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6.1 INTRODUCTION

The term ecotourism came to existence in the late 1980s as a result of the world’s attention and response to sustainable practices for the protection of the naturally conserved areas. Additionally, the popularity of nature and travel documentaries on television, and the interest in the conservation and environmental matters, eco-tourism has become phenomenon characteristic in the beginning of the 21st century. Ecotourism has now become one of the largest global economic activities along with the contribution in conservation of natural resources and sustainable livelihood to the local people. Both developed and developing countries realize the economic and social benefits from tourism and regular attempts to gain maximum share of benefits (Sultana, 2001). Eco-Tourism involved the activities like Bird watching, Trekking, Nature trails, River rafting, mountaineering, horse riding and elephant riding within the forest wilderness trail, staying in natural caves, studying about flora and fauna, simple bush walking, fishing, animal behavior study, ecological studies (Ramaswami, 2000), and more importantly mere watching of the scenic beauty of the Hills, Valleys, Meadows. Water bodies and the natural processes and learn to live in Nature. Eco-tourism also attains the understanding and respecting various cultures and customs of people living in the area. Ecotourism works to create simplistic images of local people and understanding of their surroundings (Belsky 1999). Ecotourism works on the principle of sustainable use of the resources to reduce the overconsumption and promote the biodiversity conservation practices by involving local communities with integrated approach. The approach could be accomplished with the linking of stakeholders and public partnership as well as developing tourism market for the local products to support local economy and livelihood perfection. The ecotourism planning can be done which can bring development of this underdeveloped area by employing the local people as well as by infrastructure development. It can also lead to pressure on local resources because of the numbers of tourist and increasing tourist activities (Panusittikorn and
Ecotourism can also lead to increased economic expectations on the part of local people (Chapin, 1990; Foucat, 2002). Developing countries face more serious problems like rapid population growth, debts, over-exploitation of wild resources, agricultural expansion, deforestation etc., which result in the loss of valuable biodiversity and degradation of national parks. Industrialized countries on the other hand are characterized by high and increasing demands for nature-based vacations, with protected areas representing first-rate attractions (WWF, 1995). Therefore Tourism could be a means of redistributing economic resources, mitigating the socio-economic situation both at local and national scale and contributing to biodiversity conservation. However, the following elements are crucial to the ultimate success of an ecotourism initiative. Ecotourism must:

- have a little impact upon natural resources of the forest;
- involve stakeholders (individuals, communities, ecotourists, tour operators and government institutions) in the development based planning and in implementation and monitoring phases;
- respect local cultures and traditions values;
- generate sustainable and equitable revenue for local communities;
- generate income for protected area conservation, funding by government departments and revenue from tourism activities; and
- educate and trained all stakeholders about their role in conservation.

Eco-tourism, therefore, incorporates both a strong commitment to nature and a sense of social responsibility. Moreover, combined efforts of the community and private sector has stimulated local action to address development and unemployment through locality-based development initiatives therefore the potential of ecotourism to serve as an important component in national and local development strategy is being emphasized (Rogerson and Visser, 2004). A key to the success of ecotourism is the formulation of strong partnership so that the multiple goals of conservation and equitable development can be achieved. Ecotourism can contributes to conservation by mean of generate funds for protected areas and can create employment for surrounding communities, thus
providing economic incentives to support protected areas to limit the negative impacts of nature tourists.

6.2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

6.2.1 Ecotourism Concept

Eco-tourism is a complex and multi-disciplinary phenomenon and one of the fastest growing sectors in the tourism industry. It is considered as a purposeful travel to natural areas to understand the cultural and natural history of environment, taking care not to alter the integrity of the ecosystem, while producing economic opportunities that make conservation of natural resources and beneficial to local people. Being a new concept, ecotourism is still misunderstood and misused in terms of allowing the use of areas, which are otherwise of low value, such as drylands, but perfectly meet the demands of the growing travel industry (WWF, 1995).

Firstly, the term ecotourism came into force by Hetzer in 1965 who identified four ‘pillars’ or principles of responsible tourism: minimizing environmental impacts, respecting host cultures, maximizing the benefits to local people, and maximizing tourist satisfaction. The first formal definition of ecotourism is generally credited to Ceballos-Lascurain (1987), defined it as “traveling to relatively undisturbed or uncontaminated natural stations areas with the specific object of studying, admiring, and enjoying the scenery and its wild plants and animals, as well as any existing cultural expressions found in these areas.”

The International Ecotourism Society (TIES) defines ecotourism as “responsible travel that conserve natural environment which benefits the socio-economic condition of the local inhabitants and at the same time promote tourism and protect the environment”.

However describe tourism as ecotourism should be fully compatible with the conservation goals for the natural resources, while at the same time pose minimum threat to the continuation of local culture and society. Moreover, it should contribute by means of economic stability and awareness to contribution of ecosystems services (Brown et al. 1997).
a) Categorization of Ecotourism Concept

There are a variety of associated terms that are commonly linked, and occasionally confused with ecotourism, including the following:

i) Agro-tourism or Green Tourism

This concept is a direct expansion of ecotourism, which encourages visitors to experience agricultural life at first hand. This sort of tourism is gathering strong support from small communities as rural people have realised the benefits of sustainable development brought about by similar forms of "green tourism".

ii) Community based Tourism

Allowing participation from the local community in the development and operations of tourism with their consent and support is the essentials of community based tourism. This type of tourism also maintains and respects the local culture, heritage and traditions.

iii) Nature Tourism

The integrated approach of ecotourism which concentrates more on enjoying and respecting the wildlife and the environment without the educational element present in nature based ecotourism.

iv) Pro-Poor Tourism

This type of tourism is set up in developing countries as a means to involve local community directly with the generated benefits of ecotourism activities. It enhances the linkages between tourism businesses and poor people so that poverty could be compacted and poor people are able to participate more effectively in tourism development.

b) Advantages of Ecotourism based Development

Various studies have conclude that ecotourism have different types of impacts and their distribution affecting the local people as well as natural environment (Taylor et al., 2003). The main focus of the study was to evaluate economic, livelihood and socio-cultural benefits at local level.
Economic benefits refer to the change in sales, income, jobs, or other parameter generated by ecotourism practices in any area. This economic impact can increase political and financial support for conservation to provide many benefits to society, including preservation of biodiversity, maintenance of watersheds, and so on but many of these benefits are intangible. By identifying the leakages and linkages within the economy, the indirect and induced impacts of tourism can be estimated. Economic impact analysis can provide valuable information when evaluating the costs and benefits of such programs.

Potential benefits of tourism in protected areas are to produce benefits and costs. It is the responsibility of the protected area planner to maximize benefits while minimizing costs. Protected areas are established primarily to preserve wildlife population, habitat, natural landscape, or cultural heritage such as a community’s cultural tradition.

6.2.2 Approaches related to Park and Ecotourism

Protected areas play an important role in the protection of forest, its wildlife and base for the relation between local people and tourism (Leader-Williams, 1990). Most countries have invested considerable amount of funds in the establishment of protected areas for conservation and tourism (Green and Paine, 1997). Tourism to protected areas has been increasing over the years and is one of the fastest growing segments of activities around the world (Kepe, 2001). Tourism in protected areas is expected to provide opportunities for local residents to improve their living conditions. It can be argued that whereas tourism development in and around protected areas continues to achieve the conservation goals, little has been achieved in terms of poverty alleviation, thus the conservation of bio-diversity and poverty reduction should be considered together (Kobokana, 2007). The poor look at protected areas as the only source of their survival (Fiallo and Jacobson, 1995) and due to little or no benefits accruing from protected areas, local communities’ attitudes towards conservation efforts could become negative. As a consequence, residents disrupt conservation efforts, by practicing illegal activities such as firing in the area, poaching, encroachment on protected areas (results in illegal cutting of trees and over harvesting of other useful resources), poisoning of fauna and there are also
poor relations that are created between the management of protected area and local residents. Such damages could minimize if protected areas generate benefits to local communities. Although tourism has been advocated and touted as an effective tool for alleviating poverty, Roe et al. (2002) have argued that "millions of poor people live in and around tourism destinations." This implies that the contribution of tourism towards poverty alleviation is hindered by certain barriers in communities near protected area. In order to alleviate poverty, some attempts have been made by developed and poor countries. So, tourism has been acknowledged as a potential tool for poverty alleviation since it creates opportunities to use local resources that exist, and are available among the poor communities. The launching of pro-poor tourism (PPT) and Sustainable Tourism as an effective tool for eliminating poverty in poor countries indicates that tourism is expected to help in reducing poverty. These approaches of tourism provide benefits the poor by maximizing the gains while minimizing the negative impact in order to alleviate poverty tourism (Muhanna, 2007; Torres and Momsen, 2004). This sort of tourism plays important role in alleviating poverty is recognized with the range from livelihood strategy to pro-poor growth, environment protection and access to local markets, among others. Tourism is notorious for its potential to disrupt, disturb, or otherwise do damage to natural habitats and local communities. Especially in rural areas, tourism has been known to generate social, ecological, cultural, and economic changes not easily managed by local residents (Belsky, 1999; Butler and Hinch, 1996; Stonich, 1998; 2000). Ecotourism can have direct impacts on local institutions, a point that has been made by other scholars in the fields of environmental anthropology (Brosius et al., 1998; Russell, 2003; Stonich, 2000), tourism management and community development (Bond et al., 2001), among others. Alternatives like ecotourism, volunteer tourism, and agro-tourism are aimed attract tour operators to tread more carefully in their relation with communities and ecosystems (Eadington and Smith, 1992). Ecotourism is the option most frequently publicized for its potential. It has been ascribed with the power to sustain rural livelihoods (Honey, 1999), catalyze new development (Weaver, 1998), renew cultural pride (Epler Wood, 2002), empower local peoples (Scheyvens, 1999), and protect biodiversity (Christ et al., 2003). In a United Nations report, Bovarnick and Gupta (2003) argue that locals are likely to achieve incentives for protecting natural resources, but only if they receive a good portion of these benefits. Similarly,
directors of the Biodiversity Conservation Network reason. "If local communities receive sufficient benefits from an enterprise that depends on biodiversity, then they will act to counter internal and external threats to that biodiversity" (BCSNet, 1999). As a result of these ideas, many in the conservation community have endorsed ecotourism with significant additions of project funds, personnel, and technical support (Doan, 2000; Kiss, 2004). It is less focused why benefits have been defined as primarily economic, measurable as new employment or cash income (Campbell, 1999; Gossling, 1999; Walpole and Goodwin, 2001; Wunder, 1999; 2000). In an overview of peer-reviewed articles, Agarwal and Redford (2006) found that newly generated local jobs and incomes were the most common "indicators of success". Langholz (1999) argued that ecotourism income can minimize or eliminate dependence of locals to exploit natural resources, such as commercial agriculture, logging, and cattle ranching. Bookbinder et al., (1998) also measured that economic benefits may be principal to success, but non-economic ones can also pressurize chances for conservation. These include new skills, broader experiences in managing people and projects, strengthened abilities to negotiate with outsiders, and expanded circles of contacts and support for community efforts with policies. Scheyvens (1999) has characterized these kinds of benefits as community empowerment and considered them as components of social capital that help strengthen local institutions for resource management (Jones, 2005; Pretty and Smith, 2003). Wunder (1999) has suggested that ethnic, cultural, and historical influences can affect the association between economic benefits and conservation. Based on reviews, ecotourism has created only meager economic benefits for communities (Kinnaird and O'Brien, 1996). Leakage of profits from local to outside operators has been a major problem (Honey, 1999; Lindberg, 1994). Similarly, Barrett et al., (2001) find that increased income, especially when poorly linked with conservation goals and backed by weak or no enforcement, "simply fosters more rapid resource extraction". Other scholars have found that incentives are often unreasonable to make a difference for conservation (Kiss, 2004). Another challenge of new revenues is managing social conflicts that emerge from unequal earnings and increased gaps between rich and poor (Cousins and Kepe, 2004; Ogutu, 2002). Without experience in managing such conflicts, revenues can serve only to weaken trust and consistency in local communities (Jones, 2005). Scheyvens (1999) has argued that participation is linked with
conservation because ecotourism projects are more likely to lead to stewardship when locals aware with some measure of control and share equitably in the benefits. Kruger (2005) likewise reports that participation is necessary for the growth of socio-economical status of locals and conservation of the biodiversity. Belsky (1999) also concludes that participation with conservation could be achievable if communities truly benefit from the influx of tourists. A number of researches hypothesized that ecotourism’s real connection to conservation comes through participation in ownership and management rather than through economic benefits alone (Becker, 1997; Bond et al., 2001), and more recently for tourism development (Li, 2006). Anthropologists have long pointed to the need to pay greater attention to values, social relations, and institutions, as opposed to just economic change, in conservation projects (Brosius et al., 1998; Russell, 2003). Many have shown that one obstacle to conserving biodiversity is the poor integrated approach of local institutions (Barrett et al., 2001; Becker, 2003; Weinberg et al., 2002). Ross and Wall (1999a,b) developed an evaluative framework, used to compare ecotourism in three protected areas in Indonesia. They argue that the success of ecotourism depends on building “harmonious relationships” in three ways: between natural areas and local residents, between local residents and tourism, and between tourism and protected resources. Further explanatory research on the causal mechanisms among ecotourism benefits, the strength of local institutions, and conservation is recommended. Jones (2005) and others (Bray et al., 2005) have made similar calls for this kind of research. In particular, scholars should examine which participatory approaches can help build social capital and thus provide local communities with the capacities to translate ecotourism into broader and locally-sustained goals of conservation and development.

This chapter includes the assessment based on the analysis carried out to consider the attitude of the local people respect to the developmental policies and the level of awareness for the eco-development based model for the growth of their socio-economic livelihood and infrastructure development of the surrounding where they live and work. Participation and perceptions for the ecotourism based practices initiated by the forest officials play a crucial role to recommend the possible ideas for poor-people based development approaches to the inhabitants of Mayureshwar Wildlife Sanctuary and Rehekuri Blackbuck Sanctuary.
6.2.3 The Pro-Poor approach to Tourism based Development

UK Department for International Development (DFID) defined PPT as "Pro-poor tourism generates net benefits for the poor (i.e. benefits are greater than costs). Economic benefits are only one (very important) component-social, environmental and cultural costs and benefits also need to be taken into account."

Pro-poor tourism strategies are mainly focus less on expanding the overall size of tourism ad more on unlocking opportunities for specific poor people while the non-poor may also benefits. In 2000, the idea of connecting tourism more effectively with poverty reduction had been developed and a project was taken up by DFID in 2002, considered a new tourism concept as a milestone in the development.

To prepare the pro-poor tourism strategies some issues addressed to be highlighted as PPT strategies can be at local, regional or national level, undertaken by communities, NGOs, governments, businesses etc., may concentrate on just one part of the picture (Whether it's employment of the poor, skills, small enterprise, natural resource management, cultural change etc.) and PPT strategies rarely stand in isolation from general tourism development. Incorporated actions required to make the pro-poor tourism successful. Strategies for PPT can be broadly explained with six categories, such as:

1. Expansion of business opportunities for the poor people: e.g. have small enterprise development programmes (training/support/micro card) been developed or local markets expanded?

2. Expansion of employment opportunities for the poor: e.g. any unskilled job created and available to the poor?

3. Addressing/enhancing the environmental impacts of tourism that particularly affect the poor socioeconomic condition: e.g. any changes in access of the poor to land and natural resources.

4. Enhancing the positive and addressing the negative social and cultural impacts of tourism on the poor (e.g. sexual exploitation, loss of identity, women’s economic participation, improved communication, health, schools, infrastructure, etc.)

5. Building participation based policy and planning framework: e.g. encouraging government approaches that support PPT.
6. Developing the pro-poor processes along institutions contribution: e.g. decision-making that includes participation by the poor (whether in government, at local level, within a resort enterprise etc.)

Tourism is known to be the world's largest and fastest growing 'legitimate' industry. It is a 'smokeless' corridor to economic growth and diversification, direct foreign investment, job creation for locals and others and boosting gross national income (Williams, 1998). Although the numerous benefits publicized by the formal and non-formal organizations regarding tourism development for many developing countries (Reid, 2003), the emphasis on tourism are also associated with certain significant costs based on the related activities (Mowforth and Munt, 1998; Sharpley and Tlfer, 2002). It has been visualized that tourism leads to the co-modification of culture, displacement of people from traditional habitats, limited participation of host communities in planning and decision-making as well as uneven distribution of benefits, fashioning tourists-as-guests and host communities-as-servants types of relationships and destruction of the natural environment (Odendal and Schoeman, 1990; Mowforth and Munt, 1998; Fennel, 1999; Tisdell, 2001; Keyser, 2002; Scheyvens, 2002; Reid, 2003; Rogerson and Visser, 2004).

For local communities, participation and empowerment are essentials in any tourism initiative that address the issues of poverty (Scheyvens, 2002). Nature-based tourism refers broadly to tourism growth on or around the attractions of the natural environment. Outstanding to the potential costs and the fact that some forms of nature-based tourism are essentially subjected to the undisturbed environments and a diversity of cultures and people, it shows that the ecotourism bears both a responsibility for sustainable approaches to community development and environmental management (Wahab and Pigram, 1997; Honey, 1999). Turner (2001) suggests some reasons why nature-based tourism can play a leading role as a rural development strategy. First, it can generate more revenue per area than other possible land uses. Second, the positive participation of already existing conservation agencies presents the opportunity of encouragement a sound environmental management plan for a region, including surrounding communities. Third, it benefits areas that have such potential but otherwise insufficient infrastructure to be attractive enough to investors. And last, the industry is
labour intensive which is attractive to rural areas where unemployment/underemployment may be high. This issue is borne out by the theory of common property resource management and the more general practice of community-based natural resource management (IIED, 1994).

Literature on the developmental impacts of tourism, particularly nature-based tourism, in the global South has sought to identify if tourism can become part of a 'pro-poor' development strategy (Binns and Nel, 2003). Mahony and van Zyl (2002) define this as 'an approach driven by State, private sector or the community, which generates both economic and non-economic net benefits to the poor'. Thus, pro-poor tourism refers an approach to tourism development and management which aims to enhance the linkages between tourism businesses and poverty reduction. The links between poverty, environment and development, supporters of this approach maintain that in a world of mounting inequality, poverty reduction needs to be the principal feature in the sustainable development agenda (Roe and Urquhart, 2001). However, there is some confusion between the pro-poor approach and concepts such as ecotourism, sustainable tourism or community-based tourism. In an attempt to clarify the situation, Ashley et al. (2001) explain that the interdependence of development and environmental protection is the core focus of sustainable tourism. The pro-poor approach, however, focuses on tourist destinations and on promoting good practices that are particularly relevant to conditions of local poverty. To sum up, nature-based tourism is primarily concerned with attractions in the environment, whereas pro-poor tourism-based development aims to deliver net benefits to the local people. This involves more than just a community focus; it requires mechanisms for unlocking opportunities for the poor at all levels and scales of action (Ashley and Roe, 2002).

The Chapter includes the exploration of the approach of ecotourism based development and possibility for the pro-poor tourism (a new concept of tourism) in the MWS and RBS that could possibly increase the local employment to involving local people in the decision making process for any local and forest conservation based practices.
6.3 METHODOLOGY

As a part of the observation the field work was done between February and April 2008, the data collection included interviews, group discussions and review of official documents and published literature. A semi-structured questionnaire employed as basis of my household data collection. Total 150 households from the villages at Mayureshwar Wildlife Sanctuary and 150 Households from the villages at Rehekuri Blackbuck Sanctuary were sampled to collect data on the attitude of the locals towards any suggested development policy for the growth of the local area, awareness about ecotourism concept and related development practices. These questions were followed by the other related to the perceptions for the new concept of ecotourism i.e. pro-poor tourism, awareness of the benefits and problems caused by the ecotourism and willingness to be involved in home stays. Some observatory questions were close ended and respondents were asked to answer either YES or NO and POSITIVE or NEGATIVE. The possible factors act as barriers in successful development practices also evaluated based on my own assumptions considered during the field observation of the area. The observed data was based on percentile values analyzed to use MSEXCEL for results.

6.4 RESULTS

The result identified several factors, positive and negative perceptions of the local people towards park development approaches, prospects from the tourism and park relationships, which stand to extend the ability of ecotourism to generate revenue and sustainability for locals. Maximum proportions of the villagers have optimistic concern over environmental damage or community safety as a result of the tourism activity in MWS and RBS.

Few respondents showed the negative attitude as they considered that the benefits would be only for the government officials from future tourism growth. Limited benefits, optimism and positive attitudes are the main features of an early stage of tourism development (D’Amore, 1983; Butler, 1980; Doxey, 1976)
6.4.1 Perceptions of the locals towards Developmental Options

High percentages of respondents do not have familiarity about the park and its importance and the unwillingness of the locals to participate in the developmental policies made the fewer possibilities for the implementation of successful strategies in the study area. Easily available resources and less potentiality to provide better occupational sources in the dry prone area are making the locals highly dependents over the sanctuary resources.

Table: 31 Responses of local towards development opinions in MWS and RBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Supa</th>
<th>Kutwalwadi</th>
<th>Wadhnae</th>
<th>Rehekuri</th>
<th>Gykerwadi</th>
<th>Bahirobhwadi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response over development consequences on their livelihood</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What you will opt for your livelihood from development strategies?

| Employment          | 87.2 | 64.9       | 74.3    | 70.4     | 69.8      | 80.1         |
| Education           | 62.4 | 55.1       | 57.0    | 54.6     | 61.7      | 65.5         |
| Infrastructure      | 75.0 | 67.2       | 78.4    | 77.3     | 73.9      | 68.3         |

*Note: Values are in percentage. Source: Present Study*

Table 31 represents the responses about developmental initiatives accepted with positive attitudes by 85.3% (Supa), 83.0% (Kutwalwadi) and 76.3% (Wadhane) at MWS and 71.4% (Rehekuri), 70.5% (Gykerwadi) and 82.2% (Bahirobhwadi) at RBS in terms of Employment with high responses at Supa (87.2%) followed by education responses (62.4%) and Infrastructure of the village (75%) at MWS and in RBS the responses for the employment recorded at large from Bahirobhwadi (80.1%) as this village have the maximum educated person therefore the respondents look for better educational facilities (65.5%) in the village under any development initiatives.

In terms of the infrastructure improvement under any planning, respondents from Wadhane (78.4%) at MWS and Rehekuri (77.3%) and Gykerwadi (73.9%) at RBS come across with more expectations from developmental based practices and look for participating in decision making policies governed by the forest officials which can improve their socioeconomic conditions. Additionally, the age group
ranged from 41 year to above 60 year was not extremely willing and assumed the development in terms of the ecotourism activities and they had negative or very poor perception towards the conservation of the resources as they are using these resources from long time and consider it as their rightful property.

Table: 32 Age-wise distribution of the willingness for the promotion of development variables at MWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Variables</th>
<th>Supa</th>
<th>Kutwalwadi</th>
<th>Wadhane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=90(30 respondents from each village); All values are the percentile of the total responses recorded. Variables: ET: Ecotourism; DA: Development of the area (i.e. Roads, hospitals, electricity, schools, industries etc); EP: Employment; CR: Conservation of resources (i.e. Agriculture and Forest resources)

Table: 33 Age-wise distribution of the willingness for the promotion of development variables at RBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Options</th>
<th>Rehekuri</th>
<th>Gykerwadi</th>
<th>Bahirobhwadi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=90(30 respondents from each village); All values are the percentile of the total responses recorded. Variables: ET: Ecotourism; DA: Development of the area (i.e. Roads, hospitals, electricity, schools, industries etc); EP: Employment; CR: Conservation of resources (i.e. Agriculture and Forest resources)
On other side the young generation lies between the age group of 18 to 40 year were very energized and more willing to work with eco-developmental projects for better economic options and also look for the participation with conservation based practices with forest department in both the sanctuaries (MWS and RBS) (Table 32; 33). Changes were noticed because the young generation is more educated compare to the old person of the village and they get knowledge and awareness about the natural resources, role of the natural resources and conservation based development policies for the local people and sustainable future with management practices from school, colleges and training programmes conducted by the NGOs and Forest Department.

6.4.2 Knowledge and willingness to participate with the Concept of Ecotourism

In the sanctuary area tourism is at an early stage of development. The approach for providing alternative economic sources to the locals based on the eco-developmental planning (Pro-poor Tourism) mainly emphasis the local poor people below poverty line. In the study area the local understands about ecotourism is at the minority level. Out of all sampled villages, Supa had good proportion of responses (72.0%) known to ecotourism concept as a result of close proximity of the sanctuary and educational facilities in the village where timely children interact with the forest persons and get awareness about the forest related practices. Other two village’s responses for ecotourism quantified as 37% in Kutwalwadi and 35.1% in Wadhane as they located at little distance from the forest surroundings and the level of education reported low compared to the Supa Village at MWS. The similar responses were recorded from RBS, where the Bahirobhwadi village which has high percentage of the educated people showed high proportion (43.8) known to the ecotourism concept. At MWS and RBS, respondents stated newspaper and colleges as the major sources of information about ecotourism (Table 34).

Among the interview respondents who identified ‘benefits from ecotourism’, 60.4% (MWS) and 48.4% (RBS) pointed to economic benefits related to employment. For most, ecotourism is primarily a good way to make a living better with more working opportunity. A second most-frequently cited benefit, identified by the respondent, 17.5% at MWS and 27.8% at RBS is development of the infrastructure of their area. Aside from income, respondents identified growth in social benefits,
including better healthcare, education, and amenities, such as potable water for drinking and irrigation, electricity, transportation and communication and market access for selling local products. 11.1% (MWS) and 9.4% (RBS) respondents looked ecotourism as learning opportunities while to work with developmental activities with forest department. The opportunity to learn and work has also provided many businesses opportunity at local. Of 6.0% and 8.6% respondents from MWS and RBS said that the participation with ecotourism has possibility of learning and interacting with people of other cultures.

Table: 34 Interpretation of the perceptions for Ecotourism in MWS and RBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>MWS</th>
<th>RBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Do you know about Ecotourism?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Source of Information about Ecotourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. What Benefit you suppose to derive from ecotourism?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Opportunity</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with people</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All the values are the percentage of the total responses; Source: Present Study
Women acknowledged, the ecotourism will provide new roles and engagements in more activities beyond the household work. During the discussion, many female respondents said, "Working with tourism based opportunity could give us strength in knowing that women can get ahead alone with more options therefore we don't have to depend on men for our basic requirements". The opportunity under the framework of ecotourism concept shaped by the World Tourism Organization's (WTO's) (2002) explored the need for the participation based development for the successful execution of the ecotourism based conservation practices at broad level in developing countries. The present results showed the some gaps in the Tourism-Park-Community relationship as the result of antagonistic opinion about working with forest officials in developmental based planning due to past experiences. When the issues for participation with ecotourism based development were taken under group discussion the local people questioned about their role in planning and share in benefits. Therefore the strategies should be focused to ensure an equitable distribution of benefits within the local communities. Based on the results it has been considered that ecotourism should not be only for the conservation of the natural resources and wildlife of the MWS and RBS, it should also provide social and financial stability to the locals of the villages adjacent to these natural areas.

6.4.3 Perspectives about Pro-Poor Tourism as a tool to alleviate poverty

Tourism usually considered seeing forests, wildlife, natural beauty and picnicking form the tourist's point of view. When the respondents were asked to explain their ideas or concept regarding tourism, the high proportion of the respondents looked for the socioeconomic growth at first. Respectively to fulfill the constraints of the locals, the Pro-Poor Tourism based initiative could be the best possible measure to meet the need of the local as well as the help to achieve the aim to conservation of forest areas with positive participation of the locals. The concept of Pro-poor tourism is a new approach for the developing countries to achieve the objectives of conservation of the parks and alleviating poverty together with maximum benefits to improve the economic status of the inhabitants belong to that area. The survey result revealed that almost all the respondents (100%) have no idea about the Pro-Poor Tourism in all the six villages namely Supa, Kutwalwadi, Wahane at MWS and Rehekuri.
Gykerwadi. Bahirobhwadi at RBS. People said that they feel good to know about the tourist and tourism in their area (Figure 28).

When the respondents were interviewed about their willingness to be involved in home stay programs under Pro-Poor Tourism approach, 83% from MWS and 89.4% answered that they are ready to receive tourist in their homes if they are given chance to do so, but also mentioned that they do not have any training on catering, good water and sanitation facilities at home, not good enough for the tourists. If these facilities have been upgraded and security is provided, then home stay could become a good source of income for their livelihood. All the respondents (100%) from the villages at MWS and RBS expressed that they would love to host home stay if some infrastructure facilities such as Sanitation facilities, roads and security were improved, then the more benefits could be generated as a result of the more tourist flow to their area.

Figure: 28 Awareness among the local people regarding the concept of pro-poor tourism at MSW and RBS

6.4.4 Barriers to participation of the locals in Tourism

As mentioned earlier, the purpose of this chapter is to identify and examine the factors that locals identified as barriers in alleviating poverty by means of Ecotourism based approach. Based on the qualitative analysis of the findings it has been concluded that there are numerous challenges to the development of Pro-Poor Tourism in Mayureshwar wildlife Sanctuary and Rehekuri Blackbuck
Sanctuary, and this study is an attempt to identify these barriers as to prepare integrated policies to towards resolving issues for sustainable development for the study area.

a) Location

The observation carried out in Mayureshwar Wildlife Sanctuary and Rehekuri Blackbuck Sanctuary resulted the overall 73.7% views about the location of the village is a barrier to support the concept of Pro-Poor Tourism. Lack of roads and extremely dry conditions identified as the most important constraints to tourism development in the area. Long distances and poor transportation facilities from the nearest tourists' arrival points (Moregaon, Jeuri, Pune (MWS) and Sidhitek, Karjat (RBS)) influence access to the tourism market. 81.8% of the locals supported that if State Government and Forest Department will focus to these areas and motivate the private sector to take up the development of this area required then significant results could be generated with ecotourism planning.

b) Low capacity to meet Tourist Expectations

Most of the local people in MWS and RBS, especially women may have never travelled outside the surrounding area of their own villages and have no understanding of who tourists are and what they expect. 81.8% of the respondents addressed that the awareness raising programmes need to be addressing to overcome with the poor sanitation and hygiene along the sanctuary trekking trail to fulfill the tourists’ expectations. Development of tourism ‘products’ such as camping facilities, village home stay, cultural shows and village tours by local guides will be undertaken with expert advice and guidance of Forest Department with the participation of the local communities. NGOs should participate to provide tourism awareness raising training and orientation programme for the locals to enhance their interest and knowledge regarding participation with tourism related activities.

c) Lack of Magnetized ‘product’

Apart from the natural scenery and scanty ‘wilderness’ there are no tourism products which could be offered by MWS and RBS. 64.6% of the answered suggested that there is need to boost some interest among tourist by offering bird watching, village tours, home stay and cultural shows. Social
mobilization and training provided to the local communities by forest officials could facilitate the
development and management of these products in the next few years. Consumer products (Local
food, fruit and handicrafts) and improved staying facilities produced by villagers along the sanctuary
may the result to gain the attention of the tourists to the sanctuary.

d) The short length-of-stay of tourists

Length of stay of tourists at a destination remains an important aspect in tourism planning and
management. What a destination has in terms of attractions and facilities plays a significant role in
determining the length of tourists’ stay. In this study, 45.4% of the residents recognized that tourists
stay for a short time in the sanctuary because it lacks a variety of tourist attractions and activities. As
a consequence, tourists just drive through the community. From the tourists’ perspective, there might
be other reasons why they do not stay long in sanctuary. Tourists’ perceptions and opinions towards
sanctuary and its attractiveness as a tourist destination should be more focused by forest department
and researchers.

e) Lack of linkages between formal and informal sectors

Weak linkages between the poor conveniences of MWS and RBS villages (with poor road services,
medical, and hotels) are a severe constraint. Poor people along the MWS and RBS trails lack the
capacity or the opportunity to form linkages with informal or formal sectors in the tourism industry.
Education can play a major role to develop he tourism market in these areas. The knowledge about
the control all the transportation facility, hotel services, food supplies and biodiversity around may
lead to the betterment of the livelihood by getting opportunities to be a part of ecotourism. However,
45.5% responses suggested that by providing skills and knowledge/awareness about tourism to local
residents by the educational and training programs with the coordination of formal and non-formal
sectors is a way of ensuring the benefit from tourism.

f) The lack of tourism knowledge/awareness and skills

81.8% of the residents indicated that the lack of knowledge and skills are the main barrier to
participating in tourism. The community members expressed that there is need for the knowledge and
skill in utilizing tourism opportunities. Aref et al. (2009a) acknowledge that sufficient tourism
knowledge and skills are important for local capacity building and tourism development and
community development. Basically, it is a long process that some tourism planners and development
practitioners may find challenging to implement, especially for private companies that are driven by
profit motives. However, in the case of Mayureshwar and rekukuri sanctuary, it is a few wildlife
wealth available in the sanctuary areas and the residents have no benefit from these areas so the
development of tourism opportunity to provide the benefits among the majority of poor residents is
not possible without the upgrading of the sanctuary area and involvement of the local with the
decision making plans executed by the government for the development of the sanctuary area. As
Aref et al. (2009a) concluded that Knowledge + Skills = Tourism Development, it is important that
tourism policy makers and development practitioners should prepare communities with adequate
skills and knowledge to exploit tourism opportunities and a sustainable way of using tourism to
alleviate poverty.

Table: 35 Proportion of barriers addressed by the respondents in tourism at MWS and RBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Identified as a barrier</th>
<th>Means of overcoming it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of the village</td>
<td>72.73</td>
<td>81.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low capacity to meet tourist expectations</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>54.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of “materialized Product”</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>63.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short length-of-stay of tourists</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>63.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of linkages between formal and informal sectors/local suppliers</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of awareness for developmental practices</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial sources for business</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of tourism research</td>
<td>72.73</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=90 at MWS and 90 at RBS (30 households from each village surveyed). All the values are the
percentage of the total responses. Source: Present Study
g) The concept of a tourism revenue sharing system

The sharing of tourism revenue is important for tourism development and reduces potential conflicts between protected areas management and local communities. 63.6% of the residents think that sharing tourist revenue with local communities leads to development and also improves the relationship between the management of protected areas and local communities towards sustainable conservation efforts and poverty alleviation. However, residents indicated that tourist revenue can't benefit to their livelihood conditions but the compensation for the loss by the wildlife could be the trusted option for their livelihood improvement.

h) The lack of tourism research

Concerning the lack of tourism research, it is overviewed that forest officials do not conduct research to get to know the actual contribution of tourism to the poor. The locals pointed that if authorities had conducted researched on the local community, they would have realized how tourism can benefit the poor people and perhaps they would have proposed strategies to enable the poor to benefit. A lack of research on tourism at MWS and RBS hampered identification of impacts and appropriate ways of addressing them. It is conclude that tourism policy makers and development practitioners cannot make proper pro-poor decisions if there is insufficient information on the current need of the tourism in the area and role of locals in its development.

6.5 DISCUSSION

This study has attempted to identify the awareness and attitude of the local people towards the Development based policies and Ecotourism concept, which is new to this area and seek the conservation of the forest resources and growth of the socioeconomic status of the local with integrated approach of participation based conservation. The study also identifies major barriers which need to be addressed to overcome with a sustainable development practice in Mayureshwar Wildlife Sanctuary and Rehekuri Blackbuck Sanctuary. Unless the barriers identified would not be minimized, tourism in these areas seems unfeasible. The ecotourism planning can be done in Mayureshwar Wildlife Sanctuary and Rehekuri Blackbuck Sanctuary to look for development of this
underdeveloped area by employing the local people as well as by infrastructure development. Ecotourism can be made sustainable with continuous capacity to safeguard natural environment when it should provide and maintain the quality of tourist experience and satisfaction as well as benefit to the local people in the area (Ramaswami, 2000).

This study observed that maximum respondents have positive attitude towards ecotourism but residents' positive perceptions should not be taken for granted because if ecotourism continues to have little or no impact towards alleviating poverty, and with residents having great expectations for tourism in alleviating poverty, their perceptions are most likely to change from positive to negative. According to Belisle and Hoy (1980) when residents' perceptions are negative, tourism development is often hampered because successful tourism development depends upon the tolerance of local residents (Roe et al., 2002). In addition, severe poverty remains one of the threats to the tourism industry given the fact that in “places where the poor feel that they are not benefiting sufficiently or fairly from tourism, conflicts and violence can arise” (Roe et al., 2002).

6.5.1 Attitude towards Conservation and Development practices

In the study area the concept of conservation and development is partially supported. Responses as 'don't know' would have been calmed during survey because of poor educational level among old age group. Educational ration for the respondents in the age of 45 yrs and above were very limited as the lack of basic amenities in the rural area. This could be because of higher average literacy rate and regard for the forest as life support system. The negative attitude could be due to some recent loss incurred, e.g. crop damage and loss of livestock due to wild animals or fine or punishment from the forest department. Local Economic Development (LED), in utilizing local resources and skills, is recognized by government as a key vehicle for bringing about economic change and alleviating poverty. (RSA, 1998; Binns and Nel, 1999, 2000; Nel, 1999; Nel and Binns, 2001). Community participation in the Sadarmatha National Park in Nepal is a true example of community involvement for conservation where the locals negotiated and arranged with the conservation need for protected area. Such local’s participation highly desires for the economy output and local rights to the resources (Hough, 1988; Hough and Sherpa, 1989). There are several examples where people willingly contributed and taken initiatives in management planning include Chanki ridge in Nagaland and
Jardhar in Garhwal Himalaya (Sewell, 1973). During the survey the idea of development rapidly came to dominate discussion in the local people meeting with the researcher and resulted with the gathering of negative thoughts regarding the living conditions before the park establishment. This outcomes of the meeting included three hypothesis to get the local support for conservation; First, Local expectations regarding the economic benefits of the park should be focused. Second, the park competition with other organizations such as government initiatives and local companies, involved in development need to be reduced. Third, the issue of conservation has, to some extent at least, been pushed into the background. In India the problem inappropriate Rural Development Programmes (Mahajan, 1991), has further been aggravated by vertical and horizontal compartmentalization of sectoral plans, which prevent any integral or mutually reinforcing impact of various investments (Badola, 1995).

a) Poverty Reduction and Management

Based on the result of the awareness of the local people regarding the ecotourism and related development practices, it is necessary to implement the practices such as integrated conservation and development projects, inclusive management approaches, and creating opportunities for biodiversity conservation within the wider rural landscape in the form of community conservation areas.

i) Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDPs)

Since the 1980s, conservation organizations have been implementing approaches that aim to build support among local communities by sharing social and economic benefits from protected areas. The goals of these initiatives include compensating local people for lack of access to protected areas and providing alternative income sources that would allow people to benefit economically from conservation while nonparticipation from environmentally destructive practices. During the 1990s, ICDPs found support from international development agencies which provided funding for biodiversity conservation on an unprecedented scale (McShane and Wells, 2004). Assessments undertaken in the past decade have shown that many ICDPs have failed to meet expectations for
"win-win" conservation and development scenarios (e.g., Wells and Brandon, 1992; Larsen et al., 1998; McShane and Wells, 2004).

ii) Management approaches involving local communities

Participatory planning – involving local communities in protected area management design – is a key feature of many ICDPs (Brown, 1997). Going beyond this, the formation active participation in the day-to-day management of formal protected areas is becoming more widespread. Collaborative management between local communities and technical advisors (for example, government protected area authorities, NGOs or private contractors) can ensure that local communities have a major stake in decision-making and receive a major share of the benefits of protected areas (Wells and Brandon, 1992; Tisen and Bennett, 2000). In Kenya and Tanzania, for example, the Maasai living around Tsavo, Amboseli and Kilimanjaro National Parks have developed community wildlife sanctuaries that benefit from wildlife dispersal areas around the protected areas. Here, local communities are involved at all levels of management in a range of conservation and ecotourism enterprises (Wishitemi, 2002; Okello et al., 2003). Management and community conservation areas may contribute towards reducing poverty through social empowerment and provision of financial benefits to communities in and around protected areas as well as enough to achieve significant poverty reduction.

6.5.2 Towards integrated approach of Poverty Reduction Strategies

It has been recognized that the importance of planning and management includes making optimal use of land and water used for production, while enhancing the management of those needed primarily to conserve biodiversity. In this context, protected areas are a tool for promoting effective planning of land and water use so that they can better contribute to socio-economic development plans and programmes in the area where they are located. In the context to current debates on tourism and development with the villagers during the village meetings most of the responses have no doubt that jobs would be created, people would get empowerment and poverty would be alleviated. According to them, Ecotourism concept could be proficient to develop crucial linkages and partnerships which
embrace diverse expertise and financial support, whilst engendering a spirit of collaboration and transparency in their actions.

However, pro-poor tourism seems little admirable and unknown among the respondents as developing principal but there are some crucial practical issues need to consider to spread awareness among the local people towards the participatory approaches from their economic development to fulfill the aim of management of forest resources. Roe and Elliott (2003) defined this as “harnessing conservation in order to deliver on poverty reduction and social justice objectives”, while Fisher (2003) described it as “optimising conservation and livelihood benefits with an explicit emphasis on contributing to poverty reduction”. Scherl (2003) stressed that establishment and management of protected areas should at least not make the living conditions of poor rural and indigenous communities within and adjacent to these areas worse off than they are already (i.e., at least do no harm). IUCN states that pro-poor conservation is not just an ethical response but “an opportunity to contribute to the growth of the environmental sphere of sustainable development by proving its fundamental importance to economic and social outcomes in some of the world’s poorest but most biologically diverse regions” (IUCN 2003).

Moreover, it should be considered that a degree of confusion exists between and among levels of authorities over the ecotourism concept is?. How ecotourists could be motivated by its practices? and what the local market should offer to attract the tourists? If ecotourism is to develop successfully at Mayureshwar Wildlife Sanctuary and Rehekuri Blackbuck Sanctuary, there should be some planning and skill among the decision makers about what the ecotourism constitutes and objectives to be fulfilled for successful execution. If the authorities look for the tourist flow towards the Mayureshwar Wildlife Sanctuary and Rehekuri Blackbuck Sanctuary, they may need to consider the objectives to be highlighted as attractions for the tourists. Recommendation based on the findings suggested that in Mayureshwar Wildlife Sanctuary and Rehekuri Blackbuck Sanctuary, there is need to promote the successful development of ecotourism so that locals can use the opportunities to improve their socioeconomic status as well as can get awareness and experiences to work with forest officials, will build a sound relationship among park, people and ecotourism.
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