

Center for Community-Based Resource Management (CBRM)

Natural Resources Institute, University of Manitoba

CBRM Database

Date:	August 8, 2012	Entry Number:	1212
Case Study Name:	Local Residents Perception of Benefits and Losses From Protected Areas in India and Nepal		
Author:	Karanth, K.K and Nepal, S.K.		
Document Type:	Paper in scientific journal		
Year:	2012		
Language:	English		
Document Location:	Environmental Management 49(2):372-386		
Full Citation:	Karanth, K.K and Nepal, S.K. 2012. Local Residents Perception of Benefits and Losses From Protected Areas in India and Nepal. Environmental Management 49(2):372-386.		
Region:	South Asia		
Country:	India and Nepal		
Ecosystem Type:	Protected areas		
Social Characteristics:	Community inside/bordering protected areas		
Scale of Study:	Protected area		
Resource Type:	Protected area		
Type of Initiative:	Research-driven project		
Community Based Work:	Resource management, conservation		
Keywords:	Local attitudes, Conservation, India, Nepal, Park-people relationship, Perceptions, Protected areas, Tourism		

Summary:

High densities of people living around protected areas (PAs) in South Asia require management strategies to balance conservation goals and livelihood needs. Based on a survey of 777 households around five PAs in India and Nepal, this paper provides a comparative perspective of Indian and Nepali households' views of protected area benefits and costs, their attitude toward conservation in general, and attitude toward protected area staff. Results indicate mixed responses towards tourism, varying from very favorable in Nepal to less favorable in India. The majority (81%) held positive attitudes towards the existence and importance of PAs but had negative perceptions of PA staff (69%). Most residents perceived benefits from access to fuel wood, fodder and other PA resources including benefits from tourism, while crop and livestock losses from wildlife were the main costs. Households overall positive attitudes towards the PAs and conservation despite high losses from living around PAs suggests that local residents may support conservation if their livelihood needs are met. Comparisons of household attitudes and perceptions suggest that locally based strategies rather than top-down approaches are likely to be more effective. Extending PA benefits to smaller landholders, households that are highly resource-dependent or experiencing higher income losses from human-wildlife conflicts, and less educated residents are particularly important to balance costs and losses from living around protected areas.