

ENV 251D: International Conservation and Development COURSE OUTLINE

Course Dates: Spring 2008 'B' Term (Feb. 11 to March 7)

Location: Beaufort, Duke Marine Lab, OCC

Time: *See Detailed Course Schedule Below*

Instructor: Lisa Campbell

Office: Lab 7, Rm. 309

Phone: 504-7628

E-mail: lcampbe@duke.edu

Office Hours: Due to the compressed course schedule, I will be available to meet with students in my office each afternoon throughout the course, from 2-4pm, unless I specify otherwise. Meetings outside of this time can be arranged by email.

Synopsis

The course looks at the interrelated issues of conservation and development. Topics include the evolution of the two concepts and of theories regarding the relationship between them, the role of science, values, ethics, politics and other issues in informing beliefs about them, and strategies for resolving conflicts between them. While attention will be given to all scales of interaction (i.e. local, regional, national, international), the focus will be on international issues and the 'north-south' dimensions of the conservation and development dilemma. Examples from marine and coastal environments (primarily related to sea turtle conservation and ecotourism) will be highlighted. The course will include a combination of lectures and seminar-style discussion, as well as student-led presentations.

Course Objectives

By the end of this course, you should be able to:

- Define, explain, and effectively employ various concepts and theories related to conservation and development (e.g. sustainable use, ecotourism, discourse/narrative);
- Identify and examine the assumptions underlying particular approaches to conservation and development;
- Recognize the various actors and approaches involved in conservation and development, assess the merits (and problems) of these various approaches, and compare these approaches with one another (in theory and in practice); and
- Critically analyze and evaluate examples of 'integrated conservation and development' using concepts and theories learned in class and through readings.

Course Materials

Readings are available in the library or posted on Blackboard. In addition to daily readings, student seminars and the final exam will require that you read and use the following:

Dryzek, John (2005). The Politics of the Earth: Environmental Discourses. Oxford University Press. Second edition.

Two copies of this will be available on reserve in the library, but you may want to order your own copy from Amazon (it's a relatively cheap paperback, ~\$25-30).

Course Policies

- *Attendance*: Please let me know if you will be missing any classes *ahead of time*, whenever possible. See information on 'participation' below.
- *Academic honesty*: Students are expected to pursue their academic work with honesty and integrity. Plagiarism will not be tolerated. For details on plagiarism and tips on how to avoid it in your work, see <http://library.duke.edu/research/citing>. Students are expected to be familiar with and uphold the *Duke Community Standard*, which can be reviewed at: <http://www.integrity.duke.edu/ugrad/student.html>
- *Communication*: Verbal and written communication (including electronic) must be conducted in a way that treats others with respect and honesty. Criticism is encouraged that speaks to arguments and points, while recognizing the value of each individual.
- *Timely communication*: Because of the compressed course schedule, I recognize that students will often need to contact me 'after hours', by email. I will respond to any email message sent before 9pm by 9pm at the latest on the same day (or by 9pm on Sunday for messages sent on the weekend). After 9pm, there is no guarantee that I will receive your message prior to the next day's meeting.
- *Missed or Late Assignments*: Given the compressed course schedule, it is essential that assignments are completed in a timely manner. Assignments must be submitted **by 4pm on the due date**. Assignments submitted up to 24 hours late will be penalized by 10%; assignments submitted up to 48 hours late will be penalized by 25%. Any assignment submitted more than 48 hours after the due date will be regarded as incomplete and given a grade of 0. Assignment 2 (the student-led seminars) requires attendance and participation on the designated day, and Assignment 3 requires attendance at the scheduled debate. If you anticipate problems with due dates, speak to the instructor BEFORE the assignment is due so that alternative arrangements can be made, if appropriate. In the case of an emergency, please notify the instructor as soon as possible.

Course Assignments and Grading

Item	% of grade	Due Date
A1: Reading Log	20	Feb 11 – first 6 articles March 3 – all x articles
A2: Student-led Seminars	20	Feb 18-20
A3: Stakeholder position paper	20	
Final Exam: IAC assessment	30	March 5, 4pm (by e-mail only)
Participation	10	Assessed throughout course

Participation: The quality of the class experience is in large part dependent on student participation. Students are expected to take responsibility for their own learning by preparing for and participating in each class meeting. The course incorporates active learning techniques such as discussion, brainstorming and other small-group or individual exercises, all of which count toward your participation grade – so come to class prepared to take part! Each student’s participation will be evaluated and forms 10% of their final course grade. To provide an indication of how this grade is assessed, see the self-assessment form below, one you will complete at the end of the course. Failure to attend class will have a negative impact on the participation grade, unless absences are justified and discussed *in advance* with the instructor.

I think I deserve a grade of ___/10 for class participation, because (circle all that apply):

I was in class: *always / almost always / often / sometimes / never*

I did the reading to prepare for class: *always / almost always / often / sometimes / never*

I contributed to class discussions: *frequently / sometimes / occasionally / never*

My contributions were: *insightful / original / relevant / average / off topic / disruptive*

I performed in class exercises: *enthusiastically / satisfactorily / half-heartedly*

Basically, the class wouldn’t have been the same without me: *Yes / No*

Other Comments:

Elements of effective participation:

- Offer observations, ask questions, make claims (argue for a position) – offer your interpretation of the ideas being discussed
- Open discussion – ask questions that engage with the material; Try to open up debate and enhance understanding of issues, rather than quickly establish answers
- Limit personal anecdotes – while personal experiences often provide insight into issues, recounting these should not make up the bulk of your participation, and should be supplemented by, or interpreted through, the readings and materials we are using in class
- Strive for coherence and continuity – respond to colleagues’ ideas, make links to readings, previous classes, experiences in other courses or outside of school
- Participation should be cooperative (we are all trying to learn together) rather than competitive

Course Schedule Overview (subject to change)

Week of:	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Feb 11	Course Introduction	Assessing C&D	Evolution of thinking on Development	Evolution of thinking on Conservation and rise of Sust. Dev't	Discourse and narratives 1st reading log due; 1st 5 articles (A1)
	Environmental Issues Exercise; Defining C&D	Indicators Exercise	Video: <i>Life and Debt</i>		Video: <i>Second Nature</i> ; Narratives Exercise
Feb 18	Dryzek seminars (A2)	Dryzek seminars (A2)	Dryzek seminars (A2)	Community based conservation LAB 5	Sustainable use LAB 5
				Stakeholder exercise	
Feb 25	Ecotourism as C&D	Indigenous ecotourism as C&D	Stakeholder negotiation Stakeholder position paper due (A3)		
Mar 3	MTSG and conservation; discuss take home exam	Guest lecture: Matthew Godfrey IAC position 1	Take home exam due by 4pm, by email		
	Due: Reading log; all 10 articles (A1)	Guest Lecture: Karen Eckert. IAC position 2			

Green = lectures; Pink = activities; Aqua = student-led seminars; Grey = guest lectures; White = no class meeting

Detailed Course Schedule

Date & Time	Activities
Mon., Feb 11 9:00 to 12	<p><i>Course Introduction</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defining Conservation and Development • Environmental Issues Exercise
Tues., Feb 12 9:00 to 12	<p><i>Assessing Conservation and Development</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defining and Measuring Progress • Indicators Exercise • Read: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Morse, S. and E.D.G. Fraser. 2005. Making ‘dirty’ nations look clean? The nation state and the problem of selecting and weighting indices as tools for measuring progress towards sustainability. <i>Geoforum</i> 36: 625-640. BB (TOTAL = 15 pages)
Wed., Feb 13 9:00 to 12	<p><i>History and Evolution of Thinking on Development</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Isbister, J. 1998. “Economic Development”, pp. 171-191 in <i>Promises Not Kept</i>. West Hartford: Kumarian Press. LIB 3) Mohan, G. Participatory Development. In Desai and Potter, pp.49-54. LIB (TOTAL = 25 pages)
Thurs., Feb 14 9:00 to 12	<p><i>History and Evolution of Conservation and the Rise of Sustainable Development</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video: <i>About the United Nations: Environment and Development</i> • Read: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) WCED. 1987. “From one earth to one world: an overview by the World Commission on Environment and Development”, pp 1-23 in <i>Our Common Future</i>. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press. LIB 5) Chatterjee, P. and M. Finger. 1994. “Whose Common Future?” Ch. 1 (pp. 13-29) in <i>The Earth Broke: Power, Politics and World Development</i>. New York: Routledge. LIB (TOTAL = 40 pages)

<p>Fri., Feb 15</p> <p>9:00 to 12</p>	<p><i>Conservation and Development Narratives</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video: Second Nature • Exercise: Analyzing Representations of Environment and Development • Due by 4pm: Assignment 1 (Reading Log, 1st 5 articles) • Read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6) Adams, W. M. and D. Hulme 2001. Changing Narratives, Policies & Practices in African Conservation. In <i>African Wildlife and Livelihoods: the promise and performance of community conservation</i>. D. Hulme and M. Murphree (eds.). Oxford, James Currey, pp. 9-23. LIB <p>[You will also need to read Chapter 1 of Dryzek, <i>The Politics of the Earth</i>, for assignment 2; if you have it read before today, it will enhance your preparation for Assignment 2.]</p> <p>(TOTAL=14 pages + Dryzek)</p>
<p>Mon., Feb 18</p> <p>9:00 to 12</p>	<p><i>Environmental Discourses – Student-led Seminars (A2)</i></p>
<p>Tues, Feb 19</p> <p>9:00 to 12</p>	<p><i>Environmental Discourses – Student-led Seminars (A2)</i></p>
<p>Wed., Feb 20</p> <p>9:00-12:00</p>	<p><i>Environmental Discourses – Student-led Seminars (A2)</i></p>
<p>Thurs., Feb 21</p> <p>9:00 to 12</p>	<p><i>Components of a counter-narrative: Community-based Conservation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7) Agrawal, A. and C. Gibson. 1999. Enchantment and Disenchantment: The Role of Community in Natural Resource Conservation. <i>World Development</i> 27: 629-649. BB 8) Gray, N., and L. M. Campbell. 2007. A decommodified experience? Exploring aesthetic, economic, and ethical values for volunteer ecotourism in Costa Rica. <i>Journal of Sustainable Tourism</i> 15:463-482 <p>(TOTAL = ~40 pages)</p>
<p>Fri., Feb 22</p>	<p><i>Components of a counter-narrative: Sustainable Use</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumptive and non-consumptive use; sustainable use • <i>Guest lecture:</i> Lisa Campbell, Sea Turtle Conservation and Sustainable Use in Ostional, Costa Rica

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Read: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Campbell, L.M. 1998. Use them or lose them? Conservation and the consumptive use of marine turtle eggs at Ostional, Costa Rica. <i>Environmental Conservation</i> 25: 305-319. BB Campbell, L. M., B. J. Haalboom, and J. Trow. 2007. Sustainability of community-based conservation: sea turtle egg harvesting in Ostional (Costa Rica) ten years later. <i>Environmental Conservation</i> 34:122-131. BB <p>(TOTAL=~25 pages)</p>
<p>Mon, Feb 25</p> <p>9:00 to 12</p>	<p><i>Conservation Strategies and Practices: Ecotourism</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecotourism at national and community levels <i>Guest lecture:</i> Zoe Meletis, Local Perceptions of Tourism and Environment in Tortuguero, Costa Rica Read (before class): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Place, S. 1991. Nature Tourism and Rural Development in Tortuguero. <i>Annals of Tourism Research</i> 18: 186-201. <p>(TOTAL = 26 pages) LIB</p>
<p>Tuesday, Feb 26</p> <p>9:00 to 12</p>	<p><i>Conservation strategies and practices: Indigenous issues</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Coombes, B. (2007). "Defending community? Indigeneity, self-determination and institutional ambivalence in the restoration of Lake Whakaki." <i>Geoforum</i> 38(1): 60-72. Valdivia, G. (2005). "On indigeneity, change, and representation in the northeastern Ecuadorian Amazon." <i>Environment and Planning A</i> 37(2): 285-303. Walker, D., J. P. Jones, et al. (2007). "When participation meets empowerment: The WWF and the politics of invitation in the Chimalapas, Mexico." <i>Annals of the Association of American Geographers</i> 97(2): 423-444.
<p>Wednesday, Feb 27</p> <p>9:00 to 12</p>	<p><i>Operationalizing conservation and development</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder negotiation exercise Due: 'Stakeholder position paper' for stakeholder negotiation (A3, due in class)
<p>Thursday, Feb 28</p>	<p><u>NO CLASS</u></p>
<p>Friday, Feb 29</p>	<p><u>NO CLASS</u></p>
<p>Monday, Mar 3</p> <p>9:00 to 12</p>	<p><i>Conservation strategies and the Marine Turtle Specialist Group</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due by 4pm: Reading Log, all 10 articles (A1) MTSG positions on use and participation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructions for take home exam • Read: 13) Campbell, L.M., 2002. Science and sustainable use: views of marine turtle conservation experts. <i>Ecological Applications</i>, 12:4:1229-1246. BB <p><i>Course Conclusion</i></p>
Tuesday, Mar 4 9:00 to 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Guest lecture</i>: Matthew Godfrey, the Inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles (IAC) – Position 1 • <i>Guest lecture (FINAL EXAM)</i>: Rhema Bjorkland, the Inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles (IAC) – Position 2 • Conservation and Development – the Final Word? • Read: See readings listed on the Final Exam Description LIB/BB
Wednesday, March 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NO CLASS • Due by 4pm: Final Exam

ENV 251D: INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

ASSIGNMENT 1: READING LOG / COURSE JOURNAL

Twice during term (Feb. 15 and March 3), you will submit a reading log that records your thoughts on assigned readings and course topics. It can be typed or handwritten (but must be legible!). Although it will be evaluated, your reading log is primarily for your own educational purposes – it will help you to prepare for class and for the final exam, and will enhance the quality of classroom-based discussion. Your journal entries should demonstrate curiosity, reflection and the ability to think critically about the material under consideration (readings, lectures, and other course activities).

Your journal should include the following:

- 1) Notes on each reading:
 - Author, date, title and publication details of readings
 - Summary of the overall theme and argument of the piece
 - Your own reaction e.g. Did you understand the piece? Did you like the piece, and why/why not? Did you agree with its main points (why/why not)?
- 2) Reflections on linkages between readings, lectures, class discussion, guest lectures, videos, exercises, etc. You should explore areas of overlap as well as points of contradiction. You should critically evaluate the ideas presented, but also record your reactions to course content (e.g. does an idea make you uncomfortable?). Also – it is OK if there are ideas that you do not fully understand, but you should highlight these in your journal and attempt to explore possible meanings. (You should also raise these questions during class).

As a general guideline, you should write approx. 1-2 pages per class/reading (although this will vary depending on whether you type or write by hand, the topic, etc.). The goal is quality of notes, ideas and critical thinking, rather than sheer quantity.

Please refer to the handout “Critical Reading Toward Critical Writing” for further instruction.

According to Northey and Knight (1992, 77): “The goal of all discussion groups, seminars and tutorials are insight and understanding, and the key to achieving them is participation. In turn, the key to successful participation is preparation.... The keys to preparation are reading, thinking, and writing notes that you can use.” (Northey & Knight. 1992. *Making sense in geography and environmental studies*. Oxford University Press: Don Mills, Ontario).

DUE DATES:

- Feb 15 – Your journal **MUST** be handed in, but it will not be graded at this point. Instead, you will be given feedback and suggestions for ways to improve your notes.
- March 3 – Your complete journal will be handed in for grading.

ENV 251D: INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

ASSIGNMENT 2: STUDENT-LED SEMINARS ON ENV. DISCOURSES

We will read and discuss seven chapters from John Dryzek's (2005) book, The Politics of the Earth: environmental discourses. **Everyone** will read Chapter 1, while students working in pairs will choose one additional 'discourse' chapter (from chapters 3-6, 8-10) to focus on for a seminar presentation. The book is available from the Ship's Store for purchase and a reserve copy is in the library. For each of the 'discourse' chapters, student pairs will be responsible for presenting on the chapter and leading a discussion. The other students will not (necessarily) have read your chapter at the time you present (although I recommend that they do), so it is your responsibility to both familiarize them with the material and engage them in discussing/analyzing it.

Guidelines for the seminar you are responsible for leading:

For one of the seminars, you will be presenting and leading the discussion. The way you lead the discussion is up to you; your job is to engage the group, and you have creative license in how you do this. But you must make sure you stay focused on the issues that arise in the reading. If the discussion wanders off topic, you will have to get it back on track. Everyone will be familiar with Dryzek's approach (as outlined in Chapter 1), but it is up to you to make sure that everyone understands the key concepts in your particular chapter.

Two requirements:

1. Find an example of your discourse in relation to an environmental problem as discussed in the mass media;
2. Go to at least one of the original sources or examples listed by Dryzek to further exemplify, or critique, his categorization of that source as part of the particular discourse.

Some additional hints:

- a) Summarize the authors' essential arguments, but spend at least as much time generating a discussion of the ideas.
- b) Critique the authors' work, but make sure this is meaningful. For example, 'I don't agree with him' or 'I don't like it' is not enough.
- c) Most importantly, have a strategy for engaging the rest of the class.

TIME: Your seminar should take at least 40 minutes, but no more than 50 minutes.

This seminar is worth 20% of your final grade.

ENV 251D: INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

ASSIGNMENT 3: STAKEHOLDER NEGOTIATION – Part 1

This assignment includes 3 components:

1. A preliminary ‘stakeholder position statement’ (1/3 of grade)
2. Participation in an in-class negotiation (group grade – 1/3 of grade)
3. A summary reflection statement on negotiation (1/3 of grade)

For Parts 1:

The following fictional scenario guides this assignment:

Parks For People (PFP), a non-profit organization headquartered in Seattle, WA, wants to establish a marine protected area adjacent to Jemden village, in the southern part of Linma (a clearly made up country in Central America). This marine protected area will cover a coral reef fished by local, predominately male fishers who catch fish for both subsistence use and for sale, in addition to a rocky shoreline where women collect various mollusks and crustaceans for subsistence purposes. PFP has proposed that the community develop ecotourism to offset costs of reduced resource use, and is willing to split any entrance fees charged to tourists between PFP and the community. PFP wants the community to decide, firstly, whether or not they will accept the establishment of the MPA; secondly, what kind of rules of access will be imposed (PFP is open to some use of resources continuing); and finally, how the community will use the \$500,000 community development fund PFP will supply. PFP has only a few stipulations. First, they have insisted that all groups in the community be represented in negotiations. Second, they require that 4 of the 5 representatives agree on the outcome of the negotiations. Otherwise, the deal is off.

The following ‘stakeholders’ have been identified, and appointed to the negotiating team:

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| 1) Chair of the village council | Voting member |
| 2) Leader of the local women’s group | Voting member |
| 3) Representative of the reef fishers | Voting member |
| 4) Local entrepreneur, recent immigrant | Voting member |
| 5) Representative of the Rosjoan people (indigenous) | Voting member |
| 6) Biologist, University of Linma | Non-voting member |
| 7) Aid, Ministry of Natural Resources | Non-voting member |

Part 1: Initial Report

Working alone, write a ‘stakeholder position paper’ (maximum two pages, single-spaced, typed) for submission to PFP. The stakeholder position paper should support the outcome you want to promote, based on available literature on the specific topics. While you are to base this in

appropriate literature, you are presenting an argument and can write your position paper as such (e.g. you may think of this as constructing your own ‘narrative’ with links to discourse). Cite relevant readings and websites. In addition to any readings we have used in class already, you should include AT LEAST 3 academic sources (book chapters, journal articles) and 2 non-academic sources (reports by organizations or governments, websites, etc.). Remember, in this report you are trying to ‘sell’ your particular view of what should happen – you should offer both *arguments* (e.g. theoretical arguments for or against MPAs or ecotourism or communities, or for a particular vision of development) and *evidence* (e.g. examples or ‘real life case studies’ from your readings) to make your case. You may also want to consider possible critiques of your arguments (in anticipation of the negotiation), and try to counter them.

****Bring a copy of your expert report for the instructor to the negotiation and an additional copy for your own reference (Wednesday, Feb 27).**

ENV 251: INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

ASSIGNMENT 3: STAKEHOLDER NEGOTIATION – Parts 2 and 3

Part 2: Negotiation

On Wednesday, Feb 27, we will stage the negotiation (starting at 9am). You will have an opportunity to overview your position to the rest of the group (you will get approximately 5 minutes of air time and should be prepared to summarize your argument), but the details of the full structure will only be announced that morning.

Representatives from Parks for People will oversee the negotiation.

Part 3: Final Report

Each person will write a one page (single-spaced, typed) ‘personal reflection,’ describing and critically reflecting on the negotiation. From the perspective of your stakeholder, how did things turn out? What did your stakeholder give and get? Of the various stakeholder groups, how do you think your stakeholder fared (Very well? Average? Poorly? Why?). (While I am asking you to think about it from the perspective of your stakeholder, you are no longer taking on that persona – you write this as a student). Analyze this outcome drawing on ideas or concepts we’ve discussed in class. Three examples of approaches you might take are listed here. This is not an exhaustive list, and I’m not suggesting you use all (or any) of the examples. Depending on the stakeholder in question, some issues, ideas, theories, will be more important than others, depending on their experience of the negotiation:

- I outlined political ecology’s interest in scale, actors, power, structure/agency, and knowledge. Did any of these issues play out for your stakeholder group in the negotiation? Do you have any thoughts about their importance (or lack thereof based on your experience)
- We have talked at length about neo-liberalism and its implications for conservation. Were elements of neoliberalism at work in this negotiation that were important for your stakeholder group?
- We have critiqued concepts of community and of participation. Does your experience reflect, reinforce, contradict anything that you’ve read about these terms?

While this is a personal reflection, it should include references to appropriate literature, lectures, materials or discussions from the course, when you analyzing your experience (E.g. don’t just tell me community is a problematic term. Problematic how? How do you know this (i.e. include citations)).

ENV 298.58: International Conservation and Development

Take home exam: instructions

This is a take home exam. It is due back on or before Wednesday, March 5, by 4pm (in digital drop box). You must work alone (i.e. do not discuss the exam with other students), but you are free to draw on any and all course materials (readings, lectures, student presentations, etc.). Remember to properly reference all of your sources.

MAXIMUM LENGTH: 8 pages double-spaced (typed) (recommended – at least 6 pages)

The basic task of the exam is to evaluate arguments for and against the Inter-American Convention for the Conservation of Sea Turtles (IAC) in terms of the various discourses and narratives about environment, wildlife conservation, and human development that we have examined throughout the class. These Rhema Bjorkland (March 4).

More specific instructions:

1. Recalling Dryzek’s approach to discourse analysis that considers: a) basic entities whose existence is recognized or constructed; b) assumptions about natural relationships; c) agents and their motives; and d) key metaphors and other rhetorical devices, analyze the discourses adopted by Godfrey and Bjorkland. In doing so, pretend you have not already read several of the discourses. Ignore them! Construct your own discourse based on the presentations and name them as you wish. (Review Chapter 1 of Dryzek if you want clarification on his methods).
2. Once you have constructed your own discourses (one for Godfrey, one for Bjorkland), contrast them to the discourses we have covered in class. Where is the overlap? What elements have you identified that do not appear in any of the existing discourses?
3. Based on the range of **readings, lectures and discussions** we have had this term, choose three concepts from the list below to assess the two discourses you identified in Part 1. For example, Agrawal and Gibson (1999) talk about communities and both Godfrey and Bjorkland use the term. What would Agrawal and Gibson say about their use of the term?

Concepts:

• Community	• Indicators
• Participation	• Sustainable Use
• Scale	• Actors
• Development	• Neoliberalism

Remember to make the link to the reading, lecture or discussion you are referencing clear. Also, recall that you are not assessing the discourses in terms of whether or not they are correct about the IAC, but in terms of how they represent these concepts.

4. Based on your analysis above, what do you conclude about discourse analysis, and more specifically, the discourses that Dryzek describes?