

Household Survey Results

Socio-Demography

Among the ethnic groups in Ghandruk, the *Gurung* group is dominant accounting for 64 per cent of the sampled households, whereas the ethnic composition in Ulleri village is predominated by the Magar community (100%). In the study area as a whole, the *Magar* community represents the highest proportion of sample households (52%), followed by the *Gurung* (32%) and traditional or occupational lower-caste families (Table 4.1). The total population of the surveyed households was 261 persons, giving an average household size of 5.3, with little difference in the two areas, but with *Gurung* household size being higher (5.6) than *Magar* households (4.7).

Of the total sampled population in the study area, about 47 per cent were males as against 53 per cent females. The age group from 10-65 years constitutes the largest proportion in both the areas (Table 4.2). The percentage of illiterate females is almost two and a half times that of males in the two areas (Table 4.3). If only those who can read and write are taken into account, the difference between male and female literacy is narrower. However, if those who are literate through formal schooling are considered, the percentage of literate males is much higher than that of literate females.

² These and other types of ACAP intervention are discussed later in this chapter.

Occupation

A large percentage (42%) of the total population depends on agriculture. As an occupation those studying accounted for the second largest percentage (18%). The remaining population aged 10 years or older reported a variety of different occupations, with about eight per cent being in tourism. Across the two areas, occupational patterns do not vary much between Ghandruk and Ulleri, with the exception that Ghandruk has a relatively larger percentage (12%) of its active population in tourism than Ulleri (4%), whereas the opposite prevails in the case of those who reported service as their occupation. Further details are provided in Table 4.4.

Indirectly households can depend on tourism for sale of their produce, occasional employment, etc, besides being directly engaged in this sector. Information was solicited from the respondents to understand the strength or dependence of household heads reporting different forms of occupation with tourism. This dependence could be either high, moderate, or nil. The degree of occupational linkage with tourism appears to be more pronounced in Ulleri than in Ghandruk, especially in the agricultural sectors. For example, about 14 per cent of the households that were employed in agriculture and related occupations in Ulleri stated some linkage of their occupation with tourism, while only nine per cent in Ghandruk did (Table 4.5). This indirect or secondary linkage comes through the sale of agricultural produce or working in the tourism sector. In contrast, in Ghandruk the link is more direct, through the operation of lodges. In the case study areas, as a whole, the percentage of those who stated a high, a moderate, and no link between agriculture and tourism was two, four, and 94 per cent respectively. Other details are provided in Table 4.5.

Land Use and Farming

Pakho (upland) and *khet* (lowland) are the two types of land worked by the households in Ghandruk; *pakho* is the only type of land worked by the households in Ulleri. The majority of the sampled households in both areas own less than 0.5ha and only a small percentage (12%) own more than a hectare (Table 4.6). Furthermore, the majority of households are owner-cultivators, who neither rent their land to others nor rent from others. Pure tenants (8%) were reported in Ghandruk only. Similarly, landless households constituted four per cent of the sample in both areas (Table 4.6). The average size of operated areas is marginally larger in Ghandruk than in Ulleri, with the overall average being about 0.6 of a hectare (Table 4.7).

Households were asked if their land productivity was increasing or decreasing. A large majority of the households indicated that land productivity had either decreased or had remained the same, and only about six per cent reported that land productivity had increased. About 80 per cent of the households indicated that the cause for productivity decline were shortages of manure and labour and a small percentage (10%) indicated that it was due to the lack of irrigation.

A large majority of households in the area produce food to meet their needs only, and a fairly large percentage is not even able to meet their own food needs. A small percentage was found to have surplus to sell, some of which went to the tourist market (Table 4.8). The sale of food brings in a small cash reward to the households (Table 4.9).

Livestock. Households own a variety of livestock, and the average numbers of livestock owned in terms of LSU are similar in both areas (Table 4.10). A large majority of households adopt different feeding practices, with stall feeding being confined to a small percentage of households only. Many of the households did not indicate that tourism had had any positive impact on their livestock enterprise. Also, a small percentage of households in both areas sell some livestock produce both to tourists and to other local markets (Table 4.11).

Household Dependence on Forest Resources

Although firewood continues to be the main source of energy for most households, the different programmes carried out by ACAP may be assumed to have brought changes in energy use. Still, tourism is believed to have increased firewood demand. To better understand energy use patterns, households were asked about the intensity of energy use and their perceptions regarding the changing patterns of energy use.

Table 4.12 indicates that the average annual consumption of firewood per household in Ulleri (8,847kg per year or roughly 25kg per day) is relatively higher than in Ghandruk (3,040kg per year or about 9kg per day). The result seems plausible, given that Ghandruk has electricity with an installed capacity of 50kW benefitting 261 households (Table 4.12). Households also have begun using a variety of energy-saving gadgets. About 88 per cent of the respondents in Ghandruk reported using electricity, with 16 per cent reporting the use of liquid petroleum gas (LPG) and biogas (Table 4.13). However,

electricity is mostly used for lighting, and thus about 80 per cent of the households in Ghandruk depend on firewood for their energy needs.

In Ulleri, firewood is the only source of energy available. About 90 per cent of the annual fuelwood requirement is currently met through public forest reserves, and the rest through private trees (Table 4.14). In Ghandruk, private tree sources meet a relatively higher per cent (23%) of the annual fuelwood requirement of households than in Ulleri. Despite a lower level of firewood use in Ghandruk relative to Ulleri, the annual fodder consumption rate in Ghandruk is about twice that of Ulleri. This higher use of fodder in Ghandruk may be due to most households stall-feeding their livestock, as was pointed out by households. About 61 per cent of the fodder requirement in Ulleri originates from private sources compared to 36 per cent in Ghandruk. Household dependency on public forests for fodder is greater in Ghandruk than in Ulleri.

Information was collected from the respondents regarding their perceptions about changing patterns of energy use. A large percentage (75%) of households in Ulleri indicated that the growing shortage of firewood was due to tourism (Table 4.15). In contrast, the large majority of households in Ghandruk were of the opinion that tourism was not the key factor contributing to fuelwood scarcity.

When asked about the changing patterns of energy use, about 50 per cent of the households in Ghandruk indicated that change was induced by firewood shortages, as well as availability of kerosene and electricity. Tourism was not perceived as being responsible. However, in Ulleri, households' perception of this matter was different, as increasing use of kerosene was perceived to be induced by tourism. Fuelwood shortages due to tourism were also perceived by 67 per cent of households in Ulleri, but not so in Ghandruk (Table 4.16).