



**MONTCLAIR STATE**  
UNIVERSITY

Montclair State University  
**Montclair State University Digital  
Commons**

---

Sigma Xi Student Research Symposium

2019

---

Apr 27th, 8:45 AM - 9:24 AM

## Human Wildlife Conflict and Likelihood to report the loss: A Case Study of Nepal

Gita Bhushal Adhikary  
Montclair State University, bhushalg1@montclair.edu

Pankaj Lal  
Montclair State University, lalp@montclair.edu

Bernabas Wolde  
Montclair State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/sigma-xi>



Part of the [Community-Based Research Commons](#)

---

Bhushal Adhikary, Gita; Lal, Pankaj; and Wolde, Bernabas, "Human Wildlife Conflict and Likelihood to report the loss: A Case Study of Nepal" (2019). *Sigma Xi Student Research Symposium*. 47.  
<https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/sigma-xi/2019/poster-1/47>

This Poster is brought to you for free and open access by the Conferences, Symposia and Events at Montclair State University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Sigma Xi Student Research Symposium by an authorized administrator of Montclair State University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@montclair.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@montclair.edu).

# Human Wildlife Conflict and Likelihood to report the loss: A Case Study of Nepal

Gita Bhushal Adhikary, Pankaj Lal, and Bernabas Wolde  
Department of Earth and Environmental Studies, Montclair State University

## Introduction

- Globally, approx. 6 million sq. miles of land are allocated for national parks (Gray et al., 2016; Melillo et al., 2016)
- 300-350 million people living within or nearby parks (World Wildlife Fund, 2018)
- Proximity causes heightened human-wildlife conflict (Peterson et al., 2010)


## Rationale

- Compensation schemes: ex-ante or ex-post (Boitani and Raganella, 2010)
- Schemes have been largely ineffective (Madhusan 2003)
- People choose not to, or are unable to, report their loss

## Objective

- To explore the factors influencing the likelihood to report the loss from wildlife

## Study Area



## Theoretical Framework

- Dependent variable (Y): “whether the respondent has reported a loss after experiencing human-wildlife conflict”
- The probability of a “yes” response was estimated given the independent (X) variables as:

$$\pi(x) = \text{Probability}(Y = 1|X = x) = \frac{e^{\alpha + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \dots + \beta_n x_n}}{1 + e^{\alpha + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \dots + \beta_n x_n}}$$

## Results

- All respondents reported crop loss, and about 60% reported livestock death

Table 1: Logistic Regression showing only significant variables

Variables	Coefficient (β)	Standard Error (SE)	Level comparisons
Age	1.63**	0.65	30-39 vs 20-29
	-0.99	0.54	40-49 vs 30-39
	0.56	0.68	50-59 vs 40-49
	-1.45	0.79	≥60 vs 50-59
Gender	-0.53**	0.26	Male vs Female
Family size	0.65	0.71	4-6 persons vs 1-3 persons
	1.14***	0.43	≥7 persons vs 4-6 persons
Common Leopard	0.83**	0.34	Yes vs No
Bengal Tiger	0.63***	0.22	Yes vs No
Asian Elephant	0.58**	0.27	Yes vs No

Note: \*\*\*and \*\* indicates significance at  $\alpha=0.01$  and  $\alpha=0.05$  respectively

## Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

- Statistically significant variables from Table 1 were likely to influence the likelihood to report the loss
- Age 20-29 population and males in the community should be targeted while disseminating the information about compensation scheme
- The compensation scheme should also consider deer, monkey, porcupine, black buck, and wild birds rather than being limited to the current eligible species

## Methods

- In-person survey included:
  - Part I: Socio-demographic background of respondents
  - Part II: Experience of human wildlife conflict
- 197 households were randomly surveyed
- IRB Approval # IRB-FY16-17-649
- Survey date: July, 2017



## Future Work

- This research could be expanded to include other parts of the country, and other developing countries that experience challenges with conservation areas

## Acknowledgements

- Professors and staff at MSU
- Residents of Banke district, Nepal

## References

- Boitani, L., Ciucci, P., & Raganella-Pelliccioni, E. (2010). Ex-post compensation payments for wolf predation on livestock in Italy: A tool for conservation? *Wildlife Research*, 37(8), 722. doi:10.1071/wr10029.
- Gray, C. L., Hill, S. L., Newbold, T., Hudson, L. N., Börger, L., Contu, S., Scharlemann, J. P. (2016). Local biodiversity is higher inside than outside terrestrial protected areas worldwide. *Nature Communications*, 7, 12306. doi:10.1038/ncomms12306.
- Madhusudan, M.D. 2003. Living amidst large wildlife: livestock and crop depredation by large mammals in the interior villages of Bhadra Tiger Reserve, South India. *Environmental Management* 31: 466–475.
- Melillo, J. M., Lu, X., Kicklighter, D. W., Reilly, J. M., Cai, Y., & Sokolov, A. P. (2016). Protected areas' role in climate-change mitigation. *Ambio*, 45(2), 133–145. http://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-015-0693-1.
- Peterson M.N., Birkhead J.L., Leong K., Peterson M.J. & Peterson T.R. (2010) Rearticulating the myth of human-wildlife conflict. *Conservation Letters*, 3, 74–82. doi:10.1111/j.1755-263X.2010.00099.x
- World Wildlife Fund (2018). [https://www.worldwildlife.org/habitats/forest-habitat?utm\\_medium=sociales&utm\\_source=twitter.com&utm\\_campaign=forests](https://www.worldwildlife.org/habitats/forest-habitat?utm_medium=sociales&utm_source=twitter.com&utm_campaign=forests). Retrieved on 07/05/2018.