
241 ethogram. Chayote frames are very dense and often when slow lorises enter these frames
242 they are out of sight until they re-emerge into a tree or bamboo. To see if slow lorises
243 altered their home range use between 2014-2015, we computed the home ranges of the
244 eight focal pairs based on 5851 locations using the 95% minimum convex polygon (MCP).
245 We performed all GIS work using R (R 3.0.2, adehabitatHR package) (R Core Team 2013).

246 *Sleep sites*

247 We defined a bamboo sleep site as the stand of bamboo in which a slow loris social group
248 slept. A single stand can contain over 100 stems or culms of bamboo. **During** one sleeping
249 period, slow lorises sometimes move from one stem to another, making the stand the unit
250 of analysis. We recorded location of bamboo sleep sites of the eight focal pairs of slow
251 lorises once per week from **January** 2013 (before the appearance of intensive chayote) to
252 **December** 2015, georeferencing each site using a handheld GPS unit. To measure sleep site
253 reuse we plotted the points collected during 2013, 2014, and 2015 in ArcGIS version 10.3.
254 We created a 5 m buffer around each point to account for standard GPS error in the area,
255 and then counted each point within overlapping buffers as a single reused sleep site. In
256 June 2016, we returned to the locations of 225 unique bamboo sleep sites; each site
257 revisited fell only in the range of one social pair. In particular, we examined: if the bamboo
258 sleep site still stood in 2016; if yes, had it been cut, including number of whole and cut
259 stems remaining and the number of newly sprouting stems; if no, we recorded what was
260 there instead of the bamboo.

261 *Statistical analysis*

262 **Behavioural, sleep site and ranging data** did not deviate significantly from a normal
263 distribution. To investigate the influence of the chayote production on slow loris, we tested
264 whether the percentage of chayote frame could explain observed variation in individual
265 home range size. We fitted a **multiple linear regression** to the data, with the percentage of
266 chayote frame within a home range and the year as **the explanatory** variables. We
267 conducted the analyses in R. We present descriptive statistics of the characteristics of
268 bamboo sleep sites, reporting the mean and ± 1 standard deviation, with P set at the 0.05
269 level.

270 RESULTS

271 *Farmers' perceptions of slow lorises, pests and crops*

272 In 2011 one out of six informants indicated that slow lorises were allies to farmers as they
273 consumed pest insects, but **they** mentioned **this concept** only late in the conversation. In
274 2013 many more informants (13/16) were aware that slow lorises consumed agricultural

275 pests and they brought up this topic earlier on in the conversation. The situation was similar
276 in 2015 when 15/17 informants mentioned it. Quantitatively, salience, as measured by
277 Smith's *S* of 'slow lorises and pest control' started at a low 0.04 in 2011, and then increased
278 to 0.69 in 2013 and 0.72 in 2015.

279 The knowledge of the importance of bamboo for slow lorises was high in 2011, with
280 five out of six informants mentioning it. This knowledge remained high in 2013 (14/16) and
281 2015 (13/17), with some informants mentioning it early on in the conversation and others
282 later on. Quantitatively, Smith's *S* of 'slow lorises and bamboo' was 0.54 in 2011, 0.49 in
283 2013 and 0.53 in 2015. Chayote as a crop was not significant enough for the informants to
284 mention it in 2011 and 2013. In 2015, all informants mentioned chayote as a crop, two-
285 thirds early on. As such salience of chayote was zero in 2011 and 2013 but Smith's *S*
286 equalled 0.83 in 2015, surpassing that of all the other topics they discussed.

287 The importance of chayote as a crop led farmers we interviewed to claim that
288 chayote was probably the most important cash crop in the area by December 2015. It then
289 had a market value of Rp 5000-6000 (US\$0.35-0.42) per kg. On average five trucks of
290 differing sizes collected chayote daily, with a capacity to carry four to seven metric tonnes
291 per truck. Informants estimated that some 25 t of chayote was produced a day in the wider
292 Cipaganti area, which is larger than the area where we study the slow lorises. While initially
293 chayote farmers organised their business independently, by early 2016 a chayote-growing
294 cooperation was started where 50 of the largest chayote farmers joined forces to share
295 costs, logistics, knowledge and profits.

296 To create a chayote frame, which in our study area on measures a mean of 1500 m²,
297 or 0.15 ha, 150 bamboo stems of approximately 2 m tall are required for the main vertical
298 supports and 120 lengths of bamboo measuring 6 m each are needed for the main
299 horizontal supports. Farmers we interviewed reported that up to 30% of the poles need to
300 be replaced every six months, a cost that must be considered when investing in chayote.
301 Three species of bamboo occur frequently in Java, but differ in price according to our
302 interviews, including string bamboo at Rp 5000 (US\$0.35) per stem; giant bamboo at Rp
303 9000 (US\$0.64) per stem; and clumping bamboo at Rp 20,000 (US\$1.41) per stem. At the
304 beginning of the chayote boom our interviewees reported that they sourced most, if not all,

305 this bamboo locally but by 2015 farmers ordered truckloads of bamboo from the north
306 coast of Central Java (i.e., some 250 km to the east) to meet their demands. Some farmers
307 in our area used more durable concrete poles instead of bamboo ones as a longer-term
308 option, but these are far more costly at Rp 30,000 (US\$2.12) for a 2 m length of pole. Using
309 mean figures, the initial investment for a bamboo chayote frame, with labour costs, and
310 plants amounts to some US\$500. After four months farmers can harvest the first fruits, and
311 from then on production is more or less continuous. With an annual yield of ~40 t per ha
312 (Morton 1981) the break-even point in terms of financial investment is reached well within
313 the first year.

314 *Chayote in the slow loris landscape*

315 Planting of chayote began in the study area in early 2014 with just a few small frames. By
316 July 2014, many farmers had planted chayote; we recorded 34 chayote frames
317 encompassing an area of 1.6 ha. The numbers increased, with an additional 58 frames
318 encompassing 2.5 ha planted by November 2014. By April 2015 we recorded 145 chayote
319 frames representing a total of 7.2 ha (i.e. 12% of the study area). This represents 2.7%
320 (range 0 -5.6 %) of the social pairs home ranges in 2014 and and 3.9 % (range 0 – 13.0%) in
321 2015 (Fig. 3).

322 In 2014, the mean slow loris home range size was 7.1 ha \pm 2.0. In 2015, the mean
323 was 6.6 ha \pm 1.2 (Table 1, Fig. 3). Over both years the mean was 7.5 ha \pm 1.1. Home range
324 size was not affected by the year or percentage of chayote frame ($F_{2,13} = 1.75, P = 0.21, n =$
325 16).

326

327 *Behaviour of slow lorises in chayote*

328 We first recorded use of chayote frames by two social pairs of slow lorises (LU, SI) in June
329 2014. By October 2014, we had also observed pairs SH and OE using the frames. By June
330 2015, we had recorded all social pairs regularly using chayote frames; the last pair to use the
331 frames was MA with the first record dating to January 2016. Slow lorises used the frames as
332 if they were a normal bamboo substrate, moving fluidly across the bamboo poles to reach

333 rows of trees on opposite ends of farmers' fields. Chayote frames are very dense and
334 difficult for a human observer to move under, and thus we could only record 211 all
335 occurrences sample points of slow loris behaviour in the chayote. Slow lorises used chayote
336 most frequently for travelling (68%), followed by foraging for or feeding on insects (22%),
337 allogrooming (6%), resting (2%), and other (2%). We could not identify insects to the species
338 level, but noted that slow lorises consumed flying insects that they caught with their hands
339 as well as those that they orally removed from the chayote frames.

340 *Slow loris sleep sites*

341 We recorded the social pairs in a bamboo sleep site a total of 1350 times, comprising 514
342 unique locations, 211 of which had been reused (2013, n=340 with 95 reused; 2014, n=444
343 with 53 reused; 2015, n=566 with 89 reused). Slow lorises used three species of bamboo,
344 with 8 sleep sites comprised of clumping bamboo, 52 comprised of giant bamboo, and 454
345 comprised of string bamboo (Fig. 4). In 2016, we revisited 225 bamboo sleep sites used in
346 the period 2013-2015 comprising a mean of 28 ± 21 bamboo sleep sites unique to each pair
347 (Table 2) and found that 89.3% of sleep sites (n=201) remained and were still being used by
348 slow lorises. 11 sleep sites had been replaced by chayote, 11 were replaced by bare ground,
349 and two had disappeared as a result of landslides. The remaining 201 sleep sites ranged in
350 size from 1 to 101 stems, with a mean of 35.5 ± 24.5 stems per bamboo stand. Only three of
351 these stands remained fully intact, with 198 containing cut stems. The mean number of cut
352 stems per bamboo stand was 19.9 ± 15.8 , with the mean number of newly sprouting stems
353 being 7.57 ± 10.9 . Social pairs differed in the number of sites destroyed, cut stems, and new
354 sprouting stems (Table 2).

355

356 DISCUSSION

357 Farmers in Cipaganti increasingly recognised the importance of slow lorises in the control of
358 agricultural pests, and chayote became more important over time. In 2015 some 12% of the
359 study area was used to grow chayote and on average 4% of the slow lorises' home range
360 comprised chayote frames. Range size of slow lorises only marginally increased over time
361 and remained stable in terms of their geographic position (i.e. no home range size shifts

362 were recorded). Over time Javan slow lorises started using the chayote frames, mostly for
363 travelling but also for feeding and social interactions. Although cutting for chayote disturbed
364 sleep sites, the fast growing bamboo meant that animals still had more than adequate
365 places to sleep.

366 Researchers have heralded agroforestry as a positive step towards achieving co-existence
367 between wildlife and farmers. Chayote is as a useful vine in such forests, providing shade for
368 lower strata plants (Clerck and Negreros-Castillo 2000). Humans domesticated chayote
369 centuries ago and worldwide have used it for its economic and cultural value (Lira et al.
370 2002). Chayote has replaced other more traditional agroforestry practices no longer viable
371 on Java (Iskandar et al. 2016). In Cipaganti, it provides excellent economic services, and
372 requires less intensive farming practices compared to root vegetables, being easy to harvest
373 and not requiring the use of pesticides (Morton, 1981). People introduced chayote into the
374 “traditional bamboo garden” (*kebun tatangkalan*) landscape of Cipaganti, where the crop
375 has partially persisted on the basis of deep cultural affinities to this ancient farming practice
376 (Abdoellah et al. 2015). Together with bamboo and other planted trees, chayote frames and
377 the associated climbers provide a form of living fence or canopy corridor for slow lorises and
378 other wildlife, including rare species such as Javan leopard (*Panthera pardus melas*), Javan
379 ferret badger (*Melogale orientalis*), banded linsang (*Prionodon linsang*), and binturong
380 (*Arctictis binturong*). Such a system, as opposed to monoculture plantation, seems to allow
381 this mammalian diversity to persist in Cipaganti while providing an excellent economic
382 commodity to local people.

383 Despite the increase in growth of chayote, farmers we interviewed showed
384 sensitivity towards slow lorises, and did so increasingly over the study. In particular, more
385 farmers recognised the role of slow lorises as pest controls and realised that bamboo
386 species are important plants for slow lorises. Since 2012, we have disseminated information
387 about slow lorises and other native species to farmers through newsletters and other events
388 and by providing classes to their children (Nekaris 2016). We also distributed materials such
389 as leaflets, umbrellas and t-shirts emphasising the role of slow lorises in the ecosystem.
390 Such modes of outreach have proven successful in conservation education and community
391 outreach programmes (Evans et al. 1996, Vaughan et al. 2003, Walter 2009). Indeed,
392 Waylen et al. (2010) suggest that integrating the community into conservation programmes

393 is a key way to change attitudes and allow a conservation project to succeed. **Human**
394 **attitudes towards Javan slow lorises** differ in adjacent areas, including an unsustainable pet
395 trade in the species, thus any conservation of them in human-modified landscapes must
396 include a human outreach component (Nijman and Nekaris 2015).

397 Although chayote frames comprised more than 3% of slow lorises' home ranges,
398 home range sizes of the social pairs remained stable and completely within the agroforest
399 matrix. Chayote frames provided a substrate to move across open fields that had been
400 previously planted with low growing plants treated with pesticides, such as carrots and
401 cassava. Chayote frames appeared to offer the slow lorises a network of substrates that
402 shielded them from predators and contained an abundance of insects. **Researchers have**
403 **previously reported** the ability to maintain home ranges completely within for wood mice
404 (*Apodemus sylvaticus*), golden-headed lion tamarins (*Leontopithecus chrysomelas*) and
405 three-toed sloths (*Bradypus variegatus*) (Vaughan et al. 2007, Oliviera et al. 2011, Rosalino
406 et al. 2011). Wood mice can exploit planted olive groves, and also showed a preference for
407 areas with understory; these preferences were interpreted as improving female fitness and
408 avoiding predators (Rosalino, et al., 2011). Golden-headed lion tamarins and three-toed
409 sloths could survive with their home ranges completely in agroforests (**Vaughan et al. 2007,**
410 **Oliviera et al. 2011**). Although tamarin home ranges were smaller than in primary forest,
411 animals were heavier in size and reproduced well. Tamarins relied largely on planted
412 jackfruit (*Artocarpus heterophyllus*). In the case of three-toed sloths, **they integrated**
413 **human-planted** living fences into their home ranges. A similar scenario can be observed in
414 Javan slow lorises, whose plant consumption of exudates and nectar is completely from
415 human-introduced species, and whose movements rely heavily on human-planted
416 substrates (Rode-Margono, et al., 2014). Unlike these taxa, however, slow lorises eat mainly
417 gum, insects, and nectar, meaning that resources they consume do not put them in
418 competition with humans, and even have the capacity to help humans.

419 The chayote bamboo frames **provided** a new substrate network that slow lorises
420 used for both foraging and moving across their fragmented landscape. Indeed, the full range
421 of behaviours exhibited by slow lorises in chayote in this study mirror the general
422 behavioural ethogram reported Rode-Margono et al., (2014) for the same population
423 (foraging and feeding – 22.4% in this study vs 31% in Rode-Margono, et al., 2014; resting 2%

424 vs 33%; travelling 68% vs 14%; grooming 6% vs 7%, other 2% vs 13%). The connectivity
425 provided by chayote frames and the high number of insects available due to lack of
426 pesticides can help explain the higher proportion of feeding and travelling. The rapid
427 incorporation of the frames into **the slow loris** behavioural repertoire is an example of their
428 flexibility and ability to survive in human-modified landscapes, at least for the period of our
429 study. Indeed, slow lorises conform to Nowak and Lee's (2013) statement that the ability to
430 expand niche breadth via resource switching, including substrate choice and modification of
431 diet, is key to withstanding the risks of anthropogenic habitat modification.

432 The harvesting of the fast-growing bamboo led to the disappearance of some 10% of
433 bamboo sleep sites. Most (98%) of the remaining bamboo sleep sites were affected by the
434 harvesting practises for chayote but enough bamboo stems remained for the slow lorises to
435 keep using bamboo stands as sleep sites. Bamboo is by far the most important sleep site for
436 slow lorises in Cipaganti comprising 96% of all sites observed since 2012 (1st author,
437 unpublished data). Throughout their range, slow lorises never use tree holes and rely on
438 forms of closed substrates for sleeping including dense shrubs, palms, lianas and bamboo
439 stands (Kenyon et al. 2014, Wiens 2002). Pygmy lorises (*N. pygmaeus*) sleep on high clumps
440 of terminal tree branches with a preference for very dense edge forests (**Streicher and**
441 **Nadler 2003**). **Slow** lorises have been never been observed to sleep on the ground and are
442 typically found at 1.8-35.0 m height (Wiens 2002). The maintenance of bamboo shrubs in
443 Cipaganti is clearly vital for their perseverance in this human-dominated landscape, and the
444 current human practice of only cutting parts of bamboo stands is for the time being allowing
445 this persistence.

446 We agree with Sheil and Meijaard (2010) who describe the 'tainted nature delusion',
447 whereby conservationists neglect the value of human-modified habitats. Researchers in
448 temperate regions have long recognised the value of these ecosystems (Cassano et al. 2014)
449 and it would be prudent for those working in tropical and subtropical regions to follow suit.
450 Studying a difficult to observe, cryptic nocturnal primate like the Javan slow loris in a
451 human-modified landscape has several advantages. While experiencing the effects of rapid
452 environmental change, the Javan slow loris has created an opportunity for researchers to
453 understand their ecological, behavioural, physiological and cognitive capacities (Hockings, et
454 al. 2015). Studying flexibility in these situations may shed light on the evolution and

455 adaptability of extant strepsirrhine and extinct early primates. Species level evolutionary
456 history plays an important role in the response to novel environments (Hendry et al. 2001).
457 An organism's response to human disturbance can be categorized as addressing novel
458 predators, using novel resources, avoiding novel abiotic threats, and acclimating to
459 fluctuating spatiotemporal conditions (Sih et al. 2011). In the case of the Javan slow loris,
460 our findings highlight their behavioural **flexibility in a human-modified landscape**. Recent
461 IUCN Red List assessments have determined that over 50% of primates face extinction
462 (Estrada, et al. 2017). With the rapid change in habitat transformation for agricultural
463 practices sweeping the tropics, we feel it is urgent to understand the behaviour of primates
464 in such landscapes, and to find ways they can continue to share these spaces with humans.

465

466 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

467 We thank the villagers in Cipaganti and other parts of West Java for their time and patience
468 in sharing their views and knowledge unreservedly with us. We thank Indonesia RISTEK and
469 the regional Perhutani and BKSDA for authorizing the study. Amersfoort Zoo, Augsburg Zoo,
470 Brevard Zoo, Cleveland Zoo and Zoo Society, Columbus Zoo, Conservation International
471 Primate Action Fund and Margot Marsh Biodiversity Fund, Cotswolds Wildlife Park, Disney
472 Worldwide Conservation Fund, Henry Doorly Zoo, International Primate Protection League,
473 Little Fireface Project, Longleat Safari and Adventure Park, Mohamed bin al Zayed Species
474 Conservation Fund (152511813), Memphis Zoo, Nacey Maggioncalda Foundation, National
475 Geographic (GEFNE101-13), People's Trust for Endangered Species, Phoenix Zoo, the Royal
476 Geographical Society (with IBG), Shaldon Wildlife Trust, Shepreth Wildlife Park, Sophie
477 Danforth Conservation Biology Fund, Whitley Wildlife Conservation Trust, and ZGAP
478 provided the funding for this project. We thank our field team Y. Nazmi, A. Nunur, D.
479 Rustandi, R. Cibabuddhea, D. Spaan, A. Zaelany, Jessica Wise and Lewis Castle. We thank S.
480 McCabe and R. Sawyer for editorial assistance. We thank two anonymous reviewers and the
481 Associate Editor for extensive comments and the Editor-in-Chief for her help with the
482 submission process.

483

484 REFERENCES

485 Abdoellah, O. S., Okubo, S., Withaningsih, S., Takeuchi, K., & Mizuno, K. (2015). Perceptions
486 of owners on the roles and future of bamboo-tree gardens in the agricultural landscape
487 of the Upper Citarum Basin, West Java, Indonesia. *Agricultural Sciences*, 6, 1333-1351.

488 Anderson, J. R. (1998). Sleep, sleeping sites, and sleep-related activities: awakening to their
489 significance. *American Journal of Primatology*, 46(1), 63-75.

490 Asensio, N., Arroyo-Rodríguez, V., Dunn, J. C., & Cristóbal-Azkarate, J. (2009). Conservation
491 value of landscape supplementation for howler monkeys living in forest patches.
492 *Biotropica*, 41, 768-773.

493 Bernard, H.R. (2011). *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative*
494 *approaches*. Lanham: Rowman Altamira.

495 Bhagwat, S. A., Willis, K. J., Birks, H. J. B., & Whittaker, R. J. (2008). Agroforestry: a refuge for
496 tropical biodiversity? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 23, 261-267.

497 Cassano, C. R., Barlow, J., & Pardini, R. (2014). Forest loss or management intensification?
498 Identifying causes of mammal decline in cacao agroforests. *Biological*
499 *Conservation*, 169, 14-22.

500 Chivers, D. J. (1980). *Malayan forest primates. Ten years' study in tropical rain forest*. New
501 York: Plenum Press.

502 Estrada, A., Garber, P., Heymann, E., Lambert, J., Rovero, F., Roos, C., Fuentes, A., Nijman,
503 V., Nekaris, K.A.I., McKinnon, K., Setchell, J., Fernandez-Duque, E., Boyle, S., Gillespie, T.,
504 Barelli, C., Di Fiore, A., Verde Arregoitia, L., Sussman, R., de Guinea, M., Meyer, A.,
505 Amato, K., Wich, S., Gouveia, S., Brodorovski, R., Pan, R., Li, B., Kone, I. (2017),
506 Impending collapse of the world's primates: why primates matter. *Science Advances*.
507 DOI 10.1126/sciadv.1600946, 3(1), e1600946

508 Estrada, A., Raboy, B. E., & Oliveira, L. C. (2012). Agroecosystems and primate conservation
509 in the tropics: a review. *American Journal of Primatology*, 74, 696-711.

510 Estrada, A. (2006). Human and non-human primate co-existence in the Neotropics: a
511 preliminary view of some agricultural practices as a complement for primate
512 conservation. *Ecological and Environmental Anthropology* 2, 17-29.

513 Evans, S. M., Gill, M. E., & Marchant, J. (1996). Schoolchildren as educators: the indirect
514 influence of environmental education in schools on parents' attitudes towards the
515 environment. *Journal of Biological Education*, 30(4), 243-248.

516 Gelling, M., Macdonald, D. W., & Mathews, F. (2007). Are hedgerows the route to increased
517 farmland small mammal density? Use of hedgerows in British pastoral
518 habitats. *Landscape Ecology*, 22, 1019-1032.

519 Hendry, A.P., Kinnison, M.T., Heino, M., Day, T., Smith, T.B., Fitt, G., et al. (2011).
520 Evolutionary principles and their practical application. *Evolutionary Applications*, 4, 159-
521 183.

522 Hockings, K. J., McLennan, M. R., Carvalho, S., Ancrenaz, M., Bobe, R., Byrne, R. W., et al.
523 (2015). Apes in the Anthropocene: flexibility and survival. *Trends in Ecology and*
524 *Evolution*, 30, 215-222.

525 Iskandar, J., Iskandar, B. S., & Partasasmita, R. (2016) Responses to environmental and
526 socio-economic changes in the Karangwangi traditional agroforestry system, South
527 Cianjur, West Java. *Biodiversitas* 17, 332-341.

528 Kenyon, M., Streicher, U., Loung, H., Tran, T., Tran, M., Vo, B., & Cronin, A. (2014). Survival
529 of reintroduced pygmy slow loris *Nycticebus pygmaeus* in South Vietnam. *Endangered*
530 *Species Research*, 25(2), 185-195.

531 Kumara, H. N., Sasi, R., Chandran, S., & Radhakrishna, S. (2016). Distribution of the grey
532 slender loris (*Loris lydekerianus* Cabrera, 1908) in Tamil Nadu, Southern India. *Folia*
533 *Primatologica*, 87(5), 291-302.

534 Lee, P. C. (2010). Sharing space: can ethnoprimateology contribute to the survival of
535 nonhuman primates in human-dominated globalized landscapes? *American Journal of*
536 *Primatology*, 72, 925-931.

537 Lira, R., Villaseñor, J. L., & Ortíz, E. (2002). A proposal for the conservation of the family
538 Cucurbitaceae in Mexico. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 11, 1699-1720.

539 Meijaard, E., & Sheil, D. (2008). The persistence and conservation of Borneo's mammals in
540 lowland rain forests managed for timber: observations, overviews and opportunities.
541 *Ecological Research*, 23, 21-34.

- 542 Merker, S., Yustian, I., & Mühlenberg, M. (2005). Responding to forest degradation: altered
543 habitat use by Dian's tarsier *Tarsius diana* in Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Oryx*, *39*, 189-195.
- 544 Michel, N., Burel, F., & Butet, A. (2006). How does landscape use influence small mammal
545 diversity, abundance and biomass in hedgerow networks of farming landscapes? *Acta*
546 *Oecologica*, *30*, 11-20.
- 547 Michel, N., Burel, F., Legendre, P., & Butet, A. (2007). Role of habitat and landscape in
548 structuring small mammal assemblages in hedgerow networks of contrasted farming
549 landscapes in Brittany, France. *Landscape Ecology*, *22*, 1241-1253.
- 550 Moore, R. S., Nekaris, K. A. I., & Eschmann, C. (2010). Habitat use by western purple-faced
551 langurs *Trachypitecus vetulus nestor* (Colobinae) in a fragmented suburban landscape.
552 *Endangered Species Research*, *12*, 227-234.
- 553 Morrogh-Bernard, H.C., Husson, S.J., Harsanto, F.A. & Chivers, D.J. (2014). Fine-scale habitat
554 use by orang-utans in a disturbed peat swamp forest, Central Kalimantan, and
555 implications for conservation management. *Folia Primatologica*, *85*, 135-153.
- 556 Mortelliti, A., Santarelli, L., Sozio, G., Fagiani, S., & Boitani, L. (2013). Long distance field
557 crossings by hazel dormice (*Muscardinus avellanarius*) in fragmented landscapes.
558 *Mammalian Biology*, *78*, 309-312.
- 559 Morton, J. (1981). The chayote, a perennial, climbing, subtropical vegetable. *Proceedings of*
560 *the Florida State Horticultural Society*, *94*, 240-245.
- 561 Nekaris, K. A. I. (2016). The Little Fireface Project: Community conservation of Asia's slow
562 lorises via ecology, education, and empowerment. In M. Weller (Ed)
563 *Ethnoprimatology* (pp. 259-272). New York: Springer.
- 564 Nekaris, K. A. I. (2014). Extreme primates: Ecology and evolution of Asian lorises.
565 *Evolutionary Anthropology*, *23*, 177-187.
- 566 Nekaris, K. A. I. (2003). Spacing system of the Mysore slender loris (*Loris lydekkerianus*
567 *lydekkerianus*). *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, *121*(1), 86-96.
- 568 Nekaris, K. A. I., & Rasmussen, D. T. (2003). Diet and feeding behavior of Mysore slender
569 lorises. *International Journal of Primatology*, *24*, 33-46.

- 570 Newing, H. (2011). *Conducting research in conservation — a social science perspective*.
571 Abingdon: Routledge.
- 572 Nijman, V. (2013). One hundred years of solitude: effects of long-term forest fragmentation
573 on the primate community of Java, Indonesia. In L. K. Marsh & C. A. Chapman (Eds.),
574 *Primates in fragments* (pp. 33-45). New York: Springer.
- 575 Nijman, V., & Nekaris, K. A. I. (2014). Traditions, taboos and trade in slow lorises in
576 Sundanese communities in southern Java, Indonesia. *Endangered Species Research*, 25,
577 79-88.
- 578 Nowak, K., & Lee, P. C. (2013). "Specialist" primates can be flexible in response to habitat
579 alteration. In L. K. Marsh & C. A. Chapman (Eds.), *Primates in fragments* (pp. 199-211).
580 New York: Springer.
- 581 Oliveira, L. C., Neves, L. G., Raboy, B. E., & Dietz, J. M. (2011). Abundance of jackfruit
582 (*Artocarpus heterophyllus*) affects group characteristics and use of space by golden-
583 headed lion tamarins (*Leontopithecus chrysomelas*) in cabruca
584 agroforest. *Environmental Management*, 48(2), 248-262.
- 585 Pimley, E. R., Bearder, S. K., & Dixon, A. F. (2005). Social organization of the Milne-Edward's
586 potto. *American Journal of Primatology*, 66, 317-330.
- 587 Puri R. K. (2011). Documenting local environmental knowledge and change. In: Newing H
588 (Ed) *Conducting research in conservation — a social science perspective* (pp. 146–169).
589 Abingdon: Routledge.
- 590 R Core Team. (2013). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
591 for Statistical Computing.
- 592 Reinhardt, K.D., Wirdateti, W. & Nekaris K.A.I. (2016). Climate-mediated activity of the
593 Javan slow loris, *Nycticebus javanicus*. *AIMS Environmental Science*, 3, 249-260.
- 594 Rode-Margono E. J., Nijman V., Wirdateti W., & Nekaris K. A. I. (2014). Ethology of the
595 Critically Endangered Javan slow loris *Nycticebus javanicus* E. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire in
596 West Java. *Asian Primates*, 4, 27-41.

- 597 Rode-Margono, E. J., Rademaker, M., Wirdateti, W., Strijkstra, A., & Nekaris, K. A. I. (2015).
598 Noxious arthropods as potential prey of the venomous Javan slow loris (*Nycticebus*
599 *javanicus*) in a West Javan volcanic agricultural system. *Journal of Natural History*, *49*,
600 1949-1959.
- 601 Rosalino, L. M., Ferreira, D., Leitão, I., & Santos-Reis, M. (2011). Usage patterns of
602 Mediterranean agro-forest habitat components by wood mice *Apodemus*
603 *sylvaticus*. *Mammalian Biology-Zeitschrift für Säugetierkunde*, *76*(3), 268-273.
- 604 Saade, R. L. (1996). Chayote: *Sechium edule* (Jacq.) Sw. (pp.41). Rome: International Plant
605 Genetic Resources Institute.
- 606 Schlinkert, H., Ludwig, M., Batáry, P., Holzschuh, A., Kovács-Hostyánszki, A., Tschardtke, T. &
607 Fischer, C. (2016). Forest specialist and generalist small mammals in forest edges and
608 hedges. *Wildlife Biology*, *22*, 86-94.
- 609 Sheil, D., & Meijaard, E. (2010). Purity and prejudice: deluding ourselves about biodiversity
610 conservation. *Biotropica*, *42*, 566-568.
- 611 Shepherd, C. R. (2010). Illegal primate trade in Indonesia exemplified by surveys carried out
612 over a decade in North Sumatra. *Endangered Species Research*, *11*, 201-205.
- 613 Sih, A., Ferrari, M. C., & Harris, D. J. (2011). Evolution and behavioural responses to human-
614 induced rapid environmental change. *Evolutionary Applications*, *4*, 367-387.
- 615 Sneddon J. N. (2004). *The Indonesian language: its history and role in modern society*.
616 Sydney: UNSW Press.
- 617 Stafford, C. A., Alarcon-Valenzuela, J., Patiño, J., Preziosi, R. F., & Sellers, W. I. (2016). Know
618 your monkey: identifying primate conservation challenges in an indigenous Kichwa
619 community using an ethnoprimate approach. *Folia Primatologica*, *87*, 31-47.
- 620 Streicher, U., & Nadler, T. (2003). Re-introduction of pygmy lorises in
621 Vietnam. *Reintroduction News*, *23*, 37-40.
- 622 Tisovec, K. C., Cassano, C. R., Boubli, J. P., & Pardini, R. (2014). Mixed-species groups of
623 marmosets and tamarins across a gradient of agroforestry
624 intensification. *Biotropica*, *46*, 248-255.

- 625 Vaughan, C., Gack, J., Solorazano, H., & Ray, R. (2003). The effect of environmental
626 education on schoolchildren, their parents, and community members: A study of
627 intergenerational and intercommunity learning. *The Journal of Environmental*
628 *Education*, 34(3), 12-21.
- 629 Vaughan, C., Ramírez, O., Herrera, G., & Guries, R. (2007). Spatial ecology and conservation
630 of two sloth species in a cacao landscape in Limón, Costa Rica. *Biodiversity and*
631 *Conservation*, 16, 2293-2310.
- 632 Walter, P. (2009). Local knowledge and adult learning in environmental adult education:
633 Community-based ecotourism in Southern Thailand. *International Journal of Lifelong*
634 *Education*, 28(4), 513-532.
- 635 Waylen, K. A., Fischer, A., McGowan, P. J., Thirgood, S. J., & Milner-Gulland, E. J. (2010).
636 Effect of local cultural context on the success of community-based conservation
637 interventions. *Conservation Biology*, 24(4), 1119-1129.
- 638 Whitten, A.J., Soeriaatmadja, R.E., & Afiff, S.A. (1996) *The ecology of Java and Bali, the*
639 *ecology of Indonesia series vol II*. Singapore: Periplus Editions.
- 640 Wiens, F. (2002). *Behavior and ecology of wild slow lorises (Nycticebus coucang): social*
641 *organization, infant care system, and diet* (Doctoral dissertation, Bayreuth University).
- 642 Wiens, F., Zitzmann, A., & Hussein, N. A. (2006). Fast food for slow lorises: is low metabolism
643 related to secondary compounds in high-energy plant diet? *Journal of Mammalogy*, 87,
644 790-798.
- 645 Williams-Guillén, K., McCann, C., Martínez Sánchez, J. C., & Koontz, F. (2006). Resource
646 availability and habitat use by mantled howling monkeys in a Nicaraguan coffee
647 plantation: can agroforests serve as core habitat for a forest mammal? *Animal*
648 *Conservation*, 9, 331-338.
- 649 Zhang, Z., & Usher, M. B. (1991). Dispersal of wood mice and bank voles in an agricultural
650 landscape. *Acta Theriologica*, 36, 239-245.

651

652

653 Figure Legends

654 Figure 1. Photographs of chayote frame structure in the Cipaganti area; a.) View from below
655 a fully covered chayote frame; b.) View from above a chayote frame, built as cover, over a
656 farmer's coffee plantation. Photos by Kathleen Reinhardt.

657

658 Figure 2. Location of Cipaganti in West Java, Indonesia.

659

660 Figure 3. Chayote frames and 95% MCP of Javan slow lorises social pairs (n=8) over the study
661 area in Cipaganti, Java, Indonesia in 2014 and 2015. The names of the social pairs are
662 indicated at the top.

663

664 Figure 4. **Images of Javan slow lorises in Cipaganti and their bamboo habitats.** (A) stand of
665 string bamboo; (B) a close up of a Javan slow loris in string bamboo; and (C) a typical image
666 of a slow loris from a distance in string bamboo as indicated by the arrow.

667

668

669