



Community Roles Model in the Buffer Zone of the Proboscis Monkey Habitat for Wetland Environmental Conservation

M. Ridha Ilhami[†] , Ersis Warmansyah Abbas , Bambang Subiyakto and Mutiani

Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin, Indonesia

[†]Corresponding author: M. Ridha Ilhami; ridha.ilhami@ulm.ac.id

Abbreviation: Nat. Env. & Poll. Technol.
Website: www.neptjournal.com

Received: 26-09-2025

Revised: 17-11-2025

Accepted: 16-12-2025

Key Words:

Wetland environmental conservation
Buffer zone
Proboscis monkey habitat
Community participation
Sustainable livelihoods

Citation for the Paper:

Ilhami, M.R., Abbas, E.W., Subiyakto, B. and Mutiani, 2026. Community roles model in the buffer zone of the proboscis monkey habitat for wetland environmental conservation. *Nature Environment and Pollution Technology*, 25(3), D1873. <https://doi.org/10.46488/NEPT.2026.v25i03.D1873>

Note: From 2025, the journal has adopted the use of Article IDs in citations instead of traditional consecutive page numbers. Each article is now given individual page ranges starting from page 1.



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors

Licensee: Technoscience Publications

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

ABSTRACT

This study investigates community role models in the buffer zone of the proboscis monkey (*Nasalis larvatus*) habitat to improve wetland conservation using a mixed-methods exploratory sequential design. Data were collected through in-depth interviews with local communities and the Sahabat Bekantan Indonesia Foundation, non-participatory observation, and a survey of 322 respondents in the buffer zone of the proboscis monkey habitat in South Kalimantan, Indonesia. The data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling-Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS). The results reveal that community involvement is structured around three primary constructs: (1) Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) through co-management surveillance systems and mangrove restoration, (2) Indigenous Knowledge (IK), expressed through emerging ecological awareness and locally adapted interactions with wildlife, and (3) Sustainable Livelihood Approaches (SL) that support economic resilience via ecotourism and sustainable resource use. The structural model demonstrated that these constructs significantly influenced wetland environmental conservation ($R^2 = 0.758$), with CBNRM having the strongest effect ($\beta = 0.433$), followed by SL ($\beta = 0.262$) and IK ($\beta = 0.225$). These findings emphasize that conservation success depends on empowering local governance, aligning ecological goals with livelihood security, and strengthening situational ecological knowledge. The resulting model offers practical guidance for policy formulation and adaptive management in tropical wetland buffer zones facing socioecological vulnerability.

1. INTRODUCTION

Wetlands are widely recognized for the ecological services they provide, including carbon storage, water regulation, and support for a rich variety of species (Anand et al. 2023, Badiou et al. 2011, Ballut-Dajud et al. 2024, Bhowmik 2022, Davidson 2014, Mitsch & Gosselink 2015). Despite their importance, many wetland areas continue to deteriorate owing to land conversion, pollution, resource extraction, and ineffective management, placing these ecosystems under increasing pressure (Davidson 2014, Karim et al. 2013, Newton et al. 2020). The consequences of wetland degradation are felt not only in ecological terms but also by communities whose daily lives and livelihoods depend on wetland resources (Ballut-Dajud et al. 2022, Galvanin and Caldas 2025, Hu et al. 2017, Moomaw et al. 2018, Newton et al. 2020). This highlights the need to strengthen conservation efforts by recognizing both ecological and community realities (Afriyie et al. 2022, Walpole & Davidson 2018).

Indonesia's position as a megadiverse country adds urgency to this issue. Conservation efforts in the country are complicated by population growth, industrial expansion, and the ongoing exploitation of natural resources (Nurhidayah & Alam 2020, Poor et al. 2021). One approach commonly used to protect sensitive habitats is establishing buffer zones. These areas serve as a transition between protected ecosystems and surrounding settlements and are intended to minimize human

disturbance to the core conservation zones (Badiou et al. 2011, Hansen & DeFries 2007, Jakiel et al. 2024, Karim et al. 2013, Newton et al. 2020). When managed well, buffer zones help reduce conflict between humans and wildlife and, at the same time, create space for economic activities that do not put additional pressure on the protected area, such as small-scale tourism, agroforestry, or regulated fishing (Andrianandrasana 2016, Galvanin & Caldas 2025, Stolton et al. 2015, Walpole & Davidson 2018).

The proboscis monkey (*Nasalis larvatus*) is one of the species that relies heavily on wetland health. This primate is endemic to Borneo, including Kalimantan, and is classified as an endangered species. Its presence often reflects the condition of mangrove and riparian ecosystems (Hidayat et al. 2023, Rezeki et al. 2023b, 2023a, Strier 2016). Habitat loss continues owing to land clearing, plantation conversion, and mangrove timber harvesting (Stark et al. 2012, Wardatutthoyiyibah et al. 2023). At the same time, the proboscis monkey holds cultural value for local communities and is a key attraction for ecotourism, especially in South Kalimantan (Juliana et al. 2023, Kia 2021). Therefore, the participation of communities living around the habitat, particularly those in the buffer zone of Curiak Island, is essential (Hidayat et al. 2023, Rezeki et al. 2023b).

To investigate how communities contribute to wetland conservation, this study uses three main concepts: Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM), local knowledge, and the Sustainable Livelihood Approach (SL). These concepts guided the analysis and were used in a practical and operational sense. CBNRM refers to community involvement in managing natural resources through local institutions, shared rules, and participatory decision-making (Armah et al. 2010, Baddianaah & Baaweh 2021, Foyet 2024, Ulum et al. 2024). Local knowledge (Indigenous Knowledge) encompasses ecological understanding, cultural practices, and customary norms that have developed over generations and influence how communities interact with their environment (Astheria et al. 2024, Bhatia 2025, Harly 2023, Jayawardena 2024). SL focuses on how households diversify income sources and maintain economic resilience while ensuring that their activities remain compatible with conservation objectives (Bhushan et al. 2024, Fang et al. 2024, Mani et al. 2023, Ramanantoandro et al. 2024).

Although all three concepts are frequently discussed in the literature on community-based conservation, studies examining their interactions in wetland buffer zones remain limited. Much of the existing research discusses these ideas separately, leaving little clarity about their combined influence on conservation outcomes, especially

in habitats as specialized and sensitive as those of proboscis monkeys.

This study aims to address this gap by developing and testing a model that explains how community-based natural resource management (CBNRM), local knowledge, and sustainable livelihood strategies contribute to wetland conservation in the Curiak Island buffer zone. Field data were used to assess the direct influence of each construct and its relative importance.

The novelty of this research is that it provides an empirical model of the role of communities that are specific to wetland ecosystems. This area has received little attention in previous studies. This study offers practical insights for designing conservation policies that work with communities living closest to vulnerable ecosystems in the Brazilian Amazon. These findings may be helpful in regions with similar ecological characteristics seeking ways to strengthen conservation through local participation.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Types of Research

This study employed an exploratory sequential design, initially conducting qualitative inquiries through interviews and observations with local communities in the buffer zone of the proboscis monkey habitat. The qualitative findings on indigenous knowledge, livelihood strategies, and community-based conservation practices were then used to construct a quantitative survey instrument to measure broader patterns of community roles in wetland environmental conservation. With this combined approach, this study not only explores the community's role contextually but also quantitatively measures the contribution of each construct to wetland environmental conservation (Creswell 2017).

2.2. Study Area

The research was conducted in three buffer-zone villages surrounding the Curiak Island wetland system: Marabahan Baru, Anjir Serapat Muara, and Anjir Serapat Muara I, located in the Anjir Muara Subdistrict, Barito Kuala Regency. These sites were selected because of their ecological proximity to proboscis monkey habitats and their active involvement in community-based conservation initiatives. A map of the study locations is presented in Fig. 1.

2.3. Qualitative Phase

The first phase employed a qualitative approach to examine community roles across three analytical dimensions: Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM), Indigenous Knowledge (IK), and the Sustainable




Fig. 1. Map of the Curiak Island buffer zone.

Table 1: Interview questions instrument.

No	Questions	Constructs of the roles
1.	How is the community involved in natural resource management on Curiak Island?	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
2.	Are there any community groups or local organizations that specifically deal with environmental management in this area? If so, what is their role?	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
3.	What forms of community involvement in management, such as environmental patrols, reforestation, or other activities?	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
4.	Is there any training or mentoring provided to the community in environmental management?	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
5.	Are there government programs or other institutions that support community-based management? How has the community responded?	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
6.	What are the biggest challenges facing communities in natural resource management?	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
7.	How has community-based management affected environmental conditions around the proboscis monkey habitat?	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
8.	What are the positive impacts on the community from their involvement in environmental management?	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
9.	Do you feel there has been a change in the community's attitude or behavior towards environmental sustainability in recent years?	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
10.	What traditional knowledge or practices does the community use to protect the proboscis monkey habitat area?	Local Knowledge (Indigenous Knowledge)
11.	Are there any rituals, traditions, or customary values related to environmental conservation?	Local Knowledge (Indigenous Knowledge)
12.	How does the community respond to the presence of proboscis monkeys in the area?	Local Knowledge (Indigenous Knowledge)
13.	Are there cases of people trading proboscis monkeys as exotic animals?	Local Knowledge (Indigenous Knowledge)
14.	How does the community respond to socialization from outside that is different from their local knowledge?	Local Knowledge (Indigenous Knowledge)
15.	What are the main sources of livelihood for communities around the proboscis monkey habitat buffer zone?	Sustainable Livelihood Approach
16.	How do communities adjust their livelihoods to remain sustainable?	Sustainable Livelihood Approach
17.	Has the community received any training or assistance regarding environmentally friendly livelihoods?	Sustainable Livelihood Approach
18.	What are the community's expectations for the management of this area so that their livelihoods are guaranteed?	Sustainable Livelihood Approach

Livelihoods Approach (SL). Data were collected through semi-structured, in-depth interviews and non-participatory observations of socio-ecological practices. Semi-structured interviews were used to maintain a clear thematic direction while allowing probing and follow-up questions to explore respondents' perspectives more deeply. The interview guide comprised 18 core questions, organized into three constructs (Table 1). The informants included village heads, community members engaged in conservation activities, and representatives of the Sahabat Bekantan Indonesia (SBI) Foundation. Observations focused on daily interactions with wetland environments, community decision-making processes, and practices related to riparian and mangrove ecosystems in the area. Data were analyzed thematically using initial descriptive coding derived from the interview guide, followed by axial coding to identify cross-community patterns of findings. Credibility was strengthened through source and method triangulation, as well as informant verification (Bowen 2009, Christou 2022, Kvale 2009).

2.4. Integration of Qualitative Findings into Quantitative

The findings from the qualitative analysis informed three aspects of the quantitative phase: the definition of latent constructs. The themes emerging from the interviews clarified how local communities understood the roles of community-based natural resource management (CBNRM), ecological knowledge (IK), and livelihood strategies (SL). These themes were used to refine the operational definitions of the constructs. Development of survey indicators. Statements that were frequently repeated in the interviews and observations were converted into questionnaire items. For example, collective monitoring became an operational indicator of CBNRM, traditional ecological practices identified during observations were converted into IK indicators, and livelihood strategies mentioned by respondents became the basis for SL items. Content validation. Draft indicators were discussed with local leaders and SBI representatives to ensure that they reflected community realities and local terminology. This step strengthened the alignment between the qualitative insights and the final measurement model. This integration of qualitative and quantitative methods ensured that the final SEM-PLS construct was derived directly from field data rather than solely from abstract theory, thereby strengthening the construct validity and contextual relevance.

2.5. Quantitative Phase

The quantitative phase targeted adult residents (aged ≥ 18 years) living in the buffer zones surrounding the island. Administrative records from the three villages indicated

that the total eligible population was 2,172. The required sample size was determined using Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) sample size table, which is widely used to identify minimum sample requirements based on population size (Chaokromthong & Sintao 2021). According to the table, a population of 2,000-2,500 requires approximately 322-333 respondents to achieve a 95% confidence level with an acceptable margin of error. Based on this guideline, this study established a sample size of 322 respondents, which is appropriate for representing a population of 2,172 individuals.

A simple random sampling technique with proportional allocation across the three villages was employed to ensure that the sample accurately reflected the demographic composition of the buffer zone communities. This approach increased the representativeness and strengthened the generalizability of the findings. All quantitative data were subsequently analyzed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) in SmartPLS version 3, which is suitable for exploratory modeling and the analysis of complex relationships among latent constructs.

Measuring Instruments, Sampling, and Analysis: The quantitative measuring instruments consisted of a structured questionnaire containing 24 indicators distributed evenly across four latent variables: CBNRM (six items), Local Knowledge (six items), Sustainable Livelihood Approach (six items), and Wetland Conservation (six items). Responses were recorded on a four-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree) to minimize central tendency bias.

3. RESULTS

This study integrates qualitative and quantitative approaches to understand and measure the role of communities in the buffer zone of Curiak Island in conserving the wetland habitat of proboscis monkeys (*Nasalis Larvatus*). The results are presented in three main constructs related to the role of communities: Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM), Indigenous Knowledge (IK), and Sustainable Livelihood Approach (SL). Each construct was analyzed thematically through qualitative data and then statistically tested using the Partial Least Squares structural model (SEM-PLS).

3.1. Community-Based Natural Resource Management

The qualitative findings indicate that the practice of Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) in the Curiak Island buffer zone is shaped by collaborative governance arrangements, community-driven ecological interventions, and persistence of local

socio-economic constraints. The analysis, derived from triangulated data from village heads, *tourism awareness groups (Pokdarwis)*, local residents, and documentation from the Sahabat Bekantan Indonesia (SBI) Foundation, reveals three interrelated themes: (1) co-management and community surveillance, (2) ecological restoration as a shared community mandate, and (3) socio-economic tensions and adaptive livelihood strategies.

3.1.1. Co-Management and Community Surveillance

Pokdarwis emerged as the principal community-based institution supporting conservation governance across all interview sites. Consistent testimonies from village heads confirm that *Pokdarwis* was formally established through the joint initiatives of the Barito Kuala Regency government and SBI. Document analysis of SBI management plans corroborates this organizational framework, evidencing a hybrid co-management system in which formal authority resides with the SBI. However, operational support is delegated to community groups.

Pokdarwis (tourism awareness groups) conduct routine patrols and monitoring using rotational shifts and klotok boats to deter unauthorized activities and minimize human disturbance within the Bekantan habitat (Fig. 2). The consistency of these accounts across villages and their alignment with the researchers' observations of patrol schedules demonstrate a strong degree of data convergence. These findings resonate with the broader Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) literature, which emphasizes community surveillance as a critical determinant of conservation effectiveness. Hidayatullah discussed how effective management of conservation areas often includes surveillance procedures conducted by community groups, particularly in coastal and marine settings, highlighting the significance of community involvement in maintaining ecological integrity (Hidayatullah et al.

2023). Furthermore, the engagement of community groups in anti-poaching measures, as reported by Lamichhane et al. (2020), illustrates how local involvement in monitoring activities can significantly curb illegal activities that threaten biodiversity, reinforcing the importance of community action in conservation efforts (Lamichhane et al. 2020). This aligns with the findings of Ortega-Álvarez et al., who discussed community-based monitoring enhancing the functionality of protected areas, promoting effective collaboration between local communities and conservation strategies (Ortega-Álvarez et al. 2016). Ultimately, the unanimity of data derived from local accounts and academic literature underscores the critical role that community-driven surveillance plays in effective conservation strategies (Dupa et al. 2024, Ghaderi et al. 2022).

In addition to patrolling, Pokdarwis serves as a reporting hub for incidents involving proboscis monkeys entering residential zones or becoming stranded in the river currents. Reports are subsequently relayed to the Natural Resources Conservation Agency (BKSDA), reflecting an embedded community-based early warning system. This participatory monitoring structure aligns with community-integrated conservation. Padmanaba et al. highlighted the importance of integrating local knowledge in tracking the whereabouts of species of concern, including the proboscis monkey, thereby supporting community engagement in conservation (Padmanaba et al. 2013). Toulec et al. (2022) indicated that active monitoring of proboscis monkey populations within their habitats can enhance responses to human-wildlife conflicts, thereby contributing to improved management strategies, where community reporting is vital. Moreover, Stark et al. emphasized the need for community involvement in modeling population viability and making conservation decisions, reinforcing the notion that early warning systems driven by local reporting mechanisms are essential for effective species preservation (Stark et al. 2012).



Fig. 2: Patrol of the proboscis monkey habitat on Curiak Island.



Fig. 3: Rambai Padi (*Sonneratia Caseolaris*) rehabilitation activities.

Collectively, these studies illustrate how community-driven early warning and reporting systems can significantly impact the conservation landscape, consistent with the growing body of literature on participatory conservation strategies (Sihombing et al. 2019).

3.1.2. Ecological Restoration as a Shared Community Mandate

The second major theme concerns the active participation of communities in wetland and mangrove restoration, particularly through the cultivation and planting of *Sonneratia caseolaris*, a primary dietary resource for proboscis monkeys. Interviews with Pokdarwis members, cross-validated with seedling distribution data from the Sahabat Bekantan Indonesia Foundation (SBI) and photographic field documentation, confirmed widespread community involvement in nursery development, planting, and periodic maintenance.

These activities have generated significant ecological outcomes, including the expansion of the effective habitat area from 2.4 to 4.5 ha through cumulative mangrove planting. This aligns with evidence from community-based restoration programs, where local participation correlates with measurable ecological recovery and increased species resilience. For instance, Fahlevi and Raudina highlighted that restoring proboscis monkey habitats by planting rambai mangroves is necessary to enhance food sources and stabilize populations (Fig. 3) (Fahlevi & Raudina 2023). Community engagement can improve the psychological well-being and ecological conditions of both human populations and the flora and fauna inhabiting these areas (Ke et al. 2022). Emphasize that the inclusion of local stakeholders in mangrove management can enhance restoration outcomes through shared knowledge and investment (Susilo et al. 2017).

A particularly illustrative case involved a fisherman from Marabahan Baru who rescued a distressed proboscis

monkey during a river current incident. This episode, verified through community interviews and SBI documentation, underscores the internalization of conservation ethics at the individual level. Such acts reflect the emergence of localized environmental stewardship beyond formal organizational mandates, as supported by Hardy et al. (2023) regarding community engagement in coastal resource management.

3.1.3. Socio-Economic Tensions and Adaptive Livelihood Strategies

Despite these positive contributions, communities face persistent structural pressures, primarily stemming from the expansion of coal barge operations along the Barito River. Triangulation with local land-use maps indicates the active interest of private operators in acquiring riverbank areas for docking infrastructure. Interviews revealed that this poses a dilemma for residents, who must weigh short-term financial incentives against long-term ecological considerations.

This tension is well documented in Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) systems, where competing land-use priorities can undermine conservation commitments and weaken community cohesion. Silva and Mosimane indicated that conflicting land use can challenge the equitable distribution of economic benefits derived from natural resources, exacerbating community dissatisfaction with CBNRM initiatives (Silva & Mosimane 2012). Therefore, the stability of community participation in CBNRM remains contingent upon viable alternative livelihood strategies.

In response, SBI, in collaboration with PT. Pertamina has facilitated livelihood diversification initiatives, including training in the production of Segank (water-hyacinth-based soap) and Seluang Krispi (processed river fish). While these programs have enhanced local skills, production remains sporadic and largely order-driven, indicating limited penetration into the market. Mufune argues that without

secure economic alternatives, communities may struggle to prioritize conservation over immediate economic pressures (Mufune 2015). From the perspective of the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach, this suggests that diversification efforts have not achieved the economic security necessary to fully offset conservation trade-offs, reflecting findings by Ngwenya who emphasizes that community involvement must be matched with adequate resources to ensure sustainability in CBNRM systems (Ngwenya 2024).

3.1.4. Synthesis and Implications for CBNRM

Overall, the triangulated data suggest that CBNRM in the Curiak Island buffer zone is enabled by:

- Structured co-management partnerships,
- Active community participation in ecological restoration, and
- Emerging but insufficiently stable livelihood alternatives.

These conditions collectively reinforce the study's quantitative findings, which indicate that CBNRM significantly contributes to conservation outcomes in the wetland habitat. However, long-term sustainability remains dependent on reducing external development pressures and strengthening community economic resilience.

3.2. Local Knowledge (Indigenous Knowledge)

The analysis of Indigenous Knowledge (IK) in the Curiak Island buffer zone reveals a distinctive pattern compared to many conservation contexts, where customary norms and ritual practices play a central role in mediating human-wildlife interactions. Triangulation of interview data from community leaders, Pokdarwis members, and residents, combined with field observations, indicates the absence of codified customary practices, rituals, or traditional ecological knowledge specifically directed at protecting proboscis monkey habitats in the area. This contrasts with the findings from other regions, where IK directly informs wildlife management and biodiversity protection (Garnett et al. 2018).

3.2.1. Absence of Customary Ecological Practices and Its Implications

All interview groups consistently reported that the communities surrounding Curiak Island lack formalized customary laws (*adat*), ritual prohibitions, or inherited management practices for proboscis monkey (*Nasalis larvatus*) conservation. This absence appears rooted not in neglect but in the historical and sociocultural profile of the buffer zone villages, which lack a strong tradition of forest- or wildlife-centered customary institutions.

This finding suggests that the conservation ethic in the area is constructed through contemporary interventions, particularly environmental education, outreach programs,

and economic incentives, rather than through long-standing indigenous systems. However, Gomes-Da-Silva et al. (2025) support the notion that Indigenous lands significantly contribute to biodiversity conservation through established customary governance systems that enhance ecological outcomes. Their findings highlight the essential role of local Indigenous stewardship in effective conservation practices, suggesting that modern interventions alone do not drive conservation ethics. Similarly, while Stapleton et al. (2022) discuss the coexistence of traditional governance with modern systems, their work primarily focuses on justice during war, making it misaligned with conservation issues. Consequently, references to their findings regarding political institutions in conservation contexts were omitted.

Additionally, Ridwan et al. emphasized that involving Indigenous peoples in management can bridge traditional and contemporary conservation values, fostering a more integrated approach that respects cultural practices (Ridwan et al. 2022). These perspectives indicate that while modern initiatives can contribute to conservation efforts, the significance of long-standing Indigenous systems should not be underestimated, as they remain deeply intertwined with local ecological knowledge and practices.

3.2.2. Variation in Community Responses to Proboscis Monkeys

Despite the absence of codified IK, community responses to proboscis monkeys can be analytically grouped into three emergent patterns:

1. pro-conservation attitudes
2. neutral or indifferent attitudes, and
3. conflictual attitudes

Berita Batola Nyasar ke Pemukiman Penduduk di Desa Anjir Serapat 1 Batola, Bekantan Jantan Ini Diamankan Warga

Tayang: Senin, 10 Januari 2022 13:16 WITA

Penulis: Muhammad Tabri | Editor: Hari Widodo



Bekantan: Jantan diamankan warga saat nyasar ke pemukiman penduduk di Desa Anjir Serapat 1, Batola.

Fig. 4: Community response to the presence of proboscis monkeys quoted on the website banjarmasin.tribunnews.com.

These categories emerged consistently across interviews and are supported by observational notes and local media documentation (e.g., public commentary archived on Banjarmasin Tribunnews), demonstrating data convergence (Fig. 4).

3.2.3. Positive Responses and Emerging Ecological Awareness

Communities with positive attitudes reported increased awareness of the proboscis monkey's ecological role, particularly as an indicator of wetland health and a driver of ecotourism. Interviewees linked their support to direct engagement in conservation activities, including habitat monitoring, mangrove planting, and guiding visiting researchers and tourists. These findings correspond with the literature emphasizing that community engagement breeds a deeper understanding of biodiversity and its benefits for ecosystems. Studies indicate that effective ecological conservation often arises when local communities are actively involved in and benefit economically from such initiatives (Mekonen et al. 2017, Wilfred 2010).

Communities that recognize the ecological significance of species such as the proboscis monkey often see them as indicators of broader environmental health, which can enhance local conservation efforts. Research has shown that when local populations perceive direct benefits from conservation activities, such as ecotourism, they are more likely to promote and participate in ongoing conservation projects (Rezeki et al. 2023a, 2023b, Zuhdi et al. 2024b, 2024a). This creates a sustainable cycle of support and engagement with natural surroundings (Infield & Mugisha 2013).

3.2.4. Neutral Responses

The second group expressed ambivalence, describing proboscis monkeys as a natural part of the landscape, neither particularly valuable nor threatening. This neutral stance is mainly attributable to limited access to conservation information, a factor widely recognized as influencing wildlife perceptions in rural communities. Studies have shown that access to conservation information significantly affects community attitudes towards wildlife, as increased awareness often alters perceptions from ambivalence to more proactive engagement (Dewu & Røskaft 2017, Kansky et al. 2016). For instance, without adequate information, community members may view certain species, such as the proboscis monkey, as mere elements of their environment rather than integral components of biodiversity or ecotourism potential (Ite 1996).

Research indicates that a lack of environmental education directly correlates with a community's indifference towards wildlife conservation (Hare et al. 2021). Various studies have highlighted that educational outreach and effective

communication strategies can help bridge the information gap, fostering more favorable attitudes toward wildlife and conservation efforts (Freund et al. 2019, Rakotomamonjy et al. 2014). Consequently, empowering rural communities through education not only informs them about the ecological roles of species but also encourages participatory approaches to conservation management (Llorente et al. 2025, Vergara-Ríos et al. 2020).

3.2.5. Negative Responses and Human-Wildlife Conflict

A smaller subset of participants cited crop damage and competition over fruit as reasons for their negative perceptions. These findings are consistent with human-wildlife conflict patterns documented globally, where livelihood impacts shape community attitudes (Sidi et al. 2022). Although conflicts exist, triangulated evidence from interviews and secondary data confirms no reported incidents of hunting, illicit trade, or intentional harm. This suggests a foundational level of local ecological ethics that prevents escalation of wildlife persecution. The absence of harmful actions against wildlife may indicate an underlying respect for nature and awareness of the ecological role of species, which reduces the likelihood of extremely negative behaviors, such as hunting (Peterson et al. 2010).

Additionally, social capital and local ecological knowledge can play a crucial role in human-wildlife interactions. Research has shown that communities with a better understanding of wildlife tend to exhibit more tolerance towards them despite the conflicts that arise (Putra et al. 2022). This suggests that efforts to enhance community knowledge and awareness may contribute significantly to fostering coexistence while mitigating negative perceptions and impacts on wildlife (Inskip & Zimmermann 2009, Karanth et al. 2017).

3.2.6. Factors Influencing Community Perceptions

The thematic analysis suggests that three interrelated factors shape community responses:

1. Ecological Knowledge - Households with greater exposure to SBI outreach or participation in Pokdarwis activities demonstrated more positive conservation attitudes.
2. Economic Valuation - Communities recognizing economic opportunities from ecotourism (e.g., guiding, product sales) expressed more substantial support for habitat protection. This pattern is consistent with broader findings that economic incentives can reinforce pro-conservation behavior.
3. Direct Experience with Wildlife - Farmers and riverbank residents experiencing crop loss or resource competition tended to express conflict-prone attitudes.

These influences demonstrate that while Indigenous Knowledge in the traditional sense may not always be prominently recognized, situated ecological knowledge and experiential learning significantly shape conservation behaviors. Research indicates that situated ecological knowledge, derived from individuals' direct interactions with their environment, plays a critical role in local conservation efforts (Newmaster et al. 2011, Ruíz-Mallén & Corbera 2013). Experiential learning is important for understanding and managing ecosystems, as it combines theoretical knowledge with practical experience, leading to more effective conservation behavior among community members (Gagnon & Berteaux 2009, Reo & Whyte 2011).

The integration of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) with scientific approaches enhances ecological understanding and can lead to improved conservation outcomes (Cheveau et al. 2008, Dowsley & Wenzel 2009). Acknowledging local ecological knowledge alongside broader ecological principles allows adaptive management strategies to be informed by community-based practices (Ruíz-Mallén & Corbera 2013, Shokirov & Backhaus 2020). This interplay of situated knowledge and experiential learning reveals how communities navigate ecological challenges and devise solutions that align with both traditional practices and modern conservation goals, ultimately fostering resilience in socio-ecological systems (Polfus et al. 2013, Ramos 2021). Even in situations where traditional ecological knowledge might not be emphasized, the influence of localized practices remains significant in driving conservation behavior (Ramos 2018).

3.2.7. *Engagement with External Knowledge Systems*

Community responses to external conservation socialization efforts varied significantly. Some residents readily accepted information from government agencies and non-governmental organizations, especially when programs offered clear, immediate benefits, such as training, livelihood support, or opportunities to participate in ecotourism. Conversely, resistance emerged when messages were perceived as misaligned with local needs or when conservation directives limited economic activity without adequate compensation. Such variability underscores the need for culturally sensitive, participatory, and negotiated approaches to knowledge transfer. Successful integration of external conservation knowledge requires that interventions respect local values, involve communities in decision-making, and demonstrate practical relevance, a principle that is widely reflected in community-based conservation research (Bhatia 2025, Pimid & Chambers 2025, Unks et al. 2021).

Research indicates that successful community engagement in conservation initiatives often depends on the perceived alignment between conservation objectives

and the immediate economic needs of local populations (Bhatia et al. 2019, Yazezew 2022). Resistance is common when programs fail to address these needs, as communities may prioritize economic stability over conservation mandates (Goumas et al. 2020, Yazezew 2022). Moreover, various studies have illustrated that effective conservation strategies are those that consider local knowledge and foster collaboration between external organizations and community stakeholders, ultimately leading to more sustainable outcomes (Dayer et al. 2017, Jolly & Stronza 2025, Unks et al. 2021). This participatory model aligns with the broader recognition in conservation science that the integration of local values and informed community participation enhances the effectiveness of conservation efforts (Bhatia et al. 2019, Pimid & Chambers 2025).

3.2.8. *Synthesis*

Overall, the qualitative findings indicate that Indigenous knowledge in the Curiak Island buffer zone is not articulated through formal customary systems but rather through emergent ecological awareness, livelihood-oriented motivations, and direct interactions with wildlife. While traditional ecological knowledge is limited, the community exhibits nascent forms of conservation-oriented understanding that can be strengthened through targeted education, inclusive outreach programs, and equitable economic incentives.

These findings complement quantitative evidence by demonstrating that community support for habitat protection is conditioned by socioeconomic experience, perceived benefits, and the strength of institutional engagement, rather than by inherited customary practices.

3.3. Sustainable Livelihood Approach

The livelihood patterns in the proboscis monkey habitat buffer zone on Curia Island are shaped by long-term dependence on local natural resources and the ecological dynamics of the surrounding wetlands. Interviews, observations, and village administrative data indicate that agriculture and fisheries remain central to household income, although both sectors are increasingly affected by environmental change and conservation regulations that restrict fishing. These conditions reflect the key components of the Sustainable Livelihood Approach, which highlights how livelihood strategies emerge from interactions between asset availability, vulnerability factors, and institutional arrangements (Ramadhan et al. 2024, Sallu et al. 2010).

Rice cultivation is the primary agricultural activity, primarily for household consumption, with limited surplus sold to nearby markets. Respondents reported constraints such as land availability, climate variability, and restrictions

on new land clearing due to conservation policies. These accounts are consistent with village records showing a gradual decline in the available agricultural land linked to tidal fluctuations and regulatory limitations. Such conditions contribute to increasing livelihood vulnerability among households that heavily depend on agriculture (Sallu et al. 2010).

Fishing serves as an additional, and sometimes seasonal, source of income. The use of traditional gear, such as nets, hooks, and traps, remains widespread and is generally compatible with habitat conservation. However, field observations and participant accounts noted fluctuations in fish abundance, reflecting broader ecological changes in riverine and wetland systems in the region. This variability further illustrates the community's continued reliance on natural resources (Iiyama et al. 2007, Omolo & Mafongoya 2019).

Some households have begun diversifying their livelihoods to reduce exposure to ecological and regulatory pressures. Emerging activities include the small-scale processing of local products, home-based enterprises, and participation in community-based ecotourism initiatives. Two villages in the buffer zone, Marabahan Baru and Anjir Serapat Muara 1, have developed early-stage ecotourism concepts centered on wetland landscapes and

the conservation of proboscis monkeys (Fig. 5). These locations illustrate the spatial distribution and conditions of tourism-oriented settlements in the study area (Ávila-Foucat et al. 2021).

Capacity-building programs introduced by government agencies and conservation partners have supported these diversification efforts. Participants widely recognized training on ecotourism management, sustainable agriculture, and fisheries practices as beneficial for expanding human capital (Fig. 6). However, analysis of interview data indicates several constraints that limit long-term impact: (1) limited continuity of mentoring, (2) restricted access to markets for ecotourism products and local crafts, and (3) resistance from community members who view traditional practices as more reliable or profitable. These challenges parallel findings from other contexts, where education and training require follow-up support and genuine community participation to generate lasting behavioral and economic changes (Rudiarto et al. 2019).

Community perspectives highlight the need for greater alignment between conservation objectives and livelihood security. Respondents emphasized that participatory planning, inclusive decision-making, and consistent institutional support are essential to ensure local ownership of conservation efforts. The findings indicate that integrating



Fig. 5: Two buffer zone tourism villages, left: Marabahan Baru, right: Anjir Serapat Muara 1.



Fig. 6: Ecotourism management training.

conservation goals with livelihood diversification, market development, and long-term training may enhance both ecological outcomes and socio-economic resilience in buffer zone communities (Gong et al. 2020, Zikri et al. 2024).

The qualitative findings demonstrate that the community's role in conserving the proboscis monkey habitat on Curiak Island encompasses three interrelated dimensions: Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM), Indigenous Knowledge (IK), and the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SL). These constructs reflect the current socio-ecological conditions of buffer zone communities, capturing local participation, knowledge systems, and livelihood adjustments related to wetland conservation. While these findings provide rich contextual insights, quantitative analysis is necessary to confirm the extent to which each construct contributes to conservation outcomes. Therefore, Partial Least Squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) was employed to empirically test the relationships between the constructs.

3.4. Measurement Model Assessment

The measurement model evaluation confirmed that all constructs met the criteria for internal consistency, reliability, and validity. As shown in Table 2, nearly all the indicator loadings exceeded the recommended threshold of 0.70, demonstrating strong indicator reliability across the constructs. Cronbach's alpha (0.878–0.908) and Composite Reliability (0.908–0.929) values exceeded the minimum criterion of 0.70, confirming satisfactory internal consistency. Furthermore, all Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values (0.622–0.685) were above 0.50, indicating acceptable convergent validity. (Hair et al. 2019).

Assessment of discriminant validity using the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio confirmed that all constructs were empirically distinct, with values below 1.00, as shown in Fig. 7 (Arshad et al. 2023, Franke & Sarstedt 2019, Munthe & Shuguang 2025). Multicollinearity assessment showed VIF values under 3.0, and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) value was below 0.08, indicating good overall model fit. These results confirm that the measurement

Table 2: Summary of model measurement.

Construct	Item	Loading Factor	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE
CB (Community-Based Natural Resource Management)	CB1	0.793	0.878	0,908	0,622
	CB2	0.807			
	CB3	0.803			
	CB4	0.784			
	CB5	0.771			
	CB6	0.771			
IK (Indigenous Knowledge)	IK1	0.693	0.897	0,922	0,663
	IK2	0.807			
	IK3	0.845			
	IK4	0.865			
	IK5	0.848			
	IK6	0.822			
SL (Sustainable Livelihood Approach)	SL1	0.784	0.908	0,929	0,685
	SL2	0.866			
	SL3	0.824			
	SL4	0.855			
	SL5	0.844			
	SL6	0.789			
WEC (Wetland Environmental Conservation)	WEC1	0.838	0.892	0,918	0,652
	WEC2	0.843			
	WEC3	0.839			
	WEC4	0.819			
	WEC5	0.712			
	WEC6	0.785			




Fig. 7: Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT).




Fig. 8: Community roles model in the buffer zone of the proboscis monkey habitat.

model is appropriate and can be advanced for structural evaluation (Ghasempour Ganji & Kazemi 2024, Iqbal & Rao 2023).

These findings validate that the measurement model used in this study satisfies the criteria for validity and reliability, enabling progression to analysis of the structural (inner) model. Consequently, these results reinforce the robustness of the instrument in assessing the relationships among latent variables within the context of environmental conservation in the buffer zone of the estuarine crocodile habitat.

3.5 Structural Model Assessment

The structural (inner) model shown in Fig. 8 explores how CBNRM, IK, and SL predict Wetland Environmental Conservation (WEC). It has an R^2 value of 0.758, meaning these three factors together explain 75.8% of the variation in conservation outcomes, demonstrating

strong explanatory power in environmental behavior studies.

All hypothesized relationships were positive and statistically significant (Table 3). CBNRM exhibited the strongest effect on WEC ($\beta = 0.433$, $T = 5.781$, $p < 0.001$), demonstrating that community involvement in decision-making, surveillance, and mangrove restoration remains the primary determinant of conservation performance in the buffer zone (Ali et al. 2025). The SL construct also had a significant effect on WEC ($\beta = 0.262$, $T = 3.443$, $p = 0.001$), indicating that secure and environmentally compatible livelihood options can reinforce conservation behavior (Prasath & Umashankar 2023, Yulasteriyani et al. 2025). IK contributes to WEC with the smallest yet still significant effect ($\beta = 0.225$, $T = 4.074$, $p < 0.001$), suggesting that although local ecological knowledge exists, its integration into formal conservation governance

Table 3: Model summary.

	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values	Conclusion
CB (Community-Based Natural Resource Management) -> WEC (Wetland Environmental Conservation)	0,433	0,433	0,075	5,781	0,000	Significant
IK (Indigenous Knowledge) -> WEC (Wetland Environmental Conservation)	0,225	0,224	0,055	4,074	0,000	Significant
SL (Sustainable Livelihood Approach) -> WEC (Wetland Environmental Conservation)	0,262	0,264	0,076	3,443	0,001	Significant

remains partial, limiting its full influence (Sohail & Chen 2022).

The results of the structural analysis, presented in Table 3, indicate that all constructs significantly influence wetland environmental conservation (WEC). Thus, the three main constructs tested, namely CB, IK, and SL, were proven to have a significant contribution to the conservation efforts of the wetland environment, the Proboscis Monkey habitat on Curiak Island.

3.6. Integrated Interpretation of Qualitative and Quantitative Results

The combined qualitative and quantitative findings support the conclusion that conservation success in the proboscis monkey habitat buffer zone is driven by a hybrid governance mechanism, in which community participation in natural resource management serves as the central foundation. Sustainable livelihood support and gradual strengthening of local ecological understanding enhance community motivation and capacity to contribute to conservation practices. This interplay affirms the theoretical principles of community-based conservation and adaptive co-management, demonstrating that decentralized governance, when coupled with livelihood resilience and knowledge pluralism, can generate substantial ecological benefits in sensitive wetland systems.

4. DISCUSSION

The results of the structural model underscore the crucial role of community involvement, sustainable livelihoods, and local knowledge in driving effective wetland environmental conservation (WEC) in the proboscis monkey (*Nasalis Larvatus*) habitat buffer zone. Statistically significant and positive path coefficients indicate that each construct contributes meaningfully to the conservation model, although their relative strengths vary.

4.1. Community-Based Natural Resource Management

Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM)

is a pivotal approach in contemporary conservation efforts, particularly because of its strong positive correlation with community empowerment and ecological sustainability (Ali et al. 2025). The efficacy of CBNRM strategies, which prioritize local governance structures within participatory and decentralized frameworks, has been increasingly recognized in scholarly works. Research indicates that community involvement enhances effective governance and social capital, which are vital for fostering collective action. Studies have highlighted that local engagement in resource management can reduce conflicts related to resources, underscoring the significance of local knowledge and inclusive decision-making (Gandiwa et al. 2013, Kundu et al. 2010).

In buffer zones, where institutional governance may lack the authority and cultural relevance for effective enforcement, community-based approaches are especially crucial (Berkes 2007, Sullivan et al. 2017). The literature illustrates that integrating traditional knowledge and local governance mechanisms into conservation practices significantly elevates the capability of communities to act as frontline stewards in protecting ecological resources. This integration enhances governance and fosters a sense of stewardship among community members, which is essential for sustainable environmental management (Berkes 2007, Berkes and Jolly 2002). Furthermore, the concept of participative efficacy highlights the psychological aspects wherein community involvement leads to a positive transformation in collective identity, resulting in heightened collective empowerment and unified action toward sustainability (Rees & Bamberg 2014, Sharma & Patil 2025, Zomeren et al. 2012).

The findings regarding the importance of local networks resonate with the context of ecological protection. By leveraging such networks, communities can be effectively mobilized, reinforcing their crucial role in resource management and conservation. This dynamic reflects broader trends in social psychology, where collective action inspired by a shared identity can lead to significant pro-environmental behavior (Fielding & Hornsey 2016, Keshavarzi et al. 2021). Moreover, the successful implementation of community-

driven strategies can potentially reduce the transaction costs associated with complex governance systems, thus mitigating barriers to effective resource management (Lubell et al. 2016).

This evidence supports the assertion that CB-NRM is not only a significant predictor of ecological sustainability but also a vital strategy for empowering communities. This empowerment is critical for establishing resilient ecosystems and sustainable resource use and aligning local governance with broader conservation goals.

4.2. Sustainable Livelihood Approach

The sustainable livelihood (SL) approach plays a crucial role in advancing conservation initiatives by integrating economic security into the community management of natural resources. The statistical coefficient ($\beta = 0.262$) highlights the significance of the SL in promoting community resilience, reducing dependency on unsustainable extractive practices, and encouraging a long-term perspective on conservation efforts (Apine et al. 2019, Berkes 2004). When communities perceive tangible socio-economic benefits from conservation, such as income from ecotourism or payments for ecosystem services, their participation becomes more robust and sustainable (Naidoo et al. 2011, Pailler et al. 2015).

In buffer zones, where ecological preservation intersects with human livelihoods, ensuring that residents derive tangible benefits from conservation activities is crucial. For instance, studies in the Tambopata National Reserve in Peru have demonstrated that sustainable land-use practices, such as Brazil nut harvesting and fish farming, can provide economic returns similar to those from more destructive gold mining (Buřivalová et al. 2019a). Enhancing the value of sustainably sourced products at their origin can motivate communities to pursue environmentally friendly alternatives (Naidoo et al. 2011). Similarly, in India's Kaimur Wildlife Sanctuary, the development of ecotourism not only offers a viable source of income but also mitigates environmental degradation (Su et al. 2016).

The SL also highlights the importance of empowering communities by validating their social assets and ecological assets. For example, community engagement in asset-based conservation strategies in the Peruvian Amazon has been linked to improved livelihoods and enhanced sustainability in protected areas (Gena & Jemal 2022). Research in East Africa has revealed that factors such as secure land tenure, sustainable livelihoods, and effective communication among stakeholders are crucial to the success of community-based conservation, indicating that economic incentives alone are insufficient to ensure the effective management of natural resources (Pailler et al. 2015).

Neglecting the socio-economic dimensions of conservation can lead to inequities and exacerbate poverty, which underlines the need for a balanced approach that prioritizes both ecological and community needs. Studies in tropical regions have emphasized the critical role of maintaining community access to natural resources while simultaneously investing in infrastructure and market access to support sustainable livelihoods (Buřivalová et al. 2019b). This dual focus is essential for aligning conservation goals with the well-being of local populations (Hoa & Thuy 2023).

However, implementing the SL faces challenges, including infrastructure deficits, insufficient technical capacity, and limited public awareness. The effectiveness of sustainable livelihood strategies is heavily contextual; thus, SL programs must be tailored to the unique social, cultural, and economic characteristics of the communities involved to ensure lasting impacts (Berkes 2004, Buřivalová et al. 2019b). In conclusion, leveraging the Sustainable Livelihood Approach holds great promise for harmonizing economic development and environmental conservation and promoting resilience among local communities in buffer zones and beyond.

4.3. Local Knowledge (Indigenous Knowledge)

Indigenous knowledge (IK) is pivotal for enhancing environmental conservation efforts; however, its integration into formal conservation frameworks remains insufficiently recognized. The positive correlation ($\beta = 0.225$) between IK and successful conservation outcomes highlights the potential of traditional practices, which embody generations of ecological understanding, to make meaningful contributions to conservation policies (Kohler & Brondřzio 2016, Mutasa 2015, Tholkapiyan et al. 2025). However, the technocratic frameworks that often dominate these policies typically marginalize this knowledge, overlooking the critical place-based ecological insights that IK provides (Brondřzio et al. 2021, Coutant et al. 2025).

Additionally, Traditional Ecological Knowledge, as a component of IK, offers a holistic perspective on ecosystems that can complement and enrich Western scientific approaches to conservation strategy formulation (Muswazi 2001, Yongabi 2023). However, integrating IK into these strategies faces substantial structural obstacles, including historical colonial frameworks that perpetuate unequal power dynamics in conservation discourse. Such disparities hinder the recognition of IK as an equally valid epistemological system (McGregor 2021, Obiero et al. 2023). Despite their potential, TEK principles remain underutilized in natural resource management policies, often limited to localized projects rather than being integrated into broader

frameworks (Moola and Roth 2019, Shepard and Daly [2023]).

A cross-cultural collaborative approach to bridge epistemological differences is essential to advance meaningful Indigenous community involvement in conservation efforts. This collaborative process can promote dialogue between diverse knowledge systems, facilitating mutual understanding and enhancing the effectiveness of conservation strategies (Brondízio et al. 2021, Kohler and Brondízio 2016). The decolonization of conservation practices is increasingly recognized as an urgent priority, advocating for models that empower indigenous communities to take control of their conservation initiatives, thereby addressing contemporary ecological complexities in a more contextualized and equitable manner (Moola and Roth 2019, Muswazi 2001).

While the technocratic model has contributed significantly to conservation science, achieving sustainable conservation goals necessitates a balanced integration of IK with modern scientific approaches. Both knowledge systems offer valuable insights that, when combined, can lead to more effective and resilient conservation practices (Babidge et al. 2007, Brondízio et al. 2021, Mutasa 2015, Singh et al. 2025). Ensuring that Indigenous voices are included in policymaking processes not only validates their contributions but also enriches conservation practices through a deeper understanding of local ecosystems.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study reveals that the conservation of proboscis monkey habitats within the Curiak Island buffer zone is primarily influenced by three factors: Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM), Indigenous Knowledge (IK), and the Sustainable Livelihood Approach (SL). Qualitative data indicate that local communities actively contribute to maintaining wetland ecosystem stability, although their integration of indigenous knowledge into conservation practices remains limited. Quantitative analysis using PLS-SEM confirms that all three constructs significantly impact wetland conservation efforts, with CBNRM exerting the strongest influence. The model's coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.758$) suggests it accounts for a large portion of the variance in community conservation activities, though other external factors should be investigated. The comparatively lesser role of IK highlights the need to better incorporate local knowledge into conservation strategies. Overall, the findings support that community involvement and sustainable livelihoods can bolster habitat protection for proboscis monkeys. Nevertheless, due to the limitations in statistical reporting and the specific context of the dataset, policy

recommendations should be approached cautiously and not generalized beyond this study's conditions. Future research should include additional measurement indicators, adopt longitudinal methods, and examine external influences that may affect conservation outcomes in this region.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to express our deepest gratitude to all parties who have kindly agreed to be informants and respondents in the data collection for this study, namely: Yayasan Sahabat Bekantan Indonesia, the communities of Anjir Serapat Muara I Village, Anjir Serapat Muara Village, and Marabahan Baru Village.

7. REFERENCES

- Afriyie, K., Abass, K., Frempong, F., Arthur, B. and Gyasi, R.M. 2022. The dynamics and livelihood implications of illegal mining in Ghana: a critical assessment. *Geographical Research*, 61(1), pp.32-43. [DOI]
- Ali, S.H., Mohamed, A.M. and Nyang'au, S.N. 2025. Assessment of socio-economic and ecological impacts of community-based approaches in natural resources management in Mandera East Sub-County, Kenya. *East African Journal of Environment and Natural Resources*, 8(2), pp.545-560. [DOI]
- Anand, J., Byju, H., Nefla, A., Abhijith, S., Reshi, O.R. and Aarif, K.M. 2023. Conservation significance of Changaram wetlands—a key wintering site for migratory shorebirds and other waterbirds in the western coast of Kerala, India. *Journal of Threatened Taxa*, 15(1), pp.22410-22418. [DOI]
- Andrianandrasana, H. 2016. Testing the effectiveness of community-based conservation in conserving biodiversity, protecting ecosystem services, and improving human well-being in Madagascar. [PhD Thesis, University of Oxford].
- Apine, E., Turner, L.M., Rodwell, L.D. and Bhatta, R. 2019. The application of the sustainable livelihood approach to small scale-fisheries: the case of mud crab *Scylla Serrata* in south west India. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 170, pp.17-28. [DOI]
- Armah, F.A., Yawson, D.O., Pappoe, A.N.M. and Afrifa, E.K.A. 2010. Participation and sustainable management of coastal lagoon ecosystems: the case of the Fosu Lagoon in Ghana. *Sustainability*, 2(1), pp.383-399. [DOI]
- Arshad, M.W., Moazzam, M., Raziq, M.M. and Ahmed, W. 2023. Linking the willingness of smallholder dairy farmers to adopt minimum food safety and quality standards to the country's export potential. *International Journal of Food Science and Technology*, 58(10), pp.5557-5567.
- Asteria, D., Alvernia, P., Kholila, B.N., Husein, S.I. and Asrofani, F.W. 2024. Forest conservation by the indigenous Baduy community in the form of customary law. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 14(2), pp.175-189.
- Ávila-Foucat, V.S., Revollo-Fernández, D.A. and Navarrete, C. 2021. Determinants of livelihood diversification: the case of community-based ecotourism in Oaxaca, Mexico. *Sustainability*, 13(20), 11371, pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Babidge, S., Greer, S., Henry, R. and Pam, C. 2007. Management speak: indigenous knowledge and bureaucratic engagement. *Social Analysis*, 51(3), pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Baddianaah, I. and Baaweh, L. 2021. The prospects of community-based natural resource management in Ghana: a case study of Zukpiri community resource management area. *Heliyon*, 7(10), pp.1-12.

- Retrieved from [https://www.cell.com/heliyon/fulltext/S2405-8440\(21\)02290-8](https://www.cell.com/heliyon/fulltext/S2405-8440(21)02290-8)
- Badiou, P., McDougal, R.L., Pennock, D. and Clark, B. 2011. Greenhouse gas emissions and carbon sequestration potential in restored wetlands of the Canadian prairie pothole region. *Wetlands Ecology and Management*, 19(3), pp.237-256. [DOI]
- Ballut-Dajud, G., Herazo, L.C.S., Osorio-Martínez, I.M., Báez-García, W.G., Marín-Muñiz, J.L. and Betanzo-Torres, E.A. 2024. Comparison of carbon storage in forested and non-forested soils in tropical wetlands of Caimanera, Colombia, and Llano, Mexico. *Sustainability*, 16(12), 4966, pp.1-20. [DOI]
- Ballut-Dajud, G.A., Sandoval Herazo, L.C., Fernández-Lambert, G., Marín-Muñiz, J.L., López Méndez, M.C. and Betanzo-Torres, E.A. 2022. Factors affecting wetland loss: a review. *Land*, 11(3), 434, pp.1-25.
- Berkes, F. 2004. Rethinking community-based conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 18(3), pp.621-630. [DOI]
- Berkes, F. 2007. Community-based conservation in a globalized world. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(39), pp.15188-15193.
- Berkes, F. and Jolly, D. 2002. Adapting to climate change: social-ecological resilience in a Canadian western Arctic community. *Conservation Ecology*, 5(2), pp.1-15.
- Bhatia, D.K. 2025. Indigenous knowledge systems (IKS) and climate change mitigation: a tool for sustainable environmental management. *Bionature*, 45(2), pp.69-78. [DOI]
- Bhatia, S., Redpath, S.M., Suryawanshi, K. and Mishra, C. 2019. Beyond conflict: exploring the spectrum of human-wildlife interactions and their underlying mechanisms. *Oryx*, 54(5), pp.621-628. [DOI]
- Bhowmik, S. 2022. Ecological and economic importance of wetlands and their vulnerability: a review. In: *Research Anthology on Ecosystem Conservation and Preserving Biodiversity*, pp.11-27.
- Bhushan, S., Dincă, I. and Shikha, S. 2024. Evaluating local livelihoods, sustainable forest management, and the potential for ecotourism development in Kaimur Wildlife Sanctuary, India. *Frontiers in Forests and Global Change*, 7, 1491917, pp.1-15.
- Bowen, G.A. 2009. Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), pp.27-40.
- Brondízio, E.S., Aumeeruddy-Thomas, Y., Bates, P., Carino, J., Fernández-Llamazares, Á., Ferrari, M.F., Galvin, K., Reyes-García, V., McElwee, P., Molnár, Z., Samakov, A. and Shrestha, U.B. 2021. Locally based, regionally manifested, and globally relevant: indigenous and local knowledge, values, and practices for nature. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 46(1), pp.481-509. [DOI]
- Buřivalová, Z., Allnutt, T.F., Rademacher, D., Schlemm, A., Wilcove, D.S. and Butler, R. 2019a. What works in tropical forest conservation, and what does not: effectiveness of four strategies in terms of environmental, social, and economic outcomes. *Conservation Science and Practice*, 1(6), pp.1-12. [DOI]
- Buřivalová, Z., Allnutt, T.F., Rademacher, D., Schlemm, A., Wilcove, D.S. and Butler, R. 2019b. What works in tropical forest conservation, and what does not: effectiveness of four strategies in terms of environmental, social, and economic outcomes. *Conservation Science and Practice*, 1(6), pp.1-12. [DOI]
- Chaokromthong, K. and Sintao, N. 2021. Sample size estimation using Yamane and Cochran and Krejcie and Morgan and green formulas and Cohen statistical power analysis by G* Power and comparisons. *Aphait International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences and Technology*, 10(2), pp.76-86.
- Cheveau, M., Imbeau, L., Drapeau, P. and Bélanger, L. 2008. Current status and future directions of traditional ecological knowledge in forest management: a review. *The Forestry Chronicle*, 84(2), pp.231-243. [DOI]
- Christou, P.A. 2022. How to use thematic analysis in qualitative research. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Tourism*, 3(2), pp.79-95.
- Coutant, O., Davy, D., Jahn-Oyac, A., Quartarollo, G., Valentini, A., Déjean, T., Brosse, S. and Murienne, J. 2025. Confronting forest-dweller local ecological knowledge and environmental DNA measurements of biodiversity. *People and Nature*, 7(6), pp.1382-1395. [DOI]
- Creswell, J.W. 2017. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications, pp.300.
- Davidson, N.C. 2014. How much wetland has the world lost? long-term and recent trends in global wetland area. *Marine & Freshwater Research*, 65(10), pp.934-941. [DOI]
- Dayer, A.A., Williams, A., Cosbar, E.A. and Racey, M. 2017. Blaming threatened species: media portrayal of human-wildlife conflict. *Oryx*, 53(2), pp.265-272. [DOI]
- Dewu, S. and Røskaft, E. 2017. Community attitudes towards protected areas: insights from Ghana. *Oryx*, 52(3), pp.489-496. [DOI]
- Dowsley, M. and Wenzel, G.W. 2009. "The time of the most polar bears": a co-management conflict in Nunavut. *Arctic*, 61(2), pp.1-10. [DOI]
- Dupa, H., Ansofino, A. and Irwan, I. 2024. Tourism awareness group strategy in strengthening collective action and social capital for Padang City tourism development. *International Journal of Educational Research Excellence (IJERE)*, 3(1), pp.93-100.
- Edinéia Aparecida dos Santos Galvanin and Caldas, M.M. 2025. Evaluating public policies in fire-affected conservation priority areas of the Brazilian Pantanal. *Research Square*, pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Fahlevi, R. and Raudina, N.R. 2023. Proboscis monkeys (Bekantan) rescue community: a civic engagement in the Sahabat Bekantan Indonesia Foundation. In: *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Social and Political Sciences*, pp.738-746. [DOI]
- Fang, R., Xiong, K., Ding, Y. and Wang, D. 2024. Integration of the natural world heritage conservation and development of buffer zone agroforestry: from scientometrics insights and implications for the Karst World Heritage. *Heritage Science*, 12(1), 338, pp.1-20. [DOI]
- Fielding, K.S. and Hornsey, M.J. 2016. A social identity analysis of climate change and environmental attitudes and behaviors: insights and opportunities. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 121, pp.1-10.
- Foyet, M. 2024. Community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) in southern Africa: history, principles, evolution and contemporary challenges. *NamJEnv*, 9, pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Franke, G. and Sarstedt, M. 2019. Heuristics versus statistics in discriminant validity testing: a comparison of four procedures. *Internet Research*, 29(3), pp.430-447.
- Freund, C.A., Achmad, H., Kanisius, P., Naruri, R., Tang, E. and Knott, C.D. 2019. Conserving orangutans one classroom at a time: evaluating the effectiveness of a wildlife education program for school-aged children in Indonesia. *Animal Conservation*, 23(1), pp.18-27. [DOI]
- Gagnon, C. and Berteaux, D. 2009. Integrating traditional ecological knowledge and ecological science: a question of scale. *Ecology and Society*, 14(2), pp.1-10. [DOI]
- Gandiwa, E., Heitkönig, I.M., Lokhorst, A.M., Prins, H.H. and Leeuwis, C. 2013. CAMPFIRE and human-wildlife conflicts in local communities bordering northern Gonarezhou National Park, Zimbabwe. *Ecology and Society*, 18(4), pp.1-12.
- Garnett, S.T., Burgess, N.D., Fa, J.E., Fernández-Llamazares, Á., Molnár, Z., Robinson, C.J., Watson, J.E., Zander, K.K., Austin, B. and Brondizio, E.S. 2018. A spatial overview of the global importance of indigenous lands for conservation. *Nature Sustainability*, 1(7), pp.369-374.
- Gena, H. and Jemal, M. 2022. Community based conservation approaches: implications for biodiversity conservation and socio-economic development of local community in Bale Mountains National Park, South East Ethiopia. *Research Square*, pp.1-20. [DOI]
- Ghaderi, Z., Shahabi, E., Fennell, D. and Khoshkam, M. 2022. Increasing community environmental awareness, participation in conservation, and livelihood enhancement through tourism. *Local Environment*, 27(5), pp.605-621. [DOI]

- Ghasempour Ganji, S.F. and Kazemi, A. 2024. Improving international brand performance: the implications of marketing capabilities, brand orientation and customer value cocreation. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 33(8), pp.1088-1100.
- Gomes-da-Silva, J., Lughadha, E.N. and Forzza, R.C. 2025. Protecting hidden treasures: indigenous lands safeguard 50% of areas with the highest potential for angiosperm discoveries in Brazil—patterns and conservation priorities. *PLoS One*, 20(7), e0326507, pp.1-18. [DOI]
- Gong, Y., Zhang, R., Yao, K., Liu, B. and Wang, F. 2020. A livelihood resilience measurement framework for dam-induced displacement and resettlement. *Water*, 12(11), 3191, pp.1-20. [DOI]
- Goumas, M., Lee, V.E., Boogert, N.J., Kelley, L.A. and Thornton, A. 2020. The role of animal cognition in human-wildlife interactions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, pp.1-10. [DOI]
- Hair, J.F., Risher, J.J., Sarstedt, M. and Ringle, C.M. 2019. When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), pp.2-24.
- Hansen, A.J. and DeFries, R. 2007. Ecological mechanisms linking protected areas to surrounding lands. *Ecological Applications*, 17(4), pp.974-988. [DOI]
- Hardy, G., Pacris, F.A. and Baloloy, M.V. 2023. Socio-economic component, coastal resource use and perception, and participation of coastal communities/fishing households in Caraoan, Gonzaga, Cagayan. *International Journal of Biosciences*, 22(2), pp.27-32. [DOI]
- Hare, D., Daniels, M. and Blossley, B. 2021. Public perceptions of deer management in Scotland. *Frontiers in Conservation Science*, 2, pp.1-12. [DOI]
- Harly, L.N.B. 2023. Sustainable forest management from the perspective of customary law in Indonesia: a case study in the Bayan community. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(1), pp.32-42.
- Hidayat, A., Sulistioadi, Y.B., Kustiawan, W., Sukartiningsih, Haryanto, Z. and Suba, R.B. 2023. Habitat suitability of proboscis monkey *Nasalis larvatus* Wurm. in Muara Kaman Sedulang Nature Reserve, East Kalimantan. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1282(1), 012018, pp.1-10. [DOI]
- Hidayatullah, R., Muis, A., Hernawati, H., Refandi, T., Aini, M., Amir, S. and Abdurachman, M.H. 2023. Pengawasan dengan metode smart patrol di kawasan konservasi Taman Wisata Perairan Gili Balu. [Supervision using smart patrol method in the Gili Balu Water Tourism Park conservation area]. *Jurnal Biologi Tropis*, 23(2), pp.442-449. [DOI]
- Ho, L.T. and Thuy, N.T.T. 2023. Identification of non-impact livelihoods on mangrove resources in Can Gio, Vietnam. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1247(1), 012002, pp.1-10. [DOI]
- Hu, S., Niu, Z., Chen, Y., Li, L. and Zhang, H. 2017. Global wetlands: potential distribution, wetland loss, and status. *Science of the Total Environment*, 586, pp.319-327.
- Iiyama, M., Kariuki, P., Kristjanson, P., Kaitibie, S. and Maitima, J. 2007. Livelihood diversification strategies, incomes and soil management strategies: a case study from Kerio Valley, Kenya. *Journal of International Development*, 20(3), pp.380-397. [DOI]
- Infield, M. and Mugisha, A. 2013. Culture, values and conservation: a review of perspectives, policies and practices. Fauna & Flora International, Cambridge UK, pp.2-50.
- Inskip, C. and Zimmermann, A. 2009. Human-felid conflict: a review of patterns and priorities worldwide. *Oryx*, 43(1), pp.18-34. [DOI]
- Iqbal, Z. and Rao, Z.-R. 2023. Social capital and loan credit terms: does it matter in microfinance contract? *Journal of Asian Business and Economic Studies*, 30(3), pp.187-209.
- Ite, D.U.E. 1996. Community perceptions of the Cross River National Park, Nigeria. *Environmental Conservation*, 23(4), pp.351-357. [DOI]
- Jakiel, M., Kaim, D. and Ostafin, K. 2024. Long-term landscape changes in the Ojców National Park (Poland) and its surroundings: implications for the effectiveness of buffer zones. *Sustainability*, 16(15), 6649, pp.1-20.
- Jayawardena, I. 2024. Indigenous, ethnic, and racial diversity and climate justice: New Zealand's climate adaptation policies and policy approaches. *Environmental Research: Climate*, 3(3), 035004, pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Jolly, H. and Stronza, A. 2025. Insights on human-wildlife coexistence from social science and indigenous and traditional knowledge. *Conservation Biology*, 39(2), pp.1-12. [DOI]
- Juliana, J., Sihombing, S.O. and Suwu, S.E. 2023. Community-based ecotourism in Sawarna Tourism Village. *Enrichment Journal of Management*, 13(1), pp.258-269. [DOI]
- Kansky, R., Kidd, M. and Knight, A.T. 2016. A wildlife tolerance model and case study for understanding human wildlife conflicts. *Biological Conservation*, 201, pp.137-145. [DOI]
- Karanth, K.K., Jain, S. and Weinthal, E. 2017. Human-wildlife interactions and attitudes towards wildlife and wildlife reserves in Rajasthan, India. *Oryx*, 53(3), pp.523-531. [DOI]
- Karim, F., Palmer, A. and Brodie, J. 2013. Hydrodynamic modelling of floodplain flow residence time in a wet tropical catchment, north eastern Australia. In: *Proceedings of MODSIM2013*, pp.1-7. [DOI]
- Ke, G.N., I Ketut Aria Pria Utama, Wagner, T., Sweetman, A.K., Arshad, A., Nath, T.K., Neoh, J.Y., Muchamad, L.S. and Suroso, D.S.A. 2022. Influence of mangrove forests on subjective and psychological wellbeing of coastal communities: case studies in Malaysia and Indonesia. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10, pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Keshavarzi, S., McGarty, C. and Khajehnoori, B. 2021. Testing social identity models of collective action in an Iranian environmental movement. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 31(4), pp.452-464.
- Kia, Z. 2021. Ecotourism in Indonesia: local community involvement and the affecting factors. *Journal of Governance and Public Policy*, 8(2), pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Kohler, F. and Brondizio, E.S. 2016. Considering the needs of indigenous and local populations in conservation programs. *Conservation Biology*, 31(2), pp.245-251. [DOI]
- Krejcie, R. V. and Morgan, D. W. 1970. Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, pp. 607-610.
- Kundu, R., Aura, C.M., Muchiri, M., Njiru, J.M. and Ojuok, J.E. 2010. Difficulties of fishing at Lake Naivasha, Kenya: is community participation in management the solution? *Lakes & Reservoirs: Research & Management*, 15(1), pp.15-23.
- Kvale, S. 2009. *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Sage Publications, pp.400.
- Lamichhane, S., Joshi, R., Poudel, B. and Subedi, P. 2020. Role of community in leading conservation: effectiveness, success and challenges of community-based anti-poaching unit in Nepal. *Grassroots Journal of Natural Resources*, 3(4), pp.94-109. [DOI]
- Llorente, M., Villariego, P. and Amici, F. 2025. Multimodal learning has an impact on conservation knowledge, attitudes, and behavioral intentions towards spider monkeys in Mayan children from Punta Laguna, Yucatán. *American Journal of Primatology*, 87(9), pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Lubell, M., Mewhirer, J., Berardo, R. and Scholz, J.T. 2016. Transaction costs and the perceived effectiveness of complex institutional systems. *Public Administration Review*, 77(5), pp.668-680. [DOI]
- Mani, I., Melles, G. and Gautam, S. 2023. Community development for Bote in Chitwan National Park, Nepal: a political ecology of development logic of erasure. *Sustainability*, 15(3), 2834, pp.1-18. [DOI]
- McGregor, D. 2021. Indigenous knowledge systems in environmental governance in Canada. *Kula: Knowledge Creation, Dissemination and Preservation Studies*, 5(1), pp.1-10. [DOI]
- Mekonen, S., Chinasho, A., Berhanu, K. and Tesfaye, S. 2017. Conservation opportunities and local community attitudes towards wildlife in

- Harena Forest, south east Ethiopia. *Journal of Biodiversity & Endangered Species*, 5(4), pp.1-8. [DOI]
- Mitsch, W.J. and Gosselink, J.G. 2015. *Wetlands*. John Wiley & Sons, pp.750.
- Moola, F. and Roth, R. 2019. Moving beyond colonial conservation models: indigenous protected and conserved areas offer hope for biodiversity and advancing reconciliation in the Canadian boreal forest. *Environmental Reviews*, 27(2), pp.200-201. [DOI]
- Moomaw, W.R., Chmura, G.L., Davies, G.T., Finlayson, C.M., Middleton, B.A., Natali, S.M., Perry, J.E., Roulet, N. and Sutton-Grier, A.E. 2018. Wetlands in a changing climate: science, policy and management. *Wetlands*, 38(2), pp.183-205. [DOI]
- Mufune, P. 2015. Community based natural resource management (CBNRM) and sustainable development in Namibia. *Journal of Land and Rural Studies*, 3(1), pp.121-138. [DOI]
- Munthe, N. and Shuguang, W. 2025. Mechanism of the influence of university support internal quality assurance on undergraduates' learning outcome. *Scholars Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5, pp.97-110.
- Muswazi, P. 2001. Indigenous knowledge management in Swaziland: perspectives. *Information Development*, 17(4), pp.250-256. [DOI]
- Mutasa, M. 2015. Knowledge apartheid in disaster risk management discourse: is marrying indigenous and scientific knowledge the missing link? *Jambá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*, 7(1), pp.1-8. [DOI]
- Naidoo, R., Weaver, L., Longcamp, M.D. and Plessis, P.d. 2011. Namibia's community-based natural resource management programme: an unrecognized payments for ecosystem services scheme. *Environmental Conservation*, 38(4), pp.445-453. [DOI]
- Newmaster, A., Berg, K., Ragupathy, S., Palanisamy, M., Sambandan, K. and Newmaster, S. 2011. Local knowledge and conservation of seagrasses in the Tamil Nadu State of India. *Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine*, 7(1), pp.1-10. [DOI]
- Newton, A., Icelly, J., Cristina, S., Perillo, G.M.E., Turner, R.E., Ashan, D., Cragg, S.M., Luo, Y., Tu, C., Li, Y., Zhang, H., Ramesh, R., Forbes, D.L., Solidoro, C., Béjaoui, B., Gao, S., Pastres, R., Kelsey, H., Taillie, D. and Kuenzer, C. 2020. Anthropogenic, direct pressures on coastal wetlands. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 8, pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Ngwenya, F. 2024. Biodiversity conservation strategies and their impact on ecosystem health in Mozambique. *International Journal of Natural Sciences*, 4(1), pp.32-45. [DOI]
- Nurhidayah, L. and Alam, S. 2020. The forest and its biodiversity: assessing the adequacy of biodiversity protection laws in Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Environmental Law*, 23(2), pp.178-201.
- Obiero, K., Mboya, J.B., Ouko, K.O., Kembanya, E., Nyauchi, E., Munguti, J., Outa, N. and Githukia, C.M. 2023. The role of indigenous knowledge in fisheries resource management for aquaculture development: a case study of the Kenyan Lake Victoria region. *Aquaculture, Fish and Fisheries*, 3(2), pp.175-183. [DOI]
- Omolo, N. and Mafongoya, P. 2019. Gender, social capital and adaptive capacity to climate variability. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, 11(3), pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Ortega-Álvarez, R., Sánchez-González, L.A., Valera-Bermejo, A. and Berlanga-García, H. 2016. Community-based monitoring and protected areas: towards an inclusive model. *Sustainable Development*, 25(3), pp.200-212. [DOI]
- Padmanaba, M., Sheil, D., Basuki, I. and Liswanti, N. 2013. Accessing local knowledge to identify where species of conservation concern occur in a tropical forest landscape. *Environmental Management*, 52(2), pp.348-359. [DOI]
- Pailler, S., Naidoo, R., Burgess, N.D., Freeman, O.E. and Fisher, B. 2015. Impacts of community-based natural resource management on wealth, food security and child health in Tanzania. *PLoS One*, 10(7), e0133252, pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Peterson, M.N., Birkhead, J.L., Leong, K.M., Peterson, M.J. and Peterson, T.R. 2010. Rearticulating the myth of human-wildlife conflict. *Conservation Letters*, 3(2), pp.74-82. [DOI]
- Pimid, M. and Chambers, G.K. 2025. How personal values affect conservation initiatives: indigenous community support for conservation in rural Sabah, Malaysia. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 14(3), pp.404-422. [DOI]
- Polfus, J.L., Heinemeyer, K.S. and Hebblewhite, M. 2013. Comparing traditional ecological knowledge and western science woodland caribou habitat models. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 78(1), pp.112-121. [DOI]
- Poor, E.E., Imron, M.A., Novalina, R., Shaffer, L.J. and Mullinax, J.M. 2021. Increasing diversity to save biodiversity: rising to the challenge and supporting Indonesian women in conservation. *Conservation Science and Practice*, 3(6), e395, pp.1-10. [DOI]
- Prasath, S. and Umashankar, K. 2023. Livelihood resilience of smallholder dairy farmers against external shocks: a case study in the northern dry zone of Sri Lanka. *Tropical Agricultural Research*, 34(2), pp.94-106. [DOI]
- Putra, A.K., Susetyo, B.B. and Ngimba, S.D. 2022. Social capital based on local ecological knowledge in the Bompon watershed community. *KnE Social Sciences*, pp.1-10. [DOI]
- Rakotomamonjy, S.N., Jones, J.P.G., Razafimanahaka, J.H., Ramamonjisoa, B. and Williams, S.J. 2014. The effects of environmental education on children's and parents' knowledge and attitudes towards lemurs in rural Madagascar. *Animal Conservation*, 18(2), pp.157-166. [DOI]
- Ramadhan, D.M., Fadullah, M., Komalasari, D., Fadila, A., Amardani, M.S. and Imanta, L.D. 2024. Changing waves: maritime community cultural responses to the Anthropocene in Tambak Lorok, Semarang. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1317(1), 012018, pp.1-10. [DOI]
- Ramanantoandro, T., Reynolds, T.D., Andrianaharinjaka, F.A.R., Koera, R.A., Ramanitrarivo, L.C., Raobimandrantso, N.A., Randriambintsoa, T., Randrianoroosa, A., Ratsiraron, J., Mirado T.J.F. Rakotonirina, and Chaix, G. 2024. International conference on tropical wood (ICTW 2024) advancing the sustainable use of tropical forests. *Bois et Forêts des Tropiques*, 361, pp.3-8. [DOI]
- Ramos, S.C. 2018. Considerations for culturally sensitive traditional ecological knowledge research in wildlife conservation. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 42(2), pp.358-365. [DOI]
- Ramos, S.C. 2021. Understanding Yurok traditional ecological knowledge and wildlife management. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 86(1), pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Rees, J. and Bamberg, S. 2014. Climate protection needs societal change: determinants of intention to participate in collective climate action. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(5), pp.466-473. [DOI]
- Reo, N.J. and Whyte, K.P. 2011. Hunting and morality as elements of traditional ecological knowledge. *Human Ecology*, 40(1), pp.15-27. [DOI]
- Rezeki, A., Hatta, G.M., Arifin, Y.F. and Yunita, R. 2023a. Ecology of endemic primate proboscis monkeys at Curia Island Area, South Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Jurnal Multidisiplin Madani*, 3(3), pp.552-566.
- Rezeki, A., Hatta, G.M., Arifin, Y.F. and Yunita, R. 2023b. Knowledge, perception, and participation of proboscis monkey habitat buffer village communities, Curia Island Area. *Interdisciplinary Social Studies*, 2(4), pp.1866-1876. [DOI]
- Ridwan, R., Afrizal, A., Maryam, S. and Sari, S. 2022. Socio-economic perspective of indigenous community conflict with corporation. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Social and Economic Development*, pp.1-8. [DOI]
- Rudiarto, I., Handayani, W., Wijaya, H.B. and Insani, T.D. 2019. Rural livelihood resilience: an assessment of social, economic, environment, and physical dimensions. *MATEC Web of Conferences*, 280, 01002, pp.1-6. [DOI]

- Ruíz-Mallén, I. and Corbera, E. 2013. Community-based conservation and traditional ecological knowledge: implications for social-ecological resilience. *Ecology and Society*, 18(4), pp.1-12. [DOI]
- Sallu, S.M., Twyman, C. and Stringer, L.C. 2010. Resilient or vulnerable livelihoods? assessing livelihood dynamics and trajectories in rural Botswana. *Ecology and Society*, 15(4), pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Sharma, R. and Patil, V. 2025. Exploring institutional climate capacity assessment indicators of community-based organizations in the conservation projects: a participative approach. *Nature Environment & Pollution Technology*, 24(2), pp.1-10.
- Shepard, G.H. and Daly, L. 2023. Sensory ecology, bioeconomy, and the age of COVID: a parallax view of indigenous and scientific knowledge. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 15(3), pp.584-607. [DOI]
- Shokirov, Q. and Backhaus, N. 2020. Integrating hunter knowledge with community-based conservation in the Pamir Region of Tajikistan. *Ecology and Society*, 25(1), pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Sidi, M.A.M., Ahmad, B.E., Puan, C.L., Noor, M.I.M., Isa, K.A., Norsyam, W.M. and Johannis, N.J. 2022. Recreational risks: human and wildlife conflicts at Johor National Parks, Malaysia. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1019(1), 012007, pp.1-10. [DOI]
- Sihombing, D., Sihombing, M., Lubis, S. and Tarmizi, H.B. 2019. Community tourism awareness influence against tourism development and regional development in North Tapanuli Regency, Indonesia. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 10(3), pp.1-10. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3456449
- Silva, J.A. and Mosimane, A. 2012. Conservation-based rural development in Namibia. *The Journal of Environment & Development*, 22(1), pp.25-50. [DOI]
- Singh, A., Kazi, R., Gorde, S., Shukla, R.P., Gawande, A. and Kumar, A. 2025. Exploring the role of environmental education in promoting sustainability mindset: an empirical analysis using forward and hierarchical regression methods. *Nature Environment and Pollution Technology*, 24(3), pp.1-7.
- Sohail, M.T. and Chen, S. 2022. A systematic PLS-SEM approach on assessment of indigenous knowledge in adapting to floods, a way forward to sustainable agriculture. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 13, pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Stapleton, S.J., Uribe, A. and Wright, A.L. 2022. Televising justice during war. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 66(3), pp.529-552. [DOI]
- Stark, D., Nijman, V., Lhota, S., Robins, J. and Goossens, B. 2012. Modeling population viability of local proboscis monkey *Nasalis larvatus* populations: conservation implications. *Endangered Species Research*, 16(1), pp.31-43. [DOI]
- Stolton, S., Dudley, N., Avcıoğlu Çokçalışkan, B., Hunter, D., Ivanić, K.-Z., Kanga, E., Kettunen, M., Kumagai, Y., Maxted, N. and Senior, J. 2015. Values and benefits of protected areas. In: *Protected Area Governance and Management*, pp.145-168.
- Strier, K.B. 2016. *Primate behavioral ecology*. Routledge, pp.600.
- Su, M., Wall, G. and Xu, K. 2016. Tourism-induced livelihood changes at Mount Sanqingshan World Heritage Site, China. *Environmental Management*, 57(5), pp.1024-1040. [DOI]
- Sullivan, A., York, A.M., White, D.D., Hall, S.J. and Yabiku, S.T. 2017. De jure versus de facto institutions: trust, information, and collective efforts to manage the invasive mile-a-minute weed (*Mikania micrantha*). *International Journal of the Commons*, 11(1), pp.1-20.
- Susilo, H., Takahashi, Y. and Yabe, M. 2017. The opportunity cost of labor for valuing mangrove restoration in Mahakam Delta, Indonesia. *Sustainability*, 9(12), 2169, pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Tholkapiyan, M., Sankaradass, V., Hariharasudhan, C., Priyanka, M. and Ravisundar, K. 2025. Spatio-temporal changes of chlorophyll concentration with environmental parameters over the Gulf of Mannar, India. *Nature Environment & Pollution Technology*, 24(3), pp.1-10.
- Toule, T., Lhota, S., Scott, K., Putera, A.K.S., Kustiawan, W. and Nijman, V. 2022. A decade of proboscis monkey (*Nasalis larvatus*) population monitoring in Balikpapan Bay: confronting predictions with empirical data. *American Journal of Primatology*, 84(2), pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Ulum, A.S., Djati, M.S. and Rozuli, A.I. 2024. Community-based plastic waste management model in Bangun Village, Mojokerto Regency, Indonesia. *Nature Environment & Pollution Technology*, 23(4), pp.1-10.
- Unks, R.R., Goldman, M.J., Mialhe, F. and Pinho, J.R.d. 2021. "People should also look after the people": relational values of wildlife and collectively titled land in Ilkisingo Maasai group ranches in southern Kenya. *Ecology and Society*, 26(3), pp.1-20. [DOI]
- Vergara-Ríos, D., Montes-Correa, A.C., Urbina-Cardona, J.N., Luque-Villa, M.A.D., Cattán, P.E. and Granda-Rodríguez, H.D. 2020. Local community knowledge and perceptions towards amphibians in urban and rural settings: tools for biological conservation. *Research Square*, pp.1-15. [DOI]
- Walpole, M. and Davidson, N.C. 2018. Stop draining the swamp: it's time to tackle wetland loss. *Oryx*, 52(4), pp.595-596. [DOI]
- Wardatutthoyibah, W., Pudyatmoko, S., Imron, M.A. and Subrata, S.A. 2023. Habitat use of proboscis monkey (*Nasalis larvatus*) in production forests of West Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity*, 24(3), pp.1-10. [DOI]
- Wilfred, P. 2010. Towards sustainable wildlife management areas in Tanzania. *Tropical Conservation Science*, 3(1), pp.103-116. [DOI]
- Yazezew, D. 2022. Human-wildlife conflict and community perceptions towards wildlife conservation in and around Wof-Washa Natural State Forest, Ethiopia. *BMC Zoology*, 7(1), pp.1-12. [DOI]
- Yongabi, K.A. 2023. Perspectives on indigenous knowledge in mitigating climate change. *Research and Reviews on Healthcare Open Access Journal*, 8(4), pp.1-5. [DOI]
- Yulasteriyani, Y., Putri, C.A., Istiqoma, I., Abror, M.Y. and Sartika, D.D. 2025. Sustainable livelihood level of the community in Kalampadu Village, Ogan Ilir Regency: an analysis using SEM-PLS. *Society*, 13(1), pp.241-255. [DOI]
- Zikri, I., Takahashi, M., Salsabila, M., Hamid, A., Ginting, L.N. and Sofyan, S. 2024. Livelihood vulnerability of post-disaster rehabilitation in Banda Aceh and its neighbouring Gampongs. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1297(1), 012095, pp.1-10. [DOI]
- Zomeran, M.v., Saguy, T. and Schellhaas, F.M.H. 2012. Believing in "making a difference" to collective efforts: participative efficacy beliefs as a unique predictor of collective action. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 16(5), pp.618-634. [DOI]
- Zuhdi, M.H., Widi, T.S.M., Rezeki, A. and Putra, A.R.S. 2024a. Local community participation under proboscis monkey conservation-based ecotourism development in Curiak Island Area. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1360(1), 012020, pp.1-10. [DOI]
- Zuhdi, M.H., Widi, T.S.M., Rezeki, A. and Putra, A.R.S. 2024b. Perceptions of the local community on impacts of proboscis monkey conservation-based ecotourism development at Curiak Island Area. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1360(1), 012019, pp.1-10. [DOI]