ANALYZING THE ECONOMIC, LIVELIHOOD SECURITY OF LOCAL COMUNITIES ON FORESTS AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN TELANGANA

- **Dr Ravikumar Sandra**
Department of Economics
Osmania University, Hyderabad.
Email ID: sravi109@gmail.com.

Abstract:

The preference promoters for respondents to live in and work for forests are identified and arranged in the descending order of endorsement (strongly agree) include Lack of alternative sources of income, Forests improve water and air quality, Working in a natural environment, Increasing demand for natural products, Working in a healthy environment, Forests are renewable resources, Low skill requirement for the use of natural resources, Forests regulate climate, Unemployment problem, Forests protect the mankind from natural hazards, Dependence on Minor Forest Produce (MFP) for livelihoods, Resource availability within the reach of the people, and Poor living conditions. Forests not only accommodate the myriad species but also act as a survival support system to the communities that depended on them. The effectiveness of Indian forest governance in addressing the issues of afforestation, biodiversity conservation, and future carbon storehouse; similarly, there are efforts to minimize the pressure on forest resources, thereby putting them as an integral part of food-energy-water cycle. Almost a quarter of the Indian geographical area is covered by diverse forests which have been proven to be an integral part of the Indian economy. Indian forests not only act as a source of livelihood for forest-dependent people, but also are a habitat to diverse flora and fauna.

Keywords: MFP, Sustainable Development, Forest, Livelihood, Communities, climate change and Unemployment

Introduction:

Covering over 30 percent of the world's total land area, forests – commonly known as the "lungs" of our planet – represent a natural carbon sink – a reservoir that stores carbon emissions and lowers the concentration of CO2 in the atmosphere. Being home to 80 percent of land animals and plants, forests are essential to biodiversity all around the world; in addition, forests regulate water cycles, maintain soil quality, and reduce the risks of natural disasters such as floods. They also play a central role in the economy as about 1.6 billion people globally depend on them for their livelihoods and daily subsistence needs. Currently, the world still loses about 14.5 million hectares of forests annually, an area equivalent to the size of 27 million football fields or bigger than the size of Tajikistan. In this piece, WIPO GREEN explores currently available green technology solutions for forest management and how they

can be used to enhance forest health and biodiversity. Improving the lives of tribal communities.

Many tribal communities in India suffer from severe discrimination and destitution, despite living in areas rich in natural resources. The modernization of the Indian society and industries has resulted in the exploitation of these resources, such as forests, relegating the local communities to the margins. At the same time, such modernization has become an important source of revenue for the states. Large forests have been designated as "reserved" and put under the control of the state department, for the regulated extraction of timber and other produce. Consequently, tribal communities have been denied access to these resources, leading to conflicts between the community and the state's claim to the entire forest wealth. It is crucial for governments to formulate effective strategies to address these conflicts through developmental activities. To improve collaborative effort between the state and local communities, the latter must be increasingly integrated into modern society. Traditional and/or existing techniques in forestry including planting, regeneration, thinning and harvesting are fundamental for implementation of mitigation options such as afforestation, reforestation, and forest management. Further, improvement of such sustainable techniques is required and transfer could build capacity in developing countries.

Objective of the Study:

The main objective of this paper preference promoter to live in and work for forests of ITDA Utnoor in Adilabad District, Telangana state.

Methodology:

For the purpose of present study, 368 are selected from the scheduled areas of ITDA Utnoor in Adilabad, The sample respondents are selected mostly by adhering to the principle of stratified random sampling, and the criterion for stratification of sample respondents is economic status. The primary data are collected directly from the respondents by administering a pre designed questionnaire/schedule. Simple percentages, graphs, frequency distribution, 3-point Likert scale have been employed in order to study the objective of the study.

Results and Analysis:

Table-1

Preference promoter- Increasing demand for natural products

Level of agreement		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Disagree	26	7.1	7.1
	Agree	113	30.7	37.8
	Strongly agree	229	62.2	100.0
	Total	368	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Table-1 shows that there is an increasing demand for natural products and hence sample primary stakeholders preferred to live in and work for forests which is strongly agreed by 62.2 percent, just agreed by 30.7 percent and disagreed by 7.1 percent of the respondents.

Table-2

Preference promoter- Resource availability within the reach of the people

Level of agreement		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Disagree	33	9.0	9.0
	Agree	219	59.5	68.5
	Strongly agree	116	31.5	100.0
	Total	368	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Table-2 shows that resource availability is within the reach and hence sample primary stakeholders preferred to live in and work for forests which is strongly agreed by 31.5 percent, just agreed by 59.5 percent and disagreed by 9 percent of the respondents.

Table-3

Preference promoter- Low skill requirement for the use of natural resources

Level of agreement		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Disagree	38	10.3	10.3
	Agree	118	32.1	42.4
	Strongly agree	212	57.6	100.0
	Total	368	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Table-3 shows that low skill requirement for the use of natural resources which prompted the sample primary stakeholders preferred to live in and work for forests which is strongly agreed by 57.6 percent, just agreed by 32.1 percent and disagreed by 10.3 percent of the respondents.

Table-4

Preference promoter- Working in a natural environment

Level of agreement		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Disagree	31	8.4	8.4
	Agree	104	28.3	36.7
	Strongly agree	233	63.3	100.0
	Total	368	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Table-4 shows that working in a natural environment which prompted the sample primary stakeholders preferred to live in and work for forests which is strongly agreed by 63.3 percent, just agreed by 28.3 percent and disagreed by 8.4 percent of the respondents.

Table-5

Preference promoter- Dependence on MFP for livelihoods

Level of agreement		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Disagree	40	10.9	10.9
	Agree	172	46.7	57.6
	Strongly agree	156	42.4	100.0
	Total	368	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Table-5 shows that dependence on MFP for livelihoods which prompted the sample primary stakeholders preferred to live in and work for forests which is strongly agreed by 42.4 percent, just agreed by 46.7 percent and disagreed by 10.9 percent of the respondents.

Table-6

Preference promoter- Forests are renewable resources

Level of agreement		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Disagree	33	9.0	9.0
	Agree	113	30.7	39.7
	Strongly agree	222	60.3	100.0
	Total	368	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Table-6 shows that forests are renewable resources and hence the sample primary stakeholders preferred to live in and work for forests which is strongly agreed by 60.3 percent, just agreed by 30.7 percent and disagreed by 9 percent of the respondents.

Table-7

Preference promoter- Forests improve water and air quality

Level of agreement		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Disagree	28	7.6	7.6
	Agree	85	23.1	30.7
	Strongly agree	255	69.3	100.0
	Total	368	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Table-7 shows that forests improve water and air quality and hence the sample primary stakeholders preferred to live in and work for forests which is strongly agreed by 69.3 percent, just agreed by 23.1 percent and disagreed by 7.6 percent of the respondents.

Table-8

Preference promoter- Forests protect the mankind from natural hazards

Level of agreement		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Disagree	45	12.2	12.2
	Agree	141	38.3	50.5
	Strongly agree	182	49.5	100.0
	Total	368	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Table-8 shows that forests protect the mankind from natural hazards and hence the sample primary stakeholders preferred to live in and work for forests which is strongly agreed by 49.5 percent, just agreed by 38.3 percent and disagreed by 12.2 percent of the respondents.

Table-9

Preference promoter- Working in a healthy environment

Level of agreement		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Disagree	39	10.6	10.6
	Agree	101	27.4	38.0
	Strongly agree	228	62.0	100.0
	Total	368	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Table-9 shows that working in a healthy environment which prompted the sample primary stakeholders preferred to live in and work for forests which is strongly agreed by 62 percent, just agreed by 27.4 percent and disagreed by 10.6 percent of the respondents.

Table-10

Preference promoter- Poor living conditions

Level of agreement		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Disagree	34	9.2	9.2
	Agree	223	60.6	69.8
	Strongly agree	111	30.2	100.0
	Total	368	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Table-10 shows that poor living conditions which prompted the sample primary stakeholders preferred to live in and work for forests which is strongly agreed by 30.2 percent, just agreed by 60.6 percent and disagreed by 9.2 percent of the respondents.

Table-11

Preference promoter- Unemployment problem

Level of agreement		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Disagree	34	9.2	9.2
	Agree	139	37.8	47.0
	Strongly agree	195	53.0	100.0
	Total	368	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Table-11 shows that unemployment problem which prompted the sample primary stakeholders preferred to live in and work for forests which is strongly agreed by 53 percent, just agreed by 37.8 percent and disagreed by 9.2 percent of the respondents.

Table-12

Preference promoter- Lack of alternative sources of income

Level of agreement		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Disagree	21	5.7	5.7
	Agree	76	20.7	26.4
	Strongly agree	271	73.6	100.0
	Total	368	100.0	

Source: Primary data

Table-12 shows that lack of alternative sources of income which prompted the sample primary stakeholders preferred to live in and work for forests which is strongly agreed by 73.6 percent, just agreed by 20.7 percent and disagreed by 5.7 percent of the respondents.

Conclusion:

The preference promoters for respondents to live in and work for forests are identified and arranged in the descending order of endorsement (strongly agree) include Lack of alternative

sources of income, Forests improve water and air quality, Working in a natural environment, Increasing demand for natural products, Working in a healthy environment, Forests are renewable resources, Low skill requirement for the use of natural resources, Forests regulate climate, Unemployment problem, Forests protect the mankind from natural hazards, Dependence on MFP for livelihoods, Resource availability within the reach of the people, and Poor living conditions. Forests not only accommodate the myriad species but also act as a survival support system to the communities that depended on them. The effectiveness of Indian forest governance in addressing the issues of afforestation, biodiversity conservation, and future carbon storehouse; similarly, there are efforts to minimize the pressure on forest resources, thereby putting them as an integral part of food-energy-water cycle. Almost a quarter of the Indian geographical area is covered by diverse forests which have been proven to be an integral part of the Indian economy. Indian forests not only act as a source of livelihood for forest-dependent people, but also are a habitat to diverse flora and fauna.

References:

1. Roy, Burman, B.K. (1982), Report of the Committee on Forest and Tribals, *Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India,* New Delhi.
2. NTFEE, 1987 (National Task Force on Environment and Economy).Report of the National Task Force on Environment and Economy. *Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers,* Ottawa.
3. Gadgil, Madhav (1989). Deforestation: Problems and Prospects. *Foundation Day Lecture. Society for Promotion of Wastelands Development,* New Delhi.
4. Chambers, R., and M. Leach. 1989. "Trees as Savings and Security for the Rural Poor." World Development 17(3).
5. Pietila, H., 1990.Environment and sustainable development. *IFDA dossier* 77, 61–70, May/June 1990.
6. Mitlin, D., Satterthwaite, D., 1991. Sustainable Development and Cities, prepared for How Common Is Our Future? *A Global NGO Forum*. *Habitat International Coalition*, Mexico City, 4–7 March 1991.
7. Pearce, D W and J JWarford (1993): World without End: Economics, Environment and Sustainable Development, *Oxford University Press,* Oxford.

8. Dasgupta P, Kristrom B, Maler KG. 1994. The environment resource base and human welfare. Beijer Institute of Ecological Economics Discussion Paper. Stockholm: *The Beijer Institute.*

9. Sen, Abhijit, (1996) Economic Reforms, Employment and Poverty: Trends and Options, *Economic and Political Weekly,* 31(35), September1997, p.245978.

10. Scott R, Huang JK, Zhang LX. 1997. Poverty, population and environmental degradation in China. *Elsevier Sci.* 22:229–251.

11. Beckley TM (1998) The nestedness of forest dependence: a conceptual framework and empirical exploration. Soc Nat Resour 11(2):101–120.

12. Callens, I. and Tyteca, D. (1999) "Towards Indicators of Sustainable Development for Firms: A Productive efficiency perspective" *Ecological Economics*, 28; 41 – 53.

13. Kumar P. 2001. Environmental degradation in rural areas: problems and suggestions. *Yojana*. 45:44–49.

14. UNFF. 2003. *Note by the Secretariat*: Transfer of environmentally sound technologies for sustainable forest management: an overview (E/CN.18/AC.2/2003/3). Working document prepared for the Meeting of the Ad hoc Expert Group on Finance and Transfer of Environmentally Sound Technologies (Geneva, 15-19 December 2003).

15. Lakshmana CM. 2008. Effects of population growth on environmental degradation: with reference to India. *Demography India*. 37:63–79.

16. FAO (Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations) 2008. Forest and Energy: Key Issues. *FAO Forestry Paper* 154, Rome.

17. Mamo G, Sjaastad E, Vedeld P (2007) Economic dependence on forest resources: a case from Dendi District, Ethiopia. *Forest Policy Econ* 9(8):916–927.

18. Dr. V.P. Tewari, Forests, academic forestry and people: their role and significance in Indian context, March 2010, DOI:10.13140/2.1.3562.2081, Conference: 3rd GAForN International Symposium on 'Academic Forestry Education: Development and Needs', At: Xishuangbana Botanical Garden, Jinghong, Kunming (China)

19. Rajiv Rai and VijendraNath (2016), THE ROLE OF ETHNIC AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLE OF INDIA AND THEIR CULTURE IN THE CONSERVATION OF BIODIVERSITY, Tropical Forest Research Institute, Jabalpur,Indian Council of Forestry Research and Education, Madhya Pradesh, India 482021

20. ChandreshGuleria, Manoj Kumar Vaidyaet. al (2017) People's participation in joint forest management in higher hills of Himachal Pradesh, May 2017, *Journal of Applied and Natural Science* 9(2):1129-1134, DOI:10.31018/jans.v9i2.1335
21. Buddha deb Chaudhuri and Chandreyee Roy, 2017, Regeneration of Forest Resources Based on Tribal Enterprise: An Approach towads an Eco-Friendly Environment, , *E-Cardenos pen journal,* https://doi.org/10.4000/eces.2735
22. AmitHazra (2019) Development of Forest Resources: A Boost for Tribal economy in India, May 2019, Publisher: *AksharPrakashani,* ISBN: 978-81-922916-1-1.
23. Anushka Shah (2020), Modern Technology for Sustainable Forest Management in India, "Modern Technology for Sustainable Forest Management in India," ORF Issue Brief No. 382, July 2020, *Observer Research Foundation*.