Socio-Cultural and Economic Dimensions of Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) and Mitigation Effectiveness in the Western Ghats

Dr. Pushpa Hongal

Assistant Professor (Selection Grade)

Department of Management Studies

Karnatak University

Dharwad-580003

Yashpal Kshirsagar IFS

Chief Conservator of Forest

Chikkamagaluru- 577101

Dr. Gururaj Phatak

Assistant Professor

Department of Management Studies

Faculty of Management and Commerce

M S Ramaiah University of Applied Sciences

Bengaluru – 560054

1.Abstract:

Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) has become a significant challenge for conservation and rural development, especially in regions like the Western Ghats of Karnataka. Districts such as Kodagu, Hassan, and Chikkamagaluru face increasing conflicts due to expanded agricultural activities, habitat fragmentation, and climate change. Annually, wildlife interactions, especially involving elephants and wild boars, result in over 500 human deaths and around 100,000 hectares of damaged crops.

The Western Ghats landscape is marked by high forest coverage, fragmented wildlife habitats, and densely populated farming communities, creating frequent conflict situations. Over the last two decades, there has been a noticeable rise in crop damage, livestock attacks, infrastructure destruction, and human casualties. Elephants, gaurs, leopards, and wild boars are the main species involved. Such conflicts negatively impact local agricultural practices, religious attitudes toward wildlife, and traditional tribal practices, placing substantial strain on community relationships and socio-cultural norms.

Despite various mitigation efforts—including rail barricades, solar fencing, trenches designed to deter elephants, and rapid response teams—local communities remain dissatisfied, with persistent mistrust toward institutional solutions. Factors such as limited community participation, institutional mistrust, and vulnerabilities specific to gender further weaken the effectiveness of these strategies.

Keywords: Human Wildlife Conflict, Mitigation Strategy, Human Dimension, Socio-Cultural aspects, Institutional Support.

Introduction:

Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) is a significant problem worldwide, particularly affecting areas where human activities intersect closely with wildlife habitats. **HWC occurs when the actions and needs of wildlife negatively affect humans, or when human activities harm wildlife populations.** Typical examples of these conflicts include crop damage, livestock attacks, property destruction, and even human injuries or deaths. Wildlife also suffers due to retaliatory killings, habitat loss, and forced displacement. Such conflicts present serious challenges to both ecological conservation and socio-economic stability, particularly in rural areas dependent on agriculture and natural resources.

Globally, HWC is recognized as one of the most pressing conservation challenges. Key drivers include rapid population growth, habitat fragmentation, climate change, and expanding agricultural and infrastructure development. These conflicts require integrated solutions that address ecological, socio-economic, and cultural factors comprehensively.

Mitigation strategies for HWC are diverse and typically include physical barriers, wildlife management interventions, and community engagement initiatives. Physical barriers like solar fences, elephant-proof trenches, rail barricades, and watchtowers aim to separate wildlife from human settlements physically. Management interventions include rapid response teams, wildlife translocation, and monitoring systems. Community-based strategies prioritize local participation through education, compensation schemes, and livelihood support programs to promote coexistence.

However, despite these strategies, sustainable conflict resolution remains challenging. Common issues include poor implementation, inadequate maintenance, limited resources, and insufficient community involvement. Mistrust in institutions and vulnerabilities specific to gender also pose significant barriers, highlighting the need for inclusive and culturally sensitive approaches.

In India, HWC is particularly critical due to the country's diverse ecosystems and dense human populations. The Ministry of Environment, Forest, and Climate Change (MoEFCC, 2021) reports over 500 human deaths and around 100,000 hectares of crop losses annually due to wildlife conflicts, mainly involving elephants and wild boars. These figures illustrate the urgent need for targeted, effective conflict mitigation tailored to specific regional contexts.

The Western Ghats region in India, globally recognized as a biodiversity hotspot, exemplifies the complex challenges of managing HWC. Spanning six states, this region features dense forests, high biodiversity, fragmented wildlife corridors, and significant agrarian communities relying heavily on agriculture. Within Karnataka, the districts of Kodagu, Hassan, and Chikkamagaluru are notably affected due to their unique ecological and socio-economic characteristics.

Kodagu is famous for coffee plantations and rich biodiversity but frequently suffers from crop raids and property damage primarily caused by elephants and wild boars, severely impacting local agriculture and economy. Hassan district faces similar issues with frequent elephant invasions and livestock attacks due to fragmented wildlife habitats aggravated by agricultural expansion. Chikkamagaluru, characterized by its mixture of forests, coffee plantations, and densely populated agricultural areas, regularly experiences conflicts involving elephants, gaurs, leopards, and wild boars.

Over the past two decades, the severity and frequency of these conflicts have increased significantly, resulting in considerable crop damage, livestock losses, infrastructure damage, and human fatalities. These conflicts not only threaten local economies and livelihoods but also strain community cohesion and cultural traditions, creating mixed feelings of respect, fear, and frustration towards wildlife and conservation measures.

Although various mitigation methods, including physical barriers like solar fences, elephant-proof trenches, rapid response teams, and monitoring systems, have been implemented, effective long-term solutions remain elusive. Dissatisfaction persists within communities due to limited involvement in decision-making processes, mistrust in government initiatives, inadequate compensation, and gender-specific challenges affecting women in particular.

Addressing HWC effectively requires understanding its socio-cultural and economic dimensions. Community attitudes towards wildlife, household economic resilience, and gender-specific impacts play critical roles in shaping responses to conflict and determining the effectiveness of mitigation measures. Therefore, a combined ecological and socio-cultural approach is essential for developing context-specific and sustainable solutions.

This study aims to comprehensively examine the socio-cultural and economic aspects of HWC in Kodagu, Hassan, and Chikkamagaluru. It will employ a mixed-methods approach using spatial analyses, household surveys, focus group discussions, and in-depth interviews. The research will explore community perceptions, attitudes towards wildlife, economic impacts, and responses to conflict mitigation measures. Special focus will be placed on evaluating current mitigation strategies, levels of community participation, and trust in institutions.

From a social science perspective, HWC is more than just an ecological issue; it involves complex socio-cultural interactions influenced by economic livelihoods, governance systems, and spatial

inequalities. Understanding these dimensions will offer valuable insights into how local communities perceive, manage, and respond to conflicts, helping develop inclusive, context-sensitive interventions.

Human Wildlife Conflict in Western Ghats

The Western Ghats, declared a UNESCO World Heritage Site, is one of the richest biodiversity regions in the world. It is home to countless plant and animal species. But it is also a place where people and wildlife frequently clash. The increasing interaction between humans and wild animals in this region has created serious problems. These problems arise from several interconnected causes that are explained below in clear terms.

1. Habitat Loss and Fragmentation

The most important reason for this conflict is that forests are being cut down or broken into smaller parts. Human activities such as farming, building roads and dams, and even illegal encroachments have divided once continuous forests into isolated patches. Wild animals, especially large ones like elephants, need large spaces to live and move. When these spaces disappear or get split up, animals are forced to enter villages and farms in search of food and water, leading to conflict.

2. Spread of Agriculture and Monoculture

In districts like Kodagu, Chikkamagaluru, and Hassan, commercial farming has grown rapidly. Farmers are growing coffee, tea, and areca in large areas close to forests. These crops are tasty and attract herbivores like elephants, gaurs, and wild boars. As these crops grow near human settlements, animals often enter farms and damage them. In addition, fruit trees like banana and jackfruit planted near homes and farms attract animals even more.

3. Blocked Wildlife Corridors

Animals have used the same paths or corridors for migration and movement for hundreds of years. But now, these routes are blocked by human settlements, highways, railways, or fences. Elephants, for example, rely on these paths to travel between forests. When their paths are cut off, they enter villages and farmlands, leading to more human-animal encounters. Without these corridors, animals lose their natural way of moving, and that increases stress and aggression.

4. Climate Change and Resource Shortages

Changes in the climate—such as irregular rainfall, longer dry seasons, and reduced water sources—have made things worse. Forests in the Western Ghats are experiencing water shortages and declining food availability. Because of this, animals leave forests and enter nearby agricultural lands to find what they need. When animals come in contact with people more often, the chance of damage or injury increases.

5. Delays in Compensation and Poor Response

When people suffer losses due to wildlife—like damaged crops or dead livestock—the compensation provided by the government often comes too late or is not enough. Many affected people feel that the forest department does not respond quickly or adequately. This lack of support causes anger and reduces people's tolerance toward wildlife. Some may even try to harm or poison animals as revenge.

6. Increasing Human Population and Land Use

The number of people living in or near the Western Ghats has been growing. More land is needed for houses, roads, tourism, and farming. This increased pressure on land has pushed human activity deeper into wildlife territory. As people and animals live closer together, the chances of conflict also increase.

7. Lack of Community Participation

Often, government-led conflict prevention programs are planned without involving the local people. When people are not consulted or included, they do not support or maintain measures like fencing or watch-posts. For example, solar fences or trenches may be built, but if communities do not take ownership, they may get damaged or ignored. Without community support, no mitigation method can succeed in the long term.

8. Poor Maintenance of Mitigation Structures

Many conflict-reduction tools—like electric fences, elephant-proof trenches, or barriers—are set up once and then left without upkeep. Over time, these structures become weak or get damaged. Animals learn to break or avoid them. Without regular repairs and monitoring, these barriers fail to stop animals from entering human areas.

9. Rise in Conflict-Prone Species

Some animals like wild boars and gaurs have increased in number because of successful conservation or lack of predators. As their numbers grow, they move into human areas in search of food. These animals can destroy crops, injure people, and cause widespread damage. The lack of natural checks on their population adds to the problem.

10. Religion and Culture

In many parts of the Western Ghats, people have traditionally respected and even worshipped animals like elephants and snakes. However, with the increasing damage to crops and homes, people's patience is wearing thin. The old ideas of living peacefully with wildlife are being tested. Religious respect is now being replaced by fear and anger due to repeated losses.

Human-Wildlife Conflict in the Western Ghats is caused by a mix of environmental, social, and economic factors. Forests are shrinking, human settlements are expanding, and animals are struggling to survive. Climate change, poor planning, and inadequate support to affected people are making the situation worse. Solving this issue requires cooperation between forest officials, local communities, and scientists. Solutions must be long-term, community-based, and practical. Protecting forests, creating wildlife corridors, involving local people in decisions, and ensuring quick compensation are all part of the solution. Only by addressing the root causes of the conflict can we ensure that both people and wildlife can live safely in the Western Ghats.

"Human Dimension" in Human Wildlife Conflict

Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) affects people in many ways, and to solve it, we need to understand how humans think, feel, and respond to wildlife. The conflict is not just about animals entering human spaces—it is about how people live, work, and cope with these challenges. This section explains the different human factors involved in HWC in a simple and clear way.

1. People's Views and Attitudes

People's experiences shape how they feel about wildlife. In the Western Ghats, animals like elephants are often respected and even worshipped. But when these animals damage crops, break houses, or hurt people, that respect can turn into anger and fear. Older people may be more patient, while younger people may want quicker action. Attitudes also vary based on whether someone has suffered a loss or not. If someone sees elephants regularly raiding their farm, they are less likely to support wildlife conservation.

2. Dependence on Farming

Most people in forest areas depend on farming, livestock, and forest resources to live. When animals destroy crops or kill cattle, it directly affects the family's income and food supply. For small farmers, even one night of crop damage can be a big loss. Unlike city dwellers, these families have no backup income. So, wildlife becomes a serious threat to their daily survival. Some people even fall into debt trying to recover from such losses.

3. Role of Women

HWC impacts men and women differently. Women often go to forests to collect firewood or water, so they face a higher risk of running into wild animals. Women also take care of injured family members or manage the house when the men are away. But when officials visit villages or hold meetings, women are rarely asked to share their views. This makes it harder to come up with solutions that work for everyone. It is important to include women in decision-making.

4. Beliefs and Traditions

Many communities believe animals like snakes or elephants are sacred. These beliefs may stop people from harming animals, even if they cause damage. However, when conflict becomes regular, traditional beliefs start to lose power. People may begin to see wildlife as a problem, not as a symbol of nature. On the other hand, superstitions about animals like leopards can make people panic and take harmful actions out of fear.

5. Trust in the Government

When people report a problem with wildlife, they expect the Forest Department to help quickly. But when officials arrive late, or compensation takes months, people lose trust. Many feel ignored or think the system is unfair. Without trust, people are less likely to cooperate or follow official advice. If they believe the government is not on their side, they might take the law into their own hands, sometimes by harming animals.

6. Need for Community Involvement

Solutions work better when local people are involved. If villagers help build and maintain fences or trenches, they are more likely to care for them. But often, decisions are made by outsiders without asking the community. This leads to poor planning and wasted money. People feel disconnected and may even damage the very systems meant to help them. When communities are part of the solution, the success rate is much higher.

7. Awareness and Education

Many people don't know what to do when they face a wildlife threat. They may not know how to report the issue, apply for compensation, or understand animal behavior. Training and education programs can help. When people know more, they panic less and take better precautions. Using simple methods—like posters, meetings in local language, or school programs—can make a big difference.

8. Unequal Impact

Not everyone suffers equally from HWC. Tribals, landless workers, and people living on the forest edge are more exposed. They often don't have official land rights, so they are left out of compensation or relocation schemes. Richer farmers may build better fences or recover quickly, but the poor cannot. Addressing these gaps is important so that all groups get fair treatment and protection.

9. Mental and Emotional Stress

Constant fear of wild animals affects people emotionally. Farmers lose sleep guarding fields. Children miss school if their path goes through wildlife zones. Families live with anxiety, especially during crop

season. After repeated losses, many feel hopeless and depressed. This emotional stress is called "conflict fatigue" and can lead to anger, isolation, or even abandoning farming altogether.

10. Changes in Lifestyle and Migration

Some families decide to move out of conflict zones altogether. Others stop growing crops that attract animals and switch to less profitable ones. These decisions affect their income and social status. Some want the government to relocate them to safer places, while others want better protection and services. Understanding what communities want—whether it is to stay and adapt or move away—is key to long-term solutions.

Human factors play a big role in Human-Wildlife Conflict. People's opinions, economic conditions, emotions, and relationships with government agencies all shape how they deal with wildlife. To solve HWC, we need to go beyond fences and trenches. We must include people in planning, listen to their stories, and support them fairly. Special care should be taken to involve women, protect the poor, and build trust. With the right support, communities can become active partners in protecting both their lives and the wildlife around them.

***Social and Cultural Dimension* of Human Wildlife Conflict**

Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) in the Western Ghats is not just about animals damaging crops or hurting people. It is also about how local communities think, feel, and act toward wildlife. People's beliefs, traditions, social roles, and customs play a big part in how they handle conflict with wild animals. Understanding these social and cultural aspects is very important to create better solutions.

1. Community Beliefs and Traditions

Many people in the Western Ghats have lived near forests for generations. They have cultural beliefs that teach respect for animals. For example, elephants are linked with Hindu gods and are seen as sacred. Snakes are worshipped during special rituals. Some forests are believed to be homes of gods and spirits. Because of these traditions, people used to tolerate wildlife. But now, as animals damage crops and hurt people more often, this respect is slowly turning into fear and anger.

2. Group Decisions and Social Pressure

In rural areas, people usually make decisions as a group. Villagers discuss problems together and follow the advice of elders or leaders. If a wild animal attacks crops or livestock, the group may decide to report it or take action. Sometimes, the group might be angry with forest officers and decide to protest. Social pressure can stop individuals from harming animals—or push them to act against them. These social dynamics matter when planning any conflict solution.

3. Wildlife in Rituals and Celebrations

Wild animals are a part of many local festivals and beliefs. Some animals are seen as good signs. People pray to forest gods during harvest time or ask for protection from wildlife. These rituals helped build a peaceful bond with nature. But in areas where conflict is frequent, people stop seeing animals as part of their culture. They start seeing them as problems. This change in belief affects how they behave toward animals.

4. Emotional Connection to Land

For villagers, land and forests are not just places—they are part of their identity. Temples, farms, and family homes have deep emotional value. If people are asked to move away from conflict zones or stop entering forests, they feel sad and angry. They don't want to leave their land, even if it means facing danger from animals. So, when government plans ask them to relocate or restrict their forest use, they often resist.

5. Elders and Traditional Knowledge

Older people in villages know a lot about animal behavior. They can tell when elephants are likely to come or which paths are safe. They share this knowledge through stories and teachings. But today, many forest programs ignore the wisdom of elders. This leads to a loss of valuable knowledge. Involving elders can help in planning better and more respectful solutions.

6. Tribal Beliefs and Local Rules

Tribal communities have their own rules about nature. Some tribes see animals as part of their family. They follow taboos like not hunting during certain times or avoiding sacred groves. These customs help protect both people and animals. However, when government officers don't respect these traditions, it causes tension. Accepting tribal ways and mixing them with modern methods can lead to better cooperation.

7. Roles of Men and Women

In many villages, women are the ones who fetch water, collect firewood, and work in fields. These jobs put them at risk of meeting wild animals. But women are rarely included in meetings about forest problems or safety plans. Cultural beliefs sometimes say that women should not speak in public meetings. This must change. Women's experiences are valuable, and including them leads to better ideas and outcomes.

8. Youth Migration and Loss of Culture

Many young people move to cities for work or education. When they leave, traditional knowledge is not passed down. Those who come back often have different ideas and values. This can cause disagreements in the village about how to deal with wildlife. The cultural gap between old and young people also affects how the community deals with change.

9. Social Gaps and Unequal Impact

Not everyone in a village suffers equally from HWC. Poor families, tribal people, or lower castes often live closest to the forest. They are more likely to face attacks and less likely to get help. They might not own land or have documents, so they cannot claim compensation. If the government only helps the rich or powerful, others feel ignored. Solutions must be fair and help everyone.

10. Local Ways of Coping

People use many local ways to stay safe. Some grow crops that animals don't like. Others avoid going into the forest at night. They might use firecrackers or bells to scare animals. These are simple but effective methods. Instead of replacing them, we should support and improve them. Cultural knowledge helps people survive, and we must respect it.

Making Policies Work with Culture

To make conflict solutions work better, we must connect them with local culture and social life. Here are some simple ways to do that:

1. Involve Communities: Let villagers plan and manage conflict solutions themselves.
2. Map Cultural Sites: Find temples, sacred groves, and other places that matter to people.
3. Use Festivals: Share wildlife safety messages during local events.
4. Be Fair to All: Make sure poor or tribal families also get support.
5. Train Staff: Teach forest workers to respect local customs and beliefs.

Human-Wildlife Conflict in the Western Ghats is not just about forests and animals—it is about people, their beliefs, and their way of life. Social and cultural traditions shape how communities deal with conflict. When these traditions are ignored, solutions fail. But when they are respected, people feel heard and supported. Real change will come when policies understand the lives and values of people. We need to listen to villagers, include women and elders, and treat everyone fairly. Respecting social and cultural ways can turn conflict into coexistence. The Western Ghats can show the world how nature and people can live together peacefully—if we are willing to learn from the people who live there.

***Economic Dimension* of Human Wildlife Conflict:**

Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) causes major financial problems for people living near forests. In places like the Western Ghats, many people depend on farming, livestock, and forest resources to survive. When wild animals damage crops, kill animals, or destroy property, it leads to serious economic

losses. This section explains how HWC affects people's income, property, time, and overall financial well-being.

1. Crop Damage and Income Loss

The most common effect of HWC is damage to crops. Elephants, wild boars, deer, monkeys, and other animals regularly enter farms and destroy crops like banana, paddy, maize, areca, and coffee. This often happens during key growing or harvesting periods. Farmers lose a big part of their expected harvest, leading to a direct loss of income and food. Small and marginal farmers suffer the most. They usually borrow money to buy seeds and fertilizers. If their crops are destroyed, they cannot repay loans and may fall into deeper debt. Some families are forced to sell land or livestock to recover losses.

2. Loss of Livestock

Animals like leopards and bears sometimes kill livestock—such as cows, goats, or poultry. For many poor families, livestock is their most valuable asset. It provides milk, meat, manure, and income. When livestock is lost, families lose both food and money. In some cases, people are injured or killed while trying to protect their animals. Fear of attacks also stops people from taking animals out to graze freely, which affects milk production and animal health.

3. Damage to Property and Infrastructure

Elephants and wild boars damage fences, break compound walls, and sometimes destroy parts of homes while searching for food. Irrigation pipes, borewells, water tanks, and electric lines are also often damaged. These repairs cost money, which many families cannot afford. Public property such as village roads or community water sources may also be damaged. This affects entire communities and puts pressure on local authorities.

4. Loss of Time and Labor

When animals are likely to enter fields, farmers stay up all night to guard their crops. This leads to lost sleep and tiredness the next day, affecting productivity. People may skip daily jobs, children miss school, and women avoid going to the forest for firewood or water. This hidden cost—of time and energy—adds to the stress of living in conflict areas. Families change their work routines, and productivity drops over time.

5. Cost of Preventing Damage

Many families try to protect their land using electric fences, solar lights, trenches, and scare devices like crackers or bells. These methods cost money and need regular maintenance. Poor families cannot always afford them. In some cases, the government provides these facilities, but they often fall into disrepair. Once broken, fences or trenches are not effective, and people are again at risk of damage.

6. Impact on Tourism and Forest Jobs

In parts of the Western Ghats, tourism provides income to guides, jeep drivers, homestay owners, and local businesses. When HWC increases, tourists may avoid the area. Fear of danger or negative media reports can cause bookings to drop, affecting local livelihoods. People who collect forest products like honey, medicinal plants, or firewood also lose income when they cannot safely enter the forest due to animal activity.

7. Government Spending on Conflict

Governments spend a lot of money to manage HWC. This includes paying compensation to farmers for crop loss, livestock deaths, and human injuries. Other costs include building fences, training forest staff, setting up Rapid Response Teams, and installing cameras or watchtowers. While this spending is necessary, it takes up a large part of wildlife and forest department budgets. This means less money is available for other conservation or development work.

8. Delayed or Inadequate Compensation

Although most state governments have compensation schemes, many people face problems. Payments are often delayed. Farmers must fill forms, get land inspected, and wait months for approval. Sometimes they do not receive anything because of missing documents or official delays. Even when payments are made, they are often too small. A farmer who loses ₹30,000 worth of crops might get only ₹5,000. This creates frustration and reduces faith in government systems. In some cases, people become so angry that they take revenge on animals or stop cooperating with forest officials.

9. Changes in Farming and Livelihoods

Over time, repeated damage forces farmers to change their behavior. Some stop growing high-value crops and switch to less profitable but safer crops like millets or tubers. Others leave farming altogether and migrate to cities for work. Some villages request to be relocated, especially if they are in highly conflict-prone zones. But relocation requires building new homes, getting new jobs, and settling in new

areas—which is expensive and difficult. The long-term impact of relocation on people's income and well-being must be considered carefully**.**

10. Effects on Poor and Vulnerable Groups

Poor and landless people face the highest risk. They often live on the edge of forests and cannot afford to lose crops or animals. Many of them do not have official land titles, so they are not eligible for compensation. Women, elderly people, and disabled persons suffer even more as they have fewer resources to recover from losses. Without proper support, these families fall deeper into poverty. The economic impact of HWC makes their lives even more unstable and insecure.

Human-Wildlife Conflict in the Western Ghats causes serious economic damage. It affects farmers, livestock owners, small businesses, and even entire communities. The poorest people suffer the most because they have fewer resources, no insurance, and limited access to support. Government compensation and protection efforts help, but they are not enough. There are delays, low payments, and gaps in coverage. To reduce the economic impact of HWC, we need better and faster support, more community involvement, and long-term planning. **Some important steps include:**

1. Timely and fair compensation for all affected families
2. Insurance schemes for crops and livestock in conflict-prone areas
3. Community-managed protection tools like fences and watch posts
4. Better income options like eco-tourism or forest-based jobs
5. Financial support and training for people who want to shift to safer livelihoods
6. Special help for women, elderly, and landless families who face higher risk

When people are financially secure and supported, they are more likely to live peacefully with wildlife. Helping communities earn stable incomes, protect their property, and recover from losses is key to reducing conflict. In the long run, economic stability and wildlife conservation must go hand in hand to ensure peaceful coexistence in places like the Western Ghats.

The following table 1 presents core parameters of Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC), structured under Human, Social, Cultural, and Economic dimensions. Each dimension includes representative keywords that highlight specific aspects for assessment, research, or policy action.

Dimension	HWC Parameter with Keywords					
Human	Impact on individuals and households	Livelihood loss	Risk perception	Health impacts	Displacement	Human fatalities
Social	Community and institutional interactions	Community response	Institutional trust	Gender roles	Social inequality	Collective action
Cultural	Beliefs, traditions, and heritage	Traditional beliefs	Sacred species	Forest rituals	Oral knowledge	Place attachment
Economic	Financial and asset-related impacts	Crop damage	Livestock loss	Compensation delay	Infrastructure damage	Poverty vulnerability

Table 1: HSCE Dimensions, HWC Parameters and Keywords

HWC and Mitigation Strategies in Western Ghats

Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) is a serious and growing issue in the Western Ghats, especially in the districts of Kodagu, Hassan, and Chikkamagaluru. These areas are rich in biodiversity and are home to a variety of wildlife, including elephants, leopards, wild boars, and gaurs. However, due to increasing human activities near forests, interactions between people and wildlife have become more frequent. These encounters often result in damage to crops, loss of livestock, destruction of property, injuries, and even deaths. At the same time, animals also face harm or are killed in retaliation. This situation creates fear, financial loss, and distrust among communities living close to forests.

The main cause of HWC in this region is habitat loss and fragmentation. Forests have been cut down or divided to make way for roads, farms, houses, and other infrastructure. As a result, the natural paths that animals use for movement are blocked. Animals like elephants and leopards are forced to enter villages and farmland in search of food, water, and space. Farmers in these areas often grow crops such as banana, maize, coffee, and areca near forest boundaries, which are attractive to wild animals. These crops are easy to access and provide high nutrition, making them prime targets for crop-raiding by elephants and wild boars.

Climate change has also worsened the problem. Irregular rainfall and prolonged dry periods have reduced the availability of water and food in the forests. When their natural resources run out, animals have no option but to move into human-dominated landscapes. At the same time, the human population is growing, and more land is being used for farming and housing, bringing people even closer to wildlife habitats. All these factors have increased the frequency and severity of conflicts between humans and animals.

To address this growing problem, various mitigation strategies have been introduced. These strategies can be grouped into four main types: physical barriers, government or institutional measures, community-based approaches, and use of technology. Physical barriers are the most visible form of conflict prevention. Solar-powered electric fences are used in many areas to stop animals from entering farmlands. These fences are effective if maintained regularly, but many fall into disrepair due to lack of funds or support. Elephant-proof trenches are another method where deep ditches are dug along village boundaries to prevent entry. However, these too require regular maintenance. Rail fencing, which uses old railway tracks as barriers, has proven effective in high-conflict zones but is costly to implement.

Government agencies have also set up Rapid Response Teams (RRTs) to handle emergency situations. These teams are trained to safely drive animals back into the forest and help villagers during wildlife encounters. Compensation schemes are in place to provide financial support to those who suffer crop damage, livestock loss, or injury. However, many people complain that the process is slow and the payments are too low. There are also forest watch posts set up in strategic locations to monitor animal movement and send early warnings to nearby villages.

Community involvement is essential in making these strategies successful. In some places, Eco-Development Committees (EDCs) have been formed to involve villagers in conservation and conflict prevention. Local volunteers are trained to alert communities when wildlife is nearby and to help with mitigation. Awareness programs are also conducted to educate people on how to avoid danger and why it is important to protect wildlife. However, these programs often overlook women, who are usually more exposed to risk due to their roles in collecting firewood and water.

Technology is playing an increasing role in conflict management. Camera traps and drones are used to track animal movements. In some areas, elephants are fitted with GPS collars to allow real-time tracking. Mobile alerts and early warning systems are used to inform villagers of potential danger. These technological solutions can be very effective, but they require funding, skilled staff, and regular updates to stay functional.

Despite these efforts, several challenges remain. Many protective structures like fences and trenches are not maintained properly. Once damaged, they become useless and animals can easily enter. Compensation procedures are slow and complicated, discouraging people from applying. Many strategies are designed without consulting local communities, making them less effective. People feel left out and lose trust in the authorities. Gender is another ignored issue. Women face unique risks but are rarely included in planning and decision-making. Most importantly, the root cause—loss of natural habitat—continues as forests are cleared for development.

To improve the situation, a more inclusive and long-term approach is needed. Development activities, agricultural expansion, and conservation plans should be aligned to ensure wildlife corridors are preserved. Local communities must be actively involved in identifying problems and creating solutions.

Women, youth, and marginalized groups should be given a voice in these discussions. Compensation must be timely, fair, and easy to access. Forest department staff need better training, more resources, and improved mobility to respond quickly to emergencies. Finally, conflict mitigation must be based on data and feedback. Monitoring systems should not only track wildlife movement but also assess the effectiveness of strategies and listen to community experiences. Human-Wildlife Conflict in the Western Ghats is a serious and growing challenge that affects both people and animals. While various strategies have been implemented, the success of these efforts depends on regular maintenance, local participation, strong institutions, and sustainable land-use planning. By combining physical protection, smart technology, active community involvement, and policy support, it is possible to reduce conflicts and build peaceful coexistence between people and wildlife in this ecologically important region.

The table 2 below outlines the key reasons behind Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) in the Western Ghats and presents corresponding mitigation strategies aimed at promoting coexistence and reducing conflict impacts**.**

Sl. No	Reason for HWC	Corresponding Mitigation Strategy
1	Habitat fragmentation due to roads, settlements, and dams	Creation and protection of wildlife corridors; landscape-level planning
2	Expansion of agriculture near forest areas	Regulated land-use planning; crop selection guidance; buffer zones
3	Crop raiding by elephants, wild boars, gaurs	Solar fencing, elephant-proof trenches, rail barricades
4	Livestock predation by leopards and tigers	Improved livestock sheds; night enclosures; community vigilance
5	Climate change reducing forest water and food resources	Restoration of degraded habitats; water source creation inside forests
6	Lack of community involvement in planning	Participatory approaches; Eco-Development Committees (EDCs)
7	Limited awareness about safe practices and legal rights	Community awareness programs; school education; workshops
8	Retaliatory actions due to frustration	Conflict resolution support; grievance redressal cells; counseling
9	Gendered vulnerability in conflict-prone zones	Inclusive planning with women and marginalized groups

Table 2 HWC Reasons and Mitigation Strategies

Mitigation Strategies impact on Human, Social Cultural Economic Dimensions

Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) is a growing issue in the Western Ghats, where people living near forests frequently face challenges due to wild animals entering farms, homes, or villages. To reduce the damage and promote peaceful coexistence, various mitigation strategies have been introduced. These strategies include physical barriers, compensation, community involvement, and technology-based monitoring. The impact of these efforts is not limited to preventing conflict—it also affects human

wellbeing, social relationships, cultural beliefs, and economic stability. This section explains how these strategies influence the four major dimensions: human, social, cultural, and economic.

1. Human Dimension

Mitigation strategies directly affect the safety, security, and everyday life of people living in high-conflict areas. Physical barriers like solar-powered electric fencing, elephant-proof trenches, and rail barricades are among the most used methods. These reduce the chances of wild animals like elephants, wild boars, or gaurs entering farmlands. When these barriers work effectively, people feel safer, especially at night. They can sleep peacefully without guarding their fields, and women and children can move around with less fear.

Rapid Response Teams (RRTs) are another important step. These trained forest department teams respond quickly when animals enter villages. Their presence builds confidence among local people and reduces panic. Early warning systems—such as mobile SMS alerts or announcements from forest watch towers—help families prepare in advance by staying indoors or protecting their livestock.

Compensation is also a critical part of the human dimension. When people lose crops, livestock, or even suffer injury, the government offers financial support. In areas where compensation is given quickly and fairly, it reduces stress and improves people's trust in the system. However, where delays happen or payments are too low, it can lead to anger and frustration. Overall, when people feel supported and protected, they are more willing to cooperate in conflict mitigation efforts.

2. Social Dimension

On the social front, mitigation strategies help build cooperation and trust among communities and between people and forest departments. Earlier, many villagers felt left out or ignored during wildlife emergencies. Now, with the introduction of community-based approaches like Eco-Development Committees (EDCs), people are getting involved in managing conflict themselves.

These EDCs and local volunteer groups play an important role in monitoring wildlife movement, maintaining fences, and sharing updates. This encourages collective responsibility and strengthens social unity. People from different backgrounds—farmers, youth, and even retired elders—work together to find solutions. This kind of cooperation builds stronger community networks and reduces internal tensions.

Public awareness programs also help communities understand the importance of wildlife and conservation. Forest officials and NGOs organize workshops, school visits, and village meetings to explain safety practices and legal responsibilities. As a result, people's attitudes are changing. Instead of blaming or attacking wild animals, many now try to understand the reasons behind conflict and look for peaceful ways to handle it.

However, there are still gaps. In some areas, women and marginalized groups are not included in planning or decision-making. Making conflict mitigation more inclusive would further improve social outcomes and ensure all voices are heard.

3. Cultural Dimension

Culture and tradition play a big role in how communities view wildlife. In the Western Ghats, many communities have long-standing respect for animals like elephants and snakes. These animals are part of local religious beliefs and are often seen as sacred. But frequent losses and danger due to conflict can reduce this respect and increase fear or resentment toward wildlife.

Mitigation strategies that respect and involve cultural beliefs are more effective. For example, some awareness campaigns are conducted through temple committees or involve village elders who are respected as knowledge holders. This helps bring back traditional values of coexistence and harmony with nature.

Some communities still maintain sacred groves—patches of forest preserved for religious reasons. When these areas are protected through community-based conservation programs, it helps preserve not only biodiversity but also cultural heritage. Cultural practices like forest festivals, rituals, and storytelling traditions are being integrated into modern conservation efforts. This approach strengthens people's emotional and spiritual connection to forests and wildlife.

On the other hand, top-down policies that ignore or disrupt cultural traditions may face resistance. For example, forcing changes in land use without consulting local people can damage trust. Hence, aligning mitigation with local customs and traditions supports both conservation and cultural identity.

4. Economic Dimension

The economic impact of mitigation strategies is one of the most important aspects of HWC management. Crop loss is one of the biggest economic damages caused by wildlife, especially elephants, wild boars, and gaurs. In areas with functioning fences and barriers, farmers report fewer losses and more stable incomes. They can plan their agricultural activities with more confidence.

Protecting livestock from predators like leopards or bears also helps families who depend on milk, meat, or poultry for their income. Stronger animal sheds, night enclosures, and village-based watch systems have helped reduce such losses. Compensation for damaged crops or killed livestock is also crucial. When people receive timely and fair compensation, it prevents them from falling into debt or selling their assets.

Some mitigation programs also create job opportunities. Local people are hired to build fences, work in Rapid Response Teams, or take part in eco-tourism projects. This adds a new source of income for rural

families and links conservation with economic development. In areas where conservation-related tourism is promoted, villagers benefit by working as guides, drivers, or hosts in homestays.

However, the benefits are not always equal. Landless laborers, tenant farmers, and tribal communities often receive less support because they lack land ownership documents or access to government systems. Making compensation schemes more inclusive and fair is necessary to support these vulnerable groups. Diversifying rural livelihoods through forest-based crafts, small-scale industries, and eco-tourism can help reduce dependency on risky farming in conflict-prone zones.

Mitigation strategies in the Western Ghats are not just about fences and warnings—they impact people's lives in many ways. On the human level, they improve safety and reduce fear. Socially, they build cooperation and trust. Culturally, they help revive respect for nature and traditional knowledge. Economically, they protect livelihoods and reduce losses. To make these strategies work better, it is important to involve communities in every stage—from planning to maintenance.

Including women, the poor, and tribal groups in decision-making will ensure that solutions are fair and practical. Compensation must be delivered quickly and without complications. Local knowledge and cultural values should be respected and used to strengthen conservation. With a balanced and inclusive approach, mitigation can reduce conflict, support rural development, and protect wildlife in one of India's most valuable ecological landscapes.

Table 3 showing how different mitigation strategies impact the Human, Social, Cultural, and Economic dimensions of Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) in the Western Ghats:

Mitigation Strategies	Human Dimension	Social Dimension	Cultural Dimension	Economic Dimension
Solar Fencing & Rail Barriers	Increases physical safety; reduces night-time fear and injuries	Encourages collective guarding and maintenance	Promotes community ownership but may lack cultural integration	Reduces crop damage; protects livelihood; requires maintenance investment
Elephant-proof Trenches	Prevents animal intrusion; improves peace of mind	Involves community labor; promotes shared responsibility	Limited cultural impact unless locally maintained	Reduces property damage; lowers repair costs; one-time high cost
Rapid Response Teams (RRTs)	Offers emergency support; reduces casualties and fear	Builds trust between community and forest officials	May be seen as external help without traditional context	Minimizes loss escalation; reduces compensation burden
Compensation Schemes	Provides relief after damage; reduces emotional distress	Reduces social tension over losses; supports fairness	May neglect sacred value of affected species/land	Helps stabilize income after loss; delays reduce effectiveness
Eco-Development Committees	Empowers locals to protect themselves	Enhances local governance; strengthens collaboration	Recognizes traditional roles; revives shared rituals	Creates income opportunities through conservation-linked employment

Mitigation Strategies	Human Dimension	Social Dimension	Cultural Dimension	Economic Dimension
Community Awareness Programs	Educates on risks; promotes coexistence behavior	Improves social preparedness; encourages community dialogue	Revives cultural respect for animals and forests	Indirectly reduces economic loss by preventing risky behavior
Camera Traps & GPS Collars	Enables early warning; enhances personal decision-making	Encourages local participation in monitoring	Generally technical; limited direct cultural role	Avoids sudden losses; cost-effective long-term if managed well
Mobile Alerts & Early Warnings	Enhances safety and preparedness; reduces panic	Strengthens information flow and social cooperation	Has limited direct cultural relevance	Reduces reaction time and economic damage through timely action
Livestock Enclosures & Sheds	Reduces risk of predation; improves animal care	Encourages shared building responsibility	Often built respecting local housing pra	

Table 3: Mitigation Strategy impact on HSCE Dimensions

Conclusion

Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) is a serious problem in the Western Ghats, especially in the districts of Kodagu, Chikkamagaluru, and Hassan. As forests shrink and human settlements expand, wild animals like elephants, leopards, wild boars, and gaurs come into closer contact with people. These interactions often lead to damaged crops, killed livestock, destroyed property, injuries, and even human deaths. The increase in such incidents has made life difficult for many people living near forests. Several reasons contribute to HWC. These include habitat loss, broken wildlife corridors, growing farms near forests, climate change, and poor maintenance of barriers like fences or trenches. Delays in compensation and lack of involvement of local communities in planning also add to the problem. Because of all this, conflict has become more frequent and more dangerous.

To reduce the impact of HWC, different types of mitigation strategies have been used. Physical barriers like solar fences, elephant trenches, and rail barricades are built to keep animals out of farms. Forest departments have created Rapid Response Teams (RRTs) to help in emergencies. Compensation is offered to people who suffer crop, livestock, or property loss. Other efforts include using camera traps, GPS collars, and mobile alerts to monitor and warn about animal movement. Communities are also involved through Eco-Development Committees (EDCs), village-level volunteers, and awareness programs.

These strategies affect people in many ways. On the human level, they improve safety and reduce fear. When fences and early warning systems work well, people feel more secure and can sleep peacefully. Emergency teams and alerts also help save lives and prevent further damage. Compensation gives some relief to those who suffer losses, though delays remain a major issue.

On the social level, involving local people in planning and protection has built trust and better cooperation between communities and forest officials. Villagers working together to monitor wildlife or fix fences also build stronger social bonds. Awareness campaigns have made people more informed and better prepared to deal with wildlife safely.

On the cultural level, some communities have a long history of respecting and living with wildlife. However, repeated damage and fear can change people's attitudes. When strategies respect local customs and involve elders or traditional leaders, they help restore these cultural values. Protecting sacred groves or involving temples in awareness efforts has made some programs more effective.

Economically, HWC causes serious damage to farmers and livestock owners. Strategies like fences and compensation help reduce losses. Some programs also create jobs, like building barriers, guiding tourists, or working in eco-development. However, not everyone benefits equally—poor, landless, and tribal families still face challenges in accessing support.

In conclusion, solving HWC in the Western Ghats needs a combined approach that includes physical safety, community involvement, fair compensation, and respect for local culture. When people and wildlife are both protected, it creates a path for peaceful coexistence and sustainable development in these forested landscapes.

References:

1. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC). (2021). Annual Report 2020–2021. Government of India. https://moef.gov.in
2. Sukumar, R. (2003). The living elephants: Evolutionary ecology, behavior, and conservation. Oxford University Press.
3. Rangarajan, M., Desai, A., Sukumar, R., Easa, P. S., Menon, V., Vincent, S., & Ganguly, S. (2010). Gajah: Securing the future for elephants in India. Report by the Elephant Task Force, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India.
4. World Wide Fund for Nature–India (WWF-India). (2020). Human-Wildlife Conflict Mitigation: Best Practices from India. WWF-India Conservation Series.
5. Karnataka Forest Department. (2018). Mitigation Measures for Human-Elephant Conflict in Karnataka: A Strategic Plan. Government of Karnataka.
6. 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(4), 466–475. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-002-2809-4
7. Ogra, M. V. (2008). Human-wildlife conflict and gender in protected area borderlands: A case study of costs, perceptions, and vulnerabilities from Uttarakhand (Uttaranchal), India. Geoforum, 39(3), 1408–1422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2007.12.004
8. Peterson, M. N., Birckhead, J. L., Leong, K., Peterson, M. J., & Peterson, T. R. (2010). Rearticulating the myth of human-wildlife conflict. Conservation Letters, 3(2), 74–82. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2010.00099.x

9. Anand, S., & Radhakrishna, S. (2017). Investigating trends in human-wildlife conflict: Is conflict escalation real or imagined? Journal of Threatened Taxa, 9(10), 10899–10904. https://doi.org/10.11609/jott.3027.9.10.10899-10904

10. Nijhawan, S., Kumar, A., & Bhagwat, S. (2021). Elephant-human coexistence in India: Mapping patterns of conflict and tolerance. Ambio, 50(3), 567–578. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-020-01361-1

11. WWF-India & UNDP. (2021). People and Wildlife: Conflict to Coexistence. A toolkit for practitioners.

12. Wildlife Conservation Society–India (WCS-India). (2019). Reducing Human-Wildlife Conflict through Community Participation: Case studies from Western Ghats. WCS India Publications.

13. Naughton-Treves, L., Grossberg, R., & Treves, A. (2003). Paying for tolerance: Rural citizens' attitudes toward wolf depredation and compensation. Conservation Biology, 17(6), 1500–1511.

14. King, L. E., Lala, F., Nzumu, H., Mwambingu, E., & Douglas-Hamilton, I. (2017). Beehive fences as a multidimensional conflict-mitigation tool for farmers coexisting with elephants. Conservation Biology, 31(4), 743–752.

15. Barua, M., Bhagwat, S. A., & Jadhav, S. (2013). The hidden dimensions of human–wildlife conflict: Health impacts, opportunity and transaction costs. Biological Conservation, 157, 309–316.

16. Madden, F. (2004). Creating coexistence between humans and wildlife: Global perspectives on local efforts to address human–wildlife conflict. Human Dimensions of Wildlife, 9(4), 247–257.

17. Treves, A., Wallace, R. B., Naughton-Treves, L., & Morales, A. (2006). Co-managing human–wildlife conflicts: A review. Human Dimensions of Wildlife, 11(6), 383–396

18. Galvin, K. A., Beeton, T. A., & Luizza, M. W. (2018). African community-based conservation: A systematic review of social and ecological outcomes. Ecology and Society, 23(3), 39.

19. Zimmermann, A., Davies, T. E., Hazarika, N., Chakrabarty, J., & Das, D. (2019). Effectiveness of intervention methods against crop-raiding elephants. Conservation Letters, 12(5), e12679.

20. Pooley, S., Barua, M., Beinart, W., Dickman, A., Holmes, G., Lorimer, J., ... & Sillero-Zubiri, C. (2017). An interdisciplinary review of current and future approaches to improving human–predator relations. Conservation Biology, 31(3), 513–523

21. Berthet, B., Nyirenda, V. R., & Lindsey, P. A. (2021). Human-wildlife conflict mitigation impacts community perceptions around Kibale National Park, Uganda. Diversity, 13(4), 145. https://doi.org/10.3390/d13040145

22. Munyasi, C., Ringo, D., & Mwamfupe, D. (2024). Community perspectives on existence of human-wildlife conflicts and mitigation measures in Northern Tanzania. Human Ecology, 52(2), 355–368. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-024-00555-1

23. Beyene, S. T., Tesfaye, D. G., & Hailu, B. T. (2022). Human-wildlife conflict and community perceptions towards wildlife conservation in Ethiopia: A case of grivet monkeys (Chlorocebus aethiops). BMC Zoology, 7(1), Article 15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40850-022-00154-5

24. Bhattarai, S., Baral, H. S., & Devkota, B. P. (2024). Prioritizing human-wildlife conflict management strategies through importance-performance analysis: A case study of Chitwan National Park, Nepal. Journal for Nature Conservation, 77, 126249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2024.126249

25. Zhang, Y., Wang, H., & Li, Y. (2024). A bibliometric review of global research on human-wildlife conflicts: Trends, hotspots, and future directions. Frontiers in Environmental Science, 12, 1517218. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2024.1517218