CONSERVATION BIOLOGY AND THE INFLUENCE OF HUMAN ACTIVITIES ON BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM STABILITY

Arelli Raj Kumar
Research Scholar (Zoology) Sunrise University, Alwar, Rajasthan
Dr. Sunil Chauhan (Professor)
Research Supervisor, School of Science, Sunrise University, Alwar, Rajasthan

ABSTRACT

Human activities (urbanization, industrialization, and intensive agriculture) are increasingly menacing biodiversity and the stability of the ecosystems. The research aims to find out the impact of human anthropogenic pressure on species diversity, population trends, and the stability of chosen ecosystems in general. Precisely, the study evaluates the impacts of human-made habitat alteration on trophic relationships, habitat stability, and ecological functioning hence changing the ecosystem resilience. The paper also assesses current conservation measures and management initiatives that have been implemented to reduce such effects, and the purpose is to improve biodiversity conservation and sustainability of the ecosystems. The results should give some understanding of how the human activities and ecological balance are complex and give practical recommendations that would be used to plan conservation and management of the ecosystem.

Keywords: *Conservation biology, Human activities, Biodiversity, Ecosystem stability, Anthropogenic pressures, Conservation strategies*

1. INTRODUCTION

The diversity of life (genetic, species and ecosystem) is known as biodiversity, which is essential to the importance and stability of natural systems. It sustains very important ecosystems services that include nutrient cycling, pollination, climate control, as well as soil and water quality which are vital in human existence and environmental sustainability. Conservation biology has become a major scientific discipline whose aim is to comprehend the biodiversity patterns, the cause of species decline, and the creation of strategies to protect as well as restore the ecosystems. With the rising speed of global environmental changes, conservation biology has gained growing importance in the protection of the biodiversity and the stability of the ecosystem.

Over the last few decades, human actions have increased over the landscape leading to massive alteration of habitats and ecological degradation. Blistering urbanization, industrialization, agricultural intensifications and deforestation have caused habitat losses, habitat fragmentation, pollution and over exploitation of natural resources. Such human induced forces have had serious impacts on the composition of the species, population patterns and ecological relationships in ecologies. The trophic structure interruptions, the fall of keystone and vulnerable species as well as the expansion of invasive species have also undermined the stability of the ecosystem, making it impossible to withstand and recuperate the environment changes.

To be able to plan conservation properly and to manage the ecosystem on a sustainable basis, it is necessary to understand the connection between human activity and biodiversity and ecosystem stability. There are anthropogenic effects that affect the species diversity, the quality of the habitat and the ecological processes and hence scientific evaluation is essential in formulating the relevant conservation and restoration plans. The paper will assess the effects of human activity on biodiversity and ecosystem stability and locate the possible conservation strategies to make the ecology more resilient. These insights are essential in the policy decision-making process and the advertisement of sustainable practices that would harmonize human growth and the sustainability of natural ecosystems in the long term.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Storch et al. (2022) analyzed the processes of biodiversity in the Anthropocene and showed the human activities disturbed the natural balances of species richness in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. They discovered that urbanization, habitat fragmentation and changes in land-use resulted in drastic changes in species composition, frequently resulting in local extinctions and increases in the range of invasive species. They also focused on their study

on the role played by human-induced pressures to disturb previous ecological balances diminishing resilience in ecosystems and exposing them to changes in the environment.

Pennekamp et al. (2018) examined the intricate association between biodiversity and ecosystem stability at different ecological conditions. They affirmed that the increases and decreases in species richness may influence the ecosystem resilience based on redundancy and functional diversity of the species present. The analysis found out that the anthropogenic changes made like destruction of habitats and pollution disturbed the structure of communities and reduced the buffering ability of the ecosystem against environmental shocks. Their results highlighted the need to have a multiplicity of species and which are functionally complementary in maintaining ecosystem stability.

Hautier et al. (2015) investigated the impacts of human-made environmental disturbances, such as intensive agriculture, pollution, and climate changes, on the stability of the ecosystem via biodiversity loss. Their study showed that these human practices interfered with human species interactions and trophic networks leading to reduced ecosystem resistance and slow recoveries following disturbances. The work has pointed out that loss of biodiversity was not an incidental result of human action but a direct cause of ecological perturbation and biodiversity conservation was urgently needed to enhance richness and functional diversity of species.

Prakash and Verma (2022) examined the risks of multiple anthropogenic processes on the biodiversity of the world, especially in the fast-developing areas. They discovered that habitat degradation and species reduction was increased by industrialization, forest loss, and over- usage of natural resources. The research also noted that the activities not only decreased biodiversity, but also negatively affected ecosystem services hence affecting ecological health and human livelihoods. They have determined that it was of urgent need to have effective conservation plans and the proactive management practices in order to reduce these effects and enable long term ecosystem resilience.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This paper will examine how human activities, including urbanization, agriculture and industrialization affect biodiversity and stability of the ecosystem. It tries to comprehend the effects of anthropogenic pressures on species diversity, population dynamics and ecological processes and also determine conservation measures to reduce the impact. The study integrates field-based studies, ecological studies, and statistics to create a holistic perception about the correlation between human activity and ecosystem health.

3.1 Research Design

The research design used was descriptive and analytical and was aimed at determining how the human activities impacted the biodiversity and the stability of the ecosystem. The design created the possibility to systematically observe, measure, and analyze the association between the anthropogenic pressures and the ecological changes in the chosen ecosystems. The methodology incorporated both quantitative and qualitative research to measure the diversity of species, population dynamics and stability of ecosystems, and also to measure the success of measures taken to protect the systems in place.

3.2 Sample Size and Population

The study was done in the sampled terrestrial and freshwater habitats that were known to be impacted by human activity like urbanization, agriculture, and industrialization. One hundred sampling units were chosen and they comprised species observation plot, habitat site and ecological monitoring point within the study area. The sites were selected to represent the ecosystems of low, moderate, and high anthropogenic impact to ensure that a wide range of anthropogenic influence is covered.

3.3 Data Collection Methods

A combination of field survey, personal observation and secondary data collection method was used to collect data. Field survey consisted of a systematic record of the richness of the species, density, and habitat of the species through standardized ecological assessment procedures. Observational data concentrated on human-made alteration like fragmentation of habitats, level of pollution and the land-use pattern. Secondary data were acquired through the environmental reports, local conservation records, and the published scientific literature to supplement field observations. There were consistency and reliability in the collection of data using structured checklists and ecological

assessment forms.

3.4 Variables and Measurement

- **Independent Variables:** Anthropogenic processes such as urbanization, agriculturalization, industrialization and deforestation.
- **Dependent Variables:** The parameters of biodiversity indicators (species richness, population density and species evenness) and ecosystem stability (trophic interactions, habitat integrity and ecological resilience).
- **Control Variables:** To reduce the effect of climatic factors, seasonality and natural disturbances, these factors were factored in to reduce the effect on the observed relationships.

The measurements were conducted in terms of the standard ecological methods of quadrat sampling, transect surveys, and counts of species inventory. Indices of habitat quality were determined based on parameters like the vegetation cover, water quality and existence of indicator species.

3.5 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (mean, frequency, and percentage) were used to summarize the species diversity and ecosystem parameters using quantitative data. The correlation and regression analysis were used as the inferential statistical techniques to analyze the connection between human and changes of biodiversity and ecosystem stability. Thematic analysis of qualitative observations was conducted in order to explain the patterns of habitat change and the success of conservation efforts. Statistical software like SPSS or R was used to analyze data, which guaranteed rigorous and reliable outcome to use in arriving at conclusions.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The research evaluated the consequences of human activities on biodiversity and ecosystem stability of terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems. Evaluation of 100 sampling units was conducted, which is the area of low, moderate, and high anthropogenic pressure. It was found that there were significant trends in the effect of the human-made changes on the diversity of the species and their populations and functionalities of the ecosystems.

Table 1 shows the sample unit distribution in three categories of study locations based on the degree of human impact which are low-impact, moderate-impact and excessive-impact ecosystems. The table contains the data on a sample size, mean species richness and SD, mean population density and SD, and the sample of the type of human activity prevalent in each category of ecosystem. The classification will offer a systematic approach of comparison between biodiversity parameters of different levels of anthropogenic impact.

Table 1: Species Richness and Population Density Across Study Sites

Study Site Type	Sample Units (n)	Species Richness (Mean ± SD)	Population Density (Mean ± SD)	Observed Human Impact
Low-impact ecosystems	33	45 ± 3	120 ± 15	Minimal urban/agriculture activity
Moderate-impact ecosystems	34	32 ± 4	85 ± 12	Moderate agriculture and urbanization

High-impact ecosystems	33	20 ± 5	50 ± 10	Intensive urbanization and industrialization

The data show a definite decrease in the richness and the population density of both the species with the increase in the human impact. Mean species richness and population density of the low-impact ecosystems were the largest and considerably lower in the high-impact ecosystems. The moderate-impact ecosystems were moderate, implying that the reduction of biodiversity with increasing urbanization and agricultural activities was gradual. These results reveal that intensive human intervention activities e.g., urbanization and industrialization have a significant adverse impact on species diversity and structure of population in the eco systems.

Table 2 represents the ecosystem stability parameters in the study sites in terms of low, moderate and high levels of human impact. The table gives mean values that have standard deviations of trophic interaction scores, habitat integrity scores, and ecological resilience scores. The standardized ecological indices measured these parameters to determine the level of anthropogenic pressure on the functional stability and structural state of ecosystems.

Table 2: Ecosystem Stability Parameters Across Study Sites

Study Site Type	Trophic Interaction Score*	Habitat Integrity Score*	Ecological Resilience Score*
Low-impact ecosystems	8.5 ± 0.4	9.2 ± 0.3	8.8 ± 0.5
Moderate-impact ecosystems	6.3 ± 0.5	7.1 ± 0.4	6.5 ± 0.6
High-impact ecosystems	4.2 ± 0.6	5.0 ± 0.5	4.3 ± 0.7

The findings indicate a steady decrease in each of the parameters of stability of the ecosystem in the direction of human influence. Well-functioning and stable ecosystems were identified as the low-impact ecosystems that had the highest scores in terms of trophic interactions, habitat integrity, and ecological resilience. The moderate impact ecosystems showed lower scores of all parameters implying partial disturbance of ecological processes. The lowest values were registered in high-impact ecosystems, which indicated weakened tropic relationships, poor habitats, and reduced resilience. These trends point to the fact that increased human activities greatly destabilize ecosystems and make the ecosystems less resistant and resilient to disturbances.

The results of the correlation analysis between the intensity of the human activities and the main biodiversity and stability indicators of the ecosystems are displayed in Table 3. It shows correlation coefficients (r) and significant value (p-value) of relationships between human activities and species richness, population density, habitat integrity and ecological resilience. This was done to measure the magnitude and the orientation of relationships between anthropogenic pressures and ecological parameters.

Table 3: Correlation Between Human Activities and Biodiversity/Ecosystem Stability

Variables	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Significance (p-value)
Human activities vs. Species Richness	-0.72	<0.01
Human activities vs. Population Density	-0.68	<0.01
Human activities vs. Habitat Integrity	-0.70	<0.01
Human activities vs. Ecological Resilience	-0.65	<0.01

This suggests that human activities are strongly negatively correlated with all the variables that are measured of biodiversity and ecosystem stability, and all of them are found to be statistically significant. Higher rates of human activities were coupled with decreased species richness and population density and decreasing habitat integrity and ecological resilience. These results prove that anthropogenic pressures have a serious negative impact on not only the diversity of biological objects and stability of various ecosystems, but the management of the anthropogenic factors is of great importance to preserve the ecological balance.

5. CONCLUSION

The results of this research have strongly shown that human activities have a significant and stable adverse impact on the biodiversity and stability of an ecosystem. In the monitored lands and freshwater systems, the rising levels of urbanization, agricultural, and industrial progress were linked to significant decreases in species numbers, population density, trophic interactions, habitat and ecological resilience. The reported high and statistically significant negative correlations are another confirmation that anthropogenic pressures are major causes of ecological degradation and poor ecosystem functioning. These findings highlight why there is an urgent requirement of sound conservation and management practices that govern human activities, safeguard key habitats and reclaim damaged ecosystems. To improve the ecological resilience, protect the biodiversity and make the natural ecosystems and human development sustainable in the long term, it is important to integrate scientific evidence in conservation planning and policy formulation.

REFERENCES

1. *Barnosky, A. D., Hadly, E. A., Gonzalez, P., Head, J., Polly, P. D., Lawing, A. M., ... & Zhang, Z. (2017). Merging paleobiology with conservation biology to guide the future of terrestrial ecosystems. Science, 355(6325), eaah4787.*
2. *Chase, J. M., Jeliazkov, A., Ladouceur, E., & Viana, D. S. (2020). Biodiversity conservation through the lens of metacommunity ecology. Annals of the new York Academy of Sciences, 1469(1), 86-104.*
3. *Corlett, R. T., Primack, R. B., Devictor, V., Maas, B., Goswami, V. R., Bates, A. E., ... & Roth, R. (2020). Impacts of the coronavirus pandemic on biodiversity conservation. Biological conservation, 246, 108571.*
4. *Hautier, Y., Tilman, D., Isbell, F., Seabloom, E. W., Borer, E. T., & Reich, P. B. (2015). Anthropogenic environmental changes affect ecosystem stability via biodiversity. Science, 348(6232), 336-340.*
5. *Kilpatrick, A. M., Salkeld, D. J., Titcomb, G., & Hahn, M. B. (2017). Conservation of biodiversity as a strategy for improving human health and well-being. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 372(1722), 20160131.*
6. *Pennekamp, F., Pontarp, M., Tabi, A., Altermatt, F., Alther, R., Choffat, Y., ... & Petchey, O. L. (2018). Biodiversity increases and decreases ecosystem stability. Nature, 563(7729), 109-112.*
7. *Prakash, S., & Verma, A. K. (2022). Anthropogenic activities and Biodiversity threats. International Journal of Biological Innovations, IJBI, 4(1), 94-103.*

8. *Rawat, U., & Agarwal, N. K. (2015). Biodiversity: Concept, threats and conservation. Environment Conservation Journal, 16(3), 19-28.*
9. *Rey, O., Eizaguirre, C., Angers, B., Baltazar-Soares, M., Sagonas, K., Prunier, J. G., & Blanchet, S. (2020). Linking epigenetics and biological conservation: towards a conservation epigenetics perspective. Functional Ecology, 34(2), 414-427.*
10. *Roche, P. K., & Campagne, C. S. (2017). From ecosystem integrity to ecosystem condition: a continuity of concepts supporting different aspects of ecosystem sustainability. Current opinion in environmental sustainability, 29, 63-68.*
11. *Storch, D., Šímová, I., Smyčka, J., Bohdalková, E., Toszogyova, A., & Okie, J. G. (2022). Biodiversity dynamics in the Anthropocene: how human activities change equilibria of species richness. Ecography, 2022(4).*
12. *Taylor-Brown, A., Booth, R., Gillett, A., Mealy, E., Ogbourne, S. M., Polkinghorne, A., & Conroy, G. C. (2019). The impact of human activities on Australian wildlife. PloS one, 14(1), e0206958.*
13. *Trevelline, B. K., Fontaine, S. S., Hartup, B. K., & Kohl, K. D. (2019). Conservation biology needs a microbial renaissance: a call for the consideration of host-associated microbiota in wildlife management practices. Proceedings of the Royal Society B, 286(1895), 20182448.*
14. *Wehi, P. M., & Lord, J. M. (2017). Importance of including cultural practices in ecological restoration. Conservation biology, 31(5), 1109-1118.*
15. *Yang, J., Huang, Y., Jiang, X., Chen, H., Liu, M., & Wang, R. (2022). Potential geographical distribution of the edangred plant Isoetes under human activities using MaxEnt and GARP. Global Ecology and Conservation, 38, e02186.*