2 Human-baboon conflict on resettled farms in Zimbabwe: Attitudes and Perceptions among

3 local farmers.

4

5 Abstract

As human populations expand into areas where wildlife exists, competition for resources and 6 confrontation arises as a result. Some parts of rural Zimbabwe are typical of this problem especially 7 8 in newly resettled areas. The aim of this survey was to examine the impact of crop raiding and 9 livestock depredation by baboons (Papio ursinus Kerr) on farmers living around the edge of Makumbiri mountains in Concession, Mazowe District in Mashonaland Province of Zimbabwe. The 10 survey was conducted from January to mid-April 2018 using a set of structured questionnaires 11 complemented with field survey, focus group discussion and in-depth interviews. Fifty-nine crop 12 13 fields were surveyed and forty newly resettled farmers within the five villages surrounding the mountains were interviewed. The purpose was to elicit information on their experiences with 14 15 crop/livestock losses incurred from baboons, and to quantify these losses as well as to evaluate their attitudes and perceptions towards the baboons and their mitigation strategies towards their losses. 16 Apart from maize, some respondents (20%) reported that other crops raided were vegetables and 17 other small grains such as rapoko (30%). About 62.9% of the respondents indicated livestock losses 18 by baboons during the 2017 cropping season. The total maize crop destroyed in each field was 19 compared with the total estimate of the crops grown in that field producing an average percentage 20 loss of 0.11%. The χ^2 test showed that there was no relationship between the level of crop 21 destruction and the distance from the edge of the forest ($\chi^2 = 4110$, df = 58, p= 0.086). Many (62.5 22 %) farmers felt that baboons were retarding their success as a community but many opted to coexist 23 24 with baboons. Although baboons are vermin in a society relying on subsistence agriculture, their impact is perceived to be overly moderate. Peaceful coexistence between humans and baboons 25

- seems to be the favoured conservation strategy.
- 27 28
- **Key Words:** Baboons, primates, human-wildlife conflict, attitude, crops.
- 30
- 31

32

33 **1.0 Introduction**

Human wildlife conflict is a significant and critical threat to conservation across the world [1]. This 34 threat occurs when the needs of human population overlap with the requirements of the wildlife 35 which usually results in costs to both the local residents and animals [2]. [3], defines human wildlife 36 conflicts as conflicts which occur when the needs and behaviour of wildlife impact negatively on 37 38 the goals of humans, or when the goals of humans negatively impact the needs of wildlife. According to [4], local farmers may resort to lethal means of dealing with wildlife, because they 39 view them as pests and hence try to protect their land. However, this often results in the decline of 40 wildlife populations. The losses experienced by local farmers encompass financial losses when 41 crops are damaged, resulting in yield reduction. In some instances, local farmers are forced to 42 replant, thus incurring an added cost on inputs. Local farmers also experience other psycho-social 43 stresses as they try to safe guard their crops, sleeping late and waking up early and sometimes 44 having to assign guarding duties to 45

- 46 school- going children and the elderly.
- 47

48 Wild animals have also been blamed for loss of property and livestock. In Kariba, Zimbabwe, for

example, [5] reports that the proximity of human settlements to the game reserves increases the

50 chance of conflict. In Gokwe, Zimbabwe, [6] reports that households reported a 12% loss in

51 livestock due to lion and baboon raids between 1993 and 1996. In Tsavo Conservation area in

- 52 Kenya, [7] have also reported that children's learning is disrupted by elephants, reducing their
- contact hours with the teachers at school. Some of the elephants have been observed visiting the
- schools while others prevent movement to or from school. This has been observed to affect the
- 55 performance of pupils in the national school examinations.
- 56

57 Conflict between humans and wildlife is viewed as a major factor which affects conservationists' 58 efforts in Africa [8]. Conservationists are however pushing for increased tolerance of the animals' 59 behaviour and some even advocate for cohabitation between the wild animals and humans. Some 60 conservationists believe that with more information from local farmers, citing their losses, feelings, 61 experiences and losses may actually help in the formulation of mitigating strategies in this human 62 wildlife conflict [9].

63

Crops near forests are often predictable and accessible sources of nutrition for wildlife [10]. 64 Extensive damage through crop raiding can adversely impact local farmers' livelihoods [11], and 65 thus compromise their food security [12]. Local farmers settled around Makumbiri mountain ranges 66 situated in Concession, Mazowe District of Mashonaland Central Province in Zimbabwe experience 67 crop and livestock raids by the Chacma baboons (Papio ursinus) and other wild animals. The 68 previous white commercial local farmers in Zimbabwe, who used to own the farms surrounding 69 these mountains, used to ward off baboons and other wild animals through the use of rifles, and 70 could afford to put up barricades around their farm lands, which protected their crops from the 71 animals. Such deterrents, which made the animals stay away from the farms, are not easily available 72 to the new local farmers and hence they experience periodic raids from wildlife. Each season, the 73 local farmers have to spend money and time to guard their crops from attack by baboons. 74

75

76 An area that has received little attention within agricultural development is the potential damage that baboons can cause to farmers' fields. In Africa, baboons Papio spp. and vervets Chlorocebus 77 spp. top the list of crop-raiding primates [13], [14]. Farmers in developing countries often have 78 limited access to cash and are rarely compensated for their losses. Individual economic losses 79 suffered from crop-raiding can be relatively high [15]. No studies have been conducted on crop 80 damage by baboons in the resettled farms of Concession, hence, there is still an increasing need for 81 82 a proper understanding of crop raiding patterns and the need to document the level of conflict between humans and these primates. According to [8], a good understanding of the economic and 83 social costs of living with wildlife will go a long way towards alleviating the problem. For the 84 85 purpose of adopting measures for baboon conservation in and around these new human settlements, [14] advocates a comprehensive record of crop-raiding activity, including patterns of raiding, 86 farmer and raider behaviour, crop losses, and the parameters of raiding events. The aim of this 87 research was to evaluate the extent to which local farmers incur losses due to baboon raids, and to 88 determine whether baboons are as much of a threat as they are perceived to be by the local farming 89 community. 90

91

92 2.0 Methodology

93

94 2.1 Study Area

The research was conducted from January to mid-April 2018 at forest-agriculture interfaces around

- 96 Makumbiri mountain ranges, which are situated in former Bellavista farm $(17^{\circ} 30' 31'' \text{ S and } 30^{\circ}$
- 40' 29" E, altitude 2183 to 2268 m above sea level) in Concession, Mazowe District of
- 98 Mashonaland Central Province in Zimbabwe. Concession is located about 33 km north of Harare
- and 112 km west of Bindura. The forest covers an area of about 57 hectares. The average annual

rainfall is 1739 mm, with the rainy season stretching from November to March and a relatively dry

101 period from May to October. There is a high variation of temperature throughout the year but the

102 maximum temperature is in October. The main crops cultivated are maize, groundnuts, sorghum,

tomatoes, onion and various types of leaf vegetables. The farmers are also involved in small-scale

104 livestock rearing. Cattle, goats and chickens are the main livestock animals reared.

105 106

107 **2.2 Study Population**

All the households which surround the Makumbiri mountain ranges were included as the study 108 population. All study fields adjoined forest and were surveyed for vulnerability to livestock and 109 crop-raiding. These farmers were selected because they live near the mountains and some have their 110 fields near the forest or mountains. Thus, those local farmers who had previous conflicts with the 111 Chacma baboons, Papio ursinus were selected for this study. The families of these local farmers 112 also qualified for selection, as they also faced the same problems. Only a single person was taken to 113 represent their household. A total fourteen (14) households from the north side of the mountain 114 ranges and twenty-six (26) households from the south side of mountain ranges constituted the study 115 population. A total of fifty-nine (59) fields were observed from the forty (40) households. 116

117

For the human-baboon conflict assessment, participatory techniques, focal group discussions, key 118 informant interview and structured questionnaire survey of households were used. Participatory 119 120 techniques involved making visits to the maize fields and talking to people guarding the fields. Focus group discussion was used to gather information on how the local farmers perceived the 121 baboon problem, their level of tolerance and suggestions on mitigating strategies. Selection of 122 participants was based on those who have lived in the area for a minimum period of ten years. Key 123 informant interviews were carried out with community leaders and the elderly to solicit their views 124 on baboon problems and mitigatory strategies. In addition, relevant written information was 125 126 gathered from the district's agricultural office.

127 **2.3 Ethical considerations**

Field work commenced with a period of familiarization in which the researchers briefed members of the local community on the intentions of the study to allay any suspicions. Ethical considerations

of anonymity, right of refusal, and clarity of outcomes were adhered to, by not recording names or

131 guaranteeing solutions [16].

132 2.4 Field observations/Direct Assessment

Only the maize fields were considered in this study. The first observations were undertaken starting in February 2017 when the maize was at tasseling stage until harvesting time in April.2017. Walk transects around the fields were carried out once every fortnight and measurements taken of how far the fifty-nine fields were from the edge of the forest. Quadrats measuring 50mx50m were randomly demarcated and the number of maize plants whose cobs were plucked by baboons were counted. For each maize field we aimed at 10% of the sampled area. The percentage damage was calculated by dividing the total number of cobs plucked per quadrat by the total population of maize plants in

the quadrat.

141 The distance of each field from the forest edge was measured so as to ascertain the relationship 142 between the crop losses and the distance from the forest edge. Observations on the time taken to

143 guard the fields from the baboons was recorded.

144 **2.5 The Questionnaire**

A questionnaire survey was used to acquire information on the various aspects of the study about the different variables with questions being both open and close ended. The questionnaire survey was carried out between February and April among all local farmers who own fields around the forest edge. Interviews were also held to establish in-depth information about crop raiding problem and consequences on farmers' livelihoods. The questionnaire, consisting of twenty-two questions, was designed to solicit information on the losses by farmers due to baboons and preventative strategies

151 taken to alleviate the problem. The questionnaire also sought to investigate the community's

- 152 attitudes and perceptions towards baboons, and what they viewed as the best option to resolve this
- 153 human-primate conflict.

154 **2.6 Data Presentation**

- Data gathered was compiled in form of tables, pie-charts and graphs from the questionnaires and observations made. Accordingly, descriptive statistics in the form of percentage and frequency were
- 157 generated for the types of crops cultivated by farmers, types of crops mostly damaged by the
- baboons, the main causes that increase human-baboon conflict, effect of human-baboon conflict on
- 159 livelihood of farmers.

160 **2.7 Data analysis**

161 The χ^2 test was used to establish the presence or absence of relationships between the chosen 162 variables. Results were considered to be statistically significant when p < 0.05. Relationship like the 163 distance from the edge of the forests and the amount of damage was carried out.

164 **3.0 Results**

165 **3.1 Estimates of maize losses incurred in the field**

- 166 The fields sizes ranged from 0.25 hectares to 3.00 hectares with an average maize population of
- approximately 24 505 \pm 3763.7 plants per hectare. The average number of cobs plucked by baboons per hectare was 48 \pm 6.7 giving an average loss of about 0.20 % per hectare. Of the 59 fields, the
- smallest distance from the edge of the forest was 33 m while the furthest was 479 m. The average
- distance of the sample fields from the edge of the forest was 206 ± 15.4 m. There was no significant
- relationship between the distance from the edge of the forest and the amount of damage to the
- 172 maize crops ($\chi^2 = 4110$, df = 58, p>0.05).
- 173

174 **3.2 Other losses experienced by the farmers.**

- 175 Apart from maize, the other crops raided were vegetables and other small grains such as rapoko.
- 176 Goats and chickens were also raided (Fig 1).



177 178

Fig 1 Other losses incurred by farmers

179

180 **3.3 Questionnaire responses**

181 **3.3.1 Demographic characteristics of the respondents**

182

All the 40 questionnaires were answered and returned, giving a 100% return rate. There were 25 males and 15 females who filled in the questionnaire.

185

186 **Table 1 Age of respondents**

Tuble I fige of	respond	CHUS						
Age	19	and	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+
	below							
Percentage/%	12.5		22.5	32.5	20	10	0	2.5

187

3.3.2 Educational level of the respondents

189 Most of the respondents had no college level of education with the highest number (71.8%) of

respondents having reached Grade 7 and below. Only 7.7% of the respondents had reached A level and only 5.1% had attained degree level of education (Fig 2).



192 193

Fig 2 Educational qualifications of the respondents.

194 195

3.3.3 Perception of the size of the problem

197

198 Regarding perception of the size of the problem (Fig 3), 33% of the respondents felt that the 199 baboons were a major problem in the area, while 38% perceived it to be an average problem. Only 200 27% of the respondents felt that the conflict was a small issue and 2% believed that the conflict was

- 201 non-existent.
- 202



203 204

205

Fig 3 Perception of the human-baboon conflict

206 3.3.4 Preventative strategies taken against baboon raids

207

The majority of the respondents (39%), (Fig 4) reported that they resorted to guarding their fields against the baboons. Only 2% of respondents suggested increasing security in the fields, while 17.5% of the population said that they attacked the baboons with intention to injure or kill. None of the respondents interviewed had reported their problem to the national parks authorities.

- 212
- 213



216

Fig 4 Preventative strategies by local farmers against baboons

217 3.3.5 Gender and ages of those who guard the fields

The largest proportion (Fig 5) of respondents who reportedly guarded were adult males in the 20 to

59-year age group. These made up 60% of the sample, followed by adult females (27.5%). There

220 was a small percentage (7.5%) of older people over the age of 60 also reported guarding the fields.

Boys and girls of school going age were 5% and 0% respectively in as far as guarding the fields was

- 222 concerned.
- 223



224 225

Fig 5. Gender and ages of those who guard the fields

226

227 **3.3.6** Time used in guarding the fields

Nearly all local farmers interviewed suggested that they take some time to guard and protect their crops. Of these local farmers, 60% reported spending more than 9 hours per day (Fig 6) guarding the fields, while 18% reported that they spent between 4 and 8 hours per day. Those who spent between 1 and 3 hours per day guarding their fields accounted for 15% of the total population and 7% of the respondents reported spending less than 1 hour per day.

233



Fig 6 Time spent per day guarding the fields

236

237 **3.3.7** Attitudes and perceptions towards baboons

Amongst all the respondents, 55% felt that baboons were a threat to the development of their community while 45% did not agree with that notion. Most individuals who said that the baboons were a threat also mentioned issues such as the long time that they have to spend guarding their fields from baboons and the amount of money they have to use to re-sow the seeds which the baboons scratch out of the ground, as well the young maize cobs which they pluck off. Of the 55% respondents they felt that they might have done other meaningful household chores if they did not spend all that time and money on guarding fields against baboons.

245

Out of all respondents, 62.5% of them felt that humans and baboons can actually coexist, while 246 37.5% of the respondents disagreed that they could not coexist with the baboons. The higher 247 number of those who believed in a possible coexistence mentioned reasons which suggested that the 248 baboons and other wild animals were God's creation and, hence they should have a fair chance of 249 existence. A small percentage of the respondents mentioned issues to do with species preservation, 250 251 as they felt that their children had a right to know how the baboons look like and would not want to take their children to parks and to zoos in order to see these animals in their natural original 252 habitats. The people who spoke against coexistence indicated the damage which baboons cause as 253 well as the time people spend in guarding as reasons to why they would not want to have the 254 baboons living in areas near human settlements. 255 256

257 **4.0 Discussion**

The crops raided ranged from maize, small grains to vegetables while livestock ranged from goats to chickens. Such a situation indicates the vulnerability of the local farmer due to the omnivorous nature of baboons. This therefore presents a problem to the farmer in that he/she has to allocate simultaneously resources and time to protect both crops and livestock from the marauding primates.

Results also showed that no relationship seemed to exist between the distance from the edge of the forest and the number of crops raided in the fields. According to [17], the further the field is from the edge of the forest the lesser the losses which are expected to be found in the field. The lack of a direct relationship between the distance from the field and the amount of losses inflicted was quite unexpected and deviated from the norm. This could be attributed in part to baboons being unpredictable and their highly adaptable nature, and their ability to learn very rapidly and change their behaviour accordingly [18].

270

The financial losses calculated translate to about US\$0.44 per every tonne. Taking into consideration the current Zimbabwe Grain Marketing Board (GMB) producer price of US\$390.00

per tonne, this only translates to about 0.11% loss in monetary terms. These results are in agreement 273 with those reported by [19] in South Africa where she reported that tolerable levels of loss among 274 farmers in Limpopo Province ranged from zero to up to 10% of the crop. According to [20], it has 275 been estimated that the annual cost of elephant raids to crops ranges from US\$60 (Uganda) to 276 US\$510 (Cameroon) per affected farmer. For Zimbabwe however, the cost incurred due to baboons 277 is very low such that most farmers would not consider the baboon to be such a big menace which 278 would warrant its removal from the area as compared to elephants. Most were content with 279 guarding their fields during the cropping season. Thus, every farmer plans from the onset how they 280 281 will guard their field from the baboons.

282

283 Wherever a forest neighbours agricultural farms, there will be some risk of crop loss. Ameliorating these losses and elevating local tolerance for wildlife incursion will require a sophisticated blend of 284 technical, social and economic interventions [21]. Farmers have to accept a small amount of crop 285 loss to wild animals. From the results of this study, the following recommendations were made to 286 help reduce the effect of the crop raiding problem. However, this is in two categories. Those to 287 minimise crop loss to wildlife and those to conserve wildlife. The study revealed that most local 288 farmers and their families guard their fields to protect them from baboons more than any other 289 290 method. This may be due to the fact that most of the local farmers do not have the money to erect fences and barricades. [22] suggest that fences can be very effective at deterring wild animals, 291 especially electric fences. Most local farmers in Concession do not have electricity in their homes 292 293 and most of them are financially constrained to erect wooden fences. The small wooden fences which they construct around their vegetable gardens are not effective against the baboons which can 294 jump over the fence or even open the gates which they use and enter into the vegetable garden 295 easily. Most of the local farmers never bothered to report the issue to the authorities like the parks 296 297 and wildlife authorities or the police. Most local farmers felt that it was a common problem which required no law enforcement. This may actually cause an annoyance to the local farmers because 298 299 after they experience losses due to baboons, there is no one to compensate them for their losses and they cannot afford to insure their crops as was the case with the former white commercial farmers. 300 301

The majority of the respondents indicated that they spent more than nine hours per day guarding 302 their fields. Some respondents compared themselves to other local farmers who are not 303 experiencing the baboon problem. They expressed concern that if this pest problem could be 304 305 resolved or better controlled, they would have more time to be productive in other commercial ventures such as mining, where they would get extra income to supplement the income generated 306 307 from the fields. This explains why 55% of the respondents stated that the presence of the Chacma baboon was counterproductive and working against the progress of their community. Some of the 308 respondents were even against the idea of coexisting with the baboons and were advocating for their 309 310 removal from the area.

311

312 5.0 Conclusion

The community in Concession resettled at the fringes of mountains, are particularly vulnerable to 313 314 crop raids by baboons. Four major themes emerged from this study, that is, the nature of crop raiding, risks to crop yields, attitudes towards baboons and perceptions about baboons by local 315 people in Zimbabwe. The attitude of local farmers toward baboons is negative. Most of the local 316 farmers feel that the baboons are a major barrier to their community's development mainly due to 317 318 the time they have to use in the guarding of their crops from the baboons. However most local farmers welcome the idea of coexistence with the baboons only if their destructive behaviour could 319 be controlled. 320

- 321 Man and baboons are both primates, but man, being more superior and advanced than the other,
- 322 should show distinguished superiority by using brain to resolve the conflict by devising techniques
- and practice that are non-lethal in dealing with baboons so as to maintain the co-existence.
- 324 **6.0 Recommendations**

Mitigating human-baboon conflicts needs to take into consideration techniques that would not 325 result in the decimation or local extinction of the baboon population but rather would deter them so 326 that they spend more time in their natural areas, that is, the forests. The use of an electric fence 327 appears to be effective at keeping most wild animals away from crops [19]. However electrical 328 fencing has rarely been recommended for crop protection because its high cost renders it unfeasible 329 as a mitigation method for subsistence farmers [23]. Perhaps through its relevant ministries and 330 departments, the government could subsidize the local farmers in the erection of solar-powered 331 fences around their fields. Although the start-up costs may be high, it may provide for a feasible 332 333 long-term solution.

334

335 CAMPFIRE (Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources) is a programme designed to give control of wildlife management to rural communities, so that they 336 337 would invest in wildlife and habitat conservation and in turn, receive benefits such as dividends from trophy hunting. Under the program, villagers work with government agencies to develop 338 sustainable wildlife management programs based on hunting a controlled number of wildlife from 339 their areas [24]. Local farmers in Concession could benefit from CAMPFIRE's programme by 340 inviting hunters who are willing to pay hunting fees. This way, crop and livestock loss would be 341 minimised. Under international law trophy hunting is legal. Moreover, according to the 342 International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), primates such as baboons are 343 not considered endangered and so can be shot and their numbers reduced to manageable levels [25]. 344

345

Farmers could also be encouraged to concentrate on crops which are not palatable to baboons such as

347 paprika, Irish potato, onions, tea, tobacco, and pastures as buffer crops. However, this should be done

carefully by encouraging farmers to practice cattle ranching, mixed farming, and crop production in thatorder as one moves away from forest edge or protected area.

350

More education can be provided to local farmers on current environmental laws and pest management techniques, particularly those who come into conflict with baboons on a regular basis. They can be informed in legal deterrent controls that would enable the farmers to only deal with baboons rather than seeing them as problem animals need of decimation.

356 **7.0 Acknowledgements:**

We thank the local resettled farmers around Makumbiri mountains in Concession for their
cooperation in this survey. We are grateful to anonymous reviewers for their input that has made
this paper a worthy one.

360 361

362 **References**

- 1. Nyhus P, Fischer H, Madden F, Osofsky S. Taking the Bite out of Wildlife Damage: The 363 Challenges of Wildlife Compensation Schemes. Conservation in Practice.2003;(4): 37–43. 364 2. Distefano E. Human-Wildlife Conflict Worldwide: A collection of case studies, analysis of 365 management strategies and good practices. SARD Initiative Report, FAO, Rome; 2005. 366 Accessed 06 September 2018. Available: 367 http://www.fao.org/SARD/common/ecg/1357/en/HWC final.pdf 368 3. Madden F. Creating coexistence between humans and wildlife: global perspectives on local 369 efforts to address human-wildlife conflict. Human. Dimension. Wildlife.2004; (9): 247-370
- and a constant of address numan–wildlife conflict. Human. Dimension. wildlife.2004; (9): 247–
 257.
 4. Colonna C. B. Human-Wildlife Conflict on Small, Subsistence Farms in Kenya. Honors
 College Capstone Experience/Thesis Projects. Paper 308.2011. Accessed 06 September
- 374 2018 Available: https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu hon theses/308.

375	5.	Mhlanga L. Conflict Between Wildlife and People In Kariba Town in Zimbabwe. The
376		African e-Journals Project. 2001; 39-51.
377	6.	Butler V. Elephants: trimming the herd. Bioscience.2000;(48): 76–81.
378	7.	Makindi S, Mutinda M, Olekaikai N, Olelebo W, Aboud A. Human-Wildlife Conflicts:
379		Causes and Mitigation. International Journal of Science and Research. 2014; 1025-1031.
380	8	Muruthi P Human Wildlife Conflict: Lessons Learned From AWF's African Heartlands
381	0.	2005: African Wildlife Foundation Working Paper
383	9	Lamarque E Fergusson R Anderson I Lagrange M Osei-owusu V Bakker I Human-
383).	wildlife conflict in Africa- causes consequences and management strategies 2009 FAO-
201		Forestry Paper 157
204 205	10	Strum S.C. The development of primete reiding: Implications for menogement and
202	10	sources in international international of primate latence 2010: 21(1) 122, 156
380	11	Uill C.M. Deeple and ministers A coefficient of interacts. In: Detersory ID, Wellie L.
387	11	Hill C.M. People, crops, and primates: A conflict of interests. In: Paterson JD, wallis J,
388		editors. Commensalism and conflict: The human-primate interface. Norman, Oklahoma:
389		American Society of Primatologists.2005; 40–59.
390	12	Hill C.M. Conflict of interest between people and baboons: Crop raiding in Uganda.
391		International Journal of Primatology.2000; (21): 299–315.
392	13	Warren Y, Buba B, Ross C. (2007) Patterns of crop-raiding by wild and domestic animals
393		near Gashaka Gumti National Park, Nigeria. International Journal of Pest
394		Management2007; (53): 207–216.
395	14	Wallace, G.E. Monkeys in maize: Primate crop-raiding behaviour and developing on-farm
396		techniques to mitigate human-wildlife conflict [PhD Thesis].Oxford: Oxford Brookes
397		University.2010; 528 pp.
398	15	Linkie M. Dinata Y. Nofrianto A. Leader-Williams N. Patterns and perceptions of wildlife
399		crop raiding in and around Kerinci Seblat National Park, Sumatra, Animal Conservation,
400		2007: (10): 127–135
401	16	McGuinness S & Taylor D Farmers' perceptions and actions to decrease crop raiding by
402	10	forest dwelling primates around a Dwandan forest fragment. Human Dimensions of
402		Wildlife 2014, 10 (2), 170 100
403	1 -	whalle, 2014, 19 (2). 179-190
404	17	. Amaja L. G, Feyssa D. H, Gutema T. M. Assessment of types of damage and causes of
405		human-wildlife conflict in Gera district, South Western Ethiopia. Journal of Ecology and
406		the Natural Environment. 2016; 49-55.
407	10	Eles I.C. (1001) Neuhanne minister et mette In Drivete Demonster te Environmentel
407	18	Else J.G. (1991). Nonnuman primates as pests. In: Primate Responses to Environmental
408	10	Change. Box HO (ed). London: Chapman and Hall. 1991; 155-165.
409	19	Findlay L.J. Human-primate conflict: an interdisciplinary evaluation of wildlife crop
410		raiding on commercial crop farms in Limpopo Province, South Africa, Durham theses,
411	•	Durham University.2016. Accessed 10 September 2018. Available at: Durham E-Theses
412		Online:http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/11872/
	20	
413	20	FAO Managing the Conflicts between People and Lion. Wildlife Management Working
414		Paper 13. 2010. Rome. pp 69
415	21	Naughton-Treves, L., Treves, A., Chapman, C., and Wrangham, R. Temporal patterns and
416		crop raiding by primates: linking food availability in cropland and adjacent forest. Journal
417		of Applied Ecology.1998;(35):596-606.
418	22	Osborn, F.V., Parker, G.E. Towards an integrated approach for reducing the conflict
419		between elephants and people: A review of current research. Oryx. 2003; (37): 80-84.
420	23	Osborn F. V, Hill C.M. Techniques to reduce crop loss: human and technical dimensions
421		in Africa. In Woodroffe, R., Thirgood, S. & Rabinowitz, A., eds. People and Wildlife:
422		Conflict or Coexistence?. Cambridge University Press, New York. 2005; 72–85.
423	24	. https://huntforever.org/2015/09/21/hunting-is-conservation-the-campfire-program-in-
424		zimbabwe/ Accessed 21/01/19.

425	25. https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/trophy-hunting-americans-shoot-	
426	monkeys-us-humane-society-international-a8616176.html Accessed 21/01/19.	
427		