# IMPACTS OF ECOTOURISM & ANTHROPOGENIC PRESSURES ON THE MAMMALIAN FAUNA OF PENCH NATIONAL PARK AT SEONI, (M.P.)

Dr. T.P. Sagar Department of Zoology Govt. P.G. College Seoni (M.P.)

ABSTRACT: Present study impacts of ecotourism and anthropogenic pressures on mammalian fauna of Pench national Park, district Seoni in the state of Madhya Pradesh, India, was carried out from January 2023 to December 2023 along with the department of forest of Seoni. The Pench National Park is one of the largest protected areas with rich flora and fauna on the Satpura foothill. Extensive field studies related to biodiversity in the Pench Tiger Reserve comprises the Indira Priyadarshini Pench National Park, the Pench Mowgli Sanctuary and a buffer. The whole national park was divided into two zones for this study, zone A and zone B where the tourists would be frequenting. Zone A and zone B were further divided into five sub zones. The study was carried out on Sunday and Wednesday of first week of every month. Sunday being a holiday when there would be many visitors to the Pench National park and Wednesday, when the national park would be closed for visitors. The observations were taken from the watch- towers near the artificial water- holes in all the five sub-zones, set up by forest department for assessing mammalian population in the park. The data regarding tourists were collected from the forest department office and co-related with mammalian observations and were analyzed. Trends showed, the impacts of ecotourism, is species specific, with some species increasing in number and some others decreasing in density, while some others remained unaffected. When tourists were more, some mammals changed behavior some got habituated to human presence. This in effect may lead to ecological changes in a long run. If the animals are exposed to a longer period of human disturbances, it may even change the floristic make -up of the entire area. So it was concluded that seeing the possible negative impacts of ecotourism and anthropogenic pressures on mammalian fauna of such parks, the government should formulate such policies and strategies' so as to minimize the negative impacts on the wild life and their conservation.

**KEYWORDS:** Ecotourism, Pench National park, Conservation, Mammalian Fauna, Human - Disturbances.

#### INTRODUCTION:-

Diversity is the spice of life is an old saying. Biological diversity has been the back bone of human food, health and livelihood security system, ever since human civilization started. Diversity is also an index of ecosystem wellbeing. The scientist considers biological diversity as a concept encompassing all the species of plants, animal and micro-organisms and the ecosystem and ecological processes of which they are parts. Flora and fauna are incredible and price less gifts of nature. Nature has been generous enough in India in providing a rich variety of flora and fauna which constitutes the wildlife. India has a rich heritage of wildlife as well as a long history and tradition of conservation. The conservation ethic was imbibed in the sylvan surroundings of the ashrams of our sages which were the seats of learning in the country's ancient past.

Ecotourism, as defined by The International Ecotourism Society (TIES) is the responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the wildlife, environment and the well-being of the local people. It is a form of tourism involving fragile, pristine, and relatively undisturbed natural areas. This tourism has grown dramatically in recent years. The contribution of ecotourism to country's economy has increased significantly. It has been established as a solution for conserving wild flora and fauna and development while providing economic growth for people living in and around protected areas as studied by Wells and Brandon (1992). It creates serious socio-economic effects as suggested by Rajat and Aruna, (2014) and Bassam & Mujeeb Rehman, (2016). Similarly ecotourism deeply penetrates on the regional economy as explained by Madhusudan Karmakar (2011). Though ecotourism is increasing in popularity, little information exists on protected areas as informed by Boo (1990).

In India, ecotourism has developed quite recently, as India offers enormous diversity in topography, natural resources and climate. The most significant feature of ecotourism industry in India is its capacity to generate large scale- employment, especially in remote and under- developed areas. It focuses on local cultures, adventures and environmental protection. As has been studied by Aberham et al. (2017) about the attitudes and practices of local people towards wildlife in Ethiopia. Human wildlife conflict asserts a major role in the ecotourism of any place as confirmed by Bezihalem et al.(2017). Human traffic has quite adverse impacts on the wildlife as mentioned and described by Dadem et al. (2018) in their study of anthropogenic pressure on wildlife in National park in Cameroon, and by Griffiths and Shaik (1993) on the abundance and activity periods of Sumatran Rain Forest. Wells & Katrina (1992) made links between the protected area management, conservation with local communities. Ecotourism can have a vital role in conservation of wildlife as well, as has been mentioned by Ben- Yehuda (2018) and Dhookia et al. (2009). Kruger (2005) also studied and stressed the role of ecotorism in conservation. Misra et al. (2006) assessed the threats and conservation needs and found co-relation in their study of mammals of high altitudes of Arunachal Pradesh. Vladimir and Hall (2018) and also Clarke (2016) made special notes on mammal watching in protected areas and confirmed it to be a new support for science and conservation strategies. Okech (2003) bonded economy with ecotourism and showed the high amount of benefits in the case study of ecotourism in Kenya. But ecotourism can have adverse effects too on wildlife, by causing changes in their behavior, physiology or damaging their habitats. The presence of tourists may frighten animals and have negative effects on breeding and other aspects of their life.(Knight and Cole 1995). The presence of humans changes the way, animals behave and these changes may make them more vulnerable to poachers etc. The presence of humans (tourists) can also discourage natural predators, creating a kind of safe haven for smaller animals that may make them bolder.

Interacting or the presence of humans can cause significant changes in the characteristics of various species over time .Ecotourism has effects similar to those of animals domestication and urbanization.

Regular interaction between people and animals may lead to habituation, a kind of taming. The study has shown the jackal or fox for that matter have become more docile and less fearful, a process that results from evolutionary changes, but also from regular interactions with humans. It can be hoped, this study would encourage more research on mammalian fauna and their interactions with tourists visiting this Pench tiger reserve ecopark at Seoni.

### Study Area

Pench National Park or Tiger Reserve is one of the premier tiger reserves of India and the only one to straddle across two states - Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra. Ordinarily, the reference to Pench is mostly always to the tiger reserve in Madhya Pradesh. The portion of the reserve that is in Madhya Pradesh is nestled in the southern slopes of the Satpura range of Central India. Pench Tiger Reserve comprises the Indira Privadarshini Pench National Park, the Pench Mowgli Sanctuary and a buffer. It derives its name from its life line-the River Pench. Inside the park, the river flows from North to South before going on to join the Kanhan River, while splitting the Park into two, and forming the of Seoni District and Chhindwara District districts of Madhya Pradesh. The Meghdoot dam built across Pench River at Totladoh has created a large water body of 72 km<sup>2</sup> out of which 54 km<sup>2</sup> falls in M.P. and rest in the adjoining state of Maharashtra. The Pench River which emerges from Mahadeo Hills of Satpuda Ranges and the various nallas and streams which drain into it, all flow through the forests of Protected Area. The Satpuda ranges which bear the forests of the Protected Area act as an excellent watershed area for the Totladoh as well as lower Pench Reservoirs. On the Madhya Pradesh side, the Pench Tiger Reserve encompasses a core area of 411.33 km<sup>2</sup>, with a buffer of 768.3 km<sup>2</sup>., making for a total protected area of 1179.63 km<sup>2</sup>. The core area includes the Mowgli Pench Wildlife Sanctuary whose area is 118.30 km<sup>2</sup>. Zone is constituted by Reserve Forests, Protected Forests and Revenue land. Located south of the tiger reserve area in Madhya Pradesh, is the Pench Tiger Reserve, Maharashtra. On the Maharashtra side, the Pench Tiger Reserve has a core habitat area of 257.3 km<sup>2</sup> along with a buffer/peripheral area of 483.96 km<sup>2</sup>. of the Mansinghdeo Sanctuary, making for

a total protected area 741.2 km<sup>2</sup>.

This ecopark is home to various kinds of mammalian fauna, namely, fox(Vulpes bengalesis), jackal (Canis acereus), nilgai or blue bull (Boselaphus tragocamelus), chinkara (Gazella bennetti), wild boar (Sus scrofa) porcupine (Hystrix indica indica) and hyena (Hyaena hyaena). The forest type is tropical dry deciduous and has many types of hybrid fodder species, like salar (Bose wellia serrata), kherni (Wrightia tincteria), kher(acacia catechu), ber (Ziziphus mauritiana), palas (Butea monosperma), dhawda (Anogeissus pendula), gory dhawan (Anogeissus latifolia) and many types of wild grass. The location of the study area is shown in the figure-1.

### **OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY:-**

The main objective of this study is to assess the impacts of Ecotourism and Anthropogenic pressures on the mammalian fauna of Pench tiger reserve at Seoni, and to suggest ways and means to minimize such impacts.

#### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE:-**

Ecotourism may have major effects on wildlife survival and reproduction for species and population in conservation reserves where wildlife survives only in protected areas, increased disturbances from ecotourists and other wildlife watchers, especially during critical periods such as, breeding, migration may have significant consequences for conservation of species concerned. Disturbance to wildlife from sight, sound or smell of humans has been recorded for a wild range of species. Physiological indicators of stress, such a temperature and heart beat rate, are also affected by such disturbances, as experimented by Gabriel sen and Smith (1995). MacArthur et al.(1982) used remote telemetry to detect increases in heart rate of mountain bighorn sheep approached by hikers. Increases of up to 20 beats/ min. were recorded. When the wildlife species are disturbed by ecotourist, the first signs are behavioural changes like alertness or change in vocalizations as studied by Pedevillano and Wright (1987) and Grieser- Johns (1996). Perhaps the most commonly reported response to human disturbances, specially by larger mammals in open terrain, is simply, to move away as described by Buckley (2003). Tourist traffic may be a significant contributor to road-kill in many areas as declared by Gunther et al. (1998). Disturbance from tourism can affect the energy balance of affected animals as described by Moen (1976). Tourists disturbances to breeding has been recorded for a range of species. Thomsons gazelle, for example leave breeding areas if disturbed, reducing their reproductive success. Kangaroos, if disturbed ejects their joeys from the pouch as mentioned by Stuart- Dick (1987). Similary wolves & coyotes move their pups to different dens as conformed by Harrison and Gilbert (1985). There are hundreds and thousands of wildlife species worldwide, which are watched and approached by tourists, behave differently on different place, at different occasions and different conditions.

### **CONCEPTS AND HYPOTHESIS:-**

The study had following hypothesis: (a) Ecotourism and anthropogenic pressures has more of negative impacts on the behavioural patterns of mammalian fauna. (b) Ecotourism affects the population densities of mammals. (c) Ecotourism may alter the floristic makeup of an area due to altered patterns of seed dispersal.

### **METHODOLOGY:-**

This study was carried out from January 2023 to December 2023, incorporating firstly, the flagship method ie water-hole method for counting and establishing mammalian diversity, along with direct observations. The counting process was done biannually, first in the month of May- 2023 and secondly in the month of November 2023. The eco-park was divided majorly in two zones A and B and further divided into five sub-zones, as per the local names, namely, Turia, Karmajhiri, Jamtara, Telia and Rukhad, these five sub- zones had in each, an artificial water-hole, where the animals would frequent for drinking water and thus, census being done.

Zone A has an ancient temple, where hoards of visitors from the nearby villages and city dwellers would come to pray and perform rituals and also for watching wildlife in the eco-park. Zone B has Swiss-tents, set up by the forest department for tourists. The observations were taken from watch-towers at each water-hole. The behaviorial study of mammals was done on Sunday and Wednesday of first week of every month. Sunday, being a holiday, the eco-park would be flooded with visitors

whereas on Wednesday, there would be no visitors or very few visitors as the eco-park use to be closed weekly on Wednesday. The data of the tourist were collected from the forest department office, as every visitor had to take a ticket to enter into the eco-park. In order to get a fair knowledge of the study area, exploration surveys were carried out in the early months of the study period, throughout the eco-park. A few conventional methods of observations, like trail sampling, sign surveys, pug-marks, faeces, digging and territorial markings, showing the presence of animals were used.

Along with it, we interviewed the forest staff at the ecopark and the villagers living nearby regarding mammals. The villagers were also shown photographs of the animals, to create awareness about the mammalian diversity of the study area. (Misra et al.2006) We also kept a regular note on the vehicular disturbances and noise created by the vehicles passing through the ecopark going to the temple. Thus, this way we carried out the study during the entire study period and data

collected at all possible fronts.

#### **RESULTS:-**

During the study, we recorded seven species of mammals. Out of which, chinkara or Indian gazelle (Gazella bennetti), which has already been included in the Red list of IUCN as LRNT (low risk near threatened) in 2000 as mentioned by Dhookia et al (2009) was found to be decreasing in number from 77 in May 2022 to 66 in November 2022 census. This may be due to the reason that chinkara being small and shy animal, could not adapt itself to the field crop, as their favourite food is green lush grass. They are mainly grazers depending on the ground food, unlike other herbivores, nilgai and wild boar. Nilgai grew in number from 215 to 231 during this period. The carnivores, jackal and fox also grew in number from 154 to 159 and 14 to 19 respectively. Wild boar decreased in number from 38 to 35 owing to likely predation, possible poaching or vehicular accidents. Porcupine population was found to be stable in both the seasons, as shown in table-1.

Table - 1 Population - Count of Mammals in Year 2023 (Dry & Wet Season)

| Sr. | Mammals    | Jackal |      | Hyena |     | Fox |     | Nilgai |     | Chinkara |     | Wild Boar |     | Porsupine |     |
|-----|------------|--------|------|-------|-----|-----|-----|--------|-----|----------|-----|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|
| No  | Name of    | May    | Nov. | May   | Nov | May | Nov | May    | Nov | May      | Nov | May       | Nov | May       | Nov |
|     | Zone       |        |      |       |     |     |     |        |     |          |     |           |     |           |     |
| 1   | Turia      | 33     | 15   | 0     | 1   | 2   | 1   | 60     | 62  | 8        | 7   | 0         | 5   | 0         | 0   |
| 2   | Karmajhiri | 26     | 28   | 0     | 0   | 5   | 6   | 33     | 39  | 15       | 14  | 9         | 7   | 2         | 1   |
| 3   | Jamtara    | 30     | 34   | 2     | 0   | 0   | 1   | 15     | 28  | 10       | 15  | 7         | 8   | 0         | 1   |
| 4   | Telia      | 45     | 42   | 0     | 0   | 5   | 4   | 44     | 40  | 26       | 17  | 14        | 8   | 0         | 0   |
| 5   | Rukhad     | 20     | 40   | 0     | 0   | 2   | 7   | 63     | 62  | 18       | 13  | 8         | 7   | 0         | 0   |
|     | Total      | 154    | 159  | 2     | 1   | 14  | 19  | 215    | 231 | 77       | 66  | 38        | 35  | 2         | 2   |

Table -2: Mammals Diversity Anthropogenic Impact Pench National Park in Dry-Season (May-2023)

| Sr. |                      |            |           | Sun | day (With | Tourist )    |              | Wednesday (Without Tourist) |            |           |     |            |              |              |                   |
|-----|----------------------|------------|-----------|-----|-----------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------|------------|-----------|-----|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|
| No. | Mammals Name of zone | Jac<br>kal | Hyen<br>a | Fox | Nilgai    | Chink<br>ara | Wild<br>boar | Por-<br>cupine              | Jack<br>al | Hyen<br>a | Fox | Nilga<br>i | Chink<br>ara | Wild<br>boar | Por<br>cup<br>ine |
| 1   | Turia                | 3          | 1         | 3   | 4         | 2            | 2            | 0                           | 4          | 0         | 0   | 5          | 1            | 1            | 1                 |
| 2   | Karmajhiri           | 2          | 0         | 3   | 4         | 4            | 1            | 0                           | 2          | 0         | 2   | 2          | 5            | 1            | 0                 |
| 3   | Jamtara              | 2          | 0         | 2   | 2         | 3            | 1            | 0                           | 3          | 0         | 3   | 4          | 6            | 0            | 0                 |
| 4   | Telia                | 4          | 0         | 0   | 2         | 3            | 0            | 0                           | 3          | 1         | 2   | 2          | 2            | 2            | 0                 |
| 5   | Rukhad               | 0          | 0         | 0   | 3         | 2            | 0            | 0                           | 3          | 0         | 4   | 4          | 4            | 2            | 0                 |
|     | Total                | 11         | 1         | 8   | 15        | 14           | 4            | 0                           | 15         | 1         | 11  | 17         | 18           | 6            | 1                 |

Table-3: Mammals Diversity Anthropogenic Impact Pench National Park in Wet Season (Nov-2023)

| Sr. |            |     |      | Suno | day (Wit | h Tourist | )    |        | Wednesday (Without Tourist) |      |     |       |        |      |      |  |
|-----|------------|-----|------|------|----------|-----------|------|--------|-----------------------------|------|-----|-------|--------|------|------|--|
| No  | Mammals    | Jac | Hyen | Fox  | Nilga    | Chink     | Wild | Porcup | Jac                         | Hyen | Fox | Nilga | Chinka | Wild | Porc |  |
|     | Name of    | kal | a    |      | i        | ara       | boar | ine    | kal                         | a    |     | i     | ra     | boar | upin |  |
|     | zone       |     |      |      |          |           |      |        |                             |      |     |       |        |      | e    |  |
| 1   | Turia      | 5   | 0    | 4    | 2        | 0         | 3    | 0      | 6                           | 0    | 3   | 5     | 4      | 2    | 0    |  |
| 2   | Karmajhiri | 6   | 0    | 3    | 5        | 5         | 2    | 0      | 4                           | 0    | 5   | 5     | 2      | 1    | 1    |  |
| 3   | Jamtara    | 2   | 0    | 3    | 6        | 4         | 2    | 0      | 3                           | 0    | 2   | 7     | 6      | 3    | 0    |  |
| 4   | Telia      | 3   | 0    | 1    | 3        | 8         | 0    | 1      | 2                           | 1    | 3   | 8     | 6      | 1    | 0    |  |
| 5   | Rukhad     | 1   | 0    | 1    | 7        | 3         | 0    | 0      | 2                           | 0    | 1   | 2     | 4      | 2    | 0    |  |
|     | Total      | 17  | 0    | 12   | 23       | 20        | 7    | 1      | 17                          | 1    | 14  | 27    | 22     | 9    | 1    |  |

We also observed that the population of mammals at the eco-park varied on Sundays (with more visitors) and on Wednesday (without tourists) in any given month, at all the five different water-holes, in both the seasons (dry & wet), as shown in the table 2&3.

In the dry- season, we observed that the species got restricted around the water-holes than in the wet-season. On the other hand, we also noted that during wet-season, when the grasses and other fodder species becomes bountiful, mammal herd- sizes increased, while in the dry-season, when the resource availability and quality of forage declines, the mammals were found to be dispersing into small family units, hereby decreasing herd sizes.

The other observations, worth nothing were that the density of chinkara (*Gazella bennetti*) was found to be high at those points where the tourist's presence was more. It may be because these animals found humans very acceptable. The jackals were found to be howling at different times of the night differently at all the fives sub-zones. Few foxes were observed to be straying to the nearby villages occasionally. Nilgai were seen moving in groups and found grazing most of the time, especially in mornings and evenings. Their faeces were collected and studied for their eating habits. Wild – boars were seen sometimes in bunch of 3-4 whereas porcupine was traced with extreme difficulty with the help of forest observers.

### **CONCLUSION:-**

The study shows that encroachment of forest land anthropogenic disturbances seriously causes threat to

fauna of the park. Based on the theory that ecotourism is growing rapidly and the observations made by this study, it is important to determine the impacts of ecotourism on the mammalian fauna in a protected area such as this Pench National eco-park at Seoni, in the state of Madhya Pradesh. Ecotourism has great potential for negative impacts on wildlife as tourists wish to see rare species, incidentally or purposely, during sensitive times, such as breeding or nesting as mentioned by Knight and Cole (1995). It can be stressed that tourist cause negative impacts on movements, foraging and reproductive behavior of various mammals. Ecotourism impacts have resulted in abnormally high or low densities of some species in tourist areas, which can possibly lead to ecological change. Due to this reason there may be long term consequences on the floristic make-up of the area due to altered patterns of seed dispersal. These changes may have effects on the composition and functioning of the entire ecosystem. So, protected areas such as this national park, should develop management strategies to minimize the impacts of tourists on animals and wildlife in general and data of such studies can be used to formulate ecotourism development and conservation policies. Now numerous planning's are applicable and entry of peripheral population totally restricted.

### **SUGGESTIONS:-**

Seeing the tremendous future of ecotourism worldwide, Indian government should open more reserved and protected areas such as this Pench eco-park at Seoni. It should formulate such management strategies so as to minimize the negative impacts of ecotourism. As far as this Pench eco-park is concerned, more funds should be allotted for development of infrastructure like making

sustainable water – holes at more places, building proper watch- towers to observe mammals, develop more fencing to avoid poaching and felling of trees and start special drive of plantation of suitable fodder species to conserve the wildlife and their habitats.

### **REFERENCES:-**

**Impact Factor- 5.991** 

- 1. Aberham, M., Mundanthra, B. and Gurja, B. (2017). The attitudes and practices of local people towards wildlife in Chebera, Churchura national park, Ethiopia, International journal of Biodiversity and Conservation. Vol. 9 (2).pp. 45-55
- 2. Bassam, K. and Mujeeb Rehman. (2016) Social impacts of ecotourism in India. IJARIIE- ISSN (0) 2395-4396 Vol-2 Issue-6(2016)
- **3.** Behrend, D.F.and Lubeck, R.A. (1968) summer flight behavior of white-tailed dear in Adirondack forest. Journal of wildlife management 32,615-618
- **4.** Ben- yehuda T (2018). Records of mountain weasel in Ladakh, India (in press) Small carnivore conservation.
- 5. Bezihalem, N, Mesele, V. and Bewuketu, T. (2017) Human- wildlife conflict in Choke Mountains, Ethiopia. International journal of Biodiversity and Conservation. Vol. 9 (1) pp 1-8 January 2017.
- **6.** Boo, Elizabeth (1990) Ecotourism: The potential and pitfalls, wwf, Washington, DC.
- **7.** Buckley, R.C. (2003) Case studies in ecotourism CAB international, Wallingford, U.K.
- **8.** Clarke, R. (2016) some notes on mammal watching in south-west Australia Dadem,
- 9. G.C., Tehamba, N.M. and Tsi, E.A. (2018) Impacts of anthropogenic pressures on wildlife in northern sector of national park of Mbam and Djerem, Adamaou, Cameroon International journal of Biodiversity and Conservation. Vol. 10 (3) pp 145-153. March 2018
- 10. Dhookia,S., Rawat, M., Jakhar, G. and Dhookia, B. (2009). Status of Indian gazelle in Thar Desert of Rajasthan, India. Journal of Ecology and Conservation of Great Indian Desert 15: 193-206,
- **11.** Freddy, D.J., Bronaugh, W.M. and Fowler, M.C.(1986) Responses of mule deer to disturbances by persons afoot and snowmobile. Wildlife Society Bulletin 14, 63-68.
- **12.** Gabrielsen, G.W. and Smith, E.N. (1995) Physiological responses of wildlife to disturbances.

- **13.** Grieser- Johns, B.(1996) Responses of chimpanzees to habituation and tourism in the Kibale forest, Uganda. Biological conservation 18,257-262.
- **14.** Griffiths, M.and Van Shaik (1993). The impacts of human traffic on the abundance and activity periods of Sumatran Rain forest wildlife .Conservation Biology 7(3): 623-626
- **15.** Gunther, K.A., Beil, M.J. and Robinson, H.L. (1998) Factors influencing the frequency of road killed wildlife in Yellowstone National Park.
- **16.** Harrison, D.J. and Gilbert, J.R.(1985) Denning ecology and movements of coyotes in Maine during pup rearing. Journal of mammalogy 66,712-719.
- 17. Ikiara, M. and Okech, C.(2002) Impacts of ecotourism on environment in Kenya: Status and policy Knight, R. and David, N. Cole.(1995). Wildlife recreationists. Chapter 4 in Wildlife and recreationists:Co-existence through management and research.
- **18.** Kruger, O. (2005) The role of ecotourism in conservation . Biodiversity and conservation 14: 579-600,
- **19.** MacArthur, R.A. Giest, V. and Johnston, R.H. (1982) Cardiac and behavioural responses of mountain sheep to human disturbances. Journal of wildlife management 46, 351-358
- **20.** Madhusudan, K.(2011) Ecotourism and its impacts on regional economy. A Study of North Bengal, India.
- **21.** Misra, C. M.D. Madhusudhan and A. Dutta (2006). Mammals of high altitudes of western Arunachal Pradesh. An assessement of threats and conservation needs. Onyx. 40: 29-35
- **22.** Moen, A.N.(1979) Energy conservation by white-tailed deer in the winter. Ecology 57,192-198. Okech, R. (2003). Ecotourism and the economy: case study of Mara and Amboseli in Kenya. Journal of ecotourism .5: 9-13
- 23. Pedevillano, C and Wright, R.G.(1987) The influence of various visitors on mountain goat activities in Glacier National Park, Montana. Biological conservation 39, 1-11.
- 24. Rajat, B. and Aruna, D.R.(2014) Ecotourism and its Socio-Economic effects- A study for Jeypore rainforest. International Journal of scientific and Research Publication. Vol.4 (2) February 2014 Stuart-

- **25.** Dick,R.I.(1987) Parental investment in the eastern grey kangaroo. Ph.D. thesis, University of New England, Armidale, New South Wales.
- **26.** Vladimir Dinets and Jon Hall (2018). Mammal watching: A new source of support for science and conservation. Vol. 10(4) pp 154-160 April 2018. International Journal of Biodiversity and Conservation.
- **27.** Wells, M. and Katrina, B. (1992) People and parks: linking protected area management with local communities.