

PEOPLE PERCEPTION ON THE USE OF HOUSEHOLD COPING STRATEGIES AGAINST SHOCKS: A CASE STUDY OF FOREST RESOURCES USE IN GARHWAL HIMALAYA

Sushma Rawat^{1*}, Munesh Kumar¹, Rajiv Pandey² and Bhuvnesh Nagar¹

¹HNB Garhwal University, Srinagar-Garhwal, Uttarakhand 246 174, India

²ICFRE, Dehradun, Uttarakhand 248 006, India

Email: rawatsushma26@gmail.com

Received-10.10.2017, Revised-24.10.2017

Abstract: The present study investigates the use of forest resources as well as other coping strategies opted by rural households against addressal of shocks in securing and sustaining livelihoods. Multistage random sampling was applied for selection of blocks, villages and households (the primary sampling unit) in Garhwal Himalaya. The primary data on the forest resource use and coping strategies against the different types of household shocks were collected from 454 households using semi-structured questionnaire followed by discussions with local people during 2014-2016. The primary results of the study revealed that the rural households practice different strategies to minimize the adverse effect of shocks and use of forest resources for addressing household shocks. The result estimates of the study will be helpful in framing policies regarding evaluation of shocks and also development of mechanism to minimize the impact of shocks at household as well as at community level in Himalayan region.

Keywords: Addressal of shocks, Coping strategies, Forest conservation, Sustainability

REFERENCES

- Agrawal, A.; Cashore, B.; Hardin, R.; Shepherd, G.; Benson, C. and Miller, D.** (2013). Economic contributions of forests. Background Paper 1. United Nations Forum on Forests. (http://www.un.org/esa/forests/pdf/session_document_s/unff10/EcoContrForests.pdf) (retrieved 10/6/2017).
- Angelsen, A.; Jagger, P.; Babigumira, R.; Belcher, B.; Hogarth, N.J.; Bauch, S.; Borner, J.; Smith-Hall, C. and Wunder, S.** (2014). Environmental income and rural livelihoods: a global-comparative analysis. *World Development*, 64: S12-S28.
- Angelsen, A. and Wunder, S.** (2003). Exploring the forest-poverty link: Key concepts, issues and research implications. CIFOR Occasional Paper 40. Bogor: Center for International Forestry Research.
- Arnold, J.E.M. and Ruiz-Perez, M.** (1998). The role of NTFPs in conservation and development. In: Wollenberg, E., Ingles, A. (Eds.), *Incomes from the Forest. Methods for the Development and Conservation of Forest Products for Local Communities*. Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bogor, Indonesia.
- Arnold, M.; Powell, B.; Shanley, P. and Sunderland, T.C.H.** (2011). Editorial: Forests, biodiversity and food security. *International Forestry Review*, 13(3): 259-264.
- Banerjee, A. and Chowdhury, M.** (2013). Forest degradation and livelihood of local communities in India: A human rights approach. *Journal of Horticulture and Forestry*, 5(8): 122-129.
- Cavendish, W.** (2000). Empirical regularities in the poverty-environment relationship of rural household: evidence from Zimbabwe. *World Development*, 28(11): 1979-2003.
- Das, N.** (2010). Incidence of forest income on reduction of inequality: evidence from forest dependent households in milieu of joint forest management. *Ecological Economics*, 69: 1617-1625.
- De Beer, J. and Mcdermott, M.** (1996). The economic value of non-timber forest products in Southeast Asia. Amsterdam: IUCN; 197 pp.
- Debela, B.; Shively, G.; Angelsen, A. and Wik, M.** (2012). Economic shocks, diversification and forest resource use in Uganda. *Land Economics*, 88(1): 139-154.
- Dercon, S.** (2002). Income risk, coping strategies, and safety nets. *World Bank Research Observer*, 17(2): 141-166.
- Ellis, F.** (2000). The determinants of rural livelihood diversification in developing countries. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 51: 289-302.
- Fafchamps, M.** (2003). *Rural Poverty, Risk and Development*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- FAO** (2005). *State of the world's forests 2005*. Rome: Food and Agricultural Organization.
- Kalaba, F.K.; Quinn, C.H. and Dougill, A.J.** (2013). The role of forest provisioning ecosystem services in coping with household stresses and shocks in Miombo woodlands, Zambia. *Ecosystem Services*, 5: e143-e148.
- Pandey, R.** (2009). Forest resource utilization by tribal community of Jaunsar, Uttarakhand. *Indian Forester*, 135(5): 655-662.
- Pandey, R.; Harrison, S. and Gupta, A.K.** (2014). Resource Availability Versus Resource Extraction in Forests: Analysis of Forest Fodder System in Forest Density Classes in Lower Himalayas, India. *Small-scale Forestry*, 13(3): 267-279.

*Corresponding Author

Rahut, D.B.; Behera, B. and Ali, A. (2016). Do forest resources help increase rural household income and alleviate rural poverty? Empirical evidence from Bhutan. *Forests, Trees and Livelihoods*, 25(3): 187-198

Saha, D. and Sundriyal, R.C. (2012). Utilization of non-timber forest products in humid tropics: Implications for management and livelihood. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 14:28-40.

Saxena, N.C. (2003). Livelihood Diversification and Non-timber Forest Products in Orissa: Wider

Lessons on the Scope of Policy Change. London: Livelihood Strategy Paper, DFID and ODI.

Sharma, C.M.; Gairola, S.; Ghildiyal, S.K. and Suyal, S. (2009). Forest resource use patterns in relation to socioeconomic status: A case study in four temperate villages of Garhwal Himalaya, India. *Mountain Research and Development*, 29(4): 308-319.

Tongruksawattana, S.; Waibel, H. and Schmidt, E. (2010). Shocks and Coping Actions of Rural Households: Empirical Evidence from Northeast Thailand. CPRC International conference.