



The impact of information, value-deliberation and group-based decision-making on values for ecosystem services: Integrating deliberative monetary valuation and storytelling



Jasper O. Kenter^{a,b,*}, Niels Jobstvogt^b, Verity Watson^c, Katherine N. Irvine^d, Michael Christie^e, Ros Bryce^{f,b}

^a Laurence Mee Centre for Society and the Sea, Scottish Association for Marine Science (SAMS), UK

^b Aberdeen Centre for Environmental Sustainability, University of Aberdeen, UK

^c Health Economics Research Unit, University of Aberdeen, UK

^d Social, Economic and Geographical Sciences, James Hutton Institute, Aberdeen, UK

^e School of Management and Business, Aberystwyth University, UK

^f Centre for Mountain Studies, Perth College, University of the Highlands and Islands (UHI), UK

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Deliberative monetary valuation
Cultural ecosystem services
Interpretive methods
Integrated valuation
Fair price
Transcendental values

ABSTRACT

Monetary valuation quantifies exchange values, but broader approaches are needed to understand the meaning of those monetary values and the shared, plural and cultural values that underpin them. In this study, we integrated deliberative monetary valuation, storytelling, subjective well-being and psychometric approaches to comprehensively elicit cultural ecosystem service values for proposed UK marine protected areas. We elicit and compare five valuation stages: individual values from an online survey; individual and group values following deliberation on information in workshops; and individual and group values following storytelling and a 'transcendental values compass' deliberation. Deliberated group values significantly differed from non-deliberated individual values, with reduced willingness to pay and increased convergence with subjective wellbeing; deliberated individual values fell between the two. Storytelling played an important role in revealing values that were previously implicit. Participants were more confident about values elicited in the workshops than the online survey and felt that deliberated values should be used in decision-making. The results of this study (albeit with a limited sample size) suggest that shared values may be a better reflection of welfare implications than non-deliberated individual values, while at the same time more reflective of participants' transcendental values: their broader life goals and principles.

1. Introduction

Ecosystem service (ES) assessments have traditionally focused on identifying individual monetary values for ecosystem services (TEEB, 2010; UK National Ecosystem Assessment [UK NEA], 2011). Such approaches, however, have limited capability to uncover the underlying meaning of these values, and generally fail to account for broader shared, plural and cultural values (Fish et al., 2011; Kenter et al., 2015; Scholte et al., 2015; UK NEA, 2014). The integration of deliberative and non-monetary valuation approaches to the valuation of ES is increasingly being advocated as a way of uncovering these wider value concepts. Such methods, however, have had limited application in practice, mostly focused on localised case studies (Bunse et al., 2015; Hattam et al., 2015; Kenter, 2016a; Martín-López et al., 2013;

Raymond et al., 2014; Spash, 2008; Turner, 2016). There is also only a limited understanding of the impact that deliberation may have on people's values, how the impacts of deliberation on information differ from those of interventions focusing on transcendental values, and how shared values resulting from deliberative processes compare to individual values. Using a large scale case study of the value of cultural ES delivered by potential marine protected areas (MPAs) in the UK, which was undertaken as part of the UK NEA follow-on (Kenter et al., 2013; 2014b; UK NEA, 2014), we investigate the potential of a range of deliberative and non-monetary approaches for uncovering shared, plural and cultural values. We directly compare individual and deliberated group preferences and the effects of different deliberative 'treatments' on values, and investigate what new insights deliberating through storytelling might bring to the understanding of people's

* Corresponding author at: Laurence Mee Centre for Society and the Sea, Scottish Association for Marine Science (SAMS), UK.
E-mail address: Jasper.kenter@sams.ac.uk (J.O. Kenter).

values for ES.

1.1. Approaches to understanding shared and plural values

To date, almost all environmental valuation studies, including deliberative valuations (Bunse et al., 2015), have focused on eliciting individual values. However, this focus ignores that the physical interconnectedness inherent to ecosystems generates a social interconnectedness that challenges individual preferences as the most suitable vector for social choice (Vatn, 2009). The UK NEA (2014, 2011) also recognised that individual willingness to pay (WTP) does not fully reflect the collective meanings and significance ascribed to natural environments, and potentially omits important, shared dimensions of value (Fish et al., 2011; Kenter et al., 2014b).

Kenter et al. (2015) considered that the values that we share are often expressed as transcendental values, defined as the guiding principles and life goals that transcend specific situations (also see Raymond and Kenter, 2016). Transcendental values stand in contrast to contextual values, which are dependent on a specific context, and their indicators such as willingness to pay (WTP). Transcendental values refer back to common cultural understandings and experiences albeit expressed by individuals in ways unique to their own life histories. Deliberative processes can offer a mechanism to make shared transcendental values explicit, a process that Lo and Spash (2012) refer to as ‘moralisation’, which they contrast with information-based deliberative interventions that focus on ‘economising’ preferences.

There is some evidence that individuals’ or groups’ preferences and contextual values are not pre-formed, but need to be generated through some kind of transformative process of deliberation and learning (Christie et al., 2012; Irvine et al., 2016; Kenter et al., 2011; Parks and Gowdy, 2013; Schlapfer, 2009; Spash, 2008). Thus far, deliberative valuation has focused on better informing preferences, recognising that participants need time to think and become familiar with ecosystem services, which are often unfamiliar goods (Bunse et al., 2015; Lienhoop et al., 2015; Spash, 2008). Although not usually discussed explicitly, the driving motivation is the expectation that improved understanding will help participants state their preferences in hypothetical scenarios in a way that is more likely to approximate the welfare implications if the situation would become reality.

However, following Lo and Spash (2012), deliberative valuation may involve not just deliberating on information but also moralisation. Kenter et al. (2016b) argue that explicit pathways for reflecting on transcendental values and translating them into contextual values is an essential component of robust deliberative value formation processes. Given that values for environmental goods are often expressive of transcendental values (Chan et al., 2012a; Daniel et al., 2012; Fish et al., 2016; Niemeyer, 2004; Raymond and Kenter, 2016; Spash, 2006; Spash et al., 2009), it makes sense that valuation processes should aim to establish shared values in the sense of group-deliberated values, rather than individual values, as this better aligns to the way in which value indicators are captured with how they are established. Despite increasing interest in shared and social values in relation to ES (Everard et al., 2016; Fish et al., 2011; Ives and Kendal, 2014; Kenter et al., 2015; Raymond et al., 2014; Scholte et al., 2015; TEEB, 2010), and indeed some authors arguing that social valuation is one of the greatest challenges in this field (Parks and Gowdy, 2013), we are not aware of any prior studies that have applied experimental designs comparing the effects of different deliberation treatments on the formation of individual-deliberated and group-deliberated values.

There has also been an increased interest in methods that can understand the plural values of ES in a broader way than is possible using monetary valuation alone (Chan et al., 2016; Christie et al., 2012; Satterfield et al., 2013; TEEB, 2010; UK National Ecosystem Assessment, 2014, 2011). Kenter (2016a) divides non-monetary meth-

ods into deliberative, analytical-deliberative, interpretive, and psychometric categories, noting that certain interpretive and psychometric methods can also be used in a deliberative format. In this study we provide a novel integration of deliberative monetary valuation (DMV), storytelling, and psychometric testing of transcendental values and other constructs that could influence monetary values, as well as psychometric subjective well-being (SWB) indicators.

Deliberative monetary valuation (DMV) represents a group of analytical-deliberative methods that seek to embed deliberation into the valuation process. Kenter (2017) describes how DMV studies can be situated between two archetypes: *deliberated preferences* and *deliberative democratic monetary valuation* (DDMV). Deliberated preferences approaches are an adaptation of stated preferences methods (e.g. contingent valuation [CV] and choice experiments) that incorporate group deliberation with the primary aim of informing preferences, which are expressed through individual WTP. These methods express ‘weak value plurality’ participants can express ethically and ontologically plural values in the deliberation, but preferences are still assumed to be individual, self-regarding and utilitarian. DDMV, on the other hand, uses deliberation not just for informing but also moralising and democratising preferences. Preference democratisation, as defined by Lo and Spash (2012), allows participants to decide on the terms for bringing together information and transcendental values to establish their contextual values and indicators. While deliberated preferences are generally expressed as individual WTP, democratic deliberative exercises may establish value indicators as fair prices (i.e. ‘how much should we pay’ as opposed to ‘how much am I willing to pay’) or by negotiating a social willingness to pay (i.e. ‘how much should society pay’; Orchard-Webb et al., 2016 in this issue; Spash, 2008).

Storytelling, considered here as a deliberative-interpretive method, focuses on the elicitation of personal stories to form narrative accounts of meaning and value, as conceived by O’Neill et al. (2008). Narratives mix descriptive and normative statements in an organised and engaging manner. The typical format of a beginning, middle and end provides a familiar structure; the ending usually engenders an overall unity (Velleman, 2003). Stories often indirectly, rather than explicitly, communicate value judgements of all kinds (McShane, 2012). As such, they provide an avenue for meaning and value formation to extend beyond the self-regarding, utility-maximising values assumed by neoclassical economic valuation. As an expression of values, stories can provide affirmation of what is important, thus linking to a sense of identity (Shnabel et al., 2013) and self-control (Burson et al., 2012). Narratives play a prominent role in the symbolic representation and construction of places, reflecting cultural and place identities (Church et al., 2014; Cooper et al., 2016; Edwards et al., 2016; Coates et al., 2014; Fish et al. 2016) that are often latent or implicit (Kenter et al., 2011; 2016b; Niemeyer, 2004), and thus require explicit elicitation if they are to be fully reflected in ES valuations. The narratives associated with storytelling are particularly suited as a means to bring transcendental values into deliberation, providing an approachable way to consider them as well as revealing values that are not necessarily expressed through more abstract deliberations on utility, duties or virtues (Chan et al., 2016; O’Neill et al., 2008). The process of eliciting narratives and transcendental values and deliberating on them then becomes an important part of a process of forming contextual values which may then be expressed through monetary or non-monetary indicators.

Psychometric approaches provide another dimension to the understanding of value. They can inform pluralistic conceptions of subjective well-being (SWB; e.g. Ryan and Deci, 2001) as it might be experienced through interaction with the natural environment (Church et al., 2014; Irvine et al., 2013), provide a means for measuring transcendental values, and help inform how transcendental values relate to various types of beliefs and norms (Dietz et al., 2005; Raymond and Kenter, 2016), which may in turn underpin contextual values and value

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6463692>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/6463692>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)