

1 **Is bigger always better? Influence of patch attributes on breeding activity of**  
2 **birds in box-gum grassy woodland restoration plantings**

3 **\*Donna J. Belder<sup>AB</sup>, Jennifer C. Pierson<sup>AC</sup>, Karen Ikin<sup>A</sup>, Wade Blanchard<sup>A</sup>, Martin J.**  
4 **Westgate<sup>A</sup>, Mason Crane<sup>AD</sup>, David B. Lindenmayer<sup>ABD</sup>**

5 <sup>A</sup> Fenner School of Environment and Society, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT,  
6 Australia 2601.

7 <sup>B</sup> National Environmental Science Program Threatened Species Recovery Hub, The Australian  
8 National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia 2601.

9 <sup>C</sup> ACT Parks and Conservation, Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate,  
10 ACT Government, Canberra, ACT, Australia 2602.

11 <sup>D</sup> Sustainable Farms, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia 2601.

12 **Abstract**

13 Restoration plantings are an increasingly common management technique to address habitat loss in  
14 agricultural landscapes. Native fauna, including birds, may readily occupy planted areas of  
15 vegetation. However, unless restoration plantings support breeding populations, their effectiveness  
16 as a conservation strategy may be limited. We assessed breeding activity of birds in box-gum grassy  
17 woodland restoration plantings in the South-west Slopes bioregion of New South Wales, Australia.  
18 We compared breeding activity in plantings of different size (small and large) and shape (linear and  
19 block-shaped) to breeding activity in a set of remnant woodland sites. Contrary to expectations, we  
20 found that bird breeding activity was greatest per hectare in small patches. We also found a negative  
21 effect of planting age, with younger plantings supporting more breeding activity per hectare. We  
22 found no effect of patch type or shape on breeding activity, and that species' relative abundance  
23 was not predictive of their degree of breeding activity. Our results highlight the value of small  
24 habitat patches in fragmented agricultural landscapes, and indicate that restoration plantings are as  
25 valuable as remnant woodland patches for supporting bird breeding activity. We demonstrate the

26 importance of breeding studies for assessing the conservation value of restoration plantings and  
27 other habitat patches for avifauna.

28

29 **Keywords:** Woodland birds, breeding success, SLOSS, restoration, fragmentation, agricultural  
30 landscapes

31

## 32 **1. Introduction**

33 Habitat loss due to land conversion for agriculture is a significant issue globally, with numerous  
34 effects on biodiversity and ecosystem processes (Maxwell et al., 2016; Tschardt et al., 2012).

35 Land clearing is increasing worldwide, particularly in productive agricultural regions (Evans, 2016;  
36 Tilman et al., 2017). The extensive removal of native vegetation creates a highly fragmented  
37 landscape in which patches of native vegetation exist primarily as small, isolated remnants.

38 Restoration plantings in agricultural landscapes are increasingly implemented to address habitat loss  
39 and conserve threatened and declining native fauna, with hundreds of millions of hectares of  
40 vegetation being replanted around the world at a cost of billions of dollars (Crouzeilles et al., 2016).

41 To ensure cost-effectiveness and ecological integrity, it is important to quantify the effects of  
42 revegetation on biodiversity and assess whether conservation goals are being met, particularly in the  
43 long term (Barral et al., 2015; Ruiz-Jaen and Aide, 2005).

44 A core assumption of restoration success is that revegetated patches provide high-quality habitat for  
45 the species they are intended to help conserve (Ikin et al., 2016; Ruiz-Jaen and Aide, 2005). In  
46 Australia, bird communities that inhabit box-gum grassy woodlands are threatened by ongoing  
47 habitat loss and degradation (Rayner et al., 2014), and are a frequent target of restoration efforts  
48 (Freudenberger, 2001; Lindenmayer et al., 2013; Smith, 2008). There is evidence suggesting that  
49 many bird species will readily occupy restoration plantings, in some cases preferentially inhabiting  
50 plantings over remnant woodland patches or other sites (Barrett et al., 2008; Cunningham et al.,  
51 2008; Lindenmayer et al., 2016), but how much do we know about the capacity of restoration  
52 plantings to support breeding populations of these species? The majority of studies examining avian  
53 responses to restoration plantings have used measures such as species richness, diversity, and  
54 relative abundance to make inferences about occupancy trends and habitat quality (Belder et al.,  
55 2018). However, focusing on occurrence patterns provides a limited picture of how birds are using a  
56 site (Chalfoun and Martin, 2007). It is therefore important to quantify whether indicators of long-  
57 term persistence, such as breeding activity, follow the same trends.

58 *1.1. Research objectives*

59 The underlying aim of this study was to assess whether birds are able to breed successfully in box-  
60 gum grassy woodland restoration plantings. Breeding success can be measured in several ways,  
61 with nest success and daily nest survival being commonly-used metrics (Stephens et al., 2004).  
62 However, searching for, and monitoring, nests requires considerable time and effort. An alternative,  
63 and perhaps more accessible, approach is to use indicators of breeding activity as a proxy for  
64 breeding success. For example, a scoring system developed by Mac Nally (2007) ranks  
65 observations of breeding behaviour according to how strongly they indicate breeding success (Table  
66 1), providing a quantitative measure of the extent to which a given site supports successful breeding  
67 (Bennett et al., 2015; Mac Nally et al., 2010; Selwood et al., 2009). A method such as this provides  
68 a basis from which to commence the transition from traditional occupancy and abundance surveys  
69 to a more population-oriented approach to monitoring avian responses to restoration plantings.  
70 Importantly, it also facilitates the collection of breeding data on species of conservation concern,  
71 whose nests may be difficult to find in adequate numbers.

72 We sought to investigate bird breeding activity in the context of habitat restoration in a fragmented  
73 agricultural landscape. Specifically, we posed the following three questions:

74 *Question 1. How does bird breeding activity in restoration plantings compare to breeding activity*  
75 *in remnant woodland patches?*

76 We compared breeding activity in restoration plantings, similar-sized woodland remnants, and  
77 larger, more intact woodland remnants. In addition to investigating the entire bird assemblage, we  
78 assessed breeding activity for species of conservation concern, and cup-nesters vs. dome nesters  
79 (Appendix B). Remnant patches are generally considered to be high-value habitat within  
80 fragmented agricultural landscapes (Cunningham et al., 2014), and hence we predicted remnant  
81 sites would support more breeding activity than restoration plantings. We predicted that breeding  
82 activity would be highest in larger woodland remnants than in smaller, more isolated remnants and

83 restoration plantings. We made this prediction because comparative studies have shown that species  
84 richness and abundance is typically highest in large, intact remnants (Hadley et al., 2018; Helzer  
85 and Jelinski, 1999; Martin et al., 2004; Munro et al., 2011). Many species of conservation concern  
86 are more closely associated with remnants than plantings (Kinross, 2004), so we also expected to  
87 observe more breeding activity from these species in remnants than in plantings.

88 *Question 2. How do patch attributes affect breeding activity in plantings and remnant woodland*  
89 *patches?*

90 We examined breeding activity in sites of varying size (small and large) and shape (linear and  
91 block-shaped). A key finding from pattern-based studies of bird distribution and abundance in  
92 fragmented landscapes is that larger patches support more species (Kavanagh et al., 2007; Shanahan  
93 et al., 2011; Watson et al., 2003). This is consistent with the resource concentration hypothesis,  
94 which posits that there are more resources and thus more individuals and greater species diversity in  
95 larger patches (Connor et al., 2007; Root, 1973). Previous species-specific studies have also found  
96 that avian reproductive success is positively correlated with patch size (Herkert et al., 2003; Hoover  
97 et al., 1995; Luck, 2003; Zarette et al., 2000). We therefore postulated that breeding activity would  
98 increase with patch size in parallel with bird species richness and abundance. Similarly, increasing  
99 patch linearity is typically associated with lower species richness and abundance (Kinross, 2004;  
100 Lindenmayer et al., 2018a, 2007). As such, we predicted more evidence of successful breeding in  
101 block-shaped than in linear patches.

102 We predicted a stronger negative response to decreasing patch size and increasing linearity for cup-  
103 nesters compared with dome-nesters. This was because edge-effects of predation are stronger in  
104 smaller and more linear sites (Fletcher et al. 2007; Helzer and Jelinski, 1999), and cup-nesters tend  
105 to be more vulnerable to predation than other nest types (Okada et al., 2017). We also predicted that  
106 species of conservation concern, many of which are area-sensitive (Ford et al., 2009; Watson et al.,  
107 2005), would show more evidence of breeding activity in larger, block-shaped sites.

108 We also tested for an effect of planting age. Previous studies report increases in bird species  
109 richness and abundance as plantings mature (Debus et al., 2017; Freeman et al., 2009; Lindenmayer  
110 et al., 2016). This is often attributed to the tendency of the vegetation structure and composition of  
111 restoration plantings to converge on that of remnant patches over time (Munro et al., 2011). We  
112 therefore predicted that increasing planting age would have a positive effect on bird breeding  
113 activity.

114 *Question 3. Does breeding activity in restoration plantings and remnant woodland patches reflect*  
115 *species assemblage composition?*

116 We predicted that breeding activity in our study sites would be reflective of the species assemblage  
117 present. That is, we expected the effects of patch attributes (type, size, shape) on relative abundance  
118 to be correlated with the effects of patch attributes on breeding activity scores.

## 119 **2. Methods**

### 120 *2.1 Study area*

121 We conducted this study in the South-west Slopes bioregion of New South Wales, Australia (Figure  
122 1). The region is part of Australia's sheep-wheat belt and has been extensively cleared of native  
123 vegetation, with as little as 0.1% of the original vegetation remaining in intact condition (Thiele and  
124 Prober, 2000). Remnant patches consist predominantly of white box (*Eucalyptus albens*) / yellow  
125 box (*E. melliodora*) / Blakely's red gum (*E. blakelyi*) grassy woodland, which is a critically-  
126 endangered ecological community (Department of the Environment, 2018). Patches of red  
127 stringybark (*E. macrorhyncha*) woodland and mugga ironbark (*E. sideroxylon*) woodland are also  
128 present in our study region.



129  
 130 **Figure 1** Location of study sites in the South-west Slopes Bioregion of New South Wales, Australia. Map  
 131 created using ggmap for R (Kahle and Wickham, 2013).

132  
 133 **2.2 Study sites**

134 We used spring bird survey data collected over 12 years to select a subset of 12 restoration  
 135 plantings from a set of long-term monitoring sites (Appendix A) (Cunningham et al. 2007). We  
 136 selected sites on the basis that they satisfied our criteria for size and shape, and shared at least two  
 137 of three key species in common – the superb fairywren (*Malurus cyaneus*), yellow-rumped thornbill  
 138 (*Acanthiza chrysorrhoa*), and willie wagtail (*Rhipidura leucophrys*). We chose these species as they  
 139 are relatively common, typically found in woodland communities, and encompass the two major

140 nest types (one cup-nester and two dome-nesters). Additionally, the yellow-rumped thornbill is a  
141 species of conservation concern (Barrett et al., 2003). Nineteen of our 21 chosen sites contained all  
142 three target species, with two sites lacking the yellow-rumped thornbill. We attempted to control for  
143 the effects of competitive exclusion by selecting sites with low abundances of the noisy miner  
144 (*Manorina melanocephala*), as this hyper-aggressive species is known to have negative impacts on  
145 other species of native birds (Bennett et al., 2015; Maron et al., 2013). Our sites were separated  
146 geographically by at least 500 m to promote spatial independence.

147 Plantings were aged between 12 and 25 years, 1.3-7.7 ha in area, and 20-200 m in width. A typical  
148 planting contained a mature (flowering-age) *Eucalyptus* overstorey, an *Acacia* understorey, and a  
149 ground layer dominated by annual grasses (both native and exotic). The majority of planted species  
150 naturally occur in the study region. Some plantings also contained remnant trees, along with  
151 varying amounts of woody debris (fallen trees and branches).

152 We compared plantings with six box-gum grassy woodland remnants, also part of the long-term  
153 monitoring study. Remnant patch size ranged from 2.1 to 5.8 ha, with widths of 30-200 m. We also  
154 selected three large (47-110 ha) reference sites to represent intact remnant woodland in the study  
155 region (two travelling stock reserves, and one remnant on private property). Remnant sites were  
156 dominated by a *Eucalyptus* overstorey, with or without an *Acacia* understorey, and typically  
157 contained woody debris in the form of fallen trees and branches.

### 158 2.3 Bird surveys

159 To assess breeding activity, we conducted fixed time-per-unit-area surveys (one hour per hectare) in  
160 our study sites over two spring breeding seasons. The peak breeding season for the majority of bird  
161 species in our study region is September to December (Appendix B). We completed two rounds of  
162 surveys in 2015 (October and November), and three rounds in 2016 (September, October,  
163 November). We searched sites systematically, identifying and recording indicators of breeding  
164 behaviour (Table 1). We designated search areas by the size and shape of sites. For sites < 3 ha, we



165 searched 1.3 ha within the site – this was equivalent to the area of the smallest study site. For sites >  
 166 3 ha, we searched 3 ha within the site. We surveyed block sites in a grid fashion, and linear sites  
 167 along their length until we had searched the desired area (i.e. 1.3 ha or 3 ha). We surveyed sites  
 168 throughout the day, with the exception of November 2016 – in this period we completed surveys in  
 169 the 4 hours post-sunrise and 4 hours pre-sunset. On average, there was an interval of 4.5 weeks  
 170 between surveys at each site, and we structured the order of site visits to ensure that sites were not  
 171 consistently surveyed at the same time of day. We did not conduct surveys during inclement  
 172 weather. All breeding activity surveys were conducted by Author 1.

173 **Table 1** Scores allocated to behavioural observations of breeding  
 174 activity, modified from Mac Nally (2007).

Behaviour	Score
Feeding of young out of the nest	9.0
Fledglings seen	9.0
Nest with nestlings or feeding of young in the nest	8.0
Presence of juveniles or immature birds	7.5
Fledglings heard	7.5
Adult carrying food	6.0
Nest with eggs or adult on a nest	6.0
Nest empty or under construction (current breeding season)	5.0
Past breeding season's nest	3.5
Adult gathering nest material	3.0
Courtship	2.0
Territorial behaviour	1.0
Male and female pairs	1.0

175

176 To quantify breeding activity, we used a survey method modified from Mac Nally's (2007) scoring  
 177 system. The Mac Nally (2007) method involves calculating an aggregate score of breeding activity  
 178 in a study site over the course of a study. Scores are calculated based on ranking observations  
 179 according to how strongly they indicate breeding success (Table 1), with a score of zero indicating  
 180 no observations of breeding activity. Rather than aggregating breeding activity scores over the  
 181 course of the study, we modified the method to calculate a score per survey. There were two  
 182 reasons for this: first, it enabled us to test for effects of factors that may influence detectability of

183 bird behaviour during surveys, such as weather and time of day. Second, it enabled us to account  
184 for repeat observations of the same individuals or nests across multiple surveys.

185 We conducted point count surveys in 2016 to quantify bird community composition and abundance  
186 in our study sites. Point count surveys in each site were typically conducted within two days of the  
187 surveys for breeding activity, and usually on the same day. Point count surveys in September were  
188 conducted by Author 1, and in October and November were completed by different observers (the  
189 entirety of each month's surveys conducted by a different observer). We divided each study site  
190 into 25 x 25 m cells, and randomly selected cells in which to conduct point counts. For sites > 3 ha,  
191 we selected six cells, and for sites <3 ha, we selected three cells. We ensured adjacent cells were not  
192 selected. At the centre of each randomly-chosen cell, we completed a five-minute count, recording  
193 counts of birds detected within 50 m of the survey point.

#### 194 2.4 *Statistical analyses*

195 We used a model selection approach to investigate the effects of patch attributes on the total  
196 breeding activity score recorded in each survey (Table 2). We used linear mixed effects regression  
197 models with study site and survey year as random effects to account for repeated visits to sites over  
198 multiple years. The explanatory variables of primary interest were site type, size, and shape, and  
199 age of plantings. We included the variable “fenced”, to account for potential effects of cattle  
200 grazing in our study sites (Lindenmayer et al., 2018b). Our response variable was a total breeding  
201 activity score standardised by survey area (1.3 or 3.0 ha), and was square-root-transformed to  
202 improve the distribution of the data. We also scaled and centred our continuous predictor variables.  
203 Prior to fitting models with our explanatory variables of interest, we examined variables likely to  
204 influence detectability in surveys, including time of day, temperature, and wind. In addition, we  
205 accounted for variation in activity through the breeding season by including Julian date. We found  
206 that breeding activity increased with Julian date for the woodland assemblage and all subsets of the

207 assemblage, so included it as an explanatory variable in subsequent models. There were no other  
208 weather or temporal variables of statistical significance (Appendix D).

209 Prior to fitting models, we checked all explanatory variables for multi-collinearity using variance  
210 inflation factors. We corrected for multi-collinearity by removing large reference sites from models  
211 that included both size and shape. We also removed temperature due to its correlation (0.53) with  
212 time of day. We checked for a quadratic effect of time of day and found none. After fitting models,  
213 we checked for spatial autocorrelation in the data using variograms of the residuals. We detected no  
214 evidence of a nugget or sill in the variograms, and therefore assumed no spatial autocorrelation.

215 For our analyses, we included data for all terrestrial species recorded during breeding activity  
216 surveys, with the exception of introduced species (

217 Appendix B). We hereafter refer to this assemblage as the “woodland assemblage”. For babblers  
218 and finches, we included data on nests only when they could be positively identified as true nests –  
219 these species build roost nests, which can be difficult to distinguish from true nests. We subset the  
220 woodland assemblage to investigate species of conservation concern, and compared cup-nesters  
221 with dome-nesters. We defined species of conservation concern as those listed as threatened in New  
222 South Wales (NSW Environment and Heritage 2018), along with those whose reporting rates  
223 declined by >20% in the South-west Slopes bioregion between the first and second *Atlas of*  
224 *Australian Birds* (Barrett et al. 2003). We classified cup-nesters and dome-nesters as per Morcombe  
225 (2003) and Pizzey and Knight (1997). The dome-nester group was highly correlated (0.79) with the  
226 woodland assemblage, as were species of least concern (0.91), so we did not analyse these groups  
227 separately. In addition to examining species of conservation concern and cup-nesters, we subset the  
228 woodland assemblage data to remove the most dominant species (superb fairywren, yellow-rumped  
229 thornbill, and willie wagtail).

230 For the woodland assemblage, and each subset, we followed a three-step modelling approach:

- 231 1. We first accounted for variation in our response variable associated with weather and  
232 temporal factors. We incorporated variables of significance into subsequent models.
- 233 2. We then modelled our response variable against site type, comparing plantings, remnants,  
234 and large reference sites.
- 235 3. Finally, we modelled our response variable against size and shape in plantings and  
236 remnants, excluding large reference sites.

237 In each step, we fitted global models with all combinations of the variables of interest, and ranked  
238 candidate models using Akaike’s Information Criterion corrected for small sample sizes ( $AIC_c$ ). We  
239 considered models with  $\Delta AIC_c \leq 2$  as top-ranked models (Burnham and Anderson, 2004). Weather  
240 and temporal variables of significance identified in Step 1 were included in both Step 2 and Step 3.

241 We used the packages ‘lme4’ (Bates et al., 2015) and ‘MuMIn’ (Bartoń, 2018) in R version 3.4.4 (R  
 242 Core Team 2018) to fit and select models. Variograms were constructed using the package ‘geoR’  
 243 (Ribeiro and Diggle 2016).

244 **Table 2** Linear mixed model parameters. The response variable is SCORE, and all  
 245 other variables are predictors.

Variable name	Description
SCORE	Square root of score of breeding activity recorded during surveys, calculated per Mac Nally (2007) and standardised by survey area (score/1.3 for small sites, score/3.0 for large sites)
TYPE	Site type (planting, remnant, reference)
SIZE	Site size (ha)
SHAPE	Measure of site shape, calculated as perimeter/width (m)
AGE	Age of planting at the commencement of the study (years)
FENCED	Site fenced from cattle (yes/no)
SUN	Subjective measure of sun during surveys, on a numerical scale of 1-4 where 1 = full sun and 4 = overcast
TEMP	Subjective measure of temperature during surveys, on a numerical scale of 1-8 where 1 = cold and 8 = hot
WIND	Subjective measure of wind during surveys, on a numerical scale of 1-8 where 1 = calm and 8 = strong wind
TIME	Time of day surveys commenced, given as no. hours post-sunrise (hr)
DATE	Julian date on which surveys were conducted

246

247 We used multivariate latent variable models from the package ‘boral’ (Hui, 2016) to compare how  
 248 abundance and breeding activity for bird species responded to site type, size, and shape. This  
 249 approach is useful because it allows for investigation of the association between multiple species  
 250 and underlying environmental variables in a linear modelling framework, while also accounting for  
 251 potential correlations among species. Specifically, we constructed one latent variable model for  
 252 each response matrix, and then compared the coefficient estimates for each species and variable.  
 253 For this modelling approach, only species detected both in point count surveys and breeding activity  
 254 surveys could be included. We subset our data to an assemblage of interest that included woodland-  
 255 dependent species (Silcocks et al. 2005) and several other small-bodied species that characterise the  
 256 bird community of woodlands in our study region (Appendix C). Due to the disproportionate spatial  
 257 influence of the frequently-detected superb fairywren in our initial ordination plots, we excluded it  
 258 from our multivariate latent variable models.

## 259 3. Results

### 260 3.1 General findings

261 A total of 90 bird species was detected during point count surveys, of which 66, or 73%, displayed  
262 evidence of breeding activity (Appendix B). Additionally, two species – the hooded robin  
263 (*Melanodryas cucullata*) and brown goshawk (*Accipiter fasciatus*) – were recorded in breeding  
264 activity surveys but not detected in point counts. The most commonly detected species was the  
265 superb fairywren, which accounted for 26% of all breeding activity recorded in the study. Other  
266 frequently-detected species were the willie wagtail, yellow-rumped thornbill, grey shrikethrush  
267 (*Colluricincla harmonica*), and rufous whistler (*Pachycephala rufiventris*). The species of  
268 conservation concern we detected during surveys included the yellow-rumped thornbill, weebill  
269 (*Smicrornis brevirostris*), speckled warbler (*Pyrrholaemus sagittatus*), dusky woodswallow  
270 (*Artamus cyanopterus*), crested shrike-tit (*Falcunculus frontatus*), and hooded robin. For the  
271 woodland assemblage, breeding activity scores recorded during surveys ranged from 11.5 to 104.5,  
272 with a mean of 46.0 (n=105, SE=2.2). The mean score for cup-nesters was 19.1 (n=105, SE=1.4),  
273 with minimum and maximum scores of 0 and 76.0 respectively. For species of conservation  
274 concern, the mean score was 11.5 (n=105, SE=1.4), minimum score 0, and maximum score 55.0.  
275 We found no differences in breeding activity in sites that were fenced compared with sites that were  
276 exposed to grazing by stock.


### 277 3.2 How does woodland bird breeding activity in restoration plantings compare to breeding 278 activity in remnant woodland patches?

279 For the woodland assemblage, the score for breeding activity did not differ between plantings,  
280 remnants, and reference sites (Appendix E). That is, site type did not appear as a variable of  
281 significance in any of our top-ranked models. The same was true when comparing only plantings  
282 and remnants (excluding reference sites) (Table 3). We found no effect of site type on species of  
283 conservation concern, and cup-nesters showed no response to site type. Removing the superb

284 fairywren, willie wagtail and yellow-rumped thornbill from the woodland assemblage did not elicit  
285 any response to site type from the remainder of the assemblage.

### 286 3.3 *How do patch attributes affect breeding activity in plantings and remnant woodland patches?*

287 Modelling patch attributes of remnants and plantings (excluding large reference sites) against  
288 breeding activity score for the woodland assemblage revealed a strong negative effect of increasing  
289 patch size, which appeared consistently in the top two candidate models (Table 3). That is, there  
290 was more breeding activity per hectare in smaller patches (Figure 2). However, the removal of the  
291 superb fairywren from the woodland assemblage greatly reduced the negative effect of site size on  
292 breeding activity (Table 3). Size appeared as an explanatory variable in candidate models for  
293 breeding activity score of assemblages without superb fairywren, willie wagtail, and yellow-rumped  
294 thornbill, but its inclusion did not substantially improve the fit of the simplest model (containing  
295 only Julian date). Where size appeared as an explanatory variable, its effect was marginal, with a  
296 large standard error.



297

298 **Figure 2** Effect plot illustrating the influence of patch size on breeding activity score of the woodland  
 299 assemblage in restoration plantings and similarly-sized woodland remnants. Shading indicates 95%  
 300 confidence intervals.

301

302 Excluding large reference sites revealed a marginal negative effect of site type, suggesting that

303 breeding activity score was higher in plantings than in similarly-sized woodland remnants (Table

304 3). However, the inclusion of site type did not substantially improve the fit of the simplest model,

305 and it failed to appear in top-ranked models after the removal of the three dominant species from

306 the assemblage. Shape appeared in one top-ranked model when the superb fairywren was excluded

307 from the assemblage, however, the standard error was larger than the effect size itself. Site shape

308 therefore had no interpretable effect on breeding activity score.

309 For species of conservation concern, the best fitting model was the model containing only Julian

310 date (Table 3). Consequently, there were no interpretable effects of planting size, shape, or type on

311 breeding activity score for this subset. The same result was observed for cup-nesters, again



312 indicating marginal or no effects of patch attributes on breeding activity score. Dome-nesters mirror  
 313 the negative response to patch size demonstrated by the woodland assemblage (per 0.81  
 314 correlation).

315 **Table 3** Parameter estimates for total breeding score recorded during breeding activity surveys, ranked by  
 316 Akaike's Information Criterion adjusted for small sample sizes ( $AIC_c$ ). Top-ranked models ( $\Delta AIC_c \leq 2$ ) are  
 317 shown for the woodland assemblage, species of conservation concern, cup-nesters, and subsets of the  
 318 woodland assemblage that exclude dominant species. All models that differed from the top model ( $\Delta AIC_c$ ) by  
 319  $\leq 2$  are shown.

<i>Woodland assemblage</i>	Rank 1 ( $w = 0.22$ )	Rank 2 ( $w = 0.12$ )				
	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)				
Intercept	4.57 (0.22)	4.69 (0.24)				
DATE	0.59 (0.09)	0.58 (0.09)				
SIZE	- 0.40 (0.16)	- 0.39 (0.16)				
TYPE (remnant)		- 0.37 (0.33)				
<i>Excluding superb fairywren</i>	Rank 1 ( $w = 0.19$ )	Rank 2 ( $w = 0.11$ )	Rank 3 ( $w = 0.08$ )			
	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)			
Intercept	3.83 (0.12)	3.83 (0.12)	3.69 (0.12)			
DATE	0.38 (0.10)	0.38 (0.10)	0.37 (0.10)			
SIZE		- 0.13 (0.12)	- 0.53 (0.21)			
SHAPE			- 0.06 (0.11)			
SIZE:SHAPE			- 0.67 (0.32)			
<i>Excluding superb fairywren, yellow-rumped thornbill, willie wagtail</i>	Rank 1 ( $w = 0.20$ )	Rank 2 ( $w = 0.09$ )	Rank 3 ( $w = 0.09$ )			
	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)			
Intercept	3.19 (0.15)	3.19 (0.14)	3.38 (0.27)			
DATE	0.24 (0.10)	0.24 (0.10)	0.24 (0.10)			
SIZE		- 0.12 (0.14)				
FENCED (yes)			- 0.26 (0.32)			
<i>Species of conservation concern</i>	Rank 1 ( $w = 0.13$ )	Rank 2 ( $w = 0.11$ )	Rank 3 ( $w = 0.07$ )	Rank 4 ( $w = 0.06$ )	Rank 5 ( $w = 0.06$ )	Rank 6 ( $w = 0.05$ )
	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)
Intercept	1.76 (0.23)	1.99 (0.27)	1.38 (0.43)	1.76 (0.23)	1.99 (0.26)	2.00 (0.25)
DATE	0.25 (0.10)	0.24 (0.10)	0.24 (0.10)	0.25 (0.10)	0.23 (0.10)	0.24 (0.10)
TYPE (remnant)		- 0.69 (0.47)			- 0.71 (0.46)	- 0.67 (0.43)
FENCED (yes)			0.52 (0.51)			
SIZE				0.21 (0.23)	0.23 (0.22)	0.37 (0.23)
SIZE:TYPE (remnant)						- 0.77 (0.53)
<i>Cup-nesters</i>	Rank 1 ( $w = 0.23$ )	Rank 2 ( $w = 0.10$ )	Rank 3 ( $w = 0.09$ )			
	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)			
Intercept	2.58 (0.21)	2.47 (0.25)	2.58 (0.20)			

DATE	0.27 (0.10)	0.27 (0.10)	0.27 (0.10)
TYPE (remnant)		0.32 (0.43)	
SHAPE			0.14 (0.21)

320

321 Planting age was a significant predictor of breeding activity for the woodland assemblage (Table 4).

322 An increase in planting age was associated with a decrease in breeding activity. This result was no

323 longer evident when the superb fairywren, yellow-rumped thornbill and willie wagtail were

324 removed from the assemblage. However, species of conservation concern also responded negatively

325 to an increase in planting age. No effect of planting age was observed for cup-nesters. For the latter

326 subset, the null model was the top-ranked model.

327 **Table 4** Parameter estimates for total breeding score recorded during breeding activity surveys, ranked by  
 328 Akaike's Information Criterion adjusted for small sample sizes ( $AIC_c$ ). Top-ranked models ( $\Delta AIC_c \leq 2$ ) are  
 329 shown for the woodland assemblage, species of conservation concern, and subsets of the woodland  
 330 assemblage that exclude dominant species. All models that differed from the top model ( $\Delta AIC_c$ ) by  $\leq 2$  are  
 331 shown. Note that candidate models for cup-nesters are not included, as the null model was the top-ranked  
 332 model for this subset.

<i>Woodland assemblage</i>	Rank 1 ( $w = 0.27$ )	Rank 2 ( $w = 0.22$ )	Rank 3 ( $w = 0.10$ )
	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)
Intercept	5.65 (0.51)	4.73 (0.25)	4.73 (0.25)
DATE	0.52 (0.11)	0.54 (0.11)	0.54 (0.11)
AGE	-0.42 (0.15)	-0.51 (0.18)	-0.51 (0.18)
SIZE	-0.37 (0.14)	-0.41 (0.18)	-0.45 (0.19)
FENCED	-0.99 (0.53)		
SHAPE			-0.17 (0.19)
<i>Excluding superb fairywren</i>	Rank 1 ( $w = 0.20$ )	Rank 2 ( $w = 0.13$ )	Rank 3 ( $w = 0.13$ )
	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)
Intercept	3.85 (0.12)	3.85 (0.14)	3.30 (0.42)
DATE	0.32 (0.12)	0.31 (0.12)	0.32 (0.12)
AGE	-0.25 (0.13)		-0.30 (0.12)
FENCED			0.60 (0.45)
<i>Excluding superb fairywren, yellow-rumped thornbill, willie wagtail</i>	Rank 1 ( $w = 0.22$ )	Rank 2 ( $w = 0.12$ )	
	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)	
Intercept	3.16 (0.19)	3.16 (0.19)	
DATE	0.21 (0.11)		
<i>Species of conservation concern</i>	Rank 1 ( $w = 0.20$ )	Rank 2 ( $w = 0.12$ )	
	Estimate (SE)	Estimate (SE)	





Intercept	1.99 (0.21)	1.99 (0.26)
DATE	0.30 (0.13)	0.29 (0.13)
AGE	- 0.53 (0.21)	- 0.52 (0.27)
SIZE	0.43 (0.21)	

---

333

334 3.4 *Does breeding activity in restoration plantings and remnant woodland patches reflect species*  
335 *assemblage composition?*

336 Based on ordination modelling, we found that breeding activity was not strongly correlated with  
337 relative abundance for bird species in our study sites (Figure 3). Examining the effects of patch  
338 attributes on relative abundance and breeding activity revealed that many species differed in their  
339 responses according to the two metrics. For example, the abundance of the willie wagtail in  
340 remnants and plantings was similar, but breeding activity for this species was higher in remnants  
341 (Figure 3a). A similar pattern was observed for the buff-rumped thornbill (*Acanthiza reguloides*),  
342 for which more breeding activity was recorded in large reference sites than in plantings, despite the  
343 species occurring in similar abundances in the two site types (Figure 3b). The buff-rumped thornbill  
344 also displayed a positive response to increasing patch size according to relative abundance, but a  
345 negative response according to breeding activity (Figure 3c). Interestingly, there were no species  
346 whose abundance increased with patch linearity, but several species, including the black-faced  
347 cuckooshrike (*Coracina novaehollandiae*), brown treecreeper (*Climacteris picumnus*), and willie  
348 wagtail, showed more evidence of breeding activity in linear sites (Figure 3d). We note that  
349 confidence intervals around the estimates for many species were large (Appendix H).



350

351

352 **Figure 3** Bird species' relative abundance and breeding activity plotted according to the effects of a) patch  
 353 type: remnants vs. plantings, in which a positive effect is associated with remnants, b) patch type: reference  
 354 sites vs. plantings, in which a positive effect is associated with reference sites, c) patch size, and d) patch  
 355 shape, in which the effect becomes more negative with increasing patch linearity. Effect sizes are taken from  
 356 multivariate latent variable models. ● = species of conservation concern, ● = species of least concern.

357

#### 358 4. Discussion

359 We recorded breeding activity of a variety of bird species in both restoration plantings and remnant  
 360 woodland patches. Our analyses of the effects of patch attributes revealed several unexpected  
 361 findings – most notably, a negative effect of patch size driven by one dominant species (the superb  
 362 fairywren), in which there was more breeding activity per hectare in smaller patches. Inferences

363 from our study contrast with those of numerous studies on bird species richness and abundance in  
364 fragmented agricultural landscapes, which report a positive effect of patch size. We further discuss  
365 our key findings in the remainder of this paper and conclude with some insights for bird  
366 conservation.

#### 367 *4.1 Patch size*

368 Contrary to our predictions at the outset of this study based on patch size theory (Rosenzweig,  
369 1995), we found that breeding activity score per hectare decreased as patch size increased in  
370 plantings and remnant woodland patches. This result was driven by the most commonly-detected  
371 species in the study region, and when this species was removed, there was no effect of patch size on  
372 breeding activity. Both of these findings contrast with the majority of previous studies, which have  
373 documented higher breeding success and reproductive output in larger habitat patches than in  
374 smaller patches (e.g. Burke and Nol, 2000; Zанette, 2001; Zанette et al., 2000; Zанette and Jenkins,  
375 2000). The value of small habitat patches for biodiversity in fragmented landscapes has been  
376 highlighted via studies of bird species distribution and abundance (Fischer and Lindenmayer, 2002;  
377 Gibbons and Boak, 2002; Le Roux et al., 2015; Manning et al., 2006), and was underscored by  
378 Wintle et al. (2019) in their global synthesis of conservation studies. Our results indicate that small  
379 patches may play a substantial role in supporting bird populations, which we discuss further in the  
380 concluding sections of this paper.

381 According to island biogeography theory, which has been applied to fragmented agricultural  
382 landscapes, smaller patches may stimulate a concentration effect of animal populations in  
383 fragmented landscapes (MacArthur and Wilson, 1967). For example, waterbirds have been recorded  
384 breeding in greater abundances on small versus large islands (Erwin et al., 1995). This may be  
385 attributed to the relationship between resource distribution in the patch and surrounding matrix  
386 (Estades, 2001). Animals may retreat from the poor quality matrix into habitat patches  
387 (concentration effect), and then be reluctant to travel into the surrounding matrix (a so-called “fence

388 effect”). However, Connor et al. (2007) found that animal population densities tend to be positively  
389 correlated with area, suggesting that density compensation may not be a common phenomenon.

390 Smaller patches, including plantings, have been found to contain bird communities with lower  
391 overall species richness and a greater proportion of generalist or edge-specialist species (Flaspohler  
392 et al., 2010; Mac Nally et al., 2010). Species that are tolerant to fragmentation may take advantage  
393 of nesting habitat provided by small patches while utilising resources in the surrounding matrix  
394 (Andrén, 1994; Driscoll et al., 2013; Estades, 2001). The superb fairywren accounted for over one  
395 quarter of all observations of breeding activity in our study, and is often described as a habitat  
396 generalist (Loyn et al., 2007; Mac Nally et al., 2010). Other commonly detected species, including  
397 the willie wagtail, demonstrated a positive relationship between breeding activity and patch size,  
398 indicating that not all species in the woodland assemblage respond similarly to patch size.

399 Furthermore, we found no effect of patch size on the collective group of species of conservation  
400 concern.

401 Nest predation may have a significant influence on breeding success in birds, and can vary with  
402 predator type, patch size, and isolation in fragmented landscapes (Okada et al., 2017; Stephens et  
403 al., 2004). There is conflicting evidence pertaining to the influence of patch size on nest predation  
404 in fragmented agricultural landscapes. For example, Hoover et al. (1995) attributed lower nesting  
405 success of wood thrushes (*Hylocichla mustelina*) in smaller fragments to a greater abundance of  
406 avian predators, and Major et al. (2001) found that the grey butcherbird (*Cracticus torquatus*), a  
407 predatory species in Australian woodlands, was more abundant in smaller than in larger habitat  
408 patches. In contrast, Zanette et al. (2000) found no evidence that area-sensitivity in the eastern  
409 yellow robin (*Eopsaltria australis*) could be explained by nest predation. Lehnen and Rodewald  
410 (2009) also found no evidence of area-sensitivity in survival and recruitment of shrubland bird  
411 species of conservation concern in the eastern United States. Nest type is also confounded with  
412 predation risk. Cup-nests are inherently more vulnerable to predation than dome-nests (Okada et al.,

413 2017), and thus species that build cup-nests may be more sensitive to edge-effects in smaller  
414 patches. However, in our study, we found no evidence of a patch-size effect on cup-nesters.  
415 Conversely, smaller patches may contain lower abundances of brood parasites such as Horsfield's  
416 bronzecuckoo (*Chrysococcyx basalis*) (Brooker and Brooker, 2003), reducing the risk of brood  
417 parasitism. Indeed, cuckoos were detected infrequently in our study sites (Appendix B). Further  
418 research is warranted to directly investigate nesting success of woodland birds in fragmented  
419 agricultural landscapes.

420 A potential explanation for recording greater incidences of breeding activity in smaller patches than  
421 in larger patches is that an observer may search smaller sites more thoroughly than larger ones  
422 (Woolhouse, 1983). However, we used a search method standardised by area and time in an attempt  
423 to control for potential effects of survey effort on activity detection rates. With an equivalent time  
424 spent per unit area in each survey regardless of patch size, bias towards detecting more breeding  
425 activity in smaller sites should not have influenced our results. However, we note that breeding  
426 activity surveys are inherently biased towards species that nest in lower strata (such as the superb  
427 fairywren).

#### 428 4.2 Patch type

429 We predicted that remnant woodland patches would be characterised by more cases of successful  
430 breeding than restoration plantings. However, our results showed that there was as much breeding  
431 activity in restoration plantings as in remnant woodland patches. This result is somewhat  
432 unexpected, as previous studies have found significant differences in bird species diversity and  
433 abundance in plantings and remnants; remnants, and large remnants in particular, tend to support a  
434 more diverse species assemblage than plantings (Arnold, 2003; Cunningham et al., 2008;  
435 Lindenmayer et al., 2012; Loyn et al., 2007; Martin et al., 2011; Munro et al., 2011). Previous  
436 studies of bird assemblages in fragmented agricultural landscapes have identified bird species that  
437 are "planting specialists", which preferentially occupy restoration plantings over remnant woodland

438 patches or other sites (reviewed by Belder et al., 2018). It was possible from the outset that breeding  
439 activity in restoration plantings would be primarily accounted for by a select few of these species,  
440 such as the generalist and edge-tolerant superb fairywren and willie wagtail. However, our  
441 modelling indicated that the same trend may hold for species of conservation concern as well as the  
442 woodland assemblage as a whole. This suggests that restoration plantings are providing habitat that  
443 is as valuable for bird populations as remnant woodland patches. We note, however, that various  
444 woodland-dependent species, including species of conservation concern such as the dusky  
445 woodswallow and brown treecreeper, show a strong affinity for remnant woodland. We therefore  
446 posit that restoration plantings play a complementary role in providing habitat for woodland birds,  
447 and caution against restoration plantings being considered a direct replacement for remnant  
448 woodland (see also Cunningham et al., 2007).

#### 449 *4.3 Patch shape*

450 At this outset of this study, we predicted linear-shaped sites would support less breeding activity  
451 than block-shaped sites. We found a weak negative association between patch linearity and bird  
452 breeding activity in our study sites in only one candidate model, and therefore no strong evidence  
453 that site shape influenced bird breeding activity in our study region. Previous studies have  
454 suggested that increasing linearity negatively influences breeding birds (Helzer and Jelinski, 1999;  
455 King et al., 2009). However, Selwood et al. (2009) found more evidence of successful breeding by  
456 woodland birds in linear patches. Our ordination modelling revealed that some bird species (e.g.  
457 brown treecreeper, black-faced cuckooshrike) showed more breeding activity in sites of increasing  
458 linearity, even though this was not reflected in relative abundance. We suggest that further studies  
459 are needed to confirm whether patch linearity influences breeding success of birds in fragmented  
460 agricultural landscapes.



#### 461 4.4 *Planting age*

462 Contrary to expectations, we found that planting age was a negative predictor of bird breeding  
463 activity for the woodland assemblage and for species of conservation concern. That is, there was  
464 less evidence of breeding activity in older plantings. This finding contrasts with that of Selwood et  
465 al. (2009), who found that the age of plantings did not influence breeding activity. Barrett et al.  
466 (2003) found evidence of bird breeding activity in plantings as young as three years, noting that the  
467 species that exhibited the most breeding activity were small, shrub-swelling species such as the  
468 superb fairywren, red-browed finch, and yellow-rumped thornbill.

469 A typical planting in our study region consists of a *Eucalyptus* overstorey and *Acacia* understorey.  
470 In the absence of fire, an *Acacia* understorey is likely to senesce after 20-50 years (Broadhurst et  
471 al., 2008; Parsons and Gosper, 2011), and natural regeneration of the shrub layer in planted sites  
472 may be poor (Vesk et al., 2008). The deterioration of understorey density and diversity with  
473 planting age is likely to contribute to a reduction in suitable nesting sites for common shrub-nesting  
474 species like the superb fairywren, as well as species of conservation concern such as the yellow-  
475 rumped thornbill and diamond firetail (*Stagonopleura guttata*). This may explain why the older  
476 plantings in our study, which were around 25 years of age, did not support as much breeding  
477 activity as younger plantings. The lack of an effect of age on the assemblage when our three most  
478 dominant species were removed, as well as the absence of effects for cup-nesters, may be related to  
479 the small sample size of these subsets.

#### 480 4.5 *Other findings*

481 We found that examining breeding activity in our study sites provided a markedly different picture  
482 of bird species' responses to patch attributes than examining relative abundances obtained via point  
483 counts. There were several species whose responses to patch size, shape, and type based on relative  
484 abundance were opposite to their responses to these variables based on breeding activity. This  
485 indicates that 1) some bird species choose to breed disproportionately more in particular kinds of

486 patches, or 2) the resources birds need to breed are not necessarily provided in patches that they  
487 choose to forage in (Loyn et al., 2007). The latter is of particular interest, and important for  
488 assessing the value of restoration plantings for woodland bird conservation; if birds preferentially  
489 occupy habitat patches but are unable to breed successfully in them, then those patches may become  
490 ecological traps, exacerbating population declines (Battin, 2004). This highlights the importance of  
491 conducting research that moves beyond pattern-based data collection to include more detailed,  
492 population-oriented studies (Belder et al., 2018; Ruiz-Jaen and Aide, 2005).

493 We found that for species of conservation concern, there were no interpretable effects of site type,  
494 size, shape, or other variables on breeding activity score. The lack of an effect of site size is  
495 surprising, as previous studies have found that site occupancy by species of conservation concern is  
496 positively associated with patch size (Ford et al., 2009; Lindenmayer et al., 2010; Montague-Drake  
497 et al., 2009).

498 The absence of any effect of site type was also unexpected, as we had predicted more breeding  
499 activity by species of conservation concern in remnants due to the considerable body of evidence  
500 indicating that many threatened and declining species are dependent on or closely associated with  
501 remnant woodland (Cunningham et al., 2008; Kinross, 2004; Martin et al., 2011). We note that  
502 some species of conservation concern, such as the yellow-rumped thornbill, are among “planting  
503 specialists” identified in previous studies (Belder et al., 2018) (Appendix B). It is possible that the  
504 small number of observations of species of conservation concern in our study reduced our power to  
505 detect effects of patch attributes on these species, if they do indeed exist.

#### 506 *4.6 Inferential limitations*

507 Variables at the landscape level, such as the amount and proximity of native vegetation, may have a  
508 stronger influence on species richness and abundance (Cunningham et al., 2008; Fahrig, 2013;  
509 Lindenmayer et al., 2010; Radford and Bennett, 2007) and breeding activity (Hinsley et al., 2008,  
510 1995) than the patch-level characteristics of area and shape. Investigating these variables was

511 outside the scope of this study, but we recommend further research be undertaken to address their  
512 effects. We note the prevalence of a select few species in our data, which may be symptomatic of an  
513 environment that favours generalist and edge-tolerant species, to the detriment of richness and  
514 productivity of woodland bird assemblages in our study region. Additionally, the absence of the  
515 noisy miner in our study sites enabled us to examine the effects of patch attributes without the  
516 confounding effects of competitive exclusion, but noisy miners are regular occupants of small  
517 patches in fragmented agricultural landscapes (Major et al. 2001). We also note the small size (<10  
518 ha) of plantings and remnants in our study. These reflect the typical size of native vegetation  
519 patches in our study region, but we caution against applying our findings to much larger-scale  
520 restoration projects, as breeding birds may respond differently to them than they do to small,  
521 isolated patches. Lastly, we note the relatively short duration of our study – two breeding seasons in  
522 years of above-average rainfall. We suggest that a better understanding of woodland bird population  
523 processes could be obtained by incorporating breeding studies into long-term monitoring projects.

#### 524 *4.7 Management implications and concluding remarks*

525 Studies of bird distribution and abundance in fragmented landscapes have previously highlighted  
526 the conservation value of small habitat patches (Fischer and Lindenmayer, 2002; Flaspohler et al.,  
527 2010; Gibbons and Boak, 2002; Wintle et al., 2019). Our results add credence to these findings by  
528 providing evidence that birds not only occupy small patches, but display evidence of successful  
529 breeding within them. Previous studies of bird species richness and abundance in restoration  
530 plantings have recommended that plantings be as large as possible to maximise their conservation  
531 value (Freudenberger, 2001; Watson et al., 2001; Westphal et al., 2007). We do not seek to  
532 undermine the conservation value of very large-scale restoration projects, which were outside the  
533 scope of this study, and we fully support the planting of large areas of native vegetation as a  
534 strategy to increase vegetation cover in fragmented agricultural landscapes. However, our results  
535 suggest that the establishment and conservation of small plantings (and the conservation of small  
536 remnants) can also be of considerable value for the management of woodland bird populations (see

537 also Schippers et al., 2009). It is often easier and more cost-effective to implement and maintain  
538 small patches (Kendal et al., 2017), so we are hopeful that our findings will encourage land  
539 managers to consider implementing small plantings wherever it is not possible to establish large  
540 plantings.

541 The observation of similar levels of breeding activity among the different site types in our study can  
542 be cautiously interpreted as encouraging for the conservation value of restoration plantings, as it  
543 indicates that birds in fragmented agricultural landscapes may view restoration plantings and  
544 remnant woodland patches as equally suitable breeding habitat. However, we acknowledge that  
545 breeding activity is only a proxy for breeding success, and cannot provide a true indication of  
546 whether breeding attempts are succeeding or failing. We therefore recommend further exploration  
547 using an approach such as monitoring nest success or daily nest survival.

548 Our finding that breeding activity decreased with planting age is of considerable interest for the  
549 management of restoration plantings. If a reduction in the condition and density of the shrub layer  
550 decreases the ability of a planting to support breeding birds, including species of conservation  
551 concern, then there is a case for active management of the shrub layer (including replanting if  
552 necessary) as a planting matures. Maintaining a complex habitat structure in restoration plantings  
553 also decreases the likelihood of colonisation by the noisy miner (Kinross and Nicol, 2004; Maron et  
554 al., 2013). Although we did not find evidence that fenced sites supported more breeding activity,  
555 previous studies have shown that the ecological benefits of restoration plantings are diminished  
556 when they are exposed to grazing by stock (Lindenmayer et al., 2018b; Selwood et al., 2009). We  
557 suggest that maintaining fences around restoration plantings may assist with preserving the shrub  
558 layer and ensuring that plantings continue to support breeding birds as they mature.

559 Finally, the unexpected nature of several of our key findings exemplifies the value of moving  
560 beyond pattern data (such as site occupancy information) towards a more behaviour- and  
561 population-oriented approach in monitoring and assessing the conservation value of restoration

562 plantings and other habitat patches. As we have shown, relying solely on measures like species  
563 richness and abundance risks perpetuating critical knowledge gaps regarding habitat-use and the  
564 value of habitat patches for birds in fragmented agricultural landscapes.

## 565 **Acknowledgements**

566 We are grateful for the feedback of three anonymous reviewers, which enabled us to make  
567 substantial improvements to an earlier version of our manuscript. Ashwin Rudder and Ira Dudley-  
568 Bestow assisted with fieldwork. We thank the landholders who permitted access to their properties  
569 for the duration of the study. This work was funded by a Margaret Middleton Fund Award and  
570 Lesslie Research Scholarship to DJB, with supporting funds from the Riverina Local Land Services.  
571 Fieldwork was conducted under NSW Scientific Licence SL101588 and with approval from The  
572 Australian National University's Animal Ethics Committee.

573

574

575 **Appendices**

576 **Appendix A** Attributes of study sites in the South-west Slopes bioregion.

site	site type	shape	planting year	elevation (m)	size (ha)	perimeter (m)	width (m)	fenced
WB-6	planting	block	2001	330	1.5	678	70	
SU-5	planting	block	2003	330	1.8	713	65	✓
BL-4	planting	block	1990	270	2.5	1583	70	✓
HI-3	planting	block	1990	285	5.3	983	150	✓
MT-1	planting	block	1991	280	5.6	988	200	✓
RI-5	planting	block	2002	249	7.7	1176	200	✓
PM-4	planting	linear	1997	269	1.3	1299	40	✓
PS-3	planting	linear	1989	429	1.4	1054	40	✓
MH-6	planting	linear	2000	344	1.7	1138	30	✓
FR-A	planting	linear	1997	259	3.0	2610	15	✓
FR-3	planting	linear	1997	300	3.2	1655	40	✓
MT-3	planting	linear	1993	276	3.2	2213	30	✓
SO-1	remnant	block		303	2.1	1156	80	
WS-3	remnant	block		325	2.8	1006	130	
PK-2	remnant	block		265	5.8	1755	200	✓
WB-2	remnant	linear		262	2.3	1448	30	
SU-1	remnant	linear		297	4.1	736	60	
PK-1	remnant	linear		248	3.6	2379	25	✓
GD-4	reference	block		397	47.1	3956	555	✓
KY	reference	block		347	110	5070	400	✓
MG	reference	block		298	86	5090	400	✓

577

578 **Appendix B** Assemblages and attributes of bird species recorded during the study. Breeding activity scores are provided for each species and site type. The  
579 number of patches in which the species was detected and in which breeding occurred are provided in brackets: (no. patches breeding/no. patches present). •  
580 denotes species recorded in point count surveys but not breeding activity surveys. Species are listed in taxonomic order (Gill and Donsker, 2018). Conservation  
581 status according to NSW threatened species listing (NSW Environment & Heritage, 2018) and bird atlas trends (Barrett et al. 2003). Categories are least concern  
582 (LC), conservation concern (CC), vulnerable (V). Information on breeding season and nest type taken from Morcombe (2003) and Pizzey and Knight (1997).

Species	Abbreviation	Nest type	Breeding season	Conservation status	Plantings	Remnants	Reference sites	
stubble quail	<i>Coturnix pectoralis</i>	SQ	cup	Aug-Mar	LC	• (0/2)	• (0/1)	
wedge-tailed eagle	<i>Aquila audax</i>	WTE	cup	Jun-Nov	LC		• (0/1)	
brown goshawk	<i>Accipiter fasciatus</i>	BGOS	cup	Sep-Dec	LC	3.0 (1/0)	1.0 (1/0)	
nankeen kestrel	<i>Falco cenchroides</i>	NK	hollow	Aug-Dec	LC	1.0 (1/0)	• (0/1)	
brown falcon	<i>Falco berigora</i>	BRFA	cup	Aug-Nov	LC	• (0/2)	7.0 (1/1)	
painted buttonquail	<i>Turnix varius</i>	PBQ	cup	Aug-Feb	LC		• (0/1)	
common bronzewing	<i>Phaps chalcoptera</i>	CBZ	cup	Aug-Dec	LC	6.0 (1/3)	6.0 (1/2)	
crested pigeon	<i>Ocyphaps lophotes</i>	CP	cup	Jul-Dec	LC	48.5 (3/3)	6.0 (2/5)	
peaceful dove	<i>Geopelia placida</i>	PD	cup	Oct-Jan	LC	2.0 (1/4)	12.0 (2/4)	
gang-gang cockatoo	<i>Callocephalon fimbriatum</i>	GGC	hollow	Oct-Jan	V		7.5 (1/1)	
galah	<i>Eolophus roseicapilla</i>	GAL	hollow	Jul-Dec	LC	• (0/11)	• (0/6)	• (0/3)
little corella	<i>Cacatua sanguinea</i>	LCOR	hollow	Aug-Nov	LC	• (0/4)	• (0/3)	• (0/1)
sulphur-crested cockatoo	<i>Cacatua galerita</i>	SCC	hollow	Aug-Jan	LC	• (0/6)	• (0/4)	• (0/3)
crimson rosella	<i>Platycercus elegans</i>	CRO	hollow	Sep-Jan	LC	8.5 (2/7)		• (0/2)
eastern rosella	<i>Platycercus eximius</i>	ERO	hollow	Aug-Dec	LC	1.0 (1/12)	12.5 (2/6)	• (0/2)
red-rumped parrot	<i>Pseophotus haematonotus</i>	RRP	hollow	Aug-Jan	LC	4.0 (2/8)	• (0/5)	• (0/1)
Australian king-parrot	<i>Alisterus scapularis</i>	AKP	hollow	Sep-Jan	LC	• (0/1)	1.0 (1/1)	• (0/1)
superb parrot	<i>Polytelis swainsonii</i>	SUPA	hollow	Sep-Dec	V	• (0/2)	• (0/2)	
Horsfield's bronzecuckoo	<i>Chrysococcyx basalis</i>	HBC	parasitic	Aug-Jan	LC		• (0/1)	• (0/2)
shining bronzecuckoo	<i>Chrysococcyx lucidus</i>	SBC	parasitic	Aug-Jan	LC	• (0/1)		• (0/1)
pallid cuckoo	<i>Cacomantis pallidus</i>	PAC	parasitic	Aug-Dec	LC		• (0/1)	
fan-tailed cuckoo	<i>Cacomantis flabelliformis</i>	FTC	parasitic	Jul-Jan	LC	• (0/1)	• (0/1)	• (0/1)
laughing kookaburra	<i>Dacelo novaeguineae</i>	LK	hollow	Sep-Dec	LC	• (0/11)	11.0 (2/4)	5.0 (1/1)
sacred kingfisher	<i>Todiramphus sanctus</i>	SK	hollow	Sep-Jan	LC	• (0/2)	2.0 (2/3)	8.0 (1/2)
rainbow bee-eater	<i>Merops ornatus</i>	RBE	hollow	Oct-Jan	CC	• (0/3)	• (0/2)	• (0/1)
white-throated treecreeper	<i>Cormobates leucophaea</i>	WTTC	hollow	Aug-Jan	LC	• (0/1)	• (0/1)	1.0 (1/3)
brown treecreeper	<i>Climacteris picumnus</i>	BTC	hollow	May-Dec	V		29.0 (2/4)	26.0 (1/3)
superb fairywren	<i>Malurus cyaneus</i>	SFW	dome	Sep-Dec	LC	831.5 (12/12)	262.5 (6/12)	146.5 (3/12)
little friarbird	<i>Philemon citreogularis</i>	LFB	cup	Jul-Nov	LC	10.0 (1/2)		

noisy friarbird	<i>Philemon corniculatus</i>	NFB	cup	Jul-Jan	LC	• (0/6)	• (0/1)	9.0 (1/3)
blue-faced honeyeater	<i>Entomyzon cyanotis</i>	BFH	cup	Jul-Jan	LC	• (0/2)		
black-chinned honeyeater	<i>Melithreptus gularis</i>	BCH	cup	Jul-Dec	V		7.5 (1/1)	• (0/2)
brown-headed honeyeater	<i>Melithreptus brevirostris</i>	BHH	cup	Aug-Jan	LC	• (0/5)	7.5 (1/2)	5.0 (1/3)
red wattlebird <sup>⊕</sup>	<i>Anthochaera carunculata</i>	RWB	cup	Jul-Dec	LC	15.0 (2/9)	• (0/3)	• (0/3)
yellow-faced honeyeater	<i>Caligavis chrysops</i>	YFH	cup	Jul-Jan	LC	• (0/3)		• (0/1)
noisy miner	<i>Manorina melanocephala</i>	NM	cup	Jul-Dec	LC	4.0 (2/6)	5.0 (2/3)	
fuscous honeyeater	<i>Ptilotula fusca</i>	FUH	cup	Aug-Dec	LC			1.0 (0/1)
white-plumed honeyeater <sup>⊕</sup>	<i>Ptilotula penicillata</i>	WPH	cup	Aug-Dec	LC	21.0 (3/11)	76.0 (3/6)	• (0/3)
spotted pardalote	<i>Pardalotus punctatus</i>	SPP	hollow	Sep-Dec	LC	2.0 (1/3)		• (0/1)
striated pardalote	<i>Pardalotus striatus</i>	STP	hollow	Jun-Jan	LC	11.0 (4/12)	1.0 (1/6)	• (0/3)
speckled warbler <sup>⊕</sup>	<i>Pyrrholaemus sagittatus</i>	SW	dome	Aug-Jan	CC	1.0 (1/1)	2.0 (1/2)	51.5 (3/2)
white-browed scrubwren <sup>⊕</sup>	<i>Sericornis frontalis</i>	WBS	dome	Jul-Dec	LC	25.0 (1/1)		
weebill <sup>⊕</sup>	<i>Smicromnis brevirostris</i>	WEE	dome	Aug-Feb	CC	97.0 (7/9)	7.0 (2/2)	23.0 (2/2)
western gerygone <sup>⊕</sup>	<i>Gerygone fusca</i>	WEG	dome	Aug-Nov	LC	26.5 (3/10)	2.0 (1/4)	36.5 (3/3)
white-throated gerygone	<i>Gerygone olivacea</i>	WTG	dome	Sep-Nov	LC	• (0/3)		1.0 (1/2)
brown thornbill	<i>Acanthiza pusilla</i>	BT	dome	Aug-Dec	LC	2.0 (2/1)	• (0/1)	54.0 (1/3)
buff-rumped thornbill	<i>Acanthiza reguloides</i>	BRT	dome	Aug-Dec	LC	32.5 (2/4)	55.5 (2/2)	155.5 (3/3)
yellow-rumped thornbill <sup>⊕</sup>	<i>Acanthiza chrysorrhoa</i>	YRT	dome	Jul-Dec	CC	513.5 (10/10)	53.0 (2/3)	48.5 (2/3)
yellow thornbill <sup>⊕</sup>	<i>Acanthiza nana</i>	YET	dome	Aug-Dec	LC	31.0 (8/9)	8.0 (2/2)	6.0 (2/3)
striated thornbill <sup>⊕</sup>	<i>Acanthiza lineata</i>	STT	dome	Jul-Dec	LC	17.5 (1/2)	13.0 (1/1)	31.5 (2/3)
white-browed babbler	<i>Pomastomus superciliosus</i>	WBB	dome	Jun-Dec	LC	7.5 (1/2)	16.0 (1/1)	
grey butcherbird	<i>Cracticus torquatus</i>	GBB	cup	Aug-Dec	LC	• (0/2)	• (0/2)	
piebald butcherbird	<i>Cracticus nigrogularis</i>	PBB	cup	Aug-Nov	LC	3.5 (1/10)	7.5 (1/5)	• (0/1)
Australian magpie	<i>Cracticus tibicen</i>	AM	cup	Aug-Oct	LC	143.5 (8/12)	74.5 (4/6)	19.5 (2/3)
piebald currawong	<i>Strepera graculina</i>	PCW	cup	Aug-Dec	LC	• (0/2)	• (0/2)	• (0/1)
dusky woodswallow	<i>Artamus cyanopterus</i>	DWS	cup	Aug-Dec	V	1.0 (1/0)	36.0 (2/3)	6.0 (1/1)
black-faced cuckooshrike	<i>Coracina novaehollandiae</i>	BFCS	cup	Aug-Jan	LC	28.5 (4/12)	32.0 (4/5)	2.0 (2/3)
white-bellied cuckooshrike	<i>Coracina papuensis</i>	WBCS	cup	Aug-Mar	LC			• (0/1)
white-winged triller	<i>Lalage tricolor</i>	WWT	cup	Sep-Dec	CC	25.0 (2/1)	7.0 (1/2)	1.0 (1/2)
varied sittella	<i>Daphoenositta chrysoptera</i>	VS	cup	Sep-Dec	V			27.0 (3/3)
crested shrike-tit	<i>Falcunculus frontatus</i>	CST	cup	Sep-Jan	CC	5.0 (3/5)	9.0 (1/4)	
golden whistler	<i>Pachycephala pectoralis</i>	GOW	cup	Aug-Jan	LC	23.5 (3/2)	2.0 (2/2)	7.5 (1/0)
rufous whistler <sup>⊕</sup>	<i>Pachycephala rufiventris</i>	RUW	cup	Sep-Feb	LC	164.5 (7/12)	16.5 (3/5)	20.0 (3/3)
grey shrikethrush <sup>⊕</sup>	<i>Colluricincla harmonica</i>	GST	cup	Jul-Feb	LC	135.0 (9/12)	52.5 (4/6)	8.5 (2/3)
olive-backed oriole	<i>Oriolus sagittatus</i>	OBO	cup	Sep-Jan	LC	7.5 (1/0)	• (0/1)	
willie wagtail <sup>⊕</sup>	<i>Rhipidura leucophrys</i>	WW	cup	Aug-Dec	LC	92.5 (9/12)	176.5 (5/6)	42.5 (1/3)
grey fantail <sup>⊕</sup>	<i>Rhipidura albiscapa</i>	GF	cup	Aug-Dec	LC	60.5 (9/12)	24.0 (3/5)	17.0 (3/3)




magpie-lark	<i>Grallina cyanoleuca</i>	AML	cup	Aug-Feb	LC	10.5 (4/12)	43.0 (2/6)	5.0 (1/3)
leaden flycatcher	<i>Myiagra rubecula</i>	LFC	cup	Sep-Nov	LC	• (0/1)		• (0/1)
restless flycatcher	<i>Myiagra inquieta</i>	RFC	cup	Aug-Jan	CC	• (0/2)	• (0/5)	• (0/1)
little raven	<i>Corvus mellori</i>	LR	cup	Aug-Dec	LC	16.5 (2/8)	7.5 (1/4)	9.0 (1/2)
Australian raven	<i>Corvus coronoides</i>	AR	cup	Jul-Oct	LC	11.5 (1/12)	3.5 (1/6)	11.5 (2/3)
white-winged chough	<i>Corcorax melanoramphos</i>	WWC	cup	Aug-Dec	LC	55.5 (6/6)	40.0 (2/3)	15.5 (2/3)
eastern yellow robin <sup>‡</sup>	<i>Eopsaltria australis</i>	EYR	cup	Jul-Dec	LC		• (0/1)	7.0 (1/1)
hooded robin <sup>‡</sup>	<i>Melanodryas cucullata</i>	HR	cup	Jul-Dec	V			4.5 (1)
jacky winter	<i>Microeca fascians</i>	JW	cup	Jul-Dec	CC	• (0/1)	10.0 (2/2)	37.0 (2/2)
flame robin <sup>‡</sup>	<i>Petroica phoenicea</i>	FR	cup	Aug-Jan	V	• (0/1)	• (0/1)	
red-capped robin <sup>‡</sup>	<i>Petroica goodenovii</i>	RCR	cup	Jul-Jan	CC	95.5 (2/2)	• (0/1)	36.0 (3/1)
welcome swallow	<i>Hirundo neoxena</i>	WS	cup	Aug-Dec	LC	• (0/4)	• (0/6)	• (0/1)
fairy martin	<i>Petrochelidon ariel</i>	FM	other	Aug-Jan	CC	• (0/1)		
tree martin	<i>Petrochelidon nigricans</i>	TM	hollow	Aug-Dec	LC		8.5 (1/2)	
rufous songlark	<i>Cincloramphus mathewsi</i>	RSL	cup	Sep-Dec	LC	6.0 (1/8)	16.0 (3/3)	• (0/1)
brown songlark	<i>Cincloramphus cruralis</i>	BSL	cup	Sep-Feb	CC	• (0/3)	• (0/1)	
silveryeye	<i>Zosterops lateralis</i>	SIL	cup	Sep-Jan	LC	1.0 (1/5)	• (0/2)	• (0/1)
common starling	<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>	STA	hollow	Aug-Jan		24.0 (2/8)	10.0 (1/5)	6.0 (1/1)
common blackbird	<i>Turdus merula</i>	BKB	cup	Sep-Dec		42.0 (2/3)	• (0/1)	
mistletoebird	<i>Dicaeum hirundinaceum</i>	MTB	dome	Oct-Mar	LC	• (0/1)	• (0/2)	1.0 (1/2)
diamond firetail <sup>‡</sup>	<i>Stagonopleura guttata</i>	DF	dome	Aug-Jan	V	38.0 (2/2)	10.0 (3/2)	
red-browed finch <sup>‡</sup>	<i>Neochmia temporalis</i>	RBF	dome	Sep-Dec	LC	29.0 (2/3)	6.0 (1/1)	
double-barred finch	<i>Taeniopygia bichenovii</i>	DBF	dome	Jul-Dec	LC	2.0 (2/2)	1.0 (1/1)	
Australian pipit	<i>Anthus australis</i>	PIP	cup	Aug-Dec	LC	• (0/3)	• (0/2)	

583 <sup>‡</sup> Planting specialists (Belder et al. 2018)

584 <sup>‡</sup> Introduced species

585 **Appendix C** Total breeding activity recorded for the subset of bird species included in multivariate latent  
586 model ordinations. Acronyms corresponding to particular bird species are given in Appendix B.



587

588

589

590 **Appendix D** Mixed effects models for breeding score modelled against weather and temporal variables,  
 591 ranked by Akaike's Information Criterion adjusted for small sample sizes ( $AIC_c$ ). Top-ranked models ( $\Delta AIC_c$   
 592  $\leq 2$ ) are shown for the woodland assemblage, species of conservation concern, cup-nesters, and subsets of  
 593 the assemblage that exclude dominant species. All models that differed from the top model ( $\Delta AIC_c$ ) by  $\leq 2$   
 594 are shown, as well as the intercept-only model.

<i>Woodland assemblage</i>	df	log(L)	$AIC_c$	$\Delta AIC_c$	$AIC_w$
DATE	5	-144.46	299.52	0.00	0.29
DATE + TIME	6	-143.57	300.00	0.49	0.23
DATE + SUN	6	-144.29	301.44	1.92	0.11
Intercept only	4	-160.21	328.82	29.30	0.00
<i>Excluding superb fairywren</i>	df	log(L)	$AIC_c$	$\Delta AIC_c$	$AIC_w$
DATE	5	-144.32	299.25	0.00	0.43
Intercept only	4	-150.68	309.75	10.50	0.00
<i>Excluding superb fairywren, yellow-rumped thornbill, willie wagtail</i>	df	log(L)	$AIC_c$	$\Delta AIC_c$	$AIC_w$
DATE	5	-145.52	301.64	0.00	0.29
DATE + TIME	6	-145.15	303.17	1.53	0.14
DATE + WIND	6	-145.30	303.46	1.82	0.12
Intercept only	4	-148.41	305.23	3.59	0.05
<i>Species of conservation concern</i>	df	log(L)	$AIC_c$	$\Delta AIC_c$	$AIC_w$
DATE + TIME	6	-157.23	327.32	0.00	0.31
DATE	5	-158.89	328.39	1.06	0.18
Intercept only	4	-161.53	331.45	4.13	0.04
<i>Cup-nesters</i>	df	log(L)	$AIC_c$	$\Delta AIC_c$	$AIC_w$
DATE + TIME	6	-150.37	313.60	0.00	0.23
DATE + TIME + WIND	7	-149.54	314.23	0.63	0.17
DATE + TIME + SUN	7	-149.66	314.48	0.88	0.15
DATE	5	-151.94	314.49	0.89	0.15
DATE + TIME + SUN + WIND	8	-148.96	315.42	1.82	0.09
DATE + SUN	6	-151.34	315.53	1.93	0.09
Intercept only	4	-155.94	320.29	6.69	0.01

595

596

597 **Appendix E** Mixed effects models for total breeding score modelled against site type for all sites (planting,  
598 remnant, and reference), ranked by Akaike's Information Criterion adjusted for small sample sizes (AIC<sub>c</sub>).  
599 Top-ranked models ( $\Delta\text{AIC}_c \leq 2$ ) are shown for the woodland assemblage, species of conservation concern,  
600 cup-nesters, and subsets of the woodland assemblage that exclude dominant species. All models that  
601 differed from the top model ( $\Delta\text{AIC}_c$ ) by  $\leq 2$  are shown, as well as the intercept-only model.

<i>Woodland assemblage</i>	df	log(L)	AIC <sub>c</sub>	$\Delta\text{AIC}_c$	AIC <sub>w</sub>
DATE	5	-144.46	299.52	0.00	0.54
DATE + FENCED	6	-144.27	301.40	1.89	0.21
Intercept only	4	-160.21	328.82	29.30	0.00
<i>Excluding superb fairywren</i>	df	log(L)	AIC <sub>c</sub>	$\Delta\text{AIC}_c$	AIC <sub>w</sub>
DATE	5	-144.32	299.25	0.00	0.67
Intercept only	4	-150.68	309.75	10.50	0.00
<i>Excluding superb fairywren, yellow-rumped thornbill, willie wagtail</i>	df	log(L)	AIC <sub>c</sub>	$\Delta\text{AIC}_c$	AIC <sub>w</sub>
DATE	5	-145.52	301.64	0.00	0.47
Intercept only	4	-148.41	305.23	3.59	0.08
<i>Species of conservation concern</i>	df	log(L)	AIC <sub>c</sub>	$\Delta\text{AIC}_c$	AIC <sub>w</sub>
DATE	5	-158.89	328.39	0.00	0.34
DATE + FENCED	6	-158.10	329.05	0.67	0.24
DATE + TYPE	7	-157.23	329.62	1.24	0.18
Intercept only	4	-161.53	331.45	3.07	0.07
<i>Cup-nesters</i>	df	log(L)	AIC <sub>c</sub>	$\Delta\text{AIC}_c$	AIC <sub>w</sub>
DATE	5	-151.94	314.49	0.00	0.60
Intercept only	4	-155.94	320.29	5.79	0.03

602

603

604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609

**Appendix F** Mixed effects models for total breeding score recorded during breeding activity surveys in plantings and remnants (excluding reference sites), ranked by Akaike's Information Criterion adjusted for small sample sizes (AIC<sub>c</sub>). Top-ranked models ( $\Delta\text{AIC}_c \leq 2$ ) are shown for the woodland assemblage, species of conservation concern, cup-nesters, and subsets of the woodland assemblage that exclude dominant species. All models that differed from the top model ( $\Delta\text{AIC}_c$ ) by  $\leq 2$  are shown, as well as the intercept-only model.

<i>Woodland assemblage</i>	df	log(L)	AIC <sub>c</sub>	$\Delta\text{AIC}_c$	AIC <sub>w</sub>
DATE + SIZE	6	-122.29	257.58	0.00	0.22
DATE + SIZE + TYPE	7	-121.68	258.73	1.15	0.12
Intercept only	4	-140.70	289.88	32.29	0.00
<i>Excluding superb fairywren</i>	df	log(L)	AIC <sub>c</sub>	$\Delta\text{AIC}_c$	AIC <sub>w</sub>
DATE	5	-123.81	258.33	0.00	0.19
DATE + SIZE	6	-123.18	259.37	1.04	0.11
DATE + SIZE + SHAPE + SIZE:SHAPE	8	-121.17	260.12	1.79	0.08
Intercept only	4	-130.79	270.05	11.72	0.00
<i>Excluding superb fairywren, yellow-rumped thornbill, willie wagtail</i>	df	log(L)	AIC <sub>c</sub>	$\Delta\text{AIC}_c$	AIC <sub>w</sub>
DATE	5	-126.14	263.00	0.00	0.20
DATE + SIZE	6	-125.82	264.65	1.65	0.09
DATE + FENCED	6	-125.82	264.65	1.65	0.09
Intercept only	4	-129.16	266.79	3.79	0.03
<i>Species of conservation concern</i>	df	log(L)	AIC <sub>c</sub>	$\Delta\text{AIC}_c$	AIC <sub>w</sub>
DATE	5	-140.41	291.53	0.00	0.13
DATE + TYPE	6	-139.40	291.81	0.28	0.11
DATE + FENCED	6	-139.90	292.81	1.28	0.07
DATE + SIZE	6	-139.99	292.99	1.46	0.06
DATE + SIZE + TYPE	7	-138.84	293.05	1.52	0.06
DATE + SIZE + TYPE + SIZE:TYPE	8	-137.85	293.49	1.96	0.05
Intercept only	4	-143.08	294.63	3.10	0.03
<i>Cup-nesters</i>	df	log(L)	AIC <sub>c</sub>	$\Delta\text{AIC}_c$	AIC <sub>w</sub>
DATE	5	-133.19	277.10	0.00	0.23
DATE + TYPE	6	-132.92	278.85	1.75	0.10
DATE + SHAPE	6	-132.96	278.93	1.83	0.09
Intercept only	4	-136.61	281.69	4.59	0.02

610  
611

612 **Appendix G** Mixed effects models for total breeding score recorded during breeding activity surveys in  
 613 plantings, ranked by Akaike's Information Criterion adjusted for small sample sizes ( $AIC_c$ ). Top-ranked  
 614 models ( $\Delta AIC_c \leq 2$ ) are shown for the woodland assemblage, species of conservation concern, cup-nesters,  
 615 and subsets of the woodland assemblage that exclude dominant species. All models that differed from the  
 616 top model ( $\Delta AIC_c$ ) by  $\leq 2$  are shown, as well as the intercept-only model.

<i>Woodland assemblage</i>	df	log(L)	$AIC_c$	$\Delta AIC_c$	$AIC_w$
DATE + AGE + SIZE + FENCED	8	-76.62	172.06	0.00	0.27
DATE + AGE + SIZE	7	-78.16	172.47	0.40	0.22
DATE + AGE + SIZE + SHAPE	8	-77.60	174.01	1.95	0.10
Intercept only	4	-92.38	193.49	21.43	0.00
<i>Excluding superb fairywren</i>	Df	log(L)	$AIC_c$	$\Delta AIC_c$	$AIC_w$
DATE + AGE	6	-79.79	173.16	0.00	0.20
DATE	5	-81.45	174.00	0.84	0.13
DATE + AGE + FENCED	7	-78.95	174.06	0.90	0.13
Intercept only	4	-84.72	178.18	5.01	0.02
<i>Excluding superb fairywren, yellow-rumped thornbill, willie wagtail</i>	Df	log(L)	$AIC_c$	$\Delta AIC_c$	$AIC_w$
DATE	5	-82.35	175.81	0.00	0.22
Intercept only	4	-84.12	176.96	1.15	0.12
<i>Species of conservation concern</i>	df	log(L)	$AIC_c$	$\Delta AIC_c$	$AIC_w$
DATE + AGE + SIZE	7	-90.30	196.75	0.00	0.20
DATE + AGE	6	-92.08	197.75	1.00	0.12
Intercept only	4	-96.31	201.35	4.59	0.02
<i>Cup-nesters</i>	df	log(L)	$AIC_c$	$\Delta AIC_c$	$AIC_w$
Intercept only	4	-91.13	190.98	0.00	0.17
AGE	5	-90.42	191.94	0.96	0.10
DATE	5	-90.48	192.06	1.08	0.10

617

618  
619  
620

**Appendix H** Coefficients from multivariate latent variable models used to plot the effects of site attributes on relative abundance and breeding activity of bird species. The 95% upper and lower confidence limits around the estimate are provided in brackets. Estimates for which the confidence interval does not overlap zero are shown in bold.

common name	ABUNDANCE				BREEDING ACTIVITY			
	remnant vs. planting	reference vs. planting	patch size	patch linearity	remnant vs. planting	reference vs. planting	patch size	patch linearity
black-faced cuckooshrike	0.17 (-0.36, 0.80)	1.11 (-0.30, 2.61)	-0.21 (-0.76, 0.34)	-0.04 (-0.34, 0.21)	0.09 (-0.02, 0.21)	0.00 (-0.39, 0.32)	0.01 (-0.13, 0.14)	<b>0.05 (0.00, 0.09)</b>
brown-headed honeyeater	-0.67 (-1.86, 0.46)	-0.87 (-3.62, 1.59)	0.41 (-0.46, 1.42)	<b>-1.61 (-3.13, -0.59)</b>	0.00 (-0.04, 0.04)	<b>0.19 (0.06, 0.29)</b>	<b>-0.06 (-0.10, -0.01)</b>	0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)
buff-rumped thornbill	-0.19 (-1.25, 0.98)	-0.66 (-2.64, 1.36)	<b>1.28 (0.58, 2.03)</b>	<b>-1.49 (-2.86, -0.22)</b>	0.14 (-0.08, 0.36)	<b>1.11 (0.36, 1.76)</b>	-0.11 (-0.37, 0.18)	<b>-0.08 (-0.18, 0.00)</b>
brown thornbill	0.08 (-2.13, 1.96)	<b>3.63 (0.82, 6.17)</b>	-0.23 (-1.14, 0.71)	0.10 (-1.04, 1.15)	0.00 (-0.13, 0.11)	<b>1.67 (1.26, 2.13)</b>	<b>-0.50 (-0.65, -0.34)</b>	-0.01 (-0.05, 0.05)
brown treecreeper	<b>4.57 (2.56, 6.97)</b>	0.60 (-2.67, 4.10)	<b>1.50 (0.65, 2.42)</b>	0.09 (-0.32, 0.51)	<b>0.10 (0.04, 0.15)</b>	-0.01 (-0.19, 0.18)	0.02 (-0.04, 0.09)	<b>0.03 (0.01, 0.05)</b>
crested pigeon	<b>1.58 (0.53, 2.72)</b>	-0.56 (-6.02, 5.19)	-0.94 (-4.46, 1.42)	0.20 (-0.26, 0.68)	0.00 (-0.07, 0.07)	-0.03 (-0.23, 0.20)	0.00 (-0.08, 0.07)	0.01 (-0.02, 0.03)
double-barred finch	-0.29 (-1.94, 1.45)	-2.15 (-7.56, 2.84)	-0.50 (-3.18, 1.57)	<b>-1.48 (-3.00, -0.35)</b>	0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	-0.01 (-0.05, 0.04)	0.00 (-0.01, 0.02)	0.00 (-0.01, 0.00)
diamond firetail	-0.71 (-3.20, 0.78)	-0.89 (-6.45, 3.72)	-1.35 (-4.36, 1.22)	<b>-5.67 (-7.29, -2.35)</b>	-0.05 (-0.15, 0.04)	-0.07 (-0.32, 0.23)	-0.01 (-0.11, 0.09)	<b>-0.03 (-0.06, 0.00)</b>
dusky woodswallow	<b>4.79 (2.91, 6.69)</b>	-2.01 (-6.44, 2.55)	1.59 (-0.11, 3.24)	-0.18 (-0.93, 0.69)	<b>0.10 (0.04, 0.16)</b>	-0.05 (-0.23, 0.17)	0.02 (-0.07, 0.08)	-0.02 (-0.04, 0.01)
grey fantail	<b>-1.01 (-1.56, -0.48)</b>	-0.05 (-1.29, 1.03)	0.14 (-0.27, 0.58)	<b>-0.46 (-0.76, -0.18)</b>	0.08 (-0.01, 0.18)	0.11 (-0.19, 0.41)	-0.02 (-0.13, 0.09)	<b>-0.05 (-0.09, -0.01)</b>
golden whistler	-0.47 (-2.93, 1.57)	-1.31 (-6.81, 3.88)	-1.98 (-4.89, 0.68)	-1.19 (-2.73, 0.41)	-0.03 (-0.15, 0.06)	-0.27 (-0.59, 0.04)	<b>0.12 (0.00, 0.13)</b>	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.02)
grey shrikethrush	-0.29 (-0.66, 0.13)	0.67 (-0.59, 1.96)	-0.44 (-0.94, 0.06)	-0.07 (-0.26, 0.13)	-0.04 (-0.21, 0.11)	-0.01 (-0.15, 0.19)	-0.04 (-0.23, 0.13)	0.00 (-0.06, 0.06)
jacky winter	<b>2.22 (0.93, 3.76)</b>	2.38 (-0.16, 4.64)	0.10 (-0.71, 0.89)	<b>-3.64 (-5.06, -2.38)</b>	0.06 (-0.04, 0.14)	-0.08 (-0.38, 0.21)	<b>0.11 (0.01, 0.23)</b>	-0.01 (-0.05, 0.02)
peaceful dove	<b>1.75 (0.92, 2.68)</b>	-0.68 (-5.18, 3.70)	-1.39 (-4.14, 0.59)	-0.21 (-0.71, 0.33)	<b>0.07 (0.01, 0.13)</b>	0.01 (-0.15, 0.19)	0.00 (-0.07, 0.07)	0.02 (-0.01, 0.04)
red-capped robin	<b>-2.71 (-4.69, -0.39)</b>	-3.03 (-7.72, 0.50)	0.59 (-1.33, 2.34)	<b>-3.71 (-5.39, -2.48)</b>	<b>-0.18 (-0.34, -0.02)</b>	-0.49 (-1.05, -0.04)	0.09 (-0.09, 0.30)	<b>-0.09 (-0.16, -0.03)</b>
rufous whistler	<b>-0.89 (-1.30, -0.48)</b>	0.63 (-0.38, 1.64)	-0.09 (-0.45, 0.29)	<b>-0.23 (-0.43, -0.02)</b>	<b>-0.16 (-0.33, -0.03)</b>	-0.13 (-0.56, 0.35)	0.01 (-0.17, 0.17)	0.03 (-0.02, 0.10)
red wattlebird	-0.49 (-1.06, 0.13)	<b>-3.48 (-6.60, -1.03)</b>	<b>1.12 (0.31, 2.01)</b>	0.01 (-0.24, 0.30)	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.02)	-0.01 (-0.15, 0.11)	0.00 (-0.05, 0.05)	0.01 (-0.01, 0.03)
sacred kingfisher	<b>1.78 (0.84, 2.85)</b>	-1.34 (-4.55, 1.52)	<b>1.17 (0.25, 2.17)</b>	<b>-0.90 (-1.82, -0.03)</b>	0.01 (-0.05, 0.06)	<b>-0.17 (-0.37, 0.00)</b>	<b>0.10 (0.03, 0.17)</b>	0.00 (-0.02, 0.03)
striated pardalote	0.11 (-0.33, 0.62)	-2.27 (-4.85, 0.14)	0.46 (-0.28, 1.48)	0.13 (-0.06, 0.35)	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.01)	-0.01 (-0.09, 0.07)	0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)
striated thornbill	-0.61 (-2.61, 1.19)	<b>3.52 (1.05, 6.37)</b>	-0.12 (-1.24, 0.81)	<b>-2.06 (-4.95, -0.29)</b>	0.03 (-0.12, 0.17)	-0.02 (-0.46, 0.37)	0.09 (-0.06, 0.24)	-0.02 (-0.07, 0.03)
speckled warbler	-1.18 (-3.06, 0.41)	1.19 (-1.81, 4.39)	-0.11 (-1.32, 1.13)	<b>-2.69 (-4.29, -1.07)</b>	0.00 (-0.13, 0.13)	0.06 (-0.30, 0.48)	0.14 (-0.01, 0.28)	0.00 (-0.05, 0.05)
varied sittella	-1.65 (-4.50, 1.29)	3.10 (-0.10, 6.34)	0.14 (-0.84, 1.23)	-1.54 (-4.17, 0.57)	0.00 (-0.08, 0.08)	0.06 (-0.16, 0.30)	0.05 (-0.03, 0.13)	0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)
white-browed scrubwren	-3.00 (-7.08, 0.28)	-2.34 (-7.36, 3.75)	<b>-4.09 (-8.19, -0.80)</b>	-0.77 (-3.26, 1.14)	-0.05 (-0.14, 0.04)	-0.05 (-0.30, 0.27)	-0.01 (-0.11, 0.13)	-0.01 (-0.05, 0.02)

weebill	<b>-0.97 (-1.57, -0.33)</b>	<b>-5.07 (-6.81, -3.25)</b>	<b>1.90 (1.24, 2.47)</b>	<b>-0.67 (-1.01, -0.38)</b>	-0.13 (-0.27, 0.01)	-0.32 (-0.80, 0.12)	0.08 (-0.08, 0.26)	-0.04 (-0.09, 0.02)
western gerygone	<b>-0.91 (-1.62, -0.18)</b>	0.16 (-1.39, 1.56)	-0.01 (-0.60, 0.52)	<b>-0.88 (-1.30, -0.50)</b>	-0.06 (-0.17, 0.05)	-0.11 (-0.45, 0.25)	0.11 (-0.02, 0.24)	-0.02 (-0.06, 0.02)
white-plumed honeyeater	<b>0.77 (0.34, 1.12)</b>	<b>-4.75 (-7.35, -2.30)</b>	<b>1.51 (0.77, 2.36)</b>	0.09 (-0.10, 0.31)	<b>0.14 (0.03, 0.24)</b>	-0.01 (-0.34, 0.28)	0.00 (-0.11, 0.13)	0.02 (-0.02, 0.06)
willie wagtail	<b>0.53 (0.15, 0.91)</b>	-0.49 (-1.95, 1.13)	0.07 (-0.43, 0.63)	0.04 (-0.15, 0.24)	<b>0.47 (0.29, 0.66)</b>	-0.42 (-1.03, 0.17)	<b>0.22 (0.02, 0.45)</b>	0.03 (-0.05, 0.02)
white-winged chough	-0.52 (-1.40, 0.55)	-0.73 (-3.26, 1.75)	0.46 (-0.36, 1.36)	<b>-1.34 (-2.19, -0.62)</b>	0.03 (-0.07, 0.13)	-0.01 (-0.31, 0.28)	0.04 (-0.06, 0.16)	-0.01 (-0.05, 0.02)
yellow thornbill	<b>-1.39 (-2.05, -0.74)</b>	0.03 (-1.55, 1.66)	-0.30 (-0.98, 0.34)	<b>-0.39 (-0.68, -0.13)</b>	-0.04 (-0.11, 0.05)	-0.15 (-0.38, 0.09)	0.07 (-0.02, 0.15)	0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)
yellow-rumped thornbill	<b>-1.66 (-2.29, -1.08)</b>	0.07 (-1.53, 1.49)	-0.44 (-1.07, 0.19)	-0.19 (-0.42, 0.04)	<b>-0.54 (-0.84, -0.24)</b>	-0.59 (-1.59, 0.38)	0.00 (-0.39, 0.34)	-0.07 (-0.19, 0.04)



622 **References**

- 623 Andrén, H., 1994. Effects of Habitat Fragmentation on Birds and Mammals in Landscapes with  
624 Different Proportions of Suitable Habitat: A Review. *Oikos* 71, 355.  
625 <https://doi.org/10.2307/3545823>
- 626 Arnold, G.W., 2003. Bird species richness and abundance in wandoo woodland and in tree  
627 plantations on farmland at Baker's Hill, Western Australia. *Emu* 103, 259–269.  
628 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/MU01005>
- 629 Barral, M.P., Rey Benayas, J.M., Meli, P., Maceira, N.O., 2015. Quantifying the impacts of  
630 ecological restoration on biodiversity and ecosystem services in agroecosystems: A global  
631 meta-analysis. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 202, 223–231.  
632 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.01.009>
- 633 Barrett, G., Silcocks, A., Barry, S., Cunningham, R., and Poulter, R., 2003. The new atlas of  
634 Australian birds. Royal Australasian Ornithologists Union, Hawthorn East, Victoria.
- 635 Barrett, G.W., Freudenberger, D., Drew, A., Stol, J., Nicholls, A.O., Cawsey, E.M., 2008.  
636 Colonisation of native tree and shrub plantings by woodland birds in an agricultural landscape.  
637 *Wildl. Res.* 35, 19–32. <https://doi.org/Doi.10.1071/Wr07100>
- 638 Bartoń, K., 2018. MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. R package version 1.40.4. [https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/package=MuMIn)  
639 [project.org/package=MuMIn](https://cran.r-project.org/package=MuMIn)
- 640 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., 2015. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using  
641 lme4. *J. Stat. Softw.* 67, 1–48.
- 642 Battin, J., 2004. When good animals love bad habitats: Ecological traps and the conservation of  
643 animal populations. *Conserv. Biol.* 18, 1482–1491. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2004.00417.x)  
644 [1739.2004.00417.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2004.00417.x)
- 645 Belder, D.J., Pierson, J.C., Ikin, K., Lindenmayer, D.B., 2018. Beyond pattern to process: current  
646 themes and future directions for the conservation of woodland birds through restoration  
647 plantings. *Wildl Res* 45:473. doi: 10.1071/wr17156
- 648 Bennett, J.M., Clarke, R.H., Thomson, J.R., Mac Nally, R., 2015. Fragmentation, vegetation change  
649 and irruptive competitors affect recruitment of woodland birds. *Ecography (Cop.)*. 38, 163–  
650 171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.00936>
- 651 Broadhurst, L.M., Young, A.G., Forrester, R., 2008. Genetic and demographic responses of  
652 fragmented *Acacia dealbata* (Mimosaceae) populations in southeastern Australia. *Biol Conserv*  
653 141:2843–2856. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOCON.2008.08.021>
- 654 Brooker, M., Brooker, L., 2003. Brood parasitism by Horsfield's Bronze-Cuckoo in a fragmented  
655 agricultural landscape in Western Australia. *Emu* 103, 357–361.  
656 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/MU02034>
- 657 Burke, D.M., Nol, E., 2000. Landscape and fragment size effects on reproductive success of forest-  
658 breeding birds in Ontario. *Ecol. Appl.* 10, 1749–1761. [https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-](https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761(2000)010[1749:LAFSEO]2.0.CO;2)  
659 [0761\(2000\)010\[1749:LAFSEO\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761(2000)010[1749:LAFSEO]2.0.CO;2)
- 660 Burnham, K.P., Anderson, D.R., 2004. Multimodel inference: understanding AIC and BIC in model  
661 selection. *Sociol. Methods Res.* 33, 261–304. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124104268644>
- 662 Chalfoun, A.D., Martin, T.E., 2007. Assessments of habitat preferences and quality depend on  
663 spatial scale and metrics of fitness. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 44, 983–992.
- 664 Connor, E.F., Courtney, A.C., Yoder, J.M., 2007. Individuals-Area Relationships: The Relationship  
665 between Animal Population Density and Area. *Ecology* 81, 734–748.  
666 [https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658\(2000\)081\[0734:IARTRB\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2000)081[0734:IARTRB]2.0.CO;2)
- 667 Crouzeilles, R., Curran, M., Ferreira, M.S., Lindenmayer, D.B., Grelle, C.E. V., Rey Benayas, J.M.,  
668 2016. A global meta-analysis on the ecological drivers of forest restoration success. *Nat.*  
669 *Commun.* 7, 11666. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms11666>
- 670 Cunningham, R.B., Lindenmayer, D.B., Crane, M.J., Michael, D.R., Barton, P.S., Gibbons, P.,

671 Okada, S., Ikin, K., Stein, J.A.R., 2014. The law of diminishing returns: woodland birds  
672 respond to native vegetation cover at multiple spatial scales and over time. *Divers. Distrib.* 20,  
673 59–71. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12145>

674 Cunningham, R.B., Lindenmayer, D.B., Crane, M.J., Michael, D.R., MacGregor, C.I., 2007. Reptile  
675 and arboreal marsupial response to replanted vegetation in agricultural landscapes. *Ecol. Appl.*  
676 17, 609–619. <https://doi.org/10.1890/05-1892>

677 Cunningham, R.B., Lindenmayer, D.B., Crane, M.J., Michael, D.R., MacGregor, C.I., Montague-  
678 Drake, R.M., Fischer, J., 2008. The combined effects of remnant vegetation and tree planting  
679 on farmland birds. *Conserv. Biol.* 22, 742–752.

680 Debus, S.J.S., Martin, W.K., Lemon, J.M., 2017. Changes in woodland bird communities as  
681 replanted woodland matures. *Pacific Conserv Biol* 23:359–371.  
682 <https://doi.org/10.1071/PC16028>

683 Department of the Environment, 2018. White Box-Yellow Box-Blakely's Red Gum Grassy  
684 Woodland and Derived Native Grassland in Community and Species Profile and Threats  
685 Database [WWW Document]. Dep. Environ. Energy, Canberra. URL  
686 <http://www.environment.gov.au/sprat> (accessed 8.11.18).

687 Dray, S., Dufour, A.-B., 2007. The ade4 package: Implementing the duality diagram for ecologists.  
688 *J. Stat. Softw.* 22, 1–20.

689 Driscoll, D.A., Banks, S.C., Barton, P.S., Lindenmayer, D.B., Smith, A.L., 2013. Conceptual  
690 domain of the matrix in fragmented landscapes. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 28, 605–613.  
691 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TREE.2013.06.010>

692 Erwin, R.M., Hatfield, J.S., Wilmers, T.J., 1995. The value and vulnerability of small estuarine  
693 islands for conserving metapopulations of breeding waterbirds. *Biol. Conserv.* 71, 187–191.  
694 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207\(94\)00045-R](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(94)00045-R)

695 Estades, C.F., 2001. The effect of breeding-habitat patch size on bird population density. *Landsc.*  
696 *Ecol.* 16, 161–173. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011197432467>

697 Evans, M.C., 2016. Deforestation in Australia: drivers, trends and policy responses. *Pacific*  
698 *Conserv. Biol.* 22, 130–150. <https://doi.org/10.1071/PC15052>

699 Fahrig, L., 2013. Rethinking patch size and isolation effects: the habitat amount hypothesis. *J.*  
700 *Biogeogr.* 40, 1649–1663. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.12130>

701 Fischer, J., Lindenmayer, D.B., 2002. Small patches can be valuable for biodiversity conservation:  
702 two case studies on birds in southeastern Australia. *Biol. Conserv.* 106, 129–136.

703 Flaspohler, D.J., Giardina, C.P., Asner, G.P., Hart, P., Price, J., Lyons, C.K., Castaneda, X., 2010.  
704 Long-term effects of fragmentation and fragment properties on bird species richness in  
705 Hawaiian forests. *Biol. Conserv.* 143, 280–288.  
706 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2009.10.009>

707 Fletcher, Jr., R.J., Ries, L., Battin, J., Chalfoun, A.D., 2007. The role of habitat area and edge in  
708 fragmented landscapes: definitively distinct or inevitably intertwined? This review is one of a  
709 series dealing with some aspects of the impact of habitat fragmentation on animals and plants.  
710 This series is one of several virtual symposia focussing on ecological topics that will be  
711 published in the *Journal* from time to time. *Can. J. Zool.* 85, 1017–1030.  
712 <https://doi.org/10.1139/Z07-100>

713 Ford, H.A., Walters, J.R., Cooper, C.B., Debus, S.J.S., Doerr, V.A.J., 2009. Extinction debt or  
714 habitat change?—Ongoing losses of woodland birds in north-eastern New South Wales,  
715 Australia. *Biol. Conserv.* 142, 3182–3190.

716 Freeman, A.N.D., Freeman, A.B., Burchill, S., 2009. Bird use of revegetated sites along a creek  
717 connecting rainforest remnants. *Emu* 109:331–338. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/MU09089>

718 Freudenberger, D., 2001. “Bush for the birds: Biodiversity enhancement guidelines for the  
719 Saltshaker Project, Boorowa, NSW,” Consultancy report to Greening Australia ACT & SE  
720 NSW, Inc. CSIRO Sustainable Ecosystems, Canberra, Australia.

721 Gibbons, P., Boak, M., 2002. The value of paddock trees for regional conservation in an  
722 agricultural landscape. *Ecol. Manag. Restor.* 3, 205–210. [42](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1442-</a></p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

723 8903.2002.00114.x

724 Gill, F., Donsker, D., 2018. IOC World Bird List [WWW Document]. URL

725 <http://www.worldbirdnames.org/ioc-lists/master-list-2/> (accessed 8.14.18).

726 Goslee, S.C., Urban, D.L., 2007. The ecodist package for dissimilarity-based analysis of ecological

727 data. *J. Stat. Softw.* 22, 1–19.

728 Hadley, A.S., Frey, S.J.K., Robinson, W.D., Betts, M.G., 2018. Forest fragmentation and loss

729 reduce richness, availability, and specialization in tropical hummingbird communities.

730 *Biotropica* 50, 74–83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/btp.12487>

731 Helzer, C.J., Jelinski, D.E., 1999. The relative importance of patch area and perimeter-ratio to

732 grassland breeding birds. *Ecol. Appl.* 9, 1448–1458. [https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-](https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761(1999)009[1448:TRIOPA]2.0.CO;2)

733 [0761\(1999\)009\[1448:TRIOPA\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761(1999)009[1448:TRIOPA]2.0.CO;2)

734 Herkert, J.R., Reinking, D.L., Wiedenfeld, D.A., Winter, M., Zimmerman, J.L., Jensen, W.E.,

735 Finck, E.J., Koford, R.R., Wolfe, D.H., Sherrod, S.K., 2003. Effects of prairie fragmentation

736 on the nest success of breeding birds in the midcontinental United States. *Conserv. Biol.* 17,

737 587–594.

738 Hinsley, S.A., Bellamy, P.E., Newton, I., Sparks, T.H., 1995. Habitat and landscape factors

739 influencing the presence of individual breeding bird species in woodland fragments. *J. Avian*

740 *Biol.* 26, 94–104. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3677057>

741 Hinsley, S.A., Hill, R.A., Bellamy, P.E., Harrison, N.M., Speakman, J.R., Wilson, A.K., Ferns,

742 P.N., 2008. Effects of structural and functional habitat gaps on breeding woodland birds:

743 working harder for less. *Landsc. Ecol.* 23, 615–626.

744 Hoover, J.P., Brittingham, M.C., Goodrich, L.J., 1995. Effects of forest patch size on nesting

745 success of Wood Thrushes. *Auk* 112, 146–155. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4088774>

746 Hui, F.K.C., 2016. boral - Bayesian Ordination and Regression Analysis of Multivariate Abundance

747 Data in r. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 7, 744–750. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12514>

748 Ikin, K., Yong, D.L., Lindenmayer, D.B., 2016. Effectiveness of woodland birds as taxonomic

749 surrogates in conservation planning for biodiversity on farms. *Biol. Conserv.* 204, Part, 411–

750 416. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.11.010>

751 Kahle D., Wickham, H., 2013. ggmap: Spatial Visualization with ggplot2. *R J* 5:144–161

752 Kavanagh, R.P., Stanton, M.A., Herring, M.W., 2007. Eucalypt plantings on farms benefit

753 woodland birds in south-eastern Australia. *Austral Ecol.* 32, 635–650.

754 Kendal, D., Zeeman, B.J., Ikin, K., Lunt, I.D., McDonnell, M.J., Farrar, A., Pearce, L.M., Morgan,

755 J.W., 2017. The importance of small urban reserves for plant conservation. *Biol. Conserv.* 213,

756 146–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOCON.2017.07.007>

757 King, D.I., Chandler, R.B., Collins, J.M., Petersen, W.R., Lautzenheiser, T.E., 2009. Effects of

758 width, edge and habitat on the abundance and nesting success of scrub–shrub birds in

759 powerline corridors. *Biol. Conserv.* 142, 2672–2680.

760 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2009.06.016>

761 Kinross, C.M., 2004. Avian use of farm habitats, including windbreaks, on the New South Wales

762 Tablelands. *Pacific Conserv. Biol.* 10, 180–192.

763 Kinross, C.M., Nicol, H., 2008. Responses of birds to the characteristics of farm windbreaks in

764 central New South Wales, Australia. *Emu* 108:139–152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/MU06024>

765 Le Roux, D.S., Ikin, K., Lindenmayer, D.B., Manning, A.D., Gibbons, P., 2015. Single large or

766 several small? Applying biogeographic principles to tree-level conservation and biodiversity

767 offsets. *Biol. Conserv.* 191, 558–566.

768 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2015.08.011>

769 Lehnen, S.E., Rodewald, A.D., 2009. Investigating area-sensitivity in shrubland birds: Responses to

770 patch size in a forested landscape. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 257, 2308–2316.

771 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2009.03.008>

772 Lindenmayer, D.B., Blanchard, W., Crane, M., Michael, D., Florance, D., 2018a. Size or quality.

773 What matters in vegetation restoration for bird biodiversity in endangered temperate

774 woodlands? *Austral Ecol.* <https://doi.org/10.1111/aec.12622>

- 775 Lindenmayer D.B., Blanchard, W., Crane, M., Michael, D., Sato, C., 2018b. Biodiversity benefits  
776 of vegetation restoration are undermined by livestock grazing. *Restor Ecol* 26, 1157–1164.  
777 <https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.12676>
- 778 Lindenmayer, D.B., Cunningham, R.B., Crane, M.J., Michael, D.R., Montague-Drake, R.M., 2007.  
779 Farmland bird responses to intersecting replanted areas. *Landsc. Ecol.* 22, 1555–1562.  
780 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-007-9156-9>
- 781 Lindenmayer, D.B., Knight, E.J., Crane, M.J., Montague-Drake, R.M., Michael, D.R., MacGregor,  
782 C.I., 2010. What makes an effective restoration planting for woodland birds? *Biol. Conserv.*  
783 143, 289–301.
- 784 Lindenmayer, D.B., Lane, P.W., Barton, P.S., Crane, M.J., Ikin, K., Michael, D.R., Okada, S., 2016.  
785 Long-term bird colonization and turnover in restored woodlands. *Biodivers Conserv* 25:1587–  
786 1603. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-016-1140-8>
- 787 Lindenmayer, D.B., Northrop-Mackie, A.R., Montague-Drake, R.M., Crane, M.J., Michael, D.R.,  
788 Okada, S., Gibbons, P., 2012. Not all kinds of revegetation are created equal: revegetation type  
789 influences bird assemblages in threatened Australian woodland ecosystems. *PLoS One* 7,  
790 e34527.
- 791 Lindenmayer, D.B., Willinck, E., Crane, M.J., Michael, D.R., Okada, S., Cumming, C., Durant, K.,  
792 Frankenberg, J., 2013. Murray Catchment habitat restoration: Lessons from landscape-level  
793 research and monitoring. *Ecol. Manag. Restor.* 14, 80–92. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emr.12051>
- 794 Loyn, R.H., McNabb, E.G., Macak, P., Noble, P., 2007. Eucalypt plantations as habitat for birds on  
795 previously cleared farmland in south-eastern Australia. *Biol. Conserv.* 137, 533–548.
- 796 Luck, G.W., 2003. Differences in the reproductive success and survival of the rufous tree creeper  
797 (*Climacteris rufa*) between a fragmented and unfragmented landscape. *Biol. Conserv.* 109, 1–  
798 14.
- 799 Mac Nally, R., 2007. Consensus weightings of evidence for inferring breeding success in broad-  
800 scale bird studies. *Austral Ecol.* 32, 479–484.
- 801 Mac Nally, R., De Vries, L., Thomson, J.R., 2010. Are replanted floodplain forests in southeastern  
802 Australia providing bird biodiversity benefits? *Restor. Ecol.* 18, 85–94.
- 803 MacArthur, R.H., Wilson, E.O., 1967. *The Theory of Island Biogeography*. Princeton University  
804 Press.
- 805 Major, R.E., Gowing, G., 2001. Survival of red-capped robins (*Petroica goodenovii*) in woodland  
806 remnants of central western New South Wales, Australia. *Wildl. Res.* 28, 565–571.  
807 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/WR01040>
- 808 Major, R.E., Christie, F.J., Gowing, G., 2001. Influence of remnant and landscape attributes on  
809 Australian woodland bird communities. *Biol Conserv* 102:47–66.
- 810 Manning, A.D., Fischer, J., Lindenmayer, D.B., 2006. Scattered trees are keystone structures –  
811 Implications for conservation. *Biol. Conserv.* 132, 311–321.  
812 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2006.04.023>
- 813 Maron, M., Grey, M.J., Catterall, C.P., Major, R.E., Oliver, D.L., Clarke, M.F., Loyn, R.H., Mac  
814 Nally, R., Davidson, I., Thomson, J.R., 2013. Avifaunal disarray due to a single despotic  
815 species. *Divers. Distrib.* 19, 1468–1479. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddi.12128>
- 816 Martin, W.K., Eldridge, D., Murray, P.A., 2011. Bird assemblages in remnant and revegetated  
817 habitats in an extensively cleared landscape, Wagga Wagga, New South Wales. *Pacific*  
818 *Conserv. Biol.* 17, 110–120.
- 819 Martin, W.K., Eyars-Chaddock, M., Wilson, B.R., Lemon, J., 2004. The value of habitat  
820 reconstruction to birds at Gunnedah, New South Wales. *Emu* 104, 177–189.
- 821 Maxwell, S.L., Fuller, R.A., Brooks, T.M., Watson, J.E.M., 2016. Biodiversity: The ravages of  
822 guns, nets and bulldozers. *Nature* 536:143–145. doi: 10.1038/536143a
- 823 Montague-Drake, R.M., Lindenmayer, D.B., Cunningham, R.B., 2009. Factors affecting site  
824 occupancy by woodland bird species of conservation concern. *Biol. Conserv.* 142, 2896–2903.
- 825 Morcombe, M.K., 2003. *Field guide to Australian birds*. Steve Parish Publishing.
- 826 Munro, N.T., Fischer, J., Barrett, G.W., Wood, J.T., Leavesley, A., Lindenmayer, D.B., 2011.

- 827 Bird's response to revegetation of different structure and floristics—Are “restoration  
828 plantings” restoring bird communities? *Restor. Ecol.* 19, 223–235.
- 829 NSW Environment & Heritage, 2018. Threatened Species found in Inland Slopes IBRA sub-region.  
830 <https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/threatenedSpeciesApp/cmaSearchResults.aspx?SubCma>  
831 [Id=344](https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/threatenedSpeciesApp/cmaSearchResults.aspx?SubCma) (accessed 8.14.18).
- 832 Okada, S., Lindenmayer, D.B., Wood, J.T., Crane, M.J., Pierson, J.C., 2017. How does a  
833 transforming landscape influence bird breeding success? *Landsc. Ecol.* 32, 1039–1048.  
834 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-017-0507-x>
- 835 Parsons, B.C., Gosper, C.R., 2011. Contemporary fire regimes in a fragmented and an  
836 unfragmented landscape: implications for vegetation structure and persistence of the fire-  
837 sensitive malleefowl. *Int J Wildl Fire* 20:184. <https://doi.org/10.1071/WF09099>
- 838 Pizzey, G., Knight, F., 1997. *The Graham Pizzey and Frank Knight Field Guide to the Birds of*  
839 *Australia*. Angus & Robertson, Sydney, New South Wales.
- 840 Radford, J.Q., Bennett, A.F., 2007. The relative importance of landscape properties for woodland  
841 birds in agricultural environments. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 44, 737–747.
- 842 Rayner, L., Lindenmayer, D.B., Gibbons, P., Manning, A.D., 2014. Evaluating empirical evidence  
843 for decline in temperate woodland birds: A nationally threatened assemblage of species. *Biol.*  
844 *Conserv.* 171, 145–155. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.01.029>
- 845 Ribeiro, Jr, P.J., Diggle, P.J., 2016. *geoR: Analysis of Geostatistical Data*. R package version 1.7-  
846 5.2. <https://cran.r-project.org/package=geoR>
- 847 Root, R.B., 1973. Organization of a Plant-Arthropod Association in Simple and Diverse Habitats:  
848 The Fauna of Collards (*Brassica oleracea*). *Ecol. Monogr.* 43, 95–124.  
849 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1942161>
- 850 Rosenzweig, M.L., 1995. *Species diversity in space and time*. Cambridge University Press.
- 851 Ruiz-Jaen, M.C., Aide, T.M., 2005. Restoration success: How is it being measured? *Restor. Ecol.*  
852 13, 569–577. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100X.2005.00072.x>
- 853 Schippers, P., Grashof-Bokdam, C.J., Verboom, J., Baveco, J.M., Jochem, R., Meeuwsen, H.A.M.,  
854 Van Adrichem, M.H.C., 2009. Sacrificing patches for linear habitat elements enhances  
855 metapopulation performance of woodland birds in fragmented landscapes. *Landsc. Ecol.* 24,  
856 1123–1133.
- 857 Selwood, K., Mac Nally, R., Thomson, J.R., 2009. Native bird breeding in a chronosequence of  
858 revegetated sites. *Oecologia* 159, 435–446.
- 859 Shanahan, D.F., Miller, C., Possingham, H.P., Fuller, R.A., 2011. The influence of patch area and  
860 connectivity on avian communities in urban revegetation. *Biol. Conserv.* 144, 722–729.  
861 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2010.10.014>
- 862 Silcocks, A., Tzaros, C., Weston, M., Olsen, P., 2005. An interim guild classification for woodland  
863 and grassland birds in Australia. *Birds Australia Supplementary Report to State of the*  
864 *Environment Report 2006*, Carlton.
- 865 Smith, F.P., 2008. Who's planting what, where and why – and who's paying?: An analysis of  
866 farmland revegetation in the central wheatbelt of Western Australia. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* 86,  
867 66–78. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2007.12.008>
- 868 Stephens, S.E., Koons, D.N., Rotella, J.J., Willey, D.W., 2004. Effects of habitat fragmentation on  
869 avian nesting success: a review of the evidence at multiple spatial scales. *Biol. Conserv.* 115,  
870 101–110.
- 871 Thiele, K.R., Prober, S.M., 2000. Reserve concepts and conceptual reserves: options for the  
872 protection of fragmented ecosystems, in: Hobbs, R.J., Yates, C.J. (Eds.), *Temperate Eucalypt*  
873 *Woodlands in Australia: Biology, Conservation, Management and Restoration*. Surrey Beatty  
874 and Sons, Chipping Norton, pp. 351–358.
- 875 Tilman, D., Clark, M., Williams, D.R., Kimmel, K., Polasky, S., Packer, C., 2017. Future threats to  
876 biodiversity and pathways to their prevention. *Nature* 546, 73–81.  
877 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature22900>
- 878 Tschamntke, T., Tylianakis, J.M., Rand, T.A., Didham, R.K., Fahrig, L., Batáry, P., Bengtsson, J.,

879 Clough, Y., Crist, T.O., Dormann, C.F., Ewers, R.M., Fründ, J., Holt, R.D., Holzschuh, A.,  
880 Klein, A.M., Kleijn, D., Kremen, C., Landis, D.A., Laurance, W., Lindenmayer, D.B.,  
881 Scherber, C., Sodhi, N., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Thies, C., van der Putten, W.H., Westphal, C.,  
882 2012. Landscape moderation of biodiversity patterns and processes - eight hypotheses. *Biol.*  
883 *Rev.* 87, 661–685. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2011.00216.x>  
884 Vesk, P.A., Nolan, R., Thomson, J.R., Dorrough, J.W., Mac Nally, R., 2008. Time lags in provision  
885 of habitat resources through revegetation. *Biol Conserv* 141:174–186.  
886 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2007.09.010>  
887 Watson, J.E.M., Freudenberger, D., Paull, D., 2001. An assessment of the focal-species approach  
888 for conserving birds in variegated landscapes in southeastern Australia. *Conserv. Biol.* 15,  
889 1364–1373.  
890 Watson, J.E.M., Watson, A., Paull, D., Freudenberger, D., 2003. Woodland fragmentation is  
891 causing the decline of species and functional groups of birds in southeastern Australia. *Pacific*  
892 *Conserv. Biol.* 8, 261–270.  
893 Watson, J.E.M., Whittaker, R.J., Freudenberger, D., 2005. Bird community responses to habitat  
894 fragmentation: how consistent are they across landscapes? *J. Biogeogr.* 32, 1353–1370.  
895 Westphal, M.I., Field, S.A., Possingham, H.P., 2007. Optimizing landscape configuration: a case  
896 study of woodland birds in the Mount Lofty Ranges, South Australia. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* 81,  
897 56–66.  
898 Wintle, B.A., Kujala, H., Whitehead, A., Cameron, A., Veloz, S., Kukkala, A., Moilanen, A.,  
899 Gordon, A., Lentini, P.E., Cadenhead, N.C.R., Bekessey, S.A., 2019. Global synthesis of  
900 conservation studies reveals the importance of small habitat patches for biodiversity. *Proc Natl*  
901 *Acad Sci U S A* 116:909–914. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1813051115>  
902 Woolhouse, M.E.J., 1983. The theory and practice of the species-area effect, applied to the breeding  
903 birds of British Woods. *Biol. Conserv.* 27, 315–332. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(83)90089-7)  
904 [3207\(83\)90089-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(83)90089-7)  
905 Zanette, L., 2001. Indicators of habitat quality and the reproductive output of a forest songbird in  
906 small and large fragments. *J. Avian Biol.* 32, 38–46. [https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-](https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-048X.2001.320106.x)  
907 [048X.2001.320106.x](https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-048X.2001.320106.x)  
908 Zanette, L., Doyle, P., Trémont, S.M., 2000. Food shortage in small fragments: Evidence from an  
909 area-sensitive passerine. *Ecology* 81, 1654–1666. [https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2000)081[1654:FSISFE]2.0.CO;2)  
910 [9658\(2000\)081\[1654:FSISFE\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2000)081[1654:FSISFE]2.0.CO;2)  
911 Zanette, L., Jenkins, B., 2000. Nesting success and nest predators in forest fragments: A study using  
912 real and artificial nests. *Auk* 117, 445–454. [https://doi.org/10.1642/0004-](https://doi.org/10.1642/0004-8038(2000)117[0445:NSANPI]2.0.CO;2)  
913 [8038\(2000\)117\[0445:NSANPI\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1642/0004-8038(2000)117[0445:NSANPI]2.0.CO;2)  
914