

Assessment of Local Communities Attitudes towards Participatory Forest Management (PFM) Approach and It's Implications for Sustainability of Forest Condition and Livelihoods: The Case of Chilimo-Gaji Forest in Dendi District, West Shewa Zone, Oromia, Ethiopia

Tesfaye Samuel Saguye

Department of Disaster Risk Management and Sustainable Development, Institute of Cooperatives and Development Studies, Ambo University, Ambo, Ethiopia.
P.O. Box: 19, Ambo University, Ethiopia

Abstract

Participatory Forest Management (PFM) approach was piloted in Chilimo-Gaji Forest in Ethiopia in 1990s as an alternative forest management approach. This was necessitated by objection over forest resource degradation, clamor for decentralization and need for better forest governance system. Positive attitudes of local communities towards collaborative forest management are an essential prerequisite for local participation in forest management. In order for local residents to cooperate with a reduction of deforestation and forest degradation, they must have a positive attitude toward the forest conservation system and positive attitude toward the forest conservation approach. A positive attitude of local communities towards forest management system is an essential prerequisite for local participation in forest management. Understanding local community perceptions of forest management and the factors that influence their perceptions and attitudes are important for designing forest management policies that are sensitive to their needs. This study assesses the local communities' perceptions of and attitudes towards participatory forest management approaches in the Chilimo-Gaji forest in Ethiopia and further analyses factors that affect attitudes towards the forest and forest management. Data for the study was generated through household survey comprising of 265 respondents selected through simple random technique and substantiated by key informant interview and FGDs. Data analyzed by employing both descriptive and inferential statistics. The study findings revealed that, generally the respondents held positive attitudes towards the forest and PFM approach. The results also depicted the association between socio-economic features of people living close to the forest and their use of forest resources and demonstrated the basis of attitudes towards those managing the forest. Sixty percent of respondents were found to agree with the idea of Chilimo-Gaji forest conservation; however, statistically significant differences were found between the villages in terms of supportive attitudes toward the forest conservation system ($p = 0.02$) and toward the PFM System ($p = 0.01$). However, those highly dependent on the forest to generate income remained reluctant and unsupportive, suggesting that high levels of support toward a conservation project by sections of the community may not translate into conservation success, because the drivers of the deforestation and forest degradation are not supportive. Regression results showed that these perceptions were influenced by different socio-economic, demographic and geophysical factors. These factors included: membership in social groups, wealth strata, farm size, livestock ownership and dependency on forest for extraction. A direct financial benefit accrues from the PFM system was found to be the main factor of the respondents' attitudes and perceptions. This study then suggests that to change the perception and attitudes of local people around the forest, environmental education through awareness raising programs should be encouraged, and then addressing local development needs, ensuring real participation in PFM system if the new forest management system wants to win long lasting support of local communities in order to improve the forest condition and ensure sustainable rural livelihood.

Keywords: PFM Approach, Local Communities, Attitude, Perception, Chilimo-Gaji Forest

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and Justification of the Study

Forests have enormous ecological, economical and socio-cultural significances (Ferraro, 2002; Ostrom, 1999; Robertson and Lawes, 2005; Wiggins *et al.*, 2004). Forests constitute critical habitat for humanity, providing a range of ecological and environmental services including protection of biodiversity, sequestration of carbon, provisioning of fresh air, renewal of soil fertility, and maintenance of hydrological cycles (FAO, 2012; Campbell 2009; Strassburg *et al.*, 2009; Baker *et al.*, 2010). Rural communities worldwide depend on forests heavily, as these contribute significantly to their livelihoods, providing basic needs, cash resources, and safety-nets during times of crisis (Shackleton *et al.*, 2007). Regrettably, despite widespread acknowledgment of the significance of forests, it has been very difficult to tackle deforestation, which continues to represent a major global challenge (Kinyanjui, 2007; Bradstock *et al.* 2007; Winberg 2010). Globally, the forestry sector has over the years been

faced by a myriads of challenges including; excision of state forest land, indiscriminate destruction of natural forests, poaching of rare species, weak governance structures, and lack of resources to regulate, lack of incentives to enhance communities participation and the duplication of laws and regulations (Barrett *et al.*, 2001; Salomao and Matose, 2007). Many developing countries including Ethiopia continue to face the challenge of how best to manage and conserve their forests. Forest management systems adopted by governments, whether they are protectionist oriented or incentive-based are important in determining outcomes of conservation and sustainable use (Agrawal, 1999; Kant, 2000). Historically, conservation strategies have been dominated by attempts to fence off or reserve areas for nature and exclude people from the reserved areas (Adams and Hulme, 2001; Blaikie, 2006).

Governments from the commencement of nation-states have usurped forest management and use rights from traditional forest dependent societies as they perceive these societies as being opportunistic and non-conservationists, thus dismissing their capability to manage their forests on a sustainable basis (Saldanha, 2007; Webb, 2008; Kamal *et al.*, 2006; FAO 2006). Centralized control imposes strict regulations that disallow the use of forest products, including wildlives (Agrawal and Ostrom, 2008). One of the negative immediate impacts of forest centralization is the loss of local control over forest resources and the reduced role of local institutions in managing forests (Agrawal and Gibson 1999; Ferraro, 2002; Ostrom, 1999; Robertson and Lawes, 2005; Wiggins *et al.*, 2004). Forest dependent communities, devoid of any legal capacity to protect the resource encroach upon the protected forests to make up for the loss of use rights and incentives to manage their forests (Ostrom, 1990; Nemarundwe, 2003). This has resulted in deep-seated mistrust, antagonism and conflicts with the government, forest management regime and negative attitude towards the forest itself. In a situation in which little consideration was given to the people's livelihood needs, indigenous knowledges, values and spiritual aspirations, local people lose the feeling of owning the forests and develop negative perceptions and attitudes towards them (Kinyanjui 207; Ghate 20004). This in turn leads to indiscriminate exploitation of forests, degradation and deforestation. In such kind absolute exclusionary condition, it is not surprising that the attitudes of local people living within and adjacent to forest reserves reflect suspicion and mistrust on forest management system (Anderson *et al.*, 2006; Ongugo et al, 2008). It is not possible therefore to have the forests for exclusive use by the state alone and reject forest adjacent communities' access to the forests (Lise, 2000). The local communities, particularly poorer households, would continue to access and use the forest resource whenever available despite not having legal tenure rights to access the forest resources. In addition, the lack of local community participation in forest management has generally meant local communities have a negative attitude towards conservation efforts and the enforcement of conservation-related regulations (Obua *et al.*, 1998; Arts et al. 2013; Cleaver 2002; Li 2007; Mosse 2004; Nuijten 2005).

In response to the problems associated with the fortress approach, since the 1980s a new dialogue has arisen that stresses the need to integrate the views and aspirations of the local people in conservation (Hutton and Leader- Williams, 2003). Unlike fortress conservation that viewed people as a 'threat' to conservation, the new approach views them as potential partners in biodiversity conservation (Adams and Hulme, 2001). This approach has two distinct elements. First, it allows people in the vicinity of the protected area or others with property rights to participate in the conservation process and second, to link the objectives of conservation with the local development needs of the people (Hutton and Williams, 2003; Adams and Hulme 2001). This approach recognizes the moral implications of imposing costs on local people and the pragmatic problem of hostility of displaced or disadvantaged local people to conservation organizations practicing fortress conservation strategy (Adams and Hulme, 2001). The approach adopts sustainable development concept and combines both biocentrism arguments and anthropocentric arguments in conservation. Through Participatory Forest Management (PFM) initiatives, communities are expected to manage their environment based on ecological principles, and benefit economically by becoming stewards of the forests and the lands that are close to them (Stellmacher 2007; Tsegaye et al. 2009; Yihnew 2002; World Bank, 2004).

Chilimo-Gaji forest is one of the oldest PFM intervention sites in Ethiopia in which the government had invited local people to participate in planning, designing, implementing, managing and benefit sharing of forest resources under the participatory forest management program (Garuma, 2000). In sharp contrast with the old 'command and control' system of forest governance, PFM system hoped to meet people's needs in conservation by involving them in decision-making, allowing them to share benefits of conservation, and providing them with measures to mitigate any adverse effects of conservation (Agrawal 2001; Ostrom 1999; Quinn *et al.* 2007; Stellmacher 2007; Wollenberg *et al.* 2007). So, it is expected to bring positive attitudinal change of local communities towards the forest management system and the forest itself. Integrating the views and needs of local communities in conservation processes are crucial to for the effectiveness of PFM in improving the forest condition and ensuring the sustainability of the livelihoods of the communities (Stellmacher 2007; Tsegaye et al. 2009; Yihnew 2002). However, in many cases people's perceptions of these efforts are rarely elicited, analyzed and included in decision-making processes and readjustment measures have taken (Abrar and Inoue 2012;). Understanding local communities' forest use, perceptions and attitudes of forest

management and the factors that influence these perceptions is important for designing management policies that are sensitive to their need (Adams and Hulme, 2001, Yemiru 2011 Melaku 2003; Mulugeta and Melaku, 2008; Zelalem, 2005). The objective of the study was to examine local people's attitude towards the forest and participatory forest management (PFM) approach in Chilimo-Gaji forest and further determine the factors that influence the attitudes towards the forest and PFM approach.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Description of the study area

The study was conducted in Chilimo-Gaji forest, which is one of the oldest PFM intervention sites in Ethiopia, located in Dendi district. Chilimo-Gaji Forest represents the remnants of the dry Afro-montane forests in the central plateau of Ethiopia. The main species in the canopy layers are Junipers procera, Podocarpus falcatus, Prunus africana, Olea europaea subspecies cuspidata, Hagenia abyssinica, Apodytes dimidiata, Ficus spp., Erythrina brucei, and Croton macrosyachus (Bekele, 2003). This forest is also home to some 150 bird species, of which five are Ethiopian endemics and many more are Afro Tropical Highlands' biome species. Chilimo forest is characterized by the presence of Juniperus procera (*Tsid*), Podocarpus falcatus (*Zigba*), Prunus africana (*Tikur Enchet*) Olea europaea subspecies cuspidata, (*Weyra*), Hagenia abyssinica, (*Kosso*) and Apodytes dimidiata, Ficus spp. (*Shola*). This makes it the main source of indigenous tree seeds for the central highlands. According to wildlife surveys undertaken in 1982, there are about 180 species of birds and 21 mammals in this forest reserve. A number of rivers including, Awash River, start from within the Chilimo-Gaji forest. The vegetation throughout this area has been subject to human interference for over 2,000 years (longer than in any other East African country), and the rate of deforestation has been extremely high, with significant changes in forest cover observed even since the 1970's.

The forest is Montane-mixed broadleaf-coniferous, although conifers predominate. Historically, this entire upland area is thought to have been covered by *Juniperus-Podocarpus* forest, but most of the forest has been cleared for agriculture, and this encroachment continued. Selective cutting of trees for commercial use stopped about 1973, but illegal cutting by the local people for fuelwood sale continued. The forest is important to local people for grazing, fodder, commercial and subsistence fuelwood extraction, herbal medicine for humans and animals, farm implements, construction poles and timber and occasionally non timber forest products. A few shrub species dominate, such as *Myrsine africana*, with others like *Maytenus arbutifolia* and *Rubus apetalus* abundant indicators of forest disturbance. Small patches of plantation forests, initiated by the forestry department of the state in 1976, are present within the forested lands. Indigenous and exotic species are used; the main exotic species are *Eucalyptus saligna*, *E.camaldulensis*, *Pinus patula* and *Cupressus lusitanica*, with indigenous ones including *Juniperus procera*, *Hagenia abyssinica* and *Podocarpus falcatus*.

2.2. Sampling Procedure and Techniques

Multi-stage sampling procedure was employed to identify the sample households for the study. There are forty eight rural kebeles in Dendi district that use the forest for different purpose. However, the PFM scheme is being implemented in parts of the forest extended in seven kebeles. Firstly, from the 48 rural kebeles existing in the district, the seven kebeles where PFM approach is being implemented were purposively selected. Secondly, from those seven kebeles the PFM approach implemented, four kebeles randomly selected. These kebeles were Chilimo, Galessa, Dano Sangota and Goban. Thirdly, the sample households were selected by simple random sampling technique. The sample size of the study was 265 households.

2.3 Data sources, Collection Techniques and Tools

Both qualitative and quantitative approaches were used. A qualitative approach was adopted, with a series of question formulated on various aspects of the forest conservation system and the local people participation, while a quantitative approach was used to study the relationship between perceptions and dependency on forest resources, and the relationship between the benefits received and the attitude to the project. Both primary and secondary source of data were used for this study. Semi-structured interview schedule was administered to household heads or their spouses by trained enumerators. The Semi-structured interview schedule elicited information on households' demographics, socio-economic and geophysical characteristics, farming activities, kinds and quantities of forest products extracted from the forest, costs they incur and their perceptions of forest management aspects. Information about the functioning of the PFM arrangements was obtained from interviews with forest managers and other secondary sources. Attitude questions concerning the forest resource use were phrased around the benefits from the forest (in terms of collecting forest products), restrictions on resource use, burning of the forest, because these are considered the contentious issues in the area. A pre-test survey was conducted with 15 respondents to check whether the questions asked were clear to the respondents as well as to the enumerators. This helped to understand how well the question suited the local setting, if the questions were easy to understand, and how long the interview would take. This was also part of training for the enumerators.

After pre-testing, some questions were modified as necessary. Fifteen enumerators, all diploma holders, recruited from the study area and two-day intensive induction training was given to them. Attitude questions concerning the forest resource use were phrased around the benefits from the forest (in terms of collecting forest products), restrictions on resource use, burning of the forest, because these are considered the contentious issues. Key-informants were drawn from development agents (DAs) working in the sample *kebeles*, Experts from district natural resources management offices, village leaders and Expert from Oromia forest and wildlife enterprise. Hence, in-depth interview with key informant was conducted with selected informants of forest user groups. A set of checklists were used to guide the interview. Additionally Key Informants (KI) was used to collect qualitative data. Key informants were identified as people knowledgeable about the area and the community. Focus group discussions were held sometimes separately with men and women and with groups of different well-being ranks

2.4. Methods of Data Analysis

The qualitative data obtained were subjected to in-depth analysis and used to complement the discussion of analyzed quantitative data. Respondent's attitude was elicited by obtaining their satisfaction ranking with performance of the PFM approach with regard to several aspects of management. The respondents were specifically asked to rank the performance of forest management approach operating a Likert scale of 1 (very satisfied) to 5 (very dissatisfied) with respect to PFM aspects. The quantitative data were cleaned, sorted, summarized, and stored using Ms Excel. In analyzing quantitative data, both descriptive and inferential statistical methods were applied. Descriptive statistics was used to summarize the data. The relationship between dependency on the forest resource and individual attitude questions, and between participation and benefit distribution were analyzed using the Pearson chi-square test, while logistic regression was used to identify the variables determine the positive attitude towards the forest and PFM. A $P \leq 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

2.4.1. Empirical Model and Identification of Variables

A. Empirical Model

From the theoretical framework, the decision to predict those people who are either willing or not willing to participate in forest management make the choice of a logistic regression a more appropriate tool for this analysis. Therefore, Logistic Regression model (Scott, and Willits, 1994) was used to assess the influence of socio-economic, geophysical and demographic factors of the households' willingness to participate in forest management. The model is represented as:

$$P = e^{-1}/1+e^{-}$$

p = probability of an individual saying 'no' (0 = unwilling) or 'yes' (1 = willing) to participatory forest management. In using the model, it is assumed that the probability that an individual supports participatory forest management is dependent of their demographic, geophysical and socio-economic characteristics, i.e,

$$\ln(P_i / 1 - P_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \dots + \beta_k X_{ki}. \quad (1)$$

Where:

i denotes the i -th observation in the sample

P is the probability of willingness to participate in forest management forest management

β_0 is the intercept term

$\beta_1 \dots \beta_k$ are the coefficients associated with each explanatory variable $X_1 \dots X_k$.

B. Identification of Variables

1. **Dependent variable:** a supportive attitude toward the forest and forest conservation system (PFM approach)
2. **Independent variables:** demographic, geophysical and socio-economic factors determining a supportive attitude toward the forest and forest conservation system

In this study we hypothesize that respondents' perception of a given dimension of management is influenced by membership to social groups, distance of the household from the forest edge, the gender of the household head, households' average level of education, a households' dependency on the forest, farm size, livestock ownership, distance from the market center, age of the household head and whether or not a household suffered any crop damage from wildlife attacks. So, the effect of these age, gender, education level, residency, total household income (income), wealth stratum, land ownership, perception of forest benefits, use of forest resources, and benefits from PFM project on participation is estimated.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics of Respondents

The survey result revealed that there is a great deal of variation in resource endowments, socio-economic, and

demographic factors. The majority of the respondents were from Chilimo, 82 (30.94 %), followed by Galessa 76 (28.68%), followed by Dano Sengota 57(21.5%) and Goban 50 (18.87%). More males were interviewed 184 (69.43%) compared to 81 (30.57%) females. With regard to educational level 30% of the respondents were cannot read and write, 50% went to primary school, 16% went to secondary cycle, and 4% went to high school. This low level of education could limit the active involvement of the local people in the PFM process. The survey result also shows that 25% of the respondents were between 20 and 30 years of age, 35% of the respondents were between 31 and 40 years of age, 30% respondents were between 41 and 50 years of age, and 7% were above 51 and 60 years of age and 3% were above 61 years of age (Table1). As a result, 67% of the respondents were between 30 and 60 years of age which is representing most productive age group.

Table1. Demographic and Socio-economic Characteristics of the respondents. (n = 265)

Characteristics		Chilimo (n= 82)	Galessa (n= 76)	Dano Sangota (n= 57)	Goban (n= 50)	X ²	df	p
Age	20-30	18	16	7	6	7.346	7	0.47
	31-40	24	21	18	17			
	41-50	28	29	22	24			
	51-60	10	8	9	3			
	>60	2	2	1	0			
Educational level	0	26	24	18	16	12.634	9	0.28
	1-5	36	42	28	24			
	6-9	14	6	8	6			
	≥10	6	4	3	4			
Family size		8	7	6	7	17.645	6	0.012
landholding	<1	32	33	33	27	14.567	7	0.03
	1-2	28	29	17	13			
	2-3	12	9	6	6			
	3-4	6	3	1	2			
	>4	4	2	0	2			
Annual cash income (in USD)	>250	6	4	2	1	17.893	8	0.01
	201-250	12	14	10	8			
	151-200	22	24	12	14			
	101-150	32	29	18	11			
	51-100	6	4	14	14			
	<50	4	1	1	2			
Wealth stratum	Poor	38	42	33	33	13.456	9	0.02
	Medium	32	30	22	12			
	Better off	10	4	2	5			

Majority of the respondents (70%) livelihood sources of the surveyed households were from subsistence agriculture; however, people that attained relatively higher education level had other considerable sources of income from non-farm small businesses such as store ownership, motorcycles and local grocery business, or a public profession. The agricultural land ownership varied from functionally landless to 4 hectare, of which 85 % of the respondents owned between half a hectare to one and half a hectare. The source of cash income mainly came from livestock rearing (32%), crop sell (30%), and PFM membership associated cash benefits distributed among the member households (20%), small business (8%) and fuelwood sale (10%). The wealth stratum of the studied households were classified using Participatory Wealth Ranking (PWR) exercise. According to this classification, 47% of the surveyed households were poor, 33% were medium class, and 20% were better-off. Characteristically, poor households were those who, reported insufficient annual income and inadequate crop production to support the basic expenditures of the household, such as food, clothes and education. Among the basic socio-economic criteria, there were significant differences among villages regarding land holding (p = 0.03), average annual income (p = 0.01), and wealth stratum (p = 0.02). The average size of land held by households living in the Dano Sengota and Goban were higher than Galessa and Chilimo (0.75 and 0.825 ha versus 0.5 and 0.625 ha, respectively), which could be fundamentally determined by the geophysical characteristics of the villages.

3.2. Forest Resource Use by the Local Communities

The survey result revealed that extraction of fuelwood, poles for building houses and fences, grass for livestock and grazing land, different parts of trees for human and livestock herbal medicinal values, thatching grass, wild fruits and green leaves for consumption and selling purpose and fibers for hand crafts preparation were the commonly practiced consumptive uses of forest products in the study areas. As in most other parts of the country, firewood is still the single dominant source of household energy supply (table2). Regardless of the

socio-economic characteristics or the *kebeles* where the respondents lived, firewood was the main source of energy in the study areas ($p = 0.072$). In addition, nearly 27% of the material for housing and fence poles came from the forest, such as thatch for roofing material and timber for the house and furniture. The use of building poles and thatching grass has declined significantly in the study area as compared to 2-3 decades ago. This is shown by a shift towards corrugated iron roofing by households in the study area (from key informant interview)

The harvest of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) resources was significantly higher for women ($p < 0.01$) and differed within villages ($p = 0.04$). Respondents from Dano Sengota and Galessa tended to harvest more edible and tradable NTFPs from the forest than the other two villages (Table 2) ($p = 0.04$), which was related to the high proportion of landless and poor women headed households and also the high natural forest coverage in Chilimo and Goban that relied on the forest to bridge the gap between household need and available crops during the latent period ($p = 0.02$). Wild Fruits and green leaves were in some cases and households dietary supplements, and green leaves were used and medicine in some cases. Fiber were used for handicraft, and its use did not differ between villages ($p = 0.42$).

Table2. Use of forest products by local communities living around Chilimo-Gaji Forest (n=265)

Resource category	Chilimo (%)	Galessa (%)	Dano Sengota (%)	Goban (%)	X ²	df	P-value
Fuelwood	98	97	98	97	1.72	11	0.072
Building and Fence Poles	83	87	86	80	2.21	6	0.58
Thatching Grass	54	57	62	60	3.42	7	0.05
Hand Crafts and fibers	25	34	35	31	6.76	7	0.42
Herbal Medicinal Purpose	33	27	33	22	8.87	9	0.03
Wild fruits and green leaves	27	22	20	21	8.67	11	0.02
Grass for livestock and grazing	99	98	99	99	0.57	5	0.98

3.3. Perception of Local Communities towards the Significance of the Forest

The study showed that 37.25% ($n = 99$) of the interviewed people perceived that the forest as a source of rain and water; habitat for various wildlife and biodiversity; and as a resource for maintaining the fertility of the land, and therefore deserves sustainable stewardship by the stakeholders especially by the local communities (Table 4). Importantly, the percentage of people who thought that the forest deserves careful stewardship was statistically different among the four villages ($p = 0.02$). The respondents who perceived the protective use of the forest were mainly age-honored (> 61 years old) ($p = 0.04$). The older respondents and the more educated people were generally more aware about the ecosystem function of the forest and were concerned about the consequences of completely deforestation and degradation of the forest. Of the interviewed local residents, 58% ($n = 154$) perceived the forest as an important source of supplementary income, and of these, majority (64%) were young and middle aged men who depended entirely on agriculture plus some cash from the forest resources. Less than five percent of the respondents ($n = 12$) claimed that the forest did not have any importance regardless of protection.

Table3. Perception of Local Communities of the Forest Importance

Kebele	Sam	Perceived benefit of the Forest (%)					
		Protective Imp	Productive Imp	No imp			
Chilimo	82	37	60	3			
Galessa	76	42	50	8			
Dano S	57	34	61	5			
Goban	50	36	61	3			
Total	265	37.25	58	4.75			

The difference in perception between villages was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 10.12$, $df = 4$, $p=0.02$).

4.4 Attitude of Local People toward the Chilimo-Gaji Forest Conservation

The majority of the respondents (94.925%) agreed that the forest area had improved and 69.725% agreed that the improvement of the forest condition had a positive impact on their livelihood. Regardless of the *kebeles* and socio-economic characteristics, 68.125 % people were in favor of conservation of the forest, and 92% agreed that it was the local community's responsibility to safeguard the forest in their surroundings. Nevertheless, as illustrated in Table 5, the number of responders that agreed or disagreed about the forest resource accesses restriction measure was significantly different between villages ($p = 0.04$), 40% and 28% of the respondents from the Dano Sengota and Chilimo, respectively did not favor the implementation of restrictive measures

toward the access to forest resources, while 81 and 76.5 % of the respondents from Galessa and Goban , respectively, indicated that implementing restrictive measures was necessary to sustain the resources. This difference in perception can be explained by the fact that the local people in Dano Sengota and Chilimo had less diversified sources of income, and therefore the forest played a considerable role in the livelihood of these residents, either from direct resources, such as fuelwood sell logging or, from extraction of NTFPs.

Table4: Local Communities Attitude toward the Chilimo-Gaji Forest Conservation.

Statement	Chilimo (n=)		Galessa(n=)		Dano Sengota(n=)		Goban(n=)		P-value
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	
Forest cover has been improved after PFM introduced	94.2	5.8	93	7	96	4	96.5	3.5	0.72
Livelihoods are affected by the forest improvement	72	38	70.8	29.2	67	33	69.1	29.9	0.57
Establishing the Protective Area is necessary to sustain the forest in your area	73	37	77.5	22.5	60	40	62	38	0.53
It is the responsibility of the local people to protect the surrounding forests	94.6	5.4	90	10	88.6	11.4	93.5	6.5	0.89
Restriction measure must be implemented to sustain the forest	72	28	81	19	60	40	76.5	23.5	0.04
Resource extraction fees are necessary to sustain the resources	68	32	73.4	27.6	59	41	56	44	0.46
The implementation of the strict conservation zone is prerequisite for the efficiency of the conservation	45	55	33	77	42	58	31	69	0.35
The forest management system solved the conflict over the forest	73.6	27.4	62	38	58.6	42.4	55.7	45.3	0.78

4.5. Benefits from the PFM approach influenced the Attitude of Local People

It is widely accepted that the decision by people on whether to participate in the developmental activities or not is largely determined by their perceived benefits. The results shown in this study indicated that most of the people that supported the forest PFM were those who directly benefited from the PFM. The respondents from Galessa and Chilimo, located in areas where efforts have made address the livelihood needs of the local communities and encouraged sustainable practices represented the highest level of support, and more than 67% of the interviewed residents were willing to support the PFM. In this study as well as potentially other areas, the people that benefited the most from the project (either through capacity building or direct employment) were found to be the people with more education or a socioeconomic advantage. These people were the elite at the local level, and although the jobs and benefits from these projects were available to everyone, majority of the local people were unable to take advantage of them for various reasons. With the objective of selling carbon credit under REDD and eco-tourism the Chilimo-Gaji forest will offer a large opportunity for the improvement in the socioeconomic conditions of the local community and for natural resource conservation. Although, the project was implemented through community groups, the representation of poor households in the groups was negligible. This finding together with the project's inability to address disadvantaged groups' problems led to an exclusion of disadvantaged households from most of the benefits provided by the PF

4.6. Local Satisfaction with PFM Approach

Among the surveyed local residents, 22.2% of the respondents claimed not satisfied with the rights provided to them by the forest user and emphasized that the period of time that they were allowed to collect resources was very limited (Table 5). The local people in the study area shared the same opinion about the low level of involvement of local people in the decision making process regarding the forest ($p = 0.08$), however, this differed by gender ($p = 0.03$), educational level ($p < 0.01$), annual income ($p < 0.01$), and age ($p = 0.03$). Elder men that were more educated and had higher income comparing with the average were those who stated to be

satisfy. To strengthen the communities' know-how, improve their livelihood, several capacities building related activities were initiated and implemented by the FUGs according to the needs and necessity of the local community. The capacity building included training for agricultural improvement, initiation for project management, training on the sustainable management of the natural resources, and training regarding income source diversification.

Table5. Local Satisfaction with PFM System (n = 265)

Statement		Chilimo (%) (n= 82)	Galessa % (n= 76)	Dano Sengota % (n= 57)	Goban % (n= 50)	Total (%)	x ²	df	P
To what extent are you satisfied with the forest user's right provided to your community	Very satisfied	31	26.4	37	32.7	31.78	4.426	3	0.34
	Somehow satisfied	52.8	42	46.2	47	47			
	Not satisfied	16.2	31.6	16.8	20.3	22.2			
To what extent are you satisfied with the functioning of your forest management committee	Very satisfied	42.6	23	29.6	33	32	8.324	2	0.12
	Somehow satisfied	31	47	51.4	47.3	44.17			
	Not satisfied	26.4	30	19	19.7	23.78			
To what extent are you satisfy with the involvement of the local people in the decision making process regarding the forest	Very satisfied	22	32	40	34	32	3.876	3	0.45
	Somehow satisfied	44	46.7	33.7	45.6	42.5			
	Not satisfied	34	21.3	26.3	20.4	25.5			
To what extent are you satisfy with the participation of the local people within forest conservation activities or development activities	Very satisfied	50	44	52.6	37	45.9	12.768	3	0.03
	Somehow satisfied	32	41	34	43.2	37.55			
	Not satisfied	18	15	13.4	19.8	16.55			
To what extent are you satisfied with the development project implemented within the forest conservation program to improve your well being	Very satisfied	31.7	32.8	50	36	37.62	14.567	3	0.01
	Somehow satisfied	44	51	34.8	51	45.2			
	Not satisfied	14.3	16.4	15.2	13	14.72			
To what extent are you satisfied with the capacity building provided by the project	Very satisfied	22	17	23	31	23.25	16.872	4	0.01
	Somehow satisfied	52	43.6	37	42.7	43.82			
	Not satisfied	26	39.4	40	26.3	32.92			

The perception toward capacity building being developed by the project was statistically different between the villages ($p = 0.01$) and between the educational levels ($p < 0.01$). Among all respondents from the four villages, 31% benefited from the capacity building being initiated and developed by the project, while the rest of the respondents (69%) did not. Based on these responses, we found that a low level of understanding of the local people (44%) and a lack of awareness (31%) were the main reasons for not adopting the training given by the project developer. The third reason was simply a lack of motivation to adopt a new technique (25%).

4.7. Correlation of Selected Households' Variables with PFM Associated Income

A Spearman *rho* correlation coefficient was calculated for the association between dependent variable PFM-associated incomes and selected few households' predictor variables. This is a non parametric procedure that determines the strength of the relationship between two variables. A significant correlation indicates a consistent association, but not necessarily a strong association. With enough subjects, a very small correlation can be significant. Generally, correlations greater than 0.7 are considered strong. Correlations less than 0.3 are considered weak. Correlations between 0.3 and 0.7 are considered moderate.

Table 6. Nonparametric correlation of PFM-associated income with independent continuous variables

Variables	Spearman's Rho	P-value
Age	-0.206	0.060*
Education level	-0.372	0.007*
Location/residency	0.460	0.001**
Annual wage income	-0.350	0.000**
Family Size	0.120	0.001**
Livestock ownership (TLU)	-0.230	0.001**
Land holding size	-0.034	0.004*

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The nonparametric correlation of continuous variables with forest income (Table 6) showed that there was a significant negative correlation between PFM-associated income and annual wage income ($p = 0.000$), education ($p = 0.007$), livestock ownership ($p = 0.001$) and land holding size (0.004). On the other hand, significant positive correlations were observed between forest income and explanatory variables such as age ($p = 0.060$), household size ($p = 0.001$) and residency ($p = 0.001$).

4.8. Linear Logistic regression model of variables associated with a supportive attitude towards the forest and the PFM system

The logistic regression analysis in Table 7 indicated that respondents from Chilimo and Galessa were more likely to have a supportive attitude toward the forest conservation project than Dano Sengota and Goban ($p = 0.03$), since they were more involved and received more benefits than the other villages ($p < 0.01$). Respondents who had a more favorable attitude were more likely to have a protective perception of the forest ($p < 0.01$), be satisfied with the rights for forest use ($p < 0.01$), have participated in capacity building ($p < 0.01$), and not be economically affected by the conservation measure of the forest ($p = 0.03$). Among the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, gender ($p < 0.01$), age ($p < 0.01$), and education level ($p < 0.01$) were associated with a favorable attitude toward the forest conservation. For this parameter, 68% of the female respondents were willing to support the forest conservation project, while only 45% of the male respondents supported the PFM system. This could be explained by the fact that women perceived the forest as less important than men, since women see the forest mainly as a source of raw material for handicrafts and consumption, while men see the forest as an important source of their livelihood. In addition, men use the forest resources for income generation, including carpentry, and house construction. Aside from gender, age and the education level of the local people were associated with their supportive attitude toward the forest conservation project. Land ownership was also found to be associated with a positive attitude toward the forest conservation project ($p < 0.01$), and residents that owned more land (3 to 4 ha) had a more favorable perception of the project than those who owned less.

Table 7. Logistic regression analysis of the relationship between demographic and socio economic factors and willingness to participate in the management of Chilimo-Gaji PFM system

Variable	B	SE	Wald	df	p
<i>Kebele</i>	-	-	11.231	5	0.02
Age (>61)	1.765	0.376	28.423	2	<0.01
Gender (female)	0.306	0.265	12.62	1	<0.
Education(above primary)	2.01	0.435	16.00	1	0.01
Family size	1.987	0.651	8.620	2	0.05
Cash income	0.206	0.567	0.351	1	0.43
Wealth stratum	-	-	7.061	1	0.03
Land tenure condition	1.086	0.376	9.082	1	0.02
Perception of forest significance	0.767	0.456	11.230	1	<0.01
Use of forest resource	0.891	0.208	6.789	1	<0.01
PFM associated benefits	0.356	0.192	1.609	1	<0.01
Constant	1.871	1.208	1.861	1.762	3.821
Correction prediction	91.6%				
LR Test	13.78				

The logistic regression results (Table 7) showed that apart from income, all other demographic and socio economic characteristics of the households did not significantly influence their decisions to participate in the management of Chilimo-Gaji PFM system. The results show that the model predictions are correct 91.60% of the time indicating that the explanatory variables can be used to specify the dependent variable, in discrete terms (1,0), with a high degree of accuracy. However, Odds ratios for these variables indicate little change in the likelihood of participation in forest management.

4.9. Conclusions and Policy Implications

This study provided an insight into the perceptions of local communities about the existing management models in the Chilimo-Gaji forest. This study attempted to explore how the socioeconomic factors, the perception regarding the forest and the forest resources, and the reception of benefits can influence the attitude and the perceptions of the local people toward forest management practices. The difference of perception is first determined by the dependency on the forest resources and then by the reception or not of individual benefit from the project. Most of the respondents were aware of the conservation of Chilimo-Gaji forest, and more than half agreed with the necessity for conserving the forest; however, being well aware of and in agreement with the necessity of conserving the forest did not necessarily generate a positive attitude towards the forest conservation

project. It is clear that the benefits from the project are lopsidedly distributed, and that this inequality is recognized by the local people and influences their perception of and attitude towards the PFM system. Since two decades, the people-centered management approach has been emphasized in several forest conservation policies and projects in most of the tropical countries, and yet due to differences in abilities, attitudes and perceptions of the forest community, securing active and equitable participation from all social layers remains a challenge for all forest conservation projects. As such to the extent possible, planners and managers must ensure fair and equitable distribution of benefits of a forest and forest conservation system in order to succeed. New forest management systems may need to be sought to provide information about all relevant aspects in appropriate forms to raise awareness and support the capacities of forest dependent communities to participate before any consultations start. In order to be truly democratic and participative, the forest FCs should reflect the social diversity within groups and represent the interests of all users.

Acknowledgements

My heartfelt thanks go to everyone who brought their contributions to this paper, and for kindly sharing ideas, comments, and suggestions. I am grateful to the local community members' for taking of their time to attend the meetings and going out of the way to provide information.

References

- Abiy, G. 2006. First round evaluation report of Agama PFM cooperative. Project evaluation report submitted to Farm-Africa and Gimbo agricultural development office. Unpublished manuscript.
- Wily LA. 2002. Participatory Forestry Management in Africa. An overview of Progress and Issues. Community-Based Natural Resource Management Net.
- World Bank. 2004. Sustaining Forests, A Development Strategy. Washington D.C: World Bank Ltd.
- Abrar, J. M., and M. Inoue. 2012. "Drawbacks of Decentralized Natural Resource Management: Experience from Chilimo Participatory Forest Management Project, Ethiopia." *The Japanese Forest Society* 17: 30–36.
- Anderson J, Benjamin C, Campell B, Tiveau D (2006). Forests, poverty and equity in Africa: new perspectives on policy and practice. *Int. For. Rev.* 8(1):44-53
- USAID (2006). Issues in Poverty Reduction and Natural Resource Management. United States Agency for International Development, Washington, DC
- Holmes C (2007). Linking Livelihoods, Land Stewardship, and Resource Conservation in the Antongil Bay Landscape, Madagascar. In *Protected areas and human livelihoods*, edit., Redford and Fearn Eva. WCS Working Paper. 32
- World Bank (2000). *World Development Report: Attacking Poverty*. World Bank, Washington DC.
- Adams W, Hulme D (2001). Conservation and community. In Hulme, David and Murphree, Marshall (eds). *African Wildlife and Livelihoods*. Oxford: James Currey Limited.
- Agrawal A, Gibson C (1999). Enchantment and disenchantment: The role of community in natural resource conservation. *World Dev.* 27(4):629-649.
- Alison O, Beth A, Kaplin A (2005). A framework for understanding community resident perceptions of Masoala National Park, Madagascar. *Found. Environ. Conserv.* 32(2):156–164. doi: 10.1017/S0376892905002146
- Anderson J, Benjamin C, Campell B, Tiveau D (2006). Forests, poverty and equity in Africa: new perspectives on policy and practice. *Int. For. Rev.* 8(1):44-53
- Blomley T, Ramadhani H. 2006. Going to Scale with Participatory Forest Management: Early Lessons from Tanzania. *International Review Volume* 8 (1): 93-100.
- Abrar, J. M., and M. Inoue. 2013. "Exploring Decentralized Forest Management in Ethiopia Using Actor-Power-Accountability Framework: Case Study in West Shoa Zone." *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 15: 807–825. doi:10.1007/s10668-012-9407-z.
- Adams, Williams, and Hulme, David. 2001. "Conservation and community." In Hulme, David and Murphree, Marshall (eds). *African Wildlife and Livelihoods*. Oxford: James Currey Limited.
- Agrawal A, Ostrom E (2001). Collective Action, Property Rights, and Decentralization in Resource Use in India and Nepal, *J. Polit. Soc.*, 29: 4 December 2001 485-514. [Assessed October 2009].
- Agrawal A, Ribot J (2000) Analyzing Decentralization: A Framewrok with South Asian and East African Cases; Environmental Governance in Africa Working paper Series World Resources Institute. Washington DC, www.wri.org [accessed 7th January 2010].
- Agrawal, A. 2001. "Common Property Institutions and Sustainable Governance of Resources." *World Development* 29: 1649–1672. doi:10.1016/S0305-750X(01)00063-8. Agrawal, A., and J. Ribot. 1999. "Accountability in Decentralization: A Framework with South Asian and West African Environmental Cases." *Journal of Development Areas* 33: 473–502.

- Agrawal, Arun, and Gibson, Clark. 1999. "Enchantment and disenchantment: The role of community in natural resource conservation." *World Development* 27(4):629-649.
- Aklilu, A. 2011. Performance of old PFM sites in Adaba-Dodola, Chilmo, Borana and Bonga sites. Project evaluation report submitted to Farm-Africa/SOS Sahel, Addis Ababa. Unpublished manuscript.
- AldenWily, L. 2011. "'The Law is to Blame': The Vulnerable Status of Common Property Rights in Sub-Saharan Africa." *Development and Change* 42 (3): 733–757. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7660.2011.01712.x.
- Alemayehu N. Ayana, Nathalie Vandenebeele & Bas Arts (2015) Performance of participatory forest management in Ethiopia: institutional arrangement versus local practices, *Critical Policy Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/19460171.2015.1024703
- Alemayehu, N. A., and K. F. Wiersum. 2006. "Community Perspective on Participatory Forest Management. The Case of Chilimo Participatory Forest Management Scheme in Ethiopia." *Ethiopian Journal of Natural Resources* 8 (1): 57–75.
- Alemayehu, N. A., B. Arts, and K. F. Wiersum. 2013. "Historical Development of Forest Policy in Ethiopia: Trends of Institutionalization and Deinstitutionalization." *Land Use Policy* 32: 186– 196. doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2012.10.008.
- Anderies, J. M., M. A. Janssen, and E. Ostrom. 2004. "A Framework to Analyze the Robustness of Social-Ecological Systems from an Institutional Perspective." *Ecology and Society* 9 (1): 18.
- Anderson J, Benjamin C, Campell B, Tiveau D (2006). Forests, poverty and equity in Africa: new perspectives on policy and practice. *Int. For. Rev.* 8(1):44-53
- Arts, B., and M. Buizer. 2009. "Forests, Discourses, Institutions: A Discursive-Institutional Analysis of Global Forest Governance." *Journal of Forest Policy and Economics* 11: 340–347. doi:10.1016/j.forpol.2008.10.004.
- Arts, B., and P. Leroy, eds. 2006. *Institutional Dynamics in Environmental Governance*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Arts, B., J. Behagel, S. Van Bommel, J. De Koning, and E. Turnhout, eds. 2013. *Forest and Nature Governance: A Practice Based Approach*. Dordrecht: Springer Science+BusinessMedia
- Bauer, Hans. 2003. "Local perceptions of Waza National Park, northern Cameroon." *Environmental Conservation* 30(2):175–181
- Bauer, Hans. 2003. "Local perceptions of Waza National Park, northern Cameroon." *Environmental Conservation* 30(2):175–181
- Behagel, J. 2012. "The Politics of Democratic Governance: The Implementation of the Water Framework Directive in the Netherlands." Unpublished doctoral diss., Wageningen University, Wageningen.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bradstock, A., I. Hovland, H. Altshul, S. Crafter, B. Irwin, B. Kaberia, G. Odhiambo, T. Zelalem, and J. Sultan. 2007. "From Grassroots to Government. Farm-Africa's experiences influencing policy in sub-Saharan Africa." Policy and research series No. 5. London: Farm-Africa and the Overseas Development Institute (ODI).
- Cleaver, F. 2002. "Reinventing Institutions: Bricolage and the Social Embeddedness of Natural Resource Management." *The European Journal of Development Research* 14 (2): 11–30. doi:10.1080/714000425.
- Dambala, G., and S. Koch. 2012. *Welfare and Common Property Rights Forestry: Evidence from Ethiopian Villages*. Working Paper 277. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Drijver, and B. Venema, 229–242. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons. Winberg, E. 2010. *Participatory Forest Management in Ethiopia, Practices and Experiences*. Addis Ababa: Food and Agriculture Organization, Subregional office for Eastern Africa (SFE). <http://www.fao.org/forestry/24514043adbe564e803444b40d3e18987b434d.pdf>.
- DSW. 2012. "The Integrated Bonga Forest Project." Accessed August 16, 2015. <http://www.dswonline.org/bong>
- Farm-Africa. 2004. *Participatory Forest Management Agreement*. Bonga Integrated Participatory Forest Management and Reproductive Health Project. Bonga, Ethiopia. Unpublished manuscript.
- Fashing, Peter, Forrestel, Alison, Scully, Christina, and Cords, Marina. 2004. "Long-term tree population dynamics for the conservation of the Kakamega forest, Kenya." *Biodiversity and Conservation* 13(4): 753-771.
- Ferraro, Paul. 2002. "The local costs of establishing protected areas in lowincome nations: Ranomafana national park, Madagascar." *Ecological Economics* 43: 261-275
- Ferraro, Paul. 2002. "The local costs of establishing protected areas in lowincome nations: Ranomafana national park, Madagascar." *Ecological Economics* 43: 261-275.
- GautamAP & Shivakoti GP. 2008. Evolution, impacts and challenges of community-based forestry in Nepal. In Webb EL & Shivakoti GP (Eds.) *Decentralization, Forests and Rural Communities. Policy Outcomes in South and Southeast Asia*. Sage, New Delhi.

- Ghate R& MehraD. 2008. Integrating informal with formal forest management institutions for sustainable collective action in India. In Webb EL & Shivakoti GP (Eds.) *Decentralization, Forests and Rural Communities. Policy Outcomes in South and Southeast Asia*. Sage, New Delhi.
- Gibson, C. 1999. *Politicians and Poachers: The Political Economy of Wildlife Policy in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giddens, A. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hardin, G. 1968. "The Tragedy of the Commons." *Science* 162: 1243–1248. doi:10.1126/science.162.3859.1243.
- IDRC (2009). The International Development Research Centre. <http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-56615-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html>. 16.04.2009.
- Kinyanjui, J.M. 2001. *Baseline Data on Permanent Sample Plots and Preliminary Volume Equations for Four Common Timber Species in Selected Forest Blocks of Transmara District*. Eldoret, Moi University. (M.Phil thesis.)
- Kubo, H. 2010. "Understanding Discretionary Decision Making of Frontline Bureaucrats in State Forestland Management: A Case from Java, Indonesia." *Society & Natural Resources* 23 (3): 240–253.
- Latour, B. 2005. *Reassembling the Social – An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Li, T. M. 2007. "Practices of Assemblage and Community Forest Management." *Economy and Society* 36: 263–293. doi:10.1080/03085140701254308.
- Likert, R. 1974. A method of constructing an attitude scale. In: *Scaling: A sourcebook for behavioral scientists*, ed. G.M. Maranell, pp. 233–43. Chicago, USA: Aldine publishing Company.
- March, J. G., and J. P. Olsen. 1989. *Rediscovering Institutions*. New York: Free Press.
- Mosse, D. 2004. "Is Good Policy Unimplementable? Reflections on the Ethnography of Aid Policy and
- Nelson, F., ed. 2010. *Community Rights, Conservation and Contested Land: The Politics of Natural Resource Governance in Africa*. London: Earthscan.
- Nuijten, M. 2005. "Power in Practice: A Force Field Approach to Natural Resource Management." *The Journal of Transdisciplinary Environmental Studies* 4 (2): 1–14.
- Ostrom, E. 1990. *Governing the Commons. The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ongugo, P.O., Mbuvi, M.T.E., Maua, J.O., Koech, C.K. & Othim, R.A. 2007. *Emerging Community Institutions for PFM Process Implementation in Kenya*. A paper presented to the 3rd International PFM Conference. Addis Ababa. Ethiopia
- Ongugo, P (2007) *Participatory Forest Management in Kenya: Is there something for the poor*.
- Ongugo, P, E. Obonyo, J. Mogoi and V. Oeba (2008) *Examining the roles of community forest Associations (CFAs) in the Decentralization process of Kenyan Forests*. England.
- Ostrom, E. 1999. "Institutional Analysis, Design Principles, and Threats to Sustainable Community Governance and Management of Commons." In *Law and the Governance of Renewable Resources: Studies from Northern Europe and Africa*, edited by E. Berge and N. S. Christian, 27–59. Oakland: CS Press.
- Ostrom, E. 2009. "A General Framework for Analyzing Sustainability of Social-Ecological Systems." *Science* 325: 419–422. doi:10.1126/science.1172133.
- Ostrom, E., J. Burger, C. Field, R. Norgaard, and D. Policansky. 1999. "Revisiting the Commons: Local lessons, Global Challenges." *Science* 284: 278–282. doi:10.1126/science.284.5412.278.
- Ostrom, E. 1999. *Self Governance and Forest Resources*. Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) Discussion paper No. 20
- Pankhurst, A., and D. Freeman. 2001. "Conclusion II: Change and Development: Lessons from the Twentieth Century." In *Living on the Edge: Marginalised Minorities of Craft Workers and Hunters in Southern Ethiopia*, edited by D. Freeman and A. Pankhurst. Addis Ababa: AAU Department of Sociology and Social Administration.
- Practice." *Development and Change* 35 (4): 639–671. doi:10.1111/j.0012-155X.2004.00374.x.
- Mulugeta, L., and T. Zelalem. 2011. "History and Experiences of PFM in Ethiopia: Capturing Lessons Learnt and Identifying Gap." Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture NRDM – Natural Resources – Participatory Forest Management Up Scaling, Addis Ababa. Unpublished report (available through the author).
- Quinn, H. C., M. Huby, H. Kiwasila, and J. C. Lovett. 2007. "Design Principles and Common Pool Resource Management: An Institutional Approach to Evaluating Community Managements in Semi-Arid Tanzania." *Journal of Environmental Management* 84: 100–113.
- Reckwitz, A. 2002. "Toward A Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5 (2): 243–263. doi:10.1177/13684310222225432.
- Salomao A & F Matose (2007). *Towards communitybased forest management in Mozambique: can this make a difference? – Community-based natural resources management of Miombo woodlands in Mozambique. Miombo woodland: Policies and Incentives*. 36 p. CIFOR, Harare, Zimbabwe.

- Schatzki, T. 2002. *The Site of the Social. A Philosophical Account of the Constitution of Social Life and Change*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Schatzki, T. 2013. "Where the Action Is – On Large Social Phenomena." Paper presented on June 3, Wageningen University, Wageningen.
- Schatzki, T., K. Knorr-Cetina, and E. von Savigny, eds. 2001. *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Scott, D., & Willits, F. K. 1994. Environmental attitudes and behaviour: A Pennsylvania survey. *Environment & Behaviour*, 26, 239-260.
- Shove, E., M. Pantzar, and M. Watson. 2012. *The Dynamics of Social Practices. Everyday Life and How it Changes*. London: SAGE.
- Stellmacher, T. 2007. *Governing the Ethiopian Coffee Forests: A Local Level Institutional Analysis in Kaffa and Bale Mountains*. Bonn: Institut für Lebensmittel- und Ressourcenökonomik (ILR).
- Stellmacher, T. 2013. *Local Forest Governance in Ethiopia: Between Legal Pluralism and Livelihood Realities*. ZEF Working Paper 110, Bonn: Center for Development Research.
- Stellmacher, T., and P. Mollinga. 2009. "The Institutional Sphere of Coffee Forest Management in Ethiopia: Local Level Findings from Koma Forest, Kaffa Zone." *International Journal of Social Forestry* 2 (1): 43–66.
- Takahashi, R., and Y. Todo. 2012. "Impact of Community-Based Forest Management on Forest Protection: Evidence from an Aid-Funded Project in Ethiopia." *Environmental Management* 50: 396–404.
- Tsegaye, G., B. Melaku, L. Mulugeta, and K. Habtemariam. 2009. "Participatory Forest Management and Its Impacts on Livelihoods and Forest Status: The Case of Bonga Forest in Ethiopia." *International Forestry Review* 11 (3): 346–358. doi:10.1505/ifor.11.3.346.
- Van Bommel, S., and M. van der Zouwen. 2013. "Creating Scientific Narratives: Experiences in Constructing and Interweaving Empirical and Theoretical Plots." In *Forest and Nature Governance: A Practice-Based Approach*, edited by B. Arts, et al. Dordrecht: Springer Science +Business Media.
- Van der Arend, S., and J. Behagel. 2011. "What Participants Do: A Practice Based Approach to Public Participation in Two Policy Fields." *Critical Policy Studies* 5 (2): 169–186. doi:10.1080/19460171.2011.576529.
- Van Tatenhove, J., B. Arts, and P. Leroy, eds. 2000. *Political Modernization and the Environment. The Renewal of Policy Arrangements*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Vandenabeele, N. 2012. "A Case Study of Local Practices of a Participatory Forest Management Project in Kaffa, Ethiopia. Self-formation between Principle and Practice." Unpublished master's thesis, Ghent University and Wageningen University
- White, Andy and Martin, Alejandra. 2002. *Who Owns World's Forests? Forest Tenure and Public Forests in Transition*. Washington D.C.: Forests Trends and Center for International Environmental Law.
- Wiersum, K. F., and B. E. Lekanne. 1995. "The Forestry Agent at the Interface between Local-Level Environmental Management and External Policies: Reflections on Forestry Interventions in the Sahel." In *Local Resource Management in Africa*, edited by J. P. M. Van den Breemer, C.
- Wiggins, Steve, Marfo, Kofi, and Anchirinah, Vincent. 2004. "Protecting the Forest or the People? Environmental Policies and Livelihoods in the Forest Margins of Southern Ghana." *World Development* 32(11):1939-1955.
- Wily, L.A. 2000. Forest laws in eastern and southern Africa: Moving towards a community forest future? *Unasylva*, 203: 19-26.
- Wollenberg, E., L. Merino, A. Agrawal, and E. Ostrom. 2007. "Fourteen Years of Monitoring Community-Managed Forests: Learning from IFRI's Experience." *International Forestry Review* 9 (2): 670–684. doi:10.1505/ifor.9.2.670.
- Yemiru, T. 2011. "Participatory Forest Management for Sustainable Livelihoods in the Bale Mountains, Southern Ethiopia." Unpublished PhD thesis, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala.
- Yihenew, Z. 2002. "Access to Forest Resources and Forest-based Livelihoods in Highland Kafa, Ethiopia: A Resource Management Perspective." Unpublished doctoral diss., University of Huddersfield.