BRIDGING THE GAP: RECOGNISING THE ROLE OF COMMUNITY IN NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

By

Karen Anne Cosgrove

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Discipline of Geography and Environmental Studies
School of Social Sciences
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
The University of Adelaide

February 2010

Table of Contents

List of Figures vii
List of Tables ix
List of Acronyms x
ABSTRACT xi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS xii
DECLARATION xiv
1 INTRODUCTION 1
1.0 Introduction 1
1.1 Aims and Objectives 3
1.2 Community Based Natural Resource Management 6
1.2.1 'Engaging' With the 'Community' 6
1.2.2 Community Engagement 7
1.2.3 The Meaning of Community 8
1.3 The Study Settings 9
1.3.1 South Australia 9
1.3.2 Arid Lands – An Institutional Response to Community Based Natural Resource Management 12
1.3.3 Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Areas Rehabilitation Project – An Institutional Response to Natural Resource Management 13
1.4 Study One - The South Australian Arid Lands 14
1.5 Study Two - Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigated Areas 17
1.6 Organisation of This Study 21
1.6.1 Thesis Framework 21
1.7 Conclusion 24
2 INTERPRETING AUSTRALIA"S RURAL TRANSITION THROUGH A POLITICAL AND SOCIAL LENS 25
2.0 Introduction 25
2.1 Rural Transition Through the Language of Politics 26
2.2 Shaping Australian Politics 27
2.2.1 Classical Liberalism 27
2.2.2 Keynesian Economics 28
2.2.3 Neo Liberalism and the Free Market 30
2.4 Adjustment Strategies 30
2.4.1 Implementation of Structural Adjustment Policies 32
2.4.2 Dairy Structural Adjustment Program 33
2.4.3 A Dairy Exit Program – A Case Study of the Lower Murray River Swamps 34
2.4.4 Rationale for the Rehabilitation Exit Package 35
2.5 Natural Resource Management and Environmental Reform 37

2.5.1 A National – Regional Approach to Environmental Management 37
2.5.2 The South Australian Case 39
2.6 Social Theory – Rural Life and the Environment 42
2.6.1 Social Theory 42
2.6.2 Conceptualising Social Theory 43
2.6.3 Symbolic Interactionism 44
2.7 Environmental Sociology 46
2.8 Schools of Thought About the Rural Domain 47
2.8.1 New Rural Sociology 47
2.8.2 Neo Marxism and Agriculture 48
2.8.3 New Political Economy of Agriculture 49
2.9 Conclusion 49
3 RURAL RESTRUCTURING AND SUSTAINABLE OUTCOMES 51
3.0 Introduction 51
3.1 Restructuring and the Transformation of Agriculture 51
3.2 The Nature of Restructuring 52
3.2.1 Globalisation 53
3.2.2 Modes of Production 56
3.2.3 Vertical Integration 59
3.2.4 Pluriactivity 60
3.2.5 Migration and The Role of Counter-Urbanisation 61
3.2.6 Tourism 62
3.3 Addressing Sustainability 63
3.3.1 Sustainability 63
3.4 Dimensions of Sustainability 66
3.5 Issues of Scale 68
3.6 The Notion of Risk and The Carrying Capacity of The Environment 69
3.7 Resource Capitals – Measuring Sustainability 70
3.7.1 Stocks of Capital – Categories for Measuring Sustainability 73
3.8 Conclusion 74
4 THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT 76
4 0 Introduction 76
4.1 Social Dimensions of Natural Resource Management 77
4.2 The Role of Social Capital in Natural Resource Management 78
4.3 Theory of Social Capital 80
4.3.1 The Notion of Trust 84
4.3.2 Linking Social Capital 85
4.3.3 Bonding and Bridging Networks 85

4.3.4. Weak Ties and Strong Ties 86
4.4 The Social Composition of a Community 87
4.4.1 Community Capacity 88
4.4.2 A Capacity Building Framework 90
4.5 Approaches to Measurement 92
4.5.1 Mapping the Structure of a Network 92
4.5.2 Capacity Indicators 94
4.5.3 Breakdown in Social Capital 99
4.6 Social Capital and the Role of the State 100
4.7 Engagement 101
4.7.1 Terms of Communication 102
4.7.2 Consultation 102
4.7.3 Participation 103
4.7.4 Engagement 104
4.8 Good Practice Community Engagement 104
4.9 Barriers to Successful Engagement 105
4.10 Belief and Decision Making 107
4.10.1 Decision Making Criteria 108
4.10.2 Values 109
4.11 The Role of Governance 113
4.12 Conclusion 115
5 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 117
5.0 Introduction 117
5.1 The Research Design 117
5.2 The South Australian Arid Lands Study 118
5.2 1 The NRM Community Capacity Tool 118
5.3 The Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Areas: Background to the Study 121
5.3.1 Research Methodology 123
5.3.2 The Development of the Natural Resource Management Tool and Process 123
5.3.3 Recruitment of Participants for Workshop Attendance 126
5.3.4 Locating Participants 128
5.3.5 Workshops 129
5.3.6 Workshop Process 130
5.3.7 Arithmetic Calculations for Each Report Tier 134
5.3.8 Discourse-based Evaluation 135
5.3.9 Capturing Participants Comments 136
5.4 LMRIA Methodology 138
5.4.1 LMRIA Pilot Study 138

5.4.2 Grounded Theory 138
5.4.3. Participant Observation 141
5.4.3 Interviews 142
5.5 Writing Up of Observational Data 143
5.5.1 Transcribing 144
5.6 Questionnaire 144
5.7 Reflections, Limitations and Research Problems 145
5.8 Conclusion 147
6 A TALE OF TWO TIERS – ASSESSING COMMUNITY BASED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT CAPACITY 150
6.0 Introduction 150
6.1 South Australian Arid Lands Study 151
6.2 The Role of the Outback Areas Community Development Trust 153
6.3 NRM Workshop Attendees 155
6.4 The SAAL NRM Board– Perceptions Of Self and Community 156
6.4.1 Participatory Culture 157
6.4.2 Board Perception of Institutional Tier 158
6.4.3 SAAL Board Perceptions of the Individual Tier (Communities) 160
6.5 Participatory Culture Across the Region 161
6.6 Individual Tier‟s Perception of the Board 164
6.6.1 Roxby Downs and Andamooka 165
6.6.2 Gawler Ranges 166
6.6.3 Oodnadatta 167
6.6.4 Northern Flinders 168
6.6.5 North Eastern Community (Mannahill) 169
6.7 SAAL Communities Perceptions of the Organisational Tier 170
6.7.1 Roxby Downs and Andamooka 171
6.7.2 Gawler Ranges 172
6.7.3 Oodnadatta 173
6.7.4 Northern Flinders 173
6.8 SAAL Community‟s Perceptions of Individual Tier 174
6.8.1 Roxby Downs and Andamooka 175
6.8.2 Gawler Ranges 176
6.8.3 Oodnadatta 176
6.8.4 Northern Flinders 178
6.8.5 North East Community (Mannahill) 179
6.9 Findings from Observations and Assessment Process 180
6.9.1 The Challenge for Building Strong Networks and Relationships 181

6.9.2 The Role of Trust in Building Networks and Relationships 184
6.10 Community Engagement and Managing the Environment 186
6.10.1 Disengagement – A Product of Poor Community Engagement 189
6.11 Building Knowledge Resources 190
6.12 Values, Beliefs and Shared Visions 192
6.12.1 Indigenous Values and Belief Systems 193
6.13 Alinytjara Wilurara NRM Region 196
6.13.1 A Vision for the Future 197
6.14 Governance – A Wide Range of Decision Makers 198
6.15 Strategic Direction 201
6.16 Leadership 204
6.17 Human Resources 206
6.18 Financial Resources 207
6.19 Physical Resources 210
6.20 Knowledge Resources 212
6.21 Implications for Regional Natural Resource Management 214
6.21.1 Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis 214
6.21.2 Indices and the Tool 215
6.22 Conclusion 217
7 THE REHABILITATION OF THE LOWER MURRAY RECLAIMED IRRIGATION AREAS: A CASE STUDY 221
7.0 Introduction 221
7.1 Background 222
7.2 Recognising the Need for Reform 224
7.3 About the Respondents 228
7.3.1 Adjusting and Comfortable Irrigators 229
7.3.2 Farming - Lifestyle, Behaviour and Attachment to the Place 229
7.4 Making a Living 231
7.4.1 Lifestyle 232
7.4.2 Countrymindedness – A Link to Lifestyle 234
7.4.3 Values and Goals and Life Choices 237
7.5 Drought – And the Final Straw 242
7.6 The Community and the Rehabilitation Project 244
7.7 Participation in Decision Making 246
7.8 A Lack of Trust Does Not Make for Building a „Trust" 247
7.9 Top Down Engagement 250
7.9.1 Lack of Respect 251
7.10 A Sense of Community 254
7.11 A Community in Crisis 256
7.12 Social Capital – A Key to Community Success 259

7.13 The Role of Leadership 260
7.14 Social/Health Impact on the Community 262
7.15 Conclusion 266
8 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 270
8.0 Introduction 270
8.1 An Intersect: Symbolic Interactionism and Environmental Sociology 270
8.2 Ideology, Policy and the Environment 271
8.3 Rural Restructuring and the Changing Relationships Between the Environment and Society 273
8.4 Building Social Capital Through Community Based Natural Resource Management 276
8.4.1 Building Trust Through Community Engagement 279
8.5 Rethinking Community: A Community of Purpose 281
8.5.1 A Blurring of Communities 282
8.6 Rethinking Community Based Natural Resource Management 285
8.7 The Strength of Capacity is in the Question 286
8.8 Important Insights 288
8.9 Summary 289
9 REFERENCES 292
9.0 References 292
APPENDIX 1 303
APPENDIX 2 307
APPENDIX 3 308
APPENDIX 4 314
APPENDIX 5 315
APPENDIX 6 316
APPENDIX 7 317
APPENDIX 8 318
APPENDIX 9 319
APPENDIX 10 320

List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Australian States and Capitals.....9
Figure 1.2: South Australia.....9
Figure 1.3: NRM Regions of Australia.....11
Figure 1.4: South Australian Arid Lands.....14
Figure 1.5: Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Areas.....17
Figure 1.6: Narrung South Australia.....18
Figure 1.7: Thesis Framework.....21

Figure 3.1: Pressures and the Environment.....52
Figure 3.2: Community Capital"s Framework.....71

Figure 4.1: Community Network Structure.....92
Figure 4.2: Primary Indicators (Constructs) Associated With Social Capital.....96
Figure 4.3: Arnstein"s Ladder of Participation.....102
Figure 4.4: Choice Modelling.....108

Figure 5.1: Arid Lands NRM Region.....119
Figure 5.2: Natural Resource Management Community Framework.....124
Figure 5.3: Natural Resource Management Schematic Framework Capacities.....124
Figure 5.4: NRM Community Capacity Indicators.....125
Figure 5.5: Capacity Indicator Statement Page.....126
Figure 5.6: SAAL NRM Community Workshops.....127
Figure 5.7: SAAL NRM Groups Districts.....128
Figure 5.8: Capacity Strength.....131
Figure 5.9: Matrix Cell.....132
Figure 5.10: Priority Rating of Each Capacity.....133
Figure 5.11: Participant Confidence Level of Each Capacity.....133

Figure 6.1: Roxby Downs, South Australia.....153
Figure 6.2: SAAL Board Participatory Culture.....157
Figure 6.3: The SAAL Board Perception of Institutional Tier.....159
Figure 6.4: SAAL Board Perception of the Individual Tier.....160
Figure 6.5 SAAL NRM Communities Participatory Culture.....162
Figure 6.6: Individual Tiers Perceptions of the SAAL NRM Board.....165
Figure 6.7: Communities Perceptions of Organisational Tier.....171
Figure 6.8: Individual Tier (Community) Perceptions of Self.....174
Figure 6.9: SAAL NRM Boards Capacity to Build Networks and Relationships.....182
Figure 6.10: Quality of Engagement Undertaken by the Board.....186
Figure 6.11: Individual NRM Knowledge Resources.....190

Figure 6.12: Shared Visions and Values 193
Figure 6.13: Alinytjara Wilurara NRM Region 196
Figure 6.14: SAAL NRM Board Governance Capacity 199
Figure 6.15: NRM Board Strategic Direction 202
Figure 6.16: NRM Board"s Leadership Capacity 204
Figure 6.17: SAAL NRM Board HR Management 206
Figure 6.18: Individual Financial Resource Capacity 208
Figure 6.19: Equipment for on Grounds Work 211
Figure 6.20: SAAL Knowledge Resources 213

Figure 7.1: Murray Lakes and Narrung 228
Figure 7.2: Reasons for Being a Dairy Farmer 230
Figure 7.3: Reasons for Residing in the LMRIA 232
Figure 7.4: Agrarian Culture – Countrymindedness and Lifestyle 233
Figure 7.5: Factors That Govern Decision Making Processes 238
Figure 7.6: Participation in Decision Making 246
Figure 7.7: Level of Respect 250
Figure 7.8: Managers Dealing Fairly With the Community 252
Figure 7.9: Identify With New Members of Community 253
Figure 7.10: Sense of Community 254
Figure 7.11: Proud of Community Commitment to Rehabilitation Project 257
Figure 7.12: Did The Rehabilitation Project Bring The Community Together? 258

PLATES

Plate 1.1: Blinman, Flinders Ranges 10
Plate 1.2: River Murray – Mannum 10
Plate 1.3: Arid Lands South Australia 16
Plate 1.4: Dairy Farm Jervois 19
Plate 1.5: Irrigation Channel 19

List of Tables

Table 4.1: Social Indicators that Reflect Social Issues 95

Table 5.1: Calculating Capacity Strength, Capacity Importance and Capacity Confidence Scores for the Individual Tier 136
Table 5.2: Qualitative Comments 137

Table 6.1: Communities Value Indigenous Knowledge and Participation in NRM 194

Table 7.1: Attributes of Dairying 235
Table 7.2: Dominant Values 237
Table 7.3: Social and Health Impact of Rehabilitation Project 264

List of Acronyms

ANAO	Australian National Audit Office
ANT	Actor Network Theory
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resource Management
CCAT	Community Capacity Assessment Tool
CCF	Community Capitals Framework
CM	Choice Modelling
COAG	Council of Australian Governments
COP	Community of Purpose
CSIRO	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation
DAA	Dairy Adjustment Authority
DEP	Dairy Exit Program
DSAP	Dairy Structural Adjustment Program Scheme
DWLBC	Dept for Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation
EMS	Environmental Management Systems
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESI	Entrepreneurial Social Infrastructure
EU	Economic Union
IAB	Irrigation Advisory Board
LMI	Lower Murray Irrigation Association
LMIAG	Lower Murray Irrigation Action Group
LMRIA	Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Area
MDB	Murray Darling Basin
MNC	Multinational Corporation
MNE	Multinational Enterprise
NAP	National Action Plan
NHT	National Heritage Trust
NRM	National Resource Management
OACDT	Outback Areas Community Development Trust
PIRSA	Dept of Primary Industries and Resources, South Australia
RSSA	Rural Solutions South Australia
SAAL	South Australia Arid Lands National Resource Management Board
SCB	Soil Conservation Board

ABSTRACT

Bridging the Gap: Recognising the role of community in natural resource management.

This study illustrates the need for purposeful community engagement, the significance of social capital and governance and the need for landholders to participate in the decision-making process regarding natural resource management. It recognises that while the contribution of social science to community based natural resource management has been significant over recent times; consideration of the links between government discourse and the generally less than favourable outcomes of community based natural resource management has been at the most, minimal.

The study consists of a comparative study of two contrasting communities and two natural resource management projects. One study focuses on the role of the regional NRM Board for the South Australian Arid Lands and its endeavour to engage with and assess outback communities in the region to undertake natural resource management. The second study examines the attempts of a government authority to engage with a rural community so as to administer a rehabilitation project of their lands.

Buy undertaking a comparative study of these two communities this thesis examines (1) the belief that strong networks, trust and transparency are prerequisites for the management of community based projects, (2) community engagement and civic governance as prerequisites for the overall success of natural resource management, and (3) the notions of community and investigates the notion that if communities are to engage and work effectively for the purpose of natural resource management, then they must mean something to the people both inside and outside of those communities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly I would like to acknowledge the support and guidance from my principal supervisor Professor Graeme Hugo. Thank you Graeme for your valuable support, critical feedback, patience and kindness you have shown me throughout my candidature. It is with understanding that you continued to support me through the ups and downs of this journey and in doing so, allowed me to regain focus and progress with my research.

I also thank my co-supervisor Dr Dianne Rudd for her ongoing support and humour which helped to make those challenging times a little lighter to bear. I offer thanks to the Staff of the Discipline of Geographical and Environmental Studies at the University of Adelaide for their additional assistance over the years, in particular Dr Louise Mendel and Associate Professor Marcus Lane for their early guidance and supervision.

I offer special thanks to Mark Meyer and Jenny Cleary, two special friends and colleagues who spent many hours discussing with me the merits of community based natural resource management. I also offer my thanks to the following individuals and organisations for their kind assistance with my research.

- The LMRIA dairy farmers who opened their homes to me and allowed me to make known through the research, their experiences of the LMRIA rehabilitation project.
- The SAAL NRM Board who provided me with an opportunity to link my study to a project I was undertaking for DWLBC and the SAAL NRM Board. I would like to extend a special thank you to Russell Flavel (DWLBC) and John Gavin (SAAL NRM Board – Manager).

I would like to thank my sons Steven and Aaron who have shown great faith in me and who have supported me wholeheartedly throughout my candidature. I also thank my son Aaron and Linda Christensen from Scribe Editing and Proofing for taking the time to proof my thesis.

And last but not least I would especially like to thank my husband Graham for all the support and patience he has shown me over the course of my candidature. To say I could not have come so far without his ongoing encouragement would be an understatement.

DECLARATION

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University"s digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australasian Digital Thesis Program (ADTP) and also through the web search engines, unless permission has been granted to the University to restrict access for a period of time.

SIGNED:_____ DATE: _____