PROTOCOL 3

Initial draft protocol for the Natural Resources Systems Programme (NRSP) Project R7562 title “Methods for consensus building for management of common property resources”, led by Julian Barr at the Centre for Land Use and Water Resources Research, University of Newcastle.

1. Project summary [from RD1]

The Purpose is development of methods for community participation in integrated sustainable management of floodplain natural resources. The Output is development of consensus building methods for improved management of common property resources. Fisheries in inland waterbodies is the focus, but a range of stakeholders, not only fishers, will be included. The project links to the Community-Based Fisheries Management-2 (CBFM-2) bilateral project. CBFM-2 NGOs will test a consensus building methodology. This process will be evaluated and used to improve the methodology. Lessons learned in Bangladesh and elsewhere will be reviewed and synthesised as a decision support tool and best practice guide.

2. Problem statement

We will be undertaking a series of structured stakeholder workshops at three locations to discuss options for community-based natural resources management. The aim is to engender mutual learning between (sometimes conflicting) stakeholder groups, to promote collective and empathetic action over resource management. We need to try to assess the level of ‘consensus’ in the communities before and after the workshops. If there is an increase in consensus compared to a control group, we can attribute it to our workshop process.

Two approaches exist to measuring consensus:

- Measurement of consensus building outcomes:
  e.g. increase in number of agreements reached over management of NRs, establishment of local CB-NRM organisations, increased membership of CB-NRM organisations, and eventually measurable improvements have their been in biodiversity, and production from the common property resources (CPRs).

- Measurement of consensus building process:
  e.g. how much participants in the CB process have learnt about each other’s livelihoods, and about each other’s use of aquatic NRs, how much has their awareness of the issues in management of aquatic CPRs been raised, and are they more likely to co-operate over CPR management?

Measurement of outcomes is more straightforward, but clearly requires a sufficient period after consensus building activity for action to be taken that can be monitored. This project does not have the time-scale to do this.

Therefore the task is to assess the process of consensus building; essentially to measure whether the workshops have stimulated an attitudinal change in participants that means they are more likely to collectively agreed on CPR management decisions. Community agreement and attitudes that predispose people to co-operate are facets of social cohesiveness. This in turn is a definition of social capital. Thus, a consensus assessment survey (CAS) activity is envisaged which entails the measurement of social capital. The World Bank and DANIDA have recently funded the Social Capital Initiative (SCI) that aims to address just this problem. The project is thus utilising SCI concepts and tools (Krishna & Shrader, 1999; Krishna & Uphoff, 1999) to design a targeted survey that will assess social capital amongst the CPR stakeholders at two points in time.
3. Survey design

Sample size: 120 households (HH)

Two treatments: HH part of consensus building (CB) process
HH not part of CB process [control group]

4 sub-treatments: 4 stakeholder groups:
- male heads of households from medium/large agricultural HH (m-Farm)
- male heads of households from landless HH (m-LL)
- female heads of households from landless HH (f-LL)
- male heads of households from fishing HH (m-Fish)

Two periods: A before/after study
- Level of consensus assessed before CB process for participants and non-participants of the CB workshop.
- Level of consensus assessed 2 weeks after the end of workshop for participants and non-participants of the CB workshop.

Schematic of the study design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Before workshop</th>
<th>After workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders involved in consensus building workshop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-Farm</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>the same 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-LL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>the same 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f-LL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>the same 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-Fish</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>the same 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders not involved in consensus building workshop (Control group)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-Farm</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>the same 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-LL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>the same 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f-LL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>the same 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-Fish</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>the same 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The Consensus Assessment Survey (CAS)

Introduction & Background (to be completed)

What the research is about… We are interested in……
The questions are hypothetical, but you should answer as if it was a real situation.

*Need instructions to enumerators.  *Need Bengali version

Key terms: consensus, unity, solidarity, reciprocity, exchange, co-operation, assistance, trust, empathy, willingness to participate, collective action, empowerment, philanthropy

Collective action
1. Overall, what proportion of people in this village participate in community activities?
   [ ] 16 Anas: Everybody (1)
   [ ] 14 Anas (2)
   [ ] 12 Anas (3)
   [ ] 10 Anas (4)
   [ ] 8 Anas (5)
   [ ] 6 Anas (6)
   [ ] 4 Anas (7)
   [ ] 0 Anas; Nobody (8)
   [ ] Don’t know (0)
   [ ] No answer (9)

Reciprocity & co-operation
2. If it was agreed that an area of the beel should be set aside as a fish refuge, and fishing was banned inside that area, what proportion of people would observe this ban?
   [ ] 16 Anas: Everybody (1)
   [ ] 14 Anas (2)
   [ ] 12 Anas (3)
   [ ] 10 Anas (4)
   [ ] 8 Anas (5)
   [ ] 6 Anas (6)
   [ ] 4 Anas (7)
   [ ] 0 Anas; Nobody (8)
   [ ] Don’t know (0)
   [ ] No answer (9)

3. If a community project does not directly benefit everybody in the village, but benefits poorer people in the community, how many people would contribute time or money to the project?
   [ ] 16 Anas: Everybody (1)
   [ ] 14 Anas (2)
   [ ] 12 Anas (3)
   [ ] 10 Anas (4)
   [ ] 8 Anas (5)
   [ ] 6 Anas (6)
   [ ] 4 Anas (7)
   [ ] 0 Anas; Nobody (8)
   [ ] Don’t know (0)
   [ ] No answer (9)

Unity
4. To what extent are people in communities around this beel in harmony with other users?
   Reply on 10 point scale:
   1 = as much harmony as I can imagine
   10 = I cannot imagine a less harmonious situation
Empowerment
2. How much influence do you think that people like yourself can have in solving disputes over land and water?
   Reply on 10 point scale:
   1 = what people like me say has no influence in solving these disputes
   10 = I cannot imagine people like me having more influence in solving these disputes

Trust
6. Suppose someone in your family faced the following choices, which one would he/she prefer most:
   [ ] Go fishing on their own, getting a catch of 2kg     (1)
   [ ] Go fishing with another person, getting a catch of 5kg    (2)
   [ ] Don’t know  (0)
   [ ] No answer  (9)

7. Please tell me in general whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:
   a. In this village people work together to help each other if they face problems [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [0] [9]
   b. In this village things happen best when people work together in a group [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [0] [9]
   c. People in this village are only interested in their own welfare [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [0] [9]
   d. The way I make a living affects other people in a beneficial or harmful way [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [0] [9]
   e. Most people in this village do not pay attention to the opinion of others [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [0] [9]
   f. If there is a problem, there is always someone there to help me [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [0] [9]
   g. People in this village share a common understanding of the main problems they face [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [0] [9]
   h. If people here face a problem with a neighbour they would prefer to negotiate with them rather than enter into a conflict with them [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [0] [9]
   i. People this here around this beel look out mainly for their own interests and are not much concerned with the welfare of the area as a whole. [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [0] [9]
   j. People like me in this village have the same interests as similar people in other villages around this beel. [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [0] [9]

   [0] Don’t know;   [9] No answer

8. Please tell which of the following local institutions you are a member of:
   Beel Management Committee, Mosque Committee, Women’s Group, etc….

5. Notes
   • We have field-tested the CAS questionnaire in Bangladesh, and the questions seem to work, and respondents understand how the answering systems work
   • The questions requiring answers in proportions (e.g. half the village) use ‘anas’ as the answer system. This system comes from the local currency; there are 16 anas in one taka. Rural people are familiar with using this 16-base system for proportions; e.g. 4 anas is 25%.
• An anchored 10 point scale system, developed by ICLARM, is used on other questions. The end points of the scale (anchors) are defined by respondents. I think this is OK because we will be measuring change in response over time from exactly the same respondents.
• The survey design and sample size are constrained by the available time and staff resources.
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