

TABLE 1  
AGE STRUCTURE AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION  
MATRIX OF THE RESPONDENTS

Age (in Years)	Ethnic Group (No.)			Total
	S.C.	S.T.	Others	
< 20	6	20	11	37
21-30	2	19	9	30
31-40	3	14	6	23
41-50		9	2	11
>50	6	28	13	47
Total	17	90	41	148

S.C.= Scheduled Caste; S.T.= Scheduled Tribe

TABLE 2  
LITERACY LEVEL AND THE ETHNIC COMPOSITION  
OF RESPONDENTS

Literacy level	Ethnic Group		Total
	S.T.	Other than S.T.	
Literate	41	38	79
Illiterate	49	20	69
Total	90	58	148

S.T.= Scheduled Tribe

distributions of the two populations (Awareness and Attitude) are the same, it is assumed that their population distributions are identical. In such cases, the Mann-Whitney U test was used for testing the Null Hypothesis. Scores were compared by Mann-Whitney U test and the number of respondents in the different categories were compared by Chi-square test. Difference between attitudes scores and awareness scores was calculated as  $U = 3224$  and  $P = 1$ . The significant difference between these two scores indicates that the central locations of the attitudes

and awareness among the people towards wildlife conservation were identical.

The tribals comprised 60.8% of the respondents and non-tribals 39.2%. To test another Null Hypothesis that attitudes and awareness do not depend on literacy ethnicity, the Chi-square test was used. Fewer tribals (45%) were literate compared to non-tribals (65%) ( $\chi^2=5.65$ , d.f.=1). Greater literacy among non-tribals influenced their attitudes and awareness about wild animals than tribals ( $\chi^2=13.98$ , d.f.=2,  $\chi^2 9.78$ , d.f.=2). There is a weak but significant positive correlation between attitude scores and awareness scores ( $r=0.18$   $P>0.05$ ,  $n=148$ ) of respondents.

From the above analysis, it can be concluded that the attitude and awareness amongst the villagers towards wildlife conservation are significantly different. Individuals from the scheduled tribe (ST) had lower attitude and awareness scores towards wildlife conservation issues than non ST individuals. This probably is due to their lower literacy level. Further, it was observed that literacy directly influences the attitudes and awareness of the villagers towards wildlife conservation.

January 10, 2001

H.S. GUPTA  
Divisional Forest Officer  
Research and Evaluation Division,  
P.O. Doranda, Ranchi 834 002  
Chattisgarh, India.

#### REFERENCES

- BERKMULLER, K. (1986): Attitude Barriers to eco-development and People's Participation. *The Indian Forester*. Pp. 949-952.
- KELLERT, S.R. (1985): Public perceptions of predators, particularly the wolf and the coyote. *Biol. Cons.* 31: 167-189.

#### 6. SOME CLARIFICATIONS REGARDING THE LESSER FLAMINGO *PHOENICOPTERUS MINOR* AND THE CRAB PLOVER *DROMAS ARDEOLA*

Concerning the lesser flamingo *Phoenicopterus minor* Geoffroy, the impression one would gain is that the main stronghold is

Sambhar Lake. This is wrong — the main breeding and later dispersal centre is the Little Rann of Kutch where a huge colony bred



successfully in 1998. Its breeding in the area was suspected for long and first confirmed by Vora of the Gujarat Forest Department. Nesting had been reported earlier by Sálím Ali and Shivraj Kumar in the Great Rann, alongside the greater flamingoes *Phoenicopterus ruber* Linn.

There are immense flocks during winter in salt pans around Saurashtra. I was shown these in the Bhavnagar salt pans and similar huge flocks at Hathat further west on exposed tidal flats by Dharmakumarsinhji. Also, a massive flock spends much of the year at Porbandar on the west coast of Saurashtra, where a special sanctuary has been declared in the city! I was the first to report a largish flock in Chilka during the survey I conducted for BNHS with P.B. Shekhar. This has been reported in the *JBNHS* (Khacher, 1966, 63: 290-297)

I remember Dharmakumarsinhji and us — Shivraj Kumar and myself — considering the huge flocks along the Saurashtra coast as coming from East Africa. Now I suspect there is an Indian population centered on Gujarat and dispersing widely across the Subcontinent east to Lake Chilka and south to Pt. Calimere. I would not be surprised if this flamingo is commoner in Sindh and also reaches the saline lakes of Baluchistan rather more frequently than believed.

To end on a rather personal note, the large flocks of crab plovers *Dromas ardeola* Paykull were “discovered” by me first in December, 1969 when the Jam Saheb had organized a boat trip for me. I have referred to this in my account of ‘The Birds of Gujarat’ *JBNHS* 93(3): 331-373. From what T.J. Roberts writes, he has gained the impression that the discovery was made by Dharmakumarsinhji, whom I showed a very large flock, which he photographed, near Ghargha south of Bhavnagar. This was the first time he realised that crab plovers were not uncommon. Interestingly, Grimmett and the Inskipp (2000) in their *BIRDS OF THE INDIAN SUBCONTINENT* have not shown crab plovers occurring in the Gujarat

section of the seacoast, though they have mentioned the birds having “traditional roosts” and state that they are “mainly crepuscular and usually very wary.” They do not have roosting sites, but like all inter-tidal mudflat waders, they collect on a beach or near an inundated shoal as the water rises. All the birds of a flock of a particular reef get restricted to one point. Should the reef get entirely submerged, as often happens during spring tides, the flock flies in low, swift direct flight across the open water to some nearby island, where it might happen that another flock has been pushed together by the water. Interestingly, crab plover never go behind sand dunes to rest during high tide on open mud flats, as other waders do. They will skirt headlands along the surf or fly across open water. They are certainly not crepuscular and, particularly when resting at high tide, they are ridiculously confiding, allowing very close approach as Dharmakumarsinhji had done to shoot his first photograph of the flock at Ghoga. They feed between the high tide marks, day and night. In *BIRDS OF PAKISTAN*, T.J. Roberts writes “In Pakistan it occurs very sparsely along the Mekran coast and occasionally in the Indus Delta, but it seems likely that numbers pass through on migration to wintering grounds in the Rann of Kutch”. They do not winter in either the Great or the Little Rann of Kachh, but do so largely in the Gulf of Kachh, where the total numbers on all the tidal mudflats and coral mangrove islands must be far greater than the 2,500 and 5,000 “revealed” by the 1984 Oxford University expedition to the Gulf of Kachh. This clarification is needed so that it does not get repeated again and again, as indeed observations on the birds’ crepuscular habits and wary disposition have been.

October 13, 1999      LAVKUMAR KHACHER  
646, Vastunirman,  
Gandhinagar 382 022,  
Gujarat, India.





Lavkumar, K S. 2002. "Some Clarifications Regarding the Lesser Flamingo *Phoenicopterus Minor* and the Crab Plover *Dromas Ardeola*." *The journal of the Bombay Natural History Society* 99, 106–107.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/189681>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/155658>

**Holding Institution**

Smithsonian Libraries and Archives

**Sponsored by**

Biodiversity Heritage Library

**Copyright & Reuse**

Copyright Status: In Copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>

Rights: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions/>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.